



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES
A DIVISION OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE – JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

MS-831: Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980-2011.

Series F: CIJE Accrual, 1981-2011, undated.
Subseries 2: Dan Pekarsky, 1981-2011, undated.

Box
74

Folder
3

Core concepts. Philosophy and practice in Jewish education,
1994-1996.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
[American Jewish Archives](http://AmericanJewishArchives.org) website.

PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE IN JEWISH EDUCATION

A Seminar and Consultation

Friday, July 19 - Friday, July 26

at CAPE, 9 Yad Harutzim Street, Jerusalem

**Sponsored by the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education and
The Mandel Institute for the Advanced Study and Development of Jewish Education**

SCHEDULE

Friday, July 19th

11:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

Lunch

12:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Introduction:
Daniel Marom and Daniel Pekarsky

Welcome:
Annette Hochstein and Alan Hoffmann

Participants' responses
to core concepts and theses

Sunday, July 21st

8:30 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.

Recapitulation and discussion
Daniel Pekarsky

10:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

From Philosophy to Practice
From Philosophy to Philosophy of Education
Seymour Fox

1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Lunch

2:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

From Practice to Philosophy
Areas of Practice as Entry Points for the
Development of Vision Driven Education
Daniel Marom

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

From Practice to Philosophy
Small groups

a) Working with Institutions: Led by Daniel Marom and Daniel Pekarsky: Amy Gerstein, Alan Hoffmann, Alvan Kaunfer, Daniel Lehmann, Michael Paley, Nessa Rapoport, and Linda Thal.

b) Developing Personnel: Led by Gail Dorph and Seymour Fox: Ellen Goldring, Daniel Gordis, Barry Holtz, Eli Holzer, Devorah Steinmetz.

Monday, July 22nd

8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.

Recapitulation and discussion

9:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

From Practice to Philosophy
Small groups continued

1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Lunch

2:00 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.

From Philosophy to Practice
Meeting with Moshe Greenberg

4:30 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

From Philosophy to Practice
An exercise in "translating" educational
philosophy to theory of practice
Daniel Marom.

Tuesday, July 23rd

Shel
group

7:30-10:30 Greenbe

8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.

Recapitulation and discussion

10:45 what have we've learned
what are our
goals

9:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

From Philosophy to Practice
Inquiries into a community-based vision for
North American Jewry

Michael Paley and Daniel Lehmann
with the participation of
Menachem Brinker and Michael Rosenak.

11:30-
Continue
today's
discussion

11:45 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Discussion
Michael Paley and Daniel Lehmann

1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Lunch

2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

From Practice to Philosophy
Community Mobilization Project:
The Milwaukee Pilot Project
Daniel Pekarsky and Nessa Rapoport

3:45 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

From Practice to Philosophy
Small groups - continuation and summation

7:30 p.m.

Dinner at Alan Hoffmann's home:
39 Tura Street, Yemin Moshe

Goal: More practice

Grants assigned to practice.

Wednesday, July 24th

8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.

Recapitulation and discussion

9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.

The Center for Advanced Professional Educators:
Its vision and program for leadership in Jewish Education

Annette Hochstein

10:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

Report of sub-group on **working with
institutions**

12:15 p.m. - 1:15 p.m.

Lunch

1:15 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

Report of sub-group on **developing personnel**

Shuttle Alenat
Sessions

+ Lehmann

Thursday, July 25th, Tisha B'Av

Individual meetings (optional)

10 - Linda Thal
11 - Eli

3 - Allan

4³⁰ - DL

Friday, July 26th

8:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.

Recapitulation and discussion

10:15 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

The Educated Jew Project - Next Steps
Seymour Fox

11:30 a.m. - 12:45 p.m.

The Goals Project for 1996-7: Topics and Issues
Daniel Pekarsky

12:45 p.m. - 1:45 p.m.

Lunch

1:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Conclusion

Michael Paley

PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE IN JEWISH EDUCATION

A Seminar and Consultation (July 1996)

PARTICIPANTS

Dorph, Gail

Gail Dorph is Senior Education Officer at CIJE. Her work is in the area of building the profession of the Jewish educator. Before coming to CIJE, she served as the director of the Fingerhut School of Education at the University of Judaism in Los Angeles. She is also one of the authors of the Melton Curriculum for Supplementary Schools in the area of Holiday/Prayer/Mitzvoth. She is interested in pedagogical content knowledge for Jewish educators, particularly in the areas of Torah and Tefillah.

E-mail: 73321.1217@compuserve.com

(W) 212-532-2360 ext. 440 (H) 212-769-0725

Fox, Seymour

Seymour Fox received his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago in the Philosophy of Education and Rabbinic ordination from the J.T.S.A. He served as Dean of the Teachers Institute of the J.T.S.A. where he established the Melton Center for Research in Jewish Education, and was active in the development of the Ramah Camps. In 1967 he was appointed director of the School of Education of the Hebrew University where he established several new departments, among them the Melton Center for Jewish Education in the Diaspora. He served as a Senior Advisor to four Ministers of Education. In 1981 he established the Jerusalem Fellows Program and in 1990 was appointed President of the Mandel Institute. He has written in the fields of philosophy of education, curriculum and the education of educators.

(W) 02-662-832

Gerstein, Amy

Amy Gerstein is Associate Director of the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative. She has been working with BASRC since its inception in 1995. Her duties include working with the membership of the Collaborative, designing the program activities and directing a network of Support Providers. Prior to working at BASRC, she was the Associate Director of the Bay Area Coalition of Essential Schools and the Associate Director of the Schools Division of the national office of the Coalition of Essential Schools based at Brown University. She has taught high school science, outdoor education and teacher education. She holds a Ph.D. in Education from Stanford University.

E-mail: AGERSTE@NestEd.Org

(W) 415-241-2719

(H) 415-487-0533

Goldring, Ellen

Ellen Goldring is Professor of Educational Leadership and Associate Dean at Peabody College, Vanderbilt University. Her research focuses on how organizational systems of governance and control impact on educational institutions. Other research examines leadership changes as schools undergo reform and restructuring. She is a consultant to CIJE where she co-directs the Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback (MEF) project. She is interested in developing professional preparation programs for educational leaders.

E-mail: GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU

(W) 615-322-8037 (Fax) 615-343-7014

(H) 615-353-7267

Gordis, Daniel

Daniel Gordis received his BA from Columbia College, an MA degree and Ordination from the Jewish Theological Seminary and his Ph.D. from the University of Southern California. He has been associated with the University of Judaism since 1984, and now serves as Vice President for Public Affairs and Community

Outreach as well as dean of the Rabbinical School. He is the author of *God Was Not In The Fire: The Search For A Spiritual Judaism* (Scribner, 1995), and of the forthcoming *The Chosen People In Crisis: Modern Jews In Search Of A Reason To Survive* (Scribner, 1997) and *For The Sake Of Heaven: Conversion, Law And Politics In The World Of Modern Orthodoxy* (University of California Press, 1998), co-authored with David Ellenson.

E-mail: 72.557.1507@compuserve.com
(W) 310-476-9777 (H) 310-842-8163/2

Hoffmann, Alan

Alan Hoffmann is the Executive Director of the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE). He is on loan from the Hebrew University where he served as Director of the Melton Center for Jewish Education in the Diaspora. He is interested in issues of educational innovation and change within the broader organizational context of Jewish communal life.

E-mail: 73321.1220@compuserve.com
NYC 212-532-2360 (W) 011-9722-662832
(H) 011-9722-235506

Holtz, Barry W.

Barry W. Holtz is Associate Professor of Jewish Education at Jewish Theological Seminary and a long time consultant to CIJE where, among other things, he directs the Best Practices Project. His areas of interest include curriculum development, teacher education, and the "translation" of Jewish scholarship and Judaica for the purposes of Jewish education.

E-mail: BaHoltz@JTSA.Edu
(W) CIJE: 212-532-2360 JTS: 212-678-8034
(H) 212-864-3529

Holzer, Eli

Born in Belgium in 1962, Eli Holzer is an Israeli citizen who has served as a shaliach for B'nei Akiva in Belgium, and as a lecturer and teacher in both youth and adult education. He holds an MA in Jewish Thought from the Hebrew University, where he is currently working on his Ph.D. He also earned his teaching certificate from the Yaakov Herzog Institute at Alon Shvut, and a BA in

Psychology and Jewish Philosophy from Bar Ilan University. As a Jerusalem Fellow, he is examining ways to utilize Jewish Thought in Jewish education and in teacher training which he plans to implement upon assuming a position in Jewish education in a North American community.

E-mail: mselie@pluto.msc.huji.ac.il
(H) 02-666902

Kaunfer, Alvan

Alvan Kaunfer is a Rabbi at Temple Emmanu'el in Providence, where he oversees educational programming. He was the founding director of the Solomon Schechter Day School in Rhode Island. He completed his doctoral work on the teaching of Midrash at the Jewish Theological Seminary, and he has published several articles on Midrash and the teaching of Midrash.

E-mail: 75574.225@compuserve.com
401-331-0219

Lehmann, Daniel

Rabbi Daniel Lehmann is the founding Headmaster of the New Jewish High School of Greater Boston, a community Jewish day high school. Most recently, he served as the Upper School Principal at the Beth Tfiloh Community School in Pikesville, MD. A graduate of Yeshiva University, and its Rabbinical School, he was the Director of KIRUV, the College Outreach Program of Yeshiva University and Assistant Rabbi of the Beth Tfiloh Congregation. During the 1993-94 academic year, he was the Wexner Heritage Foundation Fellow at the National Jewish Center for Learning and Leadership where he studied with Rabbi Irving Greenberg, taught lay and professional leaders of the New York Federation, and developed CLAL's first College Student Leadership Conference. He is the editor of *Visions and Voices*, a collection of contemporary commentaries on the Haftarah, and has lectured in various settings in Baltimore and throughout the country. In addition, he has been an active participant in scholarly programs sponsored by the Institute for Christian and Jewish Studies. He is married to Dr. Lisa Solemani Lehmann and is the proud father of two sons, Hillel and Eliyahu.

E-mail: DLEHMANN@UMDS.UMD.EDU
410-486-8991 410-484-5127

Marom, Daniel

Daniel Marom is a Senior Researcher at the Mandel Institute for the Advanced Study and Development of Jewish Education, located in Jerusalem. He is co-director of the Mandel Institute's "Educated Jew Project", the purpose of which is to develop and publish alternative conceptions of the aims of contemporary Jewish education. In addition, he collaborates with the Goals Project in facilitating the development of vision and vision-guided practice in various settings for Jewish education. Before coming to the Mandel Institute, he trained teachers in Judaica at Kerem Teacher Training Institute for Jewish Humanism and developed curricula at Melitz: Centers for Jewish-Zionist Education.

E-mail: MAROM@vms.huji.ac.il
(W) 02-662-832 (H) 02-738-933

Paley, Michael

Rabbi Michael Paley is a Professor of Jewish Studies and Dean of Special Projects at Bard College. His central responsibility is to design a new Jewish High School and Early College for Manhattan. Previous to Bard College, he was the Vice President of the Wexner Heritage Foundation. Before that he was the University Chaplain and Director of Earl Hall at Columbia University. As Chaplain he was an advocate for the religious and spiritual mission of the University and the coordinator of social service, humanitarian, political and multi-cultural activities. He was the founder and first director of the Edgar M. Bronfman Youth Fellowship in Israel, as well as the founder of the Conference on Judaism in rural New England.

E-mail: PALEY@BARD.EDU
212-666-5407 212-355-6115

Pekarsky, Daniel

Daniel Pekarsky is Professor in Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin - Madison. He is a philosopher of education with strong interests in the ethics of educational practices and policies and in moral education. He serves as a consultant to CIJE, with major

responsibilities in the Goals Project. His prior work in Jewish education included developing and directing the Cleveland Fellows Program, which was designed to upgrade Jewish education in Cleveland.

E-mail: DANPEK@macc.wisc.edu

(W) 608-262-1718 (FAX): 608-262-9074

(H) 608-233-4044

Rapoport, Nessa

Nessa Rapoport is Leadership Development Officer of CIJE. She is responsible for the domain of mobilizing community support for Jewish education, which includes fostering a partnership between lay leaders and professionals for the revitalization of the community through education. She is the author of a novel, *Preparing for Sabbath*, and of *A Woman's Book of Grieving*. She is co-editor of the *Schocken Book of Contemporary Jewish Fiction*. For ten years she was a senior editor at Bantam Books, where she edited the memoirs of Jimmy Carter, Ezer Weizman, Lee Iacocca, and Geraldine Ferraro, among others.

E-mail: 74671.3370@compuserve.com

(W) 212-532-2360 x408 (H) 212-873-8385

Steinmetz, Devorah

Devorah Steinmetz is the founder and director of Beit Rabban. She is co-director of Sh'arim, a new program for the education of future day school teachers which is co-sponsored by Beit Rabban and Drisha Institute. She teaches Talmud at the Jewish Theological Seminary and has been an instructor at Drisha Institute. She is author of *From Father to Son: Kinship, Conflict And Continuity in Genesis*.

(W) 212-595-1386 (H) 212-877-4919

Thal, Linda

Linda Thal has recently moved from Los Angeles to New York City where she will be directing a new project, *Creating Learning Congregations*, for the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and pursuing doctoral studies in the joint program in religion and education at Union Theological seminary and Columbia Teachers college. In Los Angeles she was the Director of Education at Leo Baeck Temple, she also served as a member of the

Clinical faculty at Hebrew Union College - Jewish
Institute of Religion Rhea Hirsch School of Education and
as a consultant to the Experiment in Congregational
Education. She has taught and written in areas of family
and tzedakah education, the use of art in Jewish
education, Judaism and spiritual growth, and educational
and congregational change. Linda was a 1994 recipient of
the Covenant Award.

(W) 212-249-0100 (H) 212-675-8448 (F) 212-650-4239

Background Materials

1. Seymour Fox, *"Towards a General Theory of Jewish Education"* (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1973).
2. Daniel Pekarsky, *"The Place of Vision in Jewish Educational Reform"* (working draft, CIJE, 1996).*
3. *"Introductory Notes on Professor Moshe Greenberg's Paper on the Educated Jew"* (working draft by Daniel Marom, Mandel Institute, 1994).*
4. Moshe Greenberg, *"היינו כחולמים: דמות תוצר של חינוך יהדותי מוצלח"*, (working draft, Mandel Institute, 1994).*
5. Moshe Greenberg, *"We Were as Those Who Dream: A Portrait of the Ideal Product of an Ideal Jewish Education"* (translation by Daniel Marom and Marc Rosenstein, working draft, Mandel Institute, 1994).*
6. *"Those Who Sow in Sorrow Will Reap The Harvest With Joy: Practical Implications of Professor Greenberg's Conception of Jewish Education"* (working draft edited by Daniel Marom, Mandel Institute, 1995).*
7. Menachem Brinker, *"הלימודים היהודיים בישראל מנקודת ראות ליבראלית-לאומית (חילונית)"*, (working draft, Mandel Institute, 1994).*
8. Menachem Brinker, *"Jewish Studies in Israel From a Liberal-National ("Secular") Point of View"* (translation by Ralph Mandel, working draft, Mandel Institute, 1996).*
9. *"Selected Notes from Professor Brinker's Meetings with the Fellows of the School for Educational Leadership and the Jerusalem Fellows"* (Summarised by Daniel Marom, Mandel Institute, 1994).*
10. Michael Rosenak, *"Community-Wide Vision for Jewish Education"* (The Mandel Institute, 1994).*
11. Daniel Marom, *"The Goals Project at the Agnon School"* (partial draft 28/12/95, Mandel Institute)* and *"The Agnon School Goals Project - Update and Plan"* (1/5/96, Mandel Institute).*
13. Linda Rabinovitch Thal, *"Reimagining Congregational Education: A Case Study of a Work in Progress"* in **A Congregation of Learners: Transforming the Synagogue into a Learning Community**, ed. Isa Aron, Sara Lee and Seymour Rossel (New York, UAHC Press, 1995).

* As we have mentioned in our previous discussions, these papers are working drafts. Some of these will be published by the Mandel Institute in a few months and others will be used for internal purposes. We would therefore like to repeat our request not to cite or distribute these papers.

**INTRODUCTORY NOTES ON
PROFESSOR MOSHE GREENBERG'S PAPER
ON THE EDUCATED JEW***

Professor Moshe Greenberg has long maintained a concern for Jewish education while undertaking scholarly research on Biblical law and literature. The year that he completed his graduate studies in Bible at the University of Pennsylvania (1954), he was also ordained rabbi at the Conservative movement's Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS). Then, while lecturing at both institutions in Bible and Judaic studies and continuing his research, Greenberg also served as a member of the Faculty Seminar at JTS's Melton Research Center for Jewish Education. Among other things, this led to the development of his curricular materials on "Understanding Exodus."

Greenberg's aliyah, in 1970, did not bring about any change in this pattern. Alongside his continued teaching and scholarly efforts in the Bible department at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, he served as a consultant to the Ministry of Education's Center for Curriculum Development, contributing to its work in the field of Bible curriculum. During the Yom Kippur War, Greenberg also taught Judaica in two Jerusalem high schools - an experience which profoundly influenced his educational thinking. Greenberg has formulated many of his ideas on the teaching of Bible in writing and his essays on this topic were collected in a Hebrew anthology "On the Bible and Judaism."

Greenberg's combination of efforts in Biblical scholarship and Jewish education have led to each area being profoundly influenced by the other. On the one hand, Greenberg has considered the academic study of Judaism from an educational point of view and has subsequently suggested ways in which it can make a stronger contribution to Jewish learning in general. On the other hand, his research in Biblical and Judaic studies has addressed topics on the educational agenda of modern Jews. A bibliography of Greenberg's contributions to Jewish education can be found in appendix #X (1). An English anthology of these writings will be available in the near future.

Greenberg's thinking on Jewish scholarship and education over the years has been based on a larger philosophic vision of Jewish and human existence which has profound implications for the field of Jewish education today. In the context of the "Educated Jew Project," our staff and a group of leading scholars and educators worked with Greenberg in order to clarify the fundamental principles of this vision and to explore with him ways in which they could serve as a basis for the effective design and compelling practice of Jewish education. The results of this effort are summarized here in Greenberg's paper "We Were as Dreamers: An Image of the Successful Product of Jewish Education" as well as in the ensuing discussion on its practical implications.

* summarized by D. Marom, based on Professor Greenberg's other writings and protocols of his meetings with the scholars, educators and staff of the educated Jew project and with the fellows of the School for Educational Leadership and of the Jerusalem Fellows program.

Since Greenberg's paper builds on his larger philosophical view, the reader may find it useful to first consider four of its basic tenets:

1. The Primacy of Spiritual Needs in Human Existence:

The cornerstone of Greenberg's view is the belief that humans are in need of spiritual content. They need to know the meaning and purpose of their lives, of those of their neighbors, families and communities, of their culture, environment, and of all that surrounds them - in short, they need to know "what it's all about." No matter how secure humans may feel in the routine of their everyday schedules, no matter how materially well-off, no matter what they have been trained to think or feel, sooner or later, they will hunger for that which has timeless meaning. They will crave the feeling that their actions, their toils, their struggles and even their pleasures and the larger events of their lifetimes somehow make a difference in the ultimate picture of things, in the final analysis of what is important.

Greenberg's belief is that the need for spiritual meaning in human life cannot be extinguished by satisfying other needs. This does not mean that all humans would give up all that contributes to a better material existence in favor of a life of spiritual meditation. To be sure, many people do forfeit a measure of material comfort in order to pursue what they consider to be a meaningful way of living - just as many do the opposite. The point here is that the need for spiritual meaning in human life is so deep that it makes its demands upon them more persistently. Humans will remain unsatisfied with a life devoid of spiritual meaning and when they begin to discover it in their lives, the rewards derived therefrom will be so great that they will constantly seek for more. The spiritual import of things will become a force in their lives that will govern the arrangement of their activities and the investment of their energies.

2. Judaism as a Response to Human Spiritual Needs:

Spiritual meaning is not a visible commodity that can be found on a shelf at a supermarket. Spirit, by its very nature, goes beyond what is fleeting and visible. It belongs to a transcendent realm beyond time and place. At the same time, it is not something which is beyond human reach. Humans, both individually and in groups, have throughout history discovered the spiritual dimension of reality through unique experiences, practices and insights. In turn, they have tried to communicate these to others through stories and symbols, such as behaviors, images, objects, and rites. A rite, for example, is only a ritual behavior. However, when appropriately interpreted, it can serve as a medium through which one may be pointed to that which is spiritual. The aggregate of these stories and symbols comprise what Greenberg calls a "culture" - "a particular human group's treasure of spiritual possessions, a treasure which is shaped by the circumstances of its life, by its particular confrontation with universal issues" (2)

As Greenberg sees it, Judaism is the Jewish people's particular "culture," or "treasure of spiritual possessions." Early in their history, the Jewish people experienced encounters with the transcendent realm. The record of these encounters is found in the classical texts of

Judaism - beginning with the Hebrew Bible and including the Mishna, Talmud, Midrash, and the commentaries around these books over the generations - as well as in the religious, moral, and religious practices stipulated by traditional Jewish Law. In turn, these provided Jews throughout history with a rich reservoir of values by which their spiritual needs could be satisfied. Through the study of Jewish texts and traditional Jewish practices, both individual Jews and Jewish communities could find spiritual meaning in diverse areas of existence. Among these were: the course and purpose of human life, the challenge of death, the relationship between man and woman, between the individual and the community, between the community and other communities, between the members of the family, between success and failure, between hope and despair...

3. Judaism as the Basis for Jewish Existence:

Greenberg attributes the vitality and longevity of a particular culture to its capacity to address the universal spiritual needs of its members. To the degree that a particular culture is capable of supplying its members with a measure of spiritual satisfaction on an ongoing basis, so too will it continue to thrive. By this criterion, Judaism stands out as a powerful culture, which, even against material odds, demonstrated a strong capability of meeting the spiritual needs of Jews for generations. Among the testimonies as to just how powerful Judaism has been, argues Greenberg, is the fact that the Biblical faith and view of the world, through Christianity, succeeded in meeting the spiritual needs of late Roman civilization more than various indigenous forms of pagan culture. Indeed, Israelite monotheistic culture continues to impact on humans all over the world today.

In the life of any people, some spiritual values will become obsolete. Consequently, a culture will continue to serve its people as long as it can both "sift and broaden" its spiritual treasures. The strength and self-confidence of a culture should allow it to assimilate values from other cultures and translate them into the language of its own. Judaism, argues Greenberg, has sustained its hold on the Jewish people precisely because it has been able to undertake both of these kinds of activities. Were it incapable of doing so, Jews over the centuries would have chosen, as have many other groups over the centuries have done, to assimilate into other communities whose cultures demonstrate a greater capacity to satisfy human spiritual needs. Indeed, argues Greenberg, by continually addressing the changing spiritual needs of Jews, Judaism has for centuries served as the basis of Jewish society (3).

It is important to note that Greenberg's conception does not recognize primal tribal sentiments, in and of themselves, as a viable basis for Jewish society. Without a spiritual basis for their commonality, the bonds which keep Jews living together and caring for each other will come undone. Similarly, Greenberg also rejects the possibility of assimilating into a larger "universal" human culture, one which transcends local boundaries. According to his view, such a culture is as unlikely as a universal human language. The search for it is must be understood as an attempt to circumvent or deny the authentic quest for spiritual meaning, to seek out a world with no culture (for a further elaboration of this point, see appendix #Y).

4. The Pivotal Role of Jewish Education:

Greenberg's conception of Judaism and Jewish existence leads him to define a specific role for Jewish education. Since Judaism is a treasure of cultural symbols with a strong capacity to point to the transcendent spiritual realm, and since Jewish existence is contingent upon the spiritual needs of Jews being met by Judaism, it falls to Jewish education to facilitate the encounter between Jews and the spiritual content of Judaism. Jewish education must, on the one hand, encourage Jewish learners to embark on a quest for spiritual meaning, and on the other, present Judaism in a way which addresses fundamental human spiritual needs.

Jewish education is not defined here as an act of religious persuasion, cultural initiation or even socialization. Though Greenberg sees these as likely outcomes of the Jewish educational process as he defines it, any attempt to confuse these outcomes with what Jewish education should actually be doing will be in fact endanger their actual attainment. Placing the emphasis on the Jewish learners' loyalty to Jewish cultural symbols, in and of themselves, rather than on what the spiritual meanings to which they point can lead to their being a source of disappointment and even estrangement. Greenberg's faith is truly in the spiritual attraction of Judaism per se. As such, the learner's spiritual encounter with Judaism must be a discovery of its spiritual adequacy, as an end in itself, not in the service of any other end. It is upon the authenticity of this encounter which Greenberg, in the final analysis, conditions the continuity of Judaism and therefore, of the Jewish people.

What is the nature of a Jewish education which sees its role in these terms? In which sort of setting can it thrive? What is its subject matter? What kind of presentation and pedagogy does it demand of the Jewish educators? Where does it aspire to bring the Jewish learner? These are the questions which Greenberg begins to address in his paper "We Were as Dreamers: An Image of the Ideal Product of Jewish Education," which follows this introduction.

Notes:

1. Greenberg's suggested method for Judaica/Humanities scholarship which addresses spiritual needs is discussed at length on pages xxx.
2. On this view of religion, see William Cantrell Smith, "Religion as Symbolism," volume xxx, pages xxx, Encyclopedia Britannica (19xx edition). Greenberg's discussion of Judaism in light of this view appears in "Zehut, Tevunah ve Dat" (Hebrew) in "On the Bible and Judaism," (Tel Aviv, Am Oved, 1984), pages 247 - 261.
3. On this view of Jewish religion as the central factor in Jewish continuity, see Yehezkel Kauffman, "The Religion of Israel," tr. by M. Greenberg, (New York, Schocken, 19XX) and "Golah Ve Nechar" (Tel Aviv, Dvir, 1929).

"היינו כחולמים: דמות תוצר של חינוך יהודי
מוצלח"

פרופ' משה גרינברג

טיוטה 1994

"היינו כחולמים" : דמות התוצר של חינוך יהדותי מוצלח
מאת : פרופ' משה גרינברג

נתבקשתי להציע לשיקול דעתם של מחנכים מטרוח שאליהן יכוונו את מאמצייהם ושלשגתן ימציאו תחבולות. כשהעליתי את המטרות שיפורטו להלן לא תפתי אותן לפי מידת היכולת של המערכת העכשוית להשיגן, אלא לפי מה שנראה לי הרצוי והנחוץ מצד עצמו להיות מטרות החינוך היהדותי (המושג "חינוך יהדותי" מוגדר בסעיף הבא). כוונת ההצעה היא, וכוונת הדיון בה צריכה להיות, בירור מגמת פנינו - האם אנו מכוונים כלפי יעדים נכונים, ולא בירור היעדים שבכוחנו היום להשיגם. הנותן את דעתו רק להתאים את מטרותיו לכוונותיו ימצא את כוחותיו מצטמצמים כפי חרדתו מפני כשלון, ואילו המציב לו מטרות שהיא בירודעין מעבר לכוונותיו יגלה כי כוחו גדול משחשב. אמנם עלול יאוש לצמות מפער גדול וקיים בין היעד לכוח ההגשמה. כנגד זה יש עצה: לעשות את הדרך אל היעד תחנות תחנות, שכל אחת היא בהישג, ועם השגחה משמשת היא נקודת זינוק להשגת זו הבאה אחריה. על כל פנים צריכים אנו ליעד רחוק, כדי למקם את עצמנו על פיו - האם אנו מחקרבים אליו או לא.

אני מבקש לצייר את דמות התוצר של חינוך יהדותי מוצלח - כשחינוך יהדותי מובן כחינוך הנועד לבנות אדם בעל ידע, ערכים, רגישויות, הזדהות והשתייכות הנובעים ממקורות היהדות. אינני בא לצייר את היהודי המחונך - שהוא תת-סוג של האדם המחונך - בעל ידיעות כלליות וידיעות בתחום היהדות. אני מניח כי אותו תוצר שאני מצייר הוא גם בעל ידע, ערכים והזדהות ורגישויות נוספות על היהודיות - כגון בתחום המדעי (הכרת הטבע והוקיו), ההיסטורי (תולדות העמים והתרבויות), המדיני (דמוקרטיה, זכויות הפרט), האמנותי (ספרות, מוזיקה, ציור), ההגותי (פילוסופיה, אמונות אחרות, ביקורת חברתית). משחמע מכאן שהתוצר של חינוך יהדותי מוצלח שאני מדמיון יצטרך לעמוד במתחים הקיימים בין שני העולמות שהוא חי בהם - היהודי והכללי. זה נושא נכבד שראוי מאד לנתחו.

מהו המרכיב היהדותי שביצור הדמיוני: תוצר של חינוך יהדותי מוצלח? מתוכנם של ספרי היסוד המוסמכים של היהדות: התנ"ך, החלמוד והמדרש, והפרשנות שקמה לספרי יסוד אלה במשך הדורות, בין שהיא פרשנות במובן הצר (כפירושי רש"י), בין שהיא מחשבה מסודרת

או ספרות יצירתית הבאות לתרגם את תוכן ספרי היסוד לשפה חדשה, בת
התקופה - שפה פילוסופית, מוסרית ומיסטית. ספרי יסוד אלה מכילים
מושגים ראשוניים הקובעים את התייחסותנו אל היקום, אל הסביבה
הדוממת והחיה, האנושית הכללית, הלאומית והמשפחתית; מחכונים
לאורחות חיים (משלי חכמה, מצוות, הלכות); אבטיפוסים ודגמים
למופת (בסיפורים ואגדות). תפקיד החינוך היהודי הוא למסוד מנות
משמעותיות של התכנים האלה לחניך. "משמעותי" תרתי משמע:

א. בעל משמעות וטעם בעיני החניך, נוגע אל ליבו, מדבר
בעניינים השייכים לו;

ב. בעל משמעות ייצוגית: כמות המספיקה להטעים לחניך טעם
נאמן של המקור, במדה שיתרשם מכוהו.

אם יקבל החניך "מנות משמעותיות" של ספרי היסוד במובן הכפול הזה,
יהיה סיכוי שיכיר במשקלם המוסרי והרעיוני של מקורות היהדות
ויזקק להם לאורך ימים. המטרה העליונה היא כי יעסוק החניך
בסוגיות-יסוד קיומיות, ויגלה את זהותו היהודית תוך כדי עיסוק
זה, באמצעות המפגש עם מקורות היהדות. משאלחנו היא כי תוצר
החינוך היהודי המוצלח יהוש כי ערכי יסוד קיומיים שלו נגזרים
מספרי היסוד של היהדות^{1,2}.

חינוך יהודי ייבחן על פי הצלחתו להנחיל את תוצרו ארבע תכונות:

א. חיבת לימוד התורה (= ספרי היסוד וכל שבמחכונתם) וחיבת מעשה
המצוה "שבין אדם למקום":

כלומר: חיבת הבילוי והמעשה חסרי התכליתות החמרית והתועלתית,
הבילוי והמעשה שהם טובים במהותם. כל העוסק במ רווה נחת מחחושת
דביקותו במשמעותי-במהותו. היהדות דוגלת בערכים נעלים, מעל
"העולם הזה", ערכים הרמוזים בביטוי "חיי עולם", אשר יונקים את
משמעותם מהיוחם סמלים של הוויה על-אישית, על-חברתית, ועל
אנושית. חיבה זו של לימוד תורה מחבטאת במושג "תורה לשמה" - הוא
לימוד שערכו והסיפוק שהוא מסב נובעים מעצם חויית המגע עם מה
שהוא ערכי במהותו - המשקע הספרותי של מגע האדם הישראלי עם
ההוויה שמעבר לנגלה, לארצי. הנחלת חיבת "תורה לשמה" מעניקה
לחניך את התענוג הנפשי של עשייה שהיא ערכית במהותה, ואשר בה

כרוכה הפעלת מיטב כוחו השכלי וחיידוד בינתו. הלומד תורה לשמה חווה מימוש עצמי מלא בה בשעה שהוא שט בעולם הרוחני שמעבר לעצמו.

המצוות שבין אדם למקום הן מערכת סמלים המצביעים על העולם שמעבר. שמירה השבת ועינוגה, ברכות הנהנים, תפילה, ההימנעות ממאכלות אסורים - כל מערכת הקדושה, נועדה להמחיש סמלית את התחום שמעבר. החניך שלנו לפחות יבין ויכבד את ערכה.³

החניוך היהדותי נועד לטפח את לחישה המצפון כי אין "אני ואפסי עוד", אלא אני מצווה ועומד ועלי לחת דין וחשבון על מעשיי. ללחישה זו ניתן קול וממשות בלימוד תורה לשמה ובעשיית המצוה שבין אדם למקום. באלה, ההוייה שמעבר למוחש ולנגלה מתממשת, ובפני החסד שלה - כהווייה המעניקה משמעות לחיי השעה החולפים. במגעו של הפרט עמה מתאשרים הטוב והערכי שבו, כמענה לשכונגדו. חווייה זו היא בסיס לתובנה כי אין העולם הנגלה תכלית הכול וקנה מדה לכול: ההצלחה בו והכשלון, השמחה בו והצער הם חולפים לעומת "חיי עולם" (ש) נטע בתוכנו.

ב. קבלת התורה כמורה דרך בתחום שבין אדם לחברו, עם ההכרה שקביעותיה המוסריות הן פרי פעולה פרשנית בלתי נפסקת:

כוונתי בזה לשתיים:

1. ההכרה שבהערכותיה המוסריות יש בתורה כדי לשמש מורה דרך היום. יש להצביע ראשונה על שש האמרות האחרונות שבעשרת הדברות - הן והנחותיהן ותולדותיהן:

כיבוד הורים - כהכרת טובה וכמתחייב לקיום המשפחה, שהיא תא

החברה;

"לא תרצח", כמתחייב מן "בצלם אלהים עשה את האדם";

"לא תנאף", כמתחייב מיחס הדביקות ("ודבק באשתו והיו לבשר

אחד") האמורים להוצר בין איש לאשתו;

"לא תגנב", המאשר את מושג הקניין והבעלות ברכוש, שהפרתו

מטיל תהו ובהו בחברה;

"לא תענה...עד שקר", בסיס של יחסי אימון במשפט ובמשא ומתן,

שבלעדיהם מתערער הדיבוק החברתי;

"לא תחמוד", סיג לכל האיסורים הנזכרים לעיל.

הדברים אמורים ב"כללים הגדולים" שהמסורת זיהתה:

"ואהבת לרעך כמוך (ויקרא יט, יח): ר' עקיבא אומר זה כלל גדול בתורה. בן עזאי אומר: זה ספר תולדות אדם (ביום ברוא אלוהים אדם בדמות אלוהים עשה אוחו, בראשית ה, א) - זה כלל גדול מזה" (ספרא, פרשת קדושים, ד, יב).

אחר כך בסיכומים שסיכמו נביאים וכתובים מהי חמצית דרישת ה' מן האדם, כפי שריכזם ר' שמלאי בסוף מסכת מכות:
"דרש ר' שמלאי: תרי"ג מצוות נאמרו למשה...
בא דוד והעמידן על י"א דכתיב (תהילים טו): מזמור לדוד, ה' מי יגוד באהליך ומי ישכון בהר קדשך? הולך חמים, ופועל צדק, ודובר אמת בלבבו. לא רגל על לשונו, לא עשה לרעהו רעה, וחרפה לא נשא על קרובו. נבזה בעיניו נמאס, ואת ידאי ה' יכבד; נשבע להרע ולא ימיר, כספו לא נתן בנשך, ושוחד על נקי לא לקח. עושה אלה לא ימוט לעולם.

בא ישעיהו והעמידן על ו' דכתיב (ישעיה לג): הולך צדקות, ודובר מישרים, מואס בבצע מעשקות, נוער כפיו מחמוך בשוחד, אוטם אזנו משמוע דמים, ועוצם עיניו מראות ברע.
בא מיכה והעמידן על ג' דכתיב (מיכה ו): הגיד לך אדם מה טוב ומה ה' דורש ממך, כי אם עשות משפט ואהבת חסד והצנע לכת עם אלוהיך.

חזר ישעיהו והעמידן על ב' שנאמר (ישעיהו נו): כה אמר ה' שמרו משפט ועשו צדקה.

בא עמוס והעמידן על א' שנאמר (עמוס ה): כה אמר ה' לבית ישראל דרשוני וחיו. מקשה עליו נחמן בר יוסף: שמא כוונתך "דרשוני בכל התורה כולה"? אלא בא חבקוק והעמידן על א' שנאמר (חבקוק ב): וצדיק באמונתו יחיה".

גם החכמים קבעו עקרונות-על, כגון: "דרכיה (של התורה) דרכי נועם וכל נחיבותיה שלום" (משלי ג, יז); השווה משנה תורה לרמב"ם סוף פרק י' בהלכות מלכים).

יש להגיש אל החניך את הכללים האלה, וכיוצא בהם, ואת חזון הגשמתם בנביאים, כדי שימצא סיפק ביהדות לשאיפותיו לחברה מתוקנת ולאורח חיים של טעם ושל צדק, ולא ישעה אל זרים לשאוב מהם עיקרי מוסר⁴.

2. מן התפקידים העיקריים של החינוך היהדותי הוא להציג את פירוש כללי התורה המוסריים ופירוטם הלכה למעשה כהליך מחמשך. בתוך

התהליך הזה יש מתח מתמיד בכל הדורות בין המגמה הבדלנית-הלאומית
שבחורה לבין המגמה הכלל-אנושית שבה; וכן בין הדגשת היסוד
המסתורי שבקדושה, המתגלם בסמלי עבודת האל, לבין הדגשת היסוד
המוסרי שבה. מתח זה ניכר כבר בטענת הנבואה להעדפת היסוד המוסרי
בברית ה' עם עמו על פני היסוד הפולחני שבה, והוא נמשך לאורך
הדורות בפרשנות המקרא ושאר מקורות היהדות. במתחים אלה התבטאה
ההתמודדות הנצחית של דורות יהודים עם המשמעות המחייבת של ספרי
היסוד.

יש אשר המקור המקראי הרחיב אופק ובאו חז"ל והצרו אותו; כגון
חיוב משפט-מות לרוצח, שבבראשית ט הל על כל בני נוח, ובאו חז"ל
והגבילוהו בישראל למקרה שהנרצח הוא ישראל, בעוד שישראל שרצח
גוי, פטור מדיני אדם, ודינו מסור לשמים (מכילתא על שמות כא, יד,
וראה שם את החמיהה של איסי בן יהודה). נחלקו חז"ל בינם לבין
עצמם בהיקף המונח "אדם" במקרא: ר' מאיר כלל בו גויים, ולמד
מהדבור "אשר יעשה אותם האדם וחי בהם" (ויקרא יח, ה) "שאפילו גוי
ועוסק בתורה שהוא ככהן גדול" (סנהדרין ט, ע"א). כנגדו גזר ר'
שמעון בן יוחאי "אחם קרויין אדם ואין הגויים קרויין אדם" (יבמות
סא ע"א). האחרונים חלקו בפירוש דברי רשב"י: האם נחכוון לומר
שאינ בגוי מהות אדם באותו מובן שיש ביהודי מהות אדם (כדעת
המיסטיקנים), או שמא נחכוון לומר רק שבתוקף החורה המונח אדם
מתכוון לאיש סחם, ולפי שבכל חוקה איש סחם הוא מי שכפוף לאותה
חוקה, כך סחם אדם בתורה משמעו ישראל, שלבדם כפופים לתורה (כדעת
ר' צבי הירש חיות בחידושו ליבמות). חינוך יהודתי מתוקן יסב את
חשומת לבו של החניך להתנגשויות בין מקרא והלכה הבאות בדברי
פרשני המקרא מתוך השפעת פשטם של כחובים. דמב"ם פסק (על פי
החלמוד): הגוי אין לו הונייה (אינו מוגן בחוק מהונאה), שנאמר:
(לא) חונו איש את אחיו (ויקרא כה, יד); משנה תורה, הלכות מכירה
יג, ז). בא רד"ק בפירושו על ההלים טו (מזמור המובא לעיל) והורה
אחרת:

"לא עשה לרעהו רעה וחרפה לא נשא על קרובו: ורעהו וקרובו
הוא שיש לו משא ומתן עמו, או שכנו. ובמאמרו 'לא עשה לרעהו רעה'
אינו אומר כי לאחרים עשה, אלא דבר הכתוב על ההווה (על המקרה
השכיח), כמו 'ולא חונו איש את עמיתו' (ויק' כה, יז), אינו אומר
כי מותר לו להונות אדם אחר שהוא נכדי שאינו עמיתו. וכן 'לא
חענה ברעך עד שקר', אינו אומר כי מאחר שאינו רעו מותר להעיד
עדות שקר, אלא לפי שמשאו ומחננו ועסקיו עמו. וכן הוא מנהג הלשון
בהרבה מקומות".

אחד הגורמים לדחיית המסורת על ידי חניכינו הוא חזוה הקפואה. אין הם יודעים דבר על תולדות פרשנות המקורות, ועל המגמות המחנצחות בה. אינם מכירים בהשפעה ההדדית המתמדת של הכתובים על בני הדורות, ושל פרשני הדורות על הבנת הכתובים. תרבות יהודית שורשית תיתכן רק מתוך הידברות בין המקורות לבני הדור, שבה מחבטאת דביקות בני הדור במקור עם השתתפותם בהוה ובתרבות ההוה⁵⁴.

ג. הנהגת אורה-חיים היוצר קהילה.

התוצר האדיאלי שלנו יבקש לגור בסביבה יהודית, שכן מצוות רבות ביהדות מצריכות צוותא:

"אלו דברים שאדם אוכל פירותיהם בעולם הזה והקרן קיימת לו לעולם הבא. ואלו הן, כבוד אב ואם-וגמילות חסדים והשכמת בית המדרש שחרית וערבית והכנסת אורחים וביקור חולים והכנסת כלה ולויית המת ועיון חפילה והבאת שלום בין אדם לחבירו ותלמוד תורה כנגד כולם" (חפילת השחר).

כמעט כל ההנהגות האלה מדבקות אדם לזולתו, וכמה מהן מצריכות הקמת מוסדות קהלתיים, כגון "גמילות חסדים" המתגשמת (למשל) בקרן הלוואות; "השכמת בית המדרש", המניחה קיום בית מדרש-בית כנסת; "תלמוד תורה", הדורש החזקת מורים ומוסדות לימוד למבוגרים ולקטנים. ככל שמדבים בהנהגות אלה, כן מתרבות הסיבות לקיבוץ חברים וקרבת שכנות ושיתוף משאבים כדי להקים את המוסדות לקיום מצוות כאלה. וכך נוצרת קהילת יהודים המשתתפים בשמחות ובצרות, המסייעים זה לזה בעת הצורך, והמהווים בית-גידול לילדיהם באורח חיים יהודי.⁶

ד. זיקה לכלל ישראל בכל ארצות פזוריהם:

האדם נמשך אל דומהו. בעבר היו מרבית היהודים בארצות פזוריהם שוחפים בתודעת אחדותם כבני עם-ברית ה', בדביקותם לאורה-חיים מסורתי (במדה פחותה או יתירה), ובמעמד של גוף נכרי בעיני שאר תושבי הארצות. בעיני היהודים רב היה המשותף ביניהם לבין עצמם מאשר ביניהם לשאר תושבי הארצות שבתוכם ישבו. איחדו את היהודים

הפזורים "שפה אחת" של התייחסות אל היהודי ואל הגוי, תחושת מצוקת ההווה וחקות הגאולה, לוח המועדים ואורח-חיים, ותודעת קשר מוצא "שבטי". לאחר השואה ויסוד מדינת ישראל איחוד העם עומד על שותפות בזכרון האסון הלאומי, תחושת הקשר השבטי, וענין משותף בבניינה ובגורלה של המדינה. גורמים אלה אינם מלווים את האדם תדיר ואין בהם כדי להבטיח קשר קיים בין הפוזות היהודים. רק תודעה מטופחת שיטחית (באמצעות חינוך) של (1). שותפות במוצא, (2). שותפות במעמד קיומי (בני עם-ברית), ו - (3). שותפות בחזון אחרית (תפקיד שיש לישראל למלא ב"תיקון העולם") עשויה לקיים את אחדות האומה בתנאי ההווה.

שלושה מדכיבים אלה של תודעת הייחוד היהודי כלולים בסיפור ההיסטורי-לאומי שיסודו בתנ"ך ופיתוחו הקלאסי במקורות הז"ל. הפנמת הסיפור הזה הוא הגורם המכריע ביצירת זהות יהודית. תפקיד החינוך היהודי הוא לטפח הפנמה זו, באמצעות הכניית לימודים המדגישה את השותפויות האלה.

טיפוח ההכרה בקרב יהודי מדינת ישראל כי אחים הם ליהודי התפוזות אינו פחות חשוב מטיפוח ההכרה בין יהודי התפוזות כי אחים הם ליהודי המדינה. שני מחנות אלה השקועים כל אחד בבעיות קיום מאד שונות מסחכנים בהתנכרות הדדית גוברת. רק טיפוח מכוון של יניקה ממקורות השראה משותפים, ושותפות בחוויות ערכיות זהות (תורה לשמה, קדושה, ערכי מוסר הנגזרים מאותם ספרי יסוד בכהליך פרשני נמשך) יקיימו את תודעת האחדות של הפזורים. היחס לענין "קבוץ גלויות", ובלבושו האמוני, "מצות יישוב א"י" מפריד בין חושבי המדינה לבין חושבי התפוזות. נראה כאילו האומה נחלקת בין קבוצה המגשימה ערך מקודש על כלל האומה בעבר, לבין קבוצה - הרוב היום - שזנחה אותו ערך, ובכך נחלשה מעיקר האומה המוביל לקראת "הגאולה השלימה". לכאורה כבר היה בעבר מצב דומה למצבנו היום - יישוב יהודי בא"י ובו-זמנית קיבוצי יהודים גדולים ויוצרים בגולה. לא ברור לנו כיצד יישבו היהודים בגולת בבל במשך מאות שנים אח הסחירה בין הפילוחיהם על קיבוץ גלויות לבין ישיבתם בהוץ לארץ. יחכן שגורמים מדיניים וכלכליים השפיעו. בקרב ההמונים שררה אז נטייה לתלוח שינויים מפליגים במעמדם ביזמה אלוהית. בימינו היזמה האנושית היא לא רק מוצדקת בעיני הרבים, היא משובחת, ולפיכך החריפה בינינו המבוכה בפני הימנעות מרבית האומה מלהצטרף לבנין המדינה. בעתיד הנצפה מבוכה זו לא תפוג. כי חינוך יהודי אוחנטי יקיים את המבוכה והמתיחות. מאידך היסוד "המיטלטל" של

היהדות די בו לספק תוכן יהודי ומשמעות ליושבי התפוצות. השואפים לאחות את הקרע בין מעשיהם ותפילותיהם יהוו, כמו בעבר, זרם דק של עלייה.

כאמור, חינוך יהדותי יוכל לקשר בין תושביה היהודים של מדינת ישראל לבין היהודים בתפוצות במדה - ורק במדה - שיטע בלבבות בני א"י את ההכרה כי המדינה אינה אלא כלי המשרת את המטרה העליונה של "תיקון עולם במלכות שדי" (לפי כל פרשנות המקיימת את העיקרון שהמדינה אינה אלא אמצעי להגשמת ערכים אוניברסליים); ובלבבות בני חו"ל את ההכרה כי "תקון עולם" תחילתו בתקון מעשיו של "עם ברית - ה'" פנימה. במדה שיצליח החינוך היהדותי בשתי המחנות יתקרבו הלבבות: החברה היהודית בא"י יחתרו לאורח חיים השואף להגשים ערכים עליונים, ובני חו"ל יימשכו, מתוקף הזדהותם עם עקרונות היהדות, להשתתף בניסוי הנועז הנעשה במדינה להגשמתם.

אף על פי שאין תפקידי לדון באמצעים להשגת תוצר החינוך המתואר, מבקש אני לומר דבר על ענין שהוא ספק אמצעי ספק תוכן לימודי, והוא - השפה העברית. ענין זה נוגע כמובן רק לחינוך יהודי בתפוצות.

מטענם היהודי של המושגים והערכים שנזכרו לעיל אינו מועבר בתרגום. אצלנו תרגומים ממקור עברי (או ארמי) נועדו לשמש כעזרה להבנת המקור, לפיכך לא היה יכול שום תרגום לבוא במקום המקור, אלא רק בצדו, כבאור למה שנקרא או נשמע. בנידון, המנהג אפילו קיפח את ההלכה: רשאי אדם, למשל, לומר את ה"שמע" בכל לשון אשר הוא שומע; בפועל במשך כל הדורות את השמע קוראים אך ורק בעברית, בגלל המטען האצור בתיבות העבריות דוקא.

שאפשר להנחיל את השפה העברית בגולה עד כדי יכולת להבין את המקורות בלשונם הוא דבר המוכח מן הנסיון - כשחכנית הלימודים מקציבה שעות ומשאבים וכוח אדם מיומן להוראה זו. הדבר תלוי בנכונות הציבור לראות בקניין השפה מטרה נחוצה לקניין המורשת היהודית בצורה משמעותית. נכונות זו, מצדה, תלויה בנחיצות שח הציבור בחינוך יהודי משמעותי.

סברה היא, כי חינוך יהדותי משמעותי ימשך את הנהנים ממנו והנכנים ממנו אל העמקת ידיעתם בשפה העברית. ככל שיחוו התלמידים סיפוק נפשי בלימודיהם כן תגדל נכונותם להשקיע בהם מאמץ, ואפילו על

חשבון השתכפותם המלאה בתרבות הנכרית. אך הזדהות כזאת עם היהדות
ספק אם תיוולד ללא יניקה ישירה ממקורותיה. מאידך, חינוך יהדותי
רדוד לא יצדיק את עצמו בעיני חניכים, ויוליד התנגדות ואדישות עד
סיכול כל מאמצי המורה. החניכים יבקשו את סיפוקם ממקורות
רוחניים ותרבותיים זרים.

לכאורה עשיתי לי מלאכה קלה כשהחעלמתי מחנאי המציאות הקשים של
החינוך היהדותי, וציירתי דמות של תוצר-חינוך שכולה חזון, אם לא
הזייה. תוחלתי היא כי השמעת הרהורי מחנך-הדיוט כמוני באזני
בעלי מקצוע הועיל לעורר מחשבות מכוונות יותר לפתרון החינוך
היהדותי. בזאת באתי על סיפוקי גם אם בסוף שיקול יעמדו דברי אלה
כמטרה להתנגדות בלבד.

הערות

1. כוונתי להציע גישה לחכנים יהודיים שאינה מבוססת על תורת התגלות מיוחדת, או על עקרונות אמונה המונחים מראש, ואפילו לא על הנחת יחוד היהדות (שלא לדבר על עליונותה על שאר הדתות). את הגישה שאני מבקש להציע אימצתי ממחקר הדתות, המחייב את תופעת האמונה והרואה בהן יסוד שבטבע האדם והחברה התקינה. על גישה זו הרחבתי במאמרי "זהוה, חבונה ודת" בתוך הקובץ "על המקרא ועל היהדות" (חל אביב, עם עובד, חשמ"ד), עמודים 274 - 247. בעמודים 349 - 275 באותו קובץ כונסו גם מהדהודי בהשלכות גישה זו להוראה בנושאי יהדות. על סמך גישה זו, אני מניח כי בכוחן של היצירות הספרותיות היסודיות של היהדות לענות לצרכים הרוחניים הטבועים בנשמת התלמיד ולכן אין צורך בהנחות מוקדמות להצדיק את לימודן.

2. לימוד היסטוריה בחכנית הלימודים שאני מדמיון משרת את תולדות המחשבה והספרות היהודית - יצירתה של שלשלת אנשי מופת. מי הם האב-דגמים במורשת היהודית שהפנמחם יוצרת זהות אישית יהודית? מבחינה מסויימת האב-דגמים הם כולם היסטוריים. המקרא הוא היסטוריה מבוארת, סיפור תולדות העם כדו-שיה וצוף משברים עם אלוהיו. קובצי משפט, כינון עבודת אלוהים ממוסדת, דברי שיר וחכמה ונבואה משובצים בסיפור ותלויים בגיבוריו. הסיפור מגלם תורת אלהות, תורת הבריאה, תורת מדינה, מסכת דרך ארץ ותורה אחרית הימים - הכל שוטף בזרם הזמן. גם התורה שבעל פה עוברת בשלשלת קבלה שרבים מחוליוחה הם אנשי מופת. לאחר מכן נוצרות יצירות שהן הרחבת הקבלה וילידיה: פרשנות המקרא, היצירה ההלכתית (השובות, סיכומים), פיוט, הגות, ספרות אגדות, ספרות מוסר, קבלה. כל אלה כלולים אצלי במושג ספרות-יסוד ופיתוחה שהם עיקר החוכן הלימודי. זרימת יצירה זו היא ההיסטוריה הרוחנית של עמנו - היא ביטויה של היהדות. תפיסת היהדות כרצף של התמודדות עם דעיונות-עד, זרם יצירה בהשראת אב-דגמים קדמונים על-זמניים, היא המנחה את החכנית שלי.

אני מבחין איפוא בין ההיסטוריה הרוחנית של היהודים (שגיבושיה הספרותיים מגדירים את היהדות) לבין ההיסטוריה החומרית של היהודים. ההיסטוריה החומרית היא בית היוצר של הרוחנית ובמדה מסויימת קבעה את חכונותיה (כגון שפוחיה). ובאותה מידה צריך לדעת אותה כדי להבין אותן חכונות. אבל עמדת היסוד של היצירה הרוחנית

היהודית היא עליונות הרוח על החומר ואי-שיעבודה לו. עמדה זו ראוי שחנחה את חוכנית הלימודים גם כן. יצירות הרוח המופתיים של היהדות חצו גבולות ותקופות ודלגו על מחסומי לשונות; כך צריכה חכנית הלימודים להציג אותן כעולם-עד נתון בעולם חולף, עולם-עד המשתנה מתוך התפתחות פנימית ומהמפגש התמידי עם עולמות זרים שהוא נתון בקרבם.

ההיסטוריה החומרית של עם ישראל, וספרות ישראל במובנה הרחב, הן בגדר חינוך יהדותי במדה שהן מאירות את ספרי היסוד, בין בהארת הנסיבות שבהן קמו והתפשטו, בין בהציגן את החולדות והחוצאות של ספרי היסוד. לימוד ההיסטוריה החומרית של עם ישראל לגופה, וספרות (ואמנות) ישראל לסוגיה ולתקופותיה אינני חופס כחינוך יהדותי, אלא כנושאי לימוד שהחינוך היהדותי המוצלח יגיע וידרבן את החניך להחענין בהם. יש בהם בוודאי כדי להעמיק את התודעה הלאומית, לעבות את הזהות הלאומית, ולחבל את הקשר ליהדות בחבלין של הנאות אסתטיות. אך כמקנה משמעות לחיים יהודים, וערכים על-זמניים היוצרים קשרי-נפש עם שלשלת הדורות, מדף ספרי היסוד, המשותף לכל הדורות, הוא המקור החינוכי העיקרי.

3. במאמר "זהות, חבונה ודת" (ראה הערה 1) הארכתי בענין נחיצות הסמל הדתי; כחבתי בין השאר:

"כיצד אפשר לצייר או לדמות את היבטיו של המימד ההוא, הנעלם? כיצד להמשיג היבטים אלה כדי להרהר בהם? כיצד להביע אותם כדי לשותף בהם את הזולת? רק באמצעות סמלים - הפצים או מונחים או סיפורים או טקסטים או התנהגויות, שכל כולם לא באו אלא להצביע על מציאות שהיא מעבר להם. היכרויות גלמיות של מימד המעבר לובשות צורה רק באמצעות סמלים; ורק בהם אפשר לטפח את ההכרה ולהגות בה, להביע אותה לזולת ולעוררה בליבו. כי לסמלי מימד המעבר יש סגולה לא רק לרמז וליצג, אלא אף לעורר לפעולה. הסמלים הם כלים המכילים את החפעלות הנפש, ובאמצעותם אפשר גם להפעיל את הנפש...

ערכם המוחלט של כל אביזרי הדת והנהגותיה הוא בסימולם את המימד שמעבר ובהחדותם את הכרתו לחוך חיי האדם. אין בזאת המצאת מימד שהוא טפל לעצמותו של האדם, אלא מתן ביטוי ולבוש למימד הנעלם שכל אדם מכיר בו. בכך מתאפשר לאדם לחוש, להתעורר ולעורר אחרים למימד זה. אמנם של אביזרי הדת היא לפי המידה שהם מבטאים ומרחיבים את המימד שמעבר. היא אמת המוכיחה את עצמה למשמש בהם על ידי כך, שבאמצעותם הכרתו את המימד הולכת ומתגברת, הולכת ומעמיקה. ועם זאת, יסוד ההבנה בסמלי הדת הוא להכיר שהאמת אינה

קסמל, אלא במסומל בו, וכי מערכת סמלים דתית רומזת לא רק אל מה שמעבר לאדם וגדול ממנו, אלא אל שמעבר וגדול אפילו ממנה. האמת שבדת אינה כלולה בה, אלא במציאות שהיא רומזת אליה בסמליה, ומעוררת באמצעותם להכרתה. לפיכך ניתן לומר, שהדת מקנה לאדם תבונה להבין בתחומי מציאות שרק היא פותחת לו" (עמ' 250-252).

4. מדף ספרי היסוד היהודיים אינו עומד בבדידות. ניתן לגזור ערכי יסוד קיומיים גם מספרים הנמצאים על מדפים אחרים. מטרת גישה זו, כאמור, היא שהתלמיד היהודי לא ישעה אל זרים בכדי לשאוב מהם ערכי יסוד קיומיים. בכל התקופות קיימו היהודים משא ומתן מתמיד עם העולם התרבותי שבקרבם ישבו. במשא ומתן זה נבלעו בתוך היהדות ערכים שמקורם זר אלא שנתפסו על ידי היהודים כמתחייבים מהנחות יהודיות. לדוגמא: הערך דמוקרטיה נוצר מחוץ ליהדות, אולם הוגים יהודים בקשו ומצאו לו סימוכין במקורות היהדות (ראה לדוגמא את מאמרו של אבי ז"ל *Judaism and the democratic ideal* בספרו *Simon Greenberg, Foundations of a Faith*, 113-134). תהליך זה של אימוץ ויהוד כל "הישר והטוב" בתרבות הגויים הוא שמנע את החישנות היהדות ואת התאבנותה.

5. על עניני מוסר המקרא והיהדות ובעיותיו ראה מסתו של חיים יהודה רות, "התנודה המוסרית באתיקה היהודית", בספרו דת וערכי החיים, ירושלים: מאגנס, חשל"ג, עמ' 89-106; ש.ה. ברגמן, "הרחבה וצמצום באתיקה היהודית" בחוברתו השמים והארץ הוצאת שדמות (ללא תאריך), עמ' כט-לח; ומאמריי "אתם קרויים אדם..." , על המקרא ועל היהדות, עמ' 55-67; "כיצד יש לדרוש את התורה בזמן הזה", הסגולה והכוח, הוצאת ספריית פועלים/הקיבוץ המאוחד חשמ"ו עמ' 49-67.

6. בדיון על הסעיף הזה עם שלמה פוקס עלה הבירור הבא (אני מביא את תמצית הדברים):
מי שהדור ערכים יהודיים יבקש "עולם" התומך בערכיו. "עולם" זה עשוי להוות מובלעת - חבורה שבמכוון מטפחת אורח חיים שונה משל סביבתה, כלומר תת-תרבות. שאלה נוקבת היא אם חינוך יהודי מוצלח אינו מוחנה ביצירת תת-תרבות. ושמה תוצרים מוצלחים של כל שיטת חינוך המטפחת רעיונות וערכים מוגדרים שואפים ליצור מובלעת או תת-תרבות שבתוכה יגשימו את עצמם באופן מירבי. ראה גם בסוף המאמר.

7. הרחבתי בנושא האופי היהודי של מדינת ישראל במאמרי

J.S. Ruskay et al., eds. : בתוך The task of Masorti Judaism
Deepening the Commitment: Zionism and the
Conservative /Masorti Movement, 137-146

We Were as Those Who Dream:
A Portrait of the Ideal Product of an Ideal Jewish Education*

Moshe Greenberg

**(*draft of June 1994 - for internal use only;
translated from the Hebrew by Daniel Marom and Marc Rosenstein)**

I was asked to suggest aims towards which educators might consider directing their efforts, and for the attainment of which they might plan strategies. When I conceived of the aims which are set forth herein, I did not tailor them according to the measure of the capabilities of the existing system, but rather by what seems to me to be the inherently desirable and necessary aims of a Jewish education (the concept of a Jewish education will be clarified in the next paragraph). The intent of this proposal, and the intent of the discussion of it, should be the elucidation of the direction in which we are headed - are we directed towards the right destination? - and not the elucidation of the ends it happens to be in our power to reach at the moment. He who concentrates only on adapting his aims to the powers he has to achieve them will find his powers dwindling as his fear of failure grows, whereas he who knowingly sets himself an aim which is beyond the powers he has to achieve it will discover that his power is greater than he had originally thought. While despair may arise out of the apparent chasm between the ultimate aim and the power required for its achievement, the following counsel is available: cover the distance to the attainment of the aim by moving towards it one station at a time, each one attainable, and each, with its conquest, serving as a launching point for the effort to reach the next. In any case, we need a distant aim so that we can orient ourselves with reference to it - are we moving closer to it or not?

I want to portray the ideal product of an ideal Jewish education - that is, an education whose purpose it is to cultivate a person with knowledge, values, sensitivities, identification and a sense of belonging which flow from the sources of Judaism. I do not attempt to portray an educated Jew - a sub-species of the educated person, a Jew who has acquired general knowledge as well as knowledge of Judaism. I assume that the person I am portraying will have acquired knowledge, values, identification and sensitivities in addition to those which are Jewish - for example, in the area of science (knowledge of nature and its laws), history (the development of nations and cultures), art (literature, music, painting), thought (philosophy, other faiths, social criticism). An implication of this assumption is that the ideal product of an ideal Jewish education along the lines of my portrait will have to endure the tensions which exist between the two worlds in which he lives - the Jewish and the general. This is an important topic which is worthy of analysis.

What is the Jewish component of the imaginary creature I call the ideal product of an ideal Jewish education? It is the content of the accepted fundamental books of Judaism - the Bible, Talmud, and Midrash, and the body of commentary which has grown up around these fundamental books in the course of the generations, be it commentary in the narrow

sense of the word (e.g., Rashi), or systematic thought or creative literature seeking to translate the content of the fundamental books to a contemporary vernacular - the languages of philosophy, of morality, of mysticism. These fundamental books contain the axioms which define our relationship to the universe and to our environment - living and inanimate, human, national, and familial; they contain prescriptions for ways of living (proverbs of wisdom, commandments, laws) and archetypes and models for behavior (in tales and legends). The role of Jewish education is to transmit significant portions of these contents to the student, with "significant" having two connotations:

- i) having reason and meaning in the eyes of the student, touching his heart, addressing matters which concern him;
- ii) sufficiently representative of the entire corpus: a measure which will be capable of providing an authentic taste of the original, to the degree that the student will be impressed by its power.

If the student receives "significant" portions of the fundamental books, in both these senses of the word, he is likely to recognize the moral and intellectual power of Jewish sources and to feel the need to resort to them through the years. The ultimate objective is for the student to be engaged with fundamental existential issues and for him to discover his own Jewish identity while being involved in this activity, through the encounter with Jewish sources. Our aspiration is for the product of ideal Jewish education to feel that his fundamental existential values are derived from the basic books of Judaism (1,2).

Jewish education is to be evaluated according to its success in fostering in its graduates four qualities:

1. Love of learning Torah (i.e., the fundamental books and all that is in them) and love of the fulfillment of the commandments between man and God:

That is, love of experiences and activities which have no material, utilitarian purpose, but which are good in and of themselves. All those who occupy themselves with these obtain satisfaction from the sense of having pursued that which is essentially meaningful. Judaism professes transcendent values above and beyond "this world," values hinted to in the expression "eternal life" (*chayeh olam*), drawing their meaning from their being symbols of a realm which is extra-personal, extra-societal, and extra-human. This love of learning Torah finds expression in the concept of "(the study of) Torah for its own sake" (*Torah lishma*), learning which derives its value and satisfaction from the actual experience of contact with something of essential value - the literary precipitation of the encounter of the Jew with the realm which transcends the visible, the earthly. Fostering a craving for *Torah lishma* bestows upon the student the spiritual pleasure of activity which is of essential value, which involves the activation of his highest intellectual powers and the refinement of his understanding. One who studies Torah for its own sake experiences total self-actualization precisely as he passes through a spiritual world which is beyond his self.

The commandments between man and God, are a system of symbols which point to the transcendent realm. Observing the Sabbath and taking pleasure in it, reciting the blessings of thanks, prayer, and refraining from forbidden foods - the whole system of sanctification (*kedushah*) - was intended to provide a symbolic representation of the transcendent realm. Our student will minimally understand and respect the value of these symbols (3).

The purpose of Jewish education is to amplify the whisper of conscience which denies that "I am and there is nothing other than myself." It should rather affirm the statement that I stand commanded and will have to account for my actions. This whisper is granted a voice and body in the study of Torah for its own sake and in the performance of the commandments between man and God. In these, the realm which is beyond the concrete and the visible is substantiated, in its glorious countenance, as a reality which grants meaning to life's fleeting moments. In the individual's encounter with this realm, that which is good and worthy in his being are affirmed, as a response to that which stands against him. This experience is the basis for the insight that the visible world is not the be-all and end-all nor is it the measure of all things: the successes and failures and the joys and sorrows of the visible world are transient in comparison with "eternal life He has implanted within us."

2. Acceptance of the Torah as a guide in the area of interpersonal morality, with the recognition that the ethical decrees of the Torah are the fruit of unceasing interpretive activity:

Here I am referring to two concepts:

i) The recognition that in its moral judgements, the Torah can serve as a guide in our day and age. One should begin by pointing out the six last statements in the ten commandments - them, the deeper assumptions upon which they are based, and their subsequent development:

Honoring of parents - as an expression of gratitude and as an obligation which flows from the desire to preserve the family, the basic cell of society;

"You shall not murder," as an obligation which follows from "in His image did God make man;"

"You shall not commit adultery," as an obligation which follows from the "clinging" ("and he clings to his wife so that they become as one flesh") which is to be created in the relationship between husband and wife;

"You shall not steal," which affirms the concept of property and ownership of goods, and the abrogation of which leads to social chaos;

"You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor," the basis of trust in law and in negotiation, without which social bonds collapse;

"You shall not covet," a preventive measure for all of the above-mentioned prohibitions.

These are applications of the "larger principles" that the tradition identifies:

"'Love your neighbor as yourself' (Leviticus 19:18): Rabbi Akiva said: This is a great principle of the Torah. Ben Azzai said: 'This is the book of the descendants of Adam (when God created man [adam], He made him in the likeness of God)' (Genesis 5:1). This is even a greater principle."

Sifra, Kodashim 4:12

And later on, in the summaries in the Prophets and the Writings of the essence of God's demands of man, as collected by Rabbi Simlai at the end of tractate Makkot (Babylonian Talmud):

"Rabbi Simlai when preaching said: Six hundred and thirteen precepts were communicated to Moses. . . .

David came and reduced them to eleven principles, as it is written (Psalm 15) 'A Psalm of David, Lord, who shall dwell in Your holy mountain? - [i] He that walks uprightly, and [ii] works righteousness, and [iii] speaks truth in his heart; that [iv] has no slander in his tongue, [v] nor does evil to his fellow, [vi] nor takes up a reproach against one near to him, [vii] in whose eyes a vile person is despised, but [viii] he honours those that fear the Lord, [ix] He swears to his own hurt and changes not, [x] He does not put out his money on interest, [xi] nor takes a bribe against the innocent. He that does these things shall never be moved.'

...Isaiah came and reduced them to six [principles], as it is written, (Isaiah 33:15-16) '[i] He that walks righteously, and [ii] speaks uprightly, [iii] He that despises the gain of oppressions, [iv] that shakes his hand from the holding of bribes, [v] that stops his ear from hearing of blood, [vi] and shuts his eyes from looking upon evil.'

... Micah came and reduced them to three [principles], as it is written, (Micah 6:8). 'It has been told to you, O man, what is good, and what the Lord requires of you: [i] only to do justly, and [ii] to love mercy and [iii] to walk humbly before God.'

... Again came Isaiah and reduced them to two [principles] as it is said, (Isaiah 56:1). 'Thus says the Lord: [i] Keep justice and [ii] do righteousness.'

Amos came and reduced them to one [principle], as it is said, (Amos 5:4) 'For thus says the Lord to the house of Israel, seek Me and live.'"

The Sages also stipulated general principles, such as "Her (the Torah's) ways are pleasant ways and all her paths are peaceful" (Proverbs 3:17; cf. Mishneh Torah, Laws of Kings, end of Chapter 10).

These principles and others like them should be presented to the student, together with

the prophetic vision of their fulfillment, so that he will be able to find in Judaism the answer to his aspirations for a good society and for a meaningful and just way of life, and will not turn to foreign sources in order to derive principles of morality.

ii) One of the principal functions of Jewish education is to present the interpretation of the moral laws of the Torah and of their delineation into laws of practice as an ongoing process. In this process, there is a continuous tension, throughout the generations, between the particular-national and the universal-human trends in the Torah; similarly, there is a continuous tension between the emphasis on the mysterious element in sanctity (*kedushah*), which is embodied in symbols used in the worship of God, and the emphasis on its moral element. This tension is already apparent in the prophets' claim as to the primacy of the moral element over the ritual element in the Covenant between God and His people, and it continues through the generations in Biblical commentary and in other Jewish sources. In these tensions, we find an expression of the eternal confrontation of generations of Jews with the obligatory implication of their fundamental books.

There are times when the Biblical source took a broad view and the Sages narrowed it; for example, the requirement of a death sentence for murderers, which in chapter 9 of the Book of Genesis applies to all the descendants Noah, was limited in Israel, by the Sages, so as to include only the case in which the victim is a Jew; at the same time, they deemed a Jew who murders a gentile to be exempt from human judgment and left his fate to heaven (Mechilta to Exodus 21:14; cf. the reservations of Issi ben Yehuda, *ibid.*). The Sages were divided among themselves with respect to the scope of the term "human" (*adam*) in the Bible: Rabbi Meir included gentiles, basing his position on the text "...[laws] by the pursuit of which humans (*ha-adam*) shall live" (Leviticus 18:5), meaning that "even if a gentile occupies himself with the study of the Torah, he equals [in status] the high priest" (Baba Kama 38a). In opposition to this view, Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai decreed that "You are called *adam* the idolaters are not called *adam*" (Yebamot 61a). The later scholars were divided in their interpretation of the words of R. Shimon bar Yochai: did he mean to distinguish between Jew and gentile, to say that the gentile lacks a human essence which the Jew has (as in the opinion of the mystics), or did he perhaps mean to say only that in the specific system of law in the Torah the term *adam* refers to any person and since in any legal system "person" refers to one who is under its jurisdiction, *adam* in the Torah must refer to Israel, who alone are under the Torah's jurisdiction (as in the opinion of Rabbi Zvi Hirsch Chajes in his novellae to Yebamot).

Proper Jewish education will turn the student's attention to the conflicts in the works of Biblical commentators between the conscientious reading of the Bible and the influence of the plain sense of the text. Maimonides ruled (following the Talmud) that the law against cheating does not apply to the cheating of a non-Jew, as it is written: "You shall not wrong [lit. "cheat"] one another [lit. "each one his brother"] - (Leviticus 25:14; see Mishneh Torah, Laws of Sale 13:7). But then Kimchi, in his commentary to Psalm 15 (cited above) taught differently:

"Nor do evil to his fellow (*re'ehu*), nor take up a reproach against one near to him

(*krovo*).¹ His fellow and one near to him mean someone with whom one has business, or a neighbor. And in saying, "nor do evil to his fellow," the text does not imply that he did so to others [who are not his fellows or neighbors]; but the text describes ordinary circumstances (i.e., one ordinarily is in a position to do evil - or good - to one with whom he has some business, or to a neighbor). Similarly, "You shall not cheat one another (lit. "each his comrade [*amito*]," Lev. 25:17) does not mean that one is allowed to cheat he who not his comrade. Similarly, "You shall not bear false witness against your fellow" (*rea'ka* , Exod. 20:16) does not mean that against another who is not your fellow one is allowed to bear false witness. Rather this applies to [a person with whom one ordinarily has] business and contact; that is the usage of the language in many cases."

One of the obstacles to our students' acceptance of the validity of the tradition is its frozen appearance. They are ignorant of the history of Biblical interpretation and of the conflicting trends within it, and are therefore unaware of the ongoing mutual influence of the text on generations of Jews and of commentators over the generations on the understanding of the text. Authentic Jewish culture can only arise from the dialogue between the source and the members of each generation, a dialogue in which both the loyalty of the people to the text and their participation in the culture of the present find expression (4,5).

3. Living a life-style which creates a community:

Our ideal product will want to live in a Jewish environment, since many commandments in Judaism require a group:

"These are the things, of which a person enjoys the fruits in this world, while the stock remains for him for the world to come: viz., honoring father and mother, deeds of loving kindness, timely attendance at the house of study morning and evening, hospitality to wayfarers, visiting the sick, dowering the bride, attending the dead to the grave, devotion in prayer, and making peace between man and man, but the study of Torah leads to them all."

(Daily Prayer book, Preliminaries to the Morning Service)

Almost all of these behaviors bind people to one another, and some of them require public-communal institutions; e.g., "acts of loving kindness," which are carried out (for example) by establishing a loan fund; "rising early to attend the house of study," which assumes the existence of a house of study - synagogue; "the study of Torah," which requires the employment of teachers and the maintenance of institutions of learning for adults and children. The more we undertake such behaviors, the more relations of friendship and neighborliness emerge, as well as the sharing of resources in order to establish the institutions needed to carry out commandments such as those referred to here. Thus a community of Jews is created, participating in each other's joys and sorrows, aiding one another in time of need, constituting an environment for the raising of children in a Jewish way of life (6).

4. A relationship to the Jewish people in all the lands of their dispersion:

A person is attracted to others like himself. In the past, most Jews in the diaspora shared a consciousness of unity as members of a people covenanted to God, a commitment to a traditional way of life (to a lesser or greater degree), and a status of a foreign body in the eyes of the other inhabitants of the lands in which they settled. In the eyes of the Jews, that which was shared among themselves was greater than that which was shared with the other inhabitants of these lands. The scattered Jews were united by a common "language" in relationship to Jew and gentile, a common feeling of oppression in the present and hope for redemption, a common calendar of holidays and a way of life, and a consciousness of common "tribal" origin. Since the holocaust and the establishment of the state of Israel, the unity of the people has been based on the sharing of a common memory of national tragedy, a sense of tribal bond, and a common interest in the building and future of the state. These factors are not a constant element in the consciousness of the individual, nor are they sufficient to insure the continued connections among the various Jewish diasporas. Only a systematically cultivated consciousness (by means of education), of: 1) common origins; 2) a common existential status (members of a people of the Covenant); and 3) a common vision of the future redemption (the role of Israel in the "mending of the world" [*tikkun olam*]) is likely to maintain the unity of the people under present conditions.

These three components of the consciousness of Jewish uniqueness are included in the national-historical saga whose foundation is in the Bible and whose classical development is in rabbinic literature. The internalization of this saga is the crucial factor in the creation of a Jewish identity. The role of Jewish education is to foster this internalization, by means of an educational program which emphasizes these three commonalities.

Fostering among the Jews of Israel the recognition that they are brothers to the Jews of the diaspora is no less important than the cultivation of the consciousness among diaspora Jews that they are brothers to the Jews of Israel. These two camps, each mired in very different problems of existence, are in danger of increasing mutual alienation. The only way to maintain the consciousness of unity among the scattered is to intentionally cultivate a drawing from common sources of inspiration as well as a sharing of identical value laden experiences (the study of Torah for its own sake, sanctity, moral values drawn from the fundamental books in an ongoing process of interpretation). The relationship to the "ingathering of the exiles," and, in its religious formulation, "the commandment to settle the land of Israel," separates the inhabitants of the State of Israel from those of the diaspora. It seems as though the nation is divided between a group which is actualizing a value sacred to the whole people in the past and a group which has abandoned that value, and has thus been torn away from the core of the people who are moving forward to "complete redemption." On the face of it, there was in the past a situation similar to our own today - a Jewish settlement in Israel existed simultaneously with large and creative Jewish communities in the exile. It is not clear to us how the Jews in the Babylonian exile reconciled, over a period of hundreds of years, the contradiction between their prayers for the ingathering of the exiles and their continued residence outside of Israel. Political and economic factors probably played a role. The masses once tended to see major changes in

their status as the result of divine initiative; in our day, human initiative is not only justified by the majority, it is glorified. Consequently, there has been an intensification of the confusion among us concerning the refraining of most of the nation from joining in the task of building of the state. In the foreseeable future this confusion will not be reduced, because authentic Jewish education will maintain the confusion and the tension. On the other hand, the "portable" basis of Judaism is certainly capable of supplying Jewish content and meaning to the inhabitants of the diaspora. Those who seek to mend the rift between their deeds and their prayers will generate, as in the past, a thin trickle of aliyah.

As was said above, Jewish education will be able to connect the Jewish inhabitants of the state of Israel with the Jews of the diaspora only insofar as it can plant in the hearts of those who live in the land of Israel the recognition that the state is only a means to the higher end of "mending the world in the kingdom of God" (keeping with all interpretation which upholds the principle that the state is only a means for the actualization of universal values); and in the hearts of those who live in the diaspora the recognition that "mending the world" must begin with the internal mending of the deeds of "the people of the Covenant of God." To the extent that Jewish education succeeds in both camps, there will be a coming together of the two: Jewish society in Israel will move toward a way of life which seeks to embody transcendent values, and diaspora Jews will be drawn, by virtue of their identification with the principles of Judaism, to participate in the bold experiment being carried out in the state - the actualization of those principles (7).

Even though it is not my task to discuss the means for the attainment of the product of the education described here, I must comment on one matter which is perhaps means, perhaps educational content: the Hebrew language. This matter is, of course, only relevant to Jewish education in the diaspora. The full Jewish weight of the concepts and values mentioned above cannot be transmitted in translation. For us, translations were meant to serve as an aid in understanding the original; therefore no translation could replace the original, but could only stand alongside it, as an explication of what was read or heard. In this matter, custom has even overruled law: one is permitted, for example, to recite the Shema in any language he understands; however, in practice, throughout all the generations, the "Shema" has been recited only in Hebrew, on account of the full weight stored precisely in the syllables of the Hebrew text.

That it is possible to teach the Hebrew language in the diaspora to a level sufficient for understanding the sources in their original language has been proven by experience - assuming the curriculum allocates sufficient time, resources and skilled personnel to the task. The matter depends on the willingness of the community to recognize the acquisition of the language as an objective which must necessarily be achieved in order for Jewish heritage to be acquired in a meaningful manner. This willingness is in turn dependent on the degree to which the community perceives meaningful Jewish education to be necessary.

It follows that meaningful Jewish education will draw those who enjoy it and are built

by it to deepen their knowledge of the Hebrew language. The more students feel spiritual fulfillment in their studies, the more their willingness to invest effort in them will increase, even at the expense of their full participation in non-Jewish culture. But it is doubtful that such an identification with Judaism can be born without direct nourishment from its sources. On the other hand, shallow Jewish education will not justify itself in the eyes of the students, and will surely give rise to opposition and indifference to the point where it will defeat all the teacher's attempts to pass it on. The students will seek satisfaction from foreign spiritual and cultural sources.

It may seem as if I have made my task easy by ignoring the difficult realities of Jewish education, and that I painted a portrait of a product of education which exists only in the realm of vision, if not fantasy. My hope is that sounding the meditations of a layman-educator like myself to the ears of professionals in the field may help stimulate thoughts which are more directed toward a solution for Jewish education - even if, in the end, my ideas turn out to be useful only as a foil for debate.

Notes

1. My intention is to suggest an approach to Jewish content which is not based on any special teaching about revelation, or on a-priori faith assumptions, or even on an assumption about the uniqueness of Judaism (not to mention the assumption of its superiority over other religions). I adopted this approach from the scholarly study of religion, which understands religion to be a necessary phenomenon and which views religions as being founded in human nature and the good society. I have expanded my views on this approach in my essay "Identity, Reason and Religion" (Hebrew) in the anthology "On the Bible and Judaism" (Hebrew), (Tel Aviv, Am Oved, 1984), pages 247-74. Some of my meditations on the implications of this approach for the teaching of Judaica also appear in this anthology, on pages 275-349. It is on the basis of this approach that I assume that it is within the capacity of the basic literary creations of Judaism to respond to spiritual needs which are naturally ingrained in the student's soul and consequently that there is no need for a-priori assumptions about these works in order to justify their being studied.

2. The study of Jewish history in the program which I imagine serves the study of history of Jewish thought and literature - one which was created by a chain of exemplary people. What are the prototypes in Jewish tradition which, when internalized, create a personal Jewish identity? From one perspective, one could claim that all these prototypes are historical. The Bible is annotated history, the saga of the development of a nation as an ongoing and crisis-ridden dialogue with God. Legal compendiums, the establishment of conventional worship, texts of poetry, wisdom and prophecy are integrated into this saga and bound up with its heroes. The saga embodies a theology, a cosmogony, a political doctrine, ethical practices, and an eschatology - all unfold in the stream of time. The Oral Torah also passes through the chain of tradition and its outgrowths: Biblical commentary, Halachic literature (responsa and codifications), verse, thought, the literature of legends, the literature of moral proverbs, Jewish mysticism. All these are included in my conception of the fundamental literature of Judaism and its development [in tradition] which serves as the subject matter for study. This flow of creativity is the spiritual history of our nation - it is an expression of Judaism. This conception of Judaism as a continuity of confrontation with eternal ideas, a flowing creativity inspired by timeless prototypes, is what guides my program of study.

I distinguish between the spiritual history of the Jews (whose literary crystallizations define Judaism) and the material history of the Jews. The material history is the basis upon which the spiritual history was created and to a certain degree, the former determined the latter's characteristics (for example, its languages). It is according to this same degree of influence that one must be familiar with the material history, in order to understand those characteristics. However, the basic assertion of Jewish spiritual creativity is the that the spirit is superior to matter and that it cannot be made subservient to matter. This assertion is what should guide this program of study as well. The exemplary spiritual creations of Judaism crossed geographical boundaries and time periods and skipped over obstacles of language; so too must the program of study present them as

of an eternal nature while being given in a temporal framework, an eternal nature which changes as a result of internal developments and of ongoing encounters with foreign worlds in which it situated.

Material Jewish history and Jewish literature broadly defined are within the confines of Jewish education to the extent that they illuminate the fundamental texts, whether by illumination of the conditions under which these texts arose and became widespread, or by providing an account of their development and impact. I do not see the study of Jewish material history in and of itself, nor the study of Jewish literature (and art) in all its formal and historical manifestations as Jewish education, but rather as subject matter through which an ideal Jewish education will motivate and encourage the student to express further interest. These areas certainly have in them the power to deepen national consciousness, to reinforce national identity, and to season the bond to Judaism with the spice of aesthetic pleasure. However, when it comes to giving meaning to Jewish life, when we wish to transmit eternal values which bind the soul to the continuum of the generations, the shelf containing the fundamental books, shared by all the generations, is our primary educational resource.

3. In my article, "Identity, Reason and Religion" (see note 1), I expanded on the necessity for religious symbols; I wrote:

"How is it possible to portray or to imagine the aspects of that realm, of the invisible? How can one conceptualize these aspects in order to meditate upon them? How can they be expressed so to make it possible for one to share them with others? Only through the medium of symbols - objects, terms, stories, texts or behaviors, the sole purpose of all of which is to point to a reality which is beyond them. Substantial encounters with the transcendent realm can be achieved only through symbols; and only through them is it possible to develop the recognition of the transcendent realm, to ponder upon it, to share it with another and to instill it in his heart. This is because symbols of the transcendent realm have the unique quality not only of being able to intimate and to represent, but also of being able to awaken one to action. The symbols are instruments which sustain the excitement of the soul, and through them it is possible as well to activate the soul.

"The absolute value of religion's accessories and customs is in their symbolizing the transcendent realm and in their infusion of the recognition of this realm into everyday human life. There is no invention here of a realm which is extraneous to the essence of the human being; rather, these symbols provide an outer expression and manifestation to the invisible realm which every human recognizes. Thus it is made possible for a human to sense, to be awakened and to waken others to this realm. The truth of the religious accessories is in the degree to which they express and expand the transcendent realm. This is a truth which proves itself to the person who utilizes these accessories in that through them, his recognition of this realm continuously grows, continuously deepens. Yet, at the same time, the basis for understanding religious symbols is to recognize that the truth is not in the symbol, but in that which is symbolized by the symbol; the system of religious symbols intimate not only what is beyond the human and what is greater than him, but also what is beyond and greater than the system of religious symbols itself " (pp. 250 - 52).

4. The shelf of fundamental Jewish books does not stand in isolation. It is possible to derive fundamental values from books found on other shelves as well. The aim of this approach, as was stated, is that the Jewish student will not turn to strangers in order to draw from them fundamental existential values. In all periods, Jews entered into an ongoing negotiation with the cultural world in which they settled. In this negotiation, values originating in external sources were assimilated into Judaism. However, Jews accepted these as obligatory upon them on the basis of Jewish assumptions. For example: the value of democracy was created outside of Judaism, but Jewish thinkers sought out and found a basis for it in Jewish sources (see for example the essay written by my father of blessed memory, Simon Greenberg, "Judaism and the Democratic Idea," in his book "Foundations of a Faith," pp. 113-34). This process of adopting and Judaizing all that is "good and fair" in the culture of the nations is precisely what prevented Judaism from becoming obsolete and fossilized.

5. On matters of the morality of the Bible and of Judaism and its problems see the essay by Haim Roth, "The Moral Shift in Jewish Ethics (Hebrew)", in his book "Religion and the Values of Life (Hebrew)", (Jerusalem, Magnes, 1973) pp. 89-106; also S.H. Bergman, "Extension and Reduction in Jewish Ethics (Hebrew)," in his booklet "Heaven and Earth (Hebrew)", Shdemot (no date) pp. 29-38; and my essays, "You are Called Human (Hebrew)" in "On the Bible and Judaism", op. cit., pp. 55-67; and "How Should the Bible be Interpreted in Our Day (Hebrew)," in "Chosenness and Power (Hebrew)", (Sifriyat Poalim/Hakibbutz Hame'uchad, 1986) pp. 49-67.

6. In a deliberation with Seymour Fox on this section, the following clarification arose (the following is a paraphrase): "Whoever is instilled with Jewish values will want a 'world' to support his values. This 'world' could be an enclave - a community which intentionally develops a way of life which is different than that of its surroundings, a sub-culture, as it were. A difficult question is whether an ideal Jewish education is not contingent upon the development of a sub-culture. It could be that graduates of all educational systems which cultivate defined ideas and values aspire to create an enclave or sub-culture in which they can attain a maximal degree of self-fulfillment. See also the end of the essay.

6. I have expanded on the topic of the Jewish character of the state of Israel in my essay "The Task of Masorati Judaism," in J.S. Ruskay et al., eds. "Deepening the Commitment: Zionism and the Conservative/Masorti Movement," 137 - 146.

*"Those Who Sow in Sorrow Will Reap the Harvest with Joy:
Practical Implications of Professor Greenberg's Conception of Jewish Education"**

Professor Greenberg's "We Were as Dreamers: A Portrait of the Ideal Product of an Ideal Jewish Education" begins with the admission that it proposes what is "desirable" without necessarily considering the actual "capabilities of the existing system." Indeed, this conception calls for an emphasis on the spiritual dimension of existence at a time when education is focused primarily on preparing learners for the economic job market. It begs to deny the assumption that "I am and there is nothing other than myself" while the competitive hustle and bustle in free democratic societies constantly affirm that "If I am not for myself, than who will be for me." It focuses study on Jewish classical texts and the practice of traditional Jewish law and ritual as it becomes increasingly difficult to keep up with the glut of data and the basic skills necessary for modern living. And it emphasizes a mastery over Hebrew when English has become the "lingua franca" of our times.

Greenberg himself gives counsel against this predicament: "cover the distance to the attainment of the aim by moving towards it one station at a time, each one attainable, and each, with its conquest, serving as a launching point for the effort to reach the next." In attempting to explicate the practical implications of Greenberg's conception of Jewish education, we see our role as that of beginning to overcome what he calls "the apparent chasm between the ultimate aim and the power required for its achievement." Our assumption is that it is precisely the expression of the "desirable" which makes it possible to speak of what can be "real" and that the role of one who must deal with the "real" is to creatively seek out ways of attaining that which is "desirable." (1)

In the case of Greenberg's conception, the interplay between "desirable" and "real" may be set into place by the consideration that it is precisely because it emphasizes what often gets lost in the melee of modern living that it may have so much attraction in our day. To be sure, Greenberg's spiritual emphasis seeks to complement a rigorous general education in areas such as science, history, art and thought and even demands that the Jewish learner be intimately familiarized with other languages and cultures. However, by integrating the concern for the learner's spiritual needs into this sort of general education, Greenberg's conception essentially tries to make up for a void which many systems of modern education have all but abandoned.

In her prize winning book, "The Good High School: Portraits of Character and Culture," Sara Lightfoot describes this void in a school which though it succeeds in preparing students for higher education, lacks an ideological vision, and therefore does not address spiritual needs:

* This is a draft summarized by D. Marom, based on the protocols of educators' deliberations on Professor Greenberg's paper as well as on presentations on this topic made by Professor S. Fox and by himself. (list names and dates in a separate index)

"Highland Park lacks this clear and resounding ideological stance. The educational vision shifts with the times as Principal Benson and his teachers listen for the beat of change and seek to be adaptive. Although the superb record of college admissions provides institutional pride, it does not replace the need for strong ideological vision. Rather than creating institutional cohesion, the quest for success engenders harsh competition among students. The persistent complaints from many students that they feel lost and alone is in part a statement about the missing ideological roots. Without a common bond, without a clear purpose, the school fails to encompass them and does not take psychological hold on their energies. The director of counselling at Highland Park observes students reaching out to one another through a haze of drugs in order to reduce feelings of isolation and dislocation. Drugs are the great "leveler," providing a false sense of connection and lessening the nagging pain. A minority of students are spared the loneliness and only a few can articulate "the problem," but it is visible to the stranger who misses the "school spirit." (2)

Greenberg sees Judaism as providing a rich and dependable resource for an education which, by also addressing human spiritual needs, will foster a much different kind of attitude towards life and learning among Jewish learners. If Highland Park leaves students feeling "lost and alone," "isolation and dislocation," and fails to "take psychological hold on their energies," consider what Greenberg aspires to achieve by engaging learners with classical Jewish texts which "contain the axioms which define our relationship to the universe and our environment - living and inanimate, human, national, and familial" and by allowing them to theoretically and practically consider proverbs of wisdom, commandments, laws, tales and legends which "contain prescriptions for ways of living" and "archetypes and models for behavior." In his own words, it is no less than "the spiritual pleasure of activity which is of essential value, which involves the activation of his highest intellectual powers and the refinement of his understanding." The qualitative difference between these two images of education lies not in their subject matter and methods alone, but in their very understanding about what is worth achieving in education, with ourselves and with our children.

This qualitative advantage applies to the way Jewish education seeks to achieve Jewish identity as well. Greenberg's conception will not be satisfied with providing learners with a superficial ethnic or folklorish encounter with Judaism any more than it would be with attaining a "superb record of college admissions" while leaving learners lonely and hungry for "connection" with something spiritually meaningful. Philip Roth's ironic comments on his own Jewish education, or lack thereof, provide a rich background Greenberg's point:

"...I feel in my own instance and I think, with some of my friends too - [that what has been] inherited has not been a body of law and it hasn't been a body of learning. (My familiarity with Bible is practically nil. I studied it in a college that identifies itself as a Baptist college; until then I'd gone to a Hebrew School, where I had learned what I thought was history - perhaps it is - nevertheless I didn't associate it with Bible.) So there is no body of law, no body of learning and no language, and finally, no Lord - which seems to me a significant thing to be missing. But there were reminders constantly that one was a Jew and that there were *goyim* out there

...So what I received, I think, was a psychology, not a culture and history in its totality. The simple point here is, I think, that what one received of culture, history, learning, law, one received in strands, in little bits and pieces. What one received *whole*, however, what one feels whole, is a kind of psychology; and the psychology can be

translated into three words - "Jews are better." This is what I knew from the beginning: somehow Jews were better. I'm saying this as a point of psychology; I'm not pronouncing it as a fact.

...There was a sense of specialness and from then on it was up to you to invent your specialness; to invent, as it were, your betterness...There's always that hope that somehow all those fingers were pointing, and all that pride had some reason. But I think the amazing thing - which sort of brought the blessing and the burden of having been brought up in America - was to have been given a psychology without a content, or with only the remains of a content, and then to invent off that." (3)

Roth's comments help clarify the advantage of Greenberg's approach as a particular approach to Jewish education. Rather than focusing the spiritual content of Jewish education on Jewish continuity, Greenberg focuses Jewish continuity on the spiritual content of Jewish education. Or, to use Roth's terminology, Greenberg's education seeks to generate a Jewish psychology *from* a content, rather than a Jewish psychology *without* a content. Consequently, Greenberg's message to the learner is not that "Jews are better," nor does he impose the task of inventing a content for this sort of Jewish identity. Instead, he offers the learner a simple and dignified invitation to explore the meaning and purpose of life through Judaism: "This is our culture. It is a treasure full of authentic, exciting and compelling narratives, experiences and human insights. Come and discover the mysteries of existence by engaging yourself with them, for they will introduce to you, as they have to generations of Jews and myriads of non-Jews, understandings which are beyond what your eyes can see and your hands can grasp. And through them everything you experience will be colored, ennobled and enriched."

Indeed, Greenberg's aims for Jewish education are set in terms which demonstrate that learners want to be Jewish because they have accepted this invitation and have undergone the deep experience which it offers. Following his formulation of his four major aims, we may say that the learners will emerge with:

- a) a genuine love of learning classical Jewish texts for their own sakes and a deep appreciation of and respect for the practices which tradition has passed down to them for their spiritual benefit;
- b) a strong concern for issues of interpersonal morality and a desire to seek out classical Jewish texts as a guide for their own behavior in this area;
- c) a deep desire to live in a Jewish environment so as to be able to seek out the spiritual content which derives from carrying out communal practices commanded in Jewish law;
- d) a spiritual attachment to and practical concern for Jewish people in all the lands of their dispersion.

Appropriate Settings for Jewish Education based on Greenberg's Conception:

Our teacher, the late educational historian Lawrence Cremin, has urged us to view education as taking place not only in schools and colleges, but also through a "multiplicity of individuals and institutions that educate - parents, peers, siblings, and friends, as well as families, churches, synagogues, libraries, museums, summer camps, benevolent societies, agricultural fairs, settlement houses, factories, radio stations, and television networks." Though not all of these may purposely plan their efforts so as to bring about changes in others' thinking and behavior, and though in most cases these forces do not work in tandem, Cremin invites us to consider how "configurations" of educating institutions and individuals may be systematically coordinated so as to take more responsibility for the greater part of this "ecology of education." (4)

Greenberg's conception clearly calls for a "configuration" in Jewish education which brings the learner's spiritual quest into the general existential context of study. Indeed, since Greenberg assumes that the learners' spiritual needs emerge from the fundamental issues of human existence: life, death, faith, despair, community, family, male-female relationships, and so forth, his conception places these issues in the central focus of Jewish education. In order to do so effectively, it would be therefore be necessary to undertake this sort of education in a setting or environment where life and learning coincide.

Here, the categories of formal and informal education would essentially be collapsed. The learners would both live and study life in this environment. The very witnessing of and participation in attempts of others who function in this setting to seek out and express their quest for spiritual meaning in broad range of everyday living activities would naturally encourage the learners to bring existential spiritual questions to the learning process. If things in this environment are constantly done for deeper spiritual reasons, then the question of why would be raised at every moment. At the same time, the learning process in such an environment would be able to address such questions through ongoing examination of Judaism. Each of these aspects of this setting would thereby reinforce and redeem the other and together they would attempt to launch the learner on a lifelong search for spiritual meaning in the context of life and learning in the Jewish community.

Some might consider the Jewish day school to appropriate such a setting. Indeed, the day school provides learners from a very young age with a real opportunity to experience the individual and group practice of traditional Jewish law and ritual as well as to relate to classical Jewish texts both in their original Hebrew and as resources for spiritual needs. Furthermore, since learners spend most of their week (and sometimes even weekends) in the day school, it does enable one to indeed place Jewish learning within a larger context of living. However, it would take a very special kind of effort to transform these basic conditions afforded by a day school into the kind of culture and environment which is suggested by Greenberg's conception. Without such an effort, the daily routine of day school learning can easily move far away from the task of addressing the learners' spiritual needs and settle for a compartmentalized form of Jewish study and practice, with no real connection to issues of life and death. This is a challenge which Greenberg's conception

places before the day school.

In addition, the possibilities of designing an environment or setting appropriate to Greenberg's conception go far beyond the day school. The range here may be from limited "enclaves" such as a summer camp, a youth group, a community center, or a tour of Israel and/or other Jewish communities to more comprehensive "sub-cultures" characteristic of youth groups, "chavurot," summer camps, or whole neighborhoods of Jews who live and study together as a community. An instructive example of this alternative type of configuration, one which is not inconsistent with Greenberg's conception, may be Camp Ramah:

"The leadership of Ramah of Ramah hoped to create an educational subculture that was more than a school (though it would emphasize and develop the cognitive and intellectual life of its campers and staff), more than a youth movement (though it would concentrate on affective and interpersonal development), and more than a summer camp, because all who were involved knew that not enough could be accomplished in eight weeks. The full blown, the mature idea of an educational subculture included an eight-week summer camp, combined with the year round youth movement, and Leaders Training Fellowship (LTF). A total setting for eight weeks, inseparable from a year-round youth movement, offered unique educational opportunities that were not available in any other educational institution. (5)

The components of this educational subculture were formed so as to create "a community that educates." Its particular program was to bring Judaism to engage, inform and challenge all parts of the learners' personalities, focusing on their inner lives - "*bein adam Lamakom*" (between human and God) - and their social lives - "*bein adam le-havero*" (between human and human). In order to implement this program:

...we needed sufficient space, sufficient time, a variety of experiences, and a multiplicity of human encounters. The components for this educational subculture had to be formed so that each could carry out its vital function as all interrelated organically to create a community that educates...Here one could observe the educator as he himself grappled with ideas, considered alternative lifestyles, and succeeded and failed in these endeavors,...ideas uncovered by close textual analysis in the classroom could be experimented with and applied immediately during the summer's experience and then throughout the year in LTF.... At Ramah, it was possible, and often necessary, to investigate alternative positions before they were decided upon, and therefore one could not avoid experiencing the impact of choice. And all of this could occur in an environment conducive to trial and error as crucial elements of the maturing process...." (6)

It is important to emphasize that Greenberg's conception does not call for such settings or environments to be rigid and closed. This would endanger the learner's authentic encounter with Jewish spiritual content and could thereby lead to a suffocation of the spirit. Greenberg clearly emphasizes where he thinks the search for spiritual meaning through Judaism ought to begin. However, he accepts, nay demands, that Jewish texts and practices cultural symbols be related to not as ends in and of themselves but rather as intermediaries for the encounter with the transcendent realm, that tradition not be presented as being frozen, that the learner be brought to respect the practice of Jewish law and ritual - not

necessarily to practice it in one way or another for the rest of his/her life - and that, from a position of cultural self-confidence, the study of other languages and cultures be made compulsory. Indeed, if upon entering this environment one ought to feel a qualitative change of atmosphere, upon exiting it the learner ought to feel that the challenge of finding spiritual meaning continues, rather than ends.

The Selection and Preparation of Judaic Subject Matter:

What subject matter would be taught in such a setting? Keeping with his larger conception of religious symbols as intermediaries for the encounter with the transcendent realm, Greenberg places the basic religious "symbols" of Judaism in the center of his curriculum (for Greenberg's definition of Jewish texts and practices as religious "symbols" see the introduction to his paper as well as his own footnote #3). Among these, he emphasizes:

a) *Texts*: these are "the accepted fundamental books of Judaism," including:

"the Bible, Talmud, and Midrash, and the body of commentary which has grown up around these fundamental books in the course of the generations, be it commentary in the narrow sense of the word (eg., Rashi), or systematic thought or creative literature seeking to translate the content of the fundamental books to a contemporary vernacular - the languages of philosophy, of morality, of mysticism."

b) *Commandments pertaining to man's relationship with God*: the whole system of sanctification (*kedushah*), for example: Sabbath, Blessings, Prayer, Kashrut, etc..

c) *Ethical decrees in the area of interpersonal morality*: criminal, family and international law, torts, ethical dispositions, etc..

It is difficult to underestimate Greenberg's faith in the educating power of these Jewish symbols. The "wager" of Jewish education, he argues, is that it is within their capacity to provide a response to the learner's spiritual needs. Those whose belief in Judaism is very strong must be sufficiently secure in its strength so as to assume that it will impact students when presented accurately and wisely. "In our time, there is no other authority which can impose such an impact on the soul of the learner," he argues (7). Consequently, his approach seeks to provide as much room as possible for the subject matter of Judaism to "speak for itself" to the learners. To the degree that Jewish education is capable of facilitating an "authentic" encounter between the learner and these symbols, it will, in turn, provide them with compelling spiritual content and inspire them to continue turning towards Judaism as an ongoing resource for spiritual meaning.

At the same time, Greenberg cautions that "the truth is not in the symbol, but in that which is symbolized by the symbol." Consequently, in order to allow Jewish subject matter to "speak for itself," it must itself be first understood in terms of its capacity to "point towards" the spiritual realm. It can and has happened that "systems of symbols have ceased

from serving their communities," Greenberg admits - a condition which leads to an "eclipse" or even "disease" of the spirit. As he sees it, this is a state which is not far from our own: "Who among us does not sense that this is an 'historical hour', and that a new and renewed system of Jewish symbols begs to be born? In the meantime 'the babes have reached the birthdeal? but the strength to give birth is lacking.'" (8)

To be sure, Greenberg's faith is not shattered by this admission. "In our heart persists the faith that the approach to Jewish heritage as to rich treasure houses of symbols pointing to the truths of transcendent reality and to a wealth of meanings," he writes, "that this approach will attract others to the symbols and truths of Judaism so as to excite and replenish their souls through them." As a result, he believes that a "critical mass" of people will be created - a storehouse of knowledge and wisdom, of passion, confidence, and strength - from which fresh forces will emerge and will revitalize our symbols according to the circumstances of the present." (9) Yet, more than simply restating his faith, Greenberg's conception of education points to a strategy for the preparation of Jewish subject matter so that it can appropriately address the spiritual needs of contemporary learners.

Interestingly, this strategy does not place the main responsibility for this task on teachers and educators. In Greenberg's view, the current "eclipse of the spirit" has placed these "agents of the community" in an awkward and troublesome situation. "The most that can be required of them," he writes, "is to teach the meaning of the symbols as they functioned as part of the whole historical system, that is, to point out what of a Jewish world view these symbols expressed in the period in which they flourished, when they lived and impacted upon the soul." If indeed Jewish subject matter is going to address the spiritual needs of contemporary learners, it needs to be reinterpreted and reorganized in order to do so, and only then can it be pedagogically transmitted by teachers and educators. This is an immensely creative task demanding "straining, selecting, and producing novelties." (10)

According to Greenberg, this task needs to be undertaken by "*anshei ruah mechunanim*". Literally, this term may be translated as "gifted intellectuals," "scholars" or "spiritual leaders." However, as Greenberg uses it, this term includes both intellectual and spiritual aspects and in a leadership capacity. In Greenberg's conception, far from being divorced from educational issues, the world of Jewish scholarship is an enabling factor for their successful confrontation. He boldly sees Judaica scholarship as having a great potential contribution to the spiritual life of Jews through Jewish education. It would therefore perhaps be more appropriate to describe the role which Greenberg foresees as that of modern day "commentators" who provide scholarly descriptions of the spiritual content of the symbols of Judaism. In educational terms, we may say that these "commentators" do the work of "preparing Jewish subject matter" for teaching.

Note - Greenberg does not call upon these "commentators" to suggest value-laden interpretations of cultural texts, practices and other symbols - an activity which may justifiably be regarded as being beyond the boundaries of authentic Judaica scholarship and which Greenberg's conception would possibly see as "getting in the way" of Judaism rather than teaching it. Rather, he sees them bringing their expertise in the study of religious

phenomena to bear on Judaism in order "to clarify in a descriptive manner human values and answers to existential questions that determined human creativity throughout the ages." The aim here would be to provide universal spiritual categories for the understanding of religious symbols which were produced and which addressed spiritual needs in particular Jewish historical contexts. (11) POSSIBLE DISCUSSION OF KAUFFMAN HERE OR IN FOOTNOTE, BASED ON GREENBERG'S WRITTEN COMMENTS ON HIM IN JUDAISM OR INTRO TO EZEKIEL, VOLUME ONE..

Further to this suggestion, Greenberg has proposed a method by which such gifted scholars could "prepare" Jewish subject matter so that it addresses the spiritual needs of contemporary learners. This method Greenberg delineates four separate elements in his method of preparing Jewish subject matter. Since Greenberg's own Biblical scholarship is fraught with examples of this method (see appendix #1), we will refer to one of his works, "The Biblical Grounding of Human Value," which deals with laws of murder and theft in the Bible (12), as an example at each stage:

1) *Placing the specific topic being researched within the larger context of inquiry related to human existential concerns and creative efforts made to address them:* In "The Biblical Grounding of Human Value," Greenberg places the topic of Biblical criminal law in the larger context of a larger inquiry into the spiritual principles which guide the organization of society. In this case, the spiritual principle is the value of human life. What value do these laws attribute to human life and what are the implications of this attribution to the way humans in society behave towards one another? According to Greenberg, Biblical society was revolutionary in first organizing itself around the view that human life had absolute value. This was expressed both in its severity in laws dealing with homicide - it was punishable by death, with no allowance made for ransom - and, contrarily, in its legal leniency towards property offenses - they were never punishable by the taking away of human life (except, of course, when the thief was perceived as a possible murderer).

2) *An effort to reveal the element of choice and purposefulness in all cultural creativity:* In order to expose the element of chosen purpose underlining the Biblical laws of theft and murder, Greenberg presents corresponding laws in other ancient near eastern societies from the time of the Bible - societies in which human life was valued in terms of economic utility and material worth. By doing this he attempts to give some indication of "what resulted from the adoption of one or another view of the nature of human value." In the non-Biblical societies, one could provide ransom for murder by giving over one or a number of many other human beings, usually slaves, or an equivalent sum of money, to the family of the victim. Concomitantly, in some cases, the worth of a particular property or material good was considered to be so great that stealing it was punishable by death. In addition, Greenberg traces the development of Jewish law after the Bible in order to show that the conviction that human life had absolute value paradoxically developed into to a rejection of capital punishment. Against the background of both of these aspects, one can better appreciate both the original "leap" which was necessary for Biblical society in organizing itself around the principle of the absolute value of human life and its later impact on the development of Jewish law and society.

3) *Understanding this particular creative effort in light of the larger harmonious world conception which it expresses:* Greenberg demonstrates how the Biblical laws of murder and theft are consciously based on the understanding that the worth of every human life is absolute because "man was created in God's image." Being "created in God's image" adds an extra invisible or non-material component to human life, as it were, one which renders its value absolute. Consequently, human life cannot be judged in terms of economic value and that which has economic value can never be of equal or more worth than human life. Greenberg goes on to explicate this larger world view in terms of its deeper theological and philosophical assumptions as they are presented in the Bible and explicated in Rabbinic literature (13).

4) *Understanding the particular creative effort from a position of emotional empathy (as an attempt to better understand the effort rather than to develop value-laden sympathy for it; in order to understand symbolic power in witchcraft, for example, Greenberg suggests that one consider the impact of gouging out the eyes of a baby in a photograph):* At the beginning of Greenberg's discussion, he refers to a case reported in XXXXX's novel, "The Adventures of Haji Baba of Ispahan," in which a harem girl is put to death after the Shah of Persia suspects that book's roguish hero has been trafficking with her. In the ensuing debate as to whether or not he should be put to death, Greenberg reports the Shah's considerations as follows: "The shah has lost a slave - there is a price of blood for the meanest of human beings - even a Frank or a Muscovite [i.e. a European or a Russian] have their price, and why should we expend our good gratis?" Besides undermining the reader's possible taking for granted the view of human life as having ultimate value and thereby making way for the discussions of its historical origins in the Bible, Greenberg's reference to this dramatic tale captures the emotional aspect of the question of the value of human life. The insult to human life in the Shah's words enables the reader to emotionally (re)empathize with the larger spiritual inquiry at hand (14).

This four-pronged method demonstrates one way of thinking about how scholars of Judaism can make a critical contribution to Jewish education while maintaining rigorous standards of inquiry. Were the production of scholarship based on such a method to be the basis of a broad program of research, Greenberg's conception intimates, Jewish educators and teachers would be empowered to make greater impact on their students.

Another aspect of "preparing Jewish subject matter" relates to the problem of texts, practices or other symbols in Judaism which conflict with modern day moral sensibilities. On the one hand, Greenberg's concern for the authentic encounter with the texts and practices of Judaism precludes "narcissistic" selections of Jewish subject matter which cut and paste it such that it corresponds to all that with which contemporary learners might identify. On the other hand, Greenberg's sense that Judaism's spiritual contents and ethical decrees ought to be a practical guide for interpersonal morality and a living basis for Jewish society in and across communities necessitates special attention to outdated aspects or distorted applications. Consequently, "an obstacle in the transmission of the Jewish heritage is the presence of elements in it that clash with our moral sense."

Two current examples - both of which Greenberg himself has studied and commented upon - are extremism or fundamentalism in relation to non-Jews and limitations on the legal, social and religious rights of women. According to Greenberg, issues such as these can be confronted and made ready for education by authoritative and creative Jewish "commentators" as well. The task here, as he sees it, is to "separate the grain from the kernel," or, again to come back to one of Greenberg's basic philosophical assumptions, to seek out that which is symbolized through the religious "symbol" rather than the religious "symbol" in and of itself. This involves identifying the fundamental spiritual idea behind the religious "symbol," tracing - in a disciplined manner - its application of this idea through the generations of Jewish tradition, exposing its obsolete or distorted application, presenting other attempts within the tradition to provide alternative applications of this idea into religious "symbols", and then leaving room open for cultural creativity.

In his work on the attitude toward the gentile, for example, Greenberg demonstrates how this applies to the case of the relation to non-Jews...(15) PROVIDE FULL EXAMPLE HERE.ON THE BASIS OF THIS ARTICLE.

Greenberg's suggestion coincides with his larger perception of the ideas and symbols of Jewish tradition as having been preserved over time through unceasing interpretive activity on the part of Jewish "commentators." It is precisely their attempt to bring the larger ideas of Judaism to bear on contemporary realities and comply with moral sensibilities which, in his opinion, helped maintain Judaism's vitality as a source of education and community over the generations. Just as it has been incumbent upon each generation to reinterpret and reformulate the religious "symbols" of Judaism so that their spiritual truths speak to Jews, so too Greenberg's conception of Jewish education appeals to contemporary Jewish "commentators" to undertake such an activity in our own time.

What about ideas and practices of morality and society which originate in other traditions, but are desirable for Jewish education? Greenberg himself gives the examples of democracy, which originated in Greece, and special care for the handicapped, which was emphasized in Christianity. In such cases, Greenberg calls for "adopting and Judaizing all that is 'good and fair' in the culture of the nations," adding that this too is "what prevented Judaism from becoming obsolete and fossilized." This involves yet a third activity for Jewish "commentators" in preparing subject matter for Jewish education, that of grounding such ideas and practices on Jewish assumptions. Though he does not suggest a methodology for this activity, Greenberg does refer to works in which it is undertaken. In the case of democracy, for example, he points to his father's work on "Judaism and the Democratic Ideal" Greenberg the elder's work here, makes it possible for Jewish educators to teach democracy on the basis of Jewish sources in the following way ... PROVIDE FULL EXAMPLE HERE ON THE BASIS OF SIMON GREENBERG'S WORKS ON THE TOPIC (16).

The point here is not to make Judaism the source of all the is "good and fair" in existence. Greenberg's conception clearly rules out cultural apologetics and assumes - nay demands - that the non-Jewish cultures, religions and languages be taught intimately and

effectively to Jewish students (Greenberg emphasizes English in this context, since it functions as a contemporary *lingua franca*). Indeed, in his view, it is precisely the deep and authentic encounter with that which is universal in the spiritual world of others which can enable Jewish learners to coexist and cooperate with their neighbors and assimilate positive elements into Judaism. However, neither of these activities would be possible without Jewish learners having first achieved a sensitivity to spiritual content through an authentic encounter with their own culture. After achieving a certain security about and sense of dignity in one's own culture, one is empowered to appreciate another culture or incorporate some of its novel spiritual aspects into one's own. Consequently, far from suggesting an ethnocentric curriculum, Greenberg's conception tries to open the Jewish learner to other cultures. (17)

A Pedagogy for Presenting Jewish Subject Matter as a Response to Spiritual Needs:

The development of an appropriate setting and the preparation of Jewish subject matter along the lines suggested above do not, in and of themselves, ensure that the learner will experience an authentic encounter with Jewish texts, practices and other religious "symbols." Enabling learners to encounter Judaism's spiritual content, or conversely, enabling Judaism's spiritual content to successfully address their deeper spiritual needs, depends also, and perhaps most immediately, upon the intermediation between the two by the teacher of Judaica. The principles which guide this intermediation activity amount to a unique pedagogy for the teaching of Jewish subject matter.

Greenberg himself has explored aspects of such a pedagogy for the teaching of Bible. (18) The Bible teacher does not necessarily have to accept Biblical answers to spiritual issues or the way it chooses to deal with them. Rather, his/her task is to enable the learners to understand and approach the Bible (and its interpretation along the lines of the methods suggested above) as a resource in considering spiritual issues as well as to help them grasp the profundity of its particular responses to these issues. Though it is important for the learners to perceive their Bible teacher as a spiritual seeker and an honest inquirer into realms of meaning, his/her own particular response to the Bible are besides the point. Rather, Greenberg argues that the Bible teacher's challenge - not unlike the challenge before one who teaches Islam or Christianity - is to make clear to learners how the Bible could have been, and still is, meaningful to millions of human beings over the ages:

"This is a severe demand to make upon teachers of the Bible in religious schools. It is in a way more than is required of university teachers, who can content themselves with the Bible as literature or as archaeology without responsibility for its religious teaching - i.e., for that upon which its claim to a place in history chiefly rests. But teachers in a religious school can indulge in no such luxury. Their task is to convey the religious significance of the Bible, and they can do this only after having gotten bold of the great spiritual issues that animate it. This means that they must go beyond what usually constitutes biblical studies in colleges and seminaries. They must study Hebrew and become acquainted with the civilizations of the Near East; but they must do more. They must also familiarize themselves with the history of ideas, with religious thought in general, with philosophy, especially in its religious garb - theology. This study

ought to begin in teacher' training schools, where it is all but disregarded today, but it is of little value if not pursued throughout life, if increase of experience is not matched a corresponding increase in concern over the issues to which experience exposes one. The one commitment that may be fairly expected of a teacher of Bible is to the contemplative and reflective life. This commitment is sufficient, is indeed a warrant - the only possible warrant - that his teaching will not be trivial. This much may be expected of the teacher, since it is in the hope that his students will themselves be directed toward making a similar commitment that they have been entrusted to him. The step beyond this, from understanding to conviction to faith, must be left to the effect of the material itself. Religionists ought to have enough faith in the worth of biblical teaching to allow that if it be presented honestly and sympathetically it will work by its own authority - today it can have no other - on the soul of the student." (19)

Greenberg's conception of the Judaica teacher as one who refrains from allowing his own personal convictions to get in the way of a successful encounter between the learner and Jewish texts is strikingly different than what we may have expected. Considering his characterization of our times as being marked by an "eclipse of the spirit," we might have thought that his sense of Jewish educator as "educator of the spirit" would lead him to portray a teacher who uses his own personal commitments as a charismatic spiritual light for learners. Whether as a representative of traditional Judaism or of modern spiritual movements within the Jewish world, that sort of educator would try to inspire by "bringing" answers to the learners, so that they too may benefit from them.

Greenberg's deep faith in the power of Jewish texts, as well as his belief in the fundamental and overriding human curiosity about and emotional hunger for spiritual content, moves him to suggest what seems to be the opposite of this sort of educator. His Bible teacher makes great efforts at "clearing away" what may obstruct the learner's genuine spiritual encounter with that ancient Jewish text. This teacher's pedagogical concern is with overcoming the great gap which lay between authentic Biblical language, ideas and narrative and the language, ideas and narratives which define the existence of Jewish learners in our day and age, so that the spiritual content can "speak for itself." Success here will be determined by the degree to which his students have come face to face with the "core" spiritual content of the Bible, rather than getting sidetracked by its ancient and exterior "kernel".

Greenberg's pedagogical suggestions for the teaching of the Creation narratives in the first chapters of the Book of Genesis serve as a useful illustration for this principle. Modern science's refutation of literal Biblical narrative can provide an obstacle before a teacher whose main concern is in enabling the spiritual content of these narratives to speak to the spiritual needs of Jewish learners. In response, Greenberg makes the following remarks, worth quoting in full, despite their length:

"The science of later ages has superseded the science of Genesis; there is no reason to hide this fact from the students. We can no longer regard as adequate the biblical account of the process by which heaven and earth came to be in their present state. These stories have therefore become for us *aggadot*, Platonic myths, expressing in a striking, imaginary way profound insights into reality. An *aggada*, like a fable, does

not depend for truth on the actual historicity of its content. The "Boy who Cried Wolf" may have never lived, but that does not alter one whit the significance of that fable, because its author has managed to embody in his imaginary story a truth that is perennially relevant, for fabular truth is not dependant upon the circumstances that illustrated it. What is important is that the fabulist had the insight to light upon an aspect of moral reality, and the artistry to articulate it memorably.

Just so the truth of biblical *aggadot* is entirely independent of particular circumstances whose historicity may be confirmed or confuted by science. Indeed it deals with a realm left untouched by science: the detail of what happened does not interest it so much as the human significance, the value, in that happening. It is not crucial to the truth of the creation story that the world was made in six days as the writer seems to have believed. Whatever cosmology one subscribes to, the judgements of that story will still be pertinent: that the world has a creator, and is not a product of chance or merely mechanical forces; that the ultimate principle of the cosmos is one and moral; that evil is not rooted in the nature of things; that men are free in the sense that they are capable of making moral decisions which are decisive for their well-being. These judgments are not immediately interesting to science, which carefully excludes from its scope such questions of value about which no demonstrations on its terms can be made. They are, however, of vital concern to man as a human being, with a conscience and an awareness of a realm of value. These stories address the moral consciousness of man; their truth can be appreciated by the student only after he has been sensitized to the great moral issues which are set forth in them with such simple yet moving artistry.

That is the task of the teacher. Let him teach stressing the meaningful interrelation of events, (eg., how the creations of days 1-3 were preparatory for those of days 4-6 [1 for 4, etc.]; how all preceded and were preparatory for man, the master of the house), the author's values and ideals (the benevolent purposes of God, the vegetarian ideal; the uniqueness of man; his right of dominion over all - subject only to the will of God; evil and misery as product's of man's abuse of his freedom; the ideal relation between man and woman). The intrinsic moral and artistic worth of these stories must be set forth, and the student's mind opened to appreciate them. The stumbling blocks of "unhistoricity," and "fairy tale" will be cut down to size, if not altogether removed, when the referents of the story are understood to be aspects of spiritual, rather than historic reality, an account of what befell and still befalls the soul of man rather than his body." (20).

In this passage, Greenberg actually brings together the two levels on which he deals with the question of how to present Jewish "symbols" to learners. Having demonstrated how obstacles to an authentic encounter with the spiritual content of Genesis can be "cleared away", Greenberg then suggests categories which ought to be emphasized by the Bible teacher-educator in order for that spiritual content to be made clear (this corresponds to the first stage in the four pronged approach to "preparing Jewish subject matter for education" discussed above) - and all this while leaving aside, of course, his or the teacher's own personal views.

Another aspect of this pedagogy goes beyond "clearing the way" and "clarifying" the spiritual content of the symbols of Judaism. At some point, Greenberg's Jewish educator must make an attempt to link this content up with aspects of everyday living. As was discussed above, the setting in which Greenberg's Jewish education ought to take place

allows for this both on a planned basis - through the group practice of Jewish ritual and law - as well as on an improvisational level. In the classroom, synagogue, community, the school hallways, the Sabbath prayer, on the sports field - in every place in which there is life - Greenberg's Jewish educator needs to be attentive and sensitive to opportunities to explore the spiritual content of Judaism as it relates to everyday life.

The authenticity of these experiences will be undermined by a mechanical or contrived approach to this relationship. Rather it requires a keen and intimate eye and an acute sense of time and place. In the context of ritual practice, Greenberg explains that "one must educate not so that the student will 'accept' that a specific [Jewish] symbol or value is true or beautiful, but that he should experience its truth or beauty." This is no small task. In the case of Bar-Mitzvah, for example, Greenberg himself suggests categories for this experience:

"From the viewpoint of its format, it is simple and even shallow: the thirteen year old boy is called to the Torah, recites the blessings for reading from the Torah, and afterwards the father recites the blessing "...Blessed is He who has absolved me [from the disciplining of this child]." Popular custom is that the child participates in the prayer services - usually in the reading of the Haftarah or the weekly portion, which he spent not a little time learning. Less widespread is the practice of the boy giving a *drasha* on the Torah. As long as society was absorbed with religious symbols, the deeper meaning of this ceremony was naturally sensed. Today it appears quite besides the point among those who are far away from the way of life based on faith symbols and is in need of explication. What does this ceremony point to?

One can grasp this ceremony from two points of view, that of the parents and that of the boy. From the parents' perspective the ceremony symbolizes the passing on the child to the community (and even to himself). Until now he was a son of Jews (a status with a meaning of its own), from now on he is a Jew. The ceremony of passing on takes place in the synagogue, that is, in the framework of the parents' highest values. The community to which the boy was passed on appears in its most exalted form as a religious order and the child takes his place as a member of the order, one who is allowed to participate from this day among the *minyan* [quorum] of its supplicants. **The boy clearly feels that the identity of each person in his community has a sacred and a secular aspect, and he knows the relative worth of these aspects, since his acceptance into the community was undertaken in a sacred aspect.** From the boy's perspective, one can further add that at this moment the **cognizance of truth is registered on his soul**, since he is required to go away from the secure domain of his family and take upon himself the responsibility of an adult. And in the efforts which he invested in order to train himself for participation in this ceremony (which certainly included his refraining from play) he experienced another truth: that in order to partake in possessions of spirit and wisdom, one must exert oneself and refrain from worldly pleasures." (21)

Despite still being prevalent in Jewish circles, it is not usual to see Bar-Mitzvahs experienced quite this way. Yet Greenberg poses this as an example of how all religious "symbols" should and can be experienced. Here too the movement is through the understanding of the religious "symbol" to the spiritual experience. The prior understanding of the religious "symbol" provides a pathway to the spiritual, but the pedagogical challenge

remains, in each case, to find a way for the learner to experience this particular understanding. How can one prepare a boy to chant the weekly Torah portion for his Bar Mitzvah not only so that he knows the musical intonation, but also so that he experiences it as a preparation for a possessing of spirit and wisdom? How can we enable him to experience the audience in the synagogue at the time at which he chants the weekly portion as a "community" into which he is entering? These are questions which need to be answered in order to effectively teach according to Greenberg's conception of Jewish education.

An equally important challenge is to link spontaneous everyday life experience into the spiritual values suggested by Jewish religious symbols. One cannot know in advance exactly how and when to do this appropriately. The number of cases in which principles such as "love thy neighbor as thyself" or "**have no slander in your tongue**" can arise in one day in an educational setting may be all but infinite. The question is how and when to have recourse to them so that they can serve as intimate spiritual resources for learners. In order to answer it, intimate knowledge of the principles must be at the teacher's "fingertips," together with a strong sensitivity to the learners

4. The implications of Greenberg's conception for education at the primary and adult level:

Greenberg's conception of the Jewish learner assumes that s/he has attained various skills and dispositions. Greenberg himself points to knowledge of the Hebrew language, primarily that of the classical sources, as a precondition for authentic encounter with texts of the fundamental books of Judaism. In addition, it is difficult to imagine learners being able to seek out the spiritual content of these texts without first having basic skills of interpretation and a deep reverence for Jewish symbols. In order to implement this conception in practice, therefore, there is a need for a strong effort to be made in primary education to educate learners towards the attainment of these and other similar capabilities and attitudes.

Besides having to arrive at a coherent and comprehensive sense of these skills and dispositions, each one would have to be "broken down" into its various components, and built up again into a program of educational activities. Let us look, for example, at the development of interpretive skills. In order to develop sufficient capacity for interpreting Jewish texts, seven sub-skills would have to be mastered:

- 1) Decoding: leading to mastery of the language.
- 2) Memorization: leading to *bekiyut* (erudition).
- 3) Understanding: knowing the assumptions and principles of the author, the redactor or the scholar.
- 4) Comparison: comparing or contrasting of principles.

- 5) Simulations: inventing actions coherent with the principles disclosed by the textual analysis.
- 6) Experimentation: applying alternative principles and confronting the consequences.
- 7) Behavior: learning that authentic Jewish education places reading, analysis, and behavior on one continuum.(22)

DEVELOP EACH SECTION IN GREATER DETAIL ON BASIS OF CONSULTATION WITH GREENBERG AND FOX

The development of dispositions, such as reverence for Jewish religious "symbols," also requires special care at the level of primary education. To be sure, learning in a sub-culture setting such as was described in the opening section, one in which the symbols of Judaism are intertwined with everyday living and treated reverently by young and old alike can have a strong incremental effect on the learner's attitude. (23) This sort of setting is critical for the implementation of Greenberg's conception. Yet the authentic encounter with the spiritual content of Judaism, by its very definition in Greenberg's conception, goes deeper than socialization. Indeed, the spiritual discovery of that which is "other" appears here almost as a prior and fundamental building block for the development of Jewish society itself. Consequently, one could argue that, in the final analysis, in order to develop early reverence for Jewish symbols, there is a need for an additional effort.

What are the components of a personality which has reverence for religious "symbols" and how can they be nurtured from an early age? Any attempt to answer this question ought to dispel suspicions as to a lack of emotional or non-intellectual aspects in Greenberg's conception of Jewish education. On the other hand, the question itself brings us to an area of Greenberg's conception which requires further research. Greenberg himself points to a strong measure of curiosity as a characteristic which learners will need to bring to the learning process in order to receive from it what may address their spiritual needs. "Curiosity" here seems to be defined as a desire and drive to grasp that which is beyond one's understanding and control, that which is mysterious, that which is "other" to oneself. By the same token, we might posit the capacity for "awe" and a pleasure in "wonder" as a necessary components for the development of reverence for religious symbols. These and other suggestions need to be coherently defined and critically examined in light of existing theories of personality in order to be considered as a basis for programs in primary education.

Finally, it is important to consider what happens after the learner has encountered, as Greenberg stipulates "significant portions" of Judaism. It would be mistaken to assume that Greenberg sees this as the end of Jewish education. Spiritual needs, as he has defined them, can ever be fully addressed at any point in time by Jewish education - they grow and develop as life itself. Rather, Greenberg's faith is that once the learner has been given "significant portions," s/he will naturally continue to refer to Judaism as a central resource for spiritual content at every stage of his/her life. Having facilitated this development in the learner's life, however, the role of Jewish education in Greenberg's conception is by no means complete.

At this point, Jewish education must provide adults with appropriate contexts to continue seeking out Judaism's spiritual content in relation to the categories of life which unfold before them as they grow older. At home, with a *chevruta*, in a *chavura*, in the synagogue, or in any number of houses of study, they must be given a real opportunity to continue "learning Torah for its own sake" and to discover its guidance in the complex and sophisticated matrix of adult living.

Indeed, were the experience of Jewish religious "symbols" to lose its power once "significant portions" had been received, the very sub-culture setting appropriate for Greenberg's Jewish education could be undermined. In this sense, one could make the argument that the education of adults is no less critical than primary education as an entry point into the practical implementation of Greenberg's conception of Jewish education. In any case, regardless of what comes first, to the degree that the settings for both merge, so too will the effectiveness of Jewish education be maximized and the spiritual bonds which keep Jewish society together, over place and over time, will remain strong.

notes

1. explanation of principle of educational "translation" here, refer to opening chapter;
2. Lightfoot, The Good High School, Highland Park example, page 321;
3. Roth, Congress Bi-Weekly, Sept. 13, 1963, quoted in Silberman's "A Certain People,";
NOTE: Greenberg's comments apply to Israel as well, for example in his critique of the way Bible is taught in the secular system....;
4. Cremin, The Ecology of Education in his book of essays on "Public Education" (1976)
5. Fox, Ramah - A Setting for Jewish Education, in JTS publication on Ramah;
6. Ibid.
7. Greenberg, Zehut...page 263 of On the Bible and Judaism (Israeli secular audience for Zehut) and protocols from meetings with fellows of SEL;
8. Ibid page 261;
9. Ibid;
10. Ibid;
11. Ibid; NOTE: assumption of no a-priori faith assumptions necessary; possible reference to example of Kauffmann;
12. Greenberg's method is reported in the protocols of an address to students of Ben Gurion University... "The Biblical Grounding of Human Value" published in...
13. See also Greenberg's "HaChayim"
14. The scholarly debate which ensued Greenberg's "The Biblical Grounding of Human Value" in the Interpreter's dictionary, etc...;
15. Greenberg's article in טורא; see also last footnote in 3rd article in "HaSegulah Ve HaKoach," and "Atem Keruyim Adam"; all this leads into his latest work on feminist interpretation of the Bible;
16. Simon Greenberg, "Judaism and the Democratic Ideal"...see perhaps also Tzvi Marx doctorate on Jewish approach to handicapped;

17. As was intimated in the introduction, Greenberg's fear is that by circumventing "particular Jewish culture" in search for some abstract form of "universal culture," the learner will emerge with "no culture". MENTION NEED TO FURTHER EXPLORE GREENBERG'S CONCEPTION OF TEACHING JEWISH HISTORY, LITERATURE, ETC.;
18. The integrity, coherence and consistency of Greenberg's whole system comes through in this conception of the teacher; References...;
19. Greenberg on the teacher in "Jewish Education" volume 29, #3, 1959, pp. 45-6
20. Ibid, page 48
21. Greenberg article on Bible teacher in Hebrew on pages 255-6 of On the Bible and Judaism...;
22. Fox, Ramah article...;
23. Jewish folklore is filled with examples of acts expressing and perhaps generating this sort of reverence: kissing a fallen Chumash, Yemenite kids learning Bible from all four sides of the table...etc.

הלימודים היהודיים בישראל מנקודת-ראות
ליבראלית-לאומית ("חילונית")

פרופ' מנחם ברינקר

טיוטה 1994

1. חינוך אינו מתנהל בחלל ריק. המתחנך לעולם אינו חומר=גלם 'טהור' ומערכת-החינוך הפורמלי אינה פס=ייצור היכול לעצב חומר גלם מדומה זה כרצונה. הילד ואחר-כך הנער הנכנסים בשערי מערכת-החינוך עוצבו כבר בחיק המשפחה, הרחוב והאירועים הסובבים להם. הם מגיבים להם ומוסיפים להיות מעוצבים על-ידם גם בשעה שהם שוהים חלק מיומם במערכת החינוך הפורמלית לכל שלביה: גן-הילדים, בית הספר העממי והתיכון, הצבא והאוניברסיטה. מבחינה זו כל תוכנית חינוכית אינה מבטאת אלא משאלת-לב של מורים ומחנכים ולעולם יש בה בהשוואה למערכת ההשפעות הרחבה והדינמית=יותר שהמתחנך חשוף לה מחוץ למוסדות=החינוך יסודות אידיאליים. כמובן, אין לזלזל בשל כך במערכת החינוך הפורמלי. להיפך. אפשר שהיסודות האידיאליים המצויים בה יאזנו השפעות של הסביבה שהוגי=החינוך רואים אותן כשליליות ואם גם באופן חלקי בלבד.

יש כאן מעין פרדוקס שכן 'הסביבה' במובן הרחב של המלה איננה רק גורם הניצב מול החינוך הפורמלי או אופף אותו מבחוץ. 'הסביבה' היא גם המכוונת את החינוך הפורמלי שכן לפחות בחברה דמוקרטית זקוקה מערכת=החינוך לתמיכת ההורים ולהסכמתם לתכניה. פתרונו של הפרדוקס הוא בכך שהסביבה מעניקה לחינוך תמיד דימוי אידיאלי של עצמה. לפחות עד כמה שמדובר בהורים, בכל חברה ריאלית, הם עצמם מצפים שהמתחנך בדרך=חיו ייצור את הפשרה בין החינוך ה'אידיאלי' למציאות-חיו.

2. דברים אלה הנראים לי כמוסכמות זוכים למלוא אישורם כשאנו חושבים על ההבדל העמוק בין החינוך היהודי והלימודים היהודיים של מוסדות החינוך הלא=אורתודוכסי שבתפוצות לבין אלה שבישראל.

על הלימודים היהודיים בתפוצות מטילים הורים ומחנכים - בדרגות שונות של מודעות - משימה אידיאלית קשה שהיא ברוב המקרים מעל לכוחותיו. זוהי המשימה של שימור יהודיותו של המתחנך בתוך סביבה ועולם לא=יהודיים.

האדם היהודי חי היום כמעט בכל התפוצות בעולם כפול: עולם יהודי ועולם 'כללי' (כמובן, איני מדבר כאן על אלה שכבר נתנדפה יהודיותם כליל או מצד שני על חוגי האורתודוכסיה). לפחות בארצות הרווחה עומדים שני עולמות אלה זה מול זה והמתחנך היהודי תופס את המתחנך 'שלו' כמי שבלבו

מתנהל מאבק בין כוח-המשיכה של שני העולמות האלה. כיוון שהחברה המערבית הליברלית של היום מציעה ליהודים מה שלא הוצע להם מעולם: גישה חופשית לכל מרכזי-המדע, התרבות, המסחר והמדיניות וכיוון שמצד שני, לגמרי לא ברור מה יכולה היהדות להציע לרבים מבניה שאיבדו את אמונתם הדתית - נתונים יהודים רבים בתהליך של אובדן זהותם היהודית. על החינוך היהודי מטילים את המשימה הסיזיפית של עצירת התהליך הזה או, לפחות, צמצומו. בעומק-לבם יודעים הקורים והמחנכים היטב שבסופו של דבר יוכרע הקונפליקט המצוי כביכול - בנפשו של היהודי (ה) מחוץ למערכת החינוך בהתאם לנסיבות-החיים. אך ציפיותיהם של הורים ולחצה של הקהילה מביאים את המחנכים לעסוק בייצורן של מערכות נימוקים מופשטים לטובת הכרעה 'יהודית'. נימוקים אלה ברוב המקרים אמורים להביא את המתחנך לידי כך שיראה בזהותו היהודית דבר הנובע ממשו עמוק יותר מאשר רגשות טבעיים של נאמנות משפחתית-שבטית. לחץ זה מקנה היום אופי אידיאולוגי ברור לא רק למרבית החינוך היהודי אלא גם למרבית המחשבה היהודית בארצות-הברכה.

3. הלימודים היהודיים בישראל פטורים מאילוץ זה. כאן ניתן לבחון את כוח המשיכה של התרבות היהודית לכל עומקה ההיסטורי והיקפיה הטריטוריאליים ללא צורך לרומם ולפאר אותה לעומת התרבות הכללית. העולם היהודי של המתחנך הישראלי מקיף אותו מכל עבריו. הנער והנערה חיים בתוך סביבה יהודית-ישראלית הטרואגנית. יש בה צורות שונות של תרבות וחיים יהודיים. אך כמעט שאינם נתקלים בדבר-מה אחר. הנוף הנשקף אליהם מחלון-חדרם, מרבית החדשות שהם שומעים ברדיו או קוראים עליהם בעתון, הויכוחים המשפחתיים שהם נחשפים אליהם עוד לפני שיוכלו להבינם כראוי הם כולם או מרביתם יהודיים-ישראלים. נושאים יהודיים ושאלות יהודיות-ישראליות חודרים לחייו של המתחנך הישראלי דרך כל הוויתו ולאן דווקא באמצעות מערכת החינוך הפורמלית.

לפיכך נראה לי כי ללימודים היהודיים בישראל יש נקודת מוצא טבעית וכי יעדם צריך להשתלב בצורך האקסיסטנציאלי שיש לכל צעיר (ה) להבהיר לעצמם את עולמם: העולם הסובב אותם והעולם שבתוכם.

ההווה היהודי-ישראלי יכול להיות נקודת-מוצא טובה. כבכל הווה-של אדם או של קהילה מותווים בו נתיבים של עבר שהוליד אליו ממש כפי שמשורטטים בו-ולו גם בצורה סכימאטית - אפשרויות מסוימות של עתיד אחדות מהן-קוסמות ומושכות ואחרות-מרתיעות ומפחידות. הווה זה שולח אפוא לשם עצם הבנתו את הנערה והנער אל העבר של ההיסטוריה היהודית הקרובה והרחוקה כמו גם אל אוצרותיה הספרותיים וההגותיים של התרבות היהודית. נראה לי

לפיכך כי בנפשם של הישראלים הצעירים מצוי הפוטנציאל שמתכנני מערכת לימודים יהודיים המחוננים באמפתיה וברוח ביקורתית יכולים להפיק ממנו משכילים ישראלים אמיתיים שהם ידענים של תולדות עם, תרבותו וספרותו.

4. כיוון שנקודת המוצא שלי היא ליבראלית וביסודה מצוייה ההכרה שעל בית-הספר מוטלת המשימה הפרדוקסלית של חינוך בני-אדם לחירות, דהיינו חינוכם לכך שאין הם חייבים להתאים עצמם לשום דפוס נתון מראש - אי אפשר, לדעתי, להשתית את החינוך על דפוס מחייב כזה. ההווה צריך להופיע כנקודת-מוצא לאפשרויות שונות של עתיד גם ליחיד וגם לקהילה. העבר היהודי הוא, לכל המרובה, מצע של אפשרויות=לעתיד, דגמים של עיצוב עצמי, מופתים אפשריים, מלבד היותו מקור הכרחי להבנת-ההווה.

לפי תפיסתי העבר היהודי אינו אפוא מאגר של תכנים מחייבים. הוא אינו מגלה בתוכו דגם שליט עדיף ודגמים נחותים של עיצוב החיים. על התלמיד (ה) שבבית ספרי לא מטילים להיות 'כמו אברהם אבינו' 'כמו הלל הזקן' או 'כמו בר-כוכבא'. אבל מטילים עליו לדעת מי היו אנשים אלה כפי שמטילים עליו לדעת מה חשבו הרמב"ם, יהודה הלוי, נחמן מברסלב, אחד-העם או ברדיצ'בסקי ולא מי מהם צדק לאורך כל הדרך.

הוא עצמו צריך לעשות את מלאכת הביורור וההערכה בשביל עצמו ולקבוע מי מן הדמויות האלה והאחרות הן לו למופת 'ובמה. הוא גם הצריך לגלות-לעצמו מהי מחשבה מעמיקת=ראות שבה יוכל להיעזר במחשבת=חיו ואיזו מחשבה אינה יכולה לשמשו.

החילוניות של בית-ספר זה אינה מתבטאת בכך שנלמדים בו בעיקר טקסטים מודרניים חילוניים. בית-ספר זה מלמד מבחר רחב מן הספרות הדתית של עם ישראל החל במקרא, במשנה ובמבחרים מן המדרש, עבור דרך שירת-הקודש של ימי-הביניים והפילוסופיה הדתית של תקופה זו ועד לגילויים האחרונים של התרבות היהודית הדתית. אך בצדס הוא מלמד גם מבחרים נדיבים של הספרות החילונית של עם ישראל החל ב'שיר השירים' וב'קוהלת' דרך שירת-החול של ימי-הביניים וכלה במחשבה היהודית ובספרות היפה העברית של מאתיים השנים האחרונות הבלתי=דתיות בעיקרן.

'החילוניות' היא בנקודת-המוצא. בכך שמלבד העובדה שנלמד - ואפילו מודגש - הפלורליזם העצום של תרבויות=ישראל - מוצע כל החומר הנלמד להערכתו של המתחנך. מלאכותי יהיה לדרוש ממורה או ממחנך שיעלים את דעתו בשאלות של איכות הגותית או אסתטית. אך המחנך שאני רואה לנגד עיני צריך

שיהיה מסוגל לגלות איכויות אסתטיות והגותיות ביצירות ובטקסטים בעלי אופי שונה ומנוגד.

5. פלוראליזם זה אין לעוטפו במעטפה של תורת-יהדות אחת שבדרך הטבע תיטול על עצמה ליצור היררכיה של חשוב ובלתי-חשוב, עיקר וטפל, על-פי קריטריונים שיסודם תמיד בהשקפת-עולם זו או אחרת. עדיף להגישו כמות שהוא.

דבר זה חשוב במיוחד לגבי הוראת ההיסטוריה היהודית. הדינמיקה והמתחים שבהגות העתיקה ובספרות העתיקה של עם ישראל מוסתרים מפנינו, במידה זו או אחרת, בשל העריכה הרבנית של הטקסטים העתיקים, ובשל ההוצאה מכלל-ישראל של כל מי שלא עמד בדרישות אורח החיים ההלכתי והמחשבה או היצירה שהם לפחות מתישבים אתו, (שפינוזה, למשל). אך בהיסטוריה היהודית גלויים לכל אורך הדרך הניגודים והמתחים שבין בעלי אמונות שונות: עובדי ה' ועובדי הבעל, מלכים ונביאים, פרושים, צדוקים ואיסיים, רציונליסטים ומיסטיקאים, מפסיקים ומרחיבים בהלכה, בקיאים בחוכמות ומתנגדים, אורתודוקסים ורפורמיים, ניאו-אורתודוקסים ומתבוללים, משכילים ליברלים וסוציאליסטים, ציונים ומתנגדיהם, אוניברסליסטים ופרטיקולריסטים, שמרנים ודבקים בעיקר או "עיקרים", אגנוסטיים ומרדנים-מהפכניים המבקשים להפוך את הקערה על פיה.

בתולדות ישראל שומה על המחנך לעורר הבנה לגילויים שונים של חיים יהודיים-אנושיים. למשל: עליו לעורר בתלמידיו "הבנה-מבפנים" הן כלפי ה' יוחנן בן-זכאי והן כלפי בר-כוכבא והקנאים, הן כלפי שפינוזה והן כלפי מחרימיו. בשום פנים ואופן אין לדלג, למשל, בהוראת תקופת ההתעוררות הלאומית בסוף המאה ה-י"ט על הפולמוסים מסביב לציונות. אין להציג את יריבי הציונות מקרב האורתודוקסים, האוטונומיסטים (דובנוב, למשל) או הסוציאליסטים היהודיים (ה'בונד') כאויבי-עמם. להיפך, יש להתור להבנת עמדתם למלוא-עומקה ומניעה. יש לעודד זאת לא רק בשל הכבוד שיש בה כלפי האישיות החופשית של המתחנך אלא גם מבחינה חברתית-יהודית. קנאות דתית או לאומנית או ציוניסטית אין להן דבר עם שכנוע פנימי דתי או ציוני. המדובר איננו באידיאל כלשהו של אובייקטיביות מדעית אלא במניעת אותו סוג של קנאות ובטחון א-פרירי בצידקתן הסותמים את הגולל על עצם אפשרות ההבנה. הבנה למניעה של אישיות היסטורית בין אם היא אישיות פועלת בתחום החברתי ובין אם היא אישיות יוצרת בתחום ההגותי או האמנותי מחייבת נטרול מסויים של קני-מידה שיפוטיים לפחות עד שהושגה ההבנה. אין לי כל התנגדות לכך שבסופו של לימוד יחליט הלומד שהוא 'כועס' על יוחנן בן-זכאי או על בר-כוכבא, שלבו עם שפינוזה או עם מנדיו, שהוא רואה בתנועת-הרפורמה או, להיפך, בהסתגרות האורתודוקסית, סכנה לעם ישראל וכיוצא באלה, בתנאי שעלה

יהודית=ישראלית (השואה, מלחמת השחרור וכיו"ב) על יצירות אחרות ובתנאי שרמתן האמנותית גבוהה. הסיבה לכך היא שבשל ריבוי הטקסטים האיכותיים נחוצה בלאו-הכי סלקציה גדולה. כיוון שכך יש לשאוף לכך שלימודי הספרות יאירו מצדם לא רק את הבנת הספרות עצמה - כשפה וכמערכת צורות - אלא גם את התופעות היהודיות הנלמדות בתחומי ההגות וההיסטוריה.

הוראת הספרות היפה - כאמנות - בכל בית ספר כללי היא בעיתית. בשביל הלומדים שבהם לא התעורר עניין חי בספרות זוהי מעמסה כבדה. ואילו לגבי אלה שבהם התעורר עניין זה אין די במיכסת השעות המוקצבת בדרך-כלל להוראת ספרות. לפיכך הפתרון שאני מציע מסייע לקשור את אלה שאין להם עניין ספרותי מיוחד ליצירות הנלמדות דרך הנושא והבעיתיות שהיצירה מעלה ואילו לגבי בעלי העניין המיוחד בספרות יש תמיד מקום לקיומו של חוג לספרות ולשירה שיוכל לשמש גם כסדנא לכתיבה יצירתית.

9. השפה העברית היא אחד המכנים המשותפים המינימליים אך גם הרחבים ביותר לזהותם היהודית של הישראלים. בניגוד לתפוצות, שם משמש הלימוד=מרצון של השפה העברית הוכחה לעניינם של המתחנכים בזהותם היהודית, הידע של העברית בישראל מוקנה לכל ילד וילדה באורח אוטומטי. הדאגה העיקרית כאן צריכה להיות לרמתה של השפה, שפת הדיבור ושפת-הכתב גם יחד.

לפיכך אין להזניח את תפקידם של הטקסטים העתיקים (בעיקר, מקרא ומשנה) בהעשרת העברית שבפי הלומדים וטקסטים כאלה יכולים וצריכים לדעתי להילמד בכל המקצועות של הלימודים היהודיים: מחשבת=ישראל, היסטוריה יהודית וספרות עברית. יהיה בכך משום פיצוי חלקי להתעקשותי להגביל את לימודי הטקסטים והתקופות הפרה=מודרניות למחצית שעות=ההוראה.

בהווה היהודי מהווה השפה העברית רק את אחת השפות שבהן מבטאת והוגה ההווה היהודית את עצמה. בתחומי ההגות וההיסטוריה לומדים המתחנכים הישראלים בהכרח טקסטים שנכתבו במקורם בגרמנית או ברוסית, באידיש, בערבית או באנגלית. בתחום הספרות היפה ברורה העדיפות הניתנת לטקסטים שנכתבו במקורם בעברית. אף=על=פי=כן כדי למנוע זיהוי פרובינציאלי של היהודיות עם הישראליות כדאי להפגיש אותם - ולו גם פגישות מינימליות אחדות - עם טקסטים יהודיים שנכתבו בשפות אחרות, (כגון סיפורים של קפקא, מלמוד ורות או שירים של פול צלאן ואדמונד ז'אבס).

10. כאמור גישה ליבראלית לא אורח דוכסית ללימודים היהודיים (שנוהגים לכנותה 'חילונית') ניכרת בדרך ההוראה לא פחות משהיא ניכרת במבחר המגוון יותר והפחות מצונזר של טקסטים, בעיות ואירועים הנלמדים בבית-הספר.

בבית-הספר המלמד על יסוד גישה זו חסרה המחויבות הא-פריורית להעדפת מקורות יהודיים, דעות אמונות ואורחות חיים יהודיים על מקורות, טקסטים, דעות, אמונות ואורחות חיים לא יהודיים. המימד 'היהודי' של החינוך הניתן בבית-ספר זה אינו מושתת על בידולה של היהדות כתופעה היסטורית מחשבתית או ספרותית מכל התופעות האנושיות האחרות. להיפך, הלימודים היהודיים בבית-ספר זה יעלו יפה וישיגו את מטרתם ככל שיוכל המתחנך ליצור אנאלוגיות בין תופעות שבתחום ההווה היהודית לתופעות שמחוצה לה.

למשל, אם יבין התלמיד את הרמב"ם, לא רק כמורה הוראה של היהדות אלא גם כאחד ההוגים החשובים של תקופתו בכלל, שירש מן הפילוסופיה האיסלמית של התקופה בעיתיות פילוסופית מיוחדת; אם יבין את קשרו של ריה"ל למחשבה המיסטית האיסלמית, את זיקתו של אבן-גבירול לניאו-פלטוניזם, את הרקע הרוסי והכלל-אירופי לפואימה האוטוביוגרפית של ביאליק, את ההשראה שנתנה המחשבה הליברלית והסוציאליסטית הרוסית להוגים כמו אחד-העם או א.ד. גורדון, את האופן שבו הזדקק הרב קוק לשם ביסוס הייחוד של האתיקה היהודית למודלים הגותיים של הרדר ושל ניטשה - בקצרה, אם יבין התלמיד שהיהדות נטועה בעולם רחב יותר ושכל תקופות-היצירה החשובות שלה ניהלה מגע-ומשא ער ויצירתי עם תרבויות העולם-דווקא אז תושג מטרתם העיקרית של הלימודים היהודיים.

דבר זה נכון גם לגבי הוראת הנושאים היהודיים הקלאסיים שהרי אפילו שירת-הגיבורים שבמקרא וחלקים בתורת-משה מזמינים השוואה עם טקסטים של העולם המזרח-תיכוני הקדמון וגם את המידות של הלל, ר' ישמעאל או יוסי הגלילי למדרש-התורה ניתן להשוות לכללי הלוגיקה וההרמנויטיקה של הפילוסופיה היוונית.

מטרת הלימודים היהודיים היא להעמיד לרשות המתחנכים אוצר של זכרונות מימים קדומים, מונומנטים מופתיים ואסוציאציות היסטוריות וספרותיות כמו גם דוגמאות של התמודדויות הגותיות עם גורל-האדם, אנו רוצים שאוצר זה יעמוד לרשותו בכל עת. אל לו לבודד את אלה משאר חוויותיו כמתחנך. להיפך, את אלה יבולל בידיעות אחרות המגיעות אליו מן הלימודים ההומניסטיים הכלליים, לימודי הפילוסופיה הכללית, אתיקה ותורת-מדינה,

היסטוריה וספרות יפה כללית לשם גיבוש עולמו הרוחני, תרבותו
האינדיבידואלית והשקפת-עולמו (אם יש לו צורך בהשקפת-עולם כוללת ומקיפה
ויכולת להגיע אליה).

11. התבוננות ממושכת בדרכי-החינוך בישראל ובהשפעתן על
דרכי-החשיבה וההתנהגות של ישראלים צעירים שכנעוני שזו היא הדרך האחת
והיחידה שבה יש ללכת.

אין לנו תרופה בדוקה ומובטחת, אוטומטית, כנגד השטחיות,
הוולגריות והחומרנות הגסה של 'הרחוב'. עלינו להכיר כי אלה אינן הסכנות
היחידות האורבות לנוער הישראלי. סתגרנות, העדר חשיבה עצמאית, קנאות,
התנשאות שובינסטית והלכי רוח גזעניים ופאראנואידיים אינן סכנות פחותות
מ'העדר ערכים יהודיים'.

אם יכולים 'מדעי-הרוח' או הלימודים ההומניסטיים לתקן או לאזן
במקצת את ההשפעות השליליות הרי זה רק על-ידי כך שהן מחדדות במתחנך את
הרגשת חירותו האינדיבידואלית כשחידוד זה מלווה בתחושת אחריותו לכל
הנעשה סביבו. למתחנך המרגיש בנטל העצום של החירות תעזור כמובן השראה
רוחנית. אולם אין להחליף השראה רוחנית בסמכותיות מוחלטת מאיזו שהוא
סוג. תפקידם של הלימודים היהודיים כמו גם תפקידם של לימודי הרוח
הכלליים הוא להעמיד לרשות המתחנכים מיגוון רחב של השראות אפשריות כדי
לאפשר להם ליטול סמכות עליונה על חייהם, על נוהגם עם הזולת ועל
הכרעותיהם כאזרחים.

Jewish Studies in Israel from a Liberal-National ("Secular") Point of View

Menahem Brinker

1. Education does not take place in a vacuum. Pupils are never "pure" raw material and the formal educational system cannot treat them as though they were clay in the potter's hands, to shape as it wishes. The children and afterward the young people who pass through the portals of educational institutions have indeed already been shaped by the family, the street, and by the events that impinge on their environment. They react to these stimuli and continue to be affected by them even as they go on spending part of their day in one of the stages of the formal educational system: kindergarten, elementary and high school, army, university. From this point of view, a curriculum only reflects wishes harbored by teachers and educators; it cannot brook comparison with the broader and more dynamic array of influences to which the pupil is exposed outside the educational institutions. Of course, this is no reason to disparage the formal system. On the contrary: its ideal elements may offset, even if only in part, effects of the environment that educators consider negative.

There is something of a paradox here, since the "environment," in the broad sense of the term, does more than juxtapose itself to formal education or envelop it from outside. The "environment" also guides formal education, since in a democratic society, at least, the educational system needs the support of the parents involved and their consent to its curricula. The solution to the paradox is that the environment always imbues education with an ideal image of itself. Where the parents are concerned, at any rate, in every realistic society they themselves expect that the pupils, through their way of life, will strike a compromise between "ideal" education and the reality of their lives.

2. These axioms, as I take them to be, are fully confirmed by the deep disparities which exist between the kind of Jewish education and Jewish studies offered by non-Orthodox educational institutions in the diaspora and by the educational system in Israel.

In the diaspora, parents and educators impose on Jewish studies — with differing degrees of awareness — an arduous ideal mission which it can rarely fulfill. They ask such studies to preserve the youngster's Jewishness in a non-Jewish environment.

Nowadays, in almost every diaspora, the Jewish person lives in a dual world: a Jewish world and a "general" world (naturally, I am not referring either to those whose Jewishness has already evaporated or to Orthodox circles). Certainly in the affluent countries these two worlds are in confrontation; Jewish educators know that deep down, "their" pupils are drawn to both of these polar opposites. Since today's Western liberal society offers Jews something unprecedented — free access to all the centers of science, culture, commerce, and policy — and since, at the same time, it is far from clear what Judaism can offer to its many progeny who have lost their religious faith, the result is that many Jews are experiencing a loss of their Jewish identity. Jewish education has the Sisyphean task of reversing, or at least checking, this process. In their hearts, parents and educators alike know that ultimately, the conflict which is ostensibly tormenting the Jewish soul will be resolved outside the educational system, by life's exigencies. But parental expectations and community pressures induce educators to adduce abstract rationalizations in favor of a "Jewish" decision. In general, this rationale is supposed to persuade youngsters that the wellsprings of their Jewish identity run deeper than natural feelings of family-tribal loyalty. In the affluent communities of which we are speaking, the resulting pressure confers a clear ideological character not only on most Jewish education but on Jewish thought as well.

3. Jewish studies in Israel are free of such constraints. Here we can examine the allure of Jewish culture in its full historical depth and territorial scope without the need to exalt it above the general culture. The Jewish world of Israeli pupils surrounds them at every turn. They live in a

heterogeneous Jewish-Israeli environment. It contains various forms of Jewish life and culture. But rarely do they encounter anything else. The view from their room, most of the news they hear on the radio or read about in the paper, the family quarrels to which they are exposed even before they can understand them properly are all or nearly all Jewish-Israeli in content. Jewish themes and Jewish-Israeli questions penetrate the life of Israeli pupils through every facet of their existence and not necessarily through the formal educational system.

As I see it, then, Jewish studies in Israel have a natural point of departure, and they should be integral to every young person's existential need to understand the world: the world around them and their inner world.

Present-day Jewish-Israeli life can be a useful starting point. The present, whether of a person or a community, is contoured by paths from the past which produced it, just as its blueprints, however schematically, certain possibilities for the future, some enchanting and alluring, others frightening and repellent. This present sends the boy or girl who would understand it to delve into the past of Jewish history, near and remote, and into the literary and cultural treasures of Jewish culture. So young Israelis would seem to harbor a potential which planners of Jewish studies, if they are endowed with empathy and with a critical spirit, can tap in order to produce truly educated citizens who are versed in the history, culture, and literature of their people.

4. Since I begin from a liberal position which is based on the conception that school has the paradoxical task of *educating* people to *freedom* —that is, instructing them that they are not *obliged* to conform to any preexisting pattern of behavior — it follows that education cannot be grounded in a binding pattern. For both individual and community, the present should appear as a jumping-off point for *diverse* future possibilities. The Jewish past is a multifaceted platform of future possibilities,

models for self-growth, and potential paragons, besides being a necessary source for understanding the present.

As I conceive it, then, the Jewish past is not a reservoir of binding precepts. It does not manifest within itself a superior ruling model and inferior models for shaping one's life. The pupils in my school are not called upon to be "like our forefather Abraham," "like Hillel the Elder," or "like Bar-Kokhba." But they are called upon to know who those people were, just as they are obliged to know what Maimonides, Yehuda Halevi, Nahman of Braslav, Ahad Ha'am, or Berdichevsky thought, but not which of them was right from beginning to end.

The pupils themselves must do the work of elucidation and evaluation and decide which of these and other personalities they hold up as paragons, and why. Similarly, they must discover for themselves the profound insights that can help them articulate their ideas, and also discern which thinkers will not be useful.

This school's secularity is not expressed in the pupils' study of primarily modern, secular texts. The curriculum also includes a broad selection from Jewish religious literature: from the Bible, Mishnah and midrash, to medieval sacred poetry and religious philosophy, and concluding with the latest manifestations of Jewish religious culture. But there are also generous selections from the Jewish people's secular literature: from the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes to nondevotional medieval poetry, and finally Jewish thought and Hebrew belles lettres of the last two hundred, largely irreligious, years.

"Secularity" lies in the point of origin. Besides the fact that the sweeping pluralism of the Jewish people's cultures is taught, and even *emphasized*, all the material that is studied is presented for the pupil's evaluation. It would be artificial to ask a teacher or educator to hide his opinion on

philosophical or aesthetic questions. But the educator I have in mind must be capable of divining aesthetic and philosophical qualities in diverse and contradictory texts.

5. This pluralism should not be enfolded within *one* doctrine of Judaism, which will naturally endeavor to create a hierarchy of important/unimportant and crucial/trivial based on criteria which will always rest on a particular worldview. It is preferable to present "the thing itself."

In this connection, an area of special importance is the teaching of Jewish history. The dynamics and tensions which informed Jewish thought and literature in ancient times have been obscured from our view, to one degree or another, by the rabbinical editing of the primal texts and by the ostracism of anyone in the community who did not conform to the halakhic way of life and to thought or creative work which is at least consistent with it (Spinoza, for example). Yet Jewish history is pervaded by conflicts and tensions between different beliefs: worshippers of God and worshippers of Baal, kings and prophets, Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, rationalists and mystics, accentuators and expanders in halakhah, sages versed in the wisdoms and *mitnagdim*, Orthodox and Reform, neo-Orthodox and assimilators, educated liberals and socialists, Zionists and their opponents, universalists and particularists, conservatives and clingers to a principle or to "Principles," or agnostics and rebels/revolutionaries who want to turn the world upside down.

Teachers of the history of the Jewish people must arouse understanding for different manifestations of Jewish-human life. For example, they must stir in their pupils "understanding from within" for both Rabbi Yohanan ben-Zakai and for Bar-Kokhba and the Zealots, for both Spinoza and his excommunicators. While teaching the period of national awakening in the late nineteenth century, for example, they must not under any circumstances omit the controversies that surrounded Zionism. Zionism's adversaries among the Orthodox, the autonomists (e.g., Dubnow), and the Jewish

socialists (the Bund) should not be portrayed as enemies of their people. On the contrary, every effort should be made to arrive at a thorough understanding of their position and its rationale. This is to be encouraged not only out of respect for the pupil's free personality, but also for Jewish-social reasons. Religious, nationalist, or Zionist fanaticism have nothing to do with internal conviction in these spheres. It is not a question of an ideal of scientific objectivity, but of avoiding the zealousness and a priori confidence in one's rightness that preclude any possibility of understanding. Understanding the motives of a historical personage, whether he was a social activist, an artist, or a philosopher requires that judgmental criteria be set aside, at least until the understanding is achieved. I see nothing objectionable if a pupil decides, after studying the subject, that he is "angry" at Yohanan ben-Zakai or at bar-Kokhba, that he supports Spinoza or his ostracizers, that he thinks the Reform movement or, perhaps, Orthodox insularity is a danger to the Jewish people — provided this is based on a true grasp of the intensity of the national, religious, or social issue which generated the furor and divided those involved. Only then do I stretch the scope of understanding and tolerance to the limit and obligate teachers of Jewish history in Israel to make their pupils understand the reasons, which were in fact rather perceptive, adduced by Zionism's early adversaries. The point is that pupils should take nothing for granted: they should arrive at their inner conviction not through insularity and ignorance, but by means of independent thought which rests on broad educational foundations.

6. It bears re-emphasizing that "secularity" is not adduced here as a simple antithesis to "religious." I have in mind liberal openness, not the cultivation of militant secularism. I often find an intractable refusal to grasp this distinction among observant or traditional Jews. No sooner do they hear the word "secularity" than they want to know the identity of their interlocutor's mentor and the names of the main texts which form the basis of his secular doctrine. It is as though, after listening

patiently to the nonbeliever's sincere declaration of secularity, they were to ask, nevertheless, for the name of his "rebbe" and want to know which "holy books" he believes in. As they see it, the problem is to locate the "secular community" — which is distinguished by its acceptance of one fundamental, binding axiom as the core of its belief: God's nonexistence— on the map of Judaism's branches around a specific leader and certain basic texts.

However, cultivating a free approach to texts means that there are no sacrosanct basic writings: everything is open to interpretation and evaluation. There are plenty of non-Orthodox, "secular" models for evaluating Jewish history and culture, and even for predicting the future of the Jewish people. M.L. Lilienblum, Ahad Ha'am, Bialik, David Frishman, M.I. Berdichevsky, Y.H. Brenner, Ya'akov Klachkin, Shimon Dubnow, Theodor Herzl, and Nahman Syrkin: each of these Jewish critics and thinkers espoused a "doctrine" about the Jewish people, its culture, and its future. None of them saw Judaism as a spiritual-religious school, but all of them considered Jewish culture a creation of the Jewish people which had been substantially modified over time. A liberal school will teach these doctrines within the framework of Jewish studies, alongside the ideas of Orthodox or Reform thinkers such as S.R. Hirsch, Avraham Gaiger, Franz Rosenzweig, or Rabbi Kook. But it will not teach secular theories as though they were sacred texts. On the contrary, pupils will be encouraged to discover for themselves which ideas have become irrelevant and which can still nourish their intellect. Education based on a pupil's ability to shape his own spiritual-cultural personality has no sacred texts which are above criticism or are unamenable to doubt, show no difference between durable and ephemeral, or cannot be rejected outright. Nor, by the same token, does this kind of education hold up an unequivocal paragon as the exclusive model for emulation or the final arbiter in every matter.

The true test of Israeli schools will lie primarily in how they teach the doctrines of the Zionist thinkers. Herzl, Nordau, Borochof, Syrkin, Buber, Jabotinsky, Katznelson, Ben-Gurion, and others were all thinkers of a certain stature, even if they were not "professional" philosophers. But all of them also engaged in prophecy, by which I mean that in addition to analyzing the contemporaneous condition of the Jewish people, they also tried to envision its future. A scrutiny of their prophecies shows not only their occasional accuracy (such as Herzl's pronouncement that a Jewish state would arise fifty years after the First Zionist Congress, Syrkin's declaration that only cooperative settlement would enable the pioneers to realize Zionism, or Borochof's prediction that force of circumstances would make Hebrew a spoken language in Palestine). It also turns up predictions which now seem bizarre, not to say ludicrous (consider Herzl's notion of a train that would carry millions to Palestine, Borochof's idea that the Arabs would assimilate within the Jews through mixed marriages, or Syrkin's forecast, early in the century, that Jewish immigration to America would cease because it was devoid of idealism). The pupils in a liberal-Zionist school should be able to distinguish clearly between the two types of prophecies; they must be critical even of the most venerated texts. Above all, the school must instill in them the feeling that they are their own rebbes and that Jewish culture, ancient and modern alike, cannot provide them with anything more than sources of inspiration. If they adopt texts from which they extract "principles" for their lives, or discover figures from Jewish history and thought whom they consider not only inspirational but also worthy of emulation, they do so on their responsibility, by exercising their freedom of choice. The school's task is to imbue the pupil with the feeling that behind every act of devotion stands a free person, even behind devotion to the good and the true and the beautiful, or devotion to God as the loftiest symbol of those ideals.

7. Because the goal of the liberal school is to induce pupils to exercise their freedom, and

because the purpose of Jewish studies within that framework is first and foremost to illuminate the Jewish-Israeli condition which they live and breathe every day, the proportions of the Jewish studies program in Israel's state-run schools must be altered. At least half the teaching hours in Jewish history and Jewish thought should be devoted to events and texts of the last hundred and fifty years. This is unavoidable if we want to impart a knowledge of the ideological atomization which occurred in the Jewish world during the modern era in Eastern and Western Europe, in Israel and the diaspora, and most of all in the American diaspora. What holds for Jewish thought — which I take to be the reflection on Jewish existence itself and its milieu — is equally applicable to Jewish history. If we want to acquaint the young generation with the multitude of social movements and the multifaceted existence of the Jewish people in the present, together with the major factors which impinged from the outside, they must study, as systematically and as comprehensively as possible, the Jewish Haskalah (enlightenment) movement, Hasidism and its detractors, Orthodoxy and Reformism, autonomism, territorial Zionism, the Bund, emancipation and assimilation, and also anti-Semitism and liberalism., socialism and communism, and the background and events of the two world wars.

I believe that half the teaching time devoted to Jewish history and Jewish thought will be sufficient to familiarize pupils reasonably well with the texts of ancient Jewish culture. This can be accomplished by means of sensible selections from Torah, Prophets, Writings, Mishnah, sample pages from the Talmud and midrash, and a few chapters from medieval Jewish philosophy. The other half of the teaching hours should be devoted to the closer past.

8. What applies to Jewish history and Jewish thought is sevenfold applicable to the teaching of literature.

It seems to me that the teaching of poetry, fiction, and literary criticism should begin with contemporary Israeli works. Familiarizing pupils with the life-materials of poems and stories will generate a living interest in literature. Only afterward, when a love of literature has taken root, should the teacher "go back" to poetry and fiction of earlier eras.

This approach is not based on a particular literary-poetic scale of values. I am well aware that in *every* era the poetical creation of the Jewish people has produced masterpieces worthy of study. For example, the fiction produced in the early twentieth century (Berdichevsky, Mendele, Gnessin, Bial'ik, Brenner, Berkovich, Schoffman) is artistically equal to the finest Israeli literature. Indeed, it is precisely because I believe that every period has its excellent works that I prefer to begin cultivating the literary sensibilities of young people by teaching works that say something about their own world, without a mediating buffer, before bringing them into contact with worlds more distant in time, place, and mentality.

Preference should be given to literary works which raise Jewish or Jewish-Israeli themes (Holocaust, War of Independence, etc.), provided they are of high artistic merit. This is because the large number of first-rate texts will in any case demand rigorous selection. Therefore, literary studies should seek to enhance not only the understanding of literature itself, as a language and as a system of forms, but also of the Jewish themes which arise in the study of Jewish thought and history.

The teaching of literature — as an art — is problematic in every general school. For pupils who lack a living interest in literature it is an onerous burden; while for lovers of literature there is never enough time available. My solution therefore endeavors to help the former relate to literary works by concentrating on the themes and problems they address, while for those with a craving for literature there is always place to organize a group devoted to literature and poetry which can also

serve as a creative-writing workshop.

9. The Hebrew language is one of the minimal common denominators but also one of the most extensive for establishing the Jewish identity of Israelis. In contrast to the diaspora, where the voluntary study of Hebrew serves as proof of an interest in one's Jewish identity, in Israel every boy and girl automatically acquires a knowledge of Hebrew. The main question here should be the level of the language, both written and spoken.

Therefore, the ancient texts (Bible and Mishnah in particular) should not be neglected in enriching the Hebrew of pupils, and they can and should, in my opinion, be included in every Jewish studies curriculum: Jewish thought, Jewish history, and Hebrew literature. This will partially compensate for my insistence on limiting the study of premodern eras and their texts to half the teaching hours.

At present, Hebrew constitutes only one of the languages in which Jewish thought and being are given expression. The study of Jewish thought and history compels Israeli pupils to study texts originally written in German or Russian, in Yiddish, Hebrew, or English. In the realm of belles lettres, the preference accorded to original Hebrew writing is self-evident. Nevertheless, to prevent a provincial identification of Jewishness with Israeliness, pupils should be introduced, even if only in a few minimal encounters, to Jewish texts written in other languages (such as stories by Kafka, Malamud, and Roth, or poems by Paul Celan and Edmond Javasse).

10. As noted, a liberal, non-Orthodox approach to Jewish studies (usually called a "secular" approach) is as evident in the mode of teaching as it is in the more broadly diversified and less censored selection of texts, issues, and events which are studied.

A school that follows this approach has no *apriori commitment* to prefer Jewish sources and

Jewish opinions, beliefs, and ways of life over non-Jewish sources, texts, opinions, beliefs, and life styles. The "Jewish" dimension of education in this school is not founded on isolating Judaism, as an historical, conceptual, or literary phenomenon, from all other human endeavor. On the contrary, Jewish studies will succeed and achieve their purpose to the degree that the pupil is able to draw analogies between events within the realm of Jewish existence and those in the world outside.

For example, if pupils understand Maimonides not only as a teacher and guide to Judaism but also as one of the major thinkers of his time in general, who inherited from contemporary Islamic thought a distinctive philosophical problematic; if they understand the connection of Judah Halevi to Islamic mystical thought, the affinity of Ibn-Gvirol to Neoplatonism, the Russian and pan-European background to Bialik's autobiographical poem, the inspiration that thinkers like Ahad Ha'am or A.D. Gordon drew from Russian liberal and socialist thought, the way in which Rabbi Kook drew on the Gothic models of Herder and Nietzsche to establish the distinctiveness of Jewish ethics — in short, if pupils grasp that Judaism is part of the broader world and that in all its important creative periods it held a lively and productive give-and-take dialogue with the world's cultures, then the principal goal of Jewish studies will be attained.

This is equally true for the teaching of the classic Jewish subjects. Even the heroic poetry of the Bible, and parts of the Torah, invite comparison with texts of the ancient Mediterranean world, and by the same token the rules adduced by Hillel, Rabbi Ishmael, and Yossi Hagalili for expounding the Law are comparable to the rules of logic and hermeneutics of Greek philosophy.

The purpose of Jewish studies is to place at the pupils' disposal a cornucopia of memories from ancient times, exemplary monuments, and historical and literary associations, as well as examples of philosophical confrontations with man's fate. We want them to be able to draw on this

treasure at all times. They must not set it apart from their other educational experiences. On the contrary, let them assimilate it with other knowledge that they imbibe from general humanistic studies, general philosophy, ethics, political science, history, and world literature, and use it to help crystallize their individual spiritual and cultural world and their worldview (if they have need of a comprehensive worldview and the ability to articulate it).

11. My longtime observation of education in Israel and its effect on the thinking and behavior of young Israelis has convinced me that the road outlined above is the only one to follow.

We have no automatic panacea against the superficiality, vulgarity, and materialism of "the street." We must acknowledge, too, that these are not the only dangers lurking for Israeli youth. Insularity, slavishness of thought, fanaticism, chauvinistic arrogance, and racist-paranoid frames of mind are as dangerous as a "lack of Jewish values."

If the "humanities" or humanistic studies can repair or slightly offset the negative influences, it is only by honing in pupils a feeling of individual freedom, accompanied by a sense of responsibility for everything that happens around them. Naturally, spiritual inspiration will help the pupil who feels the tremendous weight of the burden of freedom. However, spiritual inspiration must not be replaced by absolute authority of any kind. The task of Jewish studies, like that of the general humanities, is to provide pupils with a broad spectrum of possible sources of inspiration which will enable them to assume supreme authority for their lives, for their behavior toward others, and for the decisions they will make as citizens.

**SELECTED NOTES FROM PROFESSOR BRINKER'S
MEETINGS WITH THE FELLOWS OF THE SEL
AND THE JERUSALEM FELLOWS:**

(As recorded by Daniel Marom)

Draft - 1994

Selected notes from Professor Brinker's
meetings with the fellows of the SEL and the Jerusalem Fellows:

as recorded by Daniel Marom

1. On the need to learn more than one language/culture:

Language is a necessary mediating agent between the learner and the world. It therefore has a powerful impact. This impact can have a negative aspect in that if a person knows only one language, their view of the world may be narrow or overly particularistic. This negative aspect needs to be checked by studying other languages. This study of other languages exposes the individual to the "universal language" among languages, a language which may be unspoken but which is understood by all of humanity. This experience leads the learner to translate the "universal language" back into his particular language, to reinfuse it with a universal human perspective.

The debate over this claim emerged when it was exaggerated. For example, 18th century rationalist thinkers such as John Stuart Mill believed that all humans had a common language. They believed that words are local symbols or representations of intellectual or mental symbols which are universal to all humans. Consequently, they saw all languages as expressing something "commensurate" to components of a universal mental language and actually sought out the terms of this universal mental language. Romantic thinkers such as Schelling and Herder, on the other hand, cast a doubt on this scheme of things and claimed that there is no mental picture outside of that which is produced by language itself. Consequently, they argued that there is no "commensurability" in language and glorified the particular aspects of their own language. Note, by the way, that the 18th century approach eventually won out when "science" came to be perceived as a "universal" human language.

The approach of the 18th century rational thinkers had an influence on the thinker Ahad Ha'am. His conception of secular Jewish nationalism focused on Jewish culture as a particular expression of something with universal content. For him, a major question was therefore how to preserve the universal aspects which are reflected in Jewish culture as it develops and grows in changing circumstances. The romantic thinkers had an influence on the thought of Micah Joseph Berdyczewsky. According to Berdyczewsky, the Jewish culture of the Yeshiva world was an entity in and of itself, and was therefore authentic, untransferrable and inexchangeable. For him, this meant that it had to be replaced in toto with a new cultural ideal for the Jew. This was the ideal of the "European Hebrew."

Brinker himself thinks that the point of departure in this debate should be from the particular towards the universal. Without a multifaceted approach to language and culture, one can become close minded and autistic. Onefacetedness ultimately leads to a narrow and at times jingoistic folkist position. The argument against such onefacetedness was made by diverse Zionist thinkers, such as the utopian socialist A.D. Gordon and the mystical Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook. It had a strong place in Jewish society and

education. However, the Eichman trial was a watershed event which brought Jewish particularism back to the fore. In its wake, much of the prior universalism and secularity got lost.

2. On the possibilities of teaching Jewish culture in translation in the diaspora and the limitations of Israeli cultural "purity":

Brinker argues that there is no such thing as a totally original creation in any culture. The Biblical scholar Yehezkei Kaufmann showed that monotheism is not a purely Israelite creation. What matters is the adoption of a culture, the need it answers.

Consequently, the problem of translation is a very interesting one. While some translations have deep impact, others do not. In modern Israel, for example, the translation of Faulkner's works into Hebrew had a strong impact, while that of Arthur Conan Doyle was insignificant. And in the case of the 19th century eastern European Haskalah Hebrew writers, one can at times see more influence of a translated thinker, Neitschze for example, than of an authentic Hebrew writer such as Maimonides. The degree of the impact always depends on the need and the capacity of the culture which absorbs the translation to do something with it for itself. Given this assumption, one must admit that a Hebrew text in translation can have an impact on Jewish students in the diaspora equal to that of an its original version on an Israeli student - though something will be lost on the level of the aesthetic.

Similarly, there no real problem when foreign languages are allowed to fill voids in Israeli Hebrew. The foundations of Hebrew culture are strong enough so as to enable phenomena such as signs in English. These are an expression of a desire for expanse. Similarly, in Vienna there is a Cafe New York and in New York there is a Cafe Vienna. At the beginning of the century, there was a purist stream in Hebrew, which aspired to have a Hebrew word for everything. In the end, a compromise was reached - sometimes in a word created in Hebrew and sometimes in a foreign word which is expressed in Hebrew letters. On the whole, however, there are more cases when Hebrew is chosen than not, and this trend is greater in Hebrew than in other European languages. It is the role of the Hebrew Language Academy to distinguish between a mere imitation and a real contribution to Hebrew.

3. On the role of the spirit in this socio-historical conception of the educated Jew:

Humans both internalize and create social values. They internalize values from prior generations and from culture. They create social values by responding to what they have internalized and selecting from it what they want. This is a dialectic of internalization and selection.

The principle of liberty applies to the selection process. Even one who literally tries to duplicate a society based on values inherited from prior generations is expressing his freedom. There is a freedom of movement embedded in the choice to adopt these values,

as there is in the choice to reject them. Both the conservative and the revolutionary express their freedom.

There is a basic anti-determinist stance in this view. It leads to the assertion that it is impossible to receive or take in values and identity the way one takes other things from nature. This is the spiritual aspect of humanity. Liberty is the spirit. The human cannot rid himself of this spiritual aspect of human life, excepting through hypnosis, sleep or loss of consciousness. Even evil people are spiritual in this sense - Geobbels was spiritual in this sense.

The role of spirit in this conception is to allow the learner to discover his own autonomy, to awaken him to reflection, to tear him away from what is natural to him, from what he accepts by inertia, and to get him to confront it and to choose what he will.

A COMMUNITY-WIDE VISION FOR JEWISH EDUCATION

By

Michael Rosenak

1994

A Community-Wide Vision for Jewish Education

Michael Rosenak

Our task today is to examine whether we can come up with general conceptions of a community-wide agenda for Jewish life and education.

This is a large order and, we may say at the outset, appears to draw us into a situation of some paradox. It is a large order because we do not know whether we even want a common agenda. The paradox is that, at first sight, "an agenda for a community" seems to be, by definition, a non-problem.

Why? Because when people traditionally spoke of "the community," they meant, "an agenda." When people belonged to a community, it was understood to imply that that had a common practices and purposes. They were assumed to agree that there were right and wrong ways to do things. It was self-understood for them that qualified authorities guided the community. These authorities were assumed to know must clearly and definitively what right and wrong ways were, and how one walked on the right path. They were exhaustively educated in the culture and they were master educators. The educational philosopher, R.S. Peters, in his Ethics and Education, speaks of authority as a quality that is always present where people live in community and where they know that "there are rules." The "authorities" interpret and teach the rules and the rules define the community.

Furthermore, a community always constituted "an agenda" in the sense that it had an ideal conception of itself as "an educated public." At its best, it consisted of people who shared a language, especially through the medium of shared books and, most likely through a sacred literature. In a very fine essay by the philosopher Alisdair MacIntyre called "The Idea of an Educated Public" he argues that in a community of "an educated public" there are characteristic features. With specific reference to Scotland in the seventeenth century, he posits that, for example, when people argued about some cultural datum within "an educated public," they knew what they were arguing about. When people studied, they did so about and within texts that they shared. They had criteria of evaluation; so they knew when a speaker or teacher or leader was good or bad or indifferent.

The medieval Jewish community was certainly also such "an educated public" though we, no less than enthusiasts of seventeenth century Scotland, are sometimes prone to romanticize the past in which Jews lived in community, when the community was an "agenda." But today Jews, for the most part, no longer live in such communities. True, there is still a small section of the Jewish people where community is the blatant social reality, but the concepts of identity, authority and "agenda" are generally understood in such authoritarian and fundamentalistic ways there, that they appear as unacceptable models of communal life for all the others, for all who see themselves as living consciously in the modern world.

So for most people, Jews included, community is no longer an agenda. Rather, they consider "community" to be no more than a form of voluntary association. This voluntary association does not usually involve clear-cut commitments, because such commitments are associated by modern or post-modern people with some measure of public coercion. And since all rights and all genuine consciousness is viewed by the majority of contemporary people as residing in the individual, coercive publics are seen to be oppressive or, at least, benighted. It is the individual who has to decide when and how s/he wishes to be associated with others. The community of voluntary association does not possess any inherent character, it has no self-understood rights of its own and it has no self-understand right to impose duties on individuals. If duties are nevertheless accepted by individuals in voluntary communities, they have a different status than the kind of rules that used to be imposed by authorities. And so, the paradox with which we began was just a way of making that point clear, explaining why the subject of our discussion is no longer "paradoxical."

What we still do have, I believe, is a manifest desire on the part of many Jews for community-of-association, and for something common to those thus associated, that may loosely be called "an agenda." Through this desire these Jews, we might say, have "selected themselves in." Those who "select themselves in," recognize or believe that they don't "have to" belong and yet wish to. They are those who wish neither to be assimilated nor to deny themselves participation in modern culture. They are "in the middle" between what they perceive as pre-modern Judaism and the post-modern consciousness of limitless and rootless choice. These Jews "in the middle" wish "to be

together," to do certain things together. But they know that the common purpose, of being together, in community, cannot be defended and honestly cherished without moving it first through the prism of pluralism. They assume that you cannot really speak about "an agenda" for a modern community without asking what is meant by a pluralistic community and how it functions. For one of the characteristics of those "in the middle" is the desire not to give up their right to "be themselves," even while they work towards community and a common agenda.

Now, when they approach pluralism, they discover that there are two ways of looking at it. One point of view maintains that being together does not negate our being different from one another, even radically so. According to this position, all points of view are legitimate, though none of us is required to consider all or any point of view as true. I can maintain that all views are relative or, conversely, that I am right and you are wrong. In any case, you are as much within your rights in maintaining your position as I am in maintaining mine. Hence, when we get together as Jews, it is not because we agree about some vision of Jewishness, but because some perceived needs of all of us are met or at least addressed by our association. For example, we may be getting together for defense. Or for care. We may be getting together simply because we feel comfortable in being re-assured about the quality of an inescapable "Jewish identity."

This is the kind of association that makes Jews build sports clubs, old age homes, defence leagues. It is the kind of association that Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik of blessed memory once called brit goral - "a covenant of fate." If there were no anti-semitism, if there was not this peculiar status of the Jews among the nations of the world, then we probably would not have to or even want to get together. Certainly, Theodore Herzl and Max Nordau would not have wanted to establish a Jewish commonwealth had there not been "the Jewish problem" (of anti-semitism). If full assimilation were possible and other associations were consistently feasible - and dignified - we might choose them. But we are bound together by common needs created by a common "situation" of Jewishness.

That is one view of pluralism. In the context of this type of pluralism, we are in favor of an "open" society in which each does her or his "own thing," and we wish for a Jewish education in which various positions are

uninhibitedly expressed and played out. According to this approach, as noted, we take no stand on the veracity of any particular position. Our only "stand" is that they are all legitimate and they're all to be judged as "good" for those who need them or authentically embrace them. We do this not because we have philosophically evaluated and legitimated these positions but because we wish to be together. Without brit goral we are going to be in trouble. We have joined together because, without our association, Jews, as individuals or collectively, suffer, or are less comfortable, or more neurotic or are more vulnerable to persecution.

But there is a second view of pluralism, and it creates greater possibilities for a community-wide agenda. It is that pluralism should be based on a "core universe," a basic set of common assumptions and perhaps even some common commitments. The "core universe" that underlies this notion of pluralism, for Jews, involves some common interpretation of Jewish tradition or civilization. It is based on a common understanding of what is particular to this civilization that we can still share.

An example of such a common assumption was once cited by Abba Eban, in the name of Walter Rattenau, a Jewish statesman of the Weimar Republic who was murdered by anti-semitic thugs. Rattenau allegedly said that if a Jew tells you that he enjoys hunting, he's lying. I don't know if this was true in Rattenau's time or if it is still true, but there was certainly a time when an aversion to hunting was a shared premise of Jews about the proper relationship between humanity and the animal kingdom. This assumption dictated an attitude one could expect to find among Jews about the imposition of pain upon other creatures, in the name of "sport."

The late American-Jewish writer, Maurice Samuel, was a great believer in this conception of common assumptions and he had a unique talent for touching up this conception with pithy and literary associations. Samuel once wrote a book entitled The Gentleman and the Jew in which he argued that "gentlemen" are people who, when about to go fight their enemies, first line up, display their arms, shine their boots and adjust their caps. Jews, on the other hand, ask where the enemy is, how one best gets at him and how one gets the thing over with as quickly as possible.

This rhetoric, of course, is meant to represent a kind of "civilizational

language." Is it still shared? Is there anything we "naturally" share as Jews? Because, obviously, if there is nothing we can share, we cannot have a community agenda beyond the minimalistic one dictated by "a community of fate." The question is whether there are still some things we take for granted, things that we hold dear, that we will defend at all costs, things that clearly distinguish, yet without pretension or pomposity, between "Israel and the nations." Is there still an arena in which we communicate as among insiders, in which we engage in controversy "for the sake of Heaven" and know what we are arguing about? Is there anything towards which we can still educate together?

I believe that, however fragile it may sometimes seem, that there still is a common cultural language or what the sociologist Peter L. Berger has called a "plausibility structure," among Jews. And here I shall mention four possible features of it, four possible items for a common agenda, in a common "language."

The first is the item of a common sacred literature, that is, the literature that exposes our language of Jewish culture and spirit to view in a primary and foundational way. This sacred literature has traditionally been believed to deal with important things, to delve profoundly into origins and purposes, to treat of ultimate matters. It was studied "in depth" and was believed to itself be "deep." It is true that contemporary Jews no longer agree how it should be studied, what it demands or whether it has the authority to demand much of anything. But Jews still find it legitimate and potentially enriching to open these books together, and to discover points of contact among themselves that come to light when they study it together. They still view those books as singularly "theirs."

The sociologist Charles Leibman once said, with much justice I think, that this aspect of a common language or a common agenda is of primary importance. He posited that there is no Jewish community on record that ceased studying Torah yet survived. If there is no limmud Torah (study of Torah), even if it is not quite clear what is included in Torah, even if the study will lead to diverse understandings and courses of action, then it is unlikely that there will be any community at all.

Secondly: it is possible for contemporary Jews to articulate a common language and find a common vision by "taking off" from a common vocabulary. Certain words that are accompanied by certain associations may be mere scaffolding, but, as an educational enterprise of community-building, it is something to be seriously considered and cultivated. Such a common vocabulary was really the "one-ness" that the renowned Zionist publicist and thinker, Ahad Ha'am ("one of the nation") had in mind for his people-in-crisis. Ahad Ha'ar wrote a very short and concise essay entitled Bein Kodesh Vahol, "Between Sacred and Profane." His argument in this essay is that "sacred" things are to be defined as those cultural artifacts that do not shed their framework or "shell" even though and when their contents change. Thus, for example, the term "Shabbat" remains sacred even if its "particular historical contents" as a day of rest changes; the Torah remains forever within its "shell" of parchment and handwritten verses, though the "Oral Torah" reflects its changing ideals and norms. Conversely, "profane" matters are those in which the shell is discarded when the content becomes obsolete. We thus "throw away" an ancient book of physics that has outmoded scientific conceptions, but we continue to write - and read - "an eye for an eye" even after the Oral Torah has "explained" that the law requires monetary compensation and not the offender's eye.

A common vocabulary may well delineate what our common language of Jewishness, of sanctity, is. It will make a lot of difference, I think, whether Jews refer, in this Ahad Ha'amian spirit, to the Bible as Tanakh or as "Old Testament." It is significant whether they talk about motza'e Shabbat or "Saturday night." It is indeed a fact that language, even as lexicon, invites so many associations that a great deal of tarbut or "culture" comes along with it. After all, nobody could possibly say about "Saturday night" that "it begins this week at seven-forty-two," but it makes eminently good sense to refer motza'e Shabbat to a particular time and minute. As our Yiddish-speaking forbears well knew, the lexicon doesn't even have to be in Hebrew. If a Jew is told that "Shabbat comes in at 6:24" and s/he looks to the door to observe the Sabbath "coming in," there is obvious cultural illiteracy here. He or she lives in a different vocabulary. Those who "live in diverse vocabularies" will find it difficult to build a common community.

An interesting project for educators would be to try to determine what this basic vocabulary is, and to explore some of the ramifications and

"spin-offs" of its various terms. Let us say, for example, that we were to write down one hundred value-concepts, couched in words or phrases. What could we learn from these terms? What would they suggest to us?

In this connection, let me mention a joke or story about "the nine days" (between Rosh Hodesh Av and Tisha B'Av. Here, there are already three possible candidates for our lexicon: "the nine days," Tishah B'Av and Rosh Hodesh.) The story is about a person who comes into a restaurant that has moved from Jewish to Gentile proprietors. Our customer is ignorant of that fact and he sits down in anticipation of a good Jewish meal. When the waiter comes up to him and asks him what he would like to eat, the customer responds as follows: "Well, this week is the nine days, so I can't have meat but have to eat 'milkhik' so bring me a nice piece of fish." The agitated waiter goes out to the kitchen to tell the cook that there is a madman in the restaurant. "He says that there are nine days this week so he can't eat meat, and therefore he has to eat something (about) milk, so I should bring him fish."

Now this is a obviously a "language" or "plausibility structure" joke. It belongs to the same family as the classic story of the young child who runs into his immigrant grandfather's room on New York's Lower East Side of the nineteen-thirties and excitedly tells the old man that Babe Ruth has just hit his sixtieth home-run for the New York Yankees. Whereupon the grandfather solemnly asks: "Is it good for the Jews?" "Iss gut fahr die Yidden?" In both stories, there is clearly a dissonance between the "languages" being spoken. So, we could make a list of one hundred phrases like "the nine days" and ask, "How does it enhance Jewish understanding?" and "What can you do with that?" In our particular case, one of the things you can "do" with it is to understand the restaurant joke. But there are many things beyond that joke. You may learn about matters like halavi (dairy products) and besari (meat products) and so forth. And "the nine days," may, of course, set you thinking about Tishah B'Av and what, if anything, this day of mourning can signify for the modern Jew. Indeed, once you get into the phrases, you have already moved into the controversies. And you can't engage in controversy about them unless you know them.

A third possibility for creating and possessing a "core universe" for a pluralistic yet common agenda is in the realm of some common community practice. Here, of course, matters are invariably more complicated than is the

case in the realm of "vocabulary or even study. In fact, however, practice may itself be viewed as a kind of vocabulary and even a kind of "learning." It is a conversation involving such terms as Shabbat, tzedakah, and kashrut. It raises such questions as: What kinds of activities are or are not conducted on Shabbat by the community? How does the community give tzedakah? Is shrimp ever served at communal functions? Does the community maintain a kosher kitchen?

When I say that in this realm matters invariably become more complicated or "sticky," it is because common practice is easily understood as a concession to the more traditional members of the community. In operative terms, we may say that some of these practices are unlikely to be adopted unless the traditionalist suggests or even demands them. But the other side of that coin is that the community is unlikely to adopt these practices unless the traditionalists agree to throw in their lot with the less "normative" members and segments of the community. The traditionalists too must make a concession, namely to be less "denominational" and more communal. In a sense, everyone has to do so. And for everyone, there is a price to be paid for community. A common language, of practice too, emerges from studying together and using a common vocabulary. A continual negotiation goes on because members of the community wish to say certain things to their co-members but they also wish to be heard by them. And one who wishes to be heard, has to take the capacity and willingness of others to listen into account.

A fourth and final item for a common language is the joint goal of identifying problems and dealing with them. This feature of "agenda" is rooted in "the covenant of fate" but quickly grows beyond it. For the ability and willingness to deal with Jewish problems arises not only out of anxiety but also out of caring. And caring is a fundamental aspect of all community. Rosa Luxemburg, as you may know, once said that "merely" Jewish problems were too petty for her concern. She was only interested, she insisted, in universal problems. By which she meant, of course, German or European ones. She had no time or energy to care for Jews. Jewish community was not for her.

In this aspect of "agenda," we find the community that "learns," speaks and acts together, caring about Jews and their problems. Today, for better or for worse, the problems of Jews are manifold. There is the matter of expressing "particularistic" Jewish concerns in the face of an alleged universalism (often, someone else's particularism!) and, conversely, the

problem of defending universal concerns in the (particularistic) Jewish contexts of Israel and Jewish communities. There are problems of ecology in Israel, where it is a specifically "Jewish problem) and elsewhere, where Jews, together with others, have the duty to protect environments and the right to breathe. Perhaps fortunately, the panorama of Jewish problems is today as wide as humanity and particular Jewish concerns need no longer be suspected of parochialism.

In communities struggling to identify a common language, caring refers not only to the community itself and its protection, but to relationships between individuals and groups within it who seem adamantly different yet wish to find themselves culturally in some proximity and kinship to one another.

Permit me to elucidate by giving two examples. In 1959, there was a heated debate in the Knesset about an educational program proposed by the Minister of Education. It was entitled "Jewish Consciousness," and was meant to impart a love and appreciation for the Jewish tradition among pupils whose homes were largely non-traditional and who studied at non-religious state schools. Some Knesset members from religious parties declared in that debate that there was actually no problem, or rather, that they had the solution. They suggested that the minister, rather than institute a "pathetic" program of "Jewish Consciousness" in the schools, ought to change the school system by instituting the curriculum of the religious schools in all state schools. Then, happily, all "Jewish Consciousness" programs would become superfluous. But that was a triumphalist act of one-upmanship, not genuinely part of a community conversation. The families of the pupils for whom "Jewish Consciousness" programs were proposed were not going to change their lives, their convictions or their search for Jewish meanings in their own ways! The religious Knesset members who refused to see that, were refusing to engage in the conversation of community.

My second and reverse example: The late Dr. Hanoah Rinot, the first director of the Melton Center for Jewish Education in the Diaspora at the Hebrew University, once told me that when television was first introduced into the country a fierce debate was held in the Broadcasting Commission as to whether there should be television broadcasts on Friday evening. And, of course, the view of the religious parties represented on the Commission was that such a desecration of the holy day should not be permitted. The secular

members of that body were annoyed by this. They turned to the representatives of the religious parties and said: "It's all very well for you to oppose television broadcasting on Shabbat but we're living in a culture which naturally associates recreation with electronics. In other words, if you take all the sockets out of the walls, what are people going to do with their leisure time? Now you religious people have this quaint notion that by virtue of a timer ("Shabbat clock") you will still use electricity without touching electrical appliances. But we are not like that and we want to turn on our television sets.

At this point, a representative of the ultra-Orthodox Poale Agudat Yisrael party conceded the point. "I realize," he said, "that some of my neighbours are bored on Friday nights and television may change that. But if I abstain in the vote, can you guarantee - or at least promise - that the programs offered on Friday night will have a spiritual content that differs from weekday fare? This man had a sense of community. He couldn't vote with the secular parties, but the problems of other Jews were his problems. He wanted to make Friday evening more "Shabbisdik" for his neighbours. (My understanding is that the promise was given but later ignored.)

Is there, in these four features of a common agenda for contemporary community, a partially common syllabus, a broadly sketched vision for education that yet relates with care and respect to the differences within our communities? I believe there is.

The last point I wish to make concerns Israel, the place to locate a core universe for the Jewish people and the locus of many variant conceptions of Jewishness. Israel is no substitute for an agenda in the Diaspora, but it has much to teach Jews everywhere about the contours of agenda. In Israel, perhaps uniquely, one may learn how "the covenant of fate" jostles against "the covenant of destiny," and how they two (sometimes) seek accommodations with the other. At times it appears here that all we have in common is "the Jewish problem." We are here together, it then seems, because we have common enemies, common anxieties, mutual concerns for security and survival.

But then there are moments when it is absolutely clear that there is more than that. There is a language (Hebrew!) which is a cultural treasure (and not only a medium to communicate needs and concerns). There is pride, passion,

occasional shame and much love for what Jewish society can be and what potential for community there is in it. Despite our differences and sometimes, because of them.

We look into the future and see it as worrisome and uncertain. At the same time, being Jewishly challenged by it, we discern within it, an agenda. This agenda is imbued with modernity but it is not limited to that. There is freedom within it, but also commitment and community.

The Goals Project at The Agnon School (partial draft 28/12/95)

by D. Marom

In the summer of July 1994, The Mandel Institute and the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education invited educators, federation planners and lay leaders from lead and other communities in North America to participate in a seminar on goals in Jerusalem. At this seminar, a case was made for focusing on the goals of education as a means for the development of effective programs of Jewish education. Both the clarification of these goals and the mobilization of institutional efforts around their attainment were presented as having central practical import in the development of compelling educational practice.

In light of this presentation, Dan Polster and Ray Levi, respectively the president and headmaster of The Agnon School in Cleveland, turned to me with a request to undertake a goals project at their school. Since at that point the MI and the CIJE had not yet formulated a clear and systematic set of guidelines for local goals development, Agnon offered itself as a laboratory site in which the articulation of such guidelines could be undertaken. In response to Agnon's proposal, it was agreed that I would accompany Agnon in its efforts at goals development, serving both as a planning consultant and as a facilitator. At the same time, my role was to keep a record of my activities with Agnon in this context, so that it could be studied by the staff of the MI and of the CIJE's goals project and used as a resource for the articulation of guidelines for goals development in other settings.

The following is a draft of my report on activities from the summer of 1994 until the present. Since my work at Agnon was deeply informed by my work with Seymour Fox on the Mandel Institute's Educated Jew project, this report will reflect what I brought with me to the goals project at Agnon as much as what happened when I was there. At the same time, the report presents my experience according to categories which I personally chose and should be critiqued as such. Respectively, though not in any order, these categories are "content analysis," "establishing readiness," "engagement in visional discourse," "strategic decisions," and "next steps." I chose to use these categories in my report not only because they consciously guided and still consciously guided my practice in working with Agnon, but also because I thought that they could serve as useful bridges between what I experienced in my work with Agnon and a search for theoretical guidelines for goals intervention in settings of Jewish education. At the same time, I have tried to illustrate my experience within each of these categories by relaying a series of short "vignettes" for each, the sum of which should add up to an authentic portrait of that which has transpired in The Agnon School's goals project.

1. Content Analysis:

In order to be able to work with Agnon, it was necessary from the very beginning to familiarize myself with the school. Since virtually everything about Agnon could be

The Goals Project at The Agnon School (partial draft 28/12/95)

by D. Marom

In the summer of July 1994, The Mandel Institute and the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education invited educators, federation planners and lay leaders from lead and other communities in North America to participate in a seminar on goals in Jerusalem. At this seminar, a case was made for focusing on the goals of education as a means for the development of effective programs of Jewish education. Both the clarification of these goals and the mobilization of institutional efforts around their attainment were presented as having central practical import in the development of compelling educational practice.

In light of this presentation, Dan Polster and Ray Levi, respectively the president and headmaster of The Agnon School in Cleveland, turned to me with a request to undertake a goals project at their school. Since at that point the MI and the CIJE had not yet formulated a clear and systematic set of guidelines for local goals development, Agnon offered itself as a laboratory site in which the articulation of such guidelines could be undertaken. In response to Agnon's proposal, it was agreed that I would accompany Agnon in its efforts at goals development, serving both as a planning consultant and as a facilitator. At the same time, my role was to keep a record of my activities with Agnon in this context, so that it could be studied by the staff of the MI and of the CIJE's goals project and used as a resource for the articulation of guidelines for goals development in other settings.

The following is a draft of my report on activities from the summer of 1994 until the present. Since my work at Agnon was deeply informed by my work with Seymour Fox on the Mandel Institute's Educated Jew project, this report will reflect what I brought with me to the goals project at Agnon as much as what happened when I was there. At the same time, the report presents my experience according to categories which I personally chose and should be critiqued as such. Respectively, though not in any order, these categories are "content analysis," "establishing readiness," "engagement in visional discourse," "strategic decisions," and "next steps." I chose to use these categories in my report not only because they consciously guided and still consciously guided my practice in working with Agnon, but also because I thought that they could serve as useful bridges between what I experienced in my work with Agnon and a search for theoretical guidelines for goals intervention in settings of Jewish education. At the same time, I have tried to illustrate my experience within each of these categories by relaying a series of short "vignettes" for each, the sum of which should add up to an authentic portrait of that which has transpired in The Agnon School's goals project.

1. Content Analysis:

In order to be able to work with Agnon, it was necessary from the very beginning to familiarize myself with the school. Since virtually everything about Agnon could be

relevant, the challenge here was to carve out for myself a particular type of background knowledge about Agnon which would be most useful for the facilitation of goals development. The point was not only that I needed to know my audience, nor only that I had to get a sense of realities so that I could consider what could feasibly be accomplished in the school. In addition to these critical inputs, it was clear to me that in order to facilitate a profound discussion on the question "What ought Agnon to be?" I also needed to gain a deep and intimate understanding of "what Agnon is." Indeed, my assumption here was that such an understanding would enable me to raise the question of "What ought Agnon to be?" with reference to issues which I could expose in terms of "what Agnon is." It is one thing to ask, for example, "What are your aims for the teaching of Israel". It is quite another to ask, as I did on one occasion, "From looking at a series of lessons on Israel, it seems to me that you are aiming for the student to perceive of Israel as the origin of and the authentic setting for Jewish history. Mightn't that make them see Jewish life in Cleveland as inauthentic?"

My initial assignment, as I saw it, was therefore to try to learn enough about Agnon so as to be able to speak about the goals of Agnon on its own terms. In conceptualizing this assignment to myself, I found it useful to draw upon Seymour Fox's conception of "content analysis". As I understood it, "content analysis" is an analysis of an educational institution's culture, policy, curriculum and pedagogy which seeks to expose its implicit guiding vision. That is to say, a "content analysis" is an attempt to uncover the philosophical assumptions, ideas and aims which *de facto* function as a guide for educational practice in a particular institution. Hence, in trying to decipher "what Agnon is," I saw it necessary for me to visit the school and interpret what I see as an embodiment of a set of working assumptions, ideas and aims about education.

Note - I did not conceive of this assignment as an ethnographic study. Though much like an ethnographer, I would have to enter into the halls, classrooms, and meeting rooms of the school in order to study its culture from within, I did not see my inquiry as ending with a description of the culture of the school. Rather, I would need to define that culture in terms of the educational ideals which were being pursued. In thinking about this distinction, I considered Sam Heilman's compelling ethnographic study of a supplementary school, "Inside the Jewish School." In this study, Heilman points to a recurring activity in the school which he calls "flooding out": the students' constant defiance of the teacher's attempt to teach leads to a mutual moment of exasperation in which both sides submit to the absurdity and futility of the situation through laughter. This "flooding out" in turn becomes an expression of a kind of informality and intimacy which the students and teachers will not be as likely to experience at public school. As such, they experience something of a Jewish togetherness through "flooding out."

As poignant as this sort of anthropological observation may be, it would still need to be "translated" to the language of education in order to serve as a basis for the kind of observation I needed to make about Agnon. First, since the aim of goals development is to empower those who educate to more effectively carry out their *explicit* intentions, my "content analysis" would have to tilt the lense of my observation so as to focus in on what

the educators were consciously trying to pursue, how it was being received, and on the interplay between these two aspects over the course of time. Rather than attempting to describe a culture which governs both the actions of the teachers and the students, my "content analysis" would attempt to recreate the drama of the classroom as it flows between intentions, actions and responses.

Second, Heilman's type of observation does not articulate what goes on in an educational setting in terms of ideas, assumptions and aims. Even were we to assume that the "flooding out" was an intentional activity aimed at creating a sense of "Jewish togetherness," it would be important to describe as best as possible the philosophical underpinnings of this "Jewish togetherness": What is the rationale behind this sort of togetherness? What is its Jewish content? How does it respond to a lack in general education? What is its nature and qualitative component? What does it assume about human emotions in a group context? Where is it meant to lead to? In which way is it meant to connect with other experiences in the life of the learner? What makes it work more and what blocks it from taking hold? In delineating these and other similar aspects of the aim of creating "Jewish togetherness," one would be approaching a "content analysis" which more appropriately speaks in the language of educational vision.

Here, the five elements suggested by Seymour Fox as a lense for viewing educational content was another useful resource. These were: "philosophy/Jewish philosophy" (the ideal person/Jew), "philosophy of education/Jewish education" (the educated person/Jew), "translation" (theory of educational practice), "implementation" (eg. teacher training, curriculum, etc.), and "evaluation" (relating to any of the above level). Though I did not use this lense formulaically, I found it helpful in that it helped me organize my observations in terms of a continuum of ideas running from ideas to practice and back again. Given any particular expression of Agnon's vision, I was able to find its place among the five elements and explore its extended formulation by trying to rearticulate it in terms of the other elements.

This approach also differs somewhat from that suggested and demonstrated by Miriam Ben Peretz in her doctorate and subsequent research on "content analyses" of biology curricula. As seen in the appended selection from one of Ben Peretz's works, her methodology for "content analysis" involves systematically looking at educational content through the lense of each of Schwab's four educational commonplaces - "subject matter," "learner," "milieu," and "teacher" (see Schwab's "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum" in "Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education," ed. by I. Westbury and N. Wilkof, University of Chicago Press, 1978, pp. 365 - 384). In this selection, Ben Peretz lists questions she sees as guiding inquiry into the content of curricula in the area of each commonplace. My sense was that though Ben Peretz's approach offers an important tool for bridging the language of ideas and the language of practice in looking at educational content, and though her use of Schwab's commonplaces enables one to aim for a systematic and comprehensive view of curricula, it does not embark on "content analysis" from the vantage point of vision or suggest a language ideas and purposes as a basis for discussion. My preference was to keep the lense of the five elements of content as my

major tool for organizing my understanding of educational content, while keeping Schwab's commonplaces as a second "grid" for checking my the understanding which emerged from the use of that lense.

At the same time, the level of "content analysis" which I pursued in order to gain an understanding of "what Agnon is" was not nearly as systematic or comprehensive as what both Heilman or Ben Peretz had undertaken. Nor was I aiming to undertake a formal "content analysis" for the Agnon school, the kind of which Seymour Fox had once suggested as part of a strategy for generating an inquiry into goals in local settings. As I remembered it, that strategy involved undertaking a large scale and systematic effort at "content analysis" of a school's educational program, pedagogy, culture, student perceptions, etc., and then presenting it to the school's decisionmakers and educators so that they may ask themselves the question "is this what we are aiming for?" To be sure, I too wanted to create a basis for discourse on goals by making explicit and calling into question the vision implicit in Agnon's practice. However, at this early stage, the aims of my "content analysis" were much more modest. As stated above, I wanted to learn enough about Agnon's "implicit vision" so as to be able to initiate the discussion about "what Agnon ought to be?" from within. Pointing out discrepancies between "ideal" and "actual" content was unnecessary here. At this stage, I wanted more to draw out what was implicitly "ideal" so that it could be a reason and a resource for rethinking about what could be "actual".

As I visited Agnon the first time, I was inundated with a wealth of "texts" and "experiences" on the basis of which I could undertake this sort of "content analysis". In the midst of this maelstrom, I felt that I had to begin by generating a working thesis as to "what Agnon is" on the basis of one or two of my first encounters and then to test it out and on the basis of continued observation and interaction with various aspects of the school. Indeed, this sort of "rolling content analysis" provided me with a frame of reference within which I could plan, undertake and summarize my visit to Agnon. Still, in looking at the results of this "rolling content analysis," I asked myself whether the sum total of my experience had not been tipped or distorted by overexposure to any one or combination of Schwab's four commonplaces. This was a useful check on my experience. HOW DID I KNOW I WAS RIGHT IN MY INTERPRETATIONS?...

Vignette: Tu BiShevat Poster

A Tu Bishevat poster which I noted ten seconds after I walked through the doors of the school served as a point of departure for my rolling "content analysis". The poster was placed at a highly central and visible point in the hallways. Any person at Agnon would probably walk through this vestibule and past this poster a number of times a day. The poster was fairly large, perhaps two or three square yards/meters, so it was hard to miss. It was surrounded by other works by students which continued to flow along all the hallways of the school. Clearly, each set of works was unified by a common theme upon which each class was working at that particular time. It seemed that the Tu Bishevat poster was linked to a particular set of works on the theme of "the world around us." The

poster consisted of a huge tree, with a hefty brown trunk standing firmly from the ground, many brown branches stretching out in all directions, and green leaves of similar shapes and sizes flowing from them. There was a sense that the pleasing and harmonious image of the tree emerged from the many pieces which comprised it, perhaps informed by an awareness of impressionist paintings which create a unified scene from a myriad of dots. At the same time, it seemed that this effort was undertaken, at least in part, by students. Together with the tree there appeared a written statement inviting the reader to look west of the school in order to see Tu Bishevat trees.

I could not be sure of many of the details I was seeing in this Tu Bishevat poster, yet I felt confident enough with what I had perceived to begin interpreting and to allow later questions and observations to help correct my initial readings. Among the many educational ideas which the Tu Bishevat poster seemed to reflect, I considered that of *Jewish culture*. The time of my visit to the school was indeed Tu Bishevat. It was clear that the poster had been designed and placed recently in an effort to coincide with the holiday. However, this poster seemed more than a celebrative or commemorative placate. Rather, it was explicitly inviting the learner to experience the holiday through the viewing of the poster. By looking at the poster, and by recognizing through it trees in the immediate vicinity of the school, it was trying to make accessible the very subject of this special new years celebration - one which was presumably known to the student population from their Judaic studies. The goal pursued by this effort appeared to be "establish an existential connection with events in the Jewish calendar" or "generate experiential links between Jewish holidays and the students' immediate environment" (level three). If successful, such efforts would lead the student to freely associate between first-hand experiences and aspects of Jewish culture (level two). The discrepancy between the traditional Zionist Tu Bishevat emphasis on trees in Eretz Yisrael and this poster's emphasis on trees in Cleveland was very telling on this level. It exposed an underlying desire to make being Jewish mostly a thing of here and now. This aspect was further clarified by the lack of any reference to Tu Bishevat in the language of tradition. Clearly there was a desire to link up with Judaism as if it were a folklore, to belong to the Jewish group through a recognition of and sense of familiarity with some of its basic images and symbols.

At this point, I felt it useful to explore the possibility that this approximated Brinker's phenomenological definition of Jewish identity (level one). One is Jewish because one lives naturally in a Jewish society and environment. It struck me, however, negator of the diaspora that I am, that the language of the poster was in English and that the trees, no matter how universal in their character, were also distinctly bound up with American existence in Cleveland. Brinker's assumption was that there was no way to maintain his phenomenological definition of Jewish existence in the diaspora precisely because the immediate society and environment were largely non-Jewish. In the diaspora, one had to make an ideological or theological "leap," as it were, in looking at the immediate environment, so as to attribute to it Jewish meaning. Was the almost iconographical emphasis of the poster an attempt to make up for the lack of a "natural" Jewish society and environment? (level five) Or could this be a bold and earnest attempt to create such a "natural" environment in the confines of the school itself in the hope that this would be

enough for such a Jewish self-definition to take root among those who spend here the best part of their first years? "Bold" I say, especially in light of the unabashed invitation made by the poster to partake in an experience which the school would define as belonging to Jewish culture (level four)...

IN THE FULL VERSION, THIS DISCUSSION WOULD BE FOLLOWED BY A DISCUSSION OF OTHER IDEAS EMBEDDED IN THE TU BISHEVAT POSTER, AND BY OTHER SIMILAR VIGNETTES. THESE VIGNETTES WOULD COVER EACH OF THE COMMONPLACES AND WOULD ADD UP TO A "ROLLING" PORTRAIT OF AGNON. EXAMPLES: DAN POLSTER'S PORTRAYAL OF AGNON IN RELATIONSHIP TO HIS READING OF CURRENT EVENTS IN AMERICA; THE GRADE EIGHT INTEGRATED PROJECT; DIALOGUE WITH TEACHERS ON THE JUDAIC CURRICULUM; OBSERVATION OF TEFILLA AND BIBLE CLASS; RAY LEVI'S INTERACTION WITH TEACHERS AND STUDENTS; PETER ON THE HISTORY OF THE SCHOOL, ETC.

2. Establishing Readiness:

Both common sense and research into other efforts at generating change in education pointed to "readiness" as a critical precondition for successful intervention. A five year evaluative inquiry into the work of the "Coalition for Essential Schools" demonstrated to me just how tricky the definition of "readiness" can be. Here was a case where "readiness" would seem to have been established from the very beginning. A school could join the Coalition only after a) 70% of its lay and professional constituents voted in favour of belonging and a team consisting of the headmaster, and b) a lead teacher and a trustee were prepared to give much of their time to learning and implementing the Coalition's program for change. Yet the five year study showed, among other things, that:

- a) "In most of the schools there was not a concensus that fundamental changes in a school structure or teaching practices needed to occur."
- b) "The changes that occurred or were considered when a school joined the Coalition forced the issue of what constituted the school's philosophy and revealed differences in faculty members' perceptions of their jobs, of the school's mission, and of the best ways to educate students."
- c) "At most schools, a core of faculty members became active in their school's reform, but their efforts often ended up dividing the faculty."
- d) "Most Coalition supporters were naive about the degree to which school reform could be effected by focusing on academic concerns and about issues of power and politics within their schools."
- e) "Schools assumed that once the faculty 'accepted' a reform program, there was little need for further reflection on this decision."

The element of readiness seemed to me to be that much more important for an effort at generating change through the development of an orientation towards educational ideas. The Coalition experienced difficulties with schools when its vision was already spelled out into nine clear strategic goals. As I understood it, the goals project was aiming to engage constituents of the school in a discourse which was at once both less concrete and yet more threatening. As Israel Scheffler pointed out, often there is a certain amount of discomfort and even opposition among people to embark on a flight to the philosophical. How much more this must be the case, I thought, when what is at stake is one's professional practice, one's own children's program of education or the future of one's community. It is precisely because of the goals project's assumption that a school's vision is its intimate core that it should be hard to get to and, once getting there, that it should be harder to tinker with.

What are the factors which lead to readiness for a goals project? This was a question which I asked myself even before entering the walls of The Agnon School. At first, from the very little acquaintance I had made with Ray Levi, Dan Polster and a group of teachers at Agnon to whom I had given a two hour session on teaching Jerusalem, and then even moreso after my first visit to the school, I was inclined to answer this question in almost clinical terms:

a) Support from leadership at the very top: The headmaster and the president of the school were committed to an inquiry into the vision of Agnon, in the belief that it would indeed increase the quality of its practice, and they imparted this belief to other constituencies in the school, especially to the staff "leadership team," but also to other trustees in the school. To be sure, their confidence was bolstered by a confidence in me and the backing I would be given from the Mandel Institute and the CIJE's goals project. Also, there was definitely an aspect of personal chemistry between the three of us. However, Ray and Dan had already created some degree of readiness when I entered into the picture and this readiness was quite obviously maintained by them in between my visits. It would be impossible to explain this without reference to the fact that these were clearly two thinking people who believed in the power of ideas and were capable of bringing that message to others. When asked about whether or not a goals project would take Ray away from his responsibilities, his response to the board was that he saw the goals project as typifying the kind of work he was hired to do. Similarly, Dan decided that he wanted to continue being the trustee in charge of the goals project at Agnon even after his term of presidency expired.

b) A climate of reflection: The headmaster of the school defined much of his own work in terms of creating an orientation among staff and trustees towards goals. Ray Levi's style of leadership was definitely one which demanded staff and trustees to be reflective of their practice and school policy and to design their next steps accordingly. Especially with teachers, Ray had created regular forums for thinking about what the school's program was about and for creating new programs in light of that thinking. To some degree, he had accomplished this by bringing particular educational ideas of his own to the school and

seeing through their implementation. Ray is modest about this accomplishment, arguing both that the ideas are based on Howard Gardner's conception of multiple intelligences (Ray and The Agnon School are both members of a network of schools which try to implement Gardner's ideas) and that they reflected a vision of education not drastically different than that of his predecessor and of the board which hired him. However, it was clear to me and to many of the members of the staff that Ray had gone a considerable way in mobilizing and even energizing the school around these ideas, at times even against staff and parent opposition, and had even managed to extend them so as to include the Judaic component of the curriculum. My point here is less about Gardner's specific ideas as they played themselves at Agnon - an important topic in and of itself an element to be reconciled with its larger vision of the educated person/Jew - than about the groundwork which Ray had laid among staff and trustees for educational discourse in general. In working with Agnon on its goals, I would be able to make use of some already existing patterns and frameworks of educational discourse at the school. A good example was Ray's arranging for virtually the entire staff of the school (and even two trustees) to participate in the Melton Center's summer programs for teachers in Jerusalem. Indeed, this framework was later used to enable a week long unit which I led for a group of Agnon's teachers on its goals for teaching Israel.

c) A measure of trust, devotion and care: The feeling that Agnon is a family is unmistakable to the visitor of the school. Of course, as with most families, there can be lots of quibbling and gossiping in the Agnon family. However, it was hard not to notice how various constituencies had more than a personal stake in what happens in the school. Ray was indefatigable in his energy for thinking and rethinking issues related to the school, teachers worked hours way beyond their time in the classroom, and trustees volunteered their talents as astutely to the future of the school as they did to their own professions and businesses. It was as if participating in the school counted for something special - something beyond salary, social or professional status, or even personal need. In a cynical mood I tried to reduce it to these categories, but I found myself more compelled by the idea that doing something for the school was for many of these people a way of belonging to something of community value, or more specifically, a meaningful way to express their Jewishness. The point here was that I sensed that people gained trust or even authority at Agnon when they showed real devotion and care to a particular undertaking at the school, especially when that emerged as a real and positive contribution. To be sure, trustees and staff did not always show the respect and trust each deserved from each other. However, I noted that innovators were not automatically distrusted. Whether insiders, like Ray and the Hebrew studies director Leah, or outsiders, like Steve Israel, who led the summer experiences in Israel, or Lifsa Schachter, who guided some of the in-service training for Judaic studies teachers, people with new ideas were welcomed and heard, if only because they expressed a true desire to belong and contribute to the Agnon family. Taking this into account, whenever I could, I accepted requests to participate in Agnon activities beyond the scope of the goals project - eg. teaching, observing, helping to clear up, social events, etc. - and indeed found that this contributed to my being accepted and listened to when I entered into a conversation relating to goals. This became all that much clearer when I noted how others who do not give the same are treated by various constituencies

in the school.

These and other similar categories remained critical to what seemed to comprise Agnon's readiness for a goals project. In fact, they grew stronger in my understanding as I got more involved at Agnon and needed to be continuously bolstered by Dan, Ray and myself in order to continually provide a basis for discourse on goals. Simply, I learned to appreciate what I had taken for granted earlier, and began to realize how goals efforts would fail in other settings in which this sort of groundwork had not been laid in advance. As such, these categories may point to a significant amount of groundwork being done in many settings before engaging in goals - unless one sees a discourse on goals as a way of making it happen. Yet, notwithstanding the tangible picture which these sort of categories afford for thinking about "readiness", I found myself groping for categories which emerge from a different perspective. This new perspective emerged well into the process and was inspired, in part, by reading Sarason's seminal work on "The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change." In that work, Sarason begins with the critical question "who owns the school?" As I thought about this question in relation to Agnon, and posed it to Ray, only to get a seven page document in response, which were in turn followed by hours of mutual deliberation, it became clear to me how much an understanding of "readiness" demanded reference to factors which go way beyond the walls of the school.

Goaded by Sarason's broad perspective on what determines the culture of a school and by a frustrating realization that no single constituency really had total ownership at Agnon, I came to think of schools in general and Agnon in particular as being governed by common vision. To be sure, each constituent had an element of power and control in determining what goes on in the school - decisionmakers could define policy; Ray could hire and fire; teachers could determine what ultimately went on in the classroom; parents could pull their kids out of the school; and students could refuse to learn. However, precisely because each of these sources of power balanced and checked the other, it was clear that any cooperation between them had to emerge from a sense of shared purposes. One could not draw the map of power and control in the school as if it were a closed system or organization. Ownership of the school emerged wherever there was genuine agreement over its educational *raison d'etre*. My assumption therefore was that no matter how much this sort of agreement may appear to be a product of power politics, at root, it was a function of a degree of consensus around the aims of education. A school is an act of a community which wants to regenerate itself through the education of its youth in its own image.

This realization led me to consider Agnon's "readiness" for a goals project in terms of its already having in place an implicit, if very initial, vision of education - one which reflected a desire of a particular community of American Jews to continue being an American Jewish community. My sense was that Agnon was "ready" to seek out its goals because it was confident that it was "on to something good" and that it wanted to know more about what that "something good" was. The fact that Agnon persisted in defining itself as a non-denominational school bolstered this thesis in my eyes. According to the CJF report, the majority of American Jews define themselves as belonging either to a

"cultural group" (70%) or to an "ethnic group" (57%) (cp. 49% "religious group" and 42% "nationality") - yet the overwhelming majority of American Jewish schools remain denominational. If a group of people are choosing to send their children to The Agnon School, or are giving much of their own time, talent and energy to it, it is probably a reflection of some unique but explicit and even common hopes and aspirations about being Jewish in America.

This sort of thinking added a new series of practical implications in relationship to the question of Agnon's "readiness" for an inquiry into its educational aims, while Dan, Ray and I continued in the direction of those mentioned above. Hence, in addition to bolstering the "readiness" which had already been established at Agnon, as above, there was still a need to establish another kind of "readiness" for goals. This second kind of readiness would involve trying to get various constituencies at Agnon to admit to their common hopes and aspirations, while inviting them, at the same time, to take upon themselves the challenge of transforming these common hopes and aspirations into a more explicit and dynamic vision and program for education at Agnon. "Challenge" I say, because crossing the path between common hopes and aspirations to a guiding vision of education would demand a) confronting difficult questions and making hard decisions relating to Jewish and American self-definition and b) special efforts in aiming educational practice towards the attainment of that vision.

Note, the practical implications are not defined here yet in terms of a strategy or a specific plan of action. Rather, it is defined as a framework for discourse in and across constituencies in the school. Hence, instead of speaking about "establishing readiness" as a planned goals initiative at Agnon, I perceived it as an ongoing component of all goals activities. In every encounter with Agnon, I would be in some way attempting to "establish readiness" for a discourse on goals by framing the conversation in light of the challenge of moving from common aspirations and hopes to a vision for Agnon. In a paradoxical way, this would be an attempt of sorts at community building in a community that already exists. THE LIMITS OF READINESS....

Vignette: Undoing parents' hypocrisy in teachers' eyes: An opportunity to "establish readiness" presented itself to me as I presented a rationale for defining goals to a group of Agnon teachers who had come to the Melton Center summer program. The discussion itself was to lead to an inquiry into the goals of teaching Israel at Agnon. However, when I mentioned the claim that a school without a common vision was in danger of being experienced by the students as a "cacophony" (Lawrence Cremin's term used in relationship to the ills of public education in America), a heated debate ensued as to the commonality of purposes at Agnon. This seemed to me a good opportunity to "establish readiness" and my chance came when one of the teachers pointed out the hypocrisy of parents sending their kids to Agnon when they have no real Jewish agenda at home. In response to this comment, I asked the speaker if she might not think of a way to explain what the parents were doing that would lead her to love, respect and identify with those parents. My question was posed as an academic one, but I knew that any answer which emerged would make explicit something of the common hopes and aspirations of the

Agnon family. My question hit the group like a sharp spear and a deep silence suddenly came over those who before had been heavily debating. My sense of this silence was that it was an admission of guilt in settling with a critique of parents and a desire or curiosity about the possibility that there was something unexplicit which drew such parents to the school. The question had pointed teachers to that domain where ownership of the school goes beyond power and control. The fact that two of the teachers in the group were also parents of children in the school may have been significant as well.

Ironically, the very question which I asked was posed back at me. At such points, and there were many, it struck me how much my role in "establishing readiness" was not only to be a gadfly for vision but also to be its mouthpiece. The fact that I was engaged in an ongoing "content analysis" of the school was extremely useful in this capacity. In my "hard disk" of "texts" for content analysis, I drew upon one exchange I had with Dan Polster in which it became clear to me that his idea of an educated Jew was one whose Jewishness was grounded in a knowledge of things Jewish rather than in a mere sentiment. My task, as I saw it now, was to do now was to restate this perception in terms which would answer my own question to the teacher and which would in essence be a source of her own hopes and aspirations. Luckily, I had with me a text which I often use as a focus for discourse on American Jewry. In this short quote, Philip Roth tries to explain to a forum of Israeli and American intellectuals called together in 1963 by Ben Gurion to discuss their Jewish identity:

"...I feel in my own instance and I think, with some of my friends too - [that what has been] inherited has not been a body of law and it hasn't been a body of learning. (My familiarity with Bible is practically nil. I studied it in a college that identifies itself as a Baptist college; until then I'd gone to a Hebrew School, where I had learned what I thought was history - perhaps it is - nevertheless I didn't associate it with Bible.) So there is no body of law, no body of learning and no language, and finally, no Lord - which seems to me a significant thing to be missing. But there were reminders constantly that one was a Jew and that there were *goyim* out there

...So what I received, I think, was a psychology, not a culture and history in its totality. The simple point here is, I think, that what one received of culture, history, learning, law, one received in strands, in little bits and pieces. What one received *whole*, however, what one feels whole, is a kind of psychology; and the psychology can be translated into three words - "Jews are better." This is what I knew from the beginning: somehow Jews were better. I'm saying this as a point of psychology; I'm not pronouncing it as a fact.

...There was a sense of specialness and from then on it was up to you to invent your specialness; to invent, as it were, your betterness....There's always that hope that somehow all those fingers were pointing, and all that pride had some reason. But I think the amazing thing - which sort of brought the blessing and the burden of having been brought up in America - was to have been given a psychology without a content, or with only the remains of a content, and then to invent off that."

I used this text to suggest the following answer to my own question: Philip Roth's statement about having a Jewish "psychology without a content" accurately defines a basic feeling of many American Jews who are parents today. As Roth, many of them reject this

psychology, only in some cases, the response has been to avoid Jewish education altogether for their children, while for others, it has been to seek out a Jewish education which will ensure that their children will have a Jewish psychology based on content. Perhaps it is precisely parents who have little Jewish content who send their kids to Agnon, because they see the opportunity for them to give their children what they missed out on, while not being afraid that it given to them in a way which is dogmatic, intolerant or one faceted. Before I could get an answer to the question, "would that sort of reasoning make it easier for you to love, respect and identify with these parents?", one of the teachers screamed out "well that's why I sent my kids to the school" and heads nodded all around the table.

At that point I explained that the sort of thing which I was suggesting for the group was to carefully consider what it meant to have "a Jewish psychology with a content" and to organize the Judaic curriculum accordingly. I was not sure that the point got across at that very moment. Similarly, I did not sense that the phrase "Jewish psychology with a content" remained with the participants. However, in both cases, I kept on repeating the same messages again and again, each time in a new and different formulation, so as to consciously "establish readiness" for discourse on goals.

IN THE FULL VERSION THIS WOULD CONTINUE WITH OTHER: VIGNETTES DEALING WITH VARIOUS ASPECTS OF "ESTABLISHING READINESS" IN AND ACROSS CONSTITUENCIES IN THE SCHOOL. INTERVIEWS FOR THE ISRAEL COMPONENT; BARBARA'S CHANGING TA'AM; TEACHING EMMA LAZARUS; CHANA'S MAP; INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS WITH THE TRUSTEES; WORKING OUT PERSONAL ASPECTS OF RAY'S JEWISH IDENTITY AT HIS HOME; ALL LEADING TO THE CLIMAX OF THE CORE GROUP MEETING, IN WHICH TRUSTEES AND STAFF MET IN ORDER TO BEGIN REVISITING AGNON'S GOALS TOGETHER

3. Engagement in visional discourse:

What is the actual work of goals development which took place with Agnon constituents as "readiness" was being established? As will be seen in the section on strategic decisions, our approach was not to limit or focus our activities on "a goals project" per se, but rather to enter into existing and ongoing planning and decisionmaking discussions and raise issues relating to goals "from within.". This approach relates to Israel Scheffler's important point about visional discourse: the challenge is to speak about goals in a way which makes the importance of addressing them self-evident. While sitting in on planning meetings about the Tanach and Science curricula of the school, for example, I took upon myself the role of asking questions about goals at a "natural" point in the conversation.

When someone in the Tanach group suggested arranging the syllabus so that students would learn portions from each of the five books of the Torah in consecutive order, I would ask questions such as "are you saying that the aim of your Tanach program is to

familiarize the students with a sample of texts from each of the books in the Torah?" "What is the sort of familiarity you are aiming at?" and "could this same sort of familiarity be achieved by learning the same text each year but in different ways or by learning samples of texts by type of Biblical literature (eg. narrative, legal, historical, etc.) rather than in the order of the Bible itself?" Similarly, in the Science group, when one teacher suggested that the aim of science in the primary school was to get students to be curious about the world around them and how it works, I asked questions such as "are you speaking only of the physical world?" "isn't this the aim of study all across the Agnon school curriculum?" and "what would be the student's habits of mind in relationship to the world around him/her after completion of this program?"

These are examples from discussions with educators on the planning of their curricula. Of course, in addition to these sorts of discussions, I had many similar kinds with Ray, senior staff, individual educators, trustees of the school (parents) and even students. The questions usually bounced back and fourth between level four, "implementation," and level three, "theory of practice," in Seymour Fox's map of elements of educational content. However, at times the discussion would begin on or move on to other levels as well. Often I would draw from my "content analysis" of Agnon, or of my reservoir of distinctions, ideas, debates, and examples from the Educated Jew project in order to suggest possibilities rather than to ask questions. The point was to generate a *resonance* between ideas and practice/policy at as many levels and in as many contexts and with as many of the players at Agnon as possible. At the same time, the aim here was to lay the groundwork for more serious and systematic inquiry into the goals of Agnon as part of what would indeed be called "the goals project at Agnon."

Ultimately, I wanted this sort of "combustion energy" to lead to a desire to engage in critical study of alternative possibilities for Agnon's aims so as to make responsible decisions and design creative means for attaining desired outcomes. Obviously, in order to arrive a critical mass of such visional discourse, what would be needed was much more than what I could accomplish in a series of intense visits. In this sense, it was important to serve as a model for senior staff as to a way of thinking about education. This modelling, however, has not yet been systematized in writing or pursued in the form of a training program. In order to facilitate this, I have arranged the rest of this discussion according to alternative methods which I used at particular times, each demonstrated with a vignette.

Method: Careful examination of suggested goals statements for planned activities;
vignette: goals statement concerning the grade eight trip to Israel

It was surprising to see just how often the language of goals is used unwittingly in planning education activities in various frameworks. Such statements seemed to me to be little "gold mines," because they enabled me to focus on raising the quality and content of discourse on goals rather than on initiating such a discourse on my own "from the outside." Hence, in planning activities for an inquiry into Agnon's goals on a particular subject, I spent a bit of time looking at various texts and documents from in and around the school so as find existing "goals statements." Every time I found one, I would keep it

in a file of documents for use in any number of frameworks and discussions in which I tried to generate visional discourse.

How could such "goals statements" be used in order to generate visional discourse? My sense was that they could be the focus of careful and close textual study. Specific words could be "exploded" so as to expose assumptions, ideas, and guiding principles and so as to look at these critically in light of alternatives. The aim here was to have the participants look back at the original text after such close study and realize that "goals statements" need to be drafted with more care, in the light of critical study and examination of alternatives. Of course, a danger here was of appearing to be overly critical of those who formulated the goals statements being scrutinized. There seemed to be no way to get around this other than by asking the permission of the authors and by presenting the exercise as ennobling their efforts through criticism.

One opportunity for using this method presented itself during the week of activities with teachers visiting Israel in order to inquire into the goals for teaching Israel in the Agnon curriculum. In the middle of this week, after a general rationale for inquiry into goals had been presented, and while the teachers were experiencing "alternative relationships to Israel" (archaeological Israel, Israel of tradition, contemporary Israeli society, Israel in the eyes of cultural texts, American Israel, American Jewish Israel, etc.) and learning about the educational advantages and shortcomings of each, we spent two sessions studying a paragraph from within a two page document two teachers had written concerning the proposed grade eight trip next year to Israel. These two teachers were among the group of teachers, and one of their assignments on the trip was to plan for the trip. The paragraph was taken from a whole section relating to the goals of this grade eight trip:

"The Jewish People were born and matured in the environment that is Eretz Israel. The connection of the Jewish people to the Jewish land permeates the curriculum at every grade level at the Agnon School. As we work with children through the years at Agnon, we help them make connections between the concrete land -- its geology, topography and importance throughout history -- and the Jewish texts, identity and spirituality. We want to provide our 8th grade students with the opportunity to discover the Land with their own hands, eyes and ears. It is important for them to see the tangible expression of the learning they have done in Hebrew. This trip will serve as a culminating experience for their years of study in a Jewish Day School, and the beginning of a more personal relationship with their Jewish heritage."

In preparing to study this text with the teachers, I closely examined the text first, both by myself and with Debra Cohen, an associate of mine at the Mandel Institute. While this text seemed to us to carry across an authentic desire for the development of a meaningful encounter with Israel, it was clear that it heaped together many different and even conflicting assumptions about Israel and the teaching of Israel. Here Israel is the birthplace and incubator of the Jewish people, there it is a tangible expression of the Agnon Hebrew curriculum; Israel importance is expressed in its very geology and

topography, and then in its being a reflection of Jewish texts; Israel is a means toward a more personal relationship with Jewish heritage and yet its distance makes it in need of connections... Clearly, this text provided an excellent opportunity to make the case for clarity, precision, and coherence in the definition of goals.

The pedagogy which I employed in order to make this case was to point attention to "loaded" words and phrases in this paragraph and to ask the teachers (including those who formulated them, but not only them) to try to explicate their meaning - eg. "connections," "importance throughout history," "spirituality," "tangible," "Hebrew," "culminating," "beginning of a more personal relationship," etc. Also, I would try to heighten the "loadedness" of these words or phrases by pointing out other possibilities which could have been used and suggesting implications of their being left out. One could have said that "The Jewish people were born and matured in the environment that is Eretz Israel *and have now again placed it at the center of Jewish existence.*" Leaving out the italicized part points to a desire to stress Israel as being the place of origins but not necessarily the place where Jewish peoplehood must play itself out today. What then is the conception of Jewish life outside of Israel which should guide the teaching of local Jewish history and how should it be related to this conception of Israel as the origin of all Jewish history?

As the distinctions and debates surfaced, I both pointed out specific unclarities, contradictions, incoherencies, etc. and invited the group to consider what might be, despite all these, the overriding or underlining thrust of this conception of Israel. When theses about thrusts emerged, I asked the group to locate each in our prior discussions about "alternative Israels" and ways of teaching them, and to think about them in light of our discussions as to their relative educational advantages and shortcomings. Finally, I suggested an exercise for the next session in which participants would suggest three distinct, clearly defined and coherent goals for the Israel component of the Agnon curriculum...

I have little doubt that the impact of this series of experiences was more to set a standard for the definition of goals in general than it was to deal with the particulars of the Israel curriculum. Similarly, the linkage between the setting of this standard and the planning of curriculum according to such goals did not become sufficiently clear until I had personal meetings with each of the teachers in order to discuss their actual lessons in the teaching of Israel. Nevertheless, what clearly emerged was that this "cut" into educational planning was both practical and necessary for professional educating. In and of themselves, the most these exercises might have accomplished was to make teachers think twice before they formulated goals in the future. In the context of a larger "goals clarifying environment," however, it seemed to me that it would be possible for this sort of exercise to have an engaging and a snowballing effect. It is very important to take into account here that upon returning to the school, these teachers found that they were constantly being asked to reflect upon their practice and to explicate their goals by Ray Levi and that they would witness similar exercises being implemented with other constituencies in the school. Furthermore, after this exercise, those who were planning the grade eight Israel trip decided to reformulate their goals and plan the trip accordingly...

Strategic decisions:

- no goals project;
- chemistry
- visit, summer trip, proposals
- aim for infrastructure, bring in outsiders,
- core group meetings - the shema, etc.
- visit #2 - meet core group members individually
 - pull threads together and launch study process
 - establish readiness and set ground rules
 - national and international event

5. Next steps: three core group meetings before visit #3; glossary; Barbara's list; reports from field; mini conference at Agnon; learn commonplace of kids...

The Agnon School Goals Project

Update and Plan (draft of May 1, 1996)

1. Update: After getting approval for the goals project from its board of trustees, the Agnon School devoted over a year to laying the groundwork for goals development all across the school:

a) Under the guidance of the school's president Dan Polster and headmaster Ray Levi, and with the help of an outside consultant, Daniel Marom of the Mandel Institute-CIJE, the question of the goals of educational practice has been raised on many levels:

- Significant number of teachers have looked at the goals of their individual teaching in particular instances (eg. the teaching of Israel, the teaching of art).
- Two groups of teachers have met regularly to consider the school's curriculum within a particular discipline (Tanach and Science).
- The staff's leadership team has been engaged in thinking about Agnon's goals across areas.
- A group of over twenty representatives from among staff, administration and trustees has convened monthly in order to consider the goals of the Agnon school as a whole and is on its way to making recommendations according to its findings.
- The school's administration has made a visible attempt to explain school policy to parents and others in terms of the school's larger goals.

Two local experts, Lifsa Schachter of the Cleveland College of Jewish Studies and Rob Toren of the JIA, have actually participated in the implementation of the goals project at Agnon.

- Outside audiences and experts have been reported to and consulted with regarding the Agnon School's goals project.

b) Aspects of the larger vision of Agnon which emerge from these various levels of goals discourse are coming to the fore. The following is an attempt to formulate some of these aspects and how they might cohere:

The Agnon School is committed to education which will generate two basic qualities in its students: "**autonomous critical learning**" and "**community involvement.**"

"Autonomous critical learning" is first and foremost an attitude towards learning. This attitude values learning as a crucial resource for understanding the world and deciding how to live in it. Making judgements and decisions without learning about what must be judged or decided upon is viewed as potentially misguided and impractical. With learning, however, one has a better chance at confronting the challenges of life and making a creative contribution to the world. Consequently, in dealing with any topic or situation, an ideal Agnon graduate will feel a strong desire to learn the topic or the situation in order to address it. Indeed, by learning about the topic or situation before him/her, this graduate will feel empowered to make his/her own autonomous decision as to how to address it. In essence, learning will have liberated him/her from having his/her responses to this topic or situation conditioned by forces out of himself. To be sure, though learning will help one make an informed decision about how to respond to a topic or a situation, it will not necessarily guarantee that a person will make the right decision. However, by making the decision on the basis of his/her own learning, the individual will also view whatever emerges from this decision as an opportunity for further learning. Even if the wrong response is chosen, the individual is committed to redeeming it, at least in the level of his/her own learning, so as to improve his judgement for the future. The individual who is committed to learning as a resource for living will find him/herself constantly striving for greater wisdom as a way of expressing his/her own freedom and taking responsibility for his/her own decisions. This view of learning renders it a lifelong activity, both in that its importance never dwindles and in that it is not only concerned with learning in and of itself, nor merely for the opportunity to participate in intellectual discourse and inquiry, but also with learning as a resource for living better.

10 20 20 77
20 20 4 12
1 M 4 5
L 5 2 2
P R 1 2
TO
175
22
TE
C 2 0 7
V 1 7
29
S 1 2
L 5 7
P 2
O 1
S 1
V 8

To limit "autonomous critical learning" to an attitude would be to beg the question. This attitude will be genuine only when it becomes a regular mode of behavior - one which is facilitated by habits of mind and skills of study. The Agnon School is committed to a particular mode of learning which includes the following elements:

- locating and defining the topic of study;
- researching this topic with whatever resources are available;
- understanding this topic through many different modes of inquiry;
- arriving at one's own judgement of and response to the topic on the basis of a critical examination of alternatives;
- sharing one's own judgement of and response to the topic with others;
- benefitting from the critical response of others;
- expressing the judgement of and response to the topic in one's continued learning and lifestyle.

The Agnon School will have succeeded only if its graduates come to value and be astute at implementing this mode of learning. Learning to apply this mode of study only to the topics encountered in the Agnon School curriculum will not be sufficient proof that "autonomous critical learning" will have set in. The ideal graduate should be able to demonstrate his/her capacity to apply it to "unseen" topics and should continue to do so after s/he has left the school.

"Community involvement": is also a quality which includes both an attitude and a mode of behavior. First and foremost it expresses a paradoxical self-definition of the individual: to the degree that an individual is self-respecting, s/he will also want to define his/her self-worth through his/her relationship to others in his/her community. Watching out for oneself alone, ignoring the welfare of others, denying that which others have done for one, being indifferent to the dreams of those who preceded us and the well-being of those who follow - these attitudes are the opposite of what is sought out for those who learn at Agnon. Regardless of how prevalent they may be in our competitive and leisure oriented society, and despite the challenges imposed on those who would value the opposite, the Agnon school seeks to generate a fundamental concern for others.

Note: "community" is defined here not merely in the broad philosophical sense of "others," one which includes anyone ranging from one other human being to a whole other group or society to the human race as a whole. Rather, it is viewed in concrete existential and historical terms, so as to include a wide array of visible groups of people ranging from the individual's family, to the Agnon School community, to the Jewish communities of Cleveland, America, of the diaspora and of Israel, to the various communities of America, to the American community at large, and to the communities of western civilization.

This point here is that the Agnon School seeks to generate this positive attitude to "community" not only in the abstract moral sense, but also with reference to the actual communal contexts in which its students learn and live. It is the Agnon School's belief that neither the impassioned attempt to unite individuals around a common religious or national ideology, nor the mere fact of being exposed daily to a broad range of people can be sufficient so as to truly engender the valuing of community as an important category of existence. Rather, this will emerge only where there is a conscious and systematic attempt on the part of a particular community to provide individuals at an early stage with a rich and fruitful experience of itself. Having experienced what it means to be part of a community and what it means for a community to want to be part of you, the individual will have a better chance attributing worth to that part of living which involves living with others.

The Agnon School sees in Jewish day school education dedicated to the experience of community an opportunity which can often be lacking or too easily taken for granted in denominationally based Jewish education and/or American public school education. That is, it sees the study and experience of community at Agnon as a training ground for the development of a positive and serious commitment to community membership in the larger Jewish, American and western contexts beyond the school. Rather than being an attempt to limit the individual's commitment to community to the Jewish community alone, to define his/her commitment in one particular way, or to persuade him/her as to the necessity for the preeminence of the Jewish community in the American community, the day school Jewish educational experience is viewed here as a one which can be directed towards preparing, facilitating and deepening the individual's commitment to the category of community altogether in and beyond the Jewish context.

Keeping with this view, the attitude which the Agnon School wants to nurture in its students is that being part of the Jewish community ennobles them, and that having been ennobled thus, they want to contribute to the good of American and western society at large. In a sense, the ideal graduate of Agnon will want to do good for others, because s/he will have learned to appreciate, in his/her own education, the redeeming fruits of a society that shows genuine care and love for its members.

In the case of "community involvement" as well, a positive attitude is not considered to be sufficient. In addition, "community involvement" assumes a mode of practice - one which is also facilitated by habits of mind and skills of study. This mode of practice includes the following elements:

- familiarization with the community's authentic history, culture and development until and including the present through transmission, experience and inquiry;
- critical analysis of alternative means of expressing belonging to the community in light of the above;
- decisive, if not irreversable, commitment to particular means of expressing or belonging to the community in light of the above;
- implementation of this commitment in practice;
- continued reevaluation of this commitment in light of continuous repetition of all of the above and in light of changing perspectives on the part of the individual and changing circumstances on the part of the community.

The Agnon School will have succeeded only if its graduates come to value and be astute at implementing this mode of practice, whether with reference to their relationship to the Jewish community, as Jews in the context of the American community, as Americans in the context of western society, and so on and so forth. Learning to apply this mode of practice only to the topics encountered in the Agnon School curriculum will not be sufficient proof that "community involvement" will have set in. The ideal graduate should be able to demonstrate his/her capacity to apply it to "unseen" topics and should continue to do so after s/he has left the school.

Interplay between "autonomous critical learning" and "community involvement":

Agnon's vision emerges in full bloom when these two qualities are brought to bear on each other. "Autonomous critical learning" is meant to take place within the context of the individual's attempt to work out their "community involvement." As such, it uses as its content and focus the histories and traditions of the Jewish, American and western societies - be they religious (Bible and halacha), political (eg. American democracy), intellectual (eg. science, language & literature) or relating to the arts (eg. painting, music), and seeks to bring the learner to the point of establishing his/her own commitments with

reference to these and expressing them in practical terms. The Agnon school assumes that "autonomous critical learning," cannot take place in a vacuum or become the sole topic of its own study. In order to truly liberate the individual, "autonomous critical study" must be focused upon the very traditions which determine the world in which s/he lives.

Similarly, "community involvement" is meant to be enriched by people who are committed to "autonomous critical learning." The belief here is that people will make a stronger contribution to their communities when they have learned their histories and traditions and have arrived at their own independent conclusions about what and how they want to contribute. The Agnon School assumes that no amount of indoctrination can generate the kind of motivation, commitment and involvement with the community which flows from one's own autonomous critical learning about the community and that no amount of habituation and training in community involvement can provide the kind of qualitative contribution which can be made by an autonomous and critical learner.

Another critical aspect of this interplay relates to the value of respect and tolerance for others. By integrating "autonomous critical learning" with "community involvement," the Agnon School assumes that both the individual and the community cherish the value of pluralism. Since "autonomous critical learners" will find that others in their community have arrived at commitments divergent from their own, they will necessarily have to respect and tolerate those commitments and find a way to enter into a conversation with them about how to best live together. Similarly, since "community involvement" will be enriched by the diversity of perspectives and talents of its "autonomous critical learners," the community will have to find ways to enable people of diverse commitments to enter into a discourse and decide upon matters of common concern in order to function well. In both these senses, it is important to realize that pluralism is posed here not only as a practical notion which is agreed upon for the purposes of peaceful co-existence, but also as a positive value and normative standard regarding the very nature of life in community.

What are the limits of this interplay between "autonomous critical learning" and "community involvement," as defined by the Agnon School? One limit is on preceeding the critical analysis of alternatives to the familiarization with the community's authentic history, culture and development. It is important to provide autonomous and critical learners with a measure of authentic communal experience before engaging them with difficult questions. To begin the learning with the critique is to deny the learner with the opportunity to enter into the learning process or to limit his/her findings to criticism alone. This limitation calls for a good deal of emphasis to be placed on the transmission of authentic communal experiences in early childhood and elementary education. Examples in the Jewish context would be: daily prayer, kabbalat shabbat, acquisition of modern Hebrew language skills, study of Biblical literature, acts of charity and volunteerism in the Jewish community, etc.. Examples in the American context would be participation in holidays such as Thanksgiving and Martin Luther King Day, singing American folk songs, study of current events on the national level, meetings and exchanges with children of other communities within America etc. Examples in the larger western context would be: initiation into scientific mode of thinking through experimentation, exposure to great

works of western literature, music and art, emphasis on heroes from the western world, raising issues concerning the western world today (eg. environment), etc..

Another limitation works in the opposite direction. The emphasis on "community involvement" ought not to be used as a justification for blurring standards of "autonomous and critical learning." Those who teach must not be kept from being honest and critical of their student's achievements for fear of creating differences among them. The Agnon School's definition of "community" does not assume that all members must be equal in their talents and achievements in order for them to live well together. To the contrary. It is the community's responsibility to each individual to assist them in making the most of their potential, so that they may thrive in society and make the best possible contribution.

Yet another limitation would be willful indifference towards or intentional denial of the Agnon School community itself in the name of "autonomous critical learning." While the Agnon school would not limit its learners from expressing critical insights concerning his/her education at the Agnon School, they will not feel free to disengage from the demand to respect its vision and to be oblivious to its call for compliance with its own groundrules for community. The faith of the Agnon school is that it is precisely the affirmation of education defined this way which will lead to the desire to continue to be good and abiding citizens of the Jewish community, and of American and western society.

2. Plan: What is described above has been referred to as "groundwork" for goals development at the Agnon School rather than goals development per se. The direction which the goals project at the Agnon School needs to take now is to build on this groundwork so as to set into place and standardize goals discourse in the regular work of the school. That is, the interplay between setting goals, implementing them into practice and evaluating practice in the light of goals needs to a) characterize in an explicit way the mode in which constituents in the school go about their work in the school; b) be the topic of continuing discourse across these constituencies, and c) be the topic of inquiry with a larger community of scholars, educators, and lay leaders dedicated to the formulation and implementation of the same sort of vision which emerges at Agnon.

The following is a set of proposals, each of which is designed to facilitate the move from laying a groundwork for goals development at the Agnon School to actual goals development. These proposals are made as the basis for the development of a systematic plan for the next year of Agnon's goals project:

I) Establishing a language and writing mechanism for goals development: This is an attempt to make goals discourse explicit and functional in all circles in the school. The proposal is to require all policy and programs in the school to be defined in writing in terms of:

- a) the goals they attempt to achieve;
- b) and the means by which they suggest for such an achievement;
- c) the methods by which it would be possible to determine having achieved their goals

The written document for each policy and program area should be a summary of the deliberations which transpire among the educators, administrators and/or trustees responsible for it. Each written document should be the opening chapter of a file or portfolio in each area of policy or programming. The file or portfolio should then be added to with summaries of actual cases in implementation, summaries of deliberations on particular issues at meetings, consultation and evaluation reports, etc. Note: It will be important the requirement should be made not as a threat but as an opportunity for professional development and communication across constituencies. The actual final draft of this written exercise can and should include the input of any person in the Agnon faculty, administration, trustee groups, and consultants who can devote time to improving the formulation (it may be useful to compare this to writing up cases in the medical, military and legal professions). Furthermore, it will be important to model this exercise as part of the requirement. The current Tanach and Science program committees may be designed so as to be later used as models for other program areas, as might some of the recommendations which emerge from the core group.

II) Establishing a discourse or reporting mechanism for goals development: It would be mistaken to assume that goals development is suggested here as emerging from a single source or authority at Agnon and "trickling down" to the rest of the school. Our assumption in the goals project at Agnon has been that there is already an implicit vision in

its work and that the task of the goals project is to bring it to the fore and use it more systematically as a basis for the school's work. Ultimately, the explicit vision itself ought to be seen as the authority at the Agnon School, though, as we shall see, it would have to be the topic of constant evaluation and revision over time.

Consequently, the strategy which is suggested here is to bring various goals discussions going on in the school to bear on each other, so that the explicit vision will emerge through constant discourse on goals across constituencies of the school. This strategy will be made possible by the fact that the above proposed writing mechanism will have created a common terminology for various constituents in the school and will have made the goals discussion explicit. The strategy itself calls for these constituents to report to each other on their own particular goals discourse and to benefit from each other's critical input and search for coherence with the goals which others at the school are pursuing.

A critical factor in this reporting mechanism is the presence of a voice from the core group and the leadership to be present - i.e. a voice which speaks from the perspective of the discourse on the overarching goals of the Agnon School as a whole - so that the question of the coherence of each separate goals discourse with the larger vision of the school and with other goals discourses at the school can be raised in each and every context. Indeed, summaries of the various meetings within the reporting mechanism can and should be appended both to the files or portfolios of each of the participant groups and to a separate and discrete core group file or portfolio, the opening chapter of which will be the recommendations of the core group. This core group file should be made available to all constituents of the school at all time, and should be the topic of deliberation among an ongoing version of the core group, once it has finished its work and made its recommendations.

III) Establishing a mechanism for goals based evaluation: The promise of goals based development is that it enables one to undertake evaluation of school practice with reference to its own desired ends. In this sense, evaluation is a tool for the improvement and the enhancement of school practice more than a blade of the guillotine. The goals project at Agnon will be successful to the degree that the various constituents at Agnon can become comfortable with evaluation defined thus and make constant use of it in trying to improve its output in achieving its own goals. While the aim of goals based evaluation is constant improvement of this output, the necessary means is a constant creative tension between implementation of goals and evaluation in light of goals.

A corollary of this definition of evaluation is that it is inner-oriented. That is, the aim is to enable each group responsible for programs and policy to take responsibility for evaluating its own output with reference to goals (as was mentioned above, the original written statement should include suggested methods for evaluating the degree to which explicit goals are attained). To be sure, it will be useful to include outsiders to participate in this evaluation process - whether through the reporting mechanism or through the invitation of outside experts - so as to benefit from their input. However, no less important will be the invitation of one person from within a group to another or others to

observe his/her practice and help consider it in light of shared explicit goals. Ideally, this ought to become a regular mode of discourse for group meetings as well. Outside experts may be useful in suggesting alternative modes of practice in order to attain the said goals and rationales for their being more likely to attain these goals than actual practice (it is important to make this demand of experts, so that they do not come in on a "hit and run" basis, but rather enter into the established goals discourse and attempt to raise the level of the discourse through their suggestions).

It is important to note that the evaluation ought not to be limited to the question of whether or not actual practice attains explicit goals. In addition, it will be important to evaluate the goals themselves, in terms of their rationale, content, feasibility and coherence with other attempts in the school to attain goals, etc. etc. Outside experts may be useful here in providing useful learning material in order to facilitate this process, including even the suggestion of alternative goals for practice in light of an explicit criticism of the existing goals in a particular area (the comment made in brackets in the above paragraph applies here as well).

In any case, it will be important for written summaries of these evaluation experiences to be included in the files or portfolios of each group in addition to that mentioned above.

On the face of it, this suggestion would seem to go contrary to the regular mode of evaluation at the school, which is carried out by the Independent Schools Association. Their evaluation is based on bringing outsiders to observe the school on their terms. However, that evaluation process may be used as an opportunity to further each of the above suggestions, including the inner-oriented evaluation process suggested here. On the one hand, the requirement for the above mentioned files or portfolios can be justified in terms of preparing for the ISA evaluation. On the other hand, by including these files and portfolios into the ISA evaluation process, it will be possible to co-opt it into the inner-oriented evaluation process and/or use it as a resource in evaluating that process itself.

IV) Establishing a larger circle of discourse on the goals of the Agnon School: Though the goals project at the Agnon School will be summarized, analyzed and reported on in writing for the CIJE, as part of its goals project attempt to engage other educating institutions in similar undertakings, what is proposed here is of a different nature. The Agnon School is pioneering in its attempt to define a "community" based vision for Jewish education in America. While the 1990 CJF statistical survey of the Jewish population in America shows the majority of Jews identifying with non-denominational definitions of their Jewishness, most of Jewish education remains in the hands of denominational and synagogal agencies. There is, however, a growing number of scholars, educators, institutions, and communities in the Jewish world, who have demonstrated a strong interest in defining a "community" based vision for Jewish education in America. Apparently, there are also a number of actual educational initiatives being undertaken along these lines.

energy and talents to extracurricular and development activities. How can writing and meeting become part of the conscientious professional activity of people at Agnon, while depending on their vocational idealism?

b) The process of goals development as it is defined here could well be facilitated by a local staff person who serves as a "secretary" and "editor" of the various files or portfolios. This person's role would include activities such as: providing models of goals writing for the various groups; ensuring that files or portfolios get written and expanded upon over the course of the year; setting up meetings in which various groups report to each other on their goals discourses; participating in the reporting meetings as a voice for the core group; editing the various files or portfolios as they get developed; editing pieces of the files or portfolios for publication in the school's newsletter or other publications; serving as a "librarian" for the files and portfolios both within and beyond the school (eg. preparing materials for a new teacher at the school, for outside experts, visitors, etc.); being a regular representative of the goals project in other activities; etc. Without systematic involvement of one such person, these activities might need to be broken down and divided among a broad array of people anyway, only the expertise amassed by having one such person do all these activities would be lost. Is there any way to include this role in the work load of any of the staff of the leadership team or administration?

c) Making use of outside experts and sharing Agnon's vision with others who have a stake in the "community" based vision are all activities which do not come for free. On the other hand, the fact that Agnon efforts in goals development are pioneering, both in education and with reference to the "community" agenda, may enable the school to turn to various foundations and other sources for budgetary assistance on the goals project. Seeking out opportunities on this level could have direct relevance for the above two issues as well.

D. Marom

Furthermore, there is great interest in this sort of vision beyond the Jewish community of North America. The state of Israel's general system of education, for example, is deeply concerned about the development of a compelling program of Jewish education within the context of a "community" based identification of Jewishness - especially in light of the rampant influence of Americanization on Israeli youth. In some ways, the goals project at the Agnon School has direct relevance to the recent findings of the Shinhar Commission on Jewish education in the general system in Israel.

Finally, to these we may add the uniqueness of Agnon's vision on the American educational scene. While the multicultural agenda in American education often seems to result in an educational tug-of-war over the curriculum, the Agnon School is seeking out a vision of private cultural education which actually attempts to prepare students be more conscientious about being members of the American community at large. This attempt certainly has significance for other cultural groups in America as well.

In light of the above, there is room to consider the Agnon School's vision and goals project as a topic for a broad range of constituents who could both learn from and enrich its goals discourse on many levels. One definite advantage to sharing the Agnon School vision with these constituents is the opportunity to evaluate this vision in terms of its relevance to realities outside the Agnon school. Many scholars and experts on education have argued that educational visions can lose their power if they become redundant. Among other things, keeping in touch with this larger group of "community-oriented" constituencies can help the Agnon School evaluate its own vision in light of input on this level.

The range of activities possible for enabling the Agnon School to share its vision with these constituencies is broad. Among other possibilities, it includes individual or group visits, writing networks through newsletters or e-mail (eg. to share items in each other's files or portfolios), and conferences (at the Agnon School, in Israel, etc.). Indeed, such a conference at the Agnon School itself may be a good catalyst for the initiation of activities on this level. It should not be assumed, however, that this conference would symbolize the end of a goals project at Agnon. To the contrary. It would be no less or more of a resource in general goals development at Agnon than any of the above.

V) A note on budget, personnel, and planning: As was mentioned, the above is a set of proposals for discussion. This discussion should ultimately lead to a plan for the continuation of the goals project at Agnon. In considering these proposals and their possible translation into a plan, it is necessary to take into account a number of assumptions they make regarding people, time and money:

a) The job or role description of any faculty, administrator, or trustee at the Agnon School, as it is defined in these proposals, includes writing and meeting with others. Goals development will move as fast and as much as these activities grow. Yet, at the same time, people at Agnon already volunteer significant amounts of extra hours of their time,