2021

Applying the Present to the Past: The Experiences of Five Civil Rights Rabbis in Context of Contemporary Leadership Theory

Bradley G. Levenberg
Antioch University - PhD Program in Leadership and Change

APPLYING THE PRESENT TO THE PAST:

THE EXPERIENCES OF FIVE CIVIL RIGHTS RABBIS IN CONTEXT OF

CONTEMPORARY LEADERSHIP THEORY

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the

Graduate School of Leadership & Change

Antioch University

In partial fulfillment for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

by

Bradley G. Levenberg

ORCID Scholar No. 0000-0001-9727-6596

May 2021

APPLYING THE PRESENT TO THE PAST:

THE EXPERIENCES OF FIVE CIVIL RIGHTS RABBIS IN CONTEXT OF

CONTEMPORARY LEADERSHIP THEORY

This dissertation, by Bradley G. Levenberg, has
been approved by the committee members signed below
who recommend that it be accepted by the faculty of the
Graduate School in Leadership & Change
Antioch University
in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dissertation Committee:

S. Aqeel Tirmizi, PhD, Chairperson

Donna Ladkin, PhD, Committee Member

Rabbi Samuel K. Joseph, PhD, External Reader

ABSTRACT

APPLYING THE PRESENT TO THE PAST:

THE EXPERIENCES OF FIVE CIVIL RIGHTS RABBIS IN CONTEXT OF

CONTEMPORARY LEADERSHIP THEORY

Bradley G. Levenberg

Graduate School of Leadership & Change

Antioch University

Yellow Springs, OH

This dissertation examines the experiences of five civil rights-era rabbis (William Silverman, Randall Falk, Alfred Goodman, Irving Bloom, and Burton Padoll) to highlight their contributions, leadership approaches, struggles, and achievements with a particular emphasis on social justice. As each of the rabbis drew from their understanding of the richness of the Jewish textual canon, the study includes a survey of Biblical, Talmudic, and contemporary Jewish sources that laid the groundwork for their rabbinic activism and which compel rabbis today. The study dramatically highlights those texts as providing applicable strategies with regard to leading a congregation with a "prophetic" voice, knowing when to speak out, and how to do so, strategies that inspired—and inspire—rabbis to engage in work intended to make their communities more just and equitable. Each of the five rabbis featured in the dissertation produced vast amounts of correspondence, sermonic materials, and other writings, making archival research a particularly useful methodology to explore the volumes of primary sources and provide insight into the individual and collective experiences of these rabbis. Particular attention is further paid to context as a means of highlighting and distinguishing the choices that

these rabbis made as leaders of and within their communities. The dissertation contributes to the leadership legacy of these rabbis by contributing new and relevant materials to scholarship around the civil rights movement, the American Jewish experience, and the intersection of the two. Four contemporary leadership theories are highlighted through their experiences (Transformational Leadership Theory, Servant Leadership Theory, Relational Leadership Theory, and Courageous Leadership Theory), which, in turn, makes current scholarship in the field of leadership and change accessible to clergy. Additional theories of leadership are also explored through these exemplars, as is the introduction of a composite theory of leadership based upon the shared experiences of these rabbis. This dissertation is available in open access at AURA: Antioch University Repository and Archive, https://aura.antioch.edu/ and OhioLINK ETD Center, https://etd.ohiolink.edu/.

Keywords: archival research, civil rights, leadership, leadership theory, rabbi, social justice, South, synagogue

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

I first began thinking about this study in 2018 when I completed the first writing assignment associated with the Antioch University PhD in Leadership and Change program. The essay was to be a reflective essay on the topic of my leadership journey, and I was to consider key points and figures which had the greatest impact. As a congregational rabbi, I naturally turned to other congregational rabbis, mentors of mine, and applied intentionality to the lessons I had learned from each. My lens for the consideration of each of those that I identified was directly connected to skill acquisition: the rabbi from whom I learned the importance of pastoral visits, the rabbi from whom I learned the importance of congregational budgets (and how those budgets impact mission or, ideally, how the mission should impact the budget), and the rabbi from whom I learned the importance of hard skills such as proficiency in Hebrew, comfort with public speaking, and masterful control of a classroom setting. One of the rabbis that I considered, Rabbi Mark N. Goldman, was included solely (or so I thought) because he was quite charismatic and because I learned from him the importance of personality and charm to the congregational rabbinate.

As I explored my memories of time spent watching and learning from Rabbi Goldman, I realized that his impact on my life was much greater than I had imagined. Not only was he the rabbi of my formative years, advising me spiritually from elementary school through college, but he was also the rabbi whom I first observed with a passion for social justice.

Rabbi Goldman's bona fides in social justice work were well known in my synagogue community. He was a U.S. Army Chaplain from 1967–1969, during which time he created and helmed a program where fellow soldiers, wherever he was stationed, would begin and complete building projects (housing and schools) for underserved communities. He served as Assistant

Rabbi for three years at Temple Emanu-El in New York City, where he started the Emanu-El soup kitchen aptly named Project Isaiah: Feed the hungry (https://templebetyam.org/our-clergy-3/). He continued his rabbinate at Temple Sinai of Long Island (1972–1986) where he championed civil rights and Black-Jewish relations. He moved to Cincinnati in 1986 to serve as my rabbi at Rockdale Temple. It was in Cincinnati that he served on the founding board of Caracole House, an organization that provides affordable housing and case management for those living with HIV, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, and where he was the president of the Race Relations Council of Greater Cincinnati, receiving the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Spirit Award in 2004 (https://www.rockdaletemple.org/our-clergy.html). He spoke often about civil rights from the pulpit and fought hard-won battles with his congregational leadership to expand the scope of social justice programming for which, under his leadership, the synagogue became known. Yet there was precious little written about him, about his story, and about his motivations. I began to wonder as to why that was the case, why so many members of the clergy whose work intersected with social justice issues had articles and biographies written about them but that my own rabbi was invisible to the historical record, his accomplishments celebrated on a much humbler scale. I put the question on hold as I continued my scholastic pursuits through the academic program.

Several months later, I was given another writing assignment, to demonstrate "familiarity with and an understanding of leadership theories, concepts, and themes and apply them to an area of the student's social system or professional interest" (https://gslc.antioch.edu/mod5-nol/). Living and working as clergy in Atlanta, I have found myself inspired by the local lore and legacy of the civil rights movement. Thus, I chose to compose a paper in which I explored leadership theory as exemplified by rabbis in the civil rights movement. I chose as my symbolic

exemplars three rabbis about whom much has been written—Rabbi Jack Rothschild (Atlanta, Georgia), Rabbi Milton Graftman (Birmingham, Alabama), and Rabbi Perry Nussbaum (Jackson, Mississippi)—and immersed myself in the articles and books at my disposal. While each of these rabbis was quite well known during their lifetimes, leading to a trove of newspaper articles about their work and accomplishments—articles known within the methodology of archival research as secondary source documents, or sources created by individuals who were not direct participants in an event (Gaillet, 2012)—I found myself drawn during my research to texts that highlighted primary source documents such as journals, letters, sermons, diaries, congregational minutes, videos, and photographs—essentially, records of events as they are usually described, usually by people involved with the event (Gaillet, 2012). It seemed to me that several of the more scholarly pieces were written by authors who combed through archives in order to tell the stories of these rabbis, or at least to add chapters to stories that were already well documented.

Recalling my previous lament about the work of Rabbi Goldman and my disappointment that so little was written about his life and legacy, I began to wonder similarly about the accomplishments of other civil rights-era rabbis whose stories have yet to be recorded. What were their struggles and their victories? What compelled them to lead their communities into controversy when it would have been much more convenient and much safer had they avoided race relations during the active years of the civil rights moment? What leadership qualities and traits did they possess, and what strategies did they employ, when leading their communities through change? It was this inquiry that I felt would be scholastically relevant to leadership and change.

Purpose of the Study

A clear set of research questions began to emerge. In an era when congregational rabbis often struggle with how and when to speak up and speak out, how might the experiences of these civil rights-era rabbis inform their choices? How might the dissertation contribute to the legacy of the rabbinic exemplars? What lessons can we glean regarding the role of context—especially position in history and community—that might be useful for congregational rabbis today as they apply the principles of leadership theory to their practice?

I wondered: Were we to mine their stories and unpack the richness of several pointed episodes, might the experiences of civil rights-era rabbis be used by rabbis today to better understand principles found in leadership theory, particularly servant, transformational, relational and courageous leadership theories—all theories which lend themselves easily to current congregational rabbinic leadership roles? Are there other theories of leadership that might be better understood by considering their examples?

As these theories, in the manner in which they are understood today, were unknown in the timeframe that these rabbis engaged in civil rights activism, one must question whether it is appropriate to retroactively apply the principles of contemporary leadership theory on exemplars of the past. In my research, I have become acquainted with a precedent body of work that utilizes the actions of individuals to highlight theories about which they could not have possibly been familiar. Author Carole Balin (2000), for example, explores contemporary feminist theory through the lens of five Jewish women writers in Tsarist Russia. Though the five writers Balin covers in her seminal text were not familiar with late-twentieth-century American feminist theory, Balin is able to provoke the reader to consider that, though without a proper name, the ideas captured by American feminist theory were alive and well in the actions of these

individuals. Michelle Alexander (2012) and Isabel Wilkerson (2010) understand the mass exodus of African Americans following the Civil War using current theories around the plight of refugees, adding a contemporary vocabulary in an effort to contextualize, explain, and lead to new understandings (for a new audience) about the migration of Black citizens from the South. Rebecca Skloot (2011) uses the story of Henrietta Lacks to help a new generation understand the concepts of systemic racism and scientific classism, ideas that did not have a name when Henrietta Lacks was subject to them. These examples made me wonder.

This dissertation also adds to the growing collection of symbolic examples by using the experiences of five civil rights-era rabbis as a way to better understand contemporary leadership theories. Like Bauman (2019), I define the civil rights era as the 1950s and 1960s. While there are those who would advocate classifying as "civil rights-era rabbis" those who were engaged in extending civil rights to all marginalized groups, including those with challenges of accessibility (Pogge & Rimmer, 2010), economic insecurity (Ehrenreich, 2001), and the Hispanic community (Behnken, 2016), for the interest of this study, I chose to restrict my subjects to those involved with the race relations movement in the United States (Carson, 1991).

Finally, in applying contemporary leadership theory to civil rights era rabbis, this study makes current scholarship in the field of leadership and change accessible to clergy, focusing on applicable strategies with regard to leading a congregation with a "prophetic" voice (Heifetz & Laurie, 1999; Schedlitzki & Edwards, 2014; Sinclair, 2007), knowing when to speak out and how to do so (Aktas et al., 2017; Ladkin, 2015), and how to address immunity to change (Kegan & Lahey, 2009). I elected to devote attention to each of the following rabbis: Rabbi William Silverman (Nashville, Tennessee), Rabbi Randall Falk (Nashville, Tennessee), Rabbi Alfred Goodman (Columbus, Georgia), Rabbi Irving Bloom (Mobile, Alabama), and Rabbi Burton

Padoll (Charleston, South Carolina). This dissertation contributes original research to the field by

incorporating primary source documents and secondary source material to convey stories that

had yet to be sufficiently explored (or explored at all) in an academic context.

Why Civil Rights-Era Reform Rabbis?

The Central Conference of American Rabbi (CCAR) approved a resolution in 1982 that

helps to frame this dissertation. The resolution reads

> The CCAR reaffirms its historic commitment to the advancement of civil rights in our
> nation. Executive orders, congressional legislation, and Supreme Court Decisions over
> the past several decades reflected our national will to achieve equal opportunity in
> employment, housing, education, and voting rights. We hail this national purpose as one
> of history's momentous undertakings, while recognizing that such fundamental changes
> in the social and political structures of a nation are not easily or quickly achieved.
> Nevertheless, the last vestiges of slavery and discrimination must be rooted out by a
> determined national consciousness. (Resolution Adopted by the CCAR: Erosion of Civil
> Liberties, 1982)

Much has been written about the time when a movement came into being whose goal was

to free African Americans from discrimination and racism (Aimin, 2002; Carson, 1991; Baldwin,

2002; Branch, 1998; Cook, 1998; Dittmer, 1994; Fairclough, 2001; Farmer, 1985; Greenberg,

1994; King, 1969). Though the Black community was the prime architect of this moment that

was founded on religion, faith, and hope (Boyd, 2004; Gottheimer, 2003; Graetz, 1998; Phillips,

1998; Young, 2016), the battle for freedom would have taken longer—and been even more

torturous—if not for the participation of people who were not Black and who put their own lives

on the line to help African Americans. The additional participation of middle-class Whites,

especially ministers, priests, and rabbis, in the civil rights demonstrations helped the movement

gain attention that was needed to pass the landmark civil rights legislation of 1964 and 1965

(Lewis, 2015).

"For much of its history, the Reform movement of Judaism in the United States has been a strong advocate for the rights of others" (Sussman, 2002, p. 9). Using the prophetic model of representing truth to those in positions of power, the Reform movement forcefully used its commitment to social justice to advocate for civil rights (Bauman, 1997; Bauman, 2019; Krause, 2016; Limmer & Pesner, 2019; Rose et al., 2008; Schneier, 199; Schulweis, 2008; Schwartz, 2006; Sidman, 2014; Vorspan & Saperstein, 1998; Weiss & Weinberger, 2019). In fact, in the 1950s, Reform rabbis led their congregations toward a more activism-centered approach to Jewish practice (Sussman, 2002). Through the snapshot of the civil rights movement, students of history can learn contemporary lessons as to how religious leaders can draw upon religious tradition and apply secular leadership theory to best inform their practice of dealing with current challenges and opportunities.

Scope: Geographical Boundary

As the civil rights movement engaged rabbis regardless of geographical boundaries, some explanation as to why I adopted a more intense focus on southern rabbis is justified. First and foremost, a project of this magnitude requires a reduction in scope. Further, Supreme Court decisions relating to the civil rights movement after 1954 affected the South disproportionately, for in the South, prejudice against African Americans was entrenched in the legal system, leading to the U.S. Supreme Court singling out the region for attention (Krause, 2016; Wax, 1959).

Considering the unique climate in the South during the civil rights era (Litwak, 1998), the geographic scope of this dissertation is restricted to rabbis serving that area: Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and South Carolina. According to the 1960 census data, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and South Carolina were among the list of states with the highest percentage of

African American residents that were a part of the Confederacy (Dodd, 1993). These states were also the most dependent upon slave labor during the Antebellum period (Hagy, 1993), an issue that was still a heavy influencer one hundred years after the Civil War (Litwak, 1998).

Scope: Temporal Boundary

In addition to geographic parameters, I set a temporal limit for this study. I chose to focus on rabbis who were serving congregations following the *Brown* decision by the U.S. Supreme Court. In the years following the 1954 court case (*Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*), the region became the focal point on integrationist activity and pro-segregationist response (Lewis, 2015; McWhorter, 2001). While some communities felt an immediate impact (Litwak, 1998; McWhorter, 2001), there were other communities in the South where the impact was not felt until the 1960s (McAdam, 1998). Yet from the 1950s on, a sense of unease permeated the minds of Black and White citizens. In order to reduce the challenge that may naturally arise to the dissertation were the rabbinic subjects diverse in their years of service, the rabbis featured in this dissertation were each Reform rabbis serving between 1954 and 1968.

Scope: Why These Rabbis?

I chose to include the rabbis studied in this dissertation because, despite their achievements with regard to the struggle for civil rights as a part of the movement of the 1950s and 1960s, there is precious little written about them. Thus, what is written here is chiefly gathered from primary source documents and contributes to the field of leadership theory, as well as adding to the volumes collected reflecting unique stories during the civil rights movement.

The rabbis in this study have some commonalities, which further lend to an easier comparison. All were born between 1913 and 1931, a span of only 19 years. At the time of the

pivotal *Brown* decision, the rabbis ranged from 22 to 41 years of age. These were individuals who were in the prime of their careers, all with foundational experiences behind them and a healthy career ahead of them; not one of these rabbis could be dismissed as "inexperienced" or as a "lame duck" or as one who was "waiting out the twilight of a career." Each of these rabbis was born in the United States, each attended the same Rabbinical Seminary (Hebrew Union College), and each obtained college degrees. These rabbis all served as military chaplains. The overlap in demographic data is helpful in drawing comparisons and highlighting contradictions which feature in the conclusion of the dissertation.

While there exists an array of literature detailing the experiences of specific rabbis who were active in the civil rights movement (Bauman & Kalin, 1997; Blumberg, 1985; Moses, 2018; Rose, 2003; Salzman & West, 1997; Strober & Strober, 2019), to date, precious little has been authored about the rabbis in this dissertation, despite their activity with the civil rights movement. Consider the following:

- Rabbi Irv Bloom organized the first ministerial organization that was interethnic in his community. The work of this organization led to a less turbulent process of integration in Mobile.

- Rabbi Burt Padoll challenged his congregation to be more accepting of African American neighbors, work that led to his dismissal from his pulpit.

- Rabbi Alfred Goodman helped establish the Columbus Council on Human Relations, the first integrated group in the city. He was also an outspoken advocate of equal rights and opportunities for the city's African American citizenry.

- Rabbi Bill Silverman was an outspoken advocate for civil rights in two communities, Nashville and Kansas City. While his experiences were fraught with tension in Nashville, he met more success in Kansas City.

- Rabbi Randall Falk joined sit-ins aimed at integrating restaurants and encouraged his congregation to view the fight for civil rights as an extension of the struggles of the Jewish people. He also participated in and led marches in support of equal rights.

The stories of these rabbis need to be told, for as long as they remain obscure, an entire chapter in the story of the civil rights movement, and the intersection between the Jewish community and civil rights activism, remains missing.

Understanding Social Justice in a Jewish Context

Jewish historical oppression contributed to a cultural stance that questions the values and norms of dominant groups (Bennett, 2002; Levinson, 1998; MacDonald, 1998). Thus, the Jewish response to oppression through the pursuit of social justice is grounded in religious tradition, captured in sacred texts such as the Torah and Books of the Prophets, the Talmud, and liturgy of sabbath and festival services (Galchinsky, 2008; Gottwald, 2016; Limmer & Pesner, 2019; Malchow, 1996). This sentiment often translated into action: in the United States, Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century played an important role in leftist movements, a role exemplifying the development of a social justice ethos connected to lived experiences (Salzman & West, 1997). A more detailed exploration of the importance of social justice to the story of the rabbis studied for this dissertation appears in Chapter 2.

Positionality

The research topic for this dissertation has academic merit given the gap in literature on the rabbis explored for this study, as well as the application of contemporary leadership and change theory to their experiences. It is also a topic that resonates for me personally, for I am a member of the clergy in an affluent suburb of a major city in the South of the United States. I am Jewish and serve one of the largest synagogues in the city, granting me access to experiences and individuals that are denied to others. I have had opportunities to explore the issue of race, and I have mentors and supporters who encourage me to "dig deeper" into racial awareness. Like the rabbis about whom this study focuses, I am a straight, White male, born and raised and working in America, and like each of them, I have attained master's level education in my profession and have attended the same seminary as did each of these rabbis on whom the later chapters of the dissertation focus. I can identify mentors of mine who count these rabbis among their mentors. In fact, one of the rabbis in the study, Rabbi Irv Bloom, was a direct mentor of mine; he hired me for my first congregational employment and was a member of my synagogue until he passed away in January 2020. I was able to officiate at his funeral and provide pastoral care and support to his family.

Additional privileges bias my lens as a researcher. I am enrolled in a terminal degree-granting program at a university of prestige. Though I have competing financial obligations and commitments, I am considered affluent by contemporary standards. I was raised by two parents who remained married throughout my youth. I have had opportunities presented to me as a result of a vast network of supporters, and those opportunities have in turn expanded my network of support and granted me additional opportunities not extended to others.

Dissertation Chapters

Chapter 2 presents the literature that informs this study. The chapter begins by exploring the development of the understanding of social justice within a Jewish context, presenting both ancient and contemporary texts and how they have informed Jewish social activism. The chapter also presents a review of and reflection upon the strengths and deficiencies of contemporary literature as it relates to the story of rabbinic involvement in divisive civil issues. As the dissertation study uses primary sources, the chapter includes several examples of well-written studies that use archival data collection as a methodology. Finally, as the dissertation study applies contemporary leadership theory to the experiences of the rabbis, the chapter also includes a detailed review of the selected leadership theories.

Chapter 3 details the research method for this study. As the dissertation relies heavily upon archival research and the use of primary source documents, the chapter introduces the archival methodology and reviews the strengths and the limitations of that method of inquiry.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the research. This chapter is subdivided so as to allow for a significant study of each of the five rabbis. In addition to representing the struggles and impact of the work of the rabbis, the chapter adds the lens of contemporary leadership theory, thereby making the leadership theory more accessible to clergy currently serving pulpits.

Chapter 5 concludes the dissertation by comparing and contrasting the findings from Chapter 4. Additionally, three questions are presented to help clergy members apply the findings to their own experiences: How might the leadership practices of civil rights-era rabbis relate to leadership scholarship today? What would be the benefits for rabbis in the twenty-first century of having an understanding of the leadership theories presented in the dissertation? What lessons

can we learn from the leadership examples of the rabbis studied in this dissertation that are not covered in current leadership theory?

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This is a study about leadership and social activism as they relate to the role of the congregational rabbi, using the vehicle of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s. The literature reviewed in this chapter begins with an overview of the textual Jewish canon, arguably the source of rabbinic authority in all areas of Jewish life. It then moves into a review of more contemporary sources of Jewish activism. Following the exploration of the contemporary canon is a synthesis of material about rabbinic authority and how and when rabbis choose to engage around issues that may be viewed as divisive. I then present four archival studies which explore rabbis, their stories, and their motivations, exemplifying the contemporary style of rabbinic biographies. As this study explores leadership theory, a review of the literature surrounding applicable theories is also included in this chapter. This final section serves as the stimulus for the development of the direction of this dissertation.

The Traditional Jewish Textual Canon as It Informs Perspectives of Reform Jews Regarding Social Activism

Reform rabbis are charged with upholding the traditional Jewish textual canon. Jewish sacred scripture forms the foundation upon which that canon is based, and among its pages are instructions as to how Jews should live as responsible citizens.

The first human beings, Adam and Eve, dwell peacefully in the Garden of Eden, blissfully unaware of the human potential for violence, xenophobia, and oppression. The reader will most certainly understand that the idealism of the Garden of Eden cannot last, though, and after eating of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, Adam and Eve come to understand the difference between right and wrong. Kicked out of paradise, human beings

encounter a world in which brothers kill brothers (Genesis 4:1–16), a flood almost destroys a humanity that is declared sinful (Genesis 6–8), and people prioritize building a tower over developing human community (Genesis 11:1–9). The stories which follow can be understood to promote the idea of a civil society which cares for all its members, especially those disempowered, disenfranchised, and those without voice. Consider these two additional examples:

- Abraham pleads with God to save the condemned cities of Sodom and Gomorrah by arguing even on behalf of strangers against a perceived injustice (Genesis 18–19);

- Joseph establishes a system for storing and rationing food so that all the peoples of Egypt and surrounding lands will have enough to survive a coming famine. His political power is leveraged to protect all members of his society (Genesis 41:37–57).

As the text continues, the Israelites experience enslavement at the hands of a brutal dictator bent on subjugating others. The Book of Exodus articulates that the Egyptians "set taskmasters over them to oppress them with forced labor" (Exodus 1:11). The Israelites suffered under the oppression of the Egyptians (Exodus 2:23–25) and cried out to God in agony. The central figure of the Bible, God, is portrayed as a deity who cares about the pain of oppression, thus offering the motivation for when God came to deliver the Israelites. The Israelites were thus set free from servitude and rescued from tyranny. This gift of freedom became the basis for the covenant, the central belief of the Jewish people. Thus, the Exodus became the foundation of social justice initiatives throughout the ages amongst the Jewish people.

The priests of Leviticus have many tasks: they mediate the attempts of individuals to draw near to God through worship; they maintain sacred objects, rituals, and texts; and they see the purity in each person (as well as the community as a whole). The laws of Leviticus speak to

the structure of society as a holy society. The Holiness Code (Leviticus 19), for example, is famed for its teaching, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Leviticus 19:18). The scope of this loyalty and affection for neighbors is extended further in Leviticus: "When a stranger resides with you in your land, you shall not wrong him. The stranger who resides with you shall be to you as one of your citizens; you shall love him as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Leviticus 19:33–34). The commitment to social equality received further treatment in Leviticus 25, which describes Sabbatical and Jubilee years. These 7- and 50-year cycles are intended for the physical restoration of the land as well as communal revitalization. All who had fallen into poverty and were separated from their land are restored to their family holdings as liberty is proclaimed, "throughout the land to all its inhabitants" (Leviticus 25:10). The general systems of societal structure, intended to enable fairness and equality, are put into place through a detailed series of rules throughout the Book of Leviticus. As an example, the book commands an incredible 36 times that the people are to remember the stranger residing amongst them.

While ultimately a travelogue of sorts, the Book of Numbers nonetheless focuses on issues of social justice as well. Numbers 30, for example, establishes terms for acceptable testimony in a court of law, ensuring honesty and transparency based upon facts over hearsay in an effort to establish a system of law free of bias. Additionally, fair treatment of captives— whether Israelite or a fighter from a foreign nation—is compelled in Numbers 32.

The final book of the Pentateuch repeats many of the commands regarding social justice as found in earlier texts, occasionally building off of them and reminding the Israelites of the importance of caring for the weak, the elderly, and the marginalized in Israelite society. A communal structure is established in the Book of Deuteronomy so that the needy will find

support; the hungry will find food; and the widow, orphan, and stranger will find caring and

kindness. It is in Deuteronomy that a social justice code is established. Consider the following:

> There shall be no needy among you, for God will bless you. . . . If there is among you a needy person, one of your brethren, do not harden your heart, nor shut your hand, but you shall open your hand to him, and shall surely lend him sufficient for his need. . . . Be careful lest there is a hateful thing in your heart . . . and you look cruelly on your brother, the poor person, and do not give him. Rather you shall surely give him, and you shall not fear giving him, for on account of this, God will bless you . . . for the poor will never cease from the land. For this reason, God commands you, saying: "You shall surely open your hand to your brother, to the poor and needy in your land." (Deuteronomy 15:4–11)

In Deuteronomy, the poor are given gravity, the needy are shown compassion, and the notion of

brotherhood and sisterhood is greatly expanded.

The Torah is filled with commands that prohibit oppressive actions and call for positive

deeds toward the deprived. Several commands are quite specific—Deuteronomy 24:19–22,

Leviticus 19:9–10, and Leviticus 23:22 mandate that farmers leave the gleanings of their field to

the poor; rules related to the Sabbatical and Jubilee years (mentioned above) eliminate the

never-ending cycle of poverty; and the cultic tithe mentioned in Deuteronomy 14:22–27 provides

food for the hungry. There are also a few of the prohibitions that oppose mistreatment in more

general terms, such as Exodus 22:21 and 23:9, which forbid oppressing the sojourner, and

Exodus 22:22, which expands that prohibition to include the widow and the orphan.

Deuteronomy 10:19 even further expands the command regarding the sojourner by converting it

into a positive injunction: the reader is to love the sojourners, not merely refrain from mistreating

them. Leviticus 19:33–34 contains both thoughts and adds that Israel should look upon the

sojourner as one of themselves and love them as much as oneself. Leviticus 24:22 specifies that

sojourners and native-born Israelites are to be governed by one law. Taken together, these

commandments reveal a high ethical sensitivity not only in providing justice for people easily

marginalized but also in calling for equality with (and love toward) them.

The laws in the Torah are similarly specific with regard to forbidding actions that would deprive the poor. Exodus 22:26 discusses pledges and objects used for collateral in loans, insisting that whatever is seized be returned before sundown. One can connect the principle of ethical sensitivity to this commandment as a poor person without a cloak at sundown would have no covering for the night. Deuteronomy expands the law by prohibiting the use of a widow's garment as a pledge (Deuteronomy 24:17) and forbids a creditor from going into a debtor's house to fetch a pledge (Deuteronomy 24:10–11).

The most striking statements about social justice found in the Hebrew Bible occur in the prophetic books. Although there are significant sayings in other books, based upon the results of researching sermons given by rabbis on the topic (http://rac.org), four prophets have been cited with more frequency than others: Amos, Micah, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. In all, the books of Prophets and Writings follow the Prophets as they spoke moral truth to power, holding kings and queens accountable to considerations of right and wrong. While the role of the official, the judge, or the king was to administer society, Judaism has long understood—and even canonized— social criticism (of which Prophecy is considered in Jewish tradition) to be necessary. Activists have long found compelling these words (among others) found in this section of the Hebrew Bible:

- From Isaiah: "Learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression; bring justice to the fatherless, plead the widow's cause" (1:17).
- From Zechariah: "Thus says the Lord of hosts: Render true judgments, show kindness and mercy to one another, do not oppress the widow, the fatherless, the sojourner, or the poor, and let none of you devise evil against another in your heart" (7:9–10).

- From Proverbs: "Open your mouth for the mute, for the rights of all who are destitute. Open your mouth, judge righteously, defend the rights of the poor and needy" (31:8–9).

- From Jeremiah: "Thus says the Lord: Do justice and righteousness, and deliver from the hand of the oppressor him who has been robbed. And do no wrong or violence to the resident alien, the fatherless, and the widow, nor shed innocent blood in this place" (22:3).

- From Micah: "He has told you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, love kindness, and walk humbly with your God" (6:8)?

- From Psalms: "Give justice to the weak and the fatherless; maintain the right of the afflicted and the destitute" (82:3).

- From Amos: "Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness as a mighty stream" (5:24).

The rabbinic sages applied the Hebrew Bible as a foundational text to address the challenges of modern (in their time frame) living (Zlotowitz, 1994). They debated and addressed issues that are still applicable today in all areas of social, theological, and societal relationships and in so doing created a multivolume set called the Talmud. According to Steinsaltz (2009) and Neusner (2003), the Talmud is the primary source of Jewish religious law and theology and, until modernity, was the centerpiece of Jewish cultural life, inspiring Jewish sacred living and behavior. While there is an earlier publication called the Jerusalem Talmud, in most rabbinic communities in the United States (and elsewhere), the term *Talmud* refers to the Babylonian Talmud. Consisting of 63 volumes, a conclusive literature review of the text is beyond the scope of this dissertation study. Below are several areas related to social activism that find repetition

throughout the pages and volumes of the Babylonian Talmud and the central text of the Talmud, the Mishnah (here cited as Pirke Avot).

Lovingkindness

Jewish tradition recognizes the primacy of the principle to "love your neighbor as yourself" (Jerusalem Talmud, N'darim, p. 9:4) and extends that concept to all peoples and all nations. Other citations include:

- "Simeon the Righteous used to say: 'On three things does the world stand: on Torah, on service to God, and acts of lovingkindness'" (Pirke Avot 1:2).

- "Deeds of lovingkindness are greater even than charity. Charity is only towards the poor; but lovingkindness can be directed towards anyone" (Babylonian Talmud, Sukkot, p. 49b).

- "As God has demonstrated kindness, so, too, should you demonstrate kindness, as one should strive to imitate God's virtues. Just as God clothed the naked, so, too, should you clothe the naked. Just as God visited the sick, so, too, should you visit the sick. Just as God comforted mourners, so, too, should you comfort mourners. Just as God buried the dead, so, too, should you bury the dead" (Babylonian Talmud, Sotah, p. 14a).

Dignity of All Creatures

The Jewish principle that requires individuals to accord a level of dignity to every one of God's creatures, this idea has traditionally applied to all human beings. Recently, some have chosen to extend this ideal to the animal kingdom as well (Zlotowitz, 1998). Long before Western society embraced the concept of universal human rights, Judaism taught that every person—regardless of gender, religion, status, etc.—deserves to be treated with respect. The

centrality of this ideal comes from the Babylonian Talmud: "The fundamental dignity of all creation is very precious to God. There is no value more precious than it" (Brachot, p. 19b). There is repetition for this importance in Pirke Avot: "All people are beloved for they are created in the image of God" (3:18).

Pursue Peace

Jewish tradition teaches that wishing or praying for peace alone will not be nearly enough to achieve the goal; Judaism's call is to dedicated action and the tireless pursuit of peace (Zlotowitz, 1994). The importance that Judaism places on pursuing peace is rooted in reverence for human life. Taking a single life, according to Talmud, is like "annihilating an entire world" (Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin, 4:5), which is not to say that there is no place for taking life in the pursuit of peace. Consider Pirke Avot: "The sword comes into the world because of justice delayed and justice denied" (5:8).

Do Not Stand Idly By

The Biblical prohibition against standing idly by when a neighbor's blood is being shed finds conversation and consideration in the pages of the Talmud. Nowhere is this clearer than in the Talmud, Sanhedrin, 73a: "From where do we learn that if someone pursues his friend with the intent to kill, one is obligated to intervene, even if it means taking a life? The Torah says, 'You shall not stand idly by the blood of your neighbor.'"

The Ways of Peace

While there are eye-popping texts in Talmud that promote separatism, foundational Talmudic and Rabbinic texts used around issues of social justice ignore those in favor of the more balanced verses found in the literature. Consider the Babylonian Talmud text from Gittin: "We support the non-Jewish poor together with the Jewish poor, and we visit the non-Jewish sick

alongside the Jewish sick, and we bury non-Jewish dead alongside Jewish dead, all for the sake of the ways of peace" (p. 61a). Another verse in support of this core ideal is similarly found in Talmud: "Jews should not engage in bad behavior against gentiles because it will profane God's name" (Talmud, Baba Kama, p. 113b).

Truth

In Rabbinic Jewish thought, humanity is meant to emulate aspects of God dealing with truth. But "truth" means more than just avoiding lies (Zlotowitz, 1994). "Truth" in the Talmud mandates an attitude of moral honesty and spiritual integrity. "Truth" is what is known by the individual on the deepest level to be ethically correct; it implies integrity and avoiding hypocrisy, a charge leveled in the Talmud: "The Holy One hates people who say one thing in their mouths and another in their hearts" (Talmud, Psachim, p. 113b). Even Pirke Avot contributes to this understanding with this adage from 1:18: "The world survives because of three things: fairness, truth, and peace."

In addition to the Hebrew Bible, the Talmud and Pirke Avot, any consideration of the traditional Jewish textual canon must include the liturgical compilations (prayer books) of the movements. The reformers of nineteenth-century Germany perceived a need to publish new prayer books which reflected the ethical outlook of their reinterpretation of Judaism (Hoffman, 1987). Since the basis of Judaism in Reform ideology had shifted from ritualism to morality (Hoffman, 1987), the liturgy required corresponding changes. Great efforts were made to introduce moral values that were perceived to be lacking or underemphasized in the traditional liturgy, as well as to delete prayers expressing values antithetical to the moral thinking of the reformers, a thinking heavily influenced by the currents of German moralism of the time (Meyer, 1988). The same pattern holds true for members of the Reform movement in America, a

movement which aimed (and currently aims) to bring liturgy in line with American ethics (Frishman, 2007).

This should come as no surprise, for the fundamental assumption of the critical study of Judaism is that Judaism does not exist independent of its historical and social context. That context—the political environment, economic circumstances, social system, geographic considerations, and, to be sure, ambient ethical, and moral outlook—influence the nature of Judaism in all times and places (Silberman, 1965). The Conservative moment, on the other hand, has not made the changes characteristic of Reform prayer books, such as deleting entire prayers, substituting modern compositions, and completely restructuring the service, making the moral and ethical influence on liturgy more subtle and elusive (Hoffman, 1987).

Revision of liturgy has been employed by three techniques over time: changes in the Hebrew text, the use of and evolution of translations, and editorial comments (Hoffman, 1987). The first technique, that of changing the Hebrew text, is the most radical method of modifying the liturgy. As the liturgy was never canonized, no single "traditional" text of the prayers ever served as the common inheritance of the Jewish people. Nevertheless, a relatively standard Ashkenazic liturgy developed in Europe and America, forming the core of the liturgical selections of focus for the rabbis studied in this dissertation. With regard to ethics, morality, and social justice, the changes in the Hebrew text will take the form of deletions of offending passages, supplemental words, phrases, or entire prayers.

Translations are a second means by which the theology of a prayer book can be determined and adjusted. In many cases where theological discomfort with the Hebrew text is felt, the editor will not wish to go to the lengths of changing it, as tradition carries a great deal of weight. A less radical means of coping with the theological discomfort is to introduce the change

into the vernacular translation. The Hebrew is thus interpreted with the lens of social justice, ethical living, or moral behavior. As all translation is interpretation, this is a much less drastic approach than the evolution of the Hebrew liturgy.

The final means used to change the theology to better reflect social justice, ethics, and morals is the use of editorial comments. For use in this dissertation, I use the phrase *editorial comments* to include instructions to the reader, introductions to prayers, contextual cues for the liturgy, and explanations of prayers or the accompanying ritual gesture. While often the comments are used to provide a simple point of information that the reader should know in order to deepen a personal or communal connection to the liturgical selection, sometimes the comments are surprisingly didactic, expressing the editor's understanding of the prayers and the values deemed worthy of special influence.

A more complete study would explore the liturgy across denominations. However, for the interest of the scope of this dissertation, I briefly highlight the philosophical liturgical changes of the current flagship prayer books of progressive Judaism, Reform's Mishkan Tefilah, and the Conservative Movement's Siddur Sim Shalom.

Mishkan Tefilah, unlike any other prayerbook produced under the framework of a major denomination of Judaism, was developed in a broad and democratic process that included the opinions of clergy and lay leaders at every stage of its evolution (Frishman, 2007). As such, the text includes a wide range of contributions purposefully intended to reflect the diverse set of liturgies and practices that have percolated within the movement. In the decades that preceded the publication, technological innovation had driven much of this democratization—with the advent of desktop publishing and a desire for personalization, many communities created their own prayer books that reflected the unique vision of the community using the text.

Imitating current mores of the day, Mishkan Tefilah includes faithful (not idiomatic) translations of the Hebrew, God language that is more inclusive of different theologies, and gender-sensitive language (Frishman, 2007). Further, the essential foundation of Reform Judaism—its emphasis on ethical action and social justice—is the overriding theological message of the text: God demands something of people. Nowhere is this message clearer than the prayer book's introduction to the central petitionary prayers: "Pray as if everything depended upon God; Act as if everything depends upon you" (Frishman, 2007, p. 47).

Siddur Sim Shalom also amends the traditional liturgical selections for the Conservative movement. One marked shift in the prayer book relates to the status of women (Cahan, 1998). One can see this shift exemplified in (among other locations throughout the text) the morning blessings, where the blessing is changed in both Hebrew and English from "Blessed are You, Lord our God . . . who has not made me a woman" to "who has made me in God's image." This change, among others, plants the seeds of a more egalitarian ethic in a patriarchal denomination (Cahan, 1998).

The Conservative prayer book does not address contemporary ethics, morality, or social justice issues in an overt manner. Freedom and justice are mentioned but do not comprise a central thrust of either the translations or meditations in the text. Of the supplementary readings provided at the end of the prayer book, the section entitled "Our Way of Life" contains readings which stress social justice, ethical living, and world peace, among other universal ideals. Those ideals, however, are competing for space from readings about God, Torah, and Israel, rendering the ethical excerpts no more influential than other Jewish values.

Contemporary Jewish Texts That Inform Perspectives of Reform Rabbis Regarding Social Activism

As it is not possible to develop a comprehensive list of all texts that all Reform rabbis employ when considering their work in the area of social activism, a process of scope reduction was necessary. I first identified three significant questions that emerged:

- What contemporary sources (non-Jewish sources published after the 1990s, a time in which many contemporary issues found grounding in terminology still in use today) do rabbis use as a guide in their work in the area of social activism?

- Are there particular issues with a more transparent connection to contemporary Jewish sources than others?

- Upon which contemporary Jewish texts (those published after the late 1960s, when social activism became more commonly organized within synagogue culture) do rabbis ruminate when determining involvement?

I began with a search through my own library and the sources used by colleagues. I posted a note on the CCAR (Central Conference of American Rabbis) Facebook page inquiring as to whether rabbis turn to certain books or Jewish texts to inform their social justice work, refining the question by requesting only texts that in some way illuminate the intersection of Jewish text and social justice. Needless to say, I received a wealth of responses. In order to tackle what could potentially become an unwieldy topic, I chose, for the interest of this dissertation, to focus exclusively on texts that were suggested by at least three respondents.

For clarity and ease of future use, I have divided the contemporary texts into two categories, which emerged upon reading and critically analyzing the texts. The first section includes readings that provide textual underpinnings for contemporary social justice issues.

These readings are often divided by topic and present texts from the traditional Jewish canon as well as some basic commentary linking those texts to the topic at hand. The second section includes texts that explore the practical considerations for rabbis as they engage in social justice work. These readings are often concept papers written by those in the field, reflecting their own experiences and offering guidance to others.

Textual Underpinnings

The texts for this section provide a compelling resource guide should clergy engage in social justice activism. The standard for this collection by far is the Vorspan and Saperstein (1998) book, which offers a veritable exegesis of biblical and rabbinic texts upon which clergy can draw as foundational texts. Unfortunately, the arguments and textual topics fall short of addressing some of the more compelling issues that have arisen since the book's publication, such as issues around gender identity, hate speech, civil discourse, and xenophobia. As well, the section on race, written prior to the rise of Black Lives Matter and the rash of police shootings occurring during the writing of this dissertation, feels quite dated in its proposal of "savior" practices over systemic allyships. In fact, though still an incredible resource, the perspective of the book is quite optimistic, reflecting the zeitgeist of its publication.

Other texts delve more deeply into systemic issues of social activism, recognizing that for many Jews in the twenty-first Century, social activism is a manner in which adherents exercise their Jewish identity. While diversity and inclusion training often explore issues related to privilege, Jacobs (2009) and Waskow and Berman (2011) explore systemic privilege through a Jewish lens. Waskow and Berman (2011) in particular explore different aspects of the Exodus narrative, applying that narrative to contemporary understandings of systemic privilege. For example, the charge Moses levies to Pharaoh is discussed in relation to speaking truth to power

(pp. 53–75) and the rebellions and revolutions of the narrative are paralleled with contemporary movements like MoveOn (pp. 139–166). While income disparity and challenges related to systemic poverty occupy the pages of print journalism and cable news networks, Cohen (2012), Jacobs (2011), and Kroloff (1992) explore systemic poverty in a Jewish context. The Cohen (2013) text in particular features the writings of Jewish philosopher Emmanuel Levinas and applies that thinking to the contemporary issues surrounding homelessness, poverty, and workers' rights, thus placing activism around poverty and classism squarely within a Jewish context. Rose (2008) offers a heavy use of practical rabbinic modeling as a means of conceiving communal responses to the ethical and moral challenges in the early part of the twenty-first century. The perspective of these texts reflects a more contemporary understanding of privilege, and each suggests using the texts as a means of building networks of allies. If the Talmud is a text that informs Jewish living, then these texts inform Jewish activism.

Perhaps the most compelling text is Yanklowitz (2018). The only text written after the election of President Trump, the commentary inspires the reader to apply text not just to issues of social activism, but to see social activism as a key element of Jewish living, and therefore, the text has applicability in almost every setting.

Practical Considerations

As a congregational rabbi, I was particularly interested to identify contemporary sources that were less theoretical and were more grounded in existing practice. The literature provides a compelling guide should clergy engage in social justice activism. The Cohen (2019) article expressly details a religious grounding for such activity, building the case that rabbinic leadership (and, by extension, all clergy leadership) derives from the prophetic tradition. He offers an important challenge for consideration—that clergy may become blinded to the nuances

of an argument due to a genuine desire to affect change, leaving the clergy member vulnerable to missteps and miscues (p. 64). Cohen even goes so far as to offer a tool that a clergyperson can develop and deploy when determining the best course of action with regard to civic engagement: a simple questionnaire. Included in the questionnaire would be the following questions: "What is being asked of me? What is the biblical citation to ground this work (i.e., what command is being followed through action or ignored through inaction)? How will this impact other unrelated projects? What can be the benefit of getting involved" (p. 67)? The article also grounds the charge to engage around civil issues in a theological realm through the presentation of texts. This article, as well as that of Asch (2019), Perolman (2019), and Chasen (2019), indicates that challenges of consistency and equanimity exist within Jewish tradition in this arena. Perolman (2019) in fact adds that clergy should be trained not only to be good partners (p. 292), but also to be persuasive tellers of religious texts to assuage concerns (p. 295).

Schindler and Seldin-Cohen (2018) expand upon this idea by articulating that the rabbi is often in a more visible position to lead than others by virtue of position, training, and pulpit (p. 153). They add, "A tool for the rabbi is the network of connections at his/her fingertips enabling clergy to rally local and global support, as well as garner guidance, wisdom and partnerships (and power)" (p. 155). They, too, offer a step-by-step guide for rabbis should they choose to engage in social justice and civil issues (pp. 157–163).

Continuing the spirit of a "how to" guide, both Kolin (2019) and Stanton (2019) stress that interfaith partnerships would be a resource worth mining to offer support (and offer "cover") when clergy engage in divisive civil issues. According to Kolin (2019),

> Clergy members should for a so-called leadership team composed not of the foot soldiers of one top person but rather the discerning body who unearth their congregation's interests, help craft strategy, lead campaigns, and whose responsibility it is to open up meaningful opportunities for many others to engage in justice work and possibly become

leaders themselves. Transformational leadership is necessary in order to optimize impact. (p. 284)

The Stanton (2019) case study complements the Kolin (2019) position in this regard, finding additional agreement in the writings of Schindler and Seldin-Cohen (2018). In fact, not one article in all that were researched for this dissertation indicated that interfaith partnerships would compromise or jeopardize the clergy's ability to successfully engage with these issues, leading me to conclude that the development of such partnerships is an important consideration should clergy choose to engage around divisive issues.

Ultimately, many of the texts help to build the religious case for why clergy should either get involved with social justice issues or, once they do, inspire them to "stay the course." Miller (2006) presents a compelling charge to engage the prophetic arm of faith and work to make a difference. Galchinsky (2008) builds a case of a long history of Jewish involvement with the most challenging social justice issues of the day. The message of Galchinsky (2008) is clear: activism, from donating to a soup kitchen to marching in the streets to organizing missions, is gripping for many in the Jewish community. Even if there are those in disagreement with the strategy, tactics, or perspectives on certain issues, the work of "making the world a better place" is a central tenet of the Jewish experience and should be a central practice of congregational clergy.

Rabbinic Authority: How and When to Speak up and Speak Out

Having explored the literature as to the baseline of authority for rabbis who choose to get engaged around divisive issues—those who have used exclusively biblical texts as well as those whose efforts were organized around more contemporary texts—the dissertation must now focus on efforts aimed at understanding how and when rabbis choose to engage. Whether one refers to them as political, ethical, or moral issues, were clergy to address every issue, engage on every

topic, write a sermon or issue a statement about each undeniably significant concern, they could easily fill every hour of a week. How, then, should clergy prioritize? When do they opt to take a strong position, likely knowing not all will agree with whatever is shared, and when do they decide to maintain a quiet presence while others respond? How does one determine when to remain silent on a compelling matter and when it is time to speak? These questions, applicable today, surely were considerations for the rabbis featured in this dissertation.

The dissertation has already provided textual support to the notion that Judaism has spoken with fervor and clarity concerning the power, importance, and, ultimately, even the sense of religious obligation associated with speaking out on matters of consequence. While there is ample textual support for getting involved with issues related to social justice, there is also ample Jewish textual support from which one could draw guidance that affirms the value and importance of silence. In the first century, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel wrote, "All my days I have grown up among the wise, but I have found nothing better than silence" (Pirke Avot 1:17, JPS version). And more than two thousand years later, Rabbi Jonathan Sacks is even more explicit: "The silence that counts in Judaism is a *listening* silence—one which makes space for others to speak and to be heard" (Sacks, 2016, p. 8). Sacks comments on the many possible translations of the familiar Hebrew word *shema*—listen, hear, pay attention, understand, internalize, even respond with deeds. Noting that not one of those interpretations involves speaking, all of them *do*, however, require active and engaged presence. Regardless of whether one chooses to speak out, Sacks encourages his readers to remain engaged with the world, to listen and truly understand the contemporary moral challenges, to hear fully the cries and pleas of humanity, and to appreciate and acknowledge wholeheartedly the needs of our own communities as well. And, as certainly occurred for the rabbis in this dissertation, there will be

specific issues, situations, conflicts and crises that periodically emerge and which stir them in such a way that they determine silence—no matter how reflective, measured, or active—is no longer tenable.

The challenges inherent in this issue become apparent almost immediately, echoed by Alasdair MacIntyre (2007). For consider, beyond legal infractions and beyond the obvious societal ills and evils communally recognized as such, who determines what constitutes "wrongdoing" in today's society? Do the values and morals to which I hold steadfast, that are informed by my faith and interpretation of Jewish tradition and which guide my thinking, match those of everyone else in my community? Assuming not, does that render the actions and positions of those with varying perspectives as wrong? More practically, in today's highly polarized and politicized country and community, when my understanding of a current issue differs from another person's understanding, is one of us obligated to confront or call out the other? While all are surely meant to be rhetorical, each question is intended to highlight that the particular issues, as well as the passionate perspectives which compel one to speak out, will undoubtedly vary from one person to another.

There is literature that provides some evidence pointing to the manner in which clergy have historically been considered visionary leaders who shape the thinking and, consequently, the actions of their congregations, as well as the perceived mandate to do so. The majority of the studies imply that pastoral leadership has much to do with instructing people firmly and authoritatively about their religious obligations (Brown, 2004; Cavendish, 1997; Love, 2017). Brown (2004), in fact, concluded that pastoral leadership emanates from the spiritual authenticity given to religious leaders by God (p. 74). Further, pastoral leaders are given the authority to act

by congregants with the expectation that they exercise leadership for the benefit of the congregation, its members, and the community (Love, 2017).

Calfano (2010b) builds upon the understanding of clergy activism by identifying barriers that restrict congregational activism. In addition to exploring ideological barriers (largely around the philosophical belief that clergy should remain uninvolved, choosing to take a pastoral rather than prophetic role with their congregants, etc.), Calfano (2010b) devoted significant attention to the role that the prospect of decreased parishioner giving plays with regard to modifying the outward political behavior of clergy. Based upon data from two random samples of Protestant denominations—PC (USA) and ECUSA—collected in the summer of 2005 and considering 1,000 clergy respondents, the findings are quite conclusive: clergy would and do refrain from political activity if such activity is likely the cause of financial burden to the congregation. Further, Calfano's (2010b) study indicates that clergy are less likely to engage in overt political activity during sermons, preferring instead private and small-group activism.

This latter finding is contrary to the findings of Resner (2003), whose text presented the theory that political and civil activism from the pulpit is integral to clergy portfolios. Resner (2003) based his conclusions on a localized study among 10 Protestant congregations in the New Jersey area and the methods used by clergy when advocating for civil action. Resner (2003) further supported conclusions drawn from his own research (specifically a 1990 article by Hans-Georg Gadamer) that "conscience and ideology were prime considerations for clergy to use the resource of the pulpit and financial considerations are minor obstacles, if considered at all" (Resner, 2003, p. 12).

Davidson and Mock (1997), Smidt and Schaap (2009), and Ebaugh et. al (2003) present findings that align with Resner (2003), advocating for the use of the pulpit when clergy engage

in civil and political activities. Davidson (1997) also invites consideration of other resources that clergy should possess that would be assets if they decided to engage in civil work: they should, if possible, have the support of lay leadership and find themselves leading congregations where congregants have (a) political alignment and (b) an expectation that the clergy will engage in prophetic activities.

An interesting addition to the conversation is the paper by Guth et al. (2003), finding that clergy members identifying as more conservative are more likely to engage in civil activity, especially when it is cast as a moral issue. Exploring political participation from five evangelical Protestant denominations, the data indicated that clergy members felt primarily compelled by conscience. The article feels dated, however, as repeated references to the Christian Right and other religiously right-leaning organizations have been replaced by other organizations. Further, in 2021, I find it hard to accept the conclusion that right-leaning clergy are more politically active than left-leaning clergy, as contemporary trends point to an energized left in America.

Among the qualities and characteristics that could be barriers to clergy-led congregational activism is a lack of consistency with regard to selection of issues. Calfano (2010a), Calfano (2010b), Beyerlein and Chaves (2003), and Djupe and Gilbert (2002) all introduce the challenges that arise from perceived favoritism of one issue over another. When clergy appear to get involved with each and every divisive civil issue, they will frequently surrender a pastoral and educational pulpit to an exclusively activist pulpit (Crawford, 1995). As relatively few clergy members lead monolithic pulpits, a process must be created and identified that can offer a filter for accepting involvement in divisive civil issues. Calfano (2010a) in particular aims to address this challenge through the creation of a decision tree, encouraging clergy to ask six key questions:

- Is it controversial?

- Is there conflict among my reference groups?

- Do denominational leaders make strong statements concerning the issue?

- Does the issue pass a threshold of importance?

- Are policy goals of major importance to clergy?

- What will be the anticipated response from impacted/concerned congregants?

(Calfano, 2010a, p. 838)

By implementing a fair and equitable process for decision-making in this area, clergy members will be able to insulate themselves from accusations related to consistency of approach and project selection.

To this point, the dissertation has explored sources that inform the understanding of when it is appropriate for clergy members to speak out and when it is more appropriate for them to keep silent. An important note that further informs this process has to do with Freedom of the Pulpit and how that principle is implemented in the Reform congregations served by each of the rabbinic subjects of this dissertation.

In the Jewish faith, congregations are established not by an ecclesiastical body but rather by a group of individuals who determine that there is a need for another synagogue community. That group of individuals will work to promote the establishment of the synagogue publicly while simultaneously drafting bylaws that are intended to govern not just the establishment of the synagogue but its ongoing survival (https://urj.org/benefits-membership-urj).

Amidst the rather legal language concerning the composition of the governing board and the fiduciary structure of the synagogue are laws governing the identity of the community. These laws provide answers to such questions as, "Should membership be open to all or restricted just

to Jewish members?" and "Shall we affiliate with a denomination or stand as an unaffiliated community?" The decisions that are made concerning these topics have long-ranging implications for the community and the role that the congregation is expected to play in the lives of the members.

These early conversations will also detail a principle called *Freedom of the Pulpit*. *Freedom of the Pulpit* is the phrase used when a congregation determines that a clergy member is free to speak her or his mind on any issue that is relevant without worry of ramifications from the governing board (Auerbach, 1990; Hertzberg, 1963; Hertzberg, 1997; Hertzberg, 2002; Roy & Eckardt, 1967; Sklare, 1971). Freedom of the Pulpit was and remains a foundational principle in Reform congregations. A chief consideration for each of the rabbis studied in this dissertation remains how they interpreted this concept and how they acted in accordance with its authority.

Modern rabbis must take into consideration the richness of the traditional Jewish source canon, the complexity of the present-day culture and climate (especially with regard to compelling issues of the day), contemporary literature aimed at interpreting and reinterpreting Jewish texts and the lived Jewish experience, as well as the history of the secular environment with regard to expectations of clergy and activism. At the same time, rabbis must take their own perspective and self-defined obligations toward activism and communal engagement into account. Rabbis of today, struggling with competing and, at times, contradictory agendas, may find themselves at a loss for how to lead their communities. In times of crisis and uncertainty, considering the examples of others from recent history who have wrestled with similar dilemmas may prove insightful and quite helpful.

Four Archival Studies of Rabbis

This dissertation contributes to a field that is already well established. Biographies of rabbis have long existed, though there is most certainly a discrepancy between those biographies commissioned for purposes of scholarship and those commissioned for purposes of sentiment. It is a common practice for congregations, upon the retirement of a beloved and long-serving rabbi, to create a text as a celebratory memento of the rabbi's tenure. However, the strength of this study is that, to date, none of the biographies have applied the lens of scholarly leadership theory to the subjects of those texts. The biographies have celebrated the leadership victories of the rabbinic subjects, but they have done so devoid of the critical eye of contemporary leadership theory.

To illustrate the above point, included below are four studies that have taken a more scholarly approach to telling the story of a rabbi. Though there are many from which to choose, I selected the Blumberg text as it exemplifies the ability of the archival study to contribute to a contemporary understanding of historical trends. I chose the Green text as it presented the symbiotic relationship between subject and context, illustrating that they are both a part of a complex system (Kahane, 2013; Waddock et al., 2015; Worley et al., 2011). I selected the Langston text as it exemplifies the ability of a skilled researcher, using primary source documents, to add depth and context to the subject. Finally, the Lidji text serves as an example of a historiography where the subject—and the actions of the subject—is still very much active. One will conclude that, though well researched and well written, each of these studies (and the field that they represent) presents anecdotal and episodic support for contemporary rabbis struggling with exercising leadership without the benefit of academic or theoretical grounding, the latter considerations which would be immensely helpful to colleagues today.

Archival Study 1: Prophet in a Time of Priests by Janice Blumberg

This text, a biography of the great-grandfather of the author, Rabbi "Alphabet" Browne, presents an archival study that is very well researched and executed. Born in Slovakia, Edward Benjamin Morris Browne (then known as Moshe ben M'hader Yaakov Braun) attended one year at a local rabbinical school before moving to America. Privately ordained by the founder of the Reform Movement, Rabbi Dr. Isaac M. Wise, he went on to earn a medical degree and a law degree as well, earning himself the nickname "Alphabet." Browne served many congregational positions and, inexplicably, brushed twice with history: first, he was invited to serve as a pallbearer at the funeral for former President Ulysses S. Grant, and, later, in corresponding with Theodore Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism and the grandfather of the State of Israel.

While detailing the life and (mis)adventures of Rabbi Browne, the study also presents the historical context which adds depth and understanding to his choices. For example, when highlighting the fact that Rabbi Browne served congregations across the religious spectrum, Blumberg (2012) explains that denominationalism had yet to capture the American Jewish experience. Thus, the text also serves as a snapshot of a time that no longer exists. In another example, when detailing Browne's battles with his congregational presidents, Blumberg (2012) contextualizes the experience with regard to the emergence of bylaws and constitutions in congregations, thereby strengthening the elected officials who rarely suffered from term limits. Finally, in another example of the profound importance of this work, the text uses primary source documents to not only highlight the frictions between Rabbi Browne and others, but to also demonstrate the evolution of cultural Judaism and the transition of religious observance at the turn of the twentieth century.

While the historical context offers depth and understanding to the life of the subject, missing from the volume is a section exploring the leadership approach and style of Rabbi Browne. Thus, while the text is a remarkable and pleasurable read, it does not offer guidance for contemporary rabbis as to how they might navigate similar challenges.

Archival Study 2: Bridges and Bonds: The Life of Leon Kronish by Henry Green

This text is a study of the life of Leon Kronish (1914–1985), a Reform rabbi practicing in Miami, Florida. Rabbi Kronish was born in New York to Orthodox Jewish parents who immigrated from Galicia. Among the gems of this volume is the correspondence, recorded from primary source documents, between an impressionable Leon and Rabbis Mordecai Kaplan, the founder of Reconstructionist Judaism and a philosopher of great esteem, and Rabbi Stephen Wise, the founder of the Jewish Institute of Religion seminary in New York and head of the American Jewish Committee. These letters served to inform Rabbi Kronish's direction—from Rabbi Kaplan, Rabbi Kronish developed an insistence on the centrality of a living Jewish liturgy, one that expresses a people's commitment to both their past and the evolution of their religious identity. From Rabbi Wise, he developed a lifelong commitment to social justice causes and support for the emerging State of Israel. Due to the context provided in the study, one learns not just about Rabbi Kronish but also about the struggles between an American Jewish population looking east toward Israel while simultaneously looking inward at the gifts of being secure and Jewish in America.

Henry Green (1995), the author of this volume, argues that, in order to understand Rabbi Kronish's actions and motivations, one must consider four institutional contexts: Liberal Judaism, Zionism, Miami Beach (South Florida was a hotbed for the civil rights/desegregation movement, the debate over separation of church and state/prayer in public schools, as well as the

nuclear disarmament movement), and his synagogue, Temple Beth Shalom. Interestingly, the text does a fantastic job of helping the reader to understand how Rabbi Kronish shaped and was shaped by those four institutional contexts. Additional primary source documents help the reader to appreciate the intentionality that went into the decisions made in each of those contexts, including the ramifications of such activities. In one telling section, Rabbi Kronish's diary is referenced to share his reflections upon losing a key congregational vote that would have changed the direction of the synagogue. Until this publication, that story was never told.

Similar to other biographies of American rabbis, this text does not view Rabbi Kronish's experience through the lens of current leadership theory. One is left to wonder, for example, how Rabbi Kronish navigated immunity to change as observed in the disconnect between the four institutional contexts. One may also inquire whether Rabbi Kronish adapted his own leadership style in different settings over the course of his career or whether he identified charismatic leadership as his authentic leadership style.

Archival Study 3: Rabbi Morris Newfield: Ambassador to the Gentiles by Scott Langston

Introducing Rabbi Morris Newfield (1875–1940) as uniquely qualified to represent the Jewish community to non-Jews due to his many gifts, Langston (2008) uses two documents housed in the American Jewish Archives to illustrate the balancing act that rabbis like Newfield had to undertake to fulfill that position. Not only does the author convey the challenges that confront Jewish "ethnic brokers" (representing the Jewish community to the surrounding non-Jewish community while at the same time defending the community against insensitive remarks and overt antisemitism without fomenting further antagonism), but he gives a general and pointed history of the Jewish community in Birmingham, the city in which Rabbi Newfield

served as rabbi. This brief but rich context aids tremendously in demonstrating the importance of what might have been two overlooked documents that form the basis for the study.

The first document is a letter written on April 27,1918, to the Reverend P. B. Wells, chair of the publicity committee of Birmingham's Pastors' Union, as part of a struggle over whether movies should be shown in the city on Sundays. In addition to providing the context to better appreciate the rationale for the importance of the letter (including the issues of church overreach, struggles within the Christian community, and the ongoing fear of progress in the city of Birmingham, to name just a few), Langston elevates the importance of the letter with an understanding of the relationship between the two individuals as both worked together often, sharing "a concern for country and working together during the time of its great need" (82)—that is, World War I. Thus, the letter serves as a vehicle for reflection about the rabbi, the minister, and the climate in the city at the time.

The second document is a collection of remarks that Rabbi Newfield made to the Conference of Social Workers of Alabama. Although undated, Langston uses clues, such as letterhead which identifies the rabbi as holding an honorary degree that was given to him in 1921, and the fact that the conference was held in Birmingham in 1922, to identify that the comments would have been delivered in May 1922. Further, as his comments include a statement about the ballroom, Langston determined that the comments were delivered on May 27, the second day of the conference, at the plenary session, which, according to the program preserved by the University of Alabama archives, was held in the ballroom of the hotel next to the Lyric Theater. It is this type of analysis that further supports the importance of archival research and the use of primary source documents to add context and depth to stories where precious little had been known previously.

These same archival documents could also be viewed through the lens of contemporary leadership theory. For example, were one to apply relational-cultural theory (Comstock et al., 2008) to the letter between the rabbi and Reverend Wells, one may theorize (only much greater analysis and comparison with other primary and secondary source documents would allow one to do anything other than theorize) that the word choice of the rabbi was deliberate, intending to invite a growth-fostering relationship between the two individuals. One may easily witness some of the tools of relational-cultural theory in the language of the letter: the letter employs anticipatory empathy when the rabbi writes, "I beg to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 25th and to assure you that I noted its contents with proper consideration" (Langston, 2008, p.85). The use of anticipatory empathy, as well as applying other leadership theories to this letter, would be vital and illustrative in aiding contemporary rabbis in diffusing explosive situations.

Archival Study 4: The Seventeenth Generation by Eric Lidji

Lidji's (2018) biography of Rabbi Walter Jacob (b. 1930) is another example of a well-researched text that benefits from the use of qualitative tools such as interviews and historiography. The text details the story of Rabbi Jacob from his birth in Germany and arrival in the United States (a fascinating story highlighted in the text, in that Rabbi Jacob's father and grandfather, both rabbis, were rescued from the impending Holocaust by the American Jewish Community as a part of the wholescale attempt by American Jewry to rescue German rabbis and their families by giving them an opportunity in the United States), his subsequent decision to become a rabbi, and his long and storied career at Pittsburgh's famed Rodef Shalom synagogue. The text also explores Rabbi Jacob's return to Germany after his retirement from Pittsburgh to open the Geiger Seminary, the first Jewish seminary to open in Germany since the Holocaust.

It should be noted that I have a close connection with Rabbi Jacob: his son, Daniel, passed away in 2007, leaving behind a widow, Eslyn, who served as nanny to my daughter until her untimely passing in 2012. Throughout Eslyn's employment with my family and her illness, Rabbi Jacob was a fixture, checking on her, supporting her, and encouraging me and my rabbinic colleagues to be more present for her during her times of need.

Lidji's text is strengthened from his close friendship with Rabbi Jacob, as well as his ability to access the archives of Rodef Shalom synagogue. His study aptly places Rabbi Jacob's experiences and motivations in the context of major transitions impacting world Jewry: the resettlement of German rabbis in America, the tension between American Judaism and German Judaism, as well as the obligations that come from being a rabbi descended from rabbis and representing a tradition—German rabbinic heritage—that was all but destroyed in the Holocaust. In fact, the study is framed with that conversation as it concludes with the narrative of Rabbi Jacob returning to Germany to reestablish the lines of rabbinic tradition there.

The study could only be strengthened and find new avenues for application were Rabbi Jacob's story told through the lens of leadership theory. For example, Rabbi Jacob's experience of opening the Geiger Seminary could be further illuminated through the work of Derrick Bell (2002), which would enable contemporary rabbis to better infuse meaning in their work (by, for example, getting involved with compelling issues of social activism). Perhaps viewing Rabbi Jacob's work with the Geiger Seminary would have easily discernable and applicable lessons had that episode been conveyed through the work and vocabulary developed by Mitch Kusy (2000), enabling contemporary rabbis to engage in organizational change with less friction and failure. Finally, the application of cross-cultural leadership theory, especially the work of Cockburn (1998), would deepen the experiences of Rabbi Jacob leading his Pittsburgh

synagogue and his activism with marginalized populations outside of his synagogue, giving insight and tools to rabbis struggling with those issues today.

Rabbis as Leaders

Rabbis, especially those serving congregations, are often viewed as leaders in their communities. As an historical phenomenon in the United States, this has been well documented (Diner, 2004; Eleff, 2016; Evans, 1997; Glazer, 1957; Gordon, 1959; Heilman, 1995; Hertzberg, 2002; Joselit, 1994; Marcus, 1953; Marcus, 1959; Olitzky et al., 1993; Plaut, 1965; Sarna, 1986; Sarna, 2004; Sarna & Dalin, 1997; Schorr & Graf, 2016; Sklare, 1972; Sklare & Greenblum, 1967; Zola & Dollinger, 2014), and scholars have continued to illustrate that fact with studies on the more contemporary rabbinate (Bloom, 2012; Feinstein, 2007; Kaplan, 2013; Schwartz, 2013; Wertheimer, 2018) and studies which compel rabbis to exercise that leadership around compelling and contemporary issues (Cohen, 2007; Galperin, 2012; Laufer, 2006; Mittleman et al., 2002). While many rabbis receive leadership training through their seminary education, that training is a part of a vast overall curriculum and often focuses more on behavioral responses than leadership development. Further, lessons gleaned during seminary education, while important, remain untested until the rabbis find themselves in situations in the field requiring leadership. As rabbis may find themselves unprepared for the challenges they encounter, there is a need for rabbis to be more fully fluent in the variety of contemporary leadership theories, enabling them greater fluidity of responses. Recognizing that not all rabbis will be able to fully immerse in a study of the myriad of current theories, this dissertation utilizes the examples of several civil rights-era rabbis to introduce several relevant theories to rabbis presently in the field.

Rabbis brought unique focus to their work as leaders in the civil rights movement, and there is certainly great disparity in their achievements and areas where they fell short. To date, there has not been a study applying contemporary leadership theory to their experiences. This section presents a brief survey of the evolution of select leadership theories before delving deeply into the leadership theories and contemporary understandings that are applied in Chapter 4 of this dissertation.

Trait Theory

One cannot understand contemporary leadership theory without familiarity with trait theory. As Schedlitzki and Edwards (2014) note, "Traditionally we think of leadership studies starting with the ideal of the 'great man' theories (Carlyle, 1993), in which the idea of a leader was seen through the lens of what it takes to achieve a position of responsibility in society" (p. 22). Developed by Thomas Carlyle in 1841, scholars (Bowden, 1926; Cowley, 1931; Kohs & Irle, 1920) have sought to correctly define which particular traits are necessary for leadership to exist (or for the "great man" to emerge). The leadership theory has understandably fallen out of popularity due in large part to advanced understandings of the important role that ethnicity, culture, and gender (to name only a few examples) play in creating an ever-expanding and unlimited set of traits. As noted by Ladkin (2010),

> Similarly, leadership arises out of different and specific social constructions. Sometimes it can look forceful and outspoken and other times it is appreciated for its steady ability to hold a psychological space in which dialogue between people who hold vastly different views can safely occur. (p. 32)

However, two contemporary studies offer an appreciation of the trait theory. Judge et al. (2002) provides a qualitative review and meta-analysis of the trait theory in leadership research, noting that trait-based theory may still have relevance for those focused on leadership. Judge et al.

(2009) note that expanding the list of traits to encapsulate our contemporary understanding of identity and behavior will make trait theory newly appreciated.

Style Theory

The trait theory of leadership paved the way for the style theory of leadership, advanced by Stogdill (1948). According to the style theory, leadership is a blend of task behaviors and relationship behaviors. There were two landmark studies that served to test and expand the theory, one at The Ohio State University and one at Michigan State. Researchers at Ohio State investigated how individuals act when leading a group (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). They discovered that leaders needed to possess skills with regard to both organizational structuring and human relations in order to increase their chances of success. Similarly, a group of researchers at Michigan State investigated the impact of a leader's behavior on performance (Katz et al., 1950). Their research displayed similar results to that of the Ohio State study. Together, the studies confirmed that leaders need to be aware of their behavior and the impact that their behavior has on others. Additionally, the studies confirmed the necessity of technical proficiency in a leader. Effectively, these experiments combined the trait theory (Carlyle, 1993) with skill theory (Katz, 1974). Blake and McCanse (1991) published their seminal text on research gleaned through the Ohio State and Michigan State studies. In their text, they offer a scale to leaders that is useful for understanding how the leader's concern for results, as well as the leader's concern for people, impact leadership success. The style theory of leadership is interested in discovering the right skills or behaviors that are required on the part of the leader in order to exercise influence (Uleman, 1991).

Situational Theory

The situational approach to leadership could be viewed on the continuum with trait theory and style theory. Developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1993), the theory suggests that in order to be impactful, the leader must recognize and adjust his or her approach based upon the individual needs of the follower, as well as the parameters of the situation in which leadership is being exercised. Situational leadership challenges a leader to explore and appreciate the appropriate manner in which to engage the follower in order to be the most influential (Dansereau et al., 1973; House, 1971; Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Hersey and Blanchard (1993) highlighted the idea that the situation dictates the approach a leader should take. Blanchard et al. (1985) developed a model dividing leadership into two segments: directive (task) behaviors and supportive (relational) behaviors. Dubbed the Situational Leadership II model, the authors identified four possible leadership styles that may be appropriate in any given situation. Each style has a varying degree of direction and support based on the maturity of the follower. The first level, directing, requires high task behavior and low relational behavior. The second level, coaching, requires high task behavior and high relational behavior. The third level, supporting, requires high relational behavior and low task behavior. Finally, the fourth level, delegating, requires low relational behavior and low task behavior. Situational leadership theory holds that certain behaviors are necessary for effective leadership, but these behaviors vary depending on the situations and the players involved. This theory is closely aligned with Ladkin (2010) in that the behaviors are context-dependent and can be learned.

Leader-Member Exchange Theory

The leader-member exchange (LMX) theory traces its origins to the works of Dansereau et al. (1975), Graen (1976), and Graen and Cashman (1975). LMX theory suggests that

leadership develops as the relationship between the leader and the follower develops, traditionally marked by three phases (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1991).

In the first phase, known as the "stranger phase," subordinates submit to a leader out of obligation and act in self-interest rather than for the good of the team. The second phase is known as the "acquaintance phase." In this phase, trust begins to develop between the leader and the subordinate that leads the subordinate to begin acting in the best interest of the group. The third phase is called the "mature partnership phase." In this final phase, trust has been fully developed between the leader and the subordinate. It also leads the subordinate to make decisions for the betterment of the team on a consistent basis.

Charismatic Leadership Theory

Charismatic leadership (Weber, 1922) is a natural theory to explore when considering leaders of faith movements and stands loosely in relationship with servant leadership. As Sinclair (2007) stated: "For their part, followers often fall prey to the conviction, charisma or promise that the leader holds out" (p. 7). Charismatic leadership inspires followers to suspend critical functioning and, at times, even self-interest. Each of the rabbinic exemplars included in this dissertation possessed a great deal of charisma and used that charisma effectively to achieve position and to pursue their goals. As Schedlitzki and Edwards (2014) explain in their text, there are various necessary conditions posited to the rise of charismatic leadership:

- A person who possesses extraordinary gifts,
- A crisis or time of distress,
- A revolutionary solution to the crisis,
- Followers who believe in the person and who are attracted to the miraculous qualities of the person,

- Validation of the person's gifts through repeated successes. (p. 64)

While each of the leadership theories listed above is compelling, they ultimately exist more on the periphery of the most current scholarship in the field. Interdisciplinary approaches to leadership theory, as well an evolved understanding of the role of culture, identity, context, and the motivations of the leaders have introduced more robust theoretical approaches to leadership. While it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to explore each of them, there are a few theories that are particularly applicable to members of the clergy: transformational leadership theory, servant leadership theory, relational leadership theory, and courageous leadership. The explanations that follow should demonstrate the depth of these theories and their potential relevance to examine and inform rabbinic work in the area of social activism.

Transformational Leadership Theory

While James Burns may have first identified the notion of transforming leadership within the realm of political leaders in 1978, it was Bass in 1985 who, "distinguished leaders in terms of transactional and transformational leadership, which has been highly influential on current prescriptions for leadership" (Currie & Lockett, 2007, p. 342). As Burns explained, a transformational leader "can unite the leader and the follower in shared goals aimed at achieving a higher purpose" (1978, p. 20). Transformational leadership involves the leader influencing followers to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them and often incorporates charismatic leadership (Northouse, 2016). As it is noted to be among the more popular approaches to leadership (Zhu et al., 2019), transformational leadership is a process which changes and transforms people (Nohria & Khurana, 2010; Ljungholdm, 2014; Dambe & Moorad, 2008; Watts & Corrie, 2013). Transformational leaders often concentrate on

longer-term goals and place value and emphasis on inspiring, aligning, developing, and empowering others to take greater responsibility for success, while at the same time coaching followers to operate under the assumption that all organizational members should be developed to their fullest potential (Amelo, 2007; Avolio & Bass, 1995; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Bass et al., 2003; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Odumeru & Ogonna, 2013; Schaubroeck et al., 2007). As outlined by Northouse (2016), there are four components associated with transformational leadership: charisma or idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

- Charisma or idealized influence relates to the emotional components of leadership whereby followers identify with leaders and want to emulate them. As stated by Bass et al. (2003), leaders can earn credit from followers by considering the needs of followers and by addressing ethics, principles, and shared values.

- Inspirational motivation is a tool whereby leaders communicate high expectations to followers, inspire them through motivation to be committed to the cause or organization, and encourage them to strive for excellence (Northouse, 2016). As outlined by Bass et al. (2003), transformational leaders provide meaning and challenge to their follower's work. Further, leaders behave in a manner that motivates followers through a display of optimism and enthusiasm, both of which are contagious among followers (Bass et al., 2003).

- Intellectual stimulation involves the notion that, "there is no ridicule or public criticism of individual members' mistakes" (Bass et al., 2003, p. 208). Transformational leaders encourage followers to take different approaches and try different solutions through an act of reframing problems (Bass et al., 2003).

Northouse (2016) has posited that, "intellectual stimulation includes leadership that stimulates followers to challenge their own beliefs and values as well as the course of action" (p. 169).

- Individual consideration is representative of leaders who provide a supportive environment in which the individual needs and concerns of followers are taken into account (Avolio & Bass, 1995). Leaders are thus cast in a role of coach or advisor and contribute to a supportive climate (Bass et al., 2003).

As transformational leadership has emerged most prominently in the United States, many critics argue that, with its focus on individual-centric explanations for success, the theory is essentially a reflection on American culture (Sinclair, 2007) and would not work in a cultural setting that does not mirror American societal norms. Further, transformational leadership does not account for an imbalance of power between leaders and followers, especially as related to areas in which power is culturally out of balance (marginalized groups will not be granted power or control in this model). I believe fully that there are no universal rules for leadership that can be applied devoid of context. That said, I have chosen to include transformational leadership theory in this context because (a) the leadership situations explored in this dissertation all involve Americans, (b) the cases studied in this dissertation all take place in America, and (c) the rabbinate is, to a certain extent, an individualized profession in which the rabbi is held as an individual to a communal standard.

Transformational leadership behaviors were evidenced by several of the leaders of the civil rights movement. As Chrobot-Mason et al. (2013) explained, transformational leadership behaviors often lead to the emergence of new solutions to contemporary challenges (p. 17). Further, as outlined by Masood et al. (2006), transformational leadership can make it easier for

innovation in organizations, and it can create situations where followers are given discretion and freedom to make decisions that affect their work. Transformational leaders usually have very high standards of moral and ethical conduct and can be counted on to do the right thing and provide followers a vision and a sense of mission (Northouse, 2016). According to Zohar and Tenne-Gazit (2008), "this requires the leader to provide visions of what is possible, what needs to be done, and what is right and important for individual members of the group at large" (pp. 753–754). One could argue that civil rights-era organizations such as the SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) and the SVRM (Selma Voting Rights Movement), to name just two, would not have been possible had the interactions between leaders been distrustful and driven by internal conflict.

Engaging with the theory of transformational leadership is thus both appropriate and necessary for a study concerning rabbinic involvement in the civil rights movement. As Ng (2017) explained in his study, transformational leadership is integral in transforming a follower from a self-interested bystander into a committed follower with more utilitarian interests (p. 386). Further, as transformational leadership is reliant upon the four core components of idealized influence (exhibited when a leader demonstrates certainty that stimulates followers), inspirational motivation (when a leader charts a course, step-by-step, to success in a way that inspires followers), intellectual stimulation (exemplified in situations where leaders rationally present the case for change), and individualized consideration (situations where the leader listens to the concerns of potential followers), it lends itself nicely to application amongst members of the clergy. At least at some point in the process of shepherding their congregations, each of the rabbis included in this study had to appeal beyond the exclusive self-interest of their congregants.

Servant Leadership Theory

Ferrari and Vaclavik (2016) explained that the best leaders ultimately serve their followers and work in the interest of their followers (p. 3). Pawar and Eastman (1997) claimed that although transformational leadership appeared to dominate organizational studies of leadership, it did not explain *why* some leaders value and wish to serve their followers. Thus, no study of the leadership of religious figures is complete without consideration of servant leadership (coined by Greenleaf, 1970), for this theory of leadership, heavily influenced and inspired by religious symbolic exemplars (Greenleaf, 1979), attempts to address just that concern. It could be that the term servant leadership is somewhat contemporary, but various practices of servant leadership have existed for hundreds of years (Nyabadza, 2003). Servant leadership has been noted as a moralistic leadership approach (Patterson, 2003), one that requires much of the leader in the form of candor and honesty about his or her values. Servant leaders put their followers first and are concerned with the way leaders treat and value their followers and the potential outcomes toward followers' development. Servant leaders aim to encourage their followers to "grow heathier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 13). Servant leaders do not lead for fame or material wealth; they do so specifically to fulfill the needs of others. Servant leadership is "not a leadership style that can be used or set aside based on the needs of the situation. Servant leadership is a mindset, a paradigm, and a way of leading" (Laub, 2004, p. 9).

Greenleaf (1977) identified a set of characteristics that he believed a servant leader should possess, thereby creating the grounding of the contemporary theory of servant leadership. These characteristics are inspiration, vision, listening, communication, withdrawal, acceptance, empathy, foresight, awareness, perception, persuasion, self-assurance, and conceptualization (pp.

28–47). Over the course of time, others (Autry, 2001; Cunningham & Cordiero, 2003; Dambe & Moorad, 2008; Iarocci, 2017; Keith, 2015; Sergiovanni, 1992; Sipe & Frick, 2009; Spears, 2010b) would advance this theory and build off of Greenleaf's original thesis. Spears (2010b), for example, extended Greenleaf's work by identifying 10 characteristics or traits that effective servant leaders should possess: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (pp. 27–29). Regardless of the iteration of servant leadership and traits thereby associated, servant leadership theory is a multidimensional theory that encompasses all aspects of leadership to include ethical, relational, and outcome-based dimensions (Christensen et al., 2014; Coetzer et al., 2017; Dannhauser & Boshoff, 2007; Eva et al., 2019; van Dierendonck, 2011).

It was the work of Patterson (2003), developed out of transformational leadership deficiencies and failures to address servant leadership virtues such as love and altruism (p. 1), that offered a new and interesting chapter to servant leadership theory. Patterson (2003) posited that the focus of transformational leadership is on the organization and not on the needs and aspirations of followers. Thus, Patterson (2003) developed a model to describe the leader-follower interaction process through the following seven distinct constructs: *agapao* love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service (p. 8). This theoretical model of servant leadership explains how servant leaders interact with and view followers as an expression of *agapao* love. Patterson (2003) noted that the term *agapao* is from the ancient Greek and implies a moral or respectful consideration and treatment of others. Winston (2003) noted that *agapao* love refers to a moral love—doing the right thing at the right time for the right reason.

Greenleaf (1977) believed that to be a servant leader, one must make a conscious decision to serve the needs of followers. According to Autry (2001), the servant leader is an inspiring figure, a person that others desire to follow and emulate. Greenleaf (1977) asserted that servant leadership began with the natural feeling that one wanted to serve and then consciously chose to lead, that these leaders contrasted those who, as is the case with other leadership theories, desire to lead first. As servant leaders tend toward a more altruistic worldview, one may see why social activists may closely align with this theory. One may consider the sentiment of van Dierendonck and Patterson (2010), noting the importance of servant leadership and the need for solid, global, and inspiring service to others: "Our world might be crying out for more servant leaders" (p. 7).

In addition to the many adherents of servant leadership theory, there are critics of this approach as well. Leaders often find themselves in the spotlight, receiving the focus of followers and detractors. Therefore, because an ideal servant-leader is one who cares little about him/herself but is rather focused on the organization and their followers, leaders may act in their own self-interest were it to mean less personal criticism and critique. Further, Greenleaf (2002) has acknowledged that servant leadership theory relies upon a rigid determination that cannot be reevaluated based upon circumstance (pp. 28–47), especially considering that utilitarian interests may come into conflict when considering multiple parties (a worker, for example, may need a job, but the organization may need to eliminate the position). Further, though servant leadership theory has become increasingly well known, especially as it relates to the study of leadership within a religious context, there are problems with the existing research. In addition to the predominance of servant leadership theory literature existing in one field of study (religious nonprofits), critics content that existing research does not stand up to the scrutiny necessary for a

scholarly exploration of the theory (Kim et al., 2014). Despite these concerns, I contend that the leadership theory merits inclusion, especially considering its application and implementation in religious contexts.

Relational Leadership Theory

In 2006, Uhl-Bien outlined the relational leadership theory as a framework to advance the study of relationship development between leaders and followers, arguing that it is comprised of "combinations of interacting relations and contexts" (p. 665) and emphasizing that "there are no leadership 'truths,' only multiple realities as constructed by participants and observers" (p. 665). Uhl-Bien (2006) further structured the relational leadership theory around "processes and not persons" (p. 655). Some scholars, such as McMurray (2010), have further defined relational leadership as a style that "joins diverse people committed to a just, common good through shared experiences in a spirit of caring and social responsibility" (p.232). Lipman-Blumen (1996) and others (such as Dutton & Spreitzer, 2014; Hollander, 1992; Kouzes & Posner, 2017; McCallum & O'Connell, 2009; Seers & Chopin, 2012; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007) describe a good relational leader as an individual who derives strength from relationships, while Ladkin (2010) understands Uhl-Bien (2006) to indicate that a "truly 'relational' view of leadership would attend to . . . the relationship between those engaged in leadership itself. Such an approach would start from the 'relationship' as the unit of analysis rather than the individuals" (pp. 56–57). Thus, according to relational leadership theory, leadership is a "co-created, performative, contextual, and attributional process" (Barge & Fairhurst, 2008, p. 232) where meaning is generated and sustained in the context of ongoing relationships.

According to Uhl-Bien (2006) herself, relational leadership theory is "not a theory in the traditional sense of the word. It is an overarching framework for a variety of methods . . . that

explore the relational dynamics of leadership and organizing" (p. 668). In order to explore leadership through the lens of relational leadership theory, articulates Uhl-Bien (2006), one must recognize that leadership exists on all levels and is not strictly hierarchical, leadership relationships are affected by a myriad of factors (some having nothing to do with the organization or project itself), and that relationships occur in a context, and that said context is integral to understanding the relationship. Dr. Ron Wolfson (2013) argues that leadership will ultimately be more holistic and effective (and, potentially, collaborative) were all parties to take into consideration the myriad of relationships at play in every interaction prior to making decisions.

While there are challenges to the relational leadership theory (whether all relationships are accurately conveyed, whether one can take an objective view of a leadership opportunity or whether one is always subjectively involved, and how to account for biases and an unequal distribution of power, to name a few), relational leadership theory provides a framework for exploring rabbinic activism in the civil rights era by emphasizing the importance of both the rabbis and those already aligned with civil rights activism (outside of the Jewish community) in creating and sustaining a working relationship. Rather than focusing solely on the actions of the leader (the leader-centric view) or on the actions of the followers (the follower-centric view), relational leadership promotes combining both viewpoints. The archival research and use of primary source documents aid significantly in this process.

Courageous Leadership Theory

Finally, this dissertation aims to contribute to the growing field of texts related to courageous leadership theory. Though not as well-researched nor as institutionally accepted as transformational leadership, servant leadership, and relational leadership, scholars of leadership theory have long highlighted the importance of courage in leadership given leader responsibilities for vision setting, implementation of change, and making difficult decisions. Leaders are encouraged to be risk-takers when setting vision (Avolio, 2005; Hornstein, 1986), to rely on courage to retain their vision against opposition (Staub, 1996), to make difficult decisions (Bolt, 1996; Badaracco & Ellsworth, 1989; Snyder et al., 1994), to capitalize on the ideas of others (Staub, 1996), and to meet and exceed follower expectations for effective leader behavior (Kouzes & Posner, 1993). This study relies on the rather sparse literature focusing on courageous leadership. As well, the hope is that this study will contribute to the growing range of texts related to courageous leadership and the intersection with clergy behaviors and motivations.

Contingency Theory

While it would be convenient to ascribe only one particular theory to each rabbi, the reality is that, while they may favor one particular theory in much of their practice, a situation may have arisen in which the rabbis studied in this dissertation needed to rely upon a different set of skills and different leadership styles. The theory that supports the idea that a leader's effectiveness is contingent upon how their leadership matches the way they understand the present situation is known as contingency theory. Fiedler's (1964) leadership model was among the first to recognize that the style of leadership that would be most effective depended heavily upon the situation at hand. According to the model, leadership is on a continuum from task oriented to relational, and leaders must identify how best to motivate followers (Fiedler &

Garcia, 1987). While leadership style is important, so, too, is situational favorability. Fiedler (1971) posits that good relations between the leader and follower, highly structured tasks, and strong leader control positivity affect the degree of situational favorability.

According to contingency theory, "leaders should make their behaviors contingent on certain aspects of the followers or the situation in order to improve leadership effectiveness" (Hughes et al, 2006, p. 385). Hersey and Blanchard (1993) underscore that leadership style is a function of situation and follower maturity, highlighting that leaders, followers, and situation are not independent but rather are interdependent. By focusing on the followers and situation in addition to the style of the leader, contingency theory emphasizes the leader's ability to change their behaviors as situational and follower characteristics change (Hughes et al, 2006).

The contingency theory recognizes that different situations may require different leadership styles and that an understanding of the positionality of the leader is paramount to success. Kriger and Seng (2005) advocated for the application of contingency theory to leadership of religious sects, including the different denominations of Judaism. As leader behavior is quite dynamic, and as rabbis lead their communities and members of their communities through a myriad of situations on a daily basis, application of the contingency theory of leadership will be important for the depth and breadth of this dissertation.

The above subsection does not represent an exhaustive history of scholarly research related to the topic of leadership. However, it does reveal that the understanding of leadership is complex and has evolved significantly over the past century. While the rabbis explored in this dissertation may have been aware of some of the theories of leadership captured in the preceding pages, this study views their successes and challenges through each of these lenses. For the congregational rabbis included in this study, they each needed to understand the issues they

wanted to address while simultaneously balancing the needs of their congregation, congregants, and communal partners, as well as their obligation to Jewish tradition to engage in the work of social activism. Thus, each of the rabbis are shown to have engaged with servant leadership (by caring for their synagogues), transformational leadership (by caring for their congregants), relational leadership (by serving those outside of their synagogues with whom they were in relationship), and courageous leadership (by choosing to act in the first place).

Conclusion

This review of literature has set out to explore the relevant concepts and provide context for this dissertation. Understanding the significance of the use of classic and contemporary Jewish texts as a foundational element in rabbinic activism is a necessary elementary step for this dissertation, as is the exploration of literature delving into whether, how, when, and why clergy choose to engage around divisive issues. As well, since the dissertation applies contemporary leadership theory to an historical experience, the necessary exploration of included leadership theories—as well as the limitations of scope—is imperative. Finally, the use of examples of historiographies that have used primary source documents in this section appropriately places this dissertation in that growing body of literature.

The cohort of rabbis in the 1950s and 1960s has been celebrated for their role at the forefront of social change. As a new generation appears to be positioned to once again play a central role in the unfolding drama of history, this dissertation provides them with context, theory, and tools that were inaccessible to the generations before. The hope is that this dissertation will contribute in some meaningful way to their success.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This dissertation examines the experiences of five civil rights-era rabbis to highlight the relevance and role of contemporary leadership theory in rabbinic practice. I chose to include the rabbis studied in this dissertation because, despite their achievements with regard to the struggle for civil rights as a part of the movement of the 1950s and 1960s, there is little written about them. Thus, what is written here is chiefly gathered from primary source documents and contributes to the field of leadership theory through the use of new examples to promote understanding of the theories, as well as adding to the volumes collected reflecting unique stories during the civil rights movement.

This chapter begins first by defining archival research, locating it on the continuum of methodological inquiry. A presentation follows which details the basic process of narrative inquiry and how that process will be used in the dissertation study. The third section of this chapter addresses the benefits and limitations of archival research. The chapter then concludes with the steps I took when engaging in archival research.

What is Archival Research?

On one hand, this question is relatively easy to answer. Stan (2010) has stated, "Archives mostly consist of personal and/or public written documents, maps, and official and private letters, but more recently also of audio/videotapes and internet-based materials" (p. 2). At its most basic level, archival research can be said to involve the study of artifacts (i.e., memorabilia, photographs) and documents (i.e., memos, newspapers, letters, reports) to develop an understanding of a particular leader, organization, professional group, or event. Archival research scans archival materials (primary sources) in an attempt to better understand different points in history and moments in time.

Within the social sciences, archival analysis techniques have long been considered as a noninvasive technique of gathering requisite data (Duranti, 1993; Eastwood, 1988; Livelton, 2003). Zwijze-Koning and de Jong (2005) point out that one readily available and important form of archival data is communication records (telegrams, letters, official correspondence, etc.). Because variables such as initiators, recipients, and dates are usually available and can be coded, these are easily amenable to both quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis. Krippendorff's (2004) six-question content analysis is a tool that can be used to uncover underlying groups, power bases, and interconnected agendas and actions. Depending upon the quality of the primary source material, varying degrees of sophistication in research questions is possible. As Welch (2000) indicates, archival analysis "has a secure place in contemporary, theory-generating research" (p. 172). Archival data can be used to add empirical depth to a study by enabling verification of data from other sources, it can assist with explanations for processes of change, and it can challenge existing theories, thereby building new theoretical models.

What is the Process of Engaging in Archival Research?

According to Welch (2000), following the identification of a research question or problem, the investigator searches for and accumulates all relevant data located in preliminary, primary, and secondary sources. Preliminary sources include biographic and reference materials; primary sources include actual historical data written or captured at the time, such as documents, diaries, journals, and photographs; and secondary sources include books and articles written about the primary person or event which provide important context. In addition, archival researchers visit archives, museums, and historical sites or, if possible, interview witnesses or descendants who knew the individual or event about which the history is being written.

In the third step of the process of using archival research as a methodology for a dissertation, the investigator summarizes and evaluates historical evidence uncovered in the research phase (Welch, 2000). Archival librarian Luke Gilliland-Sweland (1991), outlined in his seminal text two competing opinions of the role of the archivist researcher within the archival community: "one that views archivists as members of a larger community of historian-scholars with a responsibility to interpret the documents in their care, and one that defines archival researchers as 'gatekeepers' for the materials—and legacies—under their control" (p. 160). James Purdy (2011) added that, "if we view the internet itself as 'the most important archive ever created' or 'the largest document ever written, stored in a digital archive,' we and our students daily serve as archival researchers" (p. 23).

Analysis of documents is central to this process, as the credibility of the historical sources must be evaluated separately, contextually, and in comparison to other contemporary texts and secondary source material. Miller and Bowdon (1999) proposed several questions necessary for determining what constitutes a primary source document worthy of consideration:

> How was the primary source material located? What standard will be applied by the researcher to accurately describe and portray the condition of primary source materials? How will the researcher successfully triangulate (find multiple sources of data to enhance credibility) findings? What method will the researcher employ to organize and store findings? Who gets represented (by whom); who gets silenced and why? What is the potential harm in crossing cultural borders? How will the researcher address the gatekeeping function of archives? (pp. 575–576)

There has been a vast array of literature published which explores these and other questions. Kirsch and Rohan's (2008) collection of essays takes up issues of positionality and the researcher's stance in regard to subject matter in nearly every chapter. Brereton and Gannett (2011) urge archival researchers to document their methodologies and methods, including the narratives of archival construction itself. Garbus (2007) warns against keeping methods and

methodologies a secret, explaining how issues of time and money, along with the conflict

between wanting to tell a convincing story and detailing the messiness of archival research,

complicate the documentation of research methodologies. She suggests that archival documents

"need to be triangulated with general documents on your topic in order to avoid making major

history blunders, such as selective use of materials and 'erroneous conclusions'" (p. 88).

In the fourth and final step of the process, the researcher reports the findings derived from

the primary source documents within an interpretive context (Welch, 2000). Interpretation

involves the process of identifying the constituent parts of the primary ideas and examining these

parts separately, in relation to each other, and against the historical record.

Benefits and Limitations of Archival Research

The benefit of using the archival research methodology is evident: a scholarly historical

investigation of overlooked subjects would be incomplete without a thorough examination of

primary source materials. Primary source materials located in archival or private collections are

particularly valuable. By accessing original materials that have not been examined previously,

the researcher is able to bring forward new information that enhances both the originality and the

usefulness of the study. As well, research involving engagement with original source material is

often devoid of commentary from outside narrators. While secondary sources are invaluable (and

frequently offer context in the arena of archival research), narrative commentary is an act of

interpretation.

Additionally, as Walbert (2004) has explained, primary sources offer researchers

windows into the past. "This window is especially important for historians because, unlike other

scholars who study people and societies such as psychologists, sociologists, or anthropologists,

historians can't use direct observation and experimentation to prove their arguments" (p. 2). Primary sources, in short, enable the researcher to interact directly with relics being studied.

Finally, archival records examine an individual's or an organization's internal documentation to learn about criteria relevant to and important for evaluating the event or personality. As Akingbola (2019) articulates, using the example of a review of archival records in relation to evaluating change in nonprofit organizations, archival records can be instrumental in recognizing prechange knowledge, skill, and performance levels. Further, archives provide historical context for the event or individual and will often include previous attempts at change, successful completion of an event, or the evolution of a personality.

As with any scholastic endeavor, archival methodologies have limitations that pose challenges for the researcher. First, archival researchers are historiographers, meaning that they are actively creating a historical narrative around particular events and objects. Historiography as a discipline is highly subjective, and this subjectivity leaves the researcher's authority open to critique by those who hold opposing views. Therefore, archival researchers must anticipate how their work will be evaluated critically to reduce the likelihood of making errors that compromise the usefulness, credibility, or value of their scholarship (Akingbola, 2019).

Secondly, archival researchers may make mistakes at any stage of the data collection process. In the selection phase, for example, a researcher may choose a topic for which sources of historical evidence are limited or inaccessible, thereby undermining the scholarship by making it more vulnerable to critique. Another example rests in the research phase: historical researchers can make errors by using only secondary data or relying on inadequate primary sources. In the evaluation phase, the researcher may draw unsubstantiated conclusions. In the interpretation

phase, the researcher must address issues of bias in the scholarship. These mistakes are easy to commit without intentionality, discipline, and thorough evaluation.

Third, archival studies are left susceptible to being discredited as they are based only on what has been discovered and preserved from history to the point of publication. The availability of data is subject to change as new archival data is discovered. Conclusions regarding archival research are almost always incomplete, and new evidence is routinely discovered which can be applied to the study. Thus, as valuable as is archival research, it is also quite limited.

Critically, there are fewer primary documents, historically, that exist documenting the experience of marginalized communities. Much of what has been preserved exists in the form of peripheral materials connected primarily to a privileged category of individual. This reality has raised concerns about the role of archives in the amplification of normative culture and dominant culture (Cook & Schwartz, 2002; Jimerson, 2009; Ketelaar, 2002; Moss, 2008), even the very nature of archival research has been called into question. There is a myriad of factors to explain this phenomenon, and Young and Brooker (2006) have gone into great detail to cover those issues while advocating for increased ethical sensitivity exhibited from archivists and researchers alike.

Utilizing Archival Research for this Dissertation

Armed with an enthralling grounding question—how can we come to understand and appreciate stories lived and told in the past—three research questions emerged: In an era when congregational rabbis often struggle with how and when to speak up and out, how might the experiences of these civil rights-era rabbis inform their choices? How might the dissertation contribute to the legacy of the rabbinic exemplars? What lessons can we glean regarding the role of context—especially position in history and community—that might be useful for

congregational rabbis today as they apply the principles of leadership theory to their practice? As the inquiry must be built upon a solid foundation of documentary facts and evidence, a central consideration is that the topic of investigation be one in which key sources of data are obtainable. In the case of this dissertation, ample sources of data were identified to explore the leadership legacies of Rabbis William Silverman, Randall Falk, Alfred Goodman, Irving Bloom, and Burton Padoll.

I collected data using archival research between July 2019 and November 2020. I started the research phase in a deductive manner with a meta-theme: each of the rabbis was in some way involved in the civil rights movement. As noted by others (Morgan-Fleming et al., 2007), the use of historical research, in which the narrative becomes valued, "symbolizes a recognition that historical actors constitute society and that their understandings of self and society shape the extent to which a particular society or perhaps more specifically its institutions are reproduced" (p. 78). I knew that I was starting with archival research to uncover the stories, that I would, indeed, be *telling* the stories, and that, ultimately, this dissertation would be an attempt at unlocking the implications of the stories.

While I had intended to visit each of the archives containing material related to the rabbis featured in this study, the COVID-19 pandemic prompted an unplanned for (but wholly welcomed) partnership with local staff archivists. Relying upon relationships I already possessed, I started the process of data collection by connecting with researchers at the four major archives related to the rabbis: The American Jewish Archives, the Southern Jewish Historical Society, the Institute for Southern Jewish Life, and the Breman Museum Archives. Each of these researchers responded graciously to my requests for assistance, and each of them generously provided not only materials which I had solicited (the collections related to the

rabbis, their congregations, and local civil rights materials) but peripheral ephemera as well. Through those researchers I was introduced to researchers at other archives that contained materials related to this study—synagogue archives, communal archives, and university-based archives.

I relied upon the existing body of literature related to rabbinic involvement in civil rights (Bauman, 1997; Bauman, 2019; Blumberg, 1985; Diner, 2000; Diner, 2004; Doyle, 1985; Evans, 1997; Graetz, 1998; Krause, 2016; Sarna, 2004; Strober, 2019) as I explored the collections for each of the rabbis. I then identified for further study those primary sources that included certain keywords and phrases that frequently appeared in materials: "social action," "race relations," "Martin Luther King," "NAACP," "Union of American Hebrew Congregations," "Central Conference of American Rabbis," "integration," "civil rights," "leadership," "negro," "march," and "sermon." While I studied every piece in the collections, I found that I gravitated toward sermonic material, material printed in congregational bulletins, board minutes and other congregational records, newspaper clippings, and private correspondence. In many cases, the collections contained oral histories and interviews given by the rabbis themselves, most often upon their retirement from congregational life.

From this initial step of codification to identify relevant data, I was able to begin analyzing the primary sources for the emergence of common themes:

- A time of moral distress, exemplified with the use of phrases such as, "I was conflicted as to the correct course of action," "You have no idea how difficult this has been," and "I knew it wasn't going to be easy."

- Courageous activity, exemplified by phrases such as, "I knew I had to call my synagogue president," "Some of our members have suggested that we call off

services on Friday night, because of the repeated threats to dynamite the Temple," "I had to start carrying a gun and traveling with police protection," and "One time, a telephone threat was made."

- Professionally risky behavior, exemplified by phrases such as, "The Temple community affairs committee and I join in extending to you and your people our friendship in this time of turmoil," "Depending on the outcome of such a ballot and the strength of your convictions and/or mine on the issue, certain changes may have to be made either in whom I represent or who represents you," and "I have heard criticisms regarding various sermons."

- Understanding of their role in the community, evidenced by such phrases as, "Publicity would kill any forward movement," "A local memorial service was held . . . and Rabbi Bloom was invited to deliver the invocation," and "We the undersigned ministers . . . do hereby state."

- Important communal relationships, highlighted by such phrases as, "He would invite African-American communal leaders to his home," "I have asked Mayor Gaillard to appoint such a committee," and "I joined with Pastor Sam Dodson of the Methodist Church and together we led a group of 130 clergymen."

- Use of Jewish textual tradition to influence their decision-making, evidenced by such phrases as, "We speak of Judaism as a religion of deed rather than creed; it is time that we permit our religious commitments to shape our attitudes and actions on the ethical and moral problems of the day," "How can Jews, of all people, descendants of slaves, deny freedom to others," and "Our congregation will . . . demonstrate the courage of prophetic Judaism when confronted with violence, intimidation, and the

attempt to inculcate fear."

These common themes allowed for an intriguing basis of comparison between the rabbis, and the particulars of each of their stories led to interesting contrast.

As further articulated by Morgan-Fleming et al. (2007),

> When studying the past, we must still ask the following questions: whose story is it? Who authored the tale? Whose voices were included? Whose voices were silenced? As our attention is called to one facet of an event, what aspects are nudged into the shadow? (p. 82)

I kept those questions in mind as I conducted my research. In an effort to prevent myself from losing the chorus of voices involved, I expanded the scope of research to include, in addition to the rabbis themselves, other names with whom they interacted, other organizations with which they were affiliated, and the events in which they either chose to participate or in which they declined. Through the use of dominant narrative (the perspective of the rabbi) as well as the use of compelling parallel narratives (other voices and actors), a more robust picture of the stories of these rabbis began to emerge, though in some cases I was more successful at including counternarratives than in others. For example, when studying the correspondence of a particular rabbi, I included in my research the corresponding partner, what role they played in the life of the rabbi, the organization, and their communal context; when studying board minutes, I did the same for other members of the board whose names appeared in the document. By including in my research others who were involved, I was able to build a more complete picture of what was occurring, and I was then able to prioritize certain primary source documents over others.

I trust that I am appropriately providing insight into the amount of research that went into this study, as well as the role of subjectivity in including certain sources, and even certain lines and quotes from those sources, over others. In order to remain honest in my endeavors, I attempted to place the primary source material in the context of the rabbinic experience. Bulletin

articles carried greater weight in the story of Rabbi Bloom than in the story of Rabbi Padoll, as

the former relied heavily upon the congregational bulletin to perpetuate his activism while the

latter relied heavily on sermons as the primary method of communication. The method of

engagement for each of these rabbis became rather apparent quite quickly in the research—a

conclusion that was confirmed by the archival research partners—and enabled me to focus more

attention on certain documents over others. Thus, Rabbi William Silverman's story, which

coalesced around the dynamiting of a neighborhood institution and his response both before and

after that seminal event through his leadership of the congregation, is told through minutes of his

Board of Trustees as well as his own personal correspondence. Rabbi Randall Falk's story,

which focused heavily on the creation of a collaborative structure and the results of an

institutional culture shift, is told through interviews that he delivered as well as papers related to

the formation of a social justice committee. Rabbi Alfred Goodman's story, which heavily

revolved around public ministerial efforts, features interviews and correspondence related to the

organization of the ministerial group and his testimony before the Sibley Commission. Rabbi

Irving Bloom's story, which revealed significant behind-the-scenes work, of which he took great

strides to keep from both his congregation and the press, is told primarily through interviews,

congregational bulletins, and private correspondence. Rabbi Burton Padoll's story, which is that

of a rabbi who used the pulpit to advocate for civil rights, is told through the sermons he

delivered.

Finally, a note about the scope of this study. In keeping the narratives close to the topic of

civil rights, the findings enable me to only to provide a snapshot into the lived experiences of

each of these rabbis. Though these are not "victory narratives," the stories ignore peripheral

professional challenges and personal foibles that impacted the rabbi's lives outside of their civil rights work.

Conclusion

This methodology chapter included a discussion of the data collection and analysis. The chapter began by situating archival research on the continuum of methodological inquiry. The process of engaging in archival research was defined and identified, and the benefits and limitations of archival research was explored. The chapter included the process of data collection employed in this dissertation, including the system of codification and theme identification. Chapter 4 presents the findings of this research study.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

This study explores the leadership legacy of five civil rights-era rabbis (William Silverman, Randall Falk, Alfred Goodman, Irving Bloom, and Burton Padoll) in relation to their style of leadership between the early 1950s and the late 1960s. The following research questions have guided this study:

1. In an era when congregational rabbis often struggle with how and when to speak up and out, how might the experiences of these civil rights era rabbis inform their choices?

2. How might the dissertation contribute to the legacy of the rabbinic exemplars?

3. What lessons can we glean regarding the role of context—especially position in history and community—that might be useful for congregational rabbis today as they apply the principles of leadership theory to their practice?

Rabbis: A Brief Introduction

While the pages that follow will provide more depth, it would be helpful to provide a brief introduction to each of the rabbis and the rationale for their inclusion in this study.

- Rabbi William (Bill) Silverman served in Nashville from 1950–1960. This study focuses on events surrounding the dynamiting of the Jewish Community Center in 1958, in particular to Rabbi Silverman's civil rights involvement prior to 1958 and in the 18 months that followed.

- Rabbi Randall (Randy) Falk served in Nashville from 1960–1986. While he was known as an advocate for social justice, this dissertation explores his work as a campaigner for civil rights during the first 10 years of his time in Nashville, a

particularly volatile time for race relations, and the creation of the social justice committee at his synagogue.

- Rabbi Alfred (Al) Goodman served in Columbus, Georgia, from 1950–1983. Rabbi Goodman spoke openly from the pulpit about his efforts related to civil rights but did not seem to cause controversy in doing so. This dissertation focuses on his approach to the integration of Columbus, Georgia, schools and institutions, highlighting his efforts with the Sibley Commission.

- Rabbi P. Irving (Irv) Bloom served in Mobile, Alabama, from 1960–1973 where he was involved in the integration of the ministerial organization. The study focuses on those efforts as well as his role working behind the scenes as a leading voice for desegregation.

- Rabbi Burton (Burt) Padoll served in Charleston from 1962–1968 where he used the pulpit to inspire and cajole his congregants. This study explores his sermons to better understand and contextualize his approach toward civil rights.

Rationale for the order of the presentation of rabbinic exemplars

Much thought went into how to order the stories of the rabbis found in the pages that follow. As not all subjects were grounded around seminal events, and as they were each overlapping in practice to some degree, the use of chronology would not be an effective tool for structuring this chapter. Considering that each rabbi practiced in the same geographic area, that, too, would not be an effective tool for ordering these stories. Rather than attempt an objective assembly, I instead enacted a subjective approach and chose to present them in this chapter in the order that they emerged as rabbinic subjects. I had heard first of Rabbi Bill Silverman from a colleague who worked in Nashville, and it was his untold story that started my thinking on this

dissertation journey. Therefore, I chose to start first with his story. Rabbi Randy Falk follows Rabbi Silverman because he was Rabbi Silverman's successor. Rabbi Goodman's story is the third that is presented as it was a congregant of mine, who grew up at Rabbi Goodman's congregation, who informed me of his civil rights activism. Though I had known Rabbi Bloom for some time personally, I remained unaware of his role in the civil rights movement until just prior to embarking upon the creation of the dissertation proposal. Prior to his involvement, I was intent on telling just three stories, but could not resist including a luminary such as Rabbi Bloom in this text. I chose to present the story of Rabbi Padoll last as I believe that his story stands in stark contrast to the others, information that was unknown to me prior to engaging in the research. While each of the other rabbis proved able to navigate the rabbinate during the years targeted for exploration with relative ease, Rabbi Padoll had the most difficulty. I felt that including his story any earlier would introduce a rather jarring disconnect that would interrupt the flow of the chapter.

This chapter is divided into five sections, with each section detailing the findings related to a single rabbi. The sections begin with a brief biographical introduction of relevant material before delving into an historical context of the community the rabbi served, both related to the secular community and specifically the Jewish community. Throughout these narratives, the research questions will be referenced, making explicit the connection of the findings, while still preserving the richness of the stories that emerged from the archival research. Summarized answers to the research questions are offered toward the end of the chapter in order to make them explicit and accessible.

Section 1: Rabbi Bill Silverman

Rabbi Bill Silverman started his career in 1941, serving for 3 years as rabbi for a congregation in Battle Creek, Michigan. He then served as rabbi in Gastonia, North Carolina, for three years, followed by a 4-year stint in Duluth, Minnesota. From 1950–1960, Rabbi Silverman served a congregation in Nashville, Tennessee, before taking a congregation in Kansas City, Missouri, a position he held until his retirement.

Rabbi Bill Silverman was a published author who worked as a teacher, pastoral presence, fundraiser and advocate for increased Jewish observance (Adler, 1972). This section explores the events surrounding Rabbi Silverman's tenure in Nashville, specifically focusing on incidents surrounding the dynamiting of the Jewish Community Center in 1958. Particular attention is paid to the events leading to the incident and actions Rabbi Silverman took in the immediate aftermath.

The Nashville Way

The foundational history of Nashville is well documented (Aimin, 2002; Dorman, 2010; Doyle, 1985; Duke, 2010; Frank, 1962; Friedman & Gordis, 1955; Goodstein, 1989; Krause, 2016; McDonough, 2013). Of note to this dissertation is the development of particular cultural institutions and a communal zeitgeist related to race relations. Within months of the end of the Civil War, four new institutions of higher learning were founded to support the burgeoning population, among them the Fisk Free Colored School (later Fisk University), a school founded to educate freed slaves (Dorman, 2010). Nashville continued to grow, boasting 300,000 residents by the end of World War II. By the time the civil rights movement began in earnest, Nashville was a thriving urban center of almost five hundred thousand people (Doyle, 1985).

Benjamin Houston (2012) wrote about manner in which certain Supreme Court rulings impacted the tenor of race relations in Nashville as well as how they emboldened extremist groups. Within hours of the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* decision, the NAACP Nashville chapter petitioned the Nashville Board of Education to immediately end segregation in the public schools. Responding to delays in implementing the decision, in May 1955, the Court gave a follow-up ruling that would become known as "Brown II." According to this second ruling, the Supreme Court gave school districts some latitude to work out their desegregation plans locally, "with all deliberate speed," under the supervision of federal district courts (Doyle, 1985). On September 23, 1955, as integration efforts were delayed past the start of the next school year, another lawsuit was filed against the Nashville city schools on behalf of 21 African American children, and Federal District Court Judge William E. Miller ruled in *Kelley v. Board of Education* that the schools had 6 months to draw up plans in compliance with the decisions of the Supreme Court. In March 1956, the school board offered a tentative plan that would begin desegregation in the first grade the following September, in 1957, and extending to all twelve grades by 1968.

Several scholars (Doyle, 1985; Houston, 2012; Krause, 2016; Webb, 2010) credit the decision and actions related to *Kelley* as galvanizing the opposition to school desegregation. The Ku Klux Klan, the White Citizens' Council (WCC), and the Tennessee Federation for Constitutional Government (TFCG) united in their fight against *Kelley* under the leadership of Frederick John Kasper (Webb, 2010). As the school year approached, city leaders feared violence would erupt in the streets following the registration of 13 Black families in first grade at previously all-White schools. Kasper urged his followers from the Klan to call the homes of the first graders and threaten the families. The *Memphis Press Scimitar* reported that Kasper "said

his followers would visit each of the thirteen Negro families and that parents would be warned

that, unless they withdrew their children from white schools, they would be shot, hanged, or have

their homes dynamited" (https://www.nashvillescene.com/news/pith-in-the-

wind/article/20974873/nashville-desegregation-and-the-bombing-of-hattie-cotton-elementary).

As the September 9 date for integration grew closer, a series of rallies were held throughout

Nashville, calling for White students to boycott the schools. The intimidation was ultimately

unsuccessful in the stated goal of preventing school integration, and on the morning of

September 9, six Nashville schools were integrated. Later that evening, Kasper held a large rally

at the steps of the Tennessee state capitol. After the rally disbanded, throngs of angry White

Nashvillians began a large-scale riot, culminating in the early morning (12:33 a.m.) bombing on

September 10 of the Hattie Cotton Elementary School (https://bygone-

nashville.mtsu.edu/items/show/71). Emboldened, similar groups would continue making threats

and engaging in acts of violence throughout the community, culminating in the dynamiting of

Clinton High School (1958) and the Jewish Community Center (also in 1958).

Following the implementation of the plan for school integration in 1957 and during the

course of the rash of bombings, Nashville divinity student C. T. Vivian (who died during the

research phase of this dissertation in 2020) formed the Nashville Christian Leadership

Conference (NCLC), a branch of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) founded

by Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (Doyle, 1985). Vivian partnered with James M. Lawson, Jr.

to form the Nashville Student Movement, which trained students from the four local black

colleges in the methods of nonviolence and passive resistance. In 1960, 40 students staged a sit-

in at Woolworth's (Houston, 2012), which quickly spread to sit-ins at other businesses and bus

depots throughout Nashville. The NCLC and the Nashville Student Movement drew support

from outside of the Black community as White Nashvillians—including a fair number of those

from the Jewish community—found the strategies and methods of those organizations made

them natural allies for the progressive Nashville community.

A Twentieth-Century Survey of the Jews of Nashville

The Jewish community of Nashville at the turn of the twentieth century was wealthy and

relatively influential despite comprising a low percentage of the community (Dorman, 2010).

Jews served as judges and board chairs and were major philanthropists in the city of Nashville.

However, as the desegregation crisis deepened, Jews became cast as subversive cultural outsiders

(Friedman & Gordis, 1955), resulting in a steady and increased rise in anti-Semitism. Some in

the Jewish community became fearful of activity that would draw comparisons to their status as

outsiders (Friedman & Gordis, 1955), and they began to discourage Jewish involvement in the

civil rights movement.

On March 16, 1958, hundreds of anti-Semitic leaflets were distributed in the city just

prior to the bombing of the Jewish Community Center. While some blamed the rise of anti-

Semitism as a response to the advocacy of Rabbi William Silverman (Silverman, 1950–1960),

many in the press and dozens of members of the congregation praised his leadership as an

advocate and encouraged him to retain his passions even in the midst of the rise of anti-Semitism

in the form of the leaflets, bombing, and threats (Silverman, 1950–1960; Silverman, 1913–2001).

Rabbi William B. Silverman

Bill Silverman was born in 1913 in Altoona, Pennsylvania, but was raised in Cleveland,

Ohio. While attending Western Reserve University, he served as executive secretary of the

Conservative Community Temple of Cleveland. One of the religious school teachers whom he

met there, Pearl Evelyn Biales, became his wife after a 6-year courtship (Adler, 1972). He

graduated in 1935 and enrolled in the Hebrew Union College seminary in Cincinnati, Ohio, serving as president of the student body prior to his ordination in 1941. During his service as president, he had the opportunity to serve as a guide to visiting alumnus, Rabbi Samuel Mayerberg, from Kansas City. Silverman was captivated with Mayerberg's accounts of his civic work in Kansas City and the two struck up a lifelong friendship, culminating, in 1960, with Rabbi Silverman succeeding Rabbi Mayerberg as the rabbi of Congregation B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City (Adler, 1972).

Rabbi Silverman served his first congregation in Battle Creek, Michigan, from 1941–1943, during which time he was also civilian chaplain at Fort Custer (Meyer, 2008). In Gastonia, North Carolina, where he served next for 3 years, he served as a teacher of Judaism to Christian audiences (Silverman, 1950–1960), a skill which he would carry throughout his career as an ardent author of texts on this subject. While in Gastonia, Rabbi Silverman would also develop another of his passions, protecting the welfare of children at risk, through his service as an organizer of an advisory committee for the Gastonia Juvenile Court (Krause, 2016). In 1946, he moved to Duluth, Minnesota, to serve Temple Israel, where he was appointed to the Minnesota Governor's Advisory Council on Youth Conservation and chaired that body's Committee on Parents and the Family (ibid.). Northland College in nearby Ashland, Wisconsin, conferred an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree on Rabbi Silverman in 1950 in recognition of his promotion of Christian-Jewish understanding and his "great influence for good" in civic affairs (Adler, 1972).

From 1950 until 1960, Rabbi Silverman served Ohavai Shalom of Nashville, Tennessee. It was there that he exhibited the first of the common themes in this text: he engaged in courageous activity by fine-tuning his passions for social justice from the pulpit, from his radio

show, and in hundreds of interviews with the press. In 1952, Rabbi Silverman took on the

American Legion and other groups in their attempt to transform a Tennessee legislative

committee's probe of public school textbooks into a general book burning and a character

assassination of politically suspect teachers (Silverman, 1913–2001). "He registered the first

outspoken opposition, on radio and in the press, for which he was subjected to hate letters and

threatening telephone calls. Nevertheless, he persisted and organized a countermovement of civic

leaders and clergy members. His view that the charges of subversive influence in the schools

were baseless was confirmed by the legislative committee" (Adler, 1972, p. 275) and the

Tennessee House of Representatives lauded Rabbi Silverman with a resolution for his leadership.

Further emphasizing his role in the community, this episode cast Rabbi Silverman as a leading

voice for the local clergy.

 Rabbi Silverman soon found himself enmeshed in Nashville's civil rights struggle, a role

that informs the findings related to third question in this dissertation (What lessons can we glean

regarding the role of context . . .?). As has been well documented (Houston, 2012; Krause, 2016;

Lipman & Vorspan, 1962; Webb, 2003) the issue of school desegregation placed Jews of the

South in a difficult position. Although many were privately sympathetic, they generally deemed

it prudent to maintain silence in order not to risk economic reprisals and the loss of social status

(Adler, 1972). Thus, at this time, in this community, for White-presenting Jews, engaging around

the issue of civil rights was a courageous act and a professionally risky behavior. Rabbi

Silverman recognized both the communal and congregational context and, ultimately, did not let

concerns of personal safety and professional security triumph. As Rabbi Silverman recalled in an

interview with P. Allen Krause, "I had been speaking about this as a problem and saying that we

Jews ought to be involved. Well, some of the members of my congregation said this is not a

problem for Jews. I was telling them that it is a problem for Jews. And some of them said that even if it is a problem let's stay out of it and not have any trouble, because we are living in the South" (Krause, 2016, p. 145).

Findings related to Rabbi Silverman's desire to involve himself with issues that were controversial in his community shed further insight into the first research question (In an era when congregational rabbis often struggle with how and when to speak up and out, how might the experiences of these civil rights era rabbis inform their choices?), for despite their reticence, Rabbi Silverman continued to cajole his congregation to get involved with the issues of the public sphere—including civil rights. Board minutes from January 17, 1956, discovered in the archives at The Temple in Nashville, reflect that "Rabbi Silverman reported that he had extended an invitation to Dr. Charles Johnson to speak at Services, February 10th" (Silverman, 1950–1960). In his correspondence with Rabbi Eugene Lipman, Director of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism later that year, Rabbi Silverman further offered,

> I have been extremely proud of my own congregation here in Nashville. As you may know, last January I went before the Board and told them that I was going to invite a Negro to occupy the pulpit. I asked the Board to give me a vote of confidence. The Board did, and voted a Resolution stating that as long as I am a Rabbi of this congregation, I have a free pulpit and may invite anyone, regardless of race or religious faith. I invited Dr. Charles Johnson, President of Fisk University, who spoke from the pulpit on a Friday night. I believe this is the first time that a Negro clergyman has spoken from any church other than a Negro church in Nashville. There were two or three hundred Negroes in attendance at our religious services, and despite a few complaints from some of the reactionaries, we had a fine evening. (Silverman, 1950–1960)

While only a short paragraph, there is much contained in the above text that can be understood as related to the common themes as well as some emerging themes particular to Rabbi Silverman. As a member of the congregational clergy, I know that there is comfort to be found in *not* pushing boundaries. That comfort is often in opposition to a genuine desire to experiment with programming, to create new initiatives that will resonate with the existing

community, and perhaps attract new adherents. Rabbi Silverman did not need to invite Dr.

Johnson to the congregation to speak from the pulpit. Yet clearly evident was his understanding

of his role—after all, he indicates, in his letter, that he recognized and utilized freedom of the

pulpit, a phrase indicating that the clergy member may determine what is articulated and by

whom it is articulated during congregational worship. Further, the letter can be used to illustrate

Rabbi Silverman's engagement with courageous activity, as he himself indicates that such an

action had not been undertaken previously in Nashville. Finally, we can observe another

common theme begin to emerge, that of the importance of communal relationships. As noted in

the section relaying the context of Nashville, Fisk University was an important community

institution in the work of civil rights, and one is left to wonder whether the rest of Rabbi

Silverman's Nashville story would have unfolded as it did without the invitation to—and

relationship with—Dr. Johnson.

One can also begin to observe a theme unique to the Rabbi Silverman, at least, unique

among the rabbis featured in this study: Rabbi Silverman sought a very public profile. While first

recognized through his use of the radio show in 1952 with his work addressing the Tennessee

legislative committee's probe of public school textbooks into a general book burning and a

character assassination of politically suspect teachers, the invitation of Dr. Johnson, and the

subsequent elevation in status of The Temple, helped to recognize the emergent theme of Rabbi

Silverman's quest for renown.

While the lecture from Dr. Johnson may have been well received, Rabbi Silverman still

felt the need to engage in courageous activity by pushing his congregants to get further involved

in civic affairs, further contributing to the findings related to the first research question. In his

report to the Board of Trustees on May 21, 1957, the minutes reflect that, "Rabbi feels we have a

tremendous job of public relations to do in this community since there is so much Religion (sic) in the public school and the existence of the Negro problem and feels we Jews should be in the forefront of our Civic Life" (TN—Board of Trustees, 1957).

Rabbi Silverman continued to build important communal relationships through his work with regard to civil rights, including forming the Nashville Community Relations Council to promote integration, both in the school system as well as the local police force. Both of these activities drew consternation from members of his congregation. He explained his response to the hesitation of his congregants by addressing, also in the interview with Krause, his methodological approach to his activism. Rabbi Silverman explains,

> I know that there were times when a method couldn't make any difference—and then you either fish or cut bait. You would come out and you take a stand and you would stand by your stand. I think basically my position has been a religious position. Not economic, not social service or social action. I insist that as a rabbi, as a teacher of Judaism, that Judaism is a religion of action and I need not support that point of view . . . and if you want to argue with me, you have to refute my Judaism. This is not always an easy thing for a layman to do. My position has always been the right side of the Lord God or the Bible or the Talmud or Judaism says this; therefore, I must act in consonance with these teachings. Now don't argue with me. Go and argue with five thousand years of Judaism. (Krause, 2016, p. 157)

From this response one can observe the emergence of another common theme, the use of Jewish textual tradition. Though Rabbi Silverman does not make reference to particular passages that he would cite, his reference to both the Bible and the Talmud, as well as general Jewish tradition, imply that he most likely had a few key passages to which he often returned. Like many rabbis, Rabbi Silverman found it important to recognize his role in his community (his communal context, as it relates to the third research question), in this case, his congregation, as a transmitter of Jewish textual tradition. Also like many rabbis, Rabbi Silverman did not simply look to tradition to provide lofty platitudes but also to instruct behavior.

While his use of Jewish text may have been a successful tool with his congregants, Rabbi Silverman did admit to embracing a different methodical approach when dealing with detractors outside of the Jewish faith. In his own words, he further illustrated the importance of the communal relationships when he stated,

> The first thing you have to do is to become a part of the community. You join with the ministers and the ministerial association. You work with them. You become friends with them through the Rotary Club or the Kiwanis Club or some other group. When I talk of Rotary I regret that I had just one stomach to give to my congregation. Creamed gravies and all of that. Do I need it? Like a hole in my stomach, but you become friends with these people. You are on a first-name basis. You work with the governor. You become a name-dropper. Does this help? Yes, you can see it helps. When you are able to go to an outstanding Christian minister on a first name basis and say to him, "Now John, let's get together and see what we can do about this situation." Once you have the Christian support you are not out on a limb all alone. You are going to be more effective. (Krause, 2016, p. 158)

The above commentary contributes further to the answer to the first research question as one can begin to understand that the relationships that Rabbi Silverman built contributed to the manner in which he spoke up and out. Rabbi Silverman didn't just develop institutional relationships—for example, a relationship between Fisk University and his congregation—but he developed personal relationships as well. It is interesting to note that, though separated by over seventy years, my own experience mirrors that of Rabbi Silverman, for though institutional relationships are important, they are often significantly more transactional than personal relationships, which can be transformational. My synagogue leadership, echoing the intentions offered by Rabbi Silverman, encourages me to be involved with non-Jewish communal organizations not just to elevate the profile of the synagogue, but also to develop relationships with others in an attempt to become better allies with those in our community. These relationships have been the key to our congregational involvement addressing poverty and homelessness, issues related to the LGBTQ community, and, most importantly, race relations.

His public role and the relationships he cultivated enabled Rabbi Silverman to develop a reputation as an activist member of the clergy in Nashville. In this role, he was invited to speak often in non-Jewish settings where he did not always receive a glowing reception, and he soon began to recognize these engagements as acts of courage. As he relates, in April 1957, he was invited to speak at a Methodist Church. "I was in a Methodist church and was beaten up by four or five guys. Some Methodists came to my defense, and I was pretty bruised and bloodied at the time" (Krause, 2016, pp. 145–146). In addition to the physical acts of intimidation, Rabbi Silverman also received hate mail. He retained in his personal correspondence, found in the Archives of The Temple in Nashville, a letter dated April 27, 1956, from M. L. Nelson. Though rather lengthy—and rather colorful—the reader will get the flavor of the tone of the correspondence, taken from the conclusion of the document:

> For your information, you and the other 119 just as well fold up and shut up, as we self respecting Americans are not going to let our children attend school with negros regardless of what any judg (sic) or lawyer says, for we have respect for our children. Have you read the record of some of the Supreme Court Judges. They are a disgrace to America. If you and the other 119 wish to embrace negros socially then get out of Tennessee and go where your kind lives. I am sure we citizens would be glad and that we would get along just fine. (Silverman, 1950–1960)

Rabbi Silverman had long warned his congregants not to delude themselves that the Jewish community would escape the attention of white supremacists. That assessment was proven correct on March 16, 1958, when the Jewish Community Center was dynamited. This section of the narrative presents findings related to research question two in that it contributes to Rabbi Silverman's legacy by amplifying previously overlooked aspects of his role in the aftermath of the attack. Minutes after the blast, a caller from the Confederate Underground telephoned the Silverman home and told Pearl, Rabbi Silverman's wife, that, "This is Captain Gordon of the Confederate Underground. We have just dynamited the Jewish Community

Center. Next will be the Temple and any other n****r-loving place. We are going to shoot

Federal Judge William Miller in cold blood and next your husband" (Silverman, 1950–1960).

Rabbi Silverman called the Jewish Community Center and spoke with a police sergeant who

confirmed the news, causing him to rush over to inspect the damage. Throughout the night, as

relayed in Rabbi Silverman's correspondence with Harry Golden (Silverman, 1913–2001), the

phone calls persisted. As Rabbi Silverman wrote,

> Police converged upon The Temple and the Rabbi's home [note that the synagogue had a parsonage, hence the odd reference]. A dead pigeon was put in the mailbox with a note, "You will haul away the dead pigeon. Next dead pigeon will be the n****r-loving Rabbi." (Silverman, 1913–2001)

As reported in the minutes of the Board (Silverman, 1950–1960) as well as his own

correspondence (Silverman, 1913–2001), police began to guard the Silverman home as the

threats multiplied, most certainly causing a great deal of moral distress for Rabbi Silverman as he

balanced the safety of his family with his desire to stand up to those making the threats. Another

telephone call threatened action against the Silverman children on Sunday morning and warned

the Jews to keep their children at home (Krause, 2016). Yet another telephone call to the rabbi

stated, "We know that your oldest son goes to Hillsboro High School and gets out at 2:30. We

know the bus he takes and his route home. Your youngest son goes to Palmer School. He gets

out at 3:00. Keep those kids at home, Jew-Rabbi. We won't kill them. We'll just maim them for

life as a sign of what happens to n****r-lovers" (Silverman, 1913–2001). Following these calls,

and with the support of the Board of Trustees (Silverman, 1913–2001), Rabbi Silverman was

sworn in as a deputy sheriff, purchased a snub-nosed .38 revolver, took daily target practice, and

began carrying a gun for the protection of his family.

As relayed to Mr. Golden, another call was received by the Silverman family announcing

that the Temple would be dynamited the next Friday evening, with the caller urging the Jews to

call off worship services. Rabbi Silverman, in another example showcasing his courageous

actions, insisted that the services be held, albeit with police surrounding the Temple (Silverman,

1913–2001). In private correspondence with Rabbi Jacob Rudin on March 19, 1958, Rabbi

Silverman wrote,

> Some of our members have suggested that we call off Services on Friday night, because of the repeated threats to dynamite the Temple. Although the Temple and the adjacent areas will be heavily guarded, we will worship Friday night, not only to observe the Sabbath, but to attest to our abiding conviction that the voice of Jacob is more powerful than the hands of Esau or the explosive potential of dynamite. (Silverman, 1913–2001)

It was during that service, held on March 28, that Rabbi Silverman used Jewish text, and

parlayed his role in the community, in the delivery of his public response to the attack, a sermon

titled, "We Will Not Yield." David Meyer (Meyer, ca. 2008) wrote of the sermon that it

"provides a meaningful reflection of significant historic consequence. At the same time, it

captures the struggles and deliberations of a young rabbi seeking to live by the ideals of his faith

under enormous communal pressures" (p. 6).

The sermon was well received (Adler, 1972; Krause, 2016) and Rabbi Silverman

received correspondence from people throughout the country. Those letters, as well as his

responses, preserved in the American Jewish Archives, offer students of leadership and change

interesting insight into exchanges between a leader in the midst of crisis and those offering

support. As well, the vast collections of letters serve as findings related to the second research

question, as they contribute to the legacy of Rabbi Silverman. Alven Ghertner of Nashville wrote

on March 28, 1958, "It is important, I think, that the leadership of a community, and certainly

you occupy that position, should take a positive stand on every important issue. I for one have

confidence in your judgment and your leadership" (Silverman, 1913–2001). Mortimer May,

writing from Jerusalem on March 20, 1958, wrote, "I am very much moved by your courage and

resolution. Your stand is redolent of our millennial heritage; is in character of a people who have ever fought for human rights for all. . . . You merit the support of all" (Silverman, 1913–2001). Mr. and Mrs. Shavin of Nashville wrote, on March 25, 1958, "It is apparent that you have the wisdom to overlook the narrow implications of those threats and the courage to voice your anger against the inevitable ugly pattern. We are invigorated by your courage. . . . Hope it continues to grow in depth and breadth" (Silverman, 1913–2001).

In addition to lay people, non-Jewish clergy members sent notes of support to Rabbi Silverman, many of which are stored in the American Jewish Archives and, in a remarkable recognition of the importance of communal relationships, Rabbi Silverman responded to each one. Minister Arthur Wayne Braden of the Vine Street Christian Church in Nashville wrote, "Please know that the people of Vine Street feel a sense of humiliation in the knowledge that this kind of thing could happen in our community" (Silverman, 1913–2001). Reverend Raymond T. Ferris of the Christ Episcopal Church in Nashville made numerous comments of support on television and in the press, meriting a note of appreciation from Rabbi Silverman (Silverman, 1913–2001). Rev. Cecil Culverhouse, President of the Nashville Ministers' Association, offered support, as did Dr. James Henley of the West End Methodist Church in Nashville, Rev. Kelly Miller Smith of Nashville's First Baptist Church, and dozens of other local clergy leaders with whom Rabbi Silverman had a relationship. Everett R. Clinchy, President of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, wrote on March 20, 1958, "I write to express my great concern about the violence which affected the Jewish center in Nashville. All the more reason to establish a Conference of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, so that citizens of all faiths may stand together and work for the defense of all" (Silverman, 1913–2001). Rabbi Silverman soundly

rejected the framing of the bombing as an attack on the Jewish community as reflected in his

letter to Rabbi Jacob Rudin on March 19, 1958,

> There has been an outpouring of Christian sympathy, and I have attempted to make it clear to the ministers and teachers, civic officials and responsible people in our community that the entire community of Nashville has been victimized, and that while this seems to be a Jewish problem, it is in essence a problem of law and order, decency and morality, and certainly one to be reckoned with by the Christian Church. (Silverman, 1913–2001)

The vast collection on Rabbi Silverman housed with the American Jewish Archives also

contains extensive correspondence between the rabbi and his rabbinic colleagues, including

Rabbi Jack Rothschild of Atlanta, Georgia, Rabbi Perry Nussbaum of Jackson, Mississippi, and

Rabbi Charles Mantinband from Hattiesburg, Mississippi, each of whom were active in the civil

rights struggle (Silverman, 1913–2001). Of particular interest is his communication with Rabbi

Samuel S. Mayerberg of Congregation B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City for, 2 years after the

exchange, Rabbi Silverman would leave Nashville to succeed Rabbi Mayerberg upon his

retirement. On March 28, 1958, Rabbi Mayerberg wrote, "I pray God that He will protect you

and give you strength to go on with your valiant leadership. I am sure that your congregation will

always be grateful that you have been in Nashville to lead in this glorious fight for human rights

and dignity. You are writing a memorable record that will shine forth in the struggle for

democracy and the implementation of the ideals of Judaism" (Silverman, 1913–2001). Rabbi

Silverman responded to Rabbi Mayerberg on April 2, 1958, writing that, "It is good to know that

I have a man of your prophetic courage standing beside me" (Silverman, 1913–2001). Rabbi

Mayerberg was himself fully engaged in the causes of civil rights and justice in his community

(Adler, 1972; Meyer, 2008; Vorspan, 1960). Interestingly, the two were featured in a national

publication for students titled *Keeping Posted* in May 1958 with the phrase "Fighter Silverman"

under Rabbi Silverman's photo and "Fighter Mayerberg" appearing under Rabbi Mayerberg's

photo (Adler, 1972). Rabbi Mayerberg was compelled, for his own safety, to carry a pistol,

leading Rabbi Silverman to dub the duo "Pistol-Packing Rabbis" (Silverman, 1913–2001).

On March 20, 1958, Rabbi Silverman embraced his communal role as a leader and a

pastoral presence when he sent a letter to the congregation. While he offered his thoughts about

the matter, he also attempted to inspire the congregants to remain steadfast in their resolve. He

closed his letter,

> We will not yield to violence. We will not submit to intimidation. Our children are
> protected. Our Temple property is under constant surveillance. Our congregation will
> maintain its schedule of activities and religious services, not only to express our
> reverence for God, but likewise to demonstrate the courage of prophetic Judaism when
> confronted with violence, intimidation and the attempt to inculcate fear. May God be
> with us. May He grant us courage, resolution, and the strength of a progressive, dynamic,
> living faith. (Silverman, 1913–2001)

Rabbi Silverman's leadership during this crisis directly relates to several of the research

questions that frame this dissertation. During his time in Nashville, Rabbi Silverman struggled

with a similar challenge to one that confronts rabbis today, namely, knowing how and when to

speak up and out on a particular issue. One can discern from Rabbi Silverman that one should

speak up when members of the greater community are targeted, as he did with regard to

becoming an outspoken champion of civil rights. Of course, not all rabbis can engage around

communally divisive issues, even if they are personally and morally compelling. Even in those

congregations, however, when a Jewish institution is targeted, or when one recognizes

anti-Semitic tropes, one has a communal obligation, as noted Rabbi Silverman, to speak out.

One may also glean from Rabbi Silverman's example the importance of communal

context for rabbinic practice today. Rabbi Silverman chose to embrace an issue—race

relations—that was already at the forefront of his community. Further, as demonstrated earlier in

this section, Nashville had its own history with regard to race relations. From this we can

appreciate that the role of context—both history and location, as related to the third research question—can be powerful tools used by a rabbi to effect change.

Returning to the story of Rabbi Silverman for a postscript, it should be noted that, 2 years after this incident, Rabbi Silverman accepted the invitation to serve as the Senior Rabbi in Kansas City, succeeding his fellow pistol-packing rabbinic colleague Rabbi Mayerberg. In his own words, he had a fine opportunity in Kansas City, a larger congregation with a larger salary, so he decided to move on (Krause, 2016). There is nothing abnormal about this type of departure. Unlike religious bodies that assign clergy to particular communities, often with a maximum time allocation, the manner in which rabbis leave one congregation and join another in Reform Judaism is dependent upon the rabbi and the congregation. While there are some cases where a rabbi surprises a congregation by departing, and some cases where a synagogue chooses to dismiss the rabbi, this case involved a peaceful and supportive separation. In fact, as a gesture of appreciation to Rabbi Silverman, two months following his departure, the congregation sent to him the balance of a particular budget line that had gone unspent, along with a note of genuine appreciation for the decade of service (Silverman, 1913–2001).

While there is much to celebrate in the story of Rabbi Silverman, one should also look with a critical eye to the narrative contained in this dissertation. As much as Rabbi Silverman's story celebrates the importance of communal relationships, one is left only with disappointment that he chose to leave the congregation after receiving so many commitments to collaborate from local faith leaders and others. In fact, following the dynamiting of the Jewish Community Center, one could argue that Rabbi Silverman had both public opinion and a union of religious, business, and civic leaders aligned in common purpose. Perhaps if he had stayed in Nashville, those relationships could have been utilized to make greater and more lasting change more quickly.

As well, while I chose to include the episode wherein Rabbi Silverman invited Dr. Charles Johnson to share the pulpit at his synagogue, I did so because of the historic nature of the activity and the opportunity to illustrate the manner in which Rabbi Silverman related to and with his board members. As a researcher, I was conflicted about including the episode, as I am acutely aware that Dr. Johnson's voice is absent from the narrative. Not only is the story incomplete, but it is also devoid of necessary context aimed at determining whether there was a genuine relationship with Dr. Johnson or whether the occurrence was transactional. Despite an exhaustive search, no further information could be gleaned about this encounter, leaving the story vastly incomplete and its context—and impact—up to conjecture.

Finally, though Rabbi Silverman's involvement with civil rights in Nashville reflects a period of important leadership, throughout his time in Nashville, and overlapping with the civil rights events, Rabbi Silverman was engaged with other activities within the congregation, many of which reflected only marginal success. For example, the minutes of the congregation reveal that, for almost every month of his decade-long tenure, Rabbi Silverman devoted a part of his remarks at the Board of Trustees meetings to chastising the board members for not attending worship services. Based upon the frequency of such repetition, it would appear that (a) the behavior did not change and (b) Rabbi Silverman's approach did not change. While relatively minor, this archival finding illustrates that Rabbi Silverman was not always as impactful in other areas of his rabbinate as he was with regard to the issue of civil rights. It also highlights that a leadership approach may work well in one setting, with a particular set of variables, yet may be less effective in other settings with a different context. One would have hoped that Rabbi Silverman would have reflected upon his approach and concluded that a different tactic was necessary to achieve the change he desired.

Despite the critique, Rabbi Silverman led his congregation through a most trying and terrifying period. While he expressed his desire to serve as a transmitter of Jewish teaching and the beauty of Jewish heritage, it was his lived example of both that largely defines the legacy of his Nashville tenure and continues to inspire generations later.

Section 2: Rabbi Randall Falk

Rabbi Randall (Randy) Falk started his career in 1947, serving for 13 years as rabbi for a congregation in Erie, Pennsylvania. He moved to Nashville to succeed Rabbi William Silverman in 1960. Rabbi Falk served the Nashville congregation until his retirement in 1986.

Rabbi Randy Falk succeeded his predecessor in every way. Like Rabbi Silverman, Rabbi Falk served as a teacher, pastoral presence, fundraiser, an advocate for increased Jewish observance, and was a published author (Falk, 2002). While he advocated for several social justice causes, this paper explores his work as an activist for civil rights during the first 10 years of his time in Nashville, a particularly volatile time for race relations, as well as the creation of the social justice committee at his congregation. As Rabbi Falk focused on desegregation efforts in the city, particular attention is paid to his efforts during which he used his rabbinic title.

Nashville Context

The road to integration in Nashville was never easy, nor was it direct, though several prominent Jews were fixtures on that path (Roseman, 2010; Herzberg, 1997). While an exhaustive study is beyond the scope of this chapter, of particular mention should be Rabbi William Silverman, whose story was cited previously in this dissertation. Rabbi Silverman came to Nashville in 1950 to serve as the rabbi of the Temple. He received from the Board of Directors a freedom of the pulpit, which enabled him to become involved in the nascent civil rights movement in Nashville. In addition to integrating the pulpit of his congregation and publicly

supporting integration efforts, he helped to organize the biracial Nashville Community Relations Council. He also spoke out against the White Citizen's Council, leading to his being attacked following a presentation at a local Methodist church. Rabbi Silverman shepherded his community following the attack on the Nashville Jewish Community Center and he himself received threats which led to his requiring police protection. (Rabbi Silverman receives significant attention in the previous section of this dissertation.)

The story of the Jewish involvement in the integration of Nashville would be incomplete without mentioning that the community as a whole was rather conflicted on this issue. While some Jews engaged in integration efforts, others preferred the societal balance which found themselves, as Jews, welcomed to certain strata of society (Roseman, 2010). Nashville Jews were caught mid-center in the ethos of the struggle for integration. The age-old quandary of supporting minority rights, theirs or those of others, without alienating majority sentiments, influenced Jewish involvement. For more than a century, Jews had been advancing toward a respected position in the social and economic scene of Nashville. Should they sacrifice that and support civil rights for African Americans or should they step back and let the drama play out before them? What is probably the most accurate assessment of general Jewish involvement in the civil rights struggle in Nashville is that Jews were sympathetic to the cause but cautious about overt action (Roseman, 2010). With more than a 100-year presence at the time civil rights became an issue, Jews had acculturated and were manifestly Southern like their neighbors (Doyle, 1985). In effect, they were accepted, however marginally, and most Jews were wary of upsetting that balance. This context is important to note, especially as it relates to the third research question, for, since the community was not monolithic regarding civil rights, any rabbi

engaging with issue would most certainly experience the themes of moral distress and

professionally risky behavior.

Rabbi Randall Falk

Randy Falk was born in Little Rock, Arkansas, on July 9, 1921. In an interview housed in

the archives of The Temple in Nashville (Falk, 2002), Rabbi Falk mentioned that he grew up in a

segregated community with segregated schools.

> I suppose my first realization of the inequalities came during my high school years. When
> I saw the kind of education we received, in a magnificent high school to which African-
> American youngsters were not permitted. They had their own schools, and while some of
> their schools certainly were very good, they did not have the facilities, the equipment, or
> the opportunities that we had in our schools, and I was very much aware of that. After I
> graduated from high school, I spent my first year at college at Little Rock Junior College
> and I walked from my home through an African-American neighborhood to get to the
> college. I became more keenly aware then of the limitations that were imposed on
> African-Americans in the South. (Falk, 2002, pp. 2–3)

Randy graduated from high school in 1939, spending one year at junior college before

moving to Cincinnati to attend the University of Cincinnati in the morning and the Hebrew

Union College in the afternoon. He graduated from the University of Cincinnati in 1942 with a

Bachelor of Arts Degree and was ordained a rabbi in 1947 (Biographical Sketch of Rabbi

Randall M. Falk, 2010). Following his ordination, he moved to Erie, Pennsylvania, to serve

Congregation Anshe Chesed, which he did until moving to Nashville in 1960. While in

Pennsylvania, he met Edna Unger of Cleveland, Ohio, and shortly thereafter, the two were

married. Together they had three children: Randall Marc, Jonathan, and Heidi.

Rabbi Falk chose to come to Nashville, in part, because he wanted to study with Lou

Silberman and work on his doctorate at Vanderbilt, an agreement he made with the search

committee from The Temple (Houston, June 18, 2003) prior to accepting the position. But he

also came because he wanted to immerse himself in the civil rights struggle (Falk, 2002). Rabbi

Falk exhibited a theme common to each of the rabbinic exemplars—the use of Jewish text as inspiration for social justice work—when he explained that his motivation for involvement in the civil rights movement was grounded in scripture. "The prophets," he said, "challenge us to be concerned with justice for people of all races, nations and creeds, because we [Jews] were slaves in Egypt and knew the suffering of the oppressed" (Fifty Years, 2010).

An early finding in the archival collections speaks to the third research question. As a result of his friendship with his predecessor, Rabbi Silverman, Rabbi Falk knew the recent history of the congregational involvement in the civil rights movement, as well the trials and tribulations Rabbi Silverman experienced following the bombing of the Nashville JCC (Falk, 2002), prior to his move to the community. Rabbi Falk relied on his understanding of the role of rabbi in his congregation when he successfully refined his job description to include civil rights activism. "When I came to Nashville," he commented, "I told the leadership of the congregation that if I came, I would be involved in the integration process, and to their credit, the Board of Trustees, the leadership of The Temple, was very supportive throughout the time that I was active in the movement" (Falk, 2002, pp. 4–5).

Another theme that emerged in the story of Rabbi Silverman is evidenced in that of Rabbi Falk: the importance of communal relationships. Upon his arrival in 1960, Rabbi Falk joined with a clergy group that met every week at Fisk University to plan different areas in which they might be effective in the civil rights movement (Three Local Clergymen Chosen for Human Relations Award, 1979). This group was very much involved in the early sit-ins at the lunch counters, including one held at Grant's which was widely publicized because, in Rabbi Falk's own words, "some rednecks from the rural area came in, tried to oppose our sit-ins, and we had a

difficult time, because the police at the time were not very sympathetic to what we were doing, either" (Falk, 2000).

The relationships formed through the clergy group are directly related to the first research question as they provided Rabbi Falk an avenue for his activism. In fact, the relationships led to other early immersive efforts with regard to the struggle for civil rights for Rabbi Falk, including his participation in weekly trainings for African American high school and college students in nonviolence (Falk, 2002) and marching in the streets along with fellow ministers Bill Barnes, Will Campbell, and Baxton Bryant, three other (and often the only other three) White members of the clergy (Houston, June 18, 2003). At one point, he participated in a "sip-in" arranged for one of the restaurant chains that had held out as a segregated eatery. Rabbi Falk and others adopted the tactic of flooding the restaurant with customers, going through the cafeteria line, and ordering nothing but coffee or soft drinks, filling all the tables. The waiters kept filling their cups for the entire luncheon period, leading the owners to integrate their restaurant after a few days (Harrelson, 2001).

As indicated previously, the Jewish community in Nashville was far from monolithic regarding civil rights, and engaging in any activity, even with the support of some in leadership, constituted professionally risky behavior. Rabbi Falk shared this illustrative anecdote:

> I'll never forget the night before the first march, I called the president of my congregation to tell him. I thought it was only fair that he knew that I was going to be one of the leaders of the march and that there would be criticism. So he said to me, after I explained it to him, "Well, are you calling to tell me what you're going to do or are you asking for my advice?" I said, "No, it's past the time for advice. I'm telling you what I've decided I have to do." He said, "Well, I will support you as far as I can, but I can't promise how the congregation is going to react." But I think to his surprise, and to mine, the congregation as a whole reacted very positively at my participation. And, though there were some who were not happy with it, and who came out to express their unhappiness, by and large I had a much easier time with my congregation than many of my clergy colleagues had with theirs. (Falk, 2002, pp. 6–7)

One can extrapolate other common themes from the above comment by Rabbi Falk. An obvious theme that emerges is the engagement in courageous activity. As addressed previously in this dissertation, public actions related to civil rights had the potential to be rather provocative, and others who had engaged previously (such as Rabbi Silverman) had been met with threats and even acts of violence. Perhaps a less obvious finding from the archival collections relates to the first and third research questions: the very action of calling the president of the synagogue. That he thought to communicate with his congregational president prior to the march (albeit so close that it would be impossible to change the planned activity) demonstrated an understanding of his role in the community and his appreciation of context. The rabbi serves at the invitation of the congregation, and congregational leadership can rescind that invitation if they deem it necessary. Rabbi Falk is thus accountable to, among others, the president of the synagogue, and his call ensured that the president heard about the march first from Rabbi Falk prior to other members of the congregation who could have been expressing upset. In providing the president with the appropriate information, the president would be better equipped to rise to Rabbi Falk's defense should the need arise, highlighting the importance of those relationships when choosing to speak up and out.

Rabbi Falk's public efforts with regard to civil rights and the positive and encouraging response from his congregants may naturally lead one to inquire as to whether Rabbi Falk attended the August 28, 1963, March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, at the time intended to be a unifying event for those supportive of civil and economic rights. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the umbrella organization for the movement of Reform Judaism, had been in active dialogue with organizers of the March to identify Jewish leaders and representatives, of which it was assumed Rabbi Falk may have been one (Falk, 2002). Research

into the sermons delivered by Rabbi Falk, through the archives at both The Temple and the

Nashville Jewish Community Center, yield no mention of either his attendance or his reflections

on the March. Leafing through Rabbi Falk's file titled "Black/Jewish," from his personal

collection of resources stored in the Archives at The Temple in Nashville, similarly yielded no

mention of the March on Washington. In a final effort to determine whether he was present, a

search was made through the American Jewish Archives to determine rabbinic participants at the

historic event. Despite numerous rabbis, and even numerous clergy members from Nashville,

Rabbi Randall Falk's name does not appear on the list.

Lest one rush to conclusions, findings during the research phase of the dissertation shed

light on the situation and address the second research question, contributing to Rabbi Falk's

legacy. Minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting from August 20, 1963 reflect the following

note:

> Mr. Albert Werthan read an article which appeared in the New York Times on August 16th telling of a press conference held by Judge Baar and Rabbi Klein, a member of the Committee on Social Action. He also advised that Rabbi Falk and Mr. Gus Kuhn had received on August 19th a bulletin from the UAHC Religious Action Center, the subject being Revised Plan for March on Washington. . . . His main concern, however, was that actions of this nature were taken without properly notifying the congregation. (TN—Board of Trustees, 1963a)

The following month, at the September 17, 1963, Executive Committee Meeting, Mr.

Werthan reported that he received a letter from the UAHC dated August 7, 1963, postmarked

August 9, 1963, but received on August 29, 1963, detailing plans for the March on Washington

and inviting Rabbi Falk to participate (TN—Board of Trustees, 1963b). Thus, it appears that

Rabbi Falk's lack of participation as an official representative of the Jewish community in such a

seminal event can be attributed to the United States Post Office.

Rabbi Falk may have missed the March on Washington, but he led the March on Nashville. Relying once again on the important communal relationships he had cultivated, on May 6, 1964, Rabbi Falk and a colleague, Sam Dodson, Pastor of the Calvary Methodist Church, led a group of 130 clergymen from an assembly point at Twentieth and West End to downtown. They walked 25 blocks, carrying signs protesting segregation and, in an action highlighting two other common themes—understanding of the unique role he played in the community and usage of Jewish texts—held an ecumenical prayer service on the courthouse steps. They then met Mayor Beverly Briley in his office and presented a 4-point program for civil rights in Nashville, insisting on the complete desegregation of all grades and a public accommodations bill (Clergy of Community Stood Up to Be Counted, 1964). That demonstration led to the establishment of the Human Relations Commission, of which Rabbi Falk was the second chairperson. Once again, the important communal relationships provided an outlet for his activism and contribute to the findings related to the first research question.

As evidenced from his personal correspondence and reminiscences by those with whom he worked (Falk, 1970), Rabbi Falk, though known as "an articulate and often controversial pulpiteer" (Roseman, 2010, p. 215), was interested in institutionalizing the congregational response to civil rights and other issues related to social justice. Addressing the first research question, findings around the establishment of a social justice committee demonstrate that Rabbi Falk employed a communal strategy to his activism, essentially both developing a team with which to work and also removing the sole focus on those projects as "Rabbi Falk's projects" (Falk, 2002). While the style of his predecessor, Rabbi William Silverman, informed the early stages of Rabbi Falk's rabbinate (Falk, 1970), he rather quickly determined that unilateral action from the rabbi was going to have increasingly limited success, especially if the activity was

orchestrated, directed, and driven solely by the rabbi. At this point, a theme in the story of Rabbi Falk begins to emerge: institution building as a result of humility. Not only did Rabbi Falk work to establish a social action group, but he removed the focus from himself. While one may contend that institution building could be completed as a political strategy, personal correspondence from Rabbi Falk found in the Archives of The Temple portray him as exceedingly humble, uncomfortable with receiving credit for his success, and highlighting the involvement of others over his own participation (Falk, 2000).

In 1961, Rabbi Falk engaged Fred Goldner, a member of the synagogue, to form and serve as the first chair of The Temple Social Action Committee (TN—Board of Trustees, 1961). The committee was ostensibly formed not only to educate the members of the congregation about social issues, but also, in turn, to chart policy, procedure, and activities for The Temple (Riven, 1993). As an institutional arm, it should be noted, the Social Action Committee is still in existence today. Further, it is still working on some of the same initiatives championed by Rabbi Falk, a further demonstration of the importance of the institution building approach of Rabbi Falk compared to the unilateral activities of Rabbi Silverman.

Based upon reports to Board of Trustees identified in minutes preserved in the Archives of The Temple in Nashville, the committee held rather perfunctory organizational meetings for the first year of its existence.

It was in 1963 that the committee's work began to expand in scope. On June 25, 1963, Dr. Goldner, acknowledging the efforts of Rabbi Falk in leading a conversation around the topic, suggested that the Social Justice Committee make known its support in writing to the Metro Human Rights Committee; and he moved, further, that a letter be sent to Governor Clement encouraging him, pursuant to representation made during his campaign, to form a Tennessee

Human Rights Committee. Dr. Goldner said that, in reference to his motion, he would "seek a meeting with the Community Relations Committee of the Jewish Community Council to secure approval of this plan, and would endeavor to report the results of the said conference at the next meeting of the Temple Board." The motion was seconded and passed (TN—Board of Trustees, 1963c).

That the Social Justice Committee adopted this course of action is relevant to this research paper for two reasons. First, the fact that the Social Justice Committee chose to adopt the cause of the formation of a Human Rights Committee foreshadows the 1964 March led by Rabbi Falk for this same purpose, indicating that the cause had both lay and clergy support. Perhaps more importantly, however, it presents clear evidence of the leadership of Rabbi Falk and how he engaged his lay partners.

A few months later, in September, 1963, the Social Justice Committee adopted a new project. According to the official report,

> Dr. Fred Goldner, Jr., reported… that letters will be in the mail this week to all members of The Temple, inviting them to participate in one or more of the parlor meetings being sponsored by his committee during October and November, to discuss the role of our congregation in furthering better race relations in Nashville. (TN—Board of Trustees, 1963b)

The committee reported back to the Board of Trustees in November 1963 "on the highly successful 16 parlor meetings held in the homes of members of The Temple on Race Relations; notes were taken at each meeting which were being reviewed and tabulated and the results will be reported to the Board" (TN—Board of Trustees, 1963d). At that same Board meeting, Rabbi Falk, relying on his understanding of the role of rabbi to uplift lay partners, went out of his way to address the work of the Social Justice Committee. According to the minutes, he "felt that never in his 17 years in the Rabbinate had he participated in any project as exciting and

stimulating; that the turnout was remarkable and that the discussions and opinions of those attending were enlightening" (TN—Board of Trustees, 1963d).

The Committee took their deliberations seriously and presented their findings to the Board at the January 1964 Board Meeting. Dr. Goldner took the helm and shared that over 350 members of the congregation participated in the parlor meetings where they were presented ten points intending to be guiding principles of the congregational approach to race relations for discussion and, ultimately, upon which they would vote. The minutes preserve a rather lengthy discussion on several minor points before adopting what became known as the "Decalogue of Guiding Principles in Human Rights." Dr. Goldner presented the decalogue as well as the tally of votes, which are found in Appendix A of this dissertation.

The tally of votes related to the Decalogue of Guiding Principles in Human Rights affirms the writings of Vorspan (1973) and others (Bauman, 2019; Doyle, 1985). The people who attended these parlor meetings had offered rather significant and unified support for the principles that addressed institutional behavior. Yet they were rather divided on the two points—numbers four and eight ("we encourage individual members of our Congregation to establish closer interpersonal relationships through gatherings in their homes on a bi-racial basis" and "we urge our members graciously to accept all neighbors regardless of race, national origin, or religion," respectively) that involved a commitment grounded in relationships. There was a distinction between the individual (rabbi) and the institution (The Temple and its affiliates) serving as exemplars of Jewish tradition and the more nuanced approach that members individually professed related to their own behavior. The institution building theme emerges again in Rabbi Falk's story as he reflected, years later, when asked about this time in his

congregation's history, "You must remember that this was 1963, 1964. I knew that we still had a ways to go, and I knew that I had my work cut out for me" (Houston, June 18, 2003).

The Temple's Annual Report from 1964, contained in the Archives of The Temple, presents the Guiding Principles to the congregation and places the document in context within the greater mores of the civil rights movement. Though not conclusive, it would appear, based upon style, cadence, and the use of Jewish text, that Rabbi Falk himself authored these words, though in the interest of institution building, he defers credit to the committee:

> The responsibility for the resolution of America's race problem is that of every American. However, we whose ancestors knew slavery, segregation in ghettoes, and persecution; and we, who in our own day have had close contact with the most sadistic persecution of Jews ever devised; and we, who know the self-doubt, the hurt and the resentment aroused by discrimination and prejudice as we lead our daily lives—we Jews, should be more sensitive to the problem and should be more aware of the need to solve the problem with urgency. (TN—Annual Report, 1964)

The work of the Social Action Committee with regard to the publication of the guiding principles was highlighted by Krause (1969), who evaluated not only the work of the committee but the process. Specifically, Krause parallels the success of Rabbi Falk in advancing and guiding this endeavor with other rabbis whose congregations were significantly more resistant to the work of civil rights. While one may attribute this success to a myriad of factors, among them would be the role of communal context (the history of The Temple), Rabbi Falk's institution-building style, and his pattern of deferring credit to those on the committee with whom he had a relationship.

Throughout the 1960s, Rabbi Falk continued to remain involved in the civil rights movement, though much of his work shifted to operations within the congregation (pulpit exchanges with black clergy, sermon delivery, and teaching) and advocacy within the Human Rights Commission (Falk, 2002). In 1968, in the midst of civil unrest and a divided citizenry, he

cofounded the Nashville Urban League, marshalling his business contacts and important communal relationships with clergy and activists from throughout the city. As race relations became more taught in the 1970s and early 1980s, Rabbi Falk remained a stalwart adherent to the belief the racial harmony was a goal worthy of continuous effort (Falk, 2002; Krause, 2016).

It wouldn't be until the 1980s—over 20 years since Rabbi Falk assumed the pulpit in Nashville—that another communal theme would emerge in his story, that of courageous activity. Though the community was far from unified as to their feelings about civil rights, Rabbi Falk did not experience the threats or the violence that had been a part of the story of his predecessor, Rabbi Silverman. That changed on May 25, 1981. Rabbi Falk and his assistant rabbi, Ken Kanter, were at The Temple catching up on work; since it was Memorial Day, they were the only two people in the building. As Rabbi Falk was packing his things to return home, he noticed a blue car right below his window. As he approached, two police cars sped over and surrounded the car. The officers took the two passengers—an older woman and a man—into custody and moved the car to the edge of the parking lot. It turned out that the two were attempting to place a bomb at the synagogue in response to the stance taken by Rabbi Falk with regard to race relations. The FBI had infiltrated the group and waited until the last moment before moving in to prevent the attack (Temple Bomb Plot Foiled, 1981). Rabbi Falk shared a rather interesting post-script to this story: "The woman and the man were taken to jail, and the woman became ill in jail, and they took her to City Hospital, and the resident who was called to attend to her was my son. He recognized her from the picture in the paper and he said to the woman, 'Before I treat you, I want you to know that I'm the son of the man whose Temple you wanted to destroy. If you would prefer for me not to treat you, we'll call someone else.' She said nothing, so he went ahead and took care of her" (Falk, 2002, p. 8). It should be noted that nowhere in the writings of

Rabbi Falk (at least the writings presently housed in archival collections) does he classify that event as causing any kind of distress, though he does indicate that the event further cemented his resolve to remain active in the cause of civil rights (Falk, 2002). This story has previously been shared in other publications, but this dissertation contributes to Rabbi Falk's legacy by linking these events to the events of his predecessor, Rabbi Silverman.

In 1979, the Nashville Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews honored Rabbi Falk with the Human Relations Award "for dedication to the highest principles which motivate humankind toward the goal of amity, understand, and mutual respect among all people under the sovereignty of God" (NCCJ Program, 1979). As well, in 1981, Rabbi Falk received the Metro Human Relations Award for "best exemplifying Martin Luther King, Jr.'s commitment to love and non-violent social change" (NAACP Head Here To Get Metro Award, 1981). In 1985, Rabbi Falk proposed and facilitated the Freedom Seder for Black Clergy, earning him additional communal recognition and accolades (TN—Annual Report, 1985).

Though beyond the scope of this dissertation, it should be mentioned that Rabbi Falk continued to remain active in a number of other causes as well. He spoke out against the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union and urged Americans to respond (Falk, 1980). He advocated for the separation of church and state by condemning the use of the Bible in schools for religious exercises and fought against the inclusion of school prayer (TN—Board of Trustees, 1965). He stood firm on his support for Israel (Harrelson, 2001) and world Jewry, even receiving recognition from the World Union for Progressive Judaism (WUPJ) in 1988. The WUPJ recognized Rabbi Falk and his wife, Edna, "for helping to establish new movement congregations in many countries" with the creation of the "Rabbi Randall and Edna Falk Fund

for International Development of Progressive Jewish Congregations" (World Union of Progressive Judaism, 1988).

Perhaps most telling about the legacy of Rabbi Falk is that he is primarily remembered for the awards that he received. Informal conversations with colleagues who knew Rabbi Falk and congregants alike were often quick to celebrate the WUPJ recognition and hold aloft his accomplishments as a public supporter of Israel as well as the 1979 Human Relations Award for building bridges between the Jewish and non-Jewish communities of Nashville. When they recognize his role as a civil rights-era rabbi, they point to his pulpit exchanges and occasional sermons as his primary activity. In reflecting upon the second research question—How might the dissertation contribute to the legacy of the rabbinic exemplars?—this study adds a rather robust chapter to the legacy of Rabbi Falk. Through the analysis of primary source materials, one is able to observe several of the common themes (importance of communal relationships, use of Jewish text, and understanding of role) as well as a theme more particular to the work of Rabbi Falk (institution building as a result of humility). These themes enable a more comprehensive appreciation for his work in civil rights for which he never received recognition. History now has a record of the manner in which Rabbi Falk used his communal relationships to engage clergy around a central issue, how he brought civic and religious leaders together to advance the cause, and how he applied those tactics both outside of and within his congregation through the formation of the Social Action Committee. Rabbi Falk dramatically expanded the circle of those fighting for civil rights in Nashville and led the charge for institutional and communal change. Though I don't intend to minimize them, Rabbi Falk did so much more than offer a few sermons and participate in a few pulpit exchanges.

While there is much to celebrate in the story of Rabbi Falk, as was done with Rabbi Silverman, one should also look with a critical eye to his narrative contained in this dissertation. After spending time in his story, one is left wondering: had Rabbi Falk been more forceful and outspoken, would his efforts have contributed to even greater success? After all, greater and more vocal involvement, especially capitalizing on the support he had when he attained the position, could have led to greater change, and this certainly speaks to the moral perspective and for the reputation of the religion.

Another challenge to the story of Rabbi Falk involves the lack of inclusion of a counternarrative. Newspaper reports, transcripts, letters, and other archival records privileged Rabbi Falk and the members of the synagogue. Thus, I am left realizing that there are nagging questions that those sources cannot answer. Where are the voices of the Black teenagers who attended the trainings with Rabbi Falk? Where are the perspectives of the clergy members with whom he partnered for change? Despite work with archivists, the materials unearthed were insignificant, and did not contribute meaningfully to the establishment of either a parallel narrative or a counternarrative, and one is left realizing that there is an agenda in the archives, especially the archives housed at The Temple, that is aggressively relaying a victory narrative about its venerated rabbis. The quest for the inclusion of those other voices remains.

Returning to the story of Rabbi Falk for a postscript, he ultimately completed his doctoral studies and Vanderbilt and, in addition to remaining a full-time congregational rabbi, began teaching in the 1970s at Fisk University (Fifty Years, 2010). He retired from The Temple in 1986 and accepted a position as a professor at Vanderbilt and the University of the South at Sewanee. Rabbi Falk died in 2014 at the age of 92, though his legacy of activism lives on in the actions of those he inspired and the institutions he helped to found.

Section 3: Rabbi Alfred Goodman

Rabbi Alfred Goodman started his career in 1944, serving for 6 years as rabbi for a congregation in Lima, Ohio. He moved to Columbus, Georgia, in 1950 and served Temple Israel until his retirement in 1983.

Rabbi Goodman delivered sermons primarily on the topics of Jewish living and Jewish values. His congregants turned to him for spiritual and pastoral sustenance, as well as, for many of them, genuine friendship (Cohn, October 28, 2015; Cohn, September 9, 2020). Rabbi Goodman spoke openly from the pulpit about his efforts related to civil rights but, unlike so many of his colleagues (Krause, 1969; Krause, 2016; Bauman, 2019), did not seem to cause controversy in doing so. This dissertation focuses on his approach to the integration of Columbus, Georgia, schools and institutions, highlighting his efforts with the Sibley Commission (a Georgia General Assembly-established commission tasked with spearheading public hearings on the topic of segregation and the future of public education).

The Columbus Context

The historical development of Columbus, Georgia, is well documented (Morgan-Fleming et al., 2007). After the end of the Civil War, Reconstruction brought free schools to the city, including the Freedmen's Bureau-created Black schools. As a response, White leaders moved to establish their own public schools in 1867 (Morgan-Fleming et al., 2007).

The history of race relations in Columbus is marked by strife and tragedy. From 1882 through 1968, 531 people were lynched in Georgia, second only to Mississippi (Tolnay & Beck, 1992). Between 1881 and 1930, when the majority of the lynchings in the Deep South occurred, the greatest concentration was along the region known as the Black Belt. This area, running from Georgia through Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, was the site of a concentration of cotton

plantations with a large population of slave labor. Columbus is located in the middle of the Black Belt, and research has indicated that, because of the ease of travel over railroad and along the Chattahoochee River, there was often an audience for lynchings. In fact, in the early 1900s, Columbus had cultivated a reputation as the lynching mecca of the South (Wynn, 2007).

Like many Deep South cities, the mayor and police chief endorsed the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) and the community took violence for granted (A Culture of Violence, 2007). Krause (2016) highlights the story of Ezra Johnston, known as "Parson Jack," who was a key force of bigotry in Columbus. Johnston founded the Baptist Tabernacle in Columbus in 1931, broadcast a weekly radio show, and published statewide newspapers, all to promote a racist message. Johnston and the KKK marched often in full regalia down the streets of Columbus. On one such occasion—September 8, 1939—the speakers openly threatened the families and the homes of Dr. James Grant and Dr. Thomas Brewer, Black activists and founders of the local chapter of the NAACP.

The above context is important to illustrate the climate that one would face were one to move to Columbus, Georgia, in the first half of the twentieth century. With violence a part of the norm, those who engaged in courageous activity around civil rights—even before it was known as civil rights—jeopardized their health and safety in so doing. Examples abound (Morgan-Fleming et al., 2007), demonstrating that those who did engage around civil rights risked their businesses and their standing in the community. The Jewish community was not immune from such retribution (Krause, 2016).

In 1952, Rev. Dr. Robert McNeill arrived in Columbus to serve the prestigious First Presbyterian Church. A dedicated civil rights activist, he was asked to write an article for *Look Magazine* about his work. In the article, published in the May 28, 1957, edition, he wrote,

As for the klansmen and their threats of violence, we do not fear them, we only pity them. God pity anyone who has to spread fear to be rid of fear, whose self-esteem is so low that he has to flatten someone else to feel that he is upright. . . . Our greatest concern is with the good citizens who create the climate of opinion, in their service clubs, in their coffee-break talks, in business transactions, in political decisions, in church affairs, in the management of the home. The heavy pressure we ministers feel comes from them . . . as though we were the real disturbers of the peace. . . . The klan is the impassioned tip of the community's refined prejudice. (Krause, 2016, p. 60)

Rev. Dr. McNeill proved to be a force for desegregation and, through his communal relationships, he brought many others to the struggle for civil rights, including Rabbi Alfred Goodman, who arrived on the scene in 1950. In the early 1950s, as a result of the work of the coalition that Rev. Dr. McNeill built (Krause, 2016), the police force was integrated and, in 1961, the "Black section" on buses was eliminated. Lunch counter desegregation came next, and, with each successive year, portents of the old guard were stripped away: in 1963, Columbus College admitted an African American student; in 1965, the integration process of the public schools began; African Americans were elected to office starting in 1965 and again in 1967 (Krause, 2016). The only way that this could occur was through communal relationships and the partnership of the African American community, the progressive White community, and clergymen like Rev. Dr. McNeill and Rabbi Goodman.

Jewish Life in Columbus

The historical development of Jewish life in Columbus is also well documented (Libo & Howe, 1984; Marcus, 1953; Marcus, 1955; Rosen, 2000; Telfair, 1929). Exquisite records are on file at the Columbus State University Archives which detail lifecycle events (and contributions) of members of the congregation (Golden Book of Life, ca. 1854–1938), as well as a rather lengthy list of members who held elected office in the congregation (Timeline and History, ca. 1959–1992). These records of names and achievements serve as important findings to the third research question as one is able to observe a theme in that the Jewish community strived for

acceptance from the non-Jewish community and was, in many ways, quite successful. This context enables others to appreciate the complexity of involving oneself in the civil rights struggle.

The twentieth century saw further growth of the Jewish community in Columbus, and Rabbi Alfred Goodman was engaged by Temple Israel to serve as spiritual leader in 1950. Among his early challenges was to shepherd the congregation through the purchase of new property and the construction of a new synagogue in 1957. The keynote speaker at the dedication, which drew 350 people from throughout the Jewish and secular community of Columbus, was Rabbi William Silverman from Nashville, the first rabbi introduced in this dissertation. This detail is important, for it addresses the second research question in that it accurately conveys that, though separated by geography, these civil rights-era rabbis knew each other and interacted with each other—and each other's stories—on more than one occasion.

Rabbi Alfred L. Goodman

Alfred Louis Goodman was born on August 16, 1918, in Cleveland, Ohio. He earned his bachelor of arts degree at Western Reserve University before enrolling in the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York. It was during his studies in New York that he crossed paths with Rayna Frank and the two were soon married. After completing his studies and receiving ordination in 1944, Rabbi Goodman served Temple Beth Israel in Lima, Ohio, for 1 year before serving briefly in the Army Chaplaincy Air Corps in Japan, reaching the title Deputy Staff Chaplain (Tribute Book, 1986). Following his service, he returned to Lima where he and Rayna started their family with the birth of their sons Glen and Steve; daughter Liz would be born after their move to Columbus.

Rabbi Goodman began considering his options and had a conversation with his friend

Rabbi William Silverman, who had just announced a move to Nashville. The following anecdote

was conveyed to me by Rabbi Goodman's daughter (Cohn, September 9, 2020) and is a finding

contributing to the first research question: "Rabbi Silverman said, 'Alfred, I have just one job for

you, it's in Columbus, Georgia.' My dad responded, 'They don't treat their negroes well down

there.' After a brief silence, Rabbi Silverman remarked, 'Alfred, what have you done here for the

negroes?'" After a brief hesitation, Rabbi Goodman took the job, realizing that "he could try to

make a difference" (Goodman, 2017). Rabbi Goodman assumed the role of spiritual leader of

Temple Israel in 1950, a post he would hold until his retirement in 1983.

A set of common themes amongst Rabbi Silverman and Rabbi Falk also begins to emerge

with regards to the experiences of Rabbi Goodman. According to Rabbi Goodman's daughter, he

moved to Georgia ostensibly because he wanted to become involved with civil rights (Cohn,

September 9, 2020). As indicated previously, race relations was a challenging issue for this

community. Compounded with the understanding that the Jewish community had a history of

assimilation with the non-Jewish community, one can conclude that Rabbi Goodman's move was

a courageous act that presents as professionally risky.

Another common theme that emerges shortly after his arrival in Columbus is that of the

importance of communal relationships, a finding that once again contributes to the first research

question. Within his first few weeks with the congregation, Rabbi Goodman became associated

with Rev. Dr. Robert McNeill, and the two of them helped to start the Columbus Council on

Human Relations, the first integrated group in the city (Tribute Book, 1986). Rabbi Goodman

spent his first few years in Georgia teaching, preaching, developing interfaith and interracial

relationships, and serving as a symbolic exemplar by delivering guest lectures and sermons outside of the Jewish community.

Starting in 1954, with the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision to integrate schools, the work of the Columbus Council on Human Relations began to focus on civil rights. Rabbi Goodman began meeting behind the scenes with members of his congregation who were involved with the School Board and those members who had relationships with politicians in the city of Columbus (Krause, 2016). Unlike the behind-the-scenes meetings of Rabbi Falk, which were to institutionalize through the lay leaders the work of social action in Nashville, Rabbi Goodman's meetings were solely intended to leverage his congregational relationships to advance the work of school integration (Krause, 2016). However, like the experience of Rabbi Falk, Rabbi Goodman had little interest in taking credit for the activities, preferring to serve as a conversation broker between the parties (Krause, 2016). This finding is most closely aligned with the first research question in that it points to the strategy of how Rabbi Goodman chose to speak up and out.

Another of the common themes is evidenced in the story of Rabbi Goodman. Like Rabbi Silverman and Rabbi Falk, he most certainly understood his role in the community, and he delivered sermons on the topic of civil rights (Cohn, September 9, 2020), findings that again connect to the first research question. According to an article that appeared in the newspaper following his retirement, Rabbi Goodman was known as an "eloquent, persuasive voice for moderation during the crisis of school integration here" (Rabbi Goodman: A Lively 36 Years, 1986).

Findings associated with perhaps the richest chapter of Rabbi Goodman's leadership journey, as it relates to the topic of this dissertation, aligns well with the first and third research

question. First, addressing the connection to the third research question, Rabbi Goodman was familiar with the context and it informed his actions (Krause, 2016). As in many communities in the South, the desegregation of schools in Georgia was oft delayed and the subject of significant legal wrangling (Dartt, 2008), and there was much division over the issue, even within cities and between ministerial groups within these cities (McGill, 1963; Roche, 1998) about which Rabbi Goodman was familiar and which provided a lens for his own activities (Goodman, 2017).

In 1960, Georgia Governor Ernest Vandiver Jr., forced to decide between closing Georgia's public schools or complying with a federal order to desegregate them, tapped State Representative George Busbee to introduce legislation creating the General Assembly Committee on Schools, which in turn created a commission headed by Atlanta banker John A. Sibley (Roche, 1998). The Sibley Commission was to hold hearings in every Georgia Congressional district and ultimately make a recommendation as to whether to continue with segregated schools or to desegregate (Johnson & Hall, 1968).

Turning to the first research question, Rabbi Goodman sought to undertake strategic actions to speak up and out, as findings related to the Sibley Commission indicate. Though professionally risky (as evidenced by the early termination of Rev. Dr. McNeill), Rabbi Goodman continued his behind-the-scenes work with regard to the Sibley Commission, all the while relying on his relationships with colleagues to provide testimony that he knew would run counter to the segregationist message delivered by others. In his own words, "I was active in seeing that people came to the commission hearings, and I was at the commission hearings myself with a number of other ministers in town who were active in this particular area" (Krause, 2016). The Columbus State University Archives has the complete testimony gathered through the Sibley Commission, and the Columbus testimony was gathered on March 31, 1960 (Sibley

Commission Testimony, 1960). J. W. Hurley, Pastor of the St. James AME Church in Columbus and then President of the Columbus Council on Human Rights, spoke for the 15 members of the group, of which twelve were present, including Rabbi Goodman. Pastor Hurley explained that, "this organization unanimously supports integration and the adoption of civil rights legislation as seen in other states" (Sibley Commission Testimony, 1960).

In all, the Sibley Commission heard from more than 1800 witnesses. In 1961, the commission delivered a report recommending the abandonment of "massive resistance" to the U.S. Supreme Court's 1954 decision calling for an end to public school segregation (Roche, 1998; Johnson & Hall, 1968). While an important decision, the commission and its hearings exposed the changes taking place in Georgia's political and social structure and the growing recognition among the business and political elite that change was inevitable (Johnson & Hall, 1968). Most certainly, this could not have been completed were it not for the courageous efforts of those like Rabbi Goodman who dared to testify and who organized others to do so as well.

While his work with the Sibley Commission was important, that was far from Rabbi Goodman's only foray into civil rights work. Rabbi Goodman was also involved in the desegregation of the local theater and the parks in the city, as well as other institutions. One will note the emergence of another common theme—the rabbi acting through a period of moral distress—related to the desegregation of the local library. The Board of Education had planned to desegregate the library but, just 2 weeks prior, the members of the local African American community demonstrated and stormed the structure, demanding that the library become desegrated. Apparently, though the Board of Education had the plan in place to do so, the African American community was never informed. In recognition of his role in the community and the relationships he built through the Columbus Council on Human Rights, the city of

Columbus turned to Rabbi Goodman to intervene. In his own words, he had some "very trying

conversations" as he tried to ease tensions (Goodman, 2017). He was able to address the

immediate concerns and provided a voice of calm in an otherwise volatile moment (Krause,

2016).

The findings related to his work with the Sibley Commission, as well as his role during

the library incident, contribute immensely to the legacy of Rabbi Goodman and further address

the second research question. He has been recognized within his congregation for his

involvement with civil rights, though that story has primarily focused on his sermonic material.

According to Rabbi Goodman, his preferred methodology was to speak passionately from the

pulpit and to wield his influence behind the scenes rather than become involved in freedom

marches or other demonstrations (Krause, 2016). Based upon findings at the Columbus State

University Archives, it becomes evident that he cultivated a reputation amongst his colleagues

and was called upon by other congregational rabbis to advise them as to how they could be

involved in the civil rights struggle without losing the support of their community.

Unfortunately, research has, at present, only uncovered the requests for assistance; his own

replies and guidance offered, which would be immensely valuable to contemporary colleagues,

remains largely yet to be discovered. However, some guidance can be gleaned from an interview

that Rabbi Goodman delivered in 1966. When asked about the role of the rabbi with regard to

civil rights activism, Rabbi Goodman expressed that he relied heavily on Jewish text. In his own

words, "I think the first responsibility of the rabbi . . . is to sensitize people to the moral

imperatives of Judaism. People have to be made aware of what Judaism demands of them as

human beings in their relations with other human beings" (Krause, 2016). In his brief statement,

Rabbi Goodman provides a response to the first research question of this dissertation. In an era

when congregational rabbis often struggle with how and when to speak up and out, how might the experiences of these civil rights era rabbis inform their choices? Rabbi Goodman's answer: when an issue runs counter to the moral imperatives of Judaism, the rabbi has a responsibility—an obligation—to speak up, to speak out, and to speak forcefully.

His collegiality led to his being invited, on March 25, 1960, by Rabbi Saul Rubin to speak at Congregation Beth Israel in Gadsden, Alabama. As Rabbi Goodman started his sermon, "a bomb was thrown at the Temple window and [it] exploded. Two congregants who ran to the street to see what happened were shot by the bomber. Alfred stayed over the next day to give blood for the wounded" (Goodman, 2017, p. 2–3). The attacker was a 16-year-old named Jerry Hunt who had attended a rally earlier in the week for white supremacist politician John Crommelin. Crommelin, at the rally, decried the partnership between the Jewish community and the African American community, indicating that a rabbi was coming to town to speak the following Friday night (Webb, 2003). Though he knew that there was contention in the greater community regarding civil rights, Rabbi Goodman remained unfazed by the attack, and continued to push from the pulpit for an end to segregation (Goodman, 2017).

Rabbi Goodman didn't have to venture to Alabama to exhibit courageous behavior, and the following finding further answers the first research question by addressing the importance of lay leader allies. He relayed that, "One time, a telephone threat was made to a member of the Board of Trustees of my congregation saying that if I continued my activity in the human relations council then what happened to other clergy members would be peanuts" (Krause, 2016, p. 67). Rayna Goodman, Rabbi Goodman's widow, relayed that shortly after that incident occurred, in 1958, a man entered the synagogue wielding a knife. Thankfully, nobody was harmed, but the Board of Trustees did discuss the matter. After Rabbi Goodman assured them

that he did not feel threatened, the Board declared their support for Rabbi Goodman and the work he was doing with regard to civil rights (Goodman, September 14, 2020; Krause, 2016).

Rabbi Goodman's story further provides insight into how and when a rabbi should take a public stand and contributes to the findings associated with the first research question. Outside of the realm of civil rights, in 1971, he risked his position by filing a lawsuit in federal court to end mandatory prayer and Bible reading in Columbus public schools (United States District Court, 1971). This was a particularly risky behavior as the Jewish community of Columbus, Georgia, had a history of flying under the radar. Rabbi Goodman chose to take a rather public stand for three reasons: first, he felt it was illegal for a school to mandate prayer and the reading of scripture in public schools; second, he felt that, after speaking with school officials who were rather dismissive (United States District Court, 1971), the lawsuit was the only tool at his disposal with which to effect change; and third, it was his daughter, Elizabeth, who was in the school and who raised the concern to her father (Cohn, September 9, 2020). While others may prioritize one reason over the others, the convergence of the three led to the action that ultimately changed the culture of school prayer in the State of Georgia.

In an effort to further support the relevance of important communal relationships to his rabbinic leadership, it is relevant to draw attention to Rabbi Goodman's involvement with organizations outside of the realm of civil rights. Rabbi Goodman also served as President of the Southeast Association of Reform Rabbis, the Columbus-Phoenix City Ministerial Alliance, B'nai Brith, and the Family Counselling Center. He was Treasurer of the National Association of Retired Reform Rabbis, served as Recording Secretary and Executive Board Member of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR), and served on the CCAR Ethics Committee, as well as on the National Commission on Rabbinic-Congregational Relations (Tribute Book,

1986). Finally, to further support the importance of the use of Jewish tradition in his leadership, it should be noted that Rabbi Goodman was recognized with the creation of a Resolution from the Sisterhood of Temple Israel in which he was extolled as a man who "led his life as a person and as Rabbi exemplifying the highest traditions and ideals of the Jewish faith" (Tribute Book, 1986).

While there is much to celebrate in the story of Rabbi Goodman, one should also look with a critical eye to the narrative contained in this dissertation. While not intending to minimize the courage of his actions, one must consider the impact he had with regard to civil rights. Ultimately, Rabbi Goodman was a spokesman for a very tiny minority, less than one percent of the community's population, and Columbus already had a relatively small population compared to cities like nearby Atlanta. Thus, while the victories he won are important, locating them within the scope of his community helps to recognize why his story has not been told in a more complete fashion previously.

Rabbi Goodman retired in 1983 and died of a viral infection on September 1, 1986, at the age of 68. His obituary opened with these stirring words: "One of the most influential and visionary Jews didn't arrive here from his native Ohio until 1950. But when he died earlier this week at 68, Rabbi Alfred Louis Goodman was without argument one of the best-known citizens, and certainly one of the best-known members of the clergy, thereabouts" (Rabbi Goodman: A lively 36 years, 1986). Findings address the second research question by contributing to Rabbi Goodman's legacy: he was a rabbi who stood his ground on the pulpit, in the courtroom, and in testifying before the Sibley Commission. He used important communal relationships to advocate for change and leveraged his relationships with congregants to use their position and power to further the struggle for desegregation and civil rights. He brought with him a moral code

informed by Jewish tradition and taught the meaning of sacred text through his actions. There is much that could and should inform rabbis today from the story of Rabbi Alfred Goodman.

Section 4: Rabbi Irv Bloom

P. Irving Bloom was ordained in 1956 and spent his first 2 years in Germany as a Chaplain for the U.S. Air Force. Upon completion of his service in 1958, he moved to New Orleans to serve as an Assistant Rabbi. Two years later, Rabbi Bloom assumed spiritual leadership of a congregation in Mobile, Alabama, where he would serve 13 years. Rabbi Bloom then served a congregation in Dayton, Ohio, from 1973 until his retirement in 1997.

Rabbi Bloom was embraced by congregants in each community he served, using his homiletical gifts and fine sense of humor to inspire teens and adults alike. He was a "rabbi's rabbi," often finding that colleagues would turn to him for guidance and advice, a testament to his success with each of his pulpits. This dissertation will focus on Rabbi Bloom's efforts at integrating the Mobile ministerial organization and the manner in which he provided a leading, behind-the-scenes voice for desegregation in Mobile. Interestingly, his congregation was rarely aware of these efforts as he actively sought to keep them out of the public eye.

Mobile in Context

The historical development of Mobile is well documented (Brueske, 2018; Cuhaj, 2020; Ellis & Kirkland, 2010; Rouillier, 2018). Of importance to this dissertation are the episodes of Mobile's history which established a framework of racial segregation and which informed the culture around civil rights. In 1860, just prior to the Civil War, the Clotilde, the last known ship to arrive in the Americas with a cargo of slaves, was abandoned near Mobile. Many of the slaves escaped and founded their own community on the banks of the Mobile River, which became

known as Africatown. The members of this community retained their African customs and language well into the twentieth century (Diouf, 2009).

Much has been written concerning the state of race relations in Mobile, especially following the Civil War (Alsobrook, 1973; Fitzgerald, 2002; Frederickson, 1971; Kirkland, 2005; Kolchin, 1972; McKiven, 2001), with multiple episodes and ample stories detailing disenfranchisement, separation, and violence. In 1902, the city government passed the first racial segregation ordinance, segregating the streetcars, leading to a 2-month boycott from Mobile's African American population. As the Black population relied on the streetcars to get from Africatown to the shipyards, the boycott collapsed after a few months. Since the boycott was unsuccessful at changing the ordinance, segregation became increasingly legislated in Mobile until the 1950s and 1960s (Arnesen, 2001). As well, racial tensions flared in the often crowded city in the first half of the twentieth century as Black and white workers fought for entry-level positions in the local shipyards (Kirkland, 2012).

Kirkland (2005) reports that, regardless of the segregation in the city and ongoing racial strife, Mobile's African American community was organized. The NAACP chapter boasted an impressive 110 members in September 1927, and African Americans had secured important victories in voting rights and even expanded their role in local politics before World War II. As a response, and as a response to the Supreme Court decision in *Smith v. Allwright*, which outlawed holding "White's only" primaries, Geneva County Representative Edward Calhoun Boswell introduced an amendment to the state legislature in the 1945 session. The codicil to the Alabama Constitution was designed to prevent African Americans from registering to vote. In Mobile, the battle over the amendment exposed deep divides and galvanized the city's African American

population and progressive white population. It also laid the groundwork for grassroots efforts aimed at advancing civil rights in the 1950s and 1960s (Kirkland, 2012).

Jews of Mobile

There exists much scholarship related to the Jewish community of Mobile, Alabama (Korn, 1969; Korn, 1970; Moses, 1904; Zeitz, 1994), with each source pointedly referencing the acceptance of Jews into civic and social life despite being relatively few in number. When, in 1856, a stove caught on fire and burned the synagogue to the ground, the Jewish community turned to the greater Mobile community for financial assistance. By the end of March 1857, enough funds had been raised for a new building to be erected. As reported by Zeitz (1994), the congregation published a thank-you notice in the local newspaper, written "to our fellow citizens of Mobile" for their assistance. In addition to serving as an important chapter in the congregation's history, this episode showcases the acceptance and fellowship the Jewish community enjoyed in Mobile, Alabama, throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Rabbi P. Irving Bloom

Paul Irving Bloom was born on November 30, 1931, in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. Upon his graduation from high school in 1948, he attended the University of Georgia for 1 year before moving to Cincinnati, Ohio, where he continued the pursuit of his degree in political science at the University of Cincinnati. During this time he was also undertaking rabbinical studies at the Hebrew Union College (Bloom, 2010).

Irving married Patricia Frankel in 1955 and he was ordained a rabbi in 1956. Like so many others of his generation, upon ordination, he entered the United States Air Force Chaplaincy where he served 2 years in Germany. In 1958, upon completion of his chaplaincy tour, he moved to New Orleans, Louisiana, to serve as Assistant Rabbi at Temple Sinai with

Rabbi Julian Feibleman (Bloom, 2010). While in New Orleans, Rabbi Bloom and Pat welcomed their eldest child, Jonathan, to be followed by Judy, who was born in Mobile.

In 1960, Rabbi Solomon Cherniak was serving Springhill Avenue Temple in Mobile while also living with Parkinson's disease. In April of that year, a young man by the name of Jack Friedlander was to become a Bar Mitzvah. Unable to officiate, Rabbi Cherniak called his friend and colleague Rabbi Feibleman, who in turn called for his assistant to officiate the service. Officiating at Jack Friedlander's Bar Mitzvah ceremony was Rabbi Bloom's first visit to Mobile. After Rabbi Cherniak passed away that summer, the leadership of the congregation invited Rabbi Bloom to interview for the job and, upon completion of any formal tasks associated with the interview process, they invited him to serve as the rabbi of the Springhill Avenue Temple (Bloom, 2010).

Compared with the civil rights activities in nearby Montgomery, Birmingham, and Selma, Alabama, Mobile was a relatively quiet community, devoid of marches and protests (Kirkland, 2005). Rabbi Bloom provides insight into the third research question by attributing that primarily to the influence and leadership style of Mobile's Mayor, Joseph N. Langan, and he is not alone in doing so (Ashmore, 2008; Nicholls, 2001; Pride, 2002). As Rabbi Bloom explained, "Joe was an incredible guy. Joe was a Roman Catholic. He maintained full communication with the Negro community. Anybody in Black leadership who wanted his ear could have it. They were in direct communication. He was the kind of guy who could and did move quietly, without newspaper publicity, which was deadly in the South. Publicity would kill any forward movement" (Bloom, 2010, p. 12).

Rabbi Bloom's comment sheds light on the nature of his approach to civil rights activism and helps to provide insight into one of the research questions, what lessons can we glean

regarding the role of context that might be useful for congregational rabbis today as they apply the principles of leadership theory to their practice? The rabbis featured previously in this dissertation each engaged publicly to convey their stance and inspire others in an effort to advance civil rights, affirming the belief that a public display would lead to the most—and the fastest—positive change. While all three used the power of their pulpit to charge their congregants, they also relied on other tools at their disposal: Rabbi Silverman used his radio show, Rabbi Falk engaged in public demonstrations, and Rabbi Goodman encouraged public testimony. Rabbi Bloom took stock of his communal context, studying the leadership example of others (specifically, in this case, Mayor Langan). He recognized that there are occasions when individuals create a communal context, and those looking to lead for change would do well to take stock of those individuals in order to determine the best approach. Ultimately, one will never know whether Rabbi Bloom was correct in his assertion that public displays would lead to conflict while private actions would lead to change, as the story of civil rights in Mobile is largely devoid of public activity. However, his comparison of Mobile with nearby Montgomery, Birmingham, and Selma, each city featuring public demonstrations with brutal reprisals, serves as compelling and supportive insight.

Despite the decision from the Supreme Court to integrate schools (*Brown v. Board of Education*), Mobile, like so many other locales in the South, had yet to do so by the start of the 1960s, and a test of Rabbi Bloom's leadership was on the horizon. On March 27, 1963, the Non-Partisan Voters League initiated the Mobile County Public School Desegregation suit. The case called for a preliminary injunction, directing defendants to present for approval of the court, without a period to be determined by the court, a plan for the reorganization of the entire school system of Montgomery County, Alabama, into a unitary, nonracial system (Krause, 2016). The

response was immediate: Alabama Governor George Wallace, who had already been fighting

desegregation activities, threatened to send the Alabama National Guard in order to prevent

African American children from entering Mobile's Murphy High School (Kirkland, 2005).

Findings from the archives provide further insight into the first and third research

questions, as Rabbi Bloom utilized an important relationship with another communal faith leader

(context) as he formulated a response to this heightened period of tension (how to speak up and

out). He called upon his friend and colleague, Father Albert Foley (a Jesuit priest and sociology

professor at Spring Hill College), to act and to act quickly. Further appreciating the desire to

avoid the front pages but still intent on impacting change, the two clergymen started an

organization called ABLE—Alabamians Behind Local Education. The point of the organization

was to counter Governor Wallace's commentary that "outsiders" were coming into Alabama and

pushing for desegregation. When the local school district accepted assistance from the National

Guard to block the school, this group, ABLE, comprised of locals from Mobile, worked behind

the scenes with the Montgomery County school board to replace National Guard soldiers with

local police officers. In an action that was prearranged by Rabbi Bloom through his role with

ABLE, 2 days after the police officers took over from the soldiers, they vacated the blockade

(Bloom, 2010; Kirkland, 2005; Krause, 2016). The school was desegregated in the fall of 1963

(Pride, 2002).

Rabbi Bloom was buoyed by this previous action and, in 1964, he went about

establishing and deepening his communal relationships (Bloom, 2010). These efforts led to

creation of the first integrated ministerial organization in Mobile, the Interfaith Ministerial

Alliance. Though in his own words, "we never did anything" (Bloom, 2010, p. 14); the fact that

the organization was formed at all is an accomplishment. It was through another ministerial

organization that Rabbi Bloom started—the Mobile Ministerial Association—that much of his civil rights activities began to take shape. In 1965, James Reeb, a White American Unitarian Minister from Boston, was beaten severely by White segregationists and died 2 days later (Duncan, 1993). A local memorial service was held for him and, due to his role within the Mobile Ministerial Association, Rabbi Bloom was invited to deliver the invocation, an invitation that he was honored to accept (Bloom, 2010).

Findings discovered through the archives provide further insight in order to address the first research question and illustrate an episode in which Rabbi Bloom chose to speak up and out to his community. Though he did not realize it at the time, participating in the funeral proved to be professionally risky for Rabbi Bloom, a theme that was presented with each of the previous rabbis. Throughout April and May 1965, Rabbi Bloom received some negative pushback from some of the members of his congregation, citing the funeral as a point of contention (Bloom, 2010; Krause, 2016). In a pattern also utilized by Rabbis Silverman, Falk, and Goodman, Rabbi Bloom used Jewish text, and his understanding of Jewish tradition, to address these detractors. Also like the previous rabbis, he used the primary tool at his disposal, the pulpit, in this case, the occasion of the congregation's annual meeting, to respond to his critics. Rabbi Bloom intoned, "We speak of Judaism as a religion of deed rather than creed. It is time that we permit our religious commitments to shape our attitudes and actions on the ethical and moral problems of the day" (Annual Meeting, 1965).

It has already been established in this dissertation that Rabbi Bloom avoided public activities with regard to civil rights activism, so the annual meeting address emerges in stark contrast and informs the first research question. A series of questions thus emerges: are the conclusions drawn to this point incorrect? Is there a counter narrative waiting to be uncovered

that is buried in the archive? If not, and the previous narrative holds, did the annual meeting commentary open the door for a shift in Rabbi Bloom's behavior, causing him to engage more publicly following those comments? How was the commentary received by the congregation? After all, as has been noted previously in this study, rabbis used their pulpits to frame civil rights efforts in a Jewish context. Why would not Rabbi Bloom behave in a similar manner on this particular topic following the annual meeting?

Further complicating the narrative is the discovery of potentially dissenting material which must be considered as informing the second research question and complicating Rabbi Bloom's legacy. Though he believes that detractors were few in number (Krause, 2016), a report from the congregation's president, Julian Lewis, to the congregation tells a different story. Found in the Archives of The Springhill Temple, Mr. Lewis' rather lengthy oration includes the following as it relates to this topic:

> I have heard criticisms regarding various sermons in the past. . . . Some people cannot stand to listen to sermons concerning Israel. Others do not care to listen to sermons on brotherhood. Still others have complained to me about sermons concerning involvement in Judaism and attendance at Temple. Still others are vehement about comments on political decisions which have moral bases. In assessing the various items that have been brought to my attention, I have come to the conclusion that you can't please most of the people even a part of the time. It seems that people like provocative sermons only when it agrees with their point of view. I may not really understand at all. It is thoroughly confusing. If a Rabbi is not to talk about social issues, the welfare of our fellow Jews, and Temple attendance, pray then, who is? (Annual Meeting, 1971)

Despite an exhaustive search through the collections in archives housed in Atlanta, Alabama, and Ohio, there is no evidence that he ever gave a sermon on the subject of civil rights, notwithstanding the existence of a tremendous amount of sermonic material on other contentious issues. While pulpit messages may have been a common mechanism used by many rabbis in the civil rights era to engage with the cause (Bauman, 2019), it would appear, once again, that communal context is key. Stories abound of rabbis who used the pulpit to persuade their

congregants, behavior that cost them professionally (Bauman, 1997; Bauman, 2019; Blumberg, 1985; Evans, 1997; Graetz, 1998; Greene, 1996; Krause, 2016; Lipman & Vorspan, 1962; Strober & Strober, 2019; Vorspan & Saperstein, 1998; Webb, 2003), and Rabbi Bloom may have been hesitant to engage in such professionally risky behavior. Or one could conclude, as indicated earlier in the dissertation, that the reports from Birmingham, Montgomery, and Selma, as well as the example of Mayor Langan, made refraining from pulpit messages a strategic decision intended to increase chances of success rather than out of an abundance of caution.

Though he refrained from speaking from the pulpit about civil rights (Zietz, 1994), Rabbi Bloom still managed to engage his congregants around the issue using another instrument at his disposal—the monthly congregational bulletin—and by doing so further informs the first research question. It was a common practice for synagogues to create monthly newsletters to distribute to their membership (a practice that is still common today, though the delivery mechanism is presently in transition), featuring articles of interest, written by synagogue members and staff, as well as announcements of upcoming programming taking place under the synagogue umbrella. Research into the Springhill Avenue Temple monthly bulletins, preserved through the archives of the temple, yielded significantly more data about Rabbi Bloom's activism than did the research into his sermons. In one of many examples, Rabbi Bloom, who exercised editorial control over the congregational bulletin, chose to include the following note under the banner "What other religious groups are saying." The note reads,

> The Southern Baptists concluded their annual convention in Dallas last week. Among other things it declared that church doors should be "open to all and closed to none." It depicted racial pride and segregation "an offense to the Gospel." The Southern Baptist body also pledged "positive leadership to obtain compliance with laws assuring equal rights for all." (The Temple Bulletin, 1965)

In formal interviews (Bloom, 2010; Krause, 2016) as well as casual conversation with the author, Rabbi Bloom would contribute further to the findings related to the first research question and affirm that the greatest impact he had on the civil rights struggle occurred through the use of another strategy beyond congregational bulletins: private conversations. He would invite African American communal leaders to his home, he would spend hours on the phone working back channels to address racial segregation in civic buildings, and he would engage fellow clergy in an attempt to build integrated working teams through each organization with which he was able to work. In this regard, one observes yet again the common theme of important communal relationships. Like Rabbi Goodman, Rabbi Bloom became a behind-the-scenes power broker, and while the resulting relationships led to great advances in the establishment of civil rights, especially in Mobile, Rabbi Bloom's role has previously been overlooked. In the telling of the story of the struggle for civil rights in Mobile, other actors and events have attained renown where fame, and even credit accorded for role, has disappointingly eluded Rabbi Bloom.

In a rare departure from an established pattern of behavior, Rabbi Bloom adopted a different tactic following the assassination of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Recognizing the important role played by clergy in Mobile, the Mobile Ministerial Association took out a large ad in the local paper, with Rabbi Bloom's name appearing second, to make the following statement:

> We, the undersigned ministers of the Mobile area, do hereby state the following:
> A. We commend the City Commission and all citizens of Mobile for the orderly presentation of the memorial service to the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.
> B. We commend the above for statements which indicate immediate action toward solving problems with reference to employment, housing, sanitation, education and public welfare.
> C. As spiritual leaders in the community, we urge immediate implementation of these proposals and we further state our conviction that everything be done

now to eradicate all inequalities which exist between the races in our community. (A Statement, 1968)

The above text offers further insight into the findings related to the second research question. Considering that Rabbi Bloom did not engage publicly in civil rights, what circumstances would compel him to adjust that self-defined policy and make an exception? Rabbinic life does not exist in a protective case, and frequently, rabbis are confronted with competing agendas. In the case of Rabbi Bloom, on one hand, he had a longstanding policy of private engagement around civil rights and of avoiding professionally risky behavior. However, on the other hand, he upheld the importance of communal relationships, especially between clergy members, and he understood the role that clergy members played in the city of Mobile. Further, he recognized that those days and weeks following Rev. Dr. King's assassination were times of great moral distress for many. Thus, from Rabbi Bloom's example, rabbis today can understand that while intentionally enacted patterns of behavior may be useful in most contexts, there are circumstances that require a shift, perhaps even an action that may be more courageous, and that the key to understanding when and how to make that exception emerges from considerations related to context.

Despite the public action mentioned above, Rabbi Bloom's example stands in stark contrast to that of Rabbi Silverman and contributes to a more robust set of findings related to the first and third research questions. Whereas the latter found his civil rights activism most successful when driven by communal events, the lesson from Rabbi Bloom's civil rights activism is that gradual integration was possible if given the right circumstances. The story of the civil rights movement, as told at the time of the writing of this dissertation, is told largely through the headlines surrounding flashpoint communities (Selma, Montgomery, Birmingham, Nashville, and Atlanta, to name a few) and flashpoint incidents (the Bloody Sunday March, the

Montgomery Bus Boycott, the bombing of The Temple in Atlanta, etc.). The patterns of collective amnesia have been perpetrated by historians and sociologists of the civil rights movement, who tend to focus on larger, more dramatic events. However, the story of Mobile, and so many other communities like Mobile, showcase that relatively peaceful change was important as well on the journey toward racial equality and civil rights. In this regard, perhaps the most glaring critique of Rabbi Bloom emerges: due to his insistence on working in relative anonymity, he has made it more challenging for a robust narrative of southern rabbinic activism to emerge. While his actions positively impacted the civil rights agenda of his day, his methodology unfairly hindered those in future generations from deriving the full depth and breadth of the lessons of his rabbinate.

In 1973, Rabbi Bloom accepted an invitation to serve Temple Israel in Dayton, Ohio, a pulpit he would hold until his retirement in 1997. His rabbinate in Ohio was marked by an explosion of interfaith activities and the growth of Temple Israel into a flagship midwestern synagogue as a result of creative programming and compelling services, all bearing the direct involvement of Rabbi Bloom. Following his retirement, he moved to Atlanta, Georgia, where he remained in active service to nearby synagogues and was a friend and teacher to Atlanta-area rabbis. Rabbi Bloom passed away in early 2020 after a short illness. As a testament to his impact, 14 colleagues, including the author of this dissertation, credited his quiet approach to the rabbinate as informing their own activism, proving that his role as an activist rabbi is not yet complete.

Section 5: Rabbi Burton Padoll

Rabbi Burton Padoll started his career in 1957, serving for 5 years as rabbi for a congregation in Brookline, Massachusetts. In 1962, he moved to Charleston, South Carolina,

where he served for 6 years, before taking a congregation in New York for 2 years. Rabbi Padoll then moved to Peabody, Massachusetts, where he served from 1969 until his retirement in 1989.

Rabbi Burton Padoll used his various pulpits to inspire and rouse his congregants, and colleagues recall him being rather adversarial at times. As such, this paper, building off of earlier work by Krause (2008), relies heavily on his sermonic material to explore the manner in which he addressed the civil rights movement in Charleston.

Charleston in Context

Volumes have been published which detail the founding and historical development of Charleston (Frazer, 1992; Greene, 2008; Hagy, 1993; Rosen, 1997). Charleston (then known as Charles Town) became a major center for the slave trade around 1670 and continued until the Civil War (Hagy, 1993; Rosen, 1997). In fact, as a result of Charleston's policy that slaves could be bought and sold on the open market, the city played an important role in fostering—and continuing—the slave trade in America (Greene, 2008). By 1820, the population of Charleston had grown to 23,000, with the majority of the population being African American. In 1822, using the rumor of a planned massive slave revolt, White Charlestonians severely curtailed the activities of the Black population of the city, passing rather restrictive laws and truncating the rights and liberties of the African American population of the city (Greene, 2008). Following the Civil War, with the economy in shambles, both freed slaves and White citizens faced poverty, leading to a rise in lynchings and race-related crimes, culminating in race riots in 1919 (Greene, 2008). The history of slavery as related above is important context, for it established a culture that would ultimately have a deleterious impact on the era of race relations and civil rights detailed in this dissertation.

Important additional context is needed to better appreciate the religious climate and the pivotal role that religion plays in Charleston. The philosophy of early Charles Town was based on religious tolerance. As a result, French Huguenots, Baptists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians all settled in the early years of the city. A Jewish congregation (KKBE—Kahal Kodesh Beth Elohim) formed in 1750, followed shortly by a Lutheran Church and Methodist assembly. The first Roman Catholic mass was held in Charleston in 1786. Because of its origins related to religious diversity, Charleston became known as "The Holy City" (Frazer, 1992; Hagy, 1993; Rosen, 1997), and members of the clergy would be viewed with authority and esteem.

The Jews of Charleston

As Hagy (1993) explains, while today the New York Jewish community is among the largest in the United States, for a short period of time that title was held by Charleston, South Carolina. From 1695, when the first Jews arrived in Charleston, the Jewish community of Charleston found high degrees of acceptance from the non-Jewish community. One area where Jews aligned particularly well with their non-Jewish Charlestonian neighbors was on the issue of slavery. The Jews of city, being White-skinned and desiring communal acceptance, quickly adopted the attitudes of the slaveholding society. Utilizing a vast array of archival material, Hagy (1993) indicates, by family, the number of slaves that the Jewish community owned. Included in his text is a letter written by Samuel Mass. Samuel Mass, an immigrant from Germany who had only recently arrived in Charleston, stated that, "only the black Africans could tolerate the heat, humidity, and hard work encountered in the Caroline Low Country" (Hagy, 1993; pp. 91–93).

Rabbi Burton Padoll

Burton Padoll was born in Canton, Ohio, on March 17, 1929, the child of, according to his own account, "a totally assimilated, non-practicing, Jewish family, living in a totally non-

Jewish world of Youngstown, Ohio, where I was the only Jewish kid in my class all the way

through school" (Padoll, 1999). Despite a lack of fluency with the Jewish experience, a young

Burton Padoll was inspired by his rabbi growing up, Rabbi Sidney Berkowitz, who, for unknown

reasons, took a vested interest in him. Rabbi Berkowitz invited Burton to participate in services,

often, "praising me and telling me that I should do this and I should do that and . . . did I ever

think of the rabbinate?" (Padoll, 1999). The aspects of rabbinic work that included teaching,

social work—especially the humanities—and acting intrigued Burton. He was accepted into

rabbinical school, eventually receiving Ordination in 1957, just 2 years after getting married (to

the sister of a rabbinical school classmate). He pursued a rabbinic position serving as an assistant

to Rabbi Albert Goldstein at Ohabei Shalom, a large congregation in Brookline, Massachusetts, a

position he would hold for 5 years.

According to Rabbi Padoll, while he was serving in Brookline, he became enmeshed and

involved with civil rights, becoming "very active in fair-housing practices, including preaching

quite a bit on civil rights" (Padoll, 1999). Perhaps he was inspired by his senior rabbi, who often

engaged publicly on housing issues. In an article for the *Brookline Chronicle Citizen*, Rabbi

Goldstein stated that "de-facto segregations exist in Brookline, this lily-white suburb. Many

people who moved to Brookline from Roxbury to escape the Blacks now feel threatened and

want to keep things as they are here; this seems to be a universal fear, without a basis in fact"

(Krause, 2008). Rabbi Padoll worked closely with Rabbi Goldstein on issues of social justice and

was inspired to do more. He stated,

> I was horrified at the things that were going on in the South and I felt very frustrated that
> I wasn't a part of [efforts to address] it. When Charleston came along, I interviewed for
> [the rabbi position] and told the people who interviewed me exactly how felt, that I
> wanted to do something constructive as far as civil rights was concerned, that if they
> wanted me to be their rabbi, they had to expect that I was going to pursue issues of civil
> rights. (Padoll, 1999)

Several common themes begin to emerge in the study of Rabbi Padoll. Like Rabbi Falk, Rabbi Padoll was driven to the congregation ostensibly to work on the issue of civil rights, thereby identifying an issue about which it was important to speak up and out and further informing the data related to the first research question; also, like Rabbi Falk, Rabbi Padoll expressed that desire in the interview process. Thus, both were exhibiting courageous activity and, considering that other rabbis at this point in history were experiencing professional challenges due to their work in civil rights, both were potentially engaging in professionally risky behavior. As well, Rabbi Padoll came to Charleston with an understanding and an appreciation for the role that a rabbi can play in the community, following in the footsteps of his mentor, Rabbi Goldstein, and excitedly preparing to engage the congregation around social issues.

Rabbi Padoll arrived in Charleston in 1961 and "was like a bull in a china shop when I got there. I was really messianic and they weren't ready for messianism at that stage of the game" (Padoll, 1999). He immediately made both his approach to the use of the pulpit and his position on civil rights known through the delivery of a sermon on December 16, 1961. While speaking about the Adolph Eichmann verdict, Rabbi Padoll seized the opportunity to parallel the Holocaust with the state of civil rights in Charleston, challenging his congregants. In a particularly transparent excerpt from the sermon, Rabbi Padoll said, "The potentiality for genocide exists in every man—yes, even in each of us who nurture and paper our own prejudices and bigotries with . . . blatant rationalizations that they are either justified or harmless . . . the understanding man will fight against this with every ounce of strength he owns" (Padoll, 1961).

He quickly found that his message resonated with some in the congregation but that he was butting heads with "a handful of rabid segregationists" (Padoll, 1999) who were pushing

back whenever he spoke about or involved the congregation around the civil rights issue. Rabbi

Padoll identified that the newer members were in agreement with his actions, and there were

people who were older members that were against his statements and subsequent actions.

According to Rabbi Padoll, "there was a vast sea of people in the middle, and those were the

people whom I came here to deal with" (Padoll, 1999). Just a few months later, in March 1962,

Rabbi Padoll spoke directly and clearly on the issue of integration. In a sermon that he titled

"Inter-racial Communication," he said,

> 43% of the citizens of this community . . . are Negroes who, due to the "proud and
> enforced traditions" of our community, find themselves in a world with separate drinking
> fountains and rest rooms, separate schools and hospitals, separate neighborhoods and
> hotels, separate restaurants and laundries and jobs and unions and wages and churches
> and just about everything else! They are sick unto death of the treatment they receive at
> the hands of their "benevolent"' fellow citizens in this wonderful and beautiful city. . . . A
> year ago last month, when I met with the Board of Trustees of this congregation, I
> explained to them that one thing I would strive to do, as your rabbi, would be to establish
> some lines of community with the Black community. . . . Just recently . . . a handful of
> respected Charleston citizens, white and Black, have finally begun to talk. . . . We have
> requested the appointment of an official Bi-Racial Committee that could sit down and
> address the problems confronting our community. "What problems?" people have asked.
> "Charleston is a peaceful town, free of strife," we've been told. . . . But the problems . . .
> are about to become quite evident to all of us unless we are willing to confront the
> seriousness of the situation. (Padoll, 1962)

The findings related to the sermon contribute to answering both to the first and third

research questions. One can find context to this sermon, and further support that it was

professionally risky for Rabbi Padoll to deliver the sermon at all, in minutes contained in the

Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society related to a group with which Rabbi Padoll

was associated, the Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC). According to the minutes

from the March 27, 1962, meeting, the committee turned to the "present race relations problem"

and "the recent start of a boycott of some King Street merchants." At that point Rabbi Padoll was

asked to report on his efforts to help form a biracial committee. Several meetings had been held

since January with leaders of the African American community and he reported that those meetings were informal. The head of the JCRC, Thomas Tobias, referencing a recent boycott that occurred in Savannah, Georgia, perhaps as a cautionary tale, then noted that the JCRC, "has a special interest in maintaining favorable race relations, as Jewish merchants would be particularly affected by a boycott such as Savannah experienced." Rabbi Padoll then disclosed that his group had asked the mayor to appoint a biracial committee. City Attorney Morris Rosen, a member of Rabbi Padoll's congregation, was approached on this matter, and Rabbi Padoll shared that Rosen's reaction was that it would be politically practical for Mayor Gaillard to appoint such a committee. The very next sentence in the minutes reads: "Since then a King Street boycott has been started by the Negro community" (JCRC Minutes, 1962). The March 2 sermon quoted above should be seen in the light of the information provided by the JCRC minutes. Rabbi Padoll, paralleling the experience of Rabbi Goodman, who served as a power broker of sorts, concluded that sermon by asking his congregants to phone or write Mayor Gaillard demanding the appointment of such a committee (Padoll, 1962). Stylistically different from Rabbi Goodman, Rabbi Padoll chose not to act behind-the-scenes but rather to engage from his position of authority, the pulpit.

On March 17, ten days before the JCRC meeting, tensions on King Street escalated as demonstrations commenced. The actions included sit-ins at lunch counters and a boycott of a few stores. Previous boycotts, in Charleston and elsewhere, included the demand that merchants hire Black employees, a demand that was met through the employment of African American individuals to work in the storage area or solely in loading and unloading merchandise. This time, merchants were picketed with the demand that they hire African Americans for jobs in the front of the store. Four weeks after the March 2 sermon, while the King Street boycott was still

in progress, Rabbi Padoll reminded his congregation: "I tried to give you some information. But it was as though I had written dirty words upon these sacred walls. This attempt on my part produced only anger, hurt, and misunderstanding" (Padoll, 1962a). Again, on April 13, he returned to the subject and provided further data related to the first research question:

> What do we do about racial and religious discrimination in our community? We fill our lives with meaningless and distracting rituals, with habitual concerns over our dress and speech and food. These trivia become the *issues* [emphasis in original] of our lives. Amos warned us to "let justice well up as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." (Padoll, 1962b)

It is interesting to note in the above text the emergence of another common theme, for by quoting the Book of Amos, Rabbi Padoll used the Jewish text to ground his argument. The above example is not the only instance of this type of activity. Another occasion occurred 1 week later, during the holiday of Passover. Rabbi Padoll, in a rather forceful critique of his community, asked how "Jews, of all people, descendants of slaves, could deny freedom to others" (Padoll, 1962c).

The King Street boycott was not the only issue related to civil rights that Rabbi Padoll addressed from the pulpit. In August, 1963, Harvey Gantt became the first African American student to integrate a South Carolina college campus, an action that caused considerable outcry (Rosen, 1997). In response, Rabbi Padoll devoted his Yom Kippur morning sermon to the problem of segregation, relying once again on Jewish text to support his statements. On October 8, he told his congregants,

> We live in an age and in an atmosphere where even the mention of the moral demands of social justice causes us alarm. It is an emotion-laden subject which we often relegate to the area of politics and say that religion should not therefore interfere—but religion isn't simply Bible tales and explanations of historical practices. Religion encompasses injustice, immorality, and sin. This is Charleston, the Holy City of the South. It has a glorious kind of past. However, it is the immediate present with which we must be concerned. . . . This is Yom Kippur, and we must realize that the only road to atonement

is through positive action against our failures of the past. Our silence in the face of moral responsibility is the sin of which we are accused today. (Padoll, 1963)

In the spring of 1964, Rabbi Padoll again chastised his congregants, and, in effect, many others in the Jewish community, for sitting "with our fingers in our ears, convinced that anonymity is the only sensible way," comparing this behavior to the behavior of the silent masses in Germany who sat by as they saw the Holocaust unfold (Padoll, 1964). Only two decades removed from the horrors of the Holocaust, and just a few years after the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem, these comparisons to the Holocaust would have been particularly striking to those in his congregation.

By mid-1965, Rabbi Padoll began to express that he had reached a stage of frustration with his congregation. With a sense of righteous pain reflective of his biblical heroes Amos and Jeremiah, Rabbi Padoll told them that his words had fallen on deaf ears and timid, if not hard, hearts. He charged,

> My requests of you over these past critical years have been based primarily on your responsibilities toward your fellow man . . . but many of you have refused to listen. You have said that this is not a "Jewish" problem and that therefore you would not lead the way. You already lost the chance to lead the way. (Padoll, 1965b)

The above reflection begins to shed light on a point of departure between Rabbi Padoll and the other rabbis whose stories appear in this dissertation, particularly when attempting to observe his behavior through the common theme of "understanding of role in the community." While Rabbi Silverman demonstrated that he understood his role through his leadership of the community after the dynamiting of the synagogue and threats to the synagogue, and Rabbi Falk demonstrated understanding of his role by uplifting his congregants and implementing an institutional change, and while Rabbi Goodman understood his role in organizing his fellow clergy members as did Rabbi Bloom, Rabbi Padoll appears to fall short of attaining that

understanding, at least as it relates to his work with civil rights. Yes, a role of the rabbi is to challenge the congregation at times, but there is always a goal in mind: to challenge congregants to change their behavior in some manner. Rabbi Padoll, perhaps so blinded by being *right*, neglected to determine that his approach may be the biggest impediment to his success. His words in the previous paragraph, particularly jarring in that they reek of defeatism, can be easily interpreted to give the impression that it is too late to change, that the proverbial ship has sailed. Knowing that, chronologically, at the time of the delivery of these words, Rabbi Padoll was nearing the end of his tenure with the congregation, these words become all the more telling.

While it is clear from the tenor of his sermons that Rabbi Padoll was not terribly happy with the responses of the congregation, it appears equally obvious that members of the congregation were unhappy with their rabbi. The disconnect between rabbi and congregation appeared at least a few years earlier, it just took some time to make it onto the pulpit. In a letter dated November 5, 1963, which Rabbi Padoll addressed to the Board of Trustees, he indicates that he had a meeting with Edwin Pearlstine Jr., president of the KKBE Brotherhood, discussing the congregation's dinner dance which was scheduled to take place on November 23. Rabbi Padoll wrote that he voiced his approval for the dance but requested that it not be held at the Hotel Fort Sumter because of their announced public stand against integration. Having explained this to both Pearlstine and the Brotherhood board, Rabbi Padoll apparently thought that his advice would be taken. Instead, on October 27 at the KKBE semiannual meeting, Pearlstine announced that the event's venue would be the Hotel Fort Sumter. The rabbi's letter concluded: "I want this Board to know, and I want the minutes of this meeting to reflect, my firm disapproval of the Brotherhood Board's decision, the personal affront to me which I find implicit in that decision, and, of course, my refusal to participate in the affair" (Padoll Letter, 1963).

The above illustration reflects another disconnect between Rabbi Padoll and the other rabbis in the dissertation. Each of the other rabbis strove to build upon relationships within the congregation and the result of that work was relative success: Rabbi Silverman was able to generate attendance at services following the dynamiting of the JCC, Rabbi Falk was able to establish the social justice committee, Rabbi Goodman was able to engage clergy colleagues in public testimony, and Rabbi Bloom was able to engage supporters to reduce tensions around school integration. Rabbi Padoll, on the other hand, could not even convince his lay leaders to follow his lead on a choice of venue for an auxiliary program. If he did not have the standing in his congregation, nor the important communal relationships, to succeed in the minor conflicts, one must ask how he ever expected the broad support needed to change the culture of his congregation and his city with regard to civil rights activism.

By February 1965, Rabbi Padoll's issues with Pearlstine escalated significantly, and without this important communal relationship, so did Rabbi Padoll's level of frustration. The Board minutes indicate that Dr. Leon Banov Jr., a friend and ally of Pearlstine and the man who was to become the next congregational president, was given the task of "considering the responsibilities and duties of our rabbi" so that "all will know whether or not the rabbi is performing the duties expected of him" (Minutes of the Board of KKBE, 1965a). At a subsequent meeting of the Board, it was reported that the Executive Committee had voted to renew the contract of Rabbi Padoll, though the vote was nine to seven (Minutes of the Board of KKBE, 1965b). Each of these actions convey how little support Rabbi Padoll had from his lay leaders, and, therefore, how perilous was his continued employment at the congregation.

The congregational meeting in 1966 makes it clear that the tensions between Rabbi

Padoll and certain members of the congregation continued to escalate. Rabbi Padoll used his

clergy report to state,

> There are some who disagree and that despite their disagreement I include and involve
> them in the causes which I support. But this must be! If the time should come when I fail
> to represent you honestly on matters of principle, if necessary, by a vote of the
> membership, we shall determine whether or not this congregation has been fairly
> represented. Depending on the outcome of such a ballot and the strength of your
> convictions and/or mine on the issue, certain changes may have to be made either in
> whom I represent or who represents you. (Minutes of the Board of KKBE, 1966)

The comments drew an immediate response from the members of the congregation, and

dozens of letters were received by members of the Board, some favorable to Rabbi Padoll but

many supporting his ouster (Krause, 2008). As the situation grew less and less tenable, Rabbi

Padoll began to privately seek another congregation to serve. He informed the Board in January

1967, and then again in March of that year that, despite having no current prospects, he would

not be signing a new contract with KKBE. On July 27, 1967, Rabbi Padoll submitted his formal

resignation to the Board, announcing that he had accepted, earlier that day, a position as the

associate rabbi of Temple Shaaray Tefila in New York City (Krause, 2008).

The dominant narrative, espoused by Rabbi Padoll himself, is that Rabbi Padoll was

forced to resign over his attitudes related to civil rights (Padoll, 1999). Others (Mendelsohn,

2015), however, have indicated that there may be other factors that contributed to his short

tenure at KKBE. Consideration of the common themes that have been presented thus far in the

dissertation may assist in understanding more completely the story of Rabbi Padoll. First, despite

his many fine attributes, Rabbi Padoll had a personality that rubbed at least some of the

congregants the wrong way in that he did not deal nicely with those with whom he disagreed.

Some members of the congregation saw his self-righteous attitude as off-putting, and some

thought him cold and unfriendly (Krause, 2008). As well, Rabbi Padoll freely acknowledges that he did not take the time he needed to get to know the congregation before immersing in change (Padoll, 1999). Rabbi Padoll did not possess important communal relationships. He did not seem to realize how professionally at risk he was because of his behavior. In effect, the common themes that emerged in this dissertation provide a good checklist for rabbis today: when those themes are present, and most certainly, when the rabbi is able to easily and readily observe them as contributing to success, the rabbi is on the right track, as can be understood from the example of four of the five rabbis in this dissertation study. When they are awry, however, one may find themselves more closely aligned with the cautionary tale of Rabbi Padoll, leading without key indicators of support.

Though one could surmise that his stance on civil rights contributed to his departure, minutes from the congregation and the letters received by the board in opposition to Rabbi Padoll relate other causes (Krause, 2008). One can just as easily conclude that Rabbi Padoll didn't understand the politics of congregational life at the time, and when he lost the support of powerful advocates—not because of his stance but rather because his tactics and personality were quite alienating—he found it difficult to accomplish his agenda (Krause, 2008). One should not conclude that Rabbi Padoll failed: his cajoling of the congregation attracted many to the struggle for civil rights, and his very public stance made it easier for his successor to become involved in the civil rights movement throughout the tumultuous 1960s (albeit with more success and using a remarkably different approach).

Rabbi Padoll served only 2 years at Temple Shaaray Tefila, accepting a position at Temple Beth Shalom in Peabody, Massachusetts. This proved to be a good match as he spent the rest of his career at the synagogue. Rabbi Padoll retired in 1989 and, as a gift, the congregation

bestowed upon him the title of Rabbi Emeritus. Beset by health problems, Rabbi Padoll relocated to Mount Jackson, Virginia, where he and his second wife, Sheila, opened an antique store. Rabbi Padoll died at the age of 76 on December 22, 2005. Sadly, as reflected in his final public statements in 2004, Rabbi Padoll still held that his stance on civil rights was the cause of the difficulty he experienced in Charleston, and he considered himself to be a victim of the scourge which he so diligently fought against.

Summary of Findings

The research questions guided the findings of this dissertation. As such, this penultimate section is further divided into subsections based upon those questions.

Q1: In an era when congregational rabbis often struggle with how and when to speak up and out, how might the experiences of these civil rights era rabbis inform their choices?

Whether one refers to them as political, ethical, or moral issues, today, more than ever, it seems, rabbis are inundated with local, national, global, political, religious, ethnic, and current events and conflicts clamoring for attention. News feeds, daily e-blasts, and the constant influx of emails and outreach from congregants passionate about one particular issue or another all urge rabbis to engage and respond with a sense of urgency. However, the truth is that were they to address every issue, engage on every topic, write a sermon or issue a statement about each undeniably significant concern, rabbis could easily fill every hour of a week. How, then, are rabbis today to prioritize? When do they opt to take a strong position, likely knowing not all will agree with whatever is shared, and when do they decide to maintain a quiet presence while others respond? How does one determine when to remain silent on a compelling matter and when it is time to speak?

Though presented through a rabbinic lens, this question surely resonates beyond those with the title "rabbi." Do I share what's on my mind when out at dinner with friends or would it be better to keep my opinions to myself? Should I share this Facebook post knowing it might be controversial, or simply read it and keep scrolling through my feed? Should I discuss my thoughts about a particular lecture or conference, or is it better to say nothing? Am I inclined to speak up or stay silent, and do I incline toward one extreme or the other? One may turn to the words of Ecclesiastes (3:7): "There is a time for every experience beneath the heavens . . . a time to be silent and a time to speak" (Ecclesiastes 3:7, JPS version). But regrettably, the book's author, Kohelet, does not clarify which time calls for which response, leaving quite the dilemma to confront.

Each of the rabbis in this study struggled with this question as it relates to civil rights. While they believed in the cause, they appear to have asked a series of questions prior to making any decision about whether to engage publicly. They first needed to conclude for themselves that the issue was compelling personally and professionally (Falk, 2002; Goodman, 2017; Krause, 2016; Padoll, 1999; Silverman, 1913–2001). Rabbi Falk, for example, made it clear to his interviewing committee that he expected to engage with civil rights should he accept the position, as did Rabbi Padoll. Similarly, Rabbi Goodman moved to Columbus, Georgia, anticipating that he would involve himself in some way with civil rights. Rabbi Silverman determined that civil rights, though ostensibly directed toward one group of people in his city, would be rather impactful to the synagogue community as well, responding to those who argued that civil rights was not a Jewish issue that, "it IS a problem for Jews" (Krause, 2016, p. 145). Rabbi Bloom, as well, determined that desegregation was a rather compelling issue so much so that he used the desegregation efforts of Mobile to write a Master's Thesis.

Researchers have investigated the relationship between an individual finding an issue or challenge compelling and short-term involvement, and those studies have shown that high levels of interest predict high levels of short-term performance (Ho et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2011; Rothbard, 2001). Having determined that the issue was personally compelling, the rabbis needed to consider the method of their engagement. Should they engage publicly, as did each of the rabbis in this study, sans Rabbi Bloom, using the power of their pulpit? Should they engage within the safety of communal organizations, as did Rabbi Bloom, Rabbi Goodman, and Rabbi Falk, each through their ministerial body? Should they work behind the scenes, as Rabbi Falk and Rabbi Bloom did, to network together people who could advance their agenda in a meaningful way?

Having identified that the rabbi is passionate and once the rabbi determines the method of their involvement, rabbis should consider how best to use their role as purveyor of the Jewish experience to meet success. The story of Rabbi Silverman highlighted this step: as Rabbi Silverman recalled, "I had been speaking about this as a problem and saying that we Jews ought to be involved. Well, some of the members of my congregation said this is not a problem for Jews. I was telling them that it is a problem for Jews. And some of them said . . . that we should stay out of it" (Krause, 2016, p. 145). Rabbis could further learn from Rabbi Silverman as to how to resolve this tension:

> I insist that as a rabbi, as a teacher of Judaism, that Judaism is a religion of action and I need not support that point of view . . . and if you want to argue with me, you have to refute my Judaism. This is not always an easy thing for a layman to do. My position has always been the right side of the Lord God or the Bible or the Talmud or Judaism say this; therefore, I must act in consonance with these teachings. Now don't argue with me. Go and argue with five thousand years of Judaism. (Krause, 2016, p. 157)

When rabbis choose to engage with contemporary issues, it is not enough just to be compelled to do so and to find grounding in the Jewish experience, and there are other steps to

take between determining the course of action and embarking on that course of action. Rabbis should be able to predict whether their involvement with an issue will provoke controversy within the congregation and should work to align a base of supporters. Again we can turn to the example of Rabbi Silverman, who chose to use his radio show to test the waters before bringing the issue of his involvement with civil rights to his congregation (Silverman, 1913–2001). This strategic move enabled him to build the case that desegregation was a Jewish issue and positioned him well to overcome initial detractors (Krause, 2016). By 1956, the Board of Trustees of the congregation was already supportive of his activities and could support his endeavors (Silverman, 1950–1960). Rabbi Falk practiced this tactic as well when he phoned his congregational president as well as in his formation of the social justice committee. While informing (or, in the best of cases, partnering with) lay leaders is a necessary step, doing so does not guarantee success in the endeavor, and rabbis should be prepared to listen to and engage with lay communal partners.

Q2: How might this dissertation contribute to the legacy of the rabbinic exemplars?

It was known among their closest confidants and communal partners that the rabbis whose stories comprise this study engaged in civil rights efforts during the 1960s. Regardless of the fact that four of the five were more public and engaged their congregants in their activities, for almost all of them, their exploits remain under recognized. With a dearth of published material available, it became apparent that, while some aspects of their rabbinates have been studied, their efforts in the civil rights movement were escaping their legacy.

Among the rabbis in this study, it is perhaps Rabbi Silverman about whom the most has been written. Present in most of the published articles reporting on his life and legacy is a focus on how he was connected to the dynamiting of the Nashville Jewish Community Center. Missing

from those materials, however, was mention, much less study, of his work leading up to that tragic moment, how he led his community during those times, and his work in the years that followed. In effect, Rabbi Silverman was largely viewed as a footnote in the story of the Nashville JCC. This dissertation builds his legacy as an advocate for civil rights long before the dynamiting of the building. It also more completely conveys his role during the immediate aftermath as he led his community in treacherous times, and presents, for the first time, his role as a behind-the-scenes mentor to other rabbis navigating their roles in the civil rights movement. His correspondence, preserved in the archives of The Temple, the Nashville JCC, and the American Jewish Archives, contribute a chapter to his story that has not previously been explored.

Rabbi Silverman's successor, Rabbi Falk, similarly had a well-earned reputation amongst his congregation and his closest colleagues as a fighter for civil rights, and his accomplishments were celebrated in Nashville upon his retirement. Outside of those circles, however, Rabbi Falk's story remains largely untold. This study contributes to his legacy by focusing on the establishment of his congregation's social justice committee and placing that significant body's work in context of other civil rights advocacy on which Rabbi Falk embarked during the 1960s. As well, Rabbi Falk actively participated in demonstrations, a component of his story untold before now. This study grounds his early activism in Nashville as a building block to the clergy march that he organized, adding another compelling dimension to the latter's success.

Precious little has been written about Rabbi Goodman and his work in Columbus, Georgia. He has already attained a localized legacy, with the members of his congregation and those who grew up in Columbus recalling him for blessing. This dissertation, though, establishes a civil rights legacy for him by presenting his efforts with the Sibley Commission in context of

the other ministerial work in which he engaged. Further, this study unearthed two stories in which Rabbi Goodman's life was threatened due to his role in the struggle for civil rights. He weathered those threats with bravery, adding another courageous chapter to his legacy.

Rabbi Bloom's legacy is still being created, as he died in the early research phase of this study. While previous permission was obtained to access his personal papers, the process of organizing his estate has proven more cumbersome than anticipated, due largely to the declining health of his widow and a desire to demonstrate compassion and patience on behalf of the researcher. As a result, papers and correspondence remain inaccessible for scholarship at this time. Therefore, the legacy established for Rabbi Bloom by this study is one of actions largely unseen. Upon learning that he was a civil rights hero, many of his former congregants remain speechless. When learning that he wanted to keep his activist work private so that it could be most impactful, those same congregants shake their heads and respond that they are unsurprised. As there is presently much research occurring with regard to Mobile's legacy within the civil rights movement, the hope is that this study will merit Rabbi Bloom's inclusion among the great civil rights advocates in Mobile during the 1960s.

While not much is known about Rabbi Padoll among more recent ordainees, his legacy amongst his older colleagues is that he was discharged from his duties in Charleston due to his civil rights work. While the analysis of sermonic material supports the understanding that he spoke passionately with—or, perhaps *at*—his congregation, archival materials point to other reasons for his departure, including that he did not have the friendship, support, or backing from the established leadership of the congregation and the largest communal donors. Identified by reputation as almost a martyr for the cause of civil rights due his being fired, this study seems to

paint a more rich and fuller portrait of a complex relationship between a rabbi and his

congregation.

Q3: What lessons can be gleaned regarding the role of context—especially position in history

and community—that might be useful for congregational rabbis today as they apply the

principles of leadership theory to their practice?

Research has demonstrated that context is relevant to leadership studies (Liden &

Antonakis, 2009). In acknowledging the centrality of context, Biggart and Hamilton (1987) have

argued that, "If leadership is embedded in social and cultural beliefs and values, then leadership

cannot be fully understood apart from the context in which it exists" (p. 437). They continue,

> Leadership is a relationship among persons embedded in a social setting at a given
> historical moment. Strategies of leadership must consider the normative basis of the
> relationship and the setting, and the distinctive performance abilities of the actors
> involved. Theorists, no less than would-be leaders, must take these factors into account.
> (p. 439)

In other words, leadership is context-sensitive. The drawing of attention to the contextual factors

and to their significance has been identified as being of critical importance for the study of

leadership behavior (Liden & Antonakis, 2009). In fact, Porter and McLaughlin (2006) argued

that context is of such vital importance that one cannot effectively lead without an understanding

and appreciation of communal context.

Of course, context devoid of analysis is largely unhelpful. The findings have

unfortunately proven incomplete to determine whether all actors—the board members,

community members, congregants, etc.—share a common understanding of context and draw the

same conclusions. Yet one can see evidence of the manner in which context influenced the

decision-making of the rabbis in this dissertation and, by virtue of their leadership and role in the

community, they may have played a particularly heightened role in the manner in which the

other parties understood their context. Rabbi Bloom determined that he would consider the context and adopt the quiet leadership example of Mayor Langan when he determined how to be the most effective in the civil rights struggle. Further, he compared the communal context of Mobile with that of Selma, Montgomery, and Birmingham (Bloom, 2010). Rabbi Silverman struggled with his congregants to place the Jewish community within the greater context of civil rights, arguing that the people who target the Black citizens of Nashville are the same people who target, and who will target, the Jewish citizens of Nashville (Krause, 2016). He also fought against those who would isolate the dynamiting of the JCC as a uniquely Jewish issue, intoning, "that the entire community of Nashville has been victimized" (Silverman, 1913–2001). Rabbi Falk, already familiar with the communal context of The Temple and the civil rights activism of his predecessor, determined to embrace that historical reality and immerse himself in the civil rights struggle (Falk, 2002), while Rabbi Goodman appreciated the horrific and racist context of Columbus, Georgia, when he determined to apply an Atlanta example to his city, engaging in civil rights through a ministerial organization while at the same time preaching passionately to his congregation (Krause, 2016).

This dissertation includes a cautionary tale that should not be overlooked by rabbis today. Rabbi Padoll was so determined to engage in the struggle for civil rights that his misread the context cues in his community. Believing that he could move to Charleston and participate immediately, without building community, endearing himself to his congregants, or taking stock of the context of the city, he ultimately impeded his success. As he himself intoned: "I was like a bull in a china shop when I got there. I was really messianic and they weren't ready for messianism at that stage of the game" (Padoll, 1999).

Contextual influences play a major role in the perception of how a situation came to be, what is *really* going on, and how to best respond in order to meet success. Congregational rabbis today can learn from the experiences of the five rabbis in this dissertation of the vital importance placed on understanding context prior to engaging in any kind of change project. For taking the time to appreciate context—both historical and communal—can mean the difference between the storied tenure of Rabbi Goodman and the abridged and disappointing tenure of Rabbi Padoll.

Summary

In summary, this is a study that used primary source documents (archival research) related to the experiences of five civil rights-era rabbis in order to identify leadership themes and patterns of behavior. Chapter 4 included a brief introduction regarding the method of inquiry and the emergence of six common themes: a time of moral distress, courageous activity, professionally risky behavior, understanding of role in the community, importance of communal relationships, and the use of the Jewish textual tradition. Analysis of the data provided insight into three compelling questions asked of the rabbis:

1. In an era when congregational rabbis often struggle with how and when to speak up and out, how might the experiences of these civil rights era rabbis inform their choices?

2. How might the dissertation contribute to the legacy of the rabbinic exemplars?

3. What lessons can be gleaned from the role of context—especially position in history and community—that might be useful for congregational rabbis today as they apply the principles of leadership theory to their practice?

Chapter 5 furthers the discussion of the findings and extends them to the field of leadership theory. In that final chapter, the leadership legacy of these five rabbis is compared

with the literature, conclusions and implications are explored, and a series of recommendations is suggested.

CHAPTER V: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

This chapter presents an interpretation of the findings from Chapter 4 along with a link to the relevant theory, research, and literature discussed in Chapter 2 and the methodology discussed in Chapter 3. It then discusses limitations of this study and recommendations for future research. The chapter concludes with a closing statement from the researcher.

Using primary source documents (archival research) related to the experiences of five civil rights era rabbis (Rabbi William Silverman, Rabbi Randall Falk, Rabbi Alfred Goodman, Rabbi Irving Bloom, and Rabbi Burton Padoll), this study addressed three questions: (1) In an era when congregational rabbis often struggle with how and when to speak up and out, how might the experiences of these civil rights era rabbis inform their choices? (2) How might the dissertation contribute to the legacy of the rabbinic exemplars? and (3) What lessons can be gleaned regarding the role of context—especially position in history and community—that might be useful for congregational rabbis today as they apply the principles of leadership theory to their practice?

An exploration of primary source documents, including letters, sermons, congregational bulletin articles, and related ephemera, revealed a pattern of behavior shared by each of the rabbinic subjects that answers the first research question. Each of the rabbis exhibited an interest in the issue they chose to address. Having identified that interest, each of the rabbis took an inventory of methods of engagement available to them, including the use of sermons, involvement in high-profile demonstrations, printed materials in congregational bulletins, and public speaking engagements, as well as private networking, communal organizing, and institution building. Some of the rabbis took an additional step of building a base of support, either from the congregational leadership or from allies throughout the community. Those rabbis

that took that step found an increased chance of success in their civil rights activism.

Considering that they were tasked with serving as purveyors of Jewish tradition, each of the rabbis grounded their activism in the richness of the Jewish textual tradition. Substantial capacity was afforded in Chapter 2 for an exploration of the texts from which these rabbis drew, especially the Biblical and Talmudic texts. Primary sources, such as the sermons of Rabbi Padoll and Rabbi Silverman, the annual meeting documents from Rabbi Falk and Rabbi Bloom, and comments from Rabbi Goodman, demonstrate the manner in which the rabbis used these texts to support their activism. Further, as they each occupied a seat of religious authority within their communities, it would be a mistake to downplay the importance of these texts to the rabbis. Findings, especially the comments from Rabbi Silverman and Rabbi Padoll, indicate that the use of the Judaic prooftexts was integral to their approach to civil rights activism. In addition to providing texts from which the five rabbinic exemplars drew, presented in Chapter 2 was a collection of more contemporary texts used in the same fashion by rabbis today.

While providing guidance for rabbis today, the findings also offer a more robust understanding of the lived experiences of each of the rabbinic exemplars than had been previously compiled. As Chapter 2 illustrated, the nature of current books and articles concerned with the experiences of southern rabbis and the civil rights movement highlights disagreements between the rabbis and their often-reluctant congregants (Bauman & Kalin, 2007; Blumberg, 1985; Moses, 2018; Rose, 2003; Salzman & West, 1997; Strober & Strober, 2019). As well, the literature tends to reflect bias toward victory narratives (Dinerstein & Palsson, 1973; Dorman, 2010; Lipman & Vorspan, 1962; Strober & Strober, 2019). Additionally, much of the narrative related to rabbinic involvement focuses on the experiences of the rabbinic partners of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.—Rabbi Jacob Rothschild and Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel (Bauman

& Kalin, 1997; Blumberg, 1985; Greene, 1996; Rose et al., 2008; Schneier, 1999; Schwartz, 2006; Vorspan & Saperstein, 1998). This dissertation finds itself placed in an emerging collection of work (Bauman, 2019; Evans, 1997; Houston, 2012; Krause, 2016; Webb, 2010; Webb, 2003) intended to expand the scope and the depth of knowledge around rabbinic involvement in the civil rights movement, contributing five previously untold stories to the growing body of literature and linking the legacies of the five rabbinic exemplars to the civil rights movement.

The findings gleaned through the exploration of primary source documents also revealed the manner in which the rabbinic experiences were shaped by context, offering several lessons to be considered by rabbis today. The most successful of the rabbis offered thoughtful consideration prior to engaging in any kind of activity to the social and cultural beliefs, values, and expectations they observed. The conclusions they drew helped to inform their approach and method of involvement. By folding their activities into communal norms, the rabbis were able to more quickly reach a higher level of impact than would have otherwise been the case. Additionally, the findings related to Rabbi Padoll should give rabbis today pause to consider communal context when they encounter resistance, giving them the opportunity to shift approach if warranted by the situation.

Findings in Light of the Leadership Literature

The precedent literature review (Chapter 2) for this research, noting both the role of the Jewish textual cannon in rabbinic framing and exploring several leadership theories which can be applied to the study of rabbinic work, provided sound footing to findings in this research. With that sound footprint in view, one may better understand the relevance of the findings from this

dissertation for both leadership scholarship today as well as for rabbis who are leading for change.

Relevance for Leadership Scholarship

As was demonstrated previously in this dissertation (Chapter 2), congregational rabbis are viewed as leaders in their communities, and their leadership examples might be used to showcase and highlight various aspects of leadership theories. During the early stages of data analysis, six common themes began to emerge from the exploration of their practice. Those themes were: a time of moral distress, courageous activity, professionally risky behavior, understanding of their role in the community, important communal relationships, and the use of Jewish textual tradition to influence decision making. Based upon the common themes, I wonder if the lived experiences of these rabbis could be used to recognize leadership theory. It would seem that the overlap in their stories can be understood through a discussion about leadership and context; leadership styles in the work of transformation, relationships, and service; and leadership and ethics, justice, and courage.

Relationship between leadership and context

Housed in the archives at Columbus State University is a box of ephemera related to Rabbi Goodman. Within that box is a folder of correspondence written to Rabbi Goodman which covers a number of topics. Several of those letters offer effusive and glowing commentary about compelling and provocative sermons delivered by Rabbi Goodman, praising him for delivering a difficult message about civil rights (Goodman, 1970). These letters support the conclusion that Rabbi Goodman both spoke from the pulpit about civil rights and did so in a manner that allowed him to curate a reputation as one skilled in homiletics. Yet that same collection features Rabbi Goodman taking a decidedly less provocative approach when assembling his colleagues to speak

at the Sibley Commission. These findings help to illustrate the role that context plays in leadership.

Context is an important component of leadership. As Hackman (2010) challenges, "What are we to do about the radical differences in the context of leadership for, say, a Boy Scout troop, a senior leadership team, a professional string quartet, and a product development team in an industrial firm? Could it really be true that leadership operates in the same way in these radically different contexts" (p. 111)? Unfortunately, much of the early leadership theories focused primarily on centering the leader and the quest for universal traits and behaviors that make some leaders more successful than others (Day, 2014; Ladkin, 2010; Lord et al, 2017).

An early proponent of highlighting the role of context within leadership was Fred Fiedler. Fiedler (1973) developed a contingency theory of leadership effectiveness, priming task motivation and circumstance as factors to consider to better enable a leader's success. Several articles of late have contributed to an understanding of the role of context in leadership (Ayman & Adams, 2012; Dambe & Moorad, 2008; Day & Antonakis, 2012; Johns, 2006; Osborn et al., 2002; Rousseau & Fried, 2001; Spillane et al., 2004). Of particular note, Porter and McLaughlin (2006) identified several areas of context worthy of consideration for leadership studies: culture, goals, people, processes, condition, structure, and time (Oc, 2018).

While still in development, the ideas advanced by the contextual theory of leadership are evidenced in the leadership examples of the rabbis included in this dissertation. In addition to the example shared above related to Rabbi Goodman, correspondence and board minutes found in the various archives demonstrate the degree to which each of the rabbinic exemplars considered the lens of context. Upon arriving in Nashville, Rabbi Falk met with the staff and was brought up to speed on certain ongoing projects. During that meeting, he was informed about the goals of

the projects and began to understand his role with regard to his staff (Falk, 1970). Rabbi Padoll

met with his staff to explain his own goals as related to his activism and made sure his staff was

aware that civil rights activism was a priority for him (Padoll, 1999). In each case, the leader

presented his own expectations of his involvement with ongoing tasks, identified how he would

plan to be involved with the task structure (and how the fellow staff members would be

involved), and affirmed his position of power. Rabbi Silverman considered context and applied a

different leadership approach when attending board meetings than he did when responding to the

dynamiting of the synagogue. These are but a few of the examples highlighted in the archival

collections of situations where the rabbi considered the context of his leadership position and

chose an approach that best suited the circumstance.

Leadership styles: The work of transformation, relationships, and service

The findings in this paper point to the complementarity of the transformative nature of

rabbinic leadership, the significance of relationships in accomplishing goals, and the notion of

service to a cause greater than oneself. On the face of it, that such a complementarity exists

should not be surprising given the role that clergy play within the superstructure of American

Reform Judaism (Bloom, 2012). Each of the rabbis in this study transformed their community,

each held significant relationships with others that enabled the transformation, and each rabbi

structured his leadership of the community first and foremost through the lens of service, either

to the synagogue, the city, or the greater cadre of the Jewish people.

Rabbinic work is, by its nature, transformational, both to communities and to individuals,

so it seems fitting to begin with an exploration of how these rabbis can be viewed as

transformational leaders. According to Ljungholm (2014), "Transformational leadership is an

informal and nonhierarchical 'cadre' of talent that is positioned throughout all sections of the

organization, depends on being highly networked, and where leaders are able to use emerging influence" (p. 79). Some of the key elements of transformational leadership promote and support followers turning into leaders and increasing the moral and ethical standards of leaders. Transformational leadership addresses sharing power and responsibility, working collaboratively, goal setting, and continuous reflection (Dambe & Moorad, 2008). Perhaps most relevant to this dissertation, though, is that, in this theory, leaders are engaged and inspire others to get involved.

One can easily recognize that each of these rabbis were engaged and actively inspiring others to get involved. Even the rabbi experiencing the greatest friction from his congregational leadership, Rabbi Padoll, managed to engage those at the JCRC table as well as some of his own congregants to get involved with the civil rights movement (Krause, 2008). Rabbi Falk's 130 clergy march would not have occurred without his own engagement in the protest and his ability to inspire clergy colleagues, especially Pastor Dodson from the Calvary Methodist Church (Clergy of Community Stood Up to Be Counted, 1964). Rabbi Bloom may not have marched in Mobile, but he was able to align his ministerial organization colleagues to stand up to Governor George Wallace's use of the Alabama National Guard to prevent school desegregation (Kirkland, 2005) and Rabbi Goodman engaged and inspired his ministerial organization colleagues to testify before the Sibley Commission (Krause, 2016). Following the dynamiting of the Jewish Community Center, Rabbi Silverman transformed letters of sympathy and condolence into invitations for action (Silverman, 1913–2001).

Ljungholm (2014) indicated, "Transformational leadership is an inspiring commitment to and enthusiasm for the leader and intention to follow his vision" (p. 79). Furthermore, transformational leaders have a clear focus and understanding of their objectives and goals,

creating a culture where followers are more likely to engage in a shared vision. Throughout the

entire experience, the transformational leader "has full understanding of what goals are relevant

to the organization. Followers tend to view the aims of their organization as their own and

understand clearly the importance of certain organizational goals" (Ljungholm, 2014, p. 79).

Watts and Corrie (2013) posited that

> Transformational leaders . . . are those who inspire their followers to shape their motives, aspirations, values and goals so that personal aspirations become aligned with the identity and vision of the organization. It is suggested that what is required is a leader who can listen to others and to themselves; who can empathize with, appreciate and empower others, and who can also work to develop strengths in themselves and others. (p. 87)

While each of the rabbis in some way shaped the manner in which the motives,

aspirations, values, and goals of their congregants became aligned with their embrace of civil

rights, Rabbi Falk's formation of the social justice committee perhaps most clearly exemplifies

this idea. Not only did he work with others to create a shared vision, but he engaged a small

cadre of congregants to lead the execution of that vision. Dr. Goldner's reports to the Board of

Trustees never credit Rabbi Falk but rather credit the work of the committee (TN—Board of

Trustees, 1963b; TN—Board of Trustees, 1963d). Further, by engaging over 350 congregants

through the 16 parlor meetings, the committee crafted a shared a vision, creating synergy and

alignment (TN—Annual Report, 1964).

Congregational and communal transformation rarely, if ever, occurs as a solo practice,

and the rabbinate as a profession places tremendous emphasis on relationships. As Rabbi Dan

Judson, director of professional development and placement at Hebrew College, explained, "So

much of the job of rabbi is working with people, being available to people, responding to people.

It's not necessarily about the best piece of Torah learning they can come up with" (Heilman,

2014). Rabbi Judson's comments certainly find confirmation in the findings presented in this

dissertation.

Effective leadership—in the vocation of the rabbinate or related to any leadership scenario—cannot exist without understanding the dynamics—the relationship—between leaders and followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2017), and Uhl-Bien (2006) elaborated to suggest that it is in the action within relationships that matters more than position or title. In addition, the individual perception one has related to the interaction is personal and constructs each person's reality, both of the interaction and, cumulatively, of the relationship over time (Seers & Chopin, 2012). This is significant since relationships matter in organizations because of their significance to the organization itself. High-quality relationships are shown to promote increased job satisfaction, decreased turnover, and, as relates to the material in this dissertation, organizational commitment (McCallum & O'Connell, 2009).

Perhaps the most striking parallel related to the significance of relationships to rabbinic leadership found in this study exists in the comparison between Rabbi Goodman and Rabbi Padoll. Rabbi Goodman developed relationships with clergy colleagues that resulted in him being called upon to offer guidance with regularity (Goodman, 2017) and to serve in leadership positions throughout his organizational affiliations (Tribute Book, 1986). He was also invited by other rabbis to speak at their synagogues during significant moments in the life of the congregation (Goodman, 2017, p. 2–3). Further, Rabbi Goodman developed deep and healthy relationships with the members of his congregation (Cohn, September 9, 2020) and spent almost 33 years at Temple Israel.

In contrast, Rabbi Padoll had a rather short and contentious relationship with his congregation, in part due to a personality that rubbed many in his congregation the wrong way (Krause, 2008). As well, Rabbi Padoll freely acknowledged that he did not take the time to

endear himself to the congregation (Padoll, 1999). He did not possess the relationships that would enable his congregants to feel a sense of connection, which made his actions both more jarring (Padoll, 1999) and divisive (Krause, 2008).

Relational leadership theory builds on the significance of relationships between and within organizations. In so doing, a more expansive historical view appears which considers more than just the roles that leaders and followers play within an organization (Uhl-Bien, 2006). Relational leadership theory takes away the overarching tasks of looking for the most salient qualities in leaders to make them effective and translates importance to the relationships.

Once again, the experiences of the rabbis in this dissertation can be used to showcase and exemplify aspects of relational leadership theory. As exhibited by the rabbis, some form of relationship, in the form of collaboration, contributed to their success. Rabbi Bloom created the interfaith ministerial organization ABLE (Bloom, 2010), Rabbi Falk participated with the interfaith clergy group that met at Fisk University (Three Local Clergymen Chosen for Human Relations Award, 1979), Rabbi Silverman formed relationships through the Rotary Club, Kiwanis Club, and other groups (Krause, 2016, p. 158), and Rabbi Goodman formed the Columbus Council on Human Rights with his clergy partner J. W. Hurley, the Pastor of the St. James AME Church (Sibley Commission Testimony, 1960). Though by comparison only marginally successful, Rabbi Padoll also formed communal relationships through his work with the local Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC Minutes, 1962).

While rabbinic leadership is transformational and remains heavily reliant on meaningful and impactful relationships, another thread that unites rabbis is the desire to engage in service. In fact, the website for the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, the seminary that ordained each of the rabbis featured in this dissertation, states this clearly on their website: "in a

complicated world, as patterns of Jewish identification and involvement shift and institutions and valued are called into question, we need courageous and authentic spiritual leaders to serve and guide us" (https://hebrewcollege.edu/graduate-leadership-programs/become-a-rabbi/). Though written many years after the retirement of the rabbinic exemplars in this study, the findings demonstrate that the desire to serve cannot be overlooked as an influencing factor.

Servant leadership describes a leader who has a willingness to classify leadership as being in service to others. Greenleaf (1970), Sergiovanni (1992), and Cunningham and Cordeiro (2003) introduced the servant leader approach to leadership. The researchers agreed that a servant leader is naturally motivated to serve others. Dambe and Moorad (2008) noted that the servant leadership approach teaches leaders the qualities of humility and kindness by putting the needs of others first. "Some of the salient features associated with this approach include the leader's commitment to the growth of the followers spiritually, personally and professionally, until they themselves become servant leaders" (Dambe & Moorad, 2008, p. 582). Greenleaf (1977) believed that to be a servant leader, one must make a conscious decision to serve the needs of followers. According to Autry (2001), the servant leader is an inspiring figure, a person that others desire to follow and emulate.

When applying the lens of servant leadership theory to the experiences of the rabbis, one can see most glaringly that each possessed a genuine desire to serve others. The work of a congregational rabbi is first and foremost a servant leader experience, as one is charged with serving the members of the congregation. Some of the rabbis, though, adopt a more utilitarian vision of service, serving their congregations as well as the greater community by living according to Jewish prophetic traditions. Rabbi Falk indicated in his interview that a compelling aspect of moving to Nashville was the opportunity to become involved with civil rights (Falk,

2002), a sentiment shared as well by Rabbi Padoll (Padoll, 1999) during his interview.

There were detractors who argued that involvement with civil rights would come in stark contrast to their service to the congregation. Rabbi Silverman confronted a group in Nashville who desired that the rabbi should spend time teaching Jewish tradition to his congregants and not risking the safety and security of the Jewish community by engaging in civil rights (Krause, 2016). Those calls became particularly sharp immediately following the dynamiting of the Jewish Community Center when some critics blamed Rabbi Silverman and his civil rights involvement for the attack (Silverman, 1913–2001). Rabbi Silverman's private correspondence highlights the manner in which he saw his activity as a part of the greater good:

> There has been an outpouring of Christian sympathy, and yet I have attempted to make it clear to the ministers and teachers, civil officials and responsible people in our community that the entire community of Nashville has been victimized . . . it is in essence a problem of . . . decency and morality. (Silverman, 1913–2001)

Some of the rabbis placed their own professional security at risk in order to engage in the struggle for civil rights and subsequently serve a cause that was greater than the scope of their professional responsibilities. Rabbi Padoll spoke often and forcefully from the pulpit (Padoll, 1965a) as did Rabbi Goodman (Webb, 2003). Rabbi Bloom chose to stand with the Christian community during the funeral for Rev. James Reeb (Bloom, 2010). Each of these function as but a few of the examples of aspects of servant leadership theory observed their stories.

Leadership grounded in ethics, devoted to justice, and exhibiting courage

While the rabbis featured in this dissertation engaged in the work of transformation, relied on meaningful relationships, and did so out of a genuine desire to serve others, the findings also demonstrate that each of them also possessed a high level of ethical clarity. According to Northouse (2016), "ethics is concerned with the kinds of values and morals an individual or society finds desirable or appropriate; furthermore, ethics is concerned with the virtuousness of

individuals and their motives" (p. 342). The use of the word "or" in the above statement indicates a dilemma that emerges within ethical leadership, highlighting two extreme approaches to ethically moral choices: ethical egotism, where a leader acts to create the greatest good for self, and ethical altruism, where the leader acts to create the greatest good for others (Northouse, 2016). As Ladkin (2015) offered, "Even people who want to act ethically can find themselves in difficult and not know what to do when they face ethically ambiguous situations" (p. 5). Ethics is central to leadership because of the nature of influence and the impact leaders have on the organization's values (Brown et al., 2005). Ethical leadership can be defined as "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through communication, modeling, and decision making" (Brown et al., 2005, p. 120). Much of the literature exploring ethical leadership falls into two categories: work that that privileges unit-based organizations and group functions within leadership (Chan et al., 2007; Peng et al., 2014). and work that focuses on the leader and the followers (Bedi et al., 2016; Ng & Feldman, 2015). Of particular interest to this dissertation is the work of Dambe and Moorad (2008) who suggest, "In essence, a moral leader is bound by certain ethics, namely the ethic of caring in which he/she demonstrates the care through action rather than just saying it" (p. 583).

As demonstrated in Chapter 4, each of the rabbis modeled the behavior for which he advocated. Rabbi Padoll preached from the pulpit about equality and, as evidenced in the findings around the JCRC meetings, engaged in relationship building intended to make Charleston a more equitable city. Rabbi Silverman advocated for school integration during his radio show and preached the story of civil rights to his congregation both before and after the synagogue was dynamited. Rabbi Falk talked the talk of inclusivity and he included a plurality of

voices around the establishment of the Social Justice committee. Each of the rabbis professed the importance of communal relationships and each became involved with interfaith clergy associations. In the most telling finding relating to the applicability of ethical leadership theory to the experiences of these rabbis, one may consider the resolution offered by the Jewish Ladies Aid Society noting that Rabbi Goodman "was a rabbi who meant what he said and said what he meant in all circumstances, and that his greatest sermon was expressed best by his own personal example" (Golden Book of Life, ca. 1854–1938).

While the findings support the application of ethical leadership theory to these rabbis, they also shed insight into the manner that their ethics impacted their actions. These rabbis were compelled by the time in which they lived and the cities in which they practiced to become change agents, devoting themselves, in part, to a vision of social justice that was a natural extension of their ethical mores. They used the tools at their disposal to pursue an agenda of a more just society for all.

Social justice leadership has been defined as leadership acted out through service on behalf of others toward increased social equity (Bent-Goodley, 2015). Social justice leadership has been described as action that flows out of personal and purposeful interactions with unjust or oppressive systems for the purpose of social change (O'Connor, 2010). Bent-Goodley (2015) described social justice leaders as people who show a commitment to disrupting inequity, stimulate discourse around ways to accomplish organizational and societal change, find ways to reframe discourse and policies that marginalize certain groups, and use a full range of skills to speak against injustice.

Social justice leadership is any activity in which individuals "advocate, lead, and keep at the center of their practice and vision issues of race, class, gender, disability, sexual orientation,

and other historically and currently marginalizing conditions" (Theoharis, 2008, p. 5). Ryan (2016) offered that whatever the characterization of social justice leadership, it is always action with an "aim to challenge the status quo" (p. 90). As such, social justice leadership aligns with the rabbinical exemplars in this dissertation exceptionally well. Through communal partnerships, each of the rabbis aligned their actions with and for others and, as the issues were directly related to civil rights, it is clear that their aim was to increase fairness, equality, and opportunity for those traditionally marginalized.

Yet the rabbis did not exclusively pursue social justice through their communal relationships. Rabbi Padoll delivered sermons intended to compel his congregants to action, as did Rabbi Goodman, Rabbi Silverman, and Rabbi Falk. Rabbi Falk pursued a broad social justice agenda, taking up issues such as poverty in Nashville, the Refusenik issue, and working to build a just society in Israel. Rabbi Bloom included social justice snippets in his congregational bulletin while in Mobile, making sure that his congregants were presented a progressive lens regarding issues about which he was passionate. Further, while the relationships may have led to the invitation, it was Rabbi Bloom who stood alone, delivering words of substance and meaning at the funeral of James Reeb. Each of these rabbis, inspired by their ethics, engaged in social justice work with the intention of making a positive impact on their congregations and their communities.

For the rabbis in this dissertation, it was important to consider the ethics involved in their decision making and, once they made those decisions, the findings highlight opportunities when they turned word into deed, transforming thought into action. One must not overlook or downplay the courage it took for each of these rabbis to engage in civil rights activity, for while the path from ethics to social justice may have been clear, there were many opportunities to

discontinue their efforts in the face of adversity and fear. That they persevered was truly an exhibition of courage.

As Avolio (2005) indicates, courage is important to leaders and followers. Leaders need courage to take risks necessary to create a sustained advantage, which often means implementing new changes in organizations that can be met with resistance and/or skepticism (Avolio, 2005; Bolt, 1996; Staub, 1996). Badaracco and Ellsworth (1989) highlight the importance of courage to leadership effectiveness. They argue that while many in positions of leadership have experience, skills, and knowledge to behave like leaders, many do not act as leaders because they lack courage. Moreover, they also need courage to "stay the course" despite reasons to become disheartened (Snyder et al., 1994).

Though they had the privilege given to them by the color of their skin to disengage, each of the rabbis in this dissertation chose to persist with regard to their civil rights activism, living experiences that can be applied to courageous leadership. Consider the example of Rabbi Silverman, who was attacked in 1957 following a presentation at a Methodist Church (Krause, 2016) a full year before the dynamiting of the Jewish Community Center (Silverman, 1950–1960; Meyer, ca. 2008). In the aftermath, he received threats of violence against himself, his family, and his community intended to unsettle and divorce him from his civil rights activities (Silverman, 1913–2001), yet he remained engaged. Rabbi Falk narrowly escaped harm when the FBI foiled an attempting bombing of his synagogue (Temple Bomb Plot Foiled, 1981) yet he was undeterred. Rabbi Goodman as well narrowly escaped the bombing of the synagogue, though in his case, the bomb did explode and, as worshippers were exiting the synagogue, two of them were shot by the bomber (Goodman, 2017, p. 2–3; Webb, 2003). Rabbi Goodman returned to Columbus determined to engage more forcefully (Goodman, September 14, 2020).

Leadership theory has little value if it cannot be applied to real world situations. With the stories of these rabbinic exemplars, I hope to contribute to the existing library of scholarship dedicated to exploring leadership theory. The knowledge generated by these stories covers important stylistic matters in the dynamic process of rabbinic leadership, particularly those matters that are related to leadership during times of great social change. Topical commonalities emerge, such as the types of tools rabbis use in leadership, the importance of a resource assessment prior to embarking upon (and, really, throughout) leadership on a contentious issue, and the strategies deployed by rabbis. Taken independently, they each singularly serve to highlight and elucidate particular theories of leadership beyond even those that have been the focus of this paper. When folded together into the envelope of this dissertation, however, they serve to offer a macro-perspective where connections to the broader portrait of leadership differences (and the tensions that comprise leadership) can be more easily studied and observed.

Implications and Contributions

As Foster (1989) has indicated, effective leadership should be socially critical and oriented towards social vision and change, not simply an organizational goal. Sosik et al. (1997) built off of that idea by stressing that leaders are those within organizations who articulate particular values and who negotiate those values into the organizational narrative that justifies, shapes, and, ultimately, sustains behavior. Rabbis are expected to be involved in all facets of congregational life, from the traditional roles of preaching, pastoral care, teaching, and fundraising to more lofty roles such as involvement with strategic planning and visioning. In each of these settings, the rabbi is often expected to be a leader, and these settings are often populated with different people representing different contexts as well as different agendas.

There is value to the rabbi having an understanding of transformational leadership theory. Transformational leadership refers to a relationship of mutuality between the leader and the followers (Burns, 1978). Bass and Avolio (1993) advanced transformational leadership theory by identifying four components that are essential to transformational leadership: (a) idealized influence, or charisma; (b) inspirational motivation; (c) intellectual stimulation; and (d) individualized consideration. Bass and Avolio (1993) further asserted that the transformational leader must (a) have great power and influence and have the trust and confidence of followers (a notion referred to idealized influence), (b) inspire and excite followers with the idea that they may be able to accomplish great things (inspirational motivation), (c) demonstrate new ways of looking at old problems and emphasize new solutions (intellectual stimulation), and (d) pay close attention to the differences of followers and act as a mentor to those who need help to grow and develop (individualized consideration).

Transformational leadership theory is relevant to members of the clergy for a number of reasons. First, clergy context within the congregation provides them with opportunities to wield power and influence, develop the confidence of followers, inspire their congregants, stimulate them intellectually, and to mentor their constituents. As demonstrated in this dissertation study, those rabbis who were the most successful as leaders of their congregations were able to engage each of the aforementioned aspects of their position successfully. In the case of Rabbi Padoll, though his position gave him great power, he was not able to develop the confidence of his followers and thereby wielded less influence, leading to his departure from Charleston. Rabbis today would do well to cultivate each of those aspects of the rabbinate in order to increase their chances of success when leading for or through change.

The second reason that clergy members today should develop an appreciation for transformational leadership theory can be found examined in several studies. Shamir et al. (1993) and Sosik et al. (1997) demonstrated a significant relationship between transformational leadership and the satisfaction of members. Bass and Avolio (1995) emphasized that transformational leaders stimulate followers to be innovative and creative, and that said creativity exists even in the face of public criticism. Clergy members today can follow the transformational example of Rabbi Falk, who organized the social action committee (Falk, 2002). Those members became the leaders of the synagogue board (Falk, 2002) in large part because they were creatively engaged by the rabbi. Rabbis today can develop adherents were they to be able to "plug in" their congregants in a meaningful way.

As rabbis frequently engage in change projects, it is important to take steps to minimize discontent. Sosik et al. (1997) demonstrate that groups working together under high levels of transformational leadership generate more supportive remarks, more questions about solutions, more embellished ideas, and more original ideas than do groups working under low levels of transformational leadership. The findings also demonstrate that a high level of transformational leadership is associated with lower levels of conflict.

Finally, Bass and Avolio (1995) argue that idealized attributes of transformational leaders are the traits of respect, trust, and faith. With these characteristics, transformational leaders go beyond their own interests for the betterment of the group and act in a manner that builds respect from others. In return, the leader receives trust, while followers emulate the leader's behavior, adopt the leader's values, and commit to achieving the leader's vision. Carson and Perrewe (1995) argue that without leadership trust, an organization's ability to solve problems and a

leader's ability to lead are seriously hampered, evidenced in this dissertation through the story of Rabbi Padoll.

While transformational leadership seeks to develop meaningful relationships, the ultimate aim of transformational leadership is for the betterment of the organization (Bass et al., 1993). On the other hand, servant leadership theory, introduced by Greenleaf (1977), develops relationships in order to serve the followers first. Servant leadership theory's attention is on and for the betterment of the follower. Servant leaders place the needs of followers ahead of the ambition of the leader.

Servant leadership theory holds that organizational change will occur once servant leadership themes are integrated with the organizational culture (Spears, 2010a). Spears (1995) synthesizes the servant leadership themes of Greenleaf (1977) to include listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. These 10 themes, or characteristics, are necessary for servant leadership to be evident in the life of the leader. Parris and Peachy (2013) add additional characteristics to the mix, including valuing people, people development, authenticity, and accountability. Over time, other characteristics have similarly been added to the theory of servant leadership. Shirin (2014), for example, adds culture, setting, leader characteristics and follower agreement. Throughout the dissertation study, the rabbis were found to exhibit these traits without an appreciation of their connectedness to servant leadership. With the theoretical grounding, rabbis today will be able to move past thinking of these traits individually as good skills to hone and realize the greater potential of associating them collectively as an approach to leadership.

The importance of servant leadership cannot be overemphasized for rabbis today.

Prioritizing the use of servant leader themes during moments when rabbis are exercising leadership, infusing servant leader themes into the culture and procedures of the synagogue, and consistently privileging the experience of others over the personal and professional ambitions of the leader can lead to a consistently thoughtful and engaging practice.

While transformational leadership privileges the institution, and servant leadership privileges the follower, relational leadership focuses on the socially constructed processes by which leaders and others relate (Uhl-Bien, 2006). Good leadership is characterized by relational interactions perceived to be egalitarian, mutual, collaborative, and is bidirectional. Further, good leadership occurs when the role of follower is important to leadership (Fletcher, 2012). Relational leadership is focused on communication patterns, the collective experience verses the individual experience, and the context in order to interpret meaning (Uhl Bien et al., 2011). As such, knowledge is not thought of as belonging to an individual but is rather a phenomenon that changes and shifts under differing social and cultural contexts (Fitzsimons, 2012). The role of the organization in relational leadership is to be the conduit by which ongoing relational dynamics can emerge, meaning can be constructed, and leadership processes can be produced (Fitzsimons, 2012).

Wolfson (2013) has, of late, been the greatest advocate for a rabbinate defined by relationships. He has argued that a core principle of community organizing is grounded in relationships and that rabbis should be in the practice of putting relationships at the center of Jewish life. Wolfson (2013) has stated that rabbis can rely on relationships to

> engage people who are already connected in a deeper way, and to make an atmosphere of welcoming new people into organizational life. The hope is to reverse the trend around the country of under-affiliation or just simply people opting out of any formal connection to the Jewish community. The goal is to help the leaders of Jewish organizations embrace the idea of focusing energy beyond programs and a transactional relationship with the

organization and instead getting to know people. It's all about relationships, and people should come before programs. (p. 9)

At the time of this writing, Wolfson's approach has enticed many in the congregational rabbinate. However, as Wolfson's methodology is grounded in relational leadership, rabbis would do well to confront the foundational literature and dive deeper into the complexity of the theory.

Few could argue that courageous leadership would not be of value to congregational rabbis. Scholars such as Chaleff (2003) have identified several behaviors indicative of courageous leadership. First, courageous leaders take risks to express new ideas that allow the organization with which they are affiliated to remain relevant and compelling (Hornstein, 1986). Second, courageous leaders challenge the status quo (Hornstein, 1986). Courageous leaders take thoughtful and logical action (Hornstein, 1986), arguing that acting courageously is not acting out a "fight or flight" response but rather involves thoughtful and reflective action. Specifically, in order to be judged as courageous, others have to conclude that a leader has logical justification for pursing a course of action.

One additional characteristic of courageous leadership that is important to the rabbinate is that courageous leaders take a stand against the things they do not believe are right (Chaleff, 2003; Kidder, 2005; Kouzes & Posner, 1993). Kidder (2005) posits that this final characteristic could be defined as exercising moral courage in that it allows leaders "to face up to ethical challenges firmly and confidently, without flinching or retreating" (p. 72). Solomon (1992) and MacIntyre (2007) argue that courage is a virtue not because it requires a special talent but because there is a belief that individuals should stand up for what they believe. Similarly, when Kouzes and Posner (1993) surveyed followers on which leaders throughout history they would most willingly follow, they found that all of the leaders listed had unwavering conviction to their

values, leading them to conclude that, "followers expect their leaders to have the courage of their

convictions" (p. 60).

As Yehuda Kirtzer (2019) wrote,

> The range of ideas and ideologies permitted as part of Jewish public discourse is
> narrowing, and the incentives for the courageous leadership that will generate a creative,
> diverse Jewish future have been replaced with incentives for risk avoidance. As a result,
> some rabbis are choosing to censor themselves and to speak with less conviction at the
> cost of collective, thoughtful public leadership on crucial issues. (p. 2)

As the rabbinic exemplars in this dissertation have demonstrated, when taking a position

of leadership, inevitably rabbis will be confronted with a challenge which compels them to take a

stand; they have to argue that a particular course of action is the right move for right now. As

indicated in Chapter 2, as heirs to the prophetic tradition, rabbis have a tremendous amount of

Jewish textual support from which to draw inspiration and communal authority, whether sections

of Talmudic literature, the prophetic portion of scripture, or rabbinic legal literature (*halacha*)

through the ages. Already familiar with the resources of Jewish tradition, rabbis who have an

understanding of courageous leadership will be able to act more consistently, with more

intention, and increase their chances for success.

There is value for rabbis practicing today to have an appreciation for the three additional

leadership theories as well. The literature review in Chapter 2 presented a vast body of the

Jewish textual cannon which provide inspiration and instruction for social justice work and

ethical living. Building those texts into a set of leadership behaviors offers value to rabbis

possessing an understanding of both social justice leadership theory and ethical leadership

theory, though, even without the appropriate terminology, the practice of the rabbinate would

indicate that both of those theories find regular use for many congregational rabbis. As well, the

findings in Chapter 4 highlight the vast importance of context to the rabbinic exemplars featured

in this dissertation. It would be difficult to amplify beyond the already stressed critical importance of developing an understanding of context (and application of that context in the process of decision-making) for rabbis in the field.

There is another lesson that rabbis can learn from the leadership examples of the rabbis studied in this dissertation that is not covered in current leadership theory. While a robust understanding of the theory, the terminology, and the practice of various leadership theories is useful, it is entirely possible to be a good leader by virtue solely of personality and context. None of the rabbis understood the richness of leadership theory, but the majority of those studied for this dissertation found themselves to be the right person, in the right congregation, at the right time, with the right resources, and the right instincts. While the findings demonstrate that the four successful experiences were based upon a rather significant amount of strategy and reflection, it is hard to conclude that an understanding of the nuances that differentiate transformational leadership from relational leadership and servant leadership from courageous leadership would have made them any more successful. Thus, while grounding and focus on these particular theories is helpful, it becomes evident from four of the five rabbinic exemplars in this dissertation that it is entirely possible to be a successful leader without any theoretical expertise whatsoever.

Another question logically emerges. In addition to discussing the ways in which leadership theory can help understand the leadership legacy of these rabbis, one must wonder how their leadership legacy could and should impact leadership studies today.

With much focus on context shaping both this chapter and the findings in Chapter 4, it seems that an acknowledgment of context is important at the beginning of this passage. During

the writing of this dissertation, massive political unrest shook the American landscape, with the 2020 election serving as a focal point. The COVID-19 global pandemic disrupted many of the institutions and much of the infrastructure on which many Americans had come to rely. Notable as well was the unrest that swept through cities following the murder of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery, with citizens clamoring for much needed change and butting against the power structure hesitant—or altogether unwilling—to act. Those who offered powerful leadership to previous generations died during this time frame, including John Lewis and C. T. Vivian and, yes, Rabbi Irv Bloom. Throughout the year and a half of research and writing, a repeated refrain came across my social media, the classes I taught, and interactions I had with classmates and congregants: Where are our leaders? Where are the people who will help lead us in these moments of challenge and transformation? As Seth Cohen (2019) has argued, regardless of how we might be living in the "age of individualism" and the era of the "sovereign self," a tribe still needs its leaders, its shepherds, its beacons of possibility that can speak for and to its generations—to counsel them and cajole them, to help them see the moment for what it is and for what it isn't.

Where are our leaders? The leadership legacy of the rabbis in this study provides an answer to that question and, in so doing, highlights enduring understandings for leadership theory in the twenty-first century. Despite having a position of recognized communal authority, each of these rabbis taught that our communities are not defined by centralized control but rather by inspired inclusivity. Through their communal partnerships around interfaith groups, they worked to amplify and empower not followers, a term they no doubt would have rejected, but partners. Rabbi Falk, for example, developed a system of learning and leading that allowed many voices to rise up and create and contribute. Rabbi Goodman empowered professionals and

volunteers alike to have agency in the development of the community they wished to create. This, then, is the first way that their leadership legacy should shape leadership theory: leaders ultimately create systems, and the method they use to do so is vastly important.

The model of system creation is fundamentally important to leaders today because the traditional institutions of American life, particularly the legacy organizations and institutions, are often compromised by their complicated history: some are dealing with foundational narratives and/or historical behaviors that are antithetical to their current mission (such as American universities with a history of racism and sexism), some are dealing with leaders who are compromised (the news is presently littered with failure narratives of those in positions of acclaim and power), some are dealing with systems that leave them unable to respond to the challenges of now (elected officials and the very broken system of government in America today). When the institutions and organizations that *used* to play leadership roles are no longer able to do so, one must follow the example of Rabbi Bloom, and Rabbi Falk, and Rabbi Goodman, and work to fill that space anew.

The second understanding from these rabbinic exemplars that should be applied to leadership theory today is the rejection of traditionally defined boundaries. The rabbinic exemplars in this dissertation rose above their silos, their stations, and the diverse communal landscape to speak to a broader community. They were leaders who spanned the boundaries both inside and outside of the Jewish community, who engaged multiple generations in a common cause, who set aside ego and focused on endeavor, and who gave voice to the thoughts that many others we rethinking but too few were saying. Yes, there is a timeliness to current needs of leadership in whatever era one is to be found. These rabbis were most certainly harnessing philanthropic funds to support their communities and fighting debates of allocations and

assimilation; they were trying to keep up with the trends to make Judaism relevant to their congregants. Yet the rabbis, rooted in the past, timeless wisdom of the Jewish people, were also proactive about the future. They defined the boundaries of their leadership journey in the traditional manner—inside the classroom, on the pulpit—and in a manner that was necessary for the unique challenges of their time—in the street, in the communal space, before the Sibley Commission, at the civil rights protest, and the funeral for James Reeb.

The rabbinic leadership of these giants of yesterday provided solace and reassurance, speaking to moments of challenge and change with moral clarity, determination, and leadership. These rabbinic exemplars created institutions and systems because those that were in existence at the time were inadequate; they privileged the voices and perspectives of others because they believed that a plurality of opinions and perspectives were not "good" but were vital. They rejected the boundaries they inherited and broke free of the shackles of expectation, seeking to redefine their portfolios, the Jewish experience, and to expand the scope of the necessary.

System creation. Boundary spanning. Cross-generational participation. Radical inclusivity. Historical grounding. Forward thinking. These are the contributions of these rabbinic exemplars. Together, they contribute to what I believe to be the beginnings of a theory of leadership for rabbis, and all clergy, today.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of this study was the COVID-19 global pandemic, which impacted my ability to interact with primary source documents. As the research phase of the dissertation coincided with a time during which travel was ill-advised, I was unable to visit in person each of the archives as originally planned. I adapted by involving on-the-ground archivists in each of those locations to serve as research partners. While those archivists were responsive and

knowledgeable about the process of gathering information and the relevance of data collected, I was unable to follow peripheral primary sources to fully determine their relevance. Additionally, archives involving several of the primary source documents related to peripheral voices have remained shuttered due to the pandemic, leaving the findings in this dissertation study rather vulnerable to challenge and additional complexity should those collections become available.

Another limitation of the study is related to the collections of Rabbi Irv Bloom. Rabbi Bloom's death during the research phase of this dissertation erected a barrier to being able to fully immerse in the depth and breadth of his work, much of which remains in his home and has not been organized or appropriately archived. While the archivist in Mobile was able to provide ample information to support the conclusions drawn in this study, there is no doubt that a more complete understanding and appreciation of the leadership legacy of Rabbi Bloom is still years away.

A third limitation is related to the positionality of the researcher. As indicated in Chapter 1, while sharing a title, geographic region, and professional position with the focus of each of the rabbinic subjects in this study presents benefits, subjective understandings leave the data and conclusions vulnerable to critique. While the affirmation of outside archivists and the dissertation committee have addressed erroneous subjective analysis, it is believable that a different researcher may come to slightly different conclusions. My hope is that my role as a scholar-practitioner will enable others to consider the unique lens that I bring to this project, and that my perspective gleaned through experience will be able to assuage any critique or concern.

Opportunities for Further Research

This research study could expand in a variety of ways to increase the academic and practical knowledge of the relevance of the leadership legacy of civil rights-era rabbis. First, the

sample could be larger. More rabbis from a wider array of southern congregations could be studied to further confirm the findings in this study. As a core tenet of this study was to contribute to the existing body of literature reflecting the intersection between the rabbis of the 1950s/1960s and the civil rights movement, there are many other stories that remain untold. In addition to the central figures playing such a commanding role in the study, scholars should also consider exploring additional archival collections to ensure that a broader representation of voices is included in future studies.

The research presents findings related to five rabbis working and headquartered in the South. This criterion allowed for the relative similarity of culture to not be an added factor in the research results. Supplemental research could focus on a more geographically diverse collection of rabbis, and expanding the geographic scope would further contribute to the representative body of literature. Through the act of researching other rabbis in other geographic regions, scholars could discover contextual nuances in leadership not presented in this study.

Finally, while the individual rabbinic experiences are well researched, there is ample material left out of the dissertation, either because it was peripheral to the research question or because it was deemed redundant. Scholars looking to engage in a more detailed exploration of the lives of the rabbinic subjects of this study will find ample opportunity to do so. There remains a rather significant set of stories to be told about each individually in addition to engaging in further comparative study.

Concluding Reflections

I am confident that I have become a better and more thoughtful rabbi because of this research. In my own role as a congregational rabbi in a southern congregation, I have found myself referring regularly and publicly to the stories of the rabbinic exemplars in this

dissertation. I have also referenced their methods when paired with other congregants and staff members as we navigate the tensions that emerge around leadership and change during contentious times. The results of this research have already impacted not only my synagogue but my additional work through the American Jewish Committee's Atlanta Black/Jewish Coalition, as the examples offered by several of the rabbis in this study around their ministerial organizations have informed my own thinking and actions through the manner in which I use my position to include a plurality of voices and through that partnership work to recreate the organization to face the unique challenges of today. As well, the application of the leadership theories discussed in this study have offered a consistent and proactive lens for consideration as I continue my leadership journey. The findings related to context have also proven impactful as consideration of context has been inconsistent in the decision-making process of our synagogue leadership. I remain convinced that others in positions of synagogue leadership will find these lessons similarly compelling, and I find myself excited about other relevant contributions that will emerge for this field from future research into the lived experiences of other rabbis.

I embarked upon this research with a stated desire to immerse myself personally in the archival collections related to the work of these rabbis. Not only did I carefully consider rabbinic subjects through the lens of my ability to spend time with their materials, but I crafted an aggressive schedule and developed contacts intending to spend a significant amount of time and resources engaged with primary source documents. My excitement grew as the plans began to take shape. The global pandemic caused a dramatic reevaluation of that plan and a reliance on the assistance of others for which I was unprepared. Though disappointed that I was only able to visit five of the archival collections in person, each of the archivists proved willing and able to provide scans or copies of any materials I desired, in some cases using their own expertise to

guide my research in a manner that I had not considered, and the effort to continue the research phase commenced with integrity. Thousands of primary source documents were procured, categorized, and analyzed. Despite the collection I now possess, I look forward to embarking upon the in-person visits to the archives when it is safe to do so for the purpose of holding the materials in my hands and following the clues to other documents and other understandings yet to be uncovered.

I now realize that not only do I play a small role in the legacy of these rabbis, but I bear the responsibility to ensure that their stories are told. It is a sacred obligation and one on which I embark with a fair sense of trepidation and a great sense of humility. Of the tasks at hand, telling their stories, introducing them to others, and contributing to the fields of civil rights literature and leadership scholarship is rather exciting. That said, I fully recognize that living a life that incorporates the lessons learned from each of these towering rabbinic giants is a most important and challenging responsibility. I hope that I am up to the undertaking.

References

A culture of violence. (2007, May 4). [Clipping from the Columbus Ledger-Enquirer]. Copy in possession of author.

A Statement. (1968, April 12). *Rabbi Bloom*. Archives of the Springhill Avenue Temple, Mobile, Alabama, United States.

Adler, F. (1972). *Roots in a moving stream: The centennial history of Congregation B'nai Jehudah of Kansas City, 1870–1970.* The Temple, Congregation B'nai Jehudah. https://doi.org/10.2307/2936838

Aimin, Z. (2002). *The origins of African American civil rights movements, 1865–1956.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315811147

Akingbola, K. (2019). Evaluating change in nonprofit organizations. In K. Akingbola, S. Rogers, & A. Baluch (Eds.), *Change management in nonprofit organizations* (pp. 223–250). Pelgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-14774-7_10

Aktas, B., Yilmaz, O., & Bahcekapili, H. (2017). Moral pluralism on the trolley tracks: Different normative principles are used for different reasons in justifying moral judgments. *Judgment and Decision Making, 12*(3), 297–307. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317264697_Moral_pluralism_on_the_trolley_tracks_Different_normative_principles_are_used_for_different_reasons_in_justifying_moral_judgments

Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow*. The New Press.

Alsobrook, D. (1973). *Alabama's port city: Mobile during the progressive era*. Auburn University.

Amelo, M. A. (2007). *Transformational leadership impetus to sustained shareholder value* [Unpublished master's thesis]. https://www.msm.nl/resources/uploads/2013/10/Marlene-Amelo.pdf.

Annual meeting. (1965, May 26). *Rabbi Bloom*. Archives of the Springhill Avenue Temple, Mobile, Alabama, United States.

Annual meeting. (1971, May 26). *Rabbi Bloom*. Archives of the Springhill Avenue Temple, Mobile, Alabama, United States.

Arnesen, E. (2001). *Brotherhoods of color: Black railroad workers and the struggle for equality*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.1086/ahr/107.3.897

Asch, E. (2019). Cutting an issue. In S. Limmer & J. Pesner (Eds.), *Moral resistance and spiritual authority* (pp. 297–308). CCAR Press.

Ashmore, S. (2008). *Carry it on: The war on poverty and the civil rights movement in Alabama, 1964-1972*. University of Georgia Press.

Auerbach, J. (1990). *Rabbis and lawyers: The journey from Torah to Constitution*. IU Press.

Autry, J. (2001). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom-line performance*. Prima Publishing.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90035-7

Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Made/born*. L. Erlbaum.

Ayman, R., & Adams, S. (2012). Contingencies, context, situations, and leadership. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 218–256). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506395029.n6

Badaracco, J. L., & Ellsworth, R. R. (1989). *Leadership and the quest for integrity*. Harvard Business School Press.

Baldwin, L. (2002). *The legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr.: The boundaries of law, politics, and religion*. University of Notre Dame.

Balin, C. (2000). *To reveal our hearts: Jewish women writers in Tzarist Russia*. HUC Press.

Barge, J., & Fairhurst, G. (2008). Living leadership: A systemic constructionist approach. *Leadership*, *4*(3), 227–251. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715008092360

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, *17*(1), 112–121. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40862298

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *The multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M. (1997). Transformational leaders: The falling domino effect. *Group and Organizational Studies*, *12*, 73–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/105960118701200106

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(2), 207–218. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 181–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843(99)00016-8

Bauman, M. (2019). *A new vision of Southern Jewish history: Studies in institution building, leadership, interaction, and mobility*. University of Alabama Press.

Bauman, M., & Kalin, B. (1997). *The quiet voices*. University of Alabama Press.

Bedi, A., Alpaslan, C. M., & Green, S. (2016). A meta-analytic review of ethical leadership outcomes and moderators. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *139*, 517–536. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2625-1

Behnken, B. (2016). *Civil rights and beyond: African American and Latino/a activism in the twentieth-century United States*. University of Georgia Press.

Bell, D. (2002). *Ethical ambition: Living a life of meaning and worth*. Bloomsbury.

Bennett, H. (2002). *Injustice made legal: Deuteronomic law and the plight of widows, strangers, and orphans in ancient Israel*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Bent-Goodley, T. B. (2015). A call for social work activism. *Social Work*, *60*(2), 101–103. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swv005

Beyerlein, K., & Chaves, M. (2003). The political activities of religious congregations in the United States. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *42*(2), 229–246. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5906.00175

Biggart, N., & Hamilton, G. (1987). An institutional theory of leadership. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *23*(4), p. 429–441. https://doi.org/10.1177/002188638702300401

Biographical Sketch of Rabbi Randall M. Falk (2010). *Rabbi Randall Falk Folder*. (Box 25). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

Blake, R., & McCanse, A. (1991). *Leadership dilemmas—grid solutions*. Gulf Publishing.

Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1985). *Leadership and the one minute manager: Increasing effectiveness through situational leadership*. William Morrow.

Bloom, I. (2010, August 17). *An oral history with Rabbi P. Irving Bloom/Interviewer: Sandra Berman*. The William Breman Jewish Heritage Museum Esther and Herbert Taylor Jewish Oral History Project of Atlanta: Alabama Jews (OHC—Paul Irving Bloom, Rabbi), William Breman Jewish Museum Archives, Atlanta, GA, United States.

Bloom, J. (2012). *The rabbi as symbolic exemplar*. The Haworth Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203049419

Blumberg, J. (1985). *One voice: Rabbi Jacob M. Rothschild and the troubled South*. University of Georgia Press.

Blumberg, J. (2012). *Prophet in a time of priests: Rabbi Alphabet Browne 1845–1929*. Apprentice House.

Bolt, J. F. (1996). Developing three-dimensional leaders. In F. Hesslebein, M. Goldsmith, and R. Beckhard (Eds.), *The leader of the future: New visions, strategies, and practices for the next era* (pp. 161-173). Jossey-Bass.

Bowden, A. (1926). A study of the personality of student leaders in colleges in the United States. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *21*(2), 149–160. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0073378

Boyd, H. (2004). *We shall overcome*. Sourcebooks.

Branch, T. (1998). *Parting the waters: America in the King years, 1954-1963*. Simon and Schuster.

Brereton, J., & Gannett, C. (2011). Review: Learning from the archives. *College English*, *53*(7), 672–681. https://doi.org/10.2307/377825

Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *97*, 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002

Brown, R. (2004). *The role race plays: Racial differences in social service provision and political activism among black and white religious congregations*. University of Michigan Press.

Brueske, P. (2018). *The last siege: The Mobile campaign, Alabama, 1865*. Casemate.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper and Row.

Cahan, L. (1998). *Siddur sim shalom for Shabbat and festivals*. United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism.

Calfano, B. (2010a). A decision theory of clergy political behavior. *The Social Science Journal*. *47*, 836–844. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2010.07.003

Calfano, B. (2010b). Prophetic at any price. *Social Science Quarterly*. *91*(3), 649–668. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2010.00712.x

Carlyle, T. (1993). *On heroes, hero-worship, and the heroic in history*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520911536

Carson, C., & Garrow, D. (1991). *The eyes on the prize civil rights reader: Documents, speeches, and firsthand accounts from the Black freedom struggle*. Penguin Books.

Carson, D. S., & Perrewe, P. L. (1995). Institutionalization of organizational ethics through transformational leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *14*(10), 829–838. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00872349

Cavendish, J. (1997). *African-American religion and the mobilization of community Activism*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Notre Dame]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Chaleff, I. (2003). *The courageous follower*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Chan, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kanfer, R., Allen, D., & Rosen, B. (2007). A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92,* 331–346. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.331

Chasen, K. (2019). The power of the pulpit. In S. Limmer & J. Pesner (Eds.), *Moral resistance and spiritual authority* (pp. 309-319). CCAR Press.

Christensen, L., Mackay, A., & Whetten, D. (2014). Taking responsibility for corporate social responsibility: The role of leaders in creating responsible firm behaviors. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *28*, 164–178. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0047

Chrobot-Mason, D., Ruderman, M., & Nishii, L. (2013). Leadership in a diverse workplace. In Q. Roberson, (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Diversity and Work* (pp. 1–48). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199736355.001.0001

Clergy of community stood up to be counted (1964, May 6). Clipping from *The Tennessean*. Copy in possession of author.

Cockburn, C. (1998). *The space between us: Negotiating gender and national identities in conflict*. Zed Books.

Coetzer, M., Bussin, M., & Geldenhuys, M. (2017). The functions of a servant leader. *Administrative Sciences*, *7*, 1–32. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci7010005

Cohen, A. (2012). *Justice in the city*. Academic Studies Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781618111111

Cohen, J. (2019). On truth, trueness, and prophecy. In S. Limmer & J. Pesner (Eds.), *Moral resistance and spiritual authority* (pp. 57–69). CCAR Press.

Cohen, N. (2007). *Moses and the journey to leadership*. Jewish Lights.

Cohen, S. (2019). Where are our leaders? https://ejewishphilanthropy.com/where-are-our-leaders/

Comstock, D., Hammer, T., Strentzsch, J., Cannon, K. Parsons, J., & Salazar, G. (2008). Relational-cultural theory: A framework for bridging relational, multicultural, and social justice competencies. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *86*(3), 279–287. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00510.x

Cook, R. (1998) *Sweet land of liberty?: The African-American struggle for civil rights in the twentieth century*. Longman. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315844039

Cook, T., & Schwartz, J. (2002). Archives, records, and power: From (postmodern) theory to (archival) performance. *Archival Science*, *2*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02435620

Cowley, W. (1931). The traits of face-to-face leaders. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *26*(3), 304–313. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0074766

Crawford, S. (1995) *Clergy at work in the secular city* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Indiana University.

Cuhaj, J. (2020). *Hidden history of Mobile*. The History Press.

Cunningham, W., & Cordeiro, P. (2003). *Educational leadership: A problem-based approach*. Allyn & Bacon.

Currie, G., & Lockett, A. (2007). A critique of transformational leadership: Moral, professional and contingent dimensions of leadership within public service organizations. *Human Relations*, *60*(2), 341–370. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726707075884

Dambe, M., & Moorad, F. (2008). From power to empowerment: A paradigm shift in leadership. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *22*(3), pp. 575–587. https://doi.org/10.4314/sajhe.v22i3.25803

Dannhauser, Z., & Boshoff, A. B. (2007). Structural equivalence of the Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) servant leadership questionnaire on North American and South African sample. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *2*, 148–168. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/ijls/new/vol2iss2/dannhauserboshoff/DannhauserBoshoffV2Is2.pdf

Dansereau Jr., F., Cashman, J., & Graen, G. (1973). Instrumentality theory and equity theory as complementary approaches in predicting the relationship of leadership and turnover among managers. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *10*(2), 184–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(73)90012-3

Dansereau Jr., F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, *13*(1), 46–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(75)90005-7

Dartt, J. (2008). *Women activists in the fight for Georgia school desegregation, 1958–1961*. McFarland.

Davidson, J., & Mock, A. (1997). Through the eye of a needle: Social ministry in affluent churches. *Review of Religious Research*, *38*(3), 247–262. https://doi.org/10.2307/3512086

Day, D. (2014). *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199755615.001.0001

Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (2012). Leadership: Past, present, and future. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 3–25). Sage. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199755615.001.0001

Diner, H. (2000). *A new promised land: A history of Jews in America*. Oxford University Press.

Diner, H. (2004). *The Jews of the United States*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520939929

Diouf, S. (2009). *Dreams of Africa in Alabama: The slave ship Clotilda and the story of the last Africans brought to America*. Oxford University Press.

Dittmer, J. (1994). *Local people: The struggle for civil rights in Mississippi*. University of Illinois Press.

Djupe, P., & Gilbert, C. (2002). The political voice of clergy. *The Journal of Politics*. *64*(2), 596–609. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2508.00142

Dodd, D. (1993). *Historical statistics of the states of the United States: Two centuries of the census, 1790–1990*. Greenwood Press.

Dorman, L. (2010). *Nashville's Jewish community*. Arcadia Publishing.

Doyle, D. (1985). *Nashville since the 1920s*. University of Tennessee Press.

Duke, J. (2010). Nashville 1800–1850—Its beginnings and early times. http://nashville.about.com/od/historyandsites/a/NashHistXlineI.htm

Duncan, H. (1993). *No greater love: the James Reeb story*. Skinner House.

Duranti, L. (1993). The archival body of knowledge: Archival theory, method, and practice, and graduate and continuing education. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, *34*(1), 8–24. https://doi.org/10.2307/40323707

Dutton, J., & Spreitzer, G. (2014). *How to be a positive leader: Small actions, big impact*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Eastwood, T. (1988). Nurturing archival education in the university. *American Archivist*, *51*(3), 228–252. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.51.3.qgk71605x660gm85

Ebaugh, H., Pipes, P., Chafetz, J., & Daniels, M. (2003). Where's the religion? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *42*(3), 411–426. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5906.00191

Ehrenreich, B. (2001). *Nickel and Dimed*. Picador.

Eleff, Z. (2016). *Who rules the synagogue? Religious authority and the formation of American Judaism*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190490270.001.0001

Ellis, C., and Kirkland, S. (2010). *Remembering Mobile*. Turner Publishing.

Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systemic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *30*, 111–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004

Evans, E. (1997). *The provincials: A personal history of Jews in the South*. Free Press Paperbacks.

Fairclough, A. (2001). *Better day coming: Blacks and equality, 1890-2000*. Viking.

Falk, R. (2000, November 10). [Letter to Bonnie Miller]. Nashville Jewish Archives (MS2, The Temple, Folder Rabbi Falk Civil Rights), Nashville, TN, United States.

Falk, R. (1970). *Correspondence*. Rabbi Randall Falk Papers. (Box 28), The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

Falk, R. (1980). *Sermons*. Rabbi Randall Falk Sermons. (Paige Box 4), The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

Falk, R. (2002). *An oral history with Rabbi Randall Falk/Interviewer: Peggy West*. Rabbi Randall Falk, The Temple Archives (Box 25, Folder Rabbi Randall Falk), The Temple, Nashville, TN.

Farmer, J. (1985). *Lay bare the heart: An autobiography of the civil rights movement*. Arbor House.

Feinstein, E. (2007). *Jews and Judaism in the 21st century*. Jewish Lights.

Ferrari, J., & Vaclavik, D. (2016). The leadership style of permanent deacons: Servant and transformational middle-aged ministers. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *18*(1), 1–16.

Fiedler, F. E. (1964). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F. E. (1971). Validation and extension of the contingency model of leadership effectiveness: A review of empirical findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, *76*(2), 122–148. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0031454

Fiedler, F. E. (1973). The contingency model: A reply to Ashour. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *9*(3), 356–368. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(73)90058-5

Fiedler, F. E., & Garcia, J. E. (1987). *New approaches to effective leadership: Cognitive resources and organizational performance*. Wiley.

Fifty Years: A Jubilee Program. (2010). *Rabbi Randall Falk Folder*. (Box 25). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

Fitzgerald, M. (2002). From Unionists to Scalawags: Elite dissent in Civil War Mobile. *Alabama Review*, *55*(2), 98–108.

Fitzsimons, D. J. (2012). The contribution of psychodynamic theory to relational leadership. In M. Uhl-Bien & S. Ospina (Eds.), *Advancing relational leadership research: A dialogue among perspectives* (pp. 143–174). Information Age.

Fletcher, J. K. (2012). The relational practice of leadership. In M. Uhl-Bien & S. Ospina (Eds.), *Advancing relational leadership research: A dialogue among perspectives* (pp. 83–106). Information Age.

Foster, W. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smith (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership*, Routledge.

Frank, F. (1962). *Five families and eight young men: Nashville and her Jewry, 1850–1861*. Tennessee Book Company.

Frazer, W. (1992). *Charleston! Charleston!: The history of a Southern city*. University of South Carolina Press.

Frederickson, G. (1971). *The black image in the white mind: The debate on Afro-American character and destiny, 1817–1914*. Harper & Rowe.

Friedman, T. and Gordis, R. (1955). *Jewish life in America*. Horizon Press.

Frishman, E. (2007). *Mishkan tefilah: A Reform Siddur*. CCAR Press.

Gaillet, L. (2012). (Per)Forming Archival Research Methodologies. *College Composition and Communication, 64*(1), 35–58. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23264916?seq=1

Galchinsky, M. (2008). *Jews and human rights*. The Rowan and Littlefield Publishing Group.

Galperin, M. (2012). *Reimagining leadership in Jewish organizations*. Jewish Lights.

Garbus, J. (2007). Vida Scudder in the archives and in the classroom. In P. Donahue & G. Moons (Eds.), *Local histories: Reading the archives of composition* (pp. 77–93). University of Pittsburgh Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv138wrdh.9

Gilliland-Swetland, L. (1991). The provenance of a profession: The permanence of the public archives and historical manuscripts traditions in American archival history. *American Archivist*, *54*, 160–175. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.54.2.w42580v137053675

Glazer, N. (1957). *American Judaism*. University of Chicago Press.

Golden Book of Life. (ca. 1854–1938). *Congregation B'nai Israel Collection* (MC 305, Box 1, Temple Israel Collection), Archives of Columbus State University, Columbus, GA, United States.

Goodman, R. (2017). *JLAS education day: Presentation by Mrs. Alfred (Rayna) Goodman*. Archives of Temple Israel, Columbus, GA, United States.

Goodstein, A. (1989). *Nashville, 1780–1860: From frontier to city*. University of Florida Press.

Gordon, A. (1959). *Jews in suburbia*. Beacon Press.

Gottheimer, J. (2003). *Ripples of hope: Great American civil rights speeches*. Basic Books.

Gottwald, N. (2016). *Social justice in the Hebrew Bible, volume 1*. Cascade Books.

Graen, G. (1976). Role making processes within complex organizations. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1201–1245). Rand-McNally.

Graen G., & Cashman, J. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143–166). Kent State University Press.

Graen G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1991). The transformation of professionals into self-making and partially self-designing contributions: Toward a theory of leadership making. *Journal of Management Systems*, *3*(3), 33–48. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/17230656.pdf

Graetz, R. (1998). *A White preacher's memoir*. Black Belt Press.

Green, H. (1995). *Bridges and bonds: The life of Leon Kronish*. Scholars Press.

Greene, H. (2008). *Slave badges and the slave-hire system in Charleston, South Carolina, 1783–1865*. McFarland & Company.

Greene, M. (1996). *The Temple bombing*. De Capo Press.

Greenberg, J. (1994). *Crusaders in the courts: How a dedicated band of lawyers fought for the civil rights revolution*. Basic Books.

Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The servant as leader*. The Robert K. Greenleaf Center. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70818-6_6

Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(79)90092-2

Greenleaf, R. (1979). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(79)90092-2

Guth, J., Beail, L., Crow, G., Gaddy, B., Montreal, S., Nelsen, B., Penning, J., & Walz, J. (2003). The political activity of evangelical clergy in the election of 2000. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. *42*(4), 501–514. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1468-5906.2003.00199.x

Hackman, J. (2010). What is this thing called leadership?. In N. Nohria & R. Khurana (Eds.), *Handbook of leadership theory and practice* (pp. 107–116). Harvard Business School Publishing.

Hagy, J. (1993). *This happy land*. University of Alabama Press.

Harrelson, W. (2001, January 19). *Lecture honoring Rabbi Falk: Rabbi Falk and Civil Rights in Nashville*. Nashville Jewish Archives (MS2, The Temple, Folder Rabbi Falk Civil Rights), Nashville, TN, United States.

Heifetz, R. A., & Laurie, D. L. (1999). Mobilizing adaptive work: Beyond visionary leadership. In J. Conger, G. Spreitzer, & E. Lawler, (Eds.) *The Leader's change handbook* (pp. 55–86). Jossey-Bass.

Heilman, S. (1995). *Portrait of American Jews*. University of Washington Press.

Heilman, U. (2014, March 14). *So you've decided to become a rabbi…*. JTA. https://www.jta.org/2014/03/14/united-states/so-youve-decided-to-become-a-rabbi

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1993). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Prentice-Hall.

Hertzberg, A. (1963). Church, state, and the Jews. *Commentary* (35), 277–288.

Hertzberg, A. (1997). *The Jews of America: Four centuries of an uneasy encounter: A history*. Columbia University Press.

Hertzberg, A. (2002). *A Jew in America*. HarperCollins.

Ho, V. T., Wong, S., & Lee, C. H. (2011). A tale of passion: Linking job passion and cognitive engagement to employee work performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, *48*(1), 26–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00878.x

Hoffman, L. (1987). *Beyond the text*. IU Press.

Hollander, E. (1992). The essential interdependence of leadership and followership. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *1*(2), 71–75. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep11509752

Hornstein, H. (1986). *Managerial courage*. John Wiley & Sons.

House, R. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*(3), 321–339. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391905

Houston, B. (2012). *The Nashville way: Racial etiquette and the struggle for social justice in a southern city*. University of Georgia Press.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership. Locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(6), 891–902. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.6.891

Hughes, R., Ginnet, R., & Curphy, G. (2006). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons from experience*. McGraw-Hill.

Iarocci, J. (2017). *Servant leadership in the workplace*. Paulist Press.

Jacobs, J. (2009). *There shall be no needy: Pursuing social justice through Jewish law and tradition*. Jewish Lights Publishing.

Jacobs, J. (2011). *Where justice dwells*. Jewish Lights Publishing.

JCRC minutes. (1962, March 27). *JCRC Minutes*. (MSS 1020, B2, F6). Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Jimerson, R. C. (2009). Archives for all: Professional responsibility and social justice. *The American Archivist*, *70*(2), 252–281. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.70.2.5n20760751v643m7

Johnson, H., & Hall, M. (1968). *School desegregation, educational change, and Georgia*. University of Georgia.

Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*, 386–408. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.20208687

Joselit, J. (1994). *The wonders of America: Reinventing Jewish culture, 1880–1950*. Owl Books.

Judge, T., Bono, J, Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 765–780. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765

Judge, T., Piccolo, R., & Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(6), 855–874. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.09.004

Kahane, A. (2013). Transformative scenario planning: A tool for systemic change. *Social Space*, 16–22. https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1109&context=lien_research

Kaplan, D. (2013). *The new Reform Judaism: Challenges and reflections*. JPS.

Katz, D., Maccoby, N., & Morse, N. (1950). *Productivity, supervision, and morale in an office situation*. Institute for Social Research.

Katz, R. (1974). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review, 52*(5), 90–102. https://hbr.org/1974/09/skills-of-an-effective-administrator

Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. (2009). *Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Keith, K. (2015). *The case for servant leadership*. Paulist Press.

Ketelaar, E. (2002). Archival temples, archival prisons: Modes of power and protection. *Archival Science*, *2*, 221–238. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02435623

Kidder, R. M. (2005). *Moral courage*. William Morrow.

Kim, S., Kim, K., & Choi, Y. (2014). A literature review of servant leadership and criticism of advanced research. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology International Journal of Economics and Management Engineering*, *8*(4), 11–54. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1092171

King, C. (1969). *My life with Martin Luther King, Jr*. Hold, Rinehart and Winston.

Kirkland, S. (2005). *Pink sheets and black ballots: Politics and civil rights in Mobile, Alabama, 1945-1985* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Alabama.

Kirkland, S. (2012). Mobile and the Boswell Amendment. *Alabama Review*, *65*(3), 205–249. https://doi.org/10.1353/ala.2012.0031

Kirsch, G., & Rohan, L. (2008). *Beyond the archives: Research as a lived process*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Kirtzer, Y. (2019). *Courageous leadership: The challenges facing Jewish leadership in a partisan age*. https://static.hartman.org.il/dev/uploads/2019/09/Courageous-Leadership-White-Paper.pdf

Kohs, S., & Irle, K. (1920). Prophesying army promotion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *4*(1), 73–87. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0070002

Kolchin, P. (1972). *First freedom: The responses to Alabama's blacks from emancipation to reconstruction*. Greenwood Press. https://doi.org/10.1080/03612759.1973.9946105

Kolin, S. (2019). Two are better than one: Community organizing and the art of building to repair the world. In S. Limmer & J. Pesner (Eds.), *Moral resistance and spiritual authority* (pp. 275–290). CCAR Press.

Korn, B. (1969). The Jews of Mobile, Alabama, prior to the organization of the first congregation in 1841. *Hebrew Union College Annual*, (40), 469–502. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23503270

Korn, B. (1970). *The Jews of Mobile, Alabama, 1763–1841*. Hebrew Union College Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. Jossey-Bass Management Series. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118983867

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2017). The value of 360-degree feedback. https://www.leadershipchallenge.com/LeadershipChallenge/media/SiteFiles/assets/whitepapers/the-value-of-360-degree-feedback-whitepaper.pdf

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2017). *The leadership challenge*. John Wiley & Sons.

Krause, A. (2008). Charleston Jewry, Black civil rights, and Rabbi Burton Padoll. *Southern Jewish History Journal*, Vol. 2, 65-122. https://www.academia.edu/41725209/Allen_Krause_Charleston_Jewry_Black_Civil_Rights_and_Rabbi_Burton_Padoll

Krause, P. (1969). Rabbis and Negro rights in the South, 1954–1967. *American Jewish Archives Journal*, *21*(1), 20–47. http://americanjewisharchives.org/publications/journal/PDF/1969_21_01_00_krause.pdf

Krause, P. (2016). *To stand aside or stand alone*. University of Alabama Press.

Kriger, M., & Seng, Y. (2005). Leadership with inner meaning: A contingency theory of leadership based on the worldviews of five religions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 771-806. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.07.007

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage.

Kroloff, C. (1992). *When Elijah knocks*. Behrman House Publishers.

Kusy, M. (2000). Putting real value into strategic planning. *Organization Development Practitioner*, *32*(2), 18–24. https://www.mitchellkusy.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Strategic_Planning.pdf

Ladkin, D. (2010). *Rethinking leadership: A new look at old leadership questions*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781849805346

Ladkin, D. (2015). *Mastering the ethical dimension of organizations: A self-reflective guide to developing ethical astuteness*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Langston, S. (2008). Rabbi Morris Newfield: Ambassador to the gentiles, a balancing act. *American Jewish Archives Journal*, *59*(1), 79–88. http://americanjewisharchives.org/publications/journal/PDF/2007_59_01_02.pdf

Laub, J. A. (2004). *Defining servant leadership: A recommended typology for servant leadership studies*. Proceedings in the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable. http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2004/laub_defining_servant.pdf

Laufer, N. (2006). *The genesis of leadership*. Jewish Lights.

Levinson, B. (1998). *Deuteronomy and the hermeneutics of legal innovation*. Oxford University Press.

Lewis, J. (2015). *Walking with the wind*. Simon & Schuster.

Libo, K., & Howe, I. (1984). *We lived there too*. St. Martin's/Marek Press.

Liden, R., & Antonakis, J. (2009). Considering context in psychological leadership research. *Human Relations*, *62*, 1587–1605. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709346374

Lidji, E. (2018). *The seventeenth generation: The lifework of Rabbi Walter Jacob*. Rodef Shalom Press.

Limmer, S., & Pesner, J. (2019). *Moral resistance and spiritual authority*. CCAR Press.

Lipman, E., & Vorspan, A. (1962). *A tale of ten cities: The triple ghetto in American religious life*. UAHC Press.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (1996). *Connective leadership: Managing in a changing world*. Oxford University.

Litwack, L. (1998). *Trouble in mind: Black Southerners in the age of Jim Crow*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Liu, D., Xiao-Ping, C., & Yao, X. (2011). From autonomy to creativity: A multilevel investigation of the mediating role of harmonious passion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(2), 294–309. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021294

Livelton, T. (2003). *Archival theory, records, and the public*. Scarecrow Press.

Ljungholm, D. (2014). Transformational leadership behavior in public sector organizations. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice*, *6*(1), 76–81.

Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(3), 434–451. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000089

Love, H. (2017). *African-American clergy engagement in politics and public policy: Liberation theology as a civic engagement motivator*. [Doctoral dissertation, Tennessee State University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

MacDonald, K. B. (1998). *The culture of critique: An evolutionary analysis of Jewish involvement in twentieth-century intellectual and political movements*. Praeger Press.

MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After Virtue*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Malchow, B. (1996). *Social justice in the Hebrew bible*. The Liturgical Press.

Marcus, J. (1953). *Early American Jewry, Volume 2*. JPS.

Marcus, J. (1955). *Memoirs of American Jews 1775–1865, Volume II*. JPS.

Marcus, J. (1959). *American Jewry: Documents, eighteenth century*. HUC Press.

Masood, S. A., Dani, S. S., Burns, N. D., & Backhouse, C. J. (2006). Transformational leadership and organizational culture: The situational strength perspective. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part B: Journal of Engineering Manufacture*, *220*(6), 941–949. https://doi.org/10.1243/09544054jem499

McAdam, D. (1998). *Freedom Summer*. Oxford University Press.

McCallum, S., & O'Connell, D. (2009). Social capital and leadership development: Building stronger leadership through enhanced relational skills. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *30*(2), 152–166. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730910935756

McDonough, J. (2013). *The western confederacy's final gamble: From Atlanta to Franklin to Nashville*. University of Tennessee Press.

McGill, R. (1963). *The South and the Southerner*. Brown Thrasher.

McKiven, H. (2001). Secession, war and reconstruction. In M. Thomason (Ed.), *Mobile: The new history of Alabama's first city* (pp. 95–97). University of Alabama.

McMurray, A. (2010). *Exploring the essence of relational leadership in the role of a university president*. Gonzaga University.

McWhorter, D. (2001). *Carry me home: Birmingham, Alabama: The climactic battle of the civil rights revolution*. Simon & Schuster.

Mendelsohn, A. (2015). "Don't whitewash Charleston's Jewish history of racism." https://forward.com/opinion/310529/dont-whitewash-charlestons-jewish-history-of-racism/

Meyer, D. (2008). Fighting segregation, threats, and dynamite: Rabbi William B. Silverman's Nashville battle. *American Jewish Archives Journal*, 60(1,2), 99–113. http://americanjewisharchives.org/publications/journal/PDF/2008_60_01_02_doc_meyer.pdf

Meyer, D. (ca. 2008). *We will not yield—annotated sermon* [Unpublished manuscript]. Rabbi William Silverman Personal Papers. American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, OH, United States.

Meyer, M. (1988). *Response to Modernity*. Wayne State University Press.

Miller, J. (2006). *The Compassionate Community*. St. Martin's Press.

Miller, T., & Bowdon, M. (1999). A rhetorical stance on the archives of civic action. *College English*, *61*(5), 574–576. https://doi.org/10.2307/378977

Minutes of the board of KKBE. (1965a, February). *Board Minutes*. (MSS 1047, B2, F6). Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Minutes of the board of KKBE. (1965b, May). *Board Minutes*. (MSS 1047, B2, F6). Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Minutes of the board of KKBE. (1966, May). *Board Minutes*. (MSS 1047, B2, F6). Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Mittleman, A., Sarna, J., & Licht, R. (2002). *Jewish polity and American civil society*. Rowan and Littlefield.

Morgan-Fleming, B., Rigle, S., & Fryer, W. (2007). Narrative inquiry in archival work. In D. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry* (pp. 81–98). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452226552.n3

Moses, A. (1904). A History of the Jews of Mobile. *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, (12), 113–125. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43059165

Moses, J. (2018). *Just and righteous causes: Rabbi Ira Sanders and the fight for racial and social justice in Arkansas, 1926–1963*. University of Arkansas Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv5npkdv

Moss, M. (2008). Opening pandora's box: What is an archive in the digital environment? In L. Craven (Ed.), *What are archives?: Cultural and theoretical perspectives* (pp. 71–88). Society of American Archivists. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315547497-13

NAACP head here to get Metro award. (1981, March 24). [Clipping from The Tennessean]. Copy in possession of author.

NCCJ Program (1979, April 30). *Program Nashville Jewish Community Archives* (MS2 Box 7A, Rabbi Randall Falk). Jewish Community Center, Nashville, TN. United States.

Neusner, J. (2003). *The Formation of the Babylonian Talmud*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Ng. T., & Feldman, D. C. (2015). Ethical leadership: Meta-analytic evidence of criterion-related and incremental validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*, 948–965. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038246

Ng, T. (2017). Transformational leadership and performance outcomes: Analysis of multiple mediation pathways. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *28*, 385–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.11.008

Nicholls, K. (2001). Politics and civil rights in post-World War II Mobile. In M. Thomason (Ed.), *Mobile: The new history of Alabama's first city* (pp. 254–256). University of Alabama Press.

Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Sage Publishing.

Nyabadza, G. (2003). Leadership at the peak: The 10th trait of effective leaders: Servant leadership. *Zimbabwe Independent-AAGM*, February 7.

Oc, B. (2018). Contextual leadership: A systematic review of how contextual factors shape leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *29*, 218–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.004

O'Connor, K. (2010). *Gender and women's leadership: A reference handbook*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412979344

Odumeru, J. A., & Ogonna, I. G. (2013). Transformational vs. transactional leadership theories: Evidence in literature. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, *2*(2), 355–361. https://www.irmbrjournal.com/papers/1371451049.pdf

Olitzky, K., Sussman, L., & Stern, M. (1993). *Reform Judaism in America*. Greenwood Press.

Osborn, R., Hunt, J., & Jauch, L. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 797–837. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843(02)00154-6

Padoll, B. (1961). *The Eichmann Verdict*. Sermon delivered on December 16, 1961. Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Padoll, B. (1962a). *Foolish thoughts in April*. Sermon delivered on April 6, 1962. Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Padoll, B. (1962b). *Knock on wood*. Sermon delivered on April 13, 1962. Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Padoll, B. (1962c). *Shabbos Chol HaMoed Pesach*. Sermon delivered on April 20, 1962. Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Padoll, B. (1963). *The racial crisis: North and South*. Sermon delivered on October 8, 1963. Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Padoll, B. (1964). *The slavery complex*. Sermon delivered on August 14, 1964. Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Padoll, B. (1965a). *Strange fire in Alabama*. Sermon delivered on April 26, 1965. Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Padoll, B. (1965b). *The journey ahead*. Sermon delivered on June 4, 1965. Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, Charleston, SC, United States.

Padoll Letter. (1963, November 5). *Letter to the Board of Trustees*. Archives of the Southern Jewish Historical Society (MSS 1047, B6, F3, JHC-CC), Charleston, SC, United States.

Padoll, B. (1999, October 21). *Jewish Heritage Collection: Oral history interview with Burton Padoll*. Burton Padoll, 1929-2004 (MSS 1035-224). Lowcountry Digital Library: College of Charleston Libraries.

Parris, D. L., & Peachy, J. W. (2013). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *113*, 377–393. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1322-6

Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Regent University.

Pawar, B. S., & Eastman, K. K. (1997). The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: A contextual examination. *Academy of Management Review*, *22*, 80–109. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9707180260

Peng, A. C., Schaubroeck, J. M., & Li, Y. (2014). Social exchange implications of own and coworkers' experiences of supervisory abuse. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*, 1385–1405. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0080

Perolman, K. (2019). Training. In S. Limmer & J. Pesner (Eds.), *Moral resistance and spiritual Authority* (pp. 291–295). CCAR Press.

Phillips, D. (1998). *Martin Luther King, Jr.: On leadership*. Grand Central Publishing.

Plaut, W. G. (1965). *The growth of Reform Judaism*. JPS.

Pogge, T., & Rimmer, M. (2010). *Incentives for global public health: Connecting international law with public law*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511750786

Porter, L., & McLaughlin, G. (2006). Leadership and organizational context: Like the weather. *Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 559–576. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.002

Pride, R. (2002). *The political use of racial narratives: School desegregation in Mobile, Alabama, 1954–1997*. University of Illinois Press.

Purdy, J. (2011). Three gifts of digital archives. *Journal of Literacy and Technology*, *12*(3), 24–29. Retrieved from: http://www.literacyandtechnology.org/uploads/1/3/6/8/136889/jlt_v12_3_purdy.pdf

Rabbi Goodman: A lively 36 years. (1986, September 4). [Clipped from the Columbus Ledger]. Copy in possession of author with gratitude to Regina Block for the article.

Resner, A. (2003). *Just preaching: Prophetic voices for economic justice*. Chalice Press.

Riven, S. (1993). *The road south: A memoir*. The Association for Tennessee History.

Roche, J. (1998). *Restructured resistance: The Sibley Commission and the politics of desegregation in Georgia*. University of Georgia Press.

Rose, O. (2003). *Abraham Joshua Heschel: Man of spirit, man of action*. JTS.

Rose, O. (2008). *Righteous indignation*. Jewish Lights Publishing.

Rose, O., Kaiser, J., & Klein, M. (2008). *A Jewish call for justice*. Jewish Lights Publishing.

Roseman, J. (2010). *Shalom Nashville*. Everready Press.

Rosen, R. (1997). *A short history of Charleston*. University of South Carolina Press.

Rosen, R. (2000). *The Jewish Confederates*. University of South Carolina Press.

Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*, 655–684. https://doi.org/10.2307/3094827

Rouillier, S. (2018). *South Mobile: 1699–2018*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Rousseau, D. M., & Fried, Y. (2001). Location, location, location: Contextualizing organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *22*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.78

Roy, A., & Eckardt, A. (1967). Silence in the churches. *Midstream* (13), 27–32.

Ryan, J. (2016). Strategic activism, educational leadership and social justice. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *19*(1), 87–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1096077

Salzman, J., & West, C. (1997). *Struggles in the promised land: Toward a history of Black-Jewish relations in the United States*. Oxford University Press.

Sarna, J. (1986). *The American Jewish experience*. Holms & Meier Publishers.

Sarna, J. (2004). *American Judaism: A history*. Yale University Press.
https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvhrczf4

Sarna, J., & Dalin, D. (1997). *Religion and state in the American Jewish experience*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S., & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(4), 1020–1030. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1020

Schedlitzki, D., & Edwards, G. (2014). *Studying leadership: Traditional and critical approaches*. Sage Publications.

Schindler, J., & Seldin-Cohen, J. (2018). *Recharging Judaism: How civic engagement is good for synagogues, Jews, and America*. CCAR Press.

Schneier, M. (1999). *Shared dreams: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Jewish community*. Jewish Lights.

Schorr, R., & Graf, A. (2016). *The sacred calling: Four decades of women in the rabbinate*. CCAR Press.

Schulweis, H. (2008). *The duty to obey and the duty to disobey*. Jewish Lights Publishing.

Schwartz, S. (2006). *The Jewish passion to repair the world*. Jewish Lights Publishing.

Schwartz, S. (2013). *Jewish megatrends: Charting the course of the American Jewish future*. Jewish Lights.

Seers, A., & Chopin, S. M. (2012). The social production of leadership: From supervisor-subordinate linkages to relational organizing. In M. Uhl-Bien & S. M. Ospina (Eds.), *Advancing Relational Leadership Research: A Dialogue Among Perspectives* (pp. 43–82). Information Age Publishing.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. Jossey-Bass.

Shamir, B., House, R., & Arthur, M. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, *4*(2), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.4.4.577

Shirin, A. V. (2014). Is servant leadership inherently Christian? *Journal of Religion and Business Ethics*, *3*, 1–25. https://via.library.depaul.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1076&context=jrbe

Sibley Committee Testimony. (1960, March 16). *Testimony*. (Schools: Desegregation, 1960, Bound Record, Special Collections), Archives of Columbus State University, Columbus, GA, United States.

Sidman, A. (2014). *From race to renewal*. A. B. Sidman Publishing.

Silberman, L. (1965). The union prayer book: A study in liturgical development. In B. Korn (Ed.), *Retrospect and prospect: Essays in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the central conference of American rabbis 1889-1964*. Central Conference Publishing, 46–61.

Silverman, W. (1950–1960). *Correspondence*. Rabbi William Silverman Papers (Box 5B, Box F513), The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

Silverman, W. (1913–2001). *Correspondence*. Rabbi William Silverman Personal Papers. American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, OH, United States.

Sinclair, A. (2007). *Leadership for the disillusioned: Moving beyond myths and heroes to leading that liberates*. Crows Nest, Allen and Unwin.

Sipe, J., & Frick, D. (2009). *Seven pillars of servant leadership: Practicing the wisdom of leading by serving*. Paulist Press.

Sklare, M. (1971). *America's Jews*. Random House.

Sklare, M. (1972). *Conservative Judaism: An American religious movement*. Schocken.

Sklare, M., & Greenblum, J. (1967). *Jewish identity on the suburban frontier*. Basic Books.

Skloot, R. (2011). *The immortal life of Henrietta Lacks*. Broadway Publishing.

Smidt, C., & Schaap, B. (2009) *Public worship and public engagement: Pastoral cues within the context of worship services*. Calvin College Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25593757?seq=1

Snyder, N. H., Dowd, J. J., & Houghton, D. M. (1994). *Vision, values and courage*. The Free Press.

Solomon, R. C. (1992). *Ethics and excellence: Cooperation and integrity in business*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1086/293672

Sosik, J. J., Avolio, B. J., & Kahai, S. S. (1997). Effects of transformational leadership and anonymity on idea generation in computer-mediated groups. *Group & Organization Management*, *22*(4), 460–480. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601197224004

Spears, L. C. (1995). *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers*. John Wiley and Sons.

Spears, L. (2010a). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, *1*, 25–30. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jvl/vol1_iss1/Spears_Final.pdf

Spears, L. (2010b). Servant leadership and Robert K. Greenleaf's legacy. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 11–24). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230299184_2

Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Curriculum Studies*, *36*(1), 3–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027032000106726

Stan, L. (2012). Archival records as evidence. In A. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research* (pp. 30–35). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412957397.n12

Stanton, J. (2019). Tools of resistance. In S. Limmer & J. Pesner (Eds.), *Moral resistance and spiritual authority* (pp. 321–327). CCAR Press.

Staub, R. E. (1996). *The heart of leadership: The twelve practices of courageous leaders*. Executive Excellence Publishing.

Steinsaltz, A. (2009). *What is the Talmud? The essential Talmud*. Basic Books.

Stogdill, R. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, *25*(1), 35–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362

Stogdill, R., & Coons, A. (Eds.). (1957). *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. The Ohio State University.

Strober, D., & Strober, G. (2019). *Confronting hate: The untold story of the rabbi who stood up for human rights, racial justice, and religious reconciliation*. Skyhorse.

Sussman, L. (2002). Reform Judaism, minority rights, and the separation of church and state. In A. Mittleman, J. Sarna, & R. Licht (Eds.), *Jewish polity and American civil society* (pp. 235–260). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Telfair, N. (1929). *A history of Columbus, Georgia, 1828–1928*. Historical Publishing Company.

Temple bomb plot foiled. (1981, May 27). [Clipping from the Nashville Jewish Observer]. Copy in possession of author.

The Temple Bulletin. (1965, June 11). Springhill Avenue Temple Archives, Mobile, Alabama, United States.

TN—Annual Report. (1964, May). Minutes 1963–1965 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

TN—Annual Report. (1985, May). Minutes 1983–1985 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

TN—Board of Trustees. (1957, May 21). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Minutes 1956–1958 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

TN—Board of Trustees. (1961, April 18). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Minutes 1960–1962 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

TN—Board of Trustees. (1962, March 27). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Minutes 1960–1962 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

TN—Board of Trustees. (1963c, June 25). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Minutes 1963–1965 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

TN—Board of Trustees. (1963a, August 20). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Minutes 1963–1965 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

TN—Board of Trustees. (1963b, September 17). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Minutes 1963–1965 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

TN—Board of Trustees. (1963d, November 26). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Minutes 1963–1965 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

TN—Board of Trustees (1964, January 21). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Minutes 1963–1965 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

TN—Board of Trustees. (1965, April 20). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Minutes 1963–1965 (Box 3A). The Temple Archives, Nashville, TN, United States.

Theoharis, G. (2008). Woven in deeply: Identity and leadership of urban social justice principals. *Education and Urban Society*, *41*(1), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124508321372

Three local clergymen chosen for human relations award. (1979, March 8). [Clipping from The Nashville Banner]. Copy in possession of author.

Timeline and History. (ca. 1859–1992). *Temple Israel Collection* (MC 312, Box 1, Folder 43), Archives of Columbus State University, Columbus, GA, United States.

Tolnay, S., & Beck, E. M. (1992). *Festival of violence: An analysis of Southern lynchings*. University of Illinois Press.

Tribute Book. (1986). *Temple Israel Collection*, Archives of Temple Israel, Columbus, GA, United States.

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 654–676. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.007

Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., and McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *Leadership Quarterly*, *18*(4), 298–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002

Uhl-Bien, M., Maslyn, J., & Ospina, S. (2011). The nature of relational leadership: A multi-theoretical lens on leadership relationships and processes. In D. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 289–330). Sage.

Uleman, J. (1991). Leadership ratings: Toward focusing more on specific behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, *2*(3), 175–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(91)90009-q

United States District Court. (1971, March 8). Archives of Temple Israel, Columbus, GA, United States. Copy in possession of author.

van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), 1228–1261. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462

van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (2010). *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230299184

Vorspan, A. (1960). *Giants of justice*. UAHC Press.

Vorspan, A. (1973). The dilemma of the southern Jew. In L. Dinnerstein and M. Palsson (Eds.), *Jews in the South* (pp. 334–340). Louisiana State University Press.

Vorspan, A., & Saperstein, D. (1998). *Jewish dimensions of social justice*. UAHC Press.

Vroom, V., & Yetton, P. (1973). *Leadership and decision making*. University of Pittsburgh Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt6wrc8r

Waddock, S., Meszoely, G. M., Waddell, S., & Dentoni, D. (2015). The complexity of wicked problems in large scale change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *28*(6), 993–1012. https://doi.org/10.1108/jocm-08-2014-0146

Walbert, K. (2004). *Reading primary sources: An introduction for students*.

https://www.ncpedia.org/anchor/appendix-reading-primary

Waskow, A., & Berman, P. (2011). *Freedom journeys*. Jewish Lights Publishing.

Watts, M., & Corrie, S. (2013). Growing the 'I' and the 'we' in transformational leadership: The lead, learn & grow model. *The Coaching Psychologist*, *9*(2), 86–99.

Wax, J. (1959). The Attitudes of Jews in the South toward integration. *CCAR Journal,* XXVI, 14-20.

Webb, C. (2003). *Fight against fear: Southern Jews and black civil rights*. University of Georgia Press.

Webb, C. (2010). *Rabble rousers: The American far right in the civil rights era*. University of Georgia Press.

Weber, M. (1922). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. University of California Press.

Weiss, A., & Weinberger, L. (2019). *American values and religious Voices*. University of Cincinnati Press.

Welch, C. (2000). The archaeology of business networks: The use of archival records in case study research. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, *8*(2), 197–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254x.2000.10815560

Wertheimer, J. (2018). *The new American Judaism*. Princeton University Press.

Wilkerson, I. (2012). *The warmth of other suns: The epic story of America's great migration*. Random House.

Winston, B. E. (2003). Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Coming full circle. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable Proceedings*. http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/home.shtml

Wolfson, R. (2013). *Relational Judaism*. Jewish Lights.

Worley, C. G., Mohrman, S. A., & Nevitt, J. A. (2011). Large-group interventions: An empirical field study of their composition, process, and outcomes. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *47*(4), 404–431. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886311410837

World Union of Progressive Judaism. (1988). *Rabbi Randall & Edna Falk Fund*. Rabbi Randall Falk, The Temple Archives (Box 25, Folder Rabbi Randall Falk), The Temple, Nashville, TN.

Wynn, B. (2007, May 3). Racial Violence in the Chattahoochee Valley. Speech delivered at the

Columbus Public Library. Columbus State University Archives, Columbus, GA, United States.

Yanklowitz, S. (2018). *Pirke avot: A social justice commentary*. CCAR Press.

Young, A. (2016). *Andrew Young and the making of modern Atlanta*. Mercer University Press.

Young, C., & Brooker, M. (2006). Safeguarding sacred lives: The ethical use of archival data for the study of diverse lives. In J. Trimble & C. Fisher (Eds.), *The handbook of ethical research with ethnocultural populations and communities* (pp. 282–298). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412986168.n15

Zeitz, R. (1994). *The gates of Heaven: Congregation Sha'arai Shomayim, the first 150 years, Mobile, Alabama, 1944–1994*. Congregation Sha'arai Shomayim.

Zhu, J., Song, L. J., Zhu, L., & Johnson, R. (2019). Visualizing the landscape and evolution of leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *30*, 215–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.06.003

Zlotowitz, M. (1994). *Pirkei avos*. Mesorah.

Zlotowitz, M. (1998). *Schottenstein edition of the Talmud*. Mesorah.

Zohar, D., & Tenne-Gazit, O. (2008). Transformational leadership and group interaction as climate antecedents: A social network analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(4), 744–757. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.744

Zola, G., & Dollinger, M. (2014). *American Jewish history: A primary source reader*. Brandeis University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv102bhct

Zwijze-Koning, K., & de Jong, M. (2005). Auditing information structures in organizations: A review of data collection techniques for analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, *8*(4), 429–453. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428105280120

APPENDIX

Decalogue of Guiding Principles in Human Rights

1. Our congregational membership is open to all Jews of every race. TO our worship services we welcome visitors from every racial, national, or religious background at any time. (335 yes, 32 no)

2. Our Congregation will support the freedom of our Rabbi in speech and in action to further the cause of equal opportunity. (291 yes, 21 no)

3. We urge our Congregation and affiliate groups to sponsor programs in our Temple and in other religious institutions, and to cooperate fully with other organizations to further racial justice and equality. (270 yes, 43 no)

4. We encourage individual members of our Congregation to establish closer interpersonal relationships through gatherings in their homes on a bi-racial basis. (153 yes, 113 no)

5. Our Congregation and all its affiliate organizations will not patronize or sponsor any activity at a place of public accommodation, which discriminates locally against anyone because of race, religion, or ethnic origin. (258 yes, 38 no)

6. We urge members who are in business or profession to institute and enforce nondiscriminatory employment and promotion policies, and to make a conscious, positive effort to hire and to train for upgrading all persons without regard to racial, national, or religious background. (287 yes, 29 no)

7. We urge our members who belong to labor, business and professional groups to take positive steps to encourage the introduction of all qualified persons into skilled trades and profession, without regard to racial, national, or religious background, and to

exert their influence in providing all such persons with equal opportunities for occupational and professional advancement. (296 yes, 24 no)

8. We urge our members graciously to accept all neighbors regardless of race, national origin, or religion. (210 yes, 77 no)

9. We urge all our members to support and work for full integration of all educational facilities. (312 yes, 18 no)

10. We urge all our members to give active support to the enactment of local, state and federal civil rights legislation and to forceful executive action at all levels of government. (281 yes, 29 no) (TN—Board of Trustees, 1964)