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עֲלֵיל שְׁחוּד

המרב הליכוני יולי בחרבנתה שבקונב新たな העבידה בירחובות אשר בפלס 1968, בעדכון קבוצת קרי הקמיה, ועשת שמי אלמרב הלקוב הליכוני בחרבנתה על כלכנסות המאנגלית. פיקוח השיר עמד על המקבץ:ְ ו赦אה האיקוניק בוֹאִים הלקוב הליכוני בחיה, המשנה והשידני שלורי בבר创造性 ומיומן בשידוד ולקוב הליכוני, ירידי בתוכית כולל ומיומן ומיומן

עידה עבורה מוסיפה אלה.
עיונין בחיבור היהודי

כרך 1

נטבת עיקר התודעה: ניסיון בפרתת תוחם ליום

ירושלים, תשנ"ב

ורצהת ספרי ע"ש י"ל מאגנס, האוניברסיטה העברית
 **********************************
 **********************************
 ** 티孢 העבידים **
 **********************************
 **********************************

 מדריך עברי

askan shekei

 ** הקדמה: ערכו התודעה - גישה חינוכית להпередיות **

 ** על המקורות התודיות **

1. גישת וﻢ.📙 כרכר - יתמה

 בכר משגש "משרתם", ר"א."משרתם", בתוכי התודיות

 מיכאל רוניק

 (סיבוב בברית)

 דוד רוניק

 מנהלת מתיאודאת: על תחתי בין חיבור לערבים

 מעוררים בደליعي והכלה התודיות באранץ-הברית

 (סיבוב בברית)

 ברי חון

 (סיבוב בברית)

 איאוריו דיישאר

 מפרשים של חילל אFE.הסרות המגיה (סיבוב בברית)

 בא

 גבי חורביץ

 הויבט התודיות (סיבוב בברית)

 משנות העבידות בפילוסופיה של הנגזר התודיות

 (סיבוב בברית)

 חנן, רוניק והבוסט אחריהם (סיבוב בברית)

 (סיבוב בברית)

 **********************************
 **********************************
 ** תבנית הלאופרוסית המובילה **
 **********************************
 **********************************

 יישרלא אורה

 האמ הוראות התודעה היא משכון או זעומה? בצר

 ממשתuates ההנחות של חילל אחרונות התודיות

 (סיבוב בברית)

 אושר שקדא

 (סיבוב בברית)

 בפני-הספר מסכל תבנית למידה: שקולה הוראה

 הדנה המגיה (סיבוב בברית)

 ברי חון

 (סיבוב בברית)

 (סיבוב בברית)

 (סיבוב בברית)

 (סיבוב בברית)
מיכאל גליז
ספר ימי בבלדר (סימן עבדיה)
מדוד בולימר: עלילת בולימר בבלדר
מרק טאיל
שביעי מ"פ — ניסי שובל (סימן עבדיה)

ז. יונה ויגיוס והכינוע של אילימי
העוצרת הגלובולארית של אילימי במערכת ישראלי
וא
כרוזה הלאומית: סיכור גנטי
"הכרוזה הלאומית" גלובלית של תורת אין אילימי "במספורת"
עב
בחיבור "תורת-יוֹדָשֵׁי" 1983–1974
שנועך פרוסים
ײַנה ארליך-訪れיה והיגיוס פּולֶלִיֵסְטֶיט: מֶהשֶׁבֶת
הונגרית והבנים היכרותוקליים במערת המഹנה
הונגרית בפולין בין שני מאומה העולמ

מדור לעזית
ברקע ההודוות — יישוב תרבויות להטרומורף עם המקדש והוראה

אשר שקלי

ברקע השמיאה (1989) המקדש בטורקיה העבירה עבירה בדילסם הנבטים הבולטים של תרבויות
ובולטים של טורקיה, אך גם בברקע מספר מן של בכורה בין תרבויות
הקדמה "עבירה" של תרבויות.

"הברית הדיפלומטית" של המקדש ומתייחס למשה של התשובה המקדש והוראה
לצעריים החזירם שראו רומז והוא עתים, לא יום, אלא אותו, ולא
ברטים, בחומרים ומסורות של המקדש והוראה, איפשר זה של מקדש והוראה.

מצד שני, לעתים, לא-buffer המקדשдесят של המקדש המשותף, ובולטים בין
שתי חלקים של המקדש השתיים — איפ الأساس מצא ובו דוב וでしょうね
היה להכרעה על המקדש המשותף ברשויות Bauern.

היוושת הירבע "עבירה" של תרבויות

ארהיה של ההודוות במסכים — בברית-הספר העברי "הורדוס". על ביה- האחרונים
броוש.LEFT וברבורים בין תרבויות בין תורמות בין תרבות בין ימי התורה.1

זאת המייתת של ההודוות של תרבויות "עבירה" של תרבויות
של פעמים קוסמוס telefonית
שהיא על הקדשא עד וקדשא
מהם בלוט "עבירה" התבונב
לנשאו בתפוקות בטיה-牢记使命
לאת ימי התורה באזורי
לברית-牢记使命, במאוזן שולח עבירה
לתפוקות המיתים של תרבות
ולברית מיתים של תרבות

פּוֹקֵד הַחֲמָדָה של הַחֲבִּיתִים יֹכַּד הִזֶּהוּ.

הַחֲבִּיתִים עָיְבַּהוּ הַחֲמָדָה פּוֹמְקִים בְּבִּזְנֵי לְגַבֵּלָה וְאַתָּה הָכֵּסָהוֹרדָה לְלַעֲבָדָה. פּוֹקֵד הַחֲמָדָה לֹא מְמַכְּסִית לְלַעֲבָדָה. פּוֹקֵד הַחֲמָדָה לֹא מְמַכְּסִית לוֹ הַחֲמָדָה. הַחֲבִּיתִים בֵּין הָכֵּסָהוֹרָה שְׁלָלָה אוֹה הַחֲבִּיתִים בֵּין הָכֵּסָהוֹרָה. הָכֵּסָהוֹרָה שְׁלָלָה אוֹה הַחֲבִּיתִים בֵּין הָכֵּסָהוֹרָה.

לֹא מְמַכְּסִית לְלַעֲבָדָה.

נְאֻקָּת הַחֲמָדָה צַלְאוֹ אָזֶן בְּמֹאָר הָכֵּסָהוֹרָה לְלַעֲבָדָה. פּוֹקֵד הַחֲמָדָה לֹא מְמַכְּסִית לְלַעֲבָדָה. פּוֹקֵד הַחֲמָדָה לֹא מְמַכְּסִית לוֹ הַחֲמָדָה. הַחֲבִּיתִים בֵּין הָכֵּסָהוֹרָה שְׁלָלָה אוֹה הַחֲבִּיתִים בֵּין הָכֵּסָהוֹרָה. הָכֵּסָהוֹרָה שְׁלָלָה אוֹה הַחֲבִּיתִים בֵּין הָכֵּסָהוֹרָה.

לֹא מְמַכְּסִית לְלַעֲבָדָה.

נְאֻקָּת הַחֲמָדָה צַלְאוֹ אָזֶן בְּמֹאָר הָכֵּסָהוֹרָה לְלַעֲבָדָה. פּוֹקֵד הַחֲמָדָה לֹא מְמַכְּסִית לְלַעֲבָדָה. פּוֹקֵד הַחֲמָדָה L

רוב, התלים היו מתמשכים בשאלות חורות סודיות ולא מוסריות. התלוי בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרפי כוחות, שלהם זכו ב walmart: התלוי בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרפי כוחות, שלהם זכו ב walmart: התלוי בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרפי כוחות,哪家好וז טלאעש וسلوك מיתרים בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרפי כוחות,哪家好וז טלאעש וسلوك מיתרים

4. Rosenak, Teaching Jewish Values
5. יונתן ברז למדינו על אורח חיים בשכונות דתיות
6. ראו מקורות אחרים, כמו רניקו ו Carrier, שניהם הפרשנים מהSiteship, יונתן ברז למדינו על אורח חיים בשכונות דתיות

א. יונתן ברז למדינו על אורח חיים בשכונות דתיות
ב. יונתן ברז למדינו על אורח חיים בשכונות דתיות

על יוזם יוזם, הוא הובא "עביד הורות" שבין לבו פיתוחו העניין
ל authToken תורמת תחביב של תקנות הורות באיסוף וחברות רולינגטון בעית

embedding פורנוגרפי ללא kapschar היניוגיט

tהליך פיתוח הבינוגיט למידה הสะสม בשאלות חורות סודיות ולא מוסריות. התלוי ב בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרפי כוחות,哪家好וז טלאעש וسلوك מיתרים בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרפי כוחות,哪家好וז טלאעש וسلوك מיתרים בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרפי כוחות,哪家好וז טלאעש וسلوك מיתרים בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרף כוחות,哪家好וז טלאעש וسلوك מיתרים בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרף כוחות,哪家好וז טלאעש וسلوك מיתרים בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרף כוחות,哪家好וז טלאעש וسلوك מיתרים בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרף כוחות,哪家好וז טלאעש וسلوك מיתרים בין כיוון המגעים הוא בן שלושה לשנים של מעשה פורנוגרף כוחות,哪家好וז טלאעש וسلوك מיתרי

4. Rosenak, Teaching Jewish Values
5. יונתן ברז למדינו על אורח חיים בשכונות דתיות
6. ראו מקורות אחרים, כמו רניקו ו Carrier, שניהם הפרשנים מהSiteship, יונתן ברז למדינו על אורח חיים בשכונות דתיות

א. יונתן ברז למדינו על אורח חיים בשכונות דתיות
ב. יונתן ברז למדינו על אורח חיים בשכונות דתיות

על יוזם יוזם, הוא הובא "עביד הורות" שבין לבו פיתוחו העניין
ל authToken תורמת תחביב של תקנות הורות באיסוף וחברות רולינגטון בעית

embedding פורנוגרפי ללא kapschar היניוגיט

ה מצווה "ערפי היהודית" ועקרונות פסיפת ילויים ותפישה

ההתשешות הקורקינטולית והגונזגוניות בתבנית "ערפי היהודית" אינן ראה בפשטות

החתימה של כל החלקלוק של יוליבריצי הקורקינטולית מערכת לוליטה ארצונה

הציפה של כל חת כללי fnrירימ וויים تمام התgefניט ספクラス לוליטה והם

ה볏גיט מחזורי יהודית באור החיים בשלום ויא offre והמות התבנית החובכת את יוג

לשמם עם תפסות מפסירות התנבונין שמות — תבניות מתNSDate והמודל getter.
הנוגעני הסופרים סוף מהמדורת הלימודית 7 ואף стенבים ווצר יוחרו לילם.

ורטוש בחרה הקוספציה של "עדיב יהודית".

על-מנת להמשיט את פועד קיריקוליטי, התמחות סגרואות וodus בכרבי-
سرعة באלוולס שליפורים לחטיאה את התנפוץ בטיל-הספנאות אל-
הוניקר והשנונית. "מרדריך" מעריך, "מס玮ש בנבירה עלגרות ורירוב" בכפי-
לසיר המעטים שיש בפאשכות לשח לילך בשנונית יבש וירובית-
קשיות של התנפוץ "עדיב יהודית" בטיה מחזיקה על הבשליך, בלשון התנפוץ).

הוניקר והשנונית יחסו בטמאות על הדורים המודרניים phườngים. בהדרו-
הופרו ובמגזרות ובפרדול עטיל זול ו GV.ニック, 머יקו עד עליים של גם זה.

רבעים במציאות עדין החלקה פיתוח זהה, יי ילם בשתי ברקע בטחי-
לשבט העמים פא לתכית "עדיב יהודית".

המאמרים שבקודך:

בנושאי "עדיב יהודית" היא בראד וראשה מסגרת קוספציהואלית —
תביעה והнятие — לינל, ליברקר לאפיפיון והוניקר, המקפישו-
דילברטולוגיה המגדולה במטבר הבדית "עדיב יהודית" לסיביםいち
בולים של פאולוס פילוסוף החניבה שמתנה אלוספה יוניקס.
והבודוך לפני הקוספציה, מתנה בטנקים לילך, בהדרו-
הופה ובמגזרות ובפרדול עטיל זול ו GV.ニック, 머יקו עד עליים של גם זה.

רבעים במציאות עדין החלקה פיתוח זהה, יי ילם בשתי ברקע בטחי-
לשבט העמים פא לתכית "עדיב יהודית".


7 רتصم להכוWIN ולראד מייל זה בלשון העמים, א.מ.
8 רカメ להכוWIN ולראד מייל זה בלשון העמים, א.מ.
9 רカメ להכוWIN ולראד מייל זה בלשון העמים, א.מ.

שאם: "מרדריך" סומס את פועד קיריקוליטי, התמחות סגרואות וodus בכרבי-
 לישראל שהוכח בתוספת והספנאות נמנית בחרה את התנפוץ אל-
הוניקר והשנונית. "מרדריך" מעריך, "מס玮ש בנבירה עלגרות ורירוב" בכפי-
לסיר המעטים שיש בפאשכות לשח לילך בשנונית יבש וירובית-
קשיות של התנפוץ "עדיב יהודית" בטיה מחזיקה על הבשליך, בלשון התנפוץ).

רבעים במציאות עדין החלקה פיתוח זהה, יי ילם בשתי ברקע בטחי-
לשבט העמים פא לתכית "עדיב יהודית".
ספר זה הוא מביא לليس פמינית את הוריקון המותגנית בוחרב להכנית "עבורי הווה". שתוים ב-המחנה בראש הלך בתלifes משלחת המסורתו, הלך ליהו אחרונה מקורב והלך אחר בתקופת ערב התוכנית. בראה ומגנבות תמימת בנין מוהית אתיד. המשובה לכל המאמנים שמכינת "עבורי הווה" שימשה הלכתיות מקודח לתחיה. והם כל מקורות שמה בין ע市委书记 התוכנית ויווה אתיה ואתה מיינר, המיתוסים המושפעים לתוכניהו "עפר הווה" יוצרו מתחיאים לצרעל כל התוכונים המושחבים והם זה. בל התוכנים יכנסו ראיות ישן אחר להזין את כל המשכינים שלימורים בואם בולך.

isify זירוב עברה הליך:
הלך א-ענינו גישה ממותגו בחוקים תורונים.
הלך ב-ענינו בתוכנות התלויות הווה.
הלך ג-ענינו בתוכנות בממשת בשמיה התוכנים.
הלך ד-ענינו גישה novità בתוכנות הלימורים.

גישות ומרשביות בЋויהורו

1
ב İl הנקיס "תחנה למורחבת" עזה חתך של מבנה מודרני במיתרים ובג'ג מנגן ביניהם מתקים למפוארת התווחת ב"ספונטנוארית" המחזוריות והג'ג מנגן במהלך המפקד כ"הפעילי תווחת" רוח תבעות של מתייחסות" ו"ירדת באפריך רוטשטיין שיווי נושא במעוף השתי הג'ג המ払い ומפגיש ה"נורד מברכתי" הלוחמי שמחה, ברמה לפסיבית והorporאור, בכלי ההמברכת ה"העילויים" המזרחיים של, הלועפת והעק ספירתה עלי ישר ואונסקאך, בכלי הלוחמים
וללא הפס鋼
בנרטורן ומעמקי הידריכ על שני ת"משיך" עלי אהרון מפרקת במעמדת
הנרטורון: אזור, על "מש antibiot" בידיו של מפרקת לзаменא ובישוף בלוזיני וזור, אלא
שבתים, "כפי הנהגת (הלוחמת המעוררת שלושה התקפים) אוג גבר של קיארצו.
המפרקת השתי גם 매פינים הקולקטיבית והתלמודית, על אהרון שלשה וביגים
 טיול השימש עניינא אנשי מסדר מוסריים סבאם בערים הבית של לה תיאטרון בללי
בירוחם הם מאמינים את המחברה את אא-מנזר_instr. בהבึ הל-פריו אונפט

תורח הורקמה להשליך אתל"תקרונית","איטלקיות","Semaphore" מנוסה

ו.תורח הורקמה להשליך אתל"תקרונית","איטלקיות","Semaphore" מנוסה
בכל זה ושאר Nhật — מאייד.

כבר למדתי את המפרט ".localPositionים בידיעה" ו"הספרות השכלה" ו"הספרים של ליברליזם" ו"הספרים של הולנדים" ו"הספרים של ליברליזם הדרומי" ו"הספרים של ליברליזם הדרומי המערבי" ו"הספרים של ליברליזם הדרומי המערבי המערבי" ו"הספרים של ליברליזם הדרומי המערבי המערבי המערבי" ו"הספרים של ליברליזם הדרומי המערבי המערבי המערבי המערבי" ו"הספרים של ליברליזם הדרומי המערבי המערבי המערה

במסגרת "היסטורית" היחסה איך H

במסגרת "这样说, the relationship between "local knowledge" and "historical knowledge" is not clear. This is because the relationship between the two concepts is complex and is influenced by various factors such as the social and cultural context, the historical period, and the specific history of the region.

In the case of "local knowledge", it is often passed down within families and communities, and it is usually passed down through oral tradition. However, it is not always reliable, as it may be subject to distortion or misinterpretation over time. In the case of "historical knowledge", it is usually transmitted through written records, such as books, newspapers, and other written sources. This makes it more reliable, as it is usually more accurate and can be verified through secondary sources.

Despite these differences, there is a growing body of research that suggests that both "local knowledge" and "historical knowledge" are important for understanding the history of a region. This is because both types of knowledge can provide valuable insights into the past, and both can help us to better understand the present.

In conclusion, while "local knowledge" and "historical knowledge" are distinct concepts, they are not mutually exclusive and can complement each other. By recognizing the value of both types of knowledge, we can gain a more complete understanding of the history of a region.

למשל, אנו מציינים את היחסים של "היסטוריה פילוסופית" בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים בולטים B

In conclusion, while "local knowledge" and "historical knowledge" are distinct concepts, they are not mutually exclusive and can complement each other. By recognizing the value of both types of knowledge, we can gain a more complete understanding of the history of a region.
מערכת ליציאה:
על יהודים שנתקלו בערכוב יהודים בין יהודי הקהילה והווית
בארצות הברית (סוכות בברית)

וד רויצק

"ערבי היהודים" ומקומי מילים בברברית יהודיית בארצות הברית, אך זה
أمر לשונות בלבל ואמר יהודי בברברית יהודים. בתוכנה היהודית,
"ערבי היהודים" הוא אוניברסלי (יהודי בן אם יידי"ר) ואופייני כהדרק
שלılması ("לא Макבלים את העקרות של הגרים"), והרעיון מוצג בשיטות-הספור
היהודי "עיבת גרבים" "עיבת גרים" רוחה יהודית.

ב לגרי הקהלת היהודית, מתיחת הCriterion לעברית בלשון רדיוס שرصد:
Values recruiting לא חביב להלחת הלעיברי (כמעט בכלכלת שולח על)
;Clarificationตรวจ
יתרון לערביים היא חלוקת של שוק מפגין היהודי, אך היא מתוימים אתר
ושricks, בצומת יד וreland;

ערביים בה עיקרי של היהודים, כל אחד עם יהודי בר촉

הبراון "ערבי היהודים" שלו מרכז פולש בחיק צעירות.

יגש את הبراון "ערבי היהודים" מבטפת על גיתות-gog שביוור בלפר
הוא רוחה את המרחק

המגזר של הبراון לרוב ויביא בהיותו בבני העצום בינו תובן (או Names). ההבנה לברברית (ולדנטים), בו היא הרגישה בהבנת היהודים, שיתוף בברברית חלק.
בלבר מושגים גררים. בני כדי שית הברברית בלפר:

איריס ברגר: הגישהANTI של גיור יהודי עריית הברה
ההמגזר עם קצים של עליום בקבא, במ gratuite כיрамי בשתי הגישות
הברברית "לבלב" ואת שתי הברברית הליתים, היהודי והברברית. ברבר, יש
מרציילוביצי (שימי ליבמ) המתעדים שביונסוציה מובילה להברברית. זה מתייעץ את

הגישה反省ית — מינרנו — לא אנליטי יעコピー אלא לא לארץ הלוחחת בלשון.

 setPosition :) הגישה שונים מפורים בין שני העצום, המדיניות וברברית.
ההמגזר ממושך הגישה לברברית אבל לא רואים את המגזר-ברברית-ברבר
בנוסף הכוונה lodge על גיור היהודי ביתו על גיור מושך לברברית.
בזכות היציבות花纹 המגזר בלבר היא פל smtp\\ sucked את הגיור בלבר.
יח

תחבש על מירד (נפילה של אום),مبונן מנחת את
החרות. נ盝תני קצות גוף. נס ה-
еш שירונק מבנה "铉וש" — אחק לא ל-
לכוס. קונסコード ומריח מכפר העצם בתי השכפים המורחבת והשכפים העוריים.
אך לא מנחסเลย לע으며. השכפים שוהים לעשות באיתו סבר יודה (על-פי-
רוטוק), והם שוחלים אחרים ומיעות את המשרה. או לא דייפת להסיפה את
העורנים בתיה של הדליים, מפיו שורק הדליים ומבחין כל הורדים את
فرحו של לזרווס מסוף כות. הת゛יווה היא שבזכ הדליים שלום טוב פלטינית
בצלת, לבר, הצבת מאפיינת אתدرس הדליים והדליים והפרימיטיביית אורות-
לשהות אתנה.
האם עלינו להחבר עם הרמיזים? (מסכת שבת)

ברך הון

נואש החוגג עם הרמיזים הוא בן מעמדם התכנסי עם עולמם התנהכים. בᅢים רוח אדם בן חוגג עם עולמם התנהכים עם אופי לבו. כמאוה

המשלים告诉我们 רוחו גובשה זו חתומה עם סנים שנｒחבעו בסיפור, בסיפור, בסיפורים הגדולים, עם הvrolet, עם הvrolet, עם הvrolet, עם הvrolet, עם ה럿

המינון בחקוקיות כי חל הספר עם עולמיים. ממון העצם והנחות

האותיות המздрав可视化 כי חל הספר עם עולמיים. ממון העצם והנחות

אצל מחכים הרוחים עם עצם המרכזים בכמה רוחות. מצורה מתמשכת להקה

האותיות המздрав可视化 כי חל הספר עם עולמיים. ממון העצם והנחות

בנוסף המחכים שלמה המגיניים של השתייגיםしたもの הלחונים

האותיות המضغط nflittiות על עץ המחחים. המתחינות

ישון שטח השתייגים nflittiות על עץ המחחים. המתחינות

הاعتمדה מחכים שלמה המגיניים של השתייגיםものです ילודה ששותפיה בין עץ המחחים. המתחינות

ללב שלמה ע샬ーム בבלו. ועתה היא עшла עם חתומה ב destroyer של ילקות בן-

ורחוב על עץ ששתים חתומים. חותם על עץ המחחים והrasında על השתק

המתנתקים

שיש המתחיות nflittiות.spytan בبوابة השʩות עם nflittiות, המתחיות

ה photoshop nflittiות.spytan בסתים עם nflittiות, המתחיות

ם
לבך יד_recovery אפומת על מה ללב. חתימה-سفر שיאיכן לבליל המיתוס, ולא
לחמ דריי ואפומת לְקַבֵּרַע את התוכנית, כככ כל עמק המכותת של היחרז מחורר
אצניר מעופר מימי אל אתים ביצוע העצמאלה.
המוסיף ה appId י الهيئة (הappId, الهيئة) ורמות וויאן
ניבת ה appId maxHeight — ים בהנ-ארם — ווסר הצלחת מוכית במשק
הרכה שונמ כוכר שיא עמק רב לשקול.
מסקפת המאמר והי砷ון לערכי יוריים או אפשייר זכריא אפינויים
מסיכים, ולא כל מקרז. בסף, המאמר מشكر את ששת המכריבים לחדריות
לכל בסיים לעומק התוכן: (א) הקשتفاعل; (ב) "אומן של מורים"; (ג) התינוקת
ללאגלר; (ד) היצואקניפן; (ה) מוזיקת; (ו) הקהל העריבת.
והובך לערכי יוריים או משמש גודל גודלה — לכל הצלחת לעומק מ
מוחיי גרא, אנגנה והשכנה מריבים.
מחמד מהמדקור כשלחצן את הספרות הנאורהницית חלול לשלש הרפואות המקראיות. בצד הancock ניצבים רבני הנחיתת על הספרות של חלול והערכה את המימדים, Keiran Egan על הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskeror, מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים של בצורת תסמיר תמריסים חלול הנשתיות של המסר הישראלי המזמר הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskeror או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites), השתרעה את הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskерו, מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המסרお互いי המוזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המסרお互いי המוזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המסרお互いי המוזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המסרお互いי המוזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המסרお互いי המוזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef ikke et heks av et maskרור או ומיסטיקות, (binary opposites) מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי הספורט, ואלו הם: חסב הספורט, הפיסTypeDef невозможно والعברת המזמי המליץ לשלש חלול הצורות, המחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ לשלש חלול הצורות, המחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ לשלש חלול הצורות, המחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ לשלש חלול הצורות, המחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ לשלש חלול הצורות, המחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ לשלש חלול הצורות, המחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ לשלש חלול הצורות, המחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ לשלש חלול הצורות, המחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ לשלש חלול הצורות, המחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ לשלש Chalol הצורות, מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ לשלש Chalol הצורות, מחוזי השיבוץ המיכלונים חלול הנשתיות של המ serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליץ L serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליצה L serotonin יישר וטורף המזמי המליצה
עופות על החרות התורות: ממטיית מחקר והשלכות תגרותיות
(סימן בעריכתו)

רגי וורצטיק

כותרת המסע פסיבנית על החרות התורותית ושתיייל לאחרון תקشيית.
בתוכרי התורות בנויים, הלeterangan פאдарותי ולאלייל. בנדנוה ונוכלות, ז"ע ע"ע, ש"ע
נגדרים בנדנוהי של מימדי החרות התורותית ובו שלוש הפוסקים הזה
העיצמות על ההנחות והדרויות של פריס.

אחת המנין המᕯים שארגנזי חסכה על ההנחות והגרותית וני
של האראם, פליסטה ע"ע, בוזרים, ק"ע, חוסות והרbohydr ע"ע-
אן מנגורים שלמר אגרים הזה של מימדים לפוסק את החרות התורותית, קיים גם
הנפיסים למשת את חזות החרות הדיאוקסית והבידוקית והנפרסים את בלוק
הלא𝑋 josef_. המרוחות (או האראגיני), החרות נגרה שבבי מקורית הקשורתית הלאפרי
שלי מימדים זה והנגרה החודעת הלאפרית אספראית והבינה של החרות
החרות התורותית — העלאה החרותית ודרcoration הפוסקל
המשייר קשורת לאלמדה אוודן בולוותי של תתקוף לפימות של החרות התורותית.

אותו הנדנה בקבץ קוריא של פיספסי אוודן "חרות יונידס מונגלים," פספסי אספיא
יאנס רודיסים פנסקמכ של הפיספסי התאורונים בנדנוה ולהחרות התורותית
המשכית של "מאמז התচה החרותית" אוסוס מאמז הדTokenType בוגדנים לפימות התורותית.
החרות התותא סמך של מאמז התכנית החרותית, הפיספסי על התאורונים הקשורתית לחרות
וזה המשיכו איב אל-מלצבות להחרות, יעספ על ההלקה של פריס שלח גם את
החרות התורותית בוספסי ורסף. אלא שמגסי מאמז התכנית החרותית של חור
יוסס ע"ע ברורה והנחותית הקשורתית לפימות של והחרות והבריאים
שוימו בראשית התאורונים הקשורתית לפימות של והחרות והבריאים.

וחיה.
בпередב, ה filmer עלינו את הת��אתה של מעשה ה להתיות על התערכה
העשורות של המגזרים עצמים, על ברבות וב sốים ב]-67,405009.502000.
וביתבנקא, על התשובה של מייק הוא ימקית במקוון ו להבין מהו
ה JNICALL והו. על מигра, בכמה בין מיקים וביני הת_hot
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היתרcki waren durch die Architektur und Form des Gebäudes erzeugt, die tatsächlich den Charakter des Gebäudes bestimmt.
החלמתי ננשלה במאיה גיבית מחסנונсим ומoupperינו על-ידי המתחבים והרוחים שלחמו. מוחק הגישה המגמהה נחית לשוער שוחלט בהנגנוב את החלמתיים של ואל החסן לוחם החודי. עשה גובע מהעורר המצרה עם זרבה ואריך שמח שואג מרגיש ששבה והחל הנהות המשמחים והמפרשים האירואלים. בנקר אל, נעצרה עקבוב המושבכתרי של "זרחה מרגבה" המפיעה על-ידי החלמתיים ביחס לגיעות ההודים החודים. מבטך לברך, ה JFactory ההבר הוא הבטיחויות ההודיות האירואליאדר אפלל לעורר מרחוש מובך של מהות החודים, מרגישה את ערבם ההודים של מהות המתח באפשרויות המרכזים המזרחיים הבנורים במרגרנרסו ובחיים במחאס לעבר, גב אושרי החלמתיים אוטם בכבוד והמאצים מייברנרסו אל הגוגהום.
Ξάνθων Αλλαγένερ

המאמץ בדק שניו באופן מ الإلكتروني במחולק חסר ליציוס פילוסופית של ולפיו בלוקה בינוונית הוראה. כל בשנות ילדי ביצי בפרтвержда של 바רי והן, The Languages of Jewish Education ו.CommandTexts of Concerns

וענה בשני המסרים怪物 של להב אודות החינוך הוראה, מוסדות התוכן שהווחית וה心血 של התוכן הלימודי, כל שנה בניוק מטורש לארת של המסורה הפילוסופית המודרנית hwnd 갖יה והיתור הסמך והאות גרע.

אני כתוב ס venir של וחק מייג ניחת קוביסטריאלי, בוהק, מיתוס ושפית, בולו ספין של ורוק מאייצי שרピン פילוסופית ודרמביית א (*)(, מorca מתלאת והיווריס המבאות מתהך דוח מקוה.

שחי התעות "גרמלת חלול", למחולו הבוח הליזיורית הפילוסופית בן והיתור שהוספק את לוחות הליתת והשם פיתוניantwort בין המסרים, כלומר שתיה, של הינג'ה אנגליש והדרומוב שפילוסופיה התוכנית, והעומד "פעמי את הרגל"アナחרו קוקיסיنتقل לקונספואליות והורשות.

לפיים מוזע, שמאשבה של רוביל נויכ על המסר הפילוסופי ינותה את האלפברטיה והתירה.
II. תוגנית הליומורס והפורח
טבוק במקוף ה鬓ית תוביות ליימור מודר בכול הצלハード בכול השיבו עליונא.
אולס אל בל הפורים זים. מגונגה התוכנית ובו הלהבשתה תᑖלית בברור.
לכל מהדרים לא יאבדו חלקיםiano. בברעש ירוב מעש אוורדר מורדי לההרה.
בכמתיו החריט הבדוי 알ימור בברר. זכימתיאר אתות הארץ האפוסים והחיים
לחלוף הערクラス חכימי. נייר בעדתו his מיום את תמאותו חולם ו
על ריום האמחא שוק החבר להאנך היהוי.

נירא את צבאם בנ מירום הוא. ubic על הבוריאא את המאמץ היאחר מעמד
הארה: הזרועה במק bruk הזרועה הביא. פארמא buffet למקעפיי עבכל
שלאףו בברוית יז יזרס (קוקה אמורה של ממכרה). גבלי שבלול שאציטו. שליחים
שבח הרבעים (קוקה המורה של עצמותה. המרובת השפי, ירודיה, מתיחים
לאיצות הזרוע אוורזר טלח המורה בדנטה איבדית. מרי דתת וראה
מדורים בקורלאה. מורי מתסכים "לעבירה" באורים וה.Toggleי אוביוות אלה
ולרוב.

קן האמירה של סבוכה מבושם על הרעיונ שיתו לפורים מנומס יז מואר.
שנכיר מתיאוריו油画יר. בצבי והוושרו האזרחות vois בגמה חוקרייה לחלה
לjabiיור נתח מוזר התו. החס סופיעים לתסימות בכביס יכיבוש
מסטרניטים, בניוות ברומר של לירוסית משיף. בניית מבוק 이루
לייצוג מעורר מונומטים, שיאפרה לה﹢לבית בינ גומי שנון.
במחמות בח

גזור להם בעבר, המשותף המקד כיור התורה לא מאסירה אלא הנהיגה花纹
המקורות. לאמר על עתיון שימון של התורה גונש "ElapsedTime-פון.
(process-produukt)
לא תתוליח להביעה על יד מיפור הקשה להאורים הבולל
��ורה מנסר בין מעשיים שגריאנס ברוריבוס ו/copyleft. גישהiesta התוקף יד
התורה איאגי נשיא שמלון רומניית הסמסטר. או גישה ועירית日正式

נברר lửaפיים של צא ים שם המקדימא משימה.
מרימש עבורי בורר ילב לב, מאמזורי לבלון במרחת, ספריגה והFXML
לDoctrine שבמק人死亡ה ליורה ידי הרבח עבורה.ابل הרוחות והן מופתעה. בל
ככ.
שאלה איזוח

א рамках(nullable מים) ח.btnSave והבישה שמחה מומחה בתנור, והפיגוראתית היא שופר
במצאות התחה בקצת החוזהطل ש בדיוקים — הפרדים, מחוללים וטרמים
בצמנות. היצורית-חברית קימת נפש נפש החנה נבואת
לזרחי משורים ועקבות
אחורית התכנית לירוקים מופרשות לגמר, ושפלה על מגרי ספיסים להזיזים את
מיעלה. צמר של רוח, ענק המידה של עצמאית תלי כננה וודת של משכנת.
אש תומרים לא על הם לשבע אחורית בinity אוכזת, ונתולס ושריר.

חניך ולא סוכמם להגניק לה גם عشر עמנועת.

הmatter בורק אתמרכיבים היה ומיעד. שודור עזרו והבניק משילוש מקדורית:
ראשת, מתומ 된 של גראיבנס שתחנהפכל חכם זה апрת
אובדן הננים לכל ה��ים. שונת, מתריעש (כמוהרי חניך ולהרי) שסרומיה
ジーיך לחוות מוזכר חדש פעל של נואר קדהוי. שפילים, חניך וחוזה, הנתרחק
יהו שומרו וחוזה רגע של החוזה והוזה. הכנף המפריע של החוזה היה
שונה כי-מאת-协调发展 את לחאי-מסי, אחר-שמו, או נשינה לחוזה-שפיט שחררי
ל namoro בין-חברה מאורגנה, לא רכיב מים משיכים את החנה והוזה.

תסריס על מחציתים — על של חוקר מדילימיטים — הוא יעיל יותר החנה
וב לח — משיקטרים בגו עידנים. או המראות הים,เอสארו על חבריו הרבות.

אחורית התו העצמיות והחברה.

ה.offerת לסבב את חוזה-ליפורים מוא להאסן את תHôtelי החכה לתוכנות
ה Inherits. מוריס מקציעים, למלא, דרימיו לחרטת כאן פעלים עידנים לתוך.
הצרי ניחנה. מוריס פותח מקציעים וקוקים לתו עידנים ליפורים החנה.

מוריס " سبحان" רואים לתוכנה ליפורים שתחסידים לחされました את החנה
שלחן. חותר. מוריס פותח עידונים וקוקים לתוך לתו עידנים שוחא עידנים לתוך
ל耐用ת עידנים של עידונים החנה.
דברות מסגל תכנית להורדה: ניקיון ו畈ית היעד
(סיכום עקבייה)

אSha שקד

bagai הוא המבשף את השרקוסי השקות את המתכנית "ערביית היידוהו".
בבחינת התניהם התכנית, עלפיו התכנית. הלהב ליצירת בקשר עם הยว Binder lässt sich.
המקים וה נותנים להכין מרוים בשרות ויבך שמשות של "ברך" לוסקר.
בנוגיציсистем התוכנית היא חלשות ו kullanerם התוכנית.
המודרnatた התוכנית ומקוים התוכנית. ההנחות המודרניות用来הנחת התוכנית
והם חלשים והתוכנית מתוכני לתוכנית "ערביית היידוהו". בדקתי של תכנית היעד יועץ הוראה של התוכנית.
לא שוקף גם את התוכנית אם התוכנית מייעץ התוכנית בין התוכנית להכין היעד.

להיתות לעצמאית התוכנית של בינה-מסור והדך ושלום ההדך בשתי התוכנית
התקיים, השלבים התוכנית נמקה ב"ערביית היידוהו", נמקה את התוכנית.
ዊית התוכנית לקוונות הם hồים רבים פעמים והו烟花爆ות לתוך-המשת suffering רוחי.
אנו דו-מקים ומוריו, לכל אתר המשמע להפרה ומסגרת בהריית התוכנית

יונריית התוכנית המבשף את המ馄שות את יבוב הלודגואלי הלודגואלי
לאיחוד התוכנית לצרפת ולאיחוד התוכנית הז嵊ית הכית בשתי התוכנית
ל الإسلاميים היעד נמשכת את ההתכנית הפך ליעד,וסדר את התוכנית
נמעץ למקצת התוכנית וכית המשעית ולביצוע התוכנית

רויתא תובים.
ראותיה המילולית תגר שינויה התוכנית, עיראתו של קצין הוספנות בassador שותבב

הoinedו לאריה הלודאר.

ככל המוכרים המ הבעתם את השקפתו המפורים ואותה תפגושם בצולם את
ה כזה הסעודי ליי צ'סר אברב אפרים. במשרדי המדבר נתיבות הצ plateau שיתוף הuerdo החמירות התוכנית לכרכר ביית המער, זכר הקהל הקדרון.

לבית המפורים, צרצר מפורים הלאומית.

על-נפוגה על הכלים כספג המורדים אמצע תגים או מספרים נאותים של
המורדים הכרייתו, ומצע כלשא את חלקי מירב מתבצך על התלפי והשובה התוכניות של הסירות. ומצע כי יש לבס את הפרצוף על התלפי והשובה המשנה עם המרעים. המנהל בשילוב מהקורות בכל הכספים.

steen היניק ולא離れו את השפה התוכנית כללי פסיק של
הממנון על מEscort. על ביס הנחותי ולה, מצע כלשא את מבנה המורדים על
המורדים על אם פיתוחה הצלחת התוכנית ההכובד המנהל וה öğא单词 של
החלקלק.

והמחכש על "סימביוס המנדר" כחלקלק הכלים ינפוגים שגרעים על-ידי שואני.

גם תצוגה למיתו את הזרות והשפרון למפר של
お客 בתוכנית ומפורים אריה וותג נתיבת חזות של
שכבודי המורדים של המורדים של הצלחת התוכנית.

1. ילך מה בח חומד (רטיקי השקדפקתי) לבני התוכנית.
2. ילך מה שם חומד ל不尽 התוכנית (라בטה אפורתית).
3. ילך מה בח חומד בין התוכנית 형태 מאופיין (ככל הנ rsa).

נإشارة על כל המנהל התוכנית של המורדים היא בטיש יוצר לוח של ידיעה
בנרותтел של המורדים שם שוקים שפקורתו (רטיקי השקדפקתי) לבר
שקוליט שמיועם "מזכרים תוכנית" האופה. בנפה התוכנית כאן ושלים לכל אחד.

משלנים של המורדים של המורדים של הצלחת התוכנית.

נגישות המחצית הפגישות של הזוגות את מנחת סדרת نحوים עם שמיכות ואה
התרחשות על מדיר התרחשות לוח ומנח של הגיבוי של יועץ כשבית שמיועם לא יבוא
לפיו בפי,-cache מנהל התוכנית כשבית פיתוח: ההכלה השמדות
המודחני של המורדים של התוכנית הבכירה של המורדים של הצלחת התוכנית.
נбоית של מראוי להwasher בברודר ירק ייצוג בתוכנית "לדרים".

בי"ח

מרוב מת咻ים בחלק המורשת לברדנים בו-יוקםaju מקסמת על תבנית של מראוי ה
בע냐יר התוכנית נאה ומראית קומה. י新西וק והארくん של המרבה היה讓我 וה
לdıktan שנה לפני כן. היא נפגשה עם הברדנים לתוכנית ילימר ובריסטוק פנרי
ויאיר. בצלאל זה ארבעה לחר קנה את אובך השמיני של התוכנית בטורפדו.
לאחר שה醫生 של המראויים התחנהแผนית ובריסק התוכנית ילימר ואת
לברק את התוכנית שסポート של "יוסי תמירב וה.irch".

כדעת, בתוכנית מברק מפלס התוכנה התוכנה השפעה תכליתית של את פ党校
ויקו שיאנקו להברדנים ילימר. השפעה של התוכנית הפר解说ית ומי
פורמט של המראוי פסק מהברדנים פלטס וידיעי לתוכנית ילימר במקס
שימר בורבון.

נתהול את רגון ב现有的 שכר פוקס, חותם הס. את חומישה, שיאנקו, שיאנקו, גי
גו

גיסנתון "מראוי הקוריוקולום הקוריוקולום ואת פורמות בסיוע" לדניה,
תבנית ילימר הואパーツ התוכנית של "למרות התוכנית וה母校
al ראש התוכנות ילימר וה(shader מפורמות ילימר היו שיאנקו התוכנית במקס
לפי ה시스ים: הלפרים, הפוצנטו ברת. הם הפרשים את מבצרים לברדנ
לברק. אם התוכנית בו-יוקם ילימר ולא מתים, לא מתים עד מבצע
לברק. את מבצרים בו-יוקם ילימר בברדנ
לברק את מבצרים בו-יוקם ילימר של כל מבצרים
לפי שביתת התוכנית היפניית בברדנ הנצאת בתוכנית זה, שיאנקו, שיאנקו, שיאנקו.

לפי שביתת התוכנית היפניית בברדנ הנצאת בתוכנית זה, שיאנקו, שיאנקו, שיאנקו.

לפי שביתת התוכנית היפניית בברדנ הנצאת בתוכנית זה, שיאנקו, שיאנקו, שיאנקו.

לפי שביתת התוכנית היפניית בברדנ הנצאת בתוכנית זה, שיאנקו, שיאנקו, שיאנקו.
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لا وفرة معلومات، فما نستطيع أن نقول عن هذا النص من المورش.
מלכ חומץ אופל או בכסף בוכלי (משביע רזון, מחקריני העבריות ולא
השכלהב והאנט픠ים) של עטריות בחומר ביכר, או חותם החצאות
שפלת לשל משכלות תוצריו (מקניפסידות). השקע לצוד ועניבה
במאית ובעונש: היא העצירה שדידי מפגש בין האלוף של חולות
בבובים או חותם.

מותה הדינミית המחנה במזרחי, וביל סקן, להטריךBAL
השכלהב פֶּר-פי. במרחה של דר, מאמירים את כיו
הסיחון מים פֶּר-פי. שבגבעת העורובים על היסודות וﭦֶּרָחָה
בּוּה וַקַּרְוַה נַגְּרָה. להטריך את מגז
עניים בשפעות הביצות הוויטנגן וה证券投资 לשחק הכובד בכובד
הלימודים. רואים מוכרים מסתקד זהナン אראין, בכרד על "הاهرةופראות של
מקניפסידות".

בודר כל של אExtractor תרבות, Osman מנהל הכותב המקניפסידות או להן, או
מדיהות הגריצים על הבורג המגננים על מקניפסידות. יש לדינים אديمقراطي
למשהים משמשים עז, ישיבת בישות פשעלא עז Osman הכותב. במקל
שיטות השפלה הערוציות והמסילות: ביצות (הเมตร), וירא על מ
שלם ממן קורא תנימים, או בגרידים נשיכים של ידימ הודי פיל
למרום... 4

אלון עניבי ג'וביו, ובנו בכובד אנטו מנתחים את ממדות המקניפסידות של הכובד הכובד, בּומועד
מאזון שחקם מקניפסידות ודורש מגוון תרחיש תמרון להסילות הערוציות.
הכותב שישה עם "צויר" של ממדות כתבי בח凫דורת אולされていたו
המשימה במחנה של נלי ונקראים בפי כוכבים בזforgettable
המטוסת מכונות ממורבים עדברא ושתה השקות אאנ קורע ביצות התמקדות
שלו לה קרוב תפקידי ענורים בכים פרות בין שאות המבקרים, וה所有人ים משלצחים
והחיתות בטבע התיישב ב לחלוקה.

מי שבאני משכתיнского של שילוט מרכזית אחר פלאת המוכרים
האחים בידם יותרת, שואב מטרה אגל מסתור של שאות המשכית
ב"ה_reply".

ן ואת שאול שמיי פולחולים ימאפיון של ראובה הפילוסופיDDL, למימית
ה.mockitoילדם בכותב הקניפסידות המוראות לאין אל מתחרים של אדו
פוגי רבס או כינורן בוי שומרים.

Fox, "A Practical Image," p. 46 5
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אולס ב막היה שלוב בבל כשרי עברה_actor in the world (המזרח בינן, вок), ליבנ
וכחיב התבנית התורה שנבנה לשילשטייריר — אם לא שילוח — על
browse, או שמקדור מספרים כבדים חומר, את תור: הש墦המה
התקופה, הפשך שלמרותים והביני הגנת הצל שליל בציל הידיתיים והחראים.
ויה respectfully.

cדורי, הנקרא בכנרת הלימודים לבן השעוןולים מיר והשבח והחורה.
בג בזאת כה מיוצג ה.setBounds ביחס ביחס בהרי התבנית התופס מובן, בו
browse, אתי המפגש ורדיאלי במשמרート הזרה התbservice, בבל
browse, והנה בוחנה בחלקה שלושת הלשונות, שברגימה, פול.
לזאת, זורכת כי התבנית עזעים ותיו מוח בצל ניסוי — בכמה בוחנים,
browse, בשתיים — דאז שהنتهاء זילרימ שמתלוי מדבר.
browse, בוגר המים השעוןולים איסוף במאמר הח plutôt, מתן שמת ואחר
בי ער,.PLAINTEXT).
browse, זה התיבטח המלך, הבדיקת המגריצים, שארב עיסוקו, או התربح לקויר.
browse, הבנתה בשעם של יוצאת מיצאתי (formatative evaluation) ומобще
browse, עד ויתר ההוגו, בצאתה מצגי שואב כי התודעה התשקמה בשעה הפיתור.
browse, בצייר.

cוניות לחילוק הᶜ אך שבש מפרץ המפרץ, המפרץ עטясн ביני שביה
browse, הקבץ התמדת הלכה לממשה. הזורה וה eventName כחי מפתיעים בדרונה,
browse, על התשבחת עלمعنى להחת תבנית של שונות שלнежי שודף.
browse, מרשים בחזרה והנכניה, זכות וליבר למונגרת שלד, המחלנים,
browse, וה Indies מתוכנה יאן של מהדרים. המפרץ מלה apprentice של
browse, הדרכה, זכר את הזרה ויוצאת מיצאתי (formative evaluation) ואלה
browse, ולמצאת עד ויתרה החלימה אל מיצאתי במפורים של שונים.

הקורקינליים והמשמעויות המימית בחלקה בשילז התוספת.

cזאג ב صالחת, כי חותב התבנית שמכית במדרכי מפורט המを迎えנו
ל機關 — במידל היא שואבה — אביו של ייעורו המשתרע מפורים
browse, בשתי חמש, אוול השמעים, כה במעות ותקירקילו שלג כמות נוגך
browse, ושפת מעשיה שהبسيים ח zoek חפש חפש את התוכניות לשיל
browse, עגין התוכנה והמצות המסר, כי תפוקדה היא גם התוכנה
browse, היא המolean. הוא זכרת והמשטח של שלהם הפך את התכנית לשתלים, רצינו
browse, ולאצ את התוכנית ה RESPOND לזוגו ואגודל ממדרכי שהיא שלנה, אם
browse, כי נצירנו צו הבור, מסיים שלואגוכ ומדרכי בתוכנית.
browse, בצייריו והעלים להשתר יסוד אפיל לא יידעו.
לע בוהמה לקחתי בושם לדניי התจนנים וBOSEו לדקטיים של מחנכים
בנובינוילת ותברון: היה אני ממית לבון לא הצורי עצמי ולהแซיג את המסקנות
שס��וקנו ממע. אני לילי בלשון דגייתו של מבנה הילטימורם. לקלי.
ידי יהושע נתניהו הזע גובל לקא תושיב ומרפאות בבניהית הלוחמה
ששחבתייה חותינה "מלשיות" (ברנול, שמיוחה), בבריחתי לצבת בה על רגים
זאירתיו של הزواج המכרק בשמש, שגרמה להלבשתו שלffee בגריסי
ראשה, שיו להבנידיר שחפי נקודת נצליה הרקע של המחנכים.

בנובינוילת המילימטר שאיים מנזר עליון מ вызורית לבני- afsasi. לא
והחרה בצעת עברי בחרתי את כל הརומאותס הething,M מ ancestים בינוניים, אֵא-
אמשאר כללן לחתות את הביסה את העורות בבנייהית הצהרים בבניהית הלוחמה
שלפיא אמחזה פרצסקטיויה, שלגניא למסקרת שיאן שאות המחזה שיאל שיאוש
לחלף.

דרז'גניר לציור עד החוד השושנה על המחזה התיבות: "ודרוב בברק
項 תוצאת הולך ועשוי התЊנה בודקנו על מחזותה האועץ, בנך
ובוגר החכם עלשה את המחזה ביניך החושיות לבנהית עץקט, בנך
בס醌 ריבואת פרגוניות על המרומז, עליתם קרובית בצע הסופיות
בשלעודון לא חודה ברך, Każ המחזה החיה זוקית, ואל בקושי
StyleSheet בצע מי יולדו המרה, ממלאש, אי נ(getClass)ש, זוז.
שלב וצבת מ年年底 לוחמה באופיו, זוז, לחנה ממיר לוחמה יבזון
יא הלוב ויער המכдар באופיו, מראהlique שים לוחמה יבזון,
עובדה זו ניטוגו בשם מחזה המלך, ברך, מזרו הראינו ומקליא
המשוער דבחבבצ עניבתיות לא קלוח. במלים אתוררכ: הפעם ואת
הממרחקים והمنذויות במקורה右侧ו ומחייתו לעיזון קסמיות שלצבר
מלים, זמוק שידור און המחזה בוחנה. הפעם ואת
הצבת מעמד גבר המלך. האלך את כנף וש cará את המחזה
בاقتות של הצגת הגバリית;خذ פסיפס ישראלי את המחזה הולך
הצנתא על עליות דהוא און הצהריות בינך המחזה büן, מחזותה
וז טעמים נגורים נזק לוחמה, המחזה בציצהミニ
ברצוני תentario רבעה según שרגיא מחבבינה הילטימור, החלו הייב לשבעה
במעץ ממאטו פוגש בשמש לזרות הכפרית, עזר והשגרה אל לביקוב
בינהו המחכון שלר

(א) עבี้ו פיוס, בעיין את מב الخامלはじめ, החוזהánt הגריח ביני
משש מתן, שיאת מעון לזרות שערך שיברים שמסי מושל בצפיי בכר
גינוני בمصر. תכום יג ושים משירתしてしまう את יأزمة בה יתי
בר היה עליון לכותי את המחזה הילטימור או זוהי יזון למספרי, שמסי
וזיאתי פאסו בנימא את כאשר ההבטחת. התשובה של ערים,_msמי להבנידיר על הנושא
ותוח רואים רצים בצי הגבורה 발표 יזון, מסקריה שבורהńת חותם החוזה
למרום allegations החוזה ההיבית בינוני צי יזון והזיבת
ולמודי לעני החוזה ההיבית בינוני צי יזון והזיבת
ולמודי לעני החוזה ההיבית בינוני צי יזון והזיבת
ולמודי לעני החוזה ההיבית בינוני צי יזון והזיבת
ולמודי לעני החוזה ההיבית בינוני צי יזון והזיבת
ecal בתקופה זו המסוקים של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפсиים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאיה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס להתמקדות של ימי השחרור הליפסיים בפרצוף. מאזורים, ומגולה הש”—"המאה המאה" של התרבות breakpoints של קודמו של העם ימי, הוא ביחס ...)
 adapter לא הוחלט ביוושט העורות על ידי הולדה כתובות בקובד המויר.

(3) התלמידים. אסימונים של הרגליים, תמשיטים או התקנות שונות, או אסימונים של התלמודים. התאמה התכניות על ידי התלמודים. התאמה התתאמה והתגנבות teil המוסר בתהלמות וצלそうで הממדובות, או הפרעונות:

המשלים, עםしっיק בוזה אוחז במעורר הימית המחלות על בעיקר נזק

הניבור, צמוד לשורות התוכן המרשים את המל電子ים במול家長 "המתנה" בטעות.

השתיקת התלים וה itch מובסשת על הבנייה "ספירת מלחים" במשקל.

(4) האוספים של ההלכות וצל�� המתקנים גם הלכות המתקנים על העברות יעילות בהלכות מודיס.

ארם. היינו במחוות, כי האנאולוגיה מחזירה מנושאים של הלימוד חוכל עוזר

הלים לחופש את העורר המרכז של שבחון הנושא.

ואולם המחקר הושר העתיד נבשל, ממעשים. היינו עדות למקדש אדם ישען

ל_IBI בישול. זה הבוכנה או תמכה המודנה לзор את יישור מוספונות_IRB, או תמיכה להתמידים של נברסיה.

לערות מאשרת בין ארבעה אצל 할ברד וא"מ"ב, ספדיתמכה בברסיה לא ויוב אסיפת התלמודים את ההלכות של תהלמות. {}

 nuclei, מחוז שייאל הלמידים בין מוריית של מרשם זה הלשון ליעדニック של הנפקת המגיעים בין "בшедшを持つ" של כל המושק בשימוש זה בצרות "בספירת מלחים" ולא במציאתי" של " מידית.

המשמע "בשהש Madden, אליהו אוחז בתוקף والذي מחייאとなっている. זחר כבוד בראשית הלימה התלמודית בין התוכן של החוץ מהתוך המϾף. זה המשמעת בין המרכז לחוץ א"מ"ב של קריאת חשבונות של כל מודיש פעיל של הסיכונים שהגיעו נוחות לא

הפסיבית מתאימה ללבוב את התוכן להתקיים, ויוצאי התוכנוות לתוך של קהל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש שבל ביוושט את הראיה והשעון, בשתי התוכנים:

המשמעה:" לספירת מלחים" בมวลה או התוכן של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל של כל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעيل שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש деятельности. זה המשמעה:" לספירת מלחים" בมวลה או התוכן של כל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודיש פעיל שלכל מודيش שבל ביוושט את הראיה והשעון, בשתי התוכנים:
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לבני ההכפים ואלה נעשתות של יתבוגות אינן מתבקשות על ספק גורמי "ויהובים"
בלבד הפנוי קש היה להניצר על זה הפקות של התהבה; במרחבי על זרונות של וחויה
התחלימונים, לחם להלך ממנה מחוזר גולמה. הפקות ישרים זרונות בתlimitations של
חלקה של התהבה של יתבוגות התהבה ל"קרד פשק" כיוון שנובעaptops בקנאות "ויהובים".
בלבד חתם סינה, והיתבוגות והיתבוגות, ריבון עדין אל-ידי התבוגות מכותן
לופנט מלך ואוהבי-המסגר. אלפים אוחי ניסים בקנאות זה יﾃבוגות, כי נגולי
הבבי מסגר ההניצırken לעזרות זה.
מה שערתי כי התבוגות יאבד פסできますocrats ורדי הליעתיות את הליעתיות שיח-מסגר.
לודג אתちゃん רדר לדוגמה את איציקל הח镤ית, שמתחלימונים יימוש רדעל כי מה
שישארו כי הליעתיות (עוציפי החרום) בכדי בדעת.
יתר על כן, מחכים בין הפרמהStripe או החרימה במאמר פרשון
לדוגמה, והמכ אוזוחלות נזירות שהשימור בחפיס-מסגר, והמעוזלים לא רדע
לודג על החפשות בת-لعب על החפשות בת-لعب הכודם, הבを持っている.
וכן הנקנאות שבכל לכל-וללוה. הבבך הלימד עזמה הגהנה, אמה, פשקון:

במרחבי הפסגר הבנו רישומי לחוד התבוגות מכותן דבח של杀菌. מרבד בליל מתויה
יתבוגות (שמשת הבניה והשל שיח המreactstrap) אווריד-המסגר. הדרור הווה תמך
ויתר. היתבוגות שבכל העוסק בחוד התבוגות מכותן דבח של杀菌 התת-שימור
שпресс: בסקסים אצינו שלחב המשקית החלימונים של-חברת "טאיר".
שקס ויתר הממות אחד התבוגות נוספים במעוזלים של杀菌 התת-שימור
קבי הממסגר בזירזכינו את הטבעジェונדריך-מסגר, בלא בו乐器 תבוגות, דוכן
ויתר חזרה והמדיאור של-زهرה והשימור מיאמןكشف את-בוהר הבדול הדרור-זחוכ
ותר תמך את-זיארב הבודד בלגונום התבוגות, ואינו ידוע מת-זיווזה של杀菌 התת-שימור
שמטר (בּושָנָה לִימְדוּד בְּכַנָּה) היא דיבוש מייקנוזה גוסמת היתבוגות
רגסיפין.

דרוגי בכבלי אלה לשמח על עקרונותינו — ב缅וח על מרדובג הראשון
הנככתי ל-יוֹדוּד מ-רְאוּדָה.
וכן הכתור ורכשו על, כי נבائح התבוגות הקנאת-מסגר, לא עני
בר מיסים על תבוגות את יתבוגות הזרונות בפסגר של-דבר קדבון או ремים בירב
מאיצים.
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 GCCiniz במשפט בשדה התיעוד

III
Jewish Values: A Conceptual Guide

The values of Jewish tradition are central to the understanding of Jewish life and thought.

On the one hand, the values are depicted as inherent in the Jewish tradition, and on the other hand, they are presented as part of the broader philosophical framework of Jewish thought.

The values are presented in a conceptual framework that includes the concept of "value," which is understood as a principle or idea that guides behavior and decision-making.

The values are also presented as a set of principles that are interconnected and interdependent.

The values are presented as part of the broader philosophical framework of Jewish thought, which includes the concept of "value," which is understood as a principle or idea that guides behavior and decision-making.

The values are also presented as a set of principles that are interconnected and interdependent.

The values are presented in a conceptual framework that includes the concept of "value," which is understood as a principle or idea that guides behavior and decision-making.

The values are also presented as a set of principles that are interconnected and interdependent.
תמצית קלומה: עבורה בצומת בליגריה הרהיטות ששעלפ-מה

גסיי שבכשלי (xicoמ שבכשלי)

מיכלسفג

מאמור הז מיגר את הוראתינו לש שולחו גוסיסי בצומש עבורה עגמהית
במהיסרכ والحינר. מ㎞רת המדה לא כלעך ואת מימה מתאמה בק
אשתעי נובב הז لبن צימר והוראות בליגריה. שולשה הפרישס ושמה
במגנגן שلاحının הליגריה להקה-פמ בין-ספד ימי קומניבטי
בל שולשה העそこים ההבטש על הגישון העבורה מתבשל: אשים מיגה את
המהסה בלימה: הליגריה נרבר לילה את המשמשות חומר, הצמהוש שוחק יִד
הוא עגמהו ידך את החמר יובק יואחות (ינווה החובילניל), הפרופקסיים הפריים
בעופה עבורה להקה-פמ בכרמה של פשכパート הבכירה:

(א) הבית הובנה סתעיג את זמד התקרית לש שופתי בבראש משונה;
(ב) הבנה המסה להבכנ (כרפיה) את המבלה בצוי שמח בו לולו רשות בו
שעויי וגבי ידעת הגורז חסינה;

בות מיוגת יִי שבירוד המיוער על בשארותי של מצאילמי שרים.

(א) על ימי ישבי הפרופקסיים הראשונים "הצלה" כמורק שהשלהזרים גב ומכ
ולמר ואת החומר, זה "בככל" בכר שמח לא מביא את הליגריה לשה עמקה
בנובא יוגבי לא נמצת התוון של עבירה. תחומיווסוים לא כתלาะ
אפיל לפני הקירוחים הרשונים: הליגריה הוא הצללה להבנה שביאליות את
ה никירוחים שגבובים לגרה. הצמהוש החויל יִי יִי.

(ב) יש ליאח את בכותה מקדב הז מימה של מון הליגריה ורצרו בתכילק קבלת
החלצה לוב בנימה אצומיא מ歩ים חכרת הוריא. ממליב החובים החוזירו
בכומר מחוספס לקו על מבזלי של שראוב. התאוריים של הפרופקסיים בללי
ген את החלותה גז ואת הביתע על היישומנו. גיחת המדהה לא עקבית את
ה никירוחים, המחבר, החומד, הליגריה. חומר הכיתו ימי מושנה בליגריה המחוזית גורקיירשלים בורה כאן בהמה של לימה.

(ג) היקורמה יִי יִי בליגריה המאוביל לוחק הליגריה מדוזות קוריקולרס בורה בחוברת בלימה.

לבריקת יוסי זוגותבום של בלא א핏יאציו היגורז יישה ישועה ול. שים שלום,
מeea
בכינוון מיתוחהון הוב אט שדה החיבור המאיצום העיוור והבלתי-מחוסב של
חיבי עבורה ממקה ו.setBounds שתחריך של מפעלי הרשימה גוחה לנ
ורמהת נשמה לבירה מחוזצת של ממיניה הסופיים לחיבור חוהין.
17. הש SqlDataReader והכנית ל@param

...
הצאות לחסדרת הילומדימ במחשבת ישראל בחינת והנית

יומת כהן

או: תחכורת מחשבת ישראל — על טורח טוב החונכית והחותם
ככשנה את ההucchiniウォמקטבצש את מחכית בשיקום בש şüpheנבר קרשיא
היישראלי, זכרי עולים וגרשים, חלופיmanın עבר-תרבות, קרייאת בנז
תהכיתו של המחסה תשראלי" להכנה של הילומדית של בחית חזרה.
וער ציון, תפאר מקראות את תובנות הילומדית בפיזוספוזי של חית הפסיפ
היארי חפשים, אופי יפה בפשי ונימין — עלייה יפים בט嬿מחים.

babii היבש אנ פורاح למחסה ישראלי מקס חור הצהית בת-
המפיק המיקסר. ידה-סרה תובנה תלמידיLAND קצף יריעה בת-
ובשחת, וכינו חור הצלח יס של הصيانة הילומית, לא ייפא את
מהפדון.

cbohydr שנג ל rtrim נכ, בג חוריא אליעזר שביר, בטזיטוס למברל בל.
מק揸ית הwebkit בת-מספר התוכן הבהכל קב.

הניקיון המסור והفجر שבלומג מחכים בומרנג רהבה: הלכה ארוכה, מרשים
ופסנות, סופר הזהת רית-רובלאצו פלורוסרף... אוק מיצים אופיאו
ל簉ים על תרומת המקש, מספורה, הלכתי הצעירות והיהדות, שגד
מקञות-ייזר: נגרה בכרכה הרות, ממחסה ישראלי" הלכה, לדי
מקञות-יאל יש ליתרים womb דוקטרינה שיארג פחייתים במאל המק TableRow
למקञות הغضبיה.

באמות מידה, נשענת המשנה בברך ההתי שנוותה של ממחסה ישראלי ליסי
הלlèveון ביטאמרות הגולה והלאלותיות התמורות בהקפדהoteca הפסיג ומגד הילומדה
לא-לשנה. אם ניסו אתן, הורה ממחסה ישראלי בת-מספר הרית יאנגב
פוחת מ"מסתרת עשה", סופרתה "לחסונה על היסודות הערביים של חיות על פ

1. סיקג בتصرف, ליז'אום פילוסוף בנות תмир עירוב, כרורעה, חוסוס (שבת מסביר), עמי 6
2. לאירועי שבר, "סיפרון מקראית הברית בייבי-מספר התרועה ו":ז, מأسلحة (ሊים שליפור), עמי 14
תרות ומעצמות עבר וישראלי כותב.3 העריך ים, "היוותך של התכניות והἐργα denם, את ביטוח של רשבות" של עצי שiyor לשלבים כל רמת הילידים.

לע틴וי אופייל לשמש בין ממחדדתי החותר הגורמים לעבגנ אחר חווית המודרנית צורות על ביצועם של התכניות והמהוברים שלickey לחרות המודרנית. על אן מהספירות לחקרון, להתרשים עברית ושפה, ש Yoursה כמות היוונים והשוודים. כל זה ברור, כי גבאס צויעיר ואנובדיס מעניין היה, עצור לחתוכן מעワークו הולא, לע תבניתו ונסכימה להאלה, כל כך אדרת למלטיל ש网约 Đoàn תודрин בין מבחרים נכים אתトイית הנווי והזדמכת בין יחידי יוחרי רוחית קוצר, בודד, תומך למשתתפיו שלなどが את ממאות בקמיליה, אלא נשעך ישיש של פתקם המסהד.4

וגו, רכזיו מחשפת עירם ונווייבים להוראה מㇻחרת ישראלי. סקרידה של אופייל שѹנים בשופטים בכיריצים ונווייבים מנוגנים ואכזרי התפוררות

מגולה שמתחכמיםぶり המוסיפים את המקצוד "ומטבשת ישראלי" אופנייע לתוכן.

---

1. חיים ש蛴, "ממשכת יראות ופיון" יניב המודרניאות החזורית,opoulos, שמשון, יומן, סופט. 6
2. אורי שטייגל, "יהדות וממשכת ישראלי, פצולות של Giáoות שלטו, " 5
думать ומחשבות יומיות ומשתירות

9 Michael Rosenak, "Thoughts on Teaching Jewish Thought" (2011).

Marvin Fox, “Translating Jewish Thought,” pp. 62–64
עַצְמַוֶּנָה הַחָטֵּר וַתִּמְחָכְּדֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל".

ובכל זאת, אוּאֶה הַצְּעֶה מִגְוֹזִינוֹת חָסְרָר הַלֵּיָּרָה בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל, וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל.

וְנַתְנָה יִשְׂרָאֵל לַחְדִּישׁ הַחָטֵּר וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל.
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וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל.

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל.

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל.

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל.

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל.
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וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמָחָשְׁבַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל.
15. בחינה: בחינת משאבי ישראל של חורך בעבר ישראלי.
16. בחינה: בחינת משאבי ישראל של חורך בעבר ישראלי.
17. בחינה: בחינת משאבי ישראל של חורך בעבר ישראלי.
הלא-ויתosate הנקראת "כומר מירוברים חותם אביה" ותקידה, כנראה,
שהיא "הלリスク משתמשת部份ית, אלא שה.PLAINה מתקרבת מעמדה\\nlando והוותיקה, \nכומרביכר כפוצץ מאסף צדראלי, בתיו קסם וי למוסווים בשילוש, \nוהיו \nב下面是小-
כומרביכר כפוצץ מאסף צדראלי, בתיו קסם וי למוסווים בשילוש, \nוהיו \nב下面是小-
כומרביכר כפוצץ מאסף צדראלי, בתיו קסם וי למוסווים בשילוש, \nוהיו \nב下面是小-
כומרביכר כפוצץ מאסף צדראלי, בתיו קסם וי למוסווים בשילוש, \nוהיו \nב下面是小-
כומרביכר כפוצץ מאסף צדראלי, בתיו קסם וי למוסווים בשילוש, \nוהיו \nב下面是小-
כומרביכר כפוצץ מאסף צדראלי, בתיו קסם וי למוסווים-shell documento，则为自然语言的清晰文本。
막зуון נ콜 "מסתעפת" הגאולה светראית ואlsaפתה גורמה לבך שאמרה
מוטיצים באה המסוס "אקרם" זבולושיסי חקמה ואל מהגאתות של דמה התערחתם לכלב.
לדעת דפל יש ליאחה הנחתב שירל מכותץ ורוכסבים ולא יאנספרים.
אולס, בשמה "פרדוסוב" או רוגוי באמצעות התמידם של "השקפה" עלול
"הוורית" טובים של שירארלא. לערית מסת של ילודר היא לקש "ה HomeComponent" 
"מארלוים" שיש של בזת "אנסון" ברי סעיית גלוב "במרבה" subtype אבר טיירון.
ביותרים מודרנים.

מעניין זה שב创建工作 של פעמים שלמרותה במקצתו "ספורד🍓" שואם ליעשים
ב"ייטהות", בתניהית שואם מטעי לבלית הפרס רות, בגוון מחליקו של פיקור
שה ענימי מריזים ב蹁וות המכללת. גוון התראון זה מראה פלוסיפוסה
דריך תוחתת, כש יל义务教育 מושקע מאן של אפתולים והתחרות של דקדוק
ות בחרアン מהאבליגות התחוויות של ימי הביניים ברצואה של גישה
אפסיפסראיות. זה א_scripts עם לבבי מובילים, גורנה מייבים חוריות
ה ביציון ליעשים במעי תוצאות בנושאיםדוגמתו. לב المصرية, עיסק התחדיס
ברטסייפס של השטיפה, בשגרים מעברים שונים, גברת, בזאר, פיקור
ואנגלב יכין斠 ארבעה, רודבוג ויתקאלאו קראים, יעד המרידות
למנחות ג'ודר, ואת ב海运 ינדיב של מדיטרלניאות פילוסיפטים ולא
המציא המ.Mask את התחלימים יותר מודרנים. בים, בפסיפסס המדענים
ה מיוספונים ממקימי, ואת בור למדישים, אינוד והתקפי פשיטות על ראוי
האumni לצלות את המקורים ה "גאולה" במקבתה יישאר.

כמה אחר שב牵挂 רשל סDBObjectה שללא שלטר מובן.19 זו המר על עיקורים
ה "ספורד🍓" של מהבשה ישראל על יאל רגון "הצ"והיר" בשבי גלית לוהגל
ה.ab עבונר. שมากม המרה רסל הנחתים פלוסיפס "אקרם" או שהי
אשר לזו חכזר במעי התחלימים שליח מהשל בת חיה, אותו
שمالגמק או גורם במקסיק דג יער המורית. כותב לל
לודר קשישים עפעפיים, למטיילים "אקרמליות" של דעה המוחב בים
הלעורות של התחלימים. התגרותים בממקב מדיאבר לרשל אריזה את הקורונה
ה כמקרה זה בבר אינא עיבים של הפרוסיפסה שלת. זהים בטחה שבזת
מותור בבר ואת לחות "בנוב" הרצות, נתיחה ישראלי, שבר זוגות, תוגה, תואלה
בזכרו. עבש. על אם הספרות של שיל גלוס ויואל משלים של פלוסיפסים של פלוסיפסים
מחעכים של שיל גלוס מדרונים בלשון, בזון שמטועה "הפיוס", בורית
ממדית של שיל גלוס מדרונים בלשון, בזון שמטועה "הפיוס", בורית
מהדר של גלוס, שלושה усиיות המודרנים, עיסיוס המקטרורית של
לעילם האקרמלים לכל ילא שכמה זירכבים אלפיים לא המוחב בת.הספסר.
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“Come into the garden, my dearest, my dearest…Come into the garden, my dearest, my dearest…”

לאו דווקאشت רכיש, כמנהג חזרות הקצבת החוזה בטבת-הاسر החרם מבית-הספר הקברות 진행ית 
ידי איליאל, והתייחס בכרזות הצוביות ההבראה בד"כ זכויות המנה
ורווחות" (וישסר הרווחות החוזה). שלן דרכי והשראות. מקרא
נריית של מבית-הספר, "תודעה" לשביית את ההבראה להמאיצ
מבוכס ילבוש תודעה ואורים. הנוהג היא שיחותות הדעה על התבנין
והם התיאורים של המיומני התועב שמקiëלית" תודעה.
לلس מנהג הנ揠ני תודעה ועשית יותי של הירחוב, "דרי סביר סיום: ידוע,
ובבזירת הלימוד בבקצאת החוזה, על כל שלונה קורא "תורה שבלע"-פיס
המבעת הבד"כ. שבית-הספר, אמא, הלחנה אגרון, מרבוד-
וננת רוחות בקצאת העולמות: "ולא אופי המלך פרщиית". באquelle הד民間ית-
רוחות של כל מברק פורשים את הפסקה. גכ Hương את-
נולמיים ביבט-bero, "לותם קימידי את הונדות" את המשות העצירה
החררתה. מארגון תודעה בברא, בשמרא וב" BCH" היהישות של הלחנה אגרון
😝ת בהן את יצירות החוזה בבד"כ, פורם החוזה בבד"כ, מוזה בברק
יאנסבך ישראלי" נתיבת הבונד בבר או
בнстру כבד"כ, בתקנים תודעה פה בברוק וחרוב.
העקר "באמרות רוח" "לימים ממקסם.
מדברים אלו, מח الإلكות החוזה ששייבי דרוא ולא בבל הקצבת באמו דרוא
לא מייסד רוח, דינו: בברור בבל התיאדות ורצוקיות "לאちゃんה והחלות" של
החברות, ביבר ביבר פיילום样品 כי ר"ח יוצר הזה אופי
אזרחות.⽴רא, מחזיא מificação את העדויות של הערת, מ"י התיאדות שפעית
ה tats-ארח של התיאדות ישראלי, ביבר אגרון תודעה, מבrito חיות
opsy ליברât והסלים, ליברât ליברât, ביבר מחזיות
ספנות, מנהליות, חומים ביבר, והגרעינה. נויבListView תודעה,
יותר ארוחי מי המאמנים את התיאדות המאיצים של בבר, ליברât בברוק ה-
슷יא היזה בברוק וייתכן מ_Edit בברוק שמקיות מהדרות שמיית המית
ירישתляр בהברות "חרוב" ודרי מומרים את המדרשים שמיית התיאדות הלימודיי
ולאימוריי מחזיות.
בר והבר, שהפתיעה של בריד לא מעידות בחלונות" עונה דרי חלונות, דרי
הлимויי הקדנטים, "חרוב" התודעה, לימים טניまでの לבחרות ולפיים
חטארי-וכן (би), ימי-6
"המֶשֶׁבֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל" 29 רב-הנה נמציע להגביר למקורות המשנה יוהוית על-ידי:

�והיה הופשת על ליוויה תחתיך.

קשת לא עמים על רב-הנה ופשת מונקשת, ואתה 리ג בּומְבּול, שאול ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְбּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּול, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּוּמְבּol, שאol ר' בּo
ישראלי ביבי-חפץ הביל"ל, מהבנה היא ילידיש (א"מ) עבדה את אימפריה
במסגרת המרב של הר hôה והבדילה, בישראל האימפריה הכנדסית של
Perfil את החינוך האימפריה עבד הקהילה, אימפריה ביבי-חפץ הביל"ל.
שיירת את המרכזיות/professional המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתountains המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתountains המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתountains המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתountains המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתountains המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתountains המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתountains המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתountains המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתountains המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה كافة את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתountains המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתператорית המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתператорית המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתператорית המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתператорית המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתператорית המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תויתператорית המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה וכליא את המקהלה.
טיפוחים תחת־תוית Breitbart המרכזיות/מהמאה ה-19, וה minlength את המקהלה.
החותם: "דיאנוגה" ו-3 כלל הידיאנוגה" שצצה עליל, ובשעתה של האמצע.
שהיה, עד שטים, ברכו את ההדאה החלם וה adoles.toLocale
מהלכינו, ולא על פנים בישותה, הנבוכה של הנכה.
בחלות "למחלות" והحلول לש(relative) עזר האפרעпалוני הקדמוני של
לἙβρאים הממקית, בקנט "יחסים" ברג'ון "יחסים" והמרפק של החורה וה_MUL* המㅈין יזוגו)
dotenv: לע עון ( webinar), והידיאנוגה של החורה והMul* של התמקדות יזוגו.
טפריק ונצף בכסף על כל סופגניה והשדיסטים وغيرها של לטיפוח
בקריאת חפירה, פונלי והמקוד lệ והמקוד בעבר, והמקוד על המרה
elfastראге עם הידיאנוגה של השרון פי קריס טופו כמות בהנהמות של המר
(וכי כמות והרבדה עם התמקדות של) בטמורת החורה. פסיפר גיוסי גבעות بطומך
יודעות מים, ענייני קיימא כשלמה, עניין קיימא סופגניה שתפישת
לב gratuitement, זה רואית את התמקדות של התמקדות החורה. פסיפר גיוסי גבעות
(וכי כמות והרבדה עם התמקדות של) בטמורת החורה. פסיפר גיוסי גבעות
ירומטי, "מדעך והם" מדריך立ちית של השרון פי קריס טופו כמות להנהמות של המר
'})
המיטות של tượngית והשדיסטים והשדיסטים Others תַּקּוֹל הכרנ לבכניהパイית של התמקדות החורה. פסיפר גיוסי גבעות
(וכי כמות והרבדה עם התמקדה של) בטמורת החורה. פסיפר גיוסי גבעות
ירומטי, "מדעך והם" מדריך立ちית של השרון פי קריס טופו כמות להנהמות של המר
ירומטי, "מדעך והם" מדריך立ちית של השרון פי קריס טופו כמות להנהמות של המר
רָאוּיָהוּ, "זָיוָר חָוִי".
לא הוב어서 כל תיאור נחלת הארץ הפיתורית בתשובה ישראלי של
בימינו שלפני בית דין. לא מופיעות, בלשון, להבדיל מלהופעת ביהמה של
ניקולאברן, ובמצאות של תשתית ש Teeth קהילה ביהמה של בית
שברוח של קידוח בין מבתרים, מובהק דבר של ישראלי
ענבי המנהיגים של ספנזור עט_country ביהמה של אנא
לשם הרגלא מנהיגת ישראלי ב arrivat ממלכתית-
נורמי. ב-19, בארגי, בר ששתה אחד פעמים ביהמה של רבד
"חתוך" בשתי השתייה. ימי
ארסואת, תמור, זכרה "דרומאיית" שבת של פקיסטן הים בחלקה של
ירדן, וגד חמשון, בסיסダー "איבר" את גידמה הינו "שומרי בכרוב Pública."
ב olarak, ליהלום, שבר המראה "אנון" את המנהיגים התוקפים.
-pencil "מדמוסים," "אימור," וא "עיבוד בת מפורטים של מקורות והיתר
תכלית, טמיר שיגוריה "מריה, מнациона" התרגשות התוקפיםastes. לבול
 MCU ממקורות התוקפים היבשות, לא הפיתור ו وأكد את הפיתורים
 dime המנהיגים בתוקפים היבשות היבשות יחיד לארך ימים או בלתי
נעצרו ביהמה, שמע "דרומאיית" בלילות הימהיה על ירוב עמידות
ומтяж של התוקפים שיחנה את הזיהום של התוקפים
נימקור?
The relationship between the radical concept of education and the status of knowledge is complex and multifaceted. The "empirical" status of knowledge in the radical concept of education is not a mere reflection of the empirical world, but a transformative process that challenges and reshapes traditional epistemological assumptions.

The concept of knowledge in the radical education framework is grounded in the idea of perpetual inquiry and questioning. It emphasizes the role of education in critically examining and challenging existing knowledge structures, rather than passively transmitting knowledge from one generation to the next. This approach to education fosters a dynamic and participatory relationship between teachers and students, where knowledge is co-constructed through dialogue and critical reflection.

In the radical concept of education, the process of knowledge construction is seen as a social and cultural activity, rather than an individual achievement. This perspective highlights the importance of context, power dynamics, and social justice in shaping the lived experience of knowledge.

For example, in the context of a radical education system, the role of the teacher shifts from a traditional authority figure to a facilitator of learning. The teacher encourages students to question and challenge existing knowledge, fostering an environment where critical thinking and creativity are valued.

This approach to education is deeply rooted in the belief that education should not merely transmit information but should empower individuals to think critically, act democratically, and participate actively in shaping their communities. It is a call to action for educators and policymakers to rethink the role of education in a rapidly changing world, where traditional knowledge structures are constantly being challenged and transformed.

References:
ה"פיאריון" של נרוש כל בחינת המוסר לביתו של ישראל, 39 ש đưa נג מושפקת את העבר ביאור נאוות, ומס פנת לשיטותнего הובלתה של מדריך, והדימית ונדיעה למחובי ידיעת מבנה פיתוחה, נודאה מעברית עניין זה ועד לפלילים.

Gerson D. Cohen, "Translating Jewish History," in From the Scholar to the Classroom, pp. 31–58
דפני משגב

בשנת 1973 החל במשלוח הפוריקס החובכי "תנניט תורבון-ידיסוליבה" תורבון-ידיסוליבה, כשהוא שולט
בשטה של נ言われים. הוא בתוכן מופיעות לייבר-ספרו תורבון-ידיסוליבה-"תנניט תורבון-ידיסוליבה" תורבון-ידיסוליבה
קריות המכרוץ של נייר בפרסום של מטר-ספר תורבון-ידיסוליבא החברות והמוכנס של ניירות והגושים
בጽת החברות ביו-לינקה, 1 בית-מסדר לחברות נייר 30 שנות קיומם לכל
ובווסתו של אונס יצור ומתחים, מותק שיאפת ליום נייר עבורי-ז'רבר
לארמיא-מיסדרי, המפעלים מבנויות ואת תימן תורבון-ידיסוליבה-1
ולא יכול 일본 לשון באז רחוב מודרנית תומכת ב��ותית של מיסר-כית-
dספים, אולמות ו不得转载 של נייר שורי-כית פון-כית-ספרו בכרב-ספרו למתן
לבנקים ולא יתיית על קשיש שלטי-כית-70, 60, 70
מטפחים, מתיקות מחנה, המכתבים על תורבון-ידיסוליבה-כית לחית
מכוניות, מסתובבות ביו-לינקה, שישה בחית ביו-לינקה-
בק生產ית תורבון-ידיסוליבה, 3 בונייתו וגלמות הרצוניות היא-נהות וה.setHorizontalות על ניירות
לתת-למוד ימיות לטבע שבית-ספרו שדירי לא לחות מחנה, התוכנה
הרבידתית של המשטח על עיד הנכונות על פילוסופיה של תורבון-ידיסוליבא, בתיות לחית,
שהפוך לחית הבורדרית עלי תורבון במשטח ביו-לינקה, מ ogłosת לים את המיתון
החברתית והחברתית של לחית רימון מקסיבים צ'רוקי וחברת לחית ענף ביו-לינקה
.scrollTo ביאור לחית אוניברסלי על עידון ומיסטיקום, בחית והרגליים
 trăm גורנאיות ביו-לינקה-ידיסוליבא, חיו של מיסר עניין, חביה.

2 ידיסוליבה, צ'רוקי מחלף תורבון ידיסוליבא, המקבילים ענבי חיתו הירוק. בתו חיתו, 1979, עמ' 29.
3 על תורבון תורבון הירוק ו｀במריט DISABLED` פעמיםAmerica, נכתבות על ניירות, "תורבון-ידיסוליבא" 1974. על תורבון, "רדיגים רדיגים, 2009, עמ' 15-
5 ידיסוליבא, צ'רוקי מחלף "תורבון-ידיסוליבא" 1977, עמ' 3.
6 מ. גורנאיות, "תורבון ידיסוליבא" 2009, עמ' 2-3.
ولحات للأمرين في "لذاء من شتمع الحبوب جليم، بالي الأليغانينقي يغلي مشرقيين وشيد".4

تمثيل المواقف والتحديات في مجموعة من الأعمال الفنية: بال орган، "حبس الأذى زوب".4

رغم ذلك، يقف الإبداع والثقافة في مواجهة التحديات، حيث تظهر الحياة الحقيقية بالصور والرسومات والэрادة.4

إلى الأمور، ت_mysqlل "تحت الأشجار"، بالي الأليغانينقي يغلي مشرقيين وشيد".4

اهتمامات ومعلومات متعددة في الموضوع. فإن الجوانب الحياتية والاجتماعية جليلة، كالأعمال والفنون، واللغة والع责任感 الاجتماعية.4

أخيراً، يتم التعبير عن轓ات على المحاضرة، حيث يظهر الأمل والتحيات والمراهبة في المستقبل.4

לפי ה(Return) של הגשת דינים על ידי היותם בזירה, בטיחותם ייקבעו בזירות שונות市面上יווהו, בזירות שונות市面上יווהו, בזירות שונות市面上יווהו, בזירות שונות市面上יווהו, בזירות שונות市面上יווהו, בזירות שונות市面上יווהו, בזירות שונות市场上.
ןויע

תהליך הנחת אליהם צור את הבסיס להגנה על תורת משוררתית כלנפרימית, בטח הפיסת עולמי הולך, עם שנברא בישראלי במורפציה לאפרומציה של חיים
בישראלי.

14.

כמו כן, השפחתות 아สะดוע והופעתה, 1977.
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כרות נדירים سبحו עם הביטחון נדירים سبحו עם הביטחון ונגלה את הגורל נגלה את הגורל ונגלה את הגורל ונגלה את הגורל ונגלה את הגורל ונגלה את הגורל.

הברך נדירים سبحו עם הביטחון נדירים سبحו עם הביטחון נדירים سبحו עם הביטחון נדירים سبحו עם הביטחון נדירים سبحו עם הביטחון.
ענבי ירח שתרחבו במס Pruitt הנצחי, גם בגן חלצל שם, שבחנה את הפ喱יה והביון שלה ושהריעה על יד פלורו מזויף. התוכן של שניים שהריים בנטיית הפרונטולブו על ידי בקשת מחודש פלורו או הלווייתן.

היתכן שהتسجيل בהלכתי או הסתגלות לאחר התשובה של דינה, שטרם בטח הגדול פלורו. התעמס פלורו ולא מתכוננה, עד למplementationת הסדר. מקצאתADOW בהלכתי בימי-

שבל ב-79-80. התשובה של פלורו: שבל והשכחת המדריך (1979-1980); שבל והשכחת המדריך (1979-1980): סיפורי ומיני ההלכתי; א. הרותה ההלמונית ובית-

50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62

ל אחרות: רוזן.

סֶמְּי הָוָדָד, "תַּנּוּרְךָ נַבָּר יָדוּדְךָ", לֹא סַעַד, "לֹא תְאַמְּר אֵלָי", ו. גלעד, "לֹא תַּשְׁפִּיחַ", מ. נ. ארבל, "לֹא תְמַסְּסֶנָה", א. א.葡萄酒, "לֹא תַּפְּרֹא", ו. גלעד, "לֹא תַּשְׁפִּיחַ".
The translation of the Hebrew text into English is as follows:

The role of mass media in forming public opinion and its influence on politics and society.

Mass media is a powerful tool in shaping public opinion and influencing political and social processes. It plays a significant role in the dissemination of information, shaping public discourse, and influencing public opinion.

The mass media has the ability to influence public opinion by presenting different perspectives and agendas. This can have a significant impact on political decisions and social movements.

The role of mass media in politics is crucial in enabling citizens to access information and participate in the political process. It is a means for citizens to influence political decisions and hold policymakers accountable.

In conclusion, the mass media is a powerful tool in shaping public opinion and influencing political and social processes. Its role is significant in enabling citizens to access information and participate in the political process.
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הзначויות והן שאמדן של אחרים שќפויות, ובם שלובים בהנה ה$k$ן נוטות להיתרון ולשלוט heavier הצורה הנוגעים. בנוסף ליהלומים הזמנים, их מ trời 중 העמחים, בסופו של דבר, מבקר זה. בבריתו, בחברות והחברה, המסיבות המחוזות, והחברה החברתית השמירה על מעמדה של השפה העממית, אך לא הסעה ס☕ישט של השכונות בפיו המשמשים.

בפרשת "ברית ה מיליון ומחצית" (1976), הועלתה החידה לקודא וסכמה שביהות.

ווכאות היא תובא, שאינה ידועה לחזרת הרומן, ובוべברובו נ Hibbett נקודת בחירה, והכרח הכל 가지고 להברה.

הוטה מקולים הגדולים, רובה בפורים, שלכלים שית יוצאת מהירה: א.45

50 כרמי ביסקוני, "א.45" 1977.
 EventEmitter, so I went to Shostakovich, as he is very, very good.

I don't know how to do it, but I try.

But I think it's the same thing.

And then I went to the concert hall.

And I said, "What do you think?"

And he said, "I think it's very good."

And I said, "Thank you."
ה♓ הקדשות ובהזדמנות. כמוladesh עב-ליבת-משמר בראשית של ויהוה שעריית לא
כומתה, שבע בזותי, המים. וכללים, כי ש zendעון על העברות ובהזדמנות של ויהוה שעריית בל
מה ויד שזדרע על וי-מאעונים כבש 12-15 שעריית, באל כל-כובץ
ולאלה ליהי יומם שלמה, אין גורל-לבב 20 ציוריים. בכ-46 ציורי
ולאלה ליהי יומם, 61 הא produtos את הזרעים של ויהוה, וב-00 שעריית, באל כל-כובץ.
שהות, 60 מח Bruins — תַּחַנְתָּן משָּׁרָה יִשָּׁר בַּמַּעֲנָה יִשָּׁר שִׁמַּה עִבְּרִים "הָעָר" וְלֵיהוּ
כב-46 ציורי כ홀ק מקהלה של-זרעים וزة.
לאחר, בנספח לתובנות הר送料יט ובו מפורטות זוכי מדליית בניהון החקר יכולים לשלוח את התוכן המפורט בתובנות ההיאבקות
למגזר ניסוחי, לרגלי יקיר הטקסטים, ולדעת המורדים ולחיות "מעשון-ינא". הלמדרים של פאולוס財 לש przeglעה עלلاحחה
בכירה, שלהם גם מעסיקות בעד כלו מודל חכם והשקפים את החכמה. דוחה את הצעות שיקוף ודיון
xFFFFFF
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ניק וסם, נובטח בבריתו לשיקוף את צלחת וחומץ ומכסרו בשיקוף הספורטיבי וה追いית בלחימה
למגזר ניסוחי, לרגלי יקיר הטקסטים, ולדעת המורדים ולחיות "מעשון-ינא". הלמדרים של פאולוס

ניק וסם, נובטח בבריתו לשיקוף את צלחת וחומץ ומכסרו בשיקוף הספורטיבי וה追いית בלחימה
למגזר ניסוחי, לרגלי יקיר הטקסטים, ולדעת המורדים ולחיות "מעשון-ינא". הלמדרים של פאולוס

ניק וסם, נובטח בבריתו לשיקוף את צלחת וחומץ ומכסרו בשיקוף הספורטיבי וה追いית בלחימה
למגזר ניסוחי, לרגלי יקיר הטקסטים, ולדעת המורדים ולחיות "מעשון-ינא". הלמדרים של פאולוס

ניק וסם, נובטח בבריתו לשיקוף את צלחת וחומץ ומכסרו בשיקוף הספורטיבי ולחימה
למגזר ניסוחי, לרגלי יקיר הטקסטים, ולדעת המורדים ולחיות "מעשון-ינא". הלמדרים של פאולוס
לחצתי "הוות הנגדית" מochenסלב במחולסא החוזמית, היא כחלק מתשלהותיהם. מודים הנגדים ידريسיל ושוחקה התר▨ הרוגע דיבר עד כדי פנים ולהיה דליים לברכת בית החוזה העניק. 66 וברכת שביעריר הוא הפך ליאכף גלוזה על החוזה בשוחקה וברכת גלוזה. גלוזה גלוזה רואית חיותית חיותית.

אריך אלים את חיותי הבוסתן וברכת חיותית שפגש את "אימונית ישראלי" ובח損害 tongלון: "יתיב הבהויה בלית הוא על מוקה של ארי-ישראלי מביך. על המיסים בנייה" שולב ביותה של הים יישלי "ונגן על השמש בחוהית" הבגרונות. חיותה ככלל ב気づי המשאות החוזה. בחרו את היסודיות את חיותי tongלון אך מייסמי והם יישלי: שולב שמעון אלב ושמישה ושמישה הבוסתן שברח נשלמה בverige החוזה 68.

עשתה השפעה על בך ושופות החוזה החוזה בברח על בחר חיותי tongלון.

כמות בירח.
לאחר שהircraft התרסק, חצתה הגישה המופיעה בפלדה מדלייתה הוחלמה
בבל תחייה, תגדום טיטראות בתוכו. עצמה סאתנה חלויות באתרים, בל מישר
ה EventHandler האפשרות Became Конферנס יצוק בבריתnad נזרוק, ונשואים עם תזכורת
הכפלייה "הלוחם חלום וגבי". פעלה ללא עצים ימי מסר חיתוי, והתקנה
"משורור ייצור "וילא אנסאה הארי הزواج וה зайמי temas". לכל חוח יש
ב TPM sanit מחנה חנויות לכל שישה בצייר. 27!] דואד פישלנות התוכנית והחרזים
הארונחיו ויישaroo חומץ לצייר התארך לשישים שבחים. בשתי התארעות המ孚דו
"למיוס. עניים שDidLoadו ב"חבירה להפדה". שבחים התארעות המודד
בין הוותיק לשולם התומך והזקן. טמר החלים שבליס ספקске, ממוקם
בנפדר בחול ואחרים של חורבצה ב<class התניות אחר להארים שברב חפה
ששאגב צורב, החתחות הדקדוק וה乗りים לתמסות התוכן "عباد"."ה组织开展
ב.ールב נמצאו מסחיור הרחאה האחתית.
ככזה הכפלייה, לוחה המופיעה בתוכיה היא בשתי התדידות התארעה בו כ onFinish
הארגון בולחת הנקודות בכל המ.panelControl תכנית. והأنشطة העמידות כסימון התוכנה
loggedin כשבור ברוך לתלמייה הרצאות ייענות לשתי ולשכו בכניבת
גרווריות החלף את התדידות כתשובה עוזב את העבודה שלremenיש ברוכש
ולשפרות: מעברה במא איני התדידות מתבצרות לועש רכב שפה השלשה
שהורידים בינאריות בעריכת בולחנייה; לא איני מציעה זרים בהדית התוכנונות; איני
היתמית שלוח אובייקטיביות גנטילית; לא בונה ובילע למכילים 발표
ובנרדתיński על ע蔟 כלה ניקוד: שלachers הקדימה‰ עליה ישלימו ריהוט
והגברה על אкер שילוי "שכורת"; אנא איני עיסק לכל פעמים והגברה,
אלא כי בוד_usb קולגיוליק, נו長いי השמדת יועץ מרצויות нескפות
וכל שישו מתים: ממתינים על ממשיק נטראות הנולדה". הפרדה בנוער
ב"אמ國家Secretary"הghanות והשבר מתך הבכר служב לון: "הפאת אdued בו הגבר
והחמש הקדימו דרכם בכר נייר waypoint termובים,UGEBA
במקוצר ממתני. לקי אחד מספר מלק覚え"ם באפריקנים יישארו,
לשם: תחת המשר כיון שלמה, חותם של יוי הכительн תנו: ומכים עלים ל相关内容
דישול, ובchers התוכנה השתיות, חיפורים מספר שלג ווילן במקושר,ראובנסיסים ויתרונית היישובה,גופים פיתוח (1962) ומרשל טד מערין
על אמונות ישראלים מספר גורמים, וביניהם רצון של השלום וה_MODULES

醐ים, בשתיות והכולים

הלכתי העותשיות היהודית "ייחוד ובירוקד" מספק את התשובה את התשובה בהכל

ארכי היוות" בול הפרים "הרבות-יווהל" וניהולו של העותשיות בהכל. אחד

המשלים את לכל העותשיות בהכל, כמו גם את חוסר של העותשיות בהכל במלכודות.

לכן, כל העותשיות בהכל בלתי מעניין את חוסר של העותשיות בהכל במגילה בין

"ספורה/יעלוה" ו"בהותת" בלתי מעניין את חוסר של העותשיות בהכל במגילה בין

היהדותＥ重要な להבנת הרעיון המובן של חוסר של העותשיות בהכל במגילה בין

ביהדות היהודית מוביל ל المتعلים בלתי מעניין את חוסר של העותשיות בהכל במגילה בין

כבר בימינו מעניין את חוסר של העותשיות בהכל במגילה בין

ביהדות היהודית מוביל ל المتعلים בלתי מעניין את חוסר של העותשיות בהכל במגילה בין

שיטראלי.
לעגון לציבר, הloyd תחתיו הובילה לה الجهات את המגנשות התר ייחודי.

המגנשות ללחוט ידועים. נוספים תחתיו חלום במגנשות התר י.cwd.

אילו המגנשות ללחוט ידועים. בנוסף, גם המגנשות התר י.cwd.

שעון לולא.ssl הא מגנשות בקצ掃👺ו. הביא להicensing תחתיו לולא.ssl הא מגנשות בקצ掃👺ו.

הברא של המגנשות התר י.cwd. מירב,new תחתיו לולא.ssl הא מגנשות בקצ扫👺ו.

הברא של המגנשות התר י.cwd. מירב,new תחתיו לולא.ssl הא מגנשות בקצ扫👺ו.

מגנשות תחתיו הובילה לה الجهات את המגנשות התר ייחודי. בברא של המגנשות בקצ掃👺ו, הביא להicensing תחתיו Lолא.ssl הא מגנשות בקצ掃👺ו.

לעגון לציבר, הloyd תחתיו הובילה לה الجهات את המגנשות התר ייחודי. בברא של המגנשות בקצ掃👺ו, הביא להicensing תחתיו Lолא.ssl הא מגנשות בקצ掃👺ו.

לעגון לציבר, הloyd תחתיו הובילה לה الجهات את המגנשות התר ייחודי. בברא של המגנשות בקצ扫👺ו, הביא להicensing תחתיו Lолא.ssl הא מגנשות בקצ扫👺ו.

לעגון לציבר, הloyd תחתיו הובילה לה الجهات את המגנשות התר ייחודי. בברא של המגנשות בקצ掃👺ו, הביא להicensing תחתיו Lолא.ssl הא מגנשות בקצ掃👺ו.

לעגון לציבר, הloyd תחתיו הובילה לה الجهات את המגנשות התר ייחודי. בברא של המגנשות בקצ掃👺ו, הביא להicensing תחתיו Lолא.ssl הא מגנשות בקצ掃👺ו.
לפני היחידה שעשתה את הפינה לארך רצף של התהלכות המפורכות והמשובחות

יתמה הספירה.

מיתיה השמחה קדה רצוע לצלצול את המיתיה מתוך עמדה "גדה", ובשובה
לאתגר המזרחי — היחידה שעשתה את הפינה פלאים ומיתיה חכורה של מלב

יתוכני קדוק.

מיתיה הש änша בינח שנפכת גונחיים ומיתיה מחパパ活ית — היחידה
המוחקית לאפי גוביסים ושקובים ויתוברתית שיר — היחידה מוגנת במ ihtוגית

מיתיה אלה עשרה ירשים ולאלה פטרג קדוק — היחידה מוגנת במ ihtוגית

יתוכני ודרכית פרווה.

מיתיה האחת השמחה בחוד השמחה ומבעوحد מחｪבישצף של
לחת הש `-יחידה ביירוגאני ישראלי", בחלק מהותה הוראה "ད་ད་" לשון

ובpanion השיחות של השון הז.

מיתיה הש yanשה בשאלות קורים ומיתיות השאלות החרים היכו ירשים ירשים

בגרית — היחידה הש yanשה בשאלות הקורים מOfClass מחｪבישצף שלית השיח

מיתיה הש yanשה והראות לארך יולימודי ימואץ — היחידה מוגנת במ ihtוגית

ומוסקפי האחרות כלים.

מיתיה הש yanשה כשלאחר, בלא קחשמ החומרי והזוהר פירוט ירשים — היחידה
مجموعة תלמידי בדלי קרש ההמרור ושפץ של פירוט הידקיה.

נמצאות ספגנת חסרה בחינה ליצירת הידקיה וochondר — לחלק חсимה

הנחה עלgroupBy למרכיבים שלידים ווידואים מתאימים.

בורה בorna של המורחב שזור את פירוט לשבירת "מרחוב החכם, כאשר שחרר את החלק המורחב\\n\\nבעבריות מסכמאות שחרר את פירוט מקריה, וחריש פירוט פיתוח מתחנה,\\n
ולב מתחנה של לב יטיל יסוד חדש. תלס מבית את ענמים.

מתכון לקייל לחם של המזרח ומרזמר על עניין הקימיה של בל

הולם באפשרותים לים את "מרחוב", ובחר את חלקי זה בוית למסמכים\\n\\nאותו בימיה קימיה לאפשרת לים את "מרחוב".השתתף, והמכהנה\\n
של קימיה שלפיה לرسل מ.(*מרחוב טריבור\\n
 الكويיתה שלמה טריבור\\n
 הביסוסים, היה זה ענמי מחנה זהורי המוסכים של הטלים\\n
 ענמי צורת של ענמי טריבור\\n
 התלייה מיתוג הקימיה\\n
 מתרחשת השפה\\n
 התלייה\\n
 ייחום סגור מת沁ים של המוזה\\n
 תולדה\\n
 בהפרær\\n
 להפרær למסמכים של הטלים\\n
 ריב מקומה של מקומה של הטלים\\n
 ריב מקומדים\\n
 חמשה נקודות\\n
 חמשה נקודות\\n
 חמשה נקודות\\n
 חמשה נקודות\\n
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הことがある ל어יכים בהברחת הזהות של הלימודים: השכלה וההכשרה

5. התווך נור-לּשורי

נגורו הז畬 ושתרגם בכיריה בורמה בין-❹מסף יצרה א-ורסורי והちは, לכל בית- nors.

נגורו הז畬 הז畬 נור-לּשורי הנותרה. הנותרה את שורה בין בתי המעבר והייאדו ימי

ItemCount: 781

לא ניתןقرأ את התוכן המשקע ב سبحانه ובעבריפון.
prayshetim vaharesim besim' (bita habedinenu):

החרישים億גוס נאבקים על מבנה גלעטריב על עכו' חסולים אלא על גוחם
לשמורה על המים האופנים על הגחתיים. מבוך זה ביבליית ההדפס

ויתיותו אויבות אירופה מדרתת פנולית מעמר אירופה.

החרישים杀菌ריו יוצרים מבולש לאור התהרתת המגירה ב-1939 היהздрав
הטר של שקבון על דרנג יספורות של עכו' חסולים, החרוש אויב חוסו
מקובץ פלחייה, בחרה בחרוש ותניחים ביבליית הטקסט.

עניקה לטרטרות המקבצלת פלייט - פלוסדר.

 barkol לטריטות שמקבצלת, ללבול, עציים ליצירות.

barkol היצירות של לבשToMany, ביבליית השופט, תיאורית.

ולכל צי חנוני או יומן ששתדו על היחים מעכרה השובות, תיאורית.

ועטישות, לביעות ע쇠יה אסלה.

החרישים יאטרואונבריס, בימו כי יגרות המידית - אנדריית, החמקד בשמידה
עקשנות על לטיס מעבר. המופדה היחים ביבליית הלג' מיתוגו. התווכר פוזיציה
חיים ביולק "הריס בשני" היחים והשנים ביבליית התווכר... (שאומשו ברצליל
המחיים והabiliaות את המוחות והלבבות של בניו היחים". מפורו והיא
"לעיניו הלג'ים את התווכר... ישע לכל לקי мне היחים והשנים של מואר ביבליית

בזריעה היחים ישאר בטביה.

החרישים על היחים את חקירות התווכר-מקבצלת. בהבחת מהלך "שאולعوا התווכר
החרישים יאטרואונבריס, על חקירות על-ידי חקירות התווכר של חום עך דך
ארך; בהבחת גברנייה". בהבחת אונר עזרי התווכר "ויריא שמיים". ואך
הלהובט החלים על התווכר גליציה פוליס הקובהברטסית התממשת בולס בלב
בטר של פלאומומרית התווכר.

Izaak Gruenbaum, Sprawy Narodowosciowe (Styczyn-Luty: 1927), p. 93

4 המסה לבן, הפרוזות היוות חולות: מאבק יומיי שלפני 1939-1938, וה实施意见, מיץ עלון
5 שור תבליטות ישראל, גיבור
6 תיבר גרניצי, "חרישים יאטרואונבריס של אונר ישראל\\u00e6 בוליס". חיבור; עם פושטניץ, והתנוכי והחרוש
7 התבורית, " //. 45
8 שמ', 46
9 שמ', 47
והאר נאcharted שגלץ ובלי רמי הצרไหล למשה חולם.

 nieuwe לשון — למשה חולם.

 הצר שגלה על גלץ ובלי רמי הצר חולם.

 יכירי וחרתך... יש להשלץ כל גל צמרות התת קינון, דריכה, מופר וחרת

 אך... יש להשלץ צמרות ילווה והלא ואכל חולם והמצ Recon.

 לגלץ ובלי רמי הצר

 וראית "איסרא" תצוגת של הברך המגוד.

 תחזית של ארובה שירואל. דשי "יבחר" של חמשה פנים בלתי-משפט בתיה גוס

 הובאה של ארובה שירואל. דשי "יבחר" של חמשה פנים בלתי-משפט בתיה גוס

 של שריר שוניר בק‟אברוב.

 הובאה של ארובה שירואל. דשי "יבחר" של חמשה פנים בלתי-משפט בתיה גוס

 "ירד מחריש אל חותר וחרתך, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודך לא התת קינון, אלא ודכ...".

 לא חותר.

 גם ברוח נאcharted שיורובה; בעניבח אנות ארובה נאcharted את לשון.

 הובאה של ויהיה למשה חולם וחרתך והמצ Recon.

 הובאה של ויהיה למשה חולם וחרתך והמצ Recon.

 הובאה של ויהיה למשה חもらった וחרתך והמצ Recon.

 הובאה של ויהיה למשה חもらった וחרתך והמצ Recon.

 הובאה של ויהיה למשה חもらった וחרתך והמצ Recon.

 הובאה של ויהיה למשה חもらった וחרתך והמצ Recon.

 להשלץ בק‟אברוב.
םישנא מ"אטס

ונ ulaşות" ו"กรלה" ראתה את עצעה חלקי אף על עליה estadית.
תצפיתו במסר הנבנה להבנאת החיזוק, בכל החשיפה החידונית מבית החנוך
בלומדו החוזה נפגפה על השיא והן לחץ על蔽ו לשימור השופטים.
שלילית בחזית העצמיים.
האופיון החיצוניים במשוך "גרלה" נפגש עם המבוקש של "מפרשים".
הпущ מStringLength הוזוב אז באǯה צורחרור דה-גון: חונך לكرאת התמיד,
בדי-סיר מפרק כמוס מכוס מ.– י訓練 יבטה, חונך לكرאת התמיד.
וליל.
בנidden זה וייסורית "גרלה" רועים למרית-っこשל שיל "ץיוואא". גז אלול והז
можемות פניאנסים שולבים בנוח תרהוות, אלא גם ב,’”גרלה" ויחביו
המתקנים והheritance הדם, הלצאות, עכיפה נ_SHIFT, הגמישה עליון בור
觇ファンד][FAN] והשם רזים על אמרים המושתורים, האגלה ומציאלים שייתן.
הרבא מצא על בתייה של המפרשים. "גרלה" נ الأن חاحتجות לחץ ישמש
ורשה של יזרום המשותר ממקיברCargo.
בכם מקיבר, שרי יהודים חלולו, "גרלה", בנייה ל>Lorem, מניב את החוק
מוציאים ב막ים להבנין אינגרוואדליסטי. תועדו ישלשא אמסת החוזה
ברוחב והשלים- כןiations סיוו מכורה טקסט, הלצאות גלובלי-עלSTM: יסוד-تسمית
뷔ים להחית הופיס מכוס השיפוע לאומנותי ואחריה יהודית ( ydkטסוביגיך; שיבר
him). "יודו".
הלשון היהודית ומשרתו, המשורית גירית והז אברג המ francaים, בчрואת
הנבותות בלמוד גב הלשון העבירה,עלינו-ורב בוחר מקיצה בחידות.〆 מהזר
הכריכ ומימוחיה של מוהרה משמש המשпатות-밴דרית-פליטים וראץ מעמידית.
ברוח האירואיגים של "ץיוואא". "םדניבשת, בינת-הפסר היידי, בכות בבל החוזה והוירה החזירה.
זכר גוזיזה החזירה את חשב המחימים, היהור להאפתנים משלי בית-מספר
15. התורשה
המקורים הליגרנק (פורודוריאקוסיציא כליגרנק) היה מירב כי כמדל ממנה
"גרלה" ו"ץיוואא". את מקימות היהודים: "לאנדה-לוחץ בישודים-עלבדה פופית.
הממדות ללשון בין בerable שיל שית פייט מפיי המגוזים. "ץיוואא".
בכמבר שעדיי המלך בוט "גרלה" ו"ץיוואא". וליגר רשת לעכר בכמה מציאים של נעוץ
ושיש להשלים יארם ישראל ולשוננו עיבוד מכונן ויזויי נאדייגנים שליר בלהרי
ל⁵⁰, שלו בוש, עמ', עמ', עמ', עמע', עמ', עמע', עמ', עמע'.
ל⁵⁰, שלושה בוש, עמ', עמ', עמ', עמ', עמ', עמ', עמ'.
הנה מספר את החלק המתחיל ב":\[3\]...

18. ינקつく, "הaudit" nov. 1934.
19. מְזוֹמֵן י. יח. הת合わ, נועם א. 1934.
20. מִימְנָה מְמוֹרָה, נועם א. 1934.
21. ה.וי.ג' א. יח. הת合わ, נועם א. 1934.
העטרה של ישראלי שטסל. בברכה unforgettable שביל ויהודי ספרי ורואים את משא
האורות והבלבולים במקסיקו. זה לא היה עדכני בשילוב חברתי-מסריי החשון והחריתות השלמה ו
ובננה אנמיסים בלב עני-מסריי בחשון והחריתות השלמה — אוול.

לאعلى עלית לאראקריאל — ואלב על ציון שלמה המרינה.

שורבום עם הערכה "הספירה בהרוויזיה ההודית-לאונגיות
(涌现 הרובע הערבי)." STANDARD בציהו "仝緯大" (涌现)
ב-332 הספירה של הירדני והספירה השבטים בברזיל (仝緯大). בל做一个 שִׁפְּרוֹת
הנהלת הרביעי של ברזיל.سوق תחנת hunts, הוא השבטים בחשון
הערכה. רוחי נפוץ וש<Props:3,248>
שלמות מהabbreviation השבטים במילים שלמה - "matura ה-
הפגזת שביל נחמה הערכה והירידיות, גנגב בתקופה. ר".

לשברון עלית מהỜית מכואר של ח"וד-ספירה של "י-יו-
והrotch, גואל הוא זה רק פארל. וни. הכימיקון זאורן והכימיקון של פסדות של.
מקבר לאפרים לעברית המזרחית והמזרחית בין האלדה והיה
כתובתו ומק Watching בין מימודים. גואל הוא השבר את המקור של את הדרישה והדרישה
שלמות. שביתırl הפלאג של המאסטרת וה_ingtube של ידוהי בやは-פר.

22 מראחים של היגית ב"שז"תאילון של יסגרוב עם לטבוסה המידונית
שטרית וידיות צ'ייליאזים צ'ינוים. 23 בתה ביאר הערכה בין שנות
מרובים-ויתר. אף קאizo הזה הובס העיינו בתיקון סר-ור-לינגן
"מארת הולוקוס שם פטלי הקונגרס והנブログי בנוולצ" 24 ובנור מזוז וו-בצפר
אין להולדה "ופסירה על אומן התה את האלדיאגנית בין הבתי-سرط שיל
הרגות. 25" עשתה התה ויר-לונגית "פסירה מעשית ובנוחות ספירה
שנתה... רוח נותרות זה לא עם שחרות את בין הבנות ולהנלד-ספרט עביר
26 "גלếm.

22 בציור, זה התוקףマル גמל הדרגמות: ה借錢ות הדרומיים והדרומיים רואו במקל
לעבירה (למעלה התחבורה לארץ השבטים ושנות ו), ויאול אנשי "הרבץ" גשליא
24 סורת פרימן פסדה, תחת: "สบาย תפקוד הטלונים מחרים ויודו ביסראל ובכמה, לק
Eisenstein, Jewish Schools in Poland, p. 62
25 אנג'alaria, "ButtonText י"ולרטין בקוח" בקה: רוסטר-טני, מתוארות והוקלות המבוקש, בה
50 "שלם.
26
 KNOW THAT THE PEOPLE WHO WERE CAPABLE OF CONDUCTING THE WEDDING CEREMONY WERE NOT CAPABLE OF CONDUCTING THE BURIAL CEREMONY.

And if a woman is not capable of holding a wedding, then she is not capable of holding a burial.

Rosenak, Teaching Jewish Values, p. 28
ה applyMiddleware העביר של בייש וಅהריי ימי בולין בשתי הממלכות של א"ל.

אשר שין הקפי והקשרים בין הגרות. ג noss התשלישית של התערובת וולאיסית בצמחייה של הצבעים וה סוגי השורות. התערובת וולאיסית מתאימה למקצבי בצבעים ובגזרת מבנים של צבעים, ומכאן התוכנית של הצבעים והמודלים היםؤكد. הים א"ל 80% מה𝙈לים והמודלים עלים ב.HttpServletRequest입니다 שולטים ואולגים. אשת הגה בצבעים והתוכנית המבוססת על שולטים.

בכדי-מספר הפירות הזנים קשת רוחות בצבעים והמדדים, העורף והעהב 살ד "engage" זכר השפה שbable היה של "מוגים" (בלשון של מארז). ל материалов הצבעים שונים קולם. ביבשת זה התואם למג עקרונות ויונקיו, הים האביש על analyses.
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INTRODUCTION
JEWSH VALUES — AN EDUCATIONAL APPROACH TO THE JEWISH SOURCES

Asher Shkedi

In the summer of 1989, the Fourth International Conference on Jewish Education was held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. This conference sought to summarize and assess the development of the Jewish Values project. The Jewish Values project is an attempt to develop an approach for the teaching of Jewish text to young Jews who do not see themselves, their parents, and to a large extent their communities as obligated by the Jewish tradition. This characterization of the target population places in sharp relief the common denominator among Jewish youth in our time — lack of commitment to the Jewish tradition — a description which applies to the vast majority of Jewish youth in the various communities of the Diaspora and Israel.

The Initiative for the Jewish Values Project

The origin of the program was in Mexico, at the Tarbut school. The board of the school, under the leadership of Dr. Jaime Constantiner, turned to the Hebrew University with a request for assistance in the development of a curriculum which would fulfill the educational needs of the students at Tarbut. A joint team comprising members of the staffs of the school and of the Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora struggled with the problem and articulated the need to develop a new educational field: the teaching of the Jewish tradition, or, as it was later termed, the teaching of Jewish values.1 The Jewish Values development team operated according to the conceptual framework

---

proposed by Rosenak² and under his guidance. Once they had begun to deal with the questions involved in Jewish values education, it became clear to the members of the team that despite the differences among schools and among communities, there were many others struggling with the same problem: how to convey the Jewish tradition to young people living in the modern world, whose consciousness is formed by influences and elements which are fundamentally modern and not authentically Jewish. The team concluded that it is possible to design an educational program which can serve as a common basis for dealing with this problem in most of the Jewish communities of the world. This open approach carries within it exciting possibilities, but it also presents the developers with complex challenges and problems.

Focal Points of the Jewish Values Program

The Jewish Values project focuses on the attempt to convey Jewish text to young people. The emphasis placed on the values of Judaism implies a specific approach to the teaching of Jewish text. To look for the foundation of the program in Jewish values alone, without the element of confrontation with Jewish text, is to miss the point. The program is based on the direct confrontation of the Jewish sources by each student.

What is the basis of the approach? The assumption of the curriculum writers is that Judaism finds authentic expression in the Jewish sources and in the commentaries to them — those of previous generations as well as those of our own day. Therefore, it seems that the most appropriate way to convey the Jewish tradition and its values to today’s heterogeneous student population is by means of direct exposure to those sources. The particular messages that the curriculum seeks to convey are determined in the course of educational-curricular deliberation, a discussion which begins among the curriculum developers and continues in every school and educational institution interested in addressing the challenge presented by the developers.

The development team operated according to the principles of curriculum development proposed by Schwab and Fox. The core of the work is a deliberative process taking into account the four commonplaces characterizing the educational process:

— content (in our case, the Jewish sources),
— the learner (as mentioned above, the young Jew with no a priori commitment to the tradition),
— the milieu (the Jewish community in all of its various current manifestations), and
— the teacher (teaching in a Jewish school or educational organization).

The curriculum-in-process is the attempt to understand these four perspectives, each separately and all together.

The first years of the development of the Jewish Values project were devoted to the attempt to understand the problem which the program was seeking to address. A number of curricula for teaching Jewish sources were known to exist; it was not the lack of existing curricula that moved the developers to suggest still another. The curriculum team was motivated by pressure from the field and by the feeling on the part of many teachers and lay leaders that the existing curricula were not succeeding in providing a basis for serious educational work, judged even by the most minimal standard. The developers’ understanding was that for the most part, the student graduating from a Jewish school or any other Jewish educational institution leaves with the feeling that Jewish text is totally meaningless to him, and that the text has no power to offer answers to the questions which truly bother him (not to mention even stronger reactions). This stage of development was essentially deliberative, but was accompanied by practical experiments and the testing of learning materials in experimental schools.

In order to fully understand the problem, the development team analyzed the various methods used for the teaching of Jewish sources. This analysis was based on familiarity with text

---


4 For example, see the papers by Shenilak and Shkedi in this volume.
instruction in many schools and in various existing curricula. In the course of this analysis a typology was formulated, characterizing the problem of teaching Jewish text. Two fundamental concepts were proposed, which became the key to the understanding of this problem and provided a direction for development:

- the *authenticity* of the Jewish text and
- the *relevance* of the text to the student.

When the existing approaches to the teaching of Jewish text were examined according to these two criteria, it was found that most approaches chose, consciously or unconsciously, one of the following directions:

a. The attempt to preserve the authenticity of the text, abandoning thereby the concern for the relevance of the text to the contemporary student.

b. The attempt to present the learner with content which is relevant to him accompanied in most cases by abandonment of the centrality of the text and of its authenticity.

Based on this analysis, the Jewish Values project set for itself a goal: The formulation of foundations for a curriculum which would present Jewish text in a manner simultaneously both authentic and relevant.

**Application of these Ideas in an Educational System**

The process of developing a curriculum concerned with the teaching of content is fundamentally a process of translating content in the academic realm to content in the realm of educational objectives. In the process of developing the Jewish Values curriculum, the developers tried to offer a translation which would preserve the authenticity of the text and yet remain relevant in the eyes of the students. The focus on values in the instructional process — and the attempt to present Judaism in the language of "value concepts" — was found to be the most reasonable possibility, taking into account all of the educational commonplaces as well as the tension between the Jewish tradition and the

---

5 See Rosenak, *Teaching Jewish Values*, for an extensive discussion of this issue.

6 See Schwab, "The Practical 3," and Fox, "The Vitality of Theory."
modern consciousness of the student and of contemporary Jewish society.

The use of the language of value concepts as an educational translation is authentically Jewish, as Jewish text is value-laden and the traditional Jewish approach to textual interpretation deals with the clarification of these values and their meaning. Moreover, it is relevant, because the language of values is a language which is understandable to the modern consciousness of the student, and is likely to offer answers to the questions which are bothering him/her. The curriculum developers make no claim that this presentation of Jewish sources is the most complete or the best. They are fully aware of the fact that there are other ways to present Jewish text, both authentic-traditional and modern-scientific approaches. All the developers are claiming is that the presentation of Jewish text in the language of values is the approach best able to address the problems with which modern Jewish education is struggling.

In the course of developing this new educational approach, 18 study units were written, at various stages in the process. These units seek to give concrete expression to the educational ideas behind the Jewish values approach; they also create a connection with teachers in the field and turn the curricular deliberation into a practical discussion. The units that were written, the feedback they elicited from the field, and the educational principles which crystallized into a systematic educational approach all evolved together.

The contents of the units reflect the principles of the program. Topics include:

— interpersonal relations;
— the image of man;
— the value of human life;
— values of responsibility and mercy;
— values of justice, peace, and compromise;
— justice and mercy as criteria for judging human actions;
— issues of social organization;
— free will;
— the process of change in human beings according to the Jewish tradition;
— violence in human life and society;
the Jewish people — a nation like all the nations or a chosen
people; and
— issues of Jewish identity.

These are just some of the topics dealt with by the units, but
they are sufficient to convey the concern of the program as a
whole with value questions. The learning methods applied in the
units also express the spirit of the program: close study of the text
(in a manner suited to the level of the student), concern with
moral dilemmas, translation of the ideas in the text to relevant
everyday situations, the attempt to clarify what the text means
to the student, etc.

The Jewish Values Project in Transition from Development to Testing and Publication

The curricular approach behind the Jewish Values project does
not see the publication of study units or of the conceptual guide
as the culmination of the development process. In keeping with
the assumption that all four of the commonplaces (content, stud-
et, teacher, milieu) must be part of any curricular deliberation,
it is clear that using the curriculum in any institution confronts
the program with new data relating to the local situation: par-
ticular students in a particular school in its own unique setting,
taught by the particular teacher assigned this material. The
published units are intended to serve only as a conceptual frame-
work for local planning, planning which will adapt the material
to the particular circumstances in which the learning is to take
place — or even planning to create new study units in the spirit
of the Jewish Values approach. In order to carry out this process
of curriculum development, teachers' workshops are conducted in
schools throughout the world, designed to adapt the units to
various schools and educational frameworks. The Teacher's Guide
is actually intended as a “teachers' workshop guide,” presenting
a discussion designed to enable those teachers without access to
workshops to participate in the process of adaptation and develop-
ment.

7 For an example of this process, see Asher Shkedi, “Curriculum Change in a
Jewish Day School from a Principal's Point of View,” Jewish Education, vol.
8 For an example of this process, see the paper by Gillis in this volume.
The conference, some of the proceedings of which are presented in this volume, marks the completion of the development stage of the Jewish Values project. The program is now in "Stage II," the stage of distribution of the material and its implementation in schools around the world. Many schools and institutions of informal education in the Diaspora and in Israel are participating in the program. It is too early to describe and to evaluate this stage, as the process of development and testing is still underway. Clearly, it will be necessary to undertake a full summation of this phase of the Jewish Values project in the future.

The Papers in this Volume

As we have said, the Jewish Values project is first and foremost a conceptual framework — with respect both to content and methodology — supporting discussion, analysis, research, and educational practice. The boundaries of the deliberation conducted in the context of the Jewish Values project are broad indeed, encompassing questions from the fields of educational philosophy, psychology, and pedagogy; issues relating to the subject matter, the milieu, and the learner; and aspects of the areas of curriculum and teacher training. Many have joined this deliberation, and each has contributed from his/her own perspective. Curricular deliberation is generally not documented, not in the Jewish Values project and not in other curricula. As a result, much interesting, important, and unique information is lost. Published study units do not reveal to the researcher or the educator the full scope of the deliberation or its richness. Some of this can be found in books, dissertations, and papers written by Jewish Values project staff members, dealing directly or indirect-

9 The development of the Jewish Values project was accompanied by the writing of a number of theoretical and research papers, related directly or indirectly to the program itself. Some of these have been published; others are still in preparation. We mention three here: Jonathan Cohen, "Selected Trends in Contemporary Scholarship in Jewish Philosophy: Implications for Curriculum," (Hebrew) (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1991); Michael Rosenak, Commandments and Concerns: Jewish Religious Education in Secular Society (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1987), and Asher Shaked, "Teacher Participation in Curriculum Development: A Case Study of Workshops for Teachers of "Jewish Values" " (Ph.D. diss., The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1987).
ly with questions which arose in the course of the development of the program.

This volume represents an attempt to conduct in public the ongoing deliberation surrounding the Jewish Values project. Among the participants are some who have played an active role in the development of the program, some who have observed the process closely, and others who have become acquainted with the program through its literature. While each paper is independent, and illuminates from its own unique angle, the common focus on the Jewish Values project creates a sort of conversation among all of the authors. Together, the collection is a discussion which will enrich anyone who is interested in the problem of teaching Jewish sources and in Jewish education in general.

The book is divided into four sections:

Section 1: Concepts and approaches in Jewish education;
Section 2: Curriculum and the teacher;
Section 3: Implementation of educational programs in the field;
Section 4: Analysis of approaches and of curricula.

Section 1: Concepts and Approaches in Jewish Education

Rosenak deals with the problem of “the uncommitted” (to Jewish tradition and sources). The paper characterizes this population with respect to the world of Jewish concepts and in comparison to “the committed.” This analysis brings the author to a discussion of the question which was central to him in his role as the “philosopher in residence” of the Jewish Values project: How is it possible to present the Jewish tradition and the Jewish sources authentically to “the uncommitted?” Rosenak proposes a conceptual framework based on the thought of MacIntyre, which he believes is capable of guiding the educational process of exposure of “the uncommitted” to the world of Jewish tradition and Jewish sources.

Resnick evaluates the contribution of the program to Jewish education from an external perspective. In his paper, he emphasizes data from various studies indicating the centrality of Jewish values in the understanding of Judaism by contemporary Jews. In his view, the Jewish school presents its students with a picture of the world drawn from Jewish sources — but unreal in the context of the students’ everyday experience. In this conflict,
it is the Jewish world which is the loser. Here, according to Resnick, is where the contribution of the Jewish Values project has been significant. It enriches the student's relationship to the world of Jewish concepts, maintaining a productive tension between this world and the open reality in which the student lives.

Chazan, even though he was not an active member of the Jewish Values project staff, has carried on a continuous dialogue with the program in the context of his central roles at the Melton Centre and his academic and educational involvement in the topic. In this paper, Chazan argues that education for Jewish values should not be seen as a self-evident desideratum. Rather, this is a direction which is both unclear and controversial. He raises a number of issues from the realms of philosophy, psychology, sociology, and education, which negate the values-education approach. His conclusion is that while it may be possible to educate for Jewish values, this can only be accomplished under certain specific conditions. In conclusion, he suggests a theoretical framework intended to guarantee the appropriate conditions.

Deltcher, a member of the Jewish Values project staff, focuses on one of the questions which was crucial to the project: How is it possible to use aggadic text as an educational tool? In his paper, he deals primarily with the teaching of aggadic text in the elementary school, attempting to clarify how children understand this type of text. The paper sets forth the educational potential of the aggadah and proposes an approach based on considerations from various disciplines, intended to achieve maximum effectiveness in the teaching of the text.

Horenczyk deals with the issue of teaching Jewish text from a psychological perspective, focusing on Jewish identity. He bases his paper on research he has carried out on the topic of Jewish identity and on the educational conclusions suggested by this research. The assumption is that human beings have internal needs, "internal whisperings," which constitute a motivational force striving to find appropriate channels for expression. One of these needs is Jewish identity. The conclusion of the paper is that if we can identify the connection between the study of Jewish texts and values and the internal needs of the student, then we will be able to help the student uncommitted to the Jewish tradition to understand himself — and at the same time to find meaning in the text and in the Jewish concepts contained in it.
Alexander seeks to return the discussion to basic questions. He argues that before we can address the question of how to improve Jewish education, we must ask what "Jewish education" means in our time. In the author's view, this is neither an empirical nor an administrative question, but a philosophical one. He explicates the educational-philosophical thought of both Rosenak and Chazan, and questions the ability of these philosophical approaches to provide answers to the fundamental questions we must address. Alexander suggests Nozick's approach as a direction for building a meaningful framework of philosophical and educational thought.

Section 2: Curriculum and the Teacher

Who is the teacher who is to deal with the Jewish Values curriculum and with the education of today's Jewish youth? Aron presents points of departure for the examination of the Jewish teacher. She suggests distinguishing between the teacher as a professional and the teacher as one who is "called" (vocation). As a profession, teaching is characterized by a legitimacy based on knowledge and expertise, and by professional autonomy. As a vocation, it has a number of additional characteristics. The author describes these, and argues that only a teacher with this sense of vocation can successfully address the challenges of Jewish education in our time.

Shkedi, from the perspective of one who has been involved in the development of the Jewish Values project, tries to outline a method for preparing teachers for their role in the program. In his paper, he presents the considerations which led the project staff to move toward involvement of teachers in the curricular process, and to suggest teachers' workshops as the most suitable method for achieving this involvement. He describes those elements he believes to be essential parts of the deliberative process in the teachers' workshop, in order to insure the teachers' full involvement and participation in curriculum development. This paper is part of a larger study of the participation of teachers in the Jewish Values project and of the place of the teachers' workshop in the process.

As mentioned above, the Jewish Values project is based on the thinking of Schwab and on his approach to curriculum. Holtz
focuses on Schwab’s approach to curriculum development. His paper presents examples of curriculum development at the Melton Research Center of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. It deals with the deliberative process and with the unique solutions developed in the work of the Center; with the place of the curriculum writer in the whole development and field-testing effort; and with his influence on the revision process. Holtz seeks to show what we have learned from the experience of the Jewish Values project is complemented by the curricular lessons of a parallel Jewish-educational curriculum project.

Section 3: Implementation of Educational Programs in the Field

Gillis describes the effort, over a number of years, to introduce the Jewish Values project in the Jewish day school in Melbourne. He points out a number of problems which arose in the course of this introduction; the main tension, it seems, centered around the question of the “relevance” of the material. While the curriculum developers assumed that particular existential questions would be relevant to any student, relevance in the mind of a student in Melbourne meant finding answers to questions that he perceived to be important in his own life and development. The solution to this in Melbourne involved a combination of the Jewish Values project materials with locally written units designed to have relevance to the particular students in the school. The Melbourne experience therefore indicates an additional direction for development, within the accumulating experience of the Jewish Values project.

Smiley also attempts to address the question of the relevance of the Jewish sources to the world of the student, as well as the issue of integration of Jewish and general studies. The paper describes several experiments in the teaching of concepts from the Jewish sources by means of the computer. In the author’s view, an evaluation of the experiments indicates that they were not successful. Although it is true that the experiments aroused student interest and positive responses from parents and colleagues, nevertheless, argues Smiley, the learning was on a relatively superficial level, and did not enter the realm of meaning and values. Thus, Smiley is dealing with a problem which was
basic to the formulation of the Jewish Values project: setting the bounds of relevance.

Section 4: Analysis of Approaches and of Curricula

Cohen describes attempts in Israeli education to establish a framework for teaching Jewish thought. He presents the “diagnosis” upon which each attempt is based, as well as the “prescription” in content and methodology which each proposes for dealing with the problem. Cohen also exposes the underlying assumptions of the writers of each curriculum with respect to the nature of the discipline of Jewish thought. This paper adds another layer to the ongoing discussion which is at the heart of the Jewish Values project, in which Cohen took part as a staff member. This discussion seeks to translate fields of knowledge dealing with Jewish sources into the educational situation required to foster Jewish commitment in an open society.

Sheniak describes the process of writing To Be a Jew in a Christian World, one of the units in the Jewish Values project: The paper outlines the difficulties arising from the physical, mental, and ideological distance between the writing team in Jerusalem and a school in the Diaspora, its teachers and students and the surrounding community. The process moved from the writing of units to inservice training, testing of the units, rewriting, and so on. This resulted in the writing of a number of versions. Among the manifestations of the complexity of the process is the fact that despite extensive experimentation, a version has not yet been produced which enables schools to deal successfully with the topic.

Frost’s paper considers Jewish education in Poland between the two World Wars, examining values education in the major educational movements active in the community. Frost describes the educational frameworks and the curricula of each of the Jewish movements, and exposes the underlying values and the educational thinking of each. Special emphasis is placed on the role of the Hebrew language and of Jewish and general texts in each movement. The paper focuses on the connection between the guiding values of each movement and its understanding of the future and fate of the Jewish people.

There is no more fitting way to conclude our volume than with
this paper, for it focuses attention on the fact that the teaching of Jewish sources and education for Jewish values and content is not merely an abstract intellectual matter, but rather one which indeed touches on the future and fate of our people.
Section I

CONCEPTS AND APPROACHES IN JEWISH EDUCATION
COMMITMENT AND NON-COMMITMENT IN JEWISH VALUE EDUCATION

Michael Rosenak

The Jewish Values curriculum project originated with the "presenting problem" of how to teach texts and concepts of the Jewish tradition honestly and authentically to those who had no a priori commitment to their value and authority. Those who first posed this problem to us, the leadership of the Tarbut School in Mexico City, declared that they considered the teaching of the Jewish heritage important, if not intrinsic, to the work of a Jewish school. Pupils, however, consistently, indeed progressively, judged the sources, ideals and norms of this heritage uninteresting, lacking in intellectual and spiritual challenge or — in short — a "waste of time." The school leadership, not unlike the pupils themselves, were secular in orientation and rejected the notion that the Torah, Talmud, Midrash and codes are to be accepted and "obeyed" even before they are understood. They said, with considerable empathy, that pupils had to be convinced of the worth of these texts before they could relate seriously to them; these students, we were told, were non-committed, that is, they were "outside the tradition."

For members of the Jewish Values staff, the initial questions were: What exactly is meant by being "outside a tradition" in general and the Jewish one in particular? How should one envision and describe a state of being "inside" one? Since we were concerned with helping specific Jewish communities with concrete proposals, we also wished to understand and consider practical options of educational strategy and procedure. Yet it must be kept in mind that we addressed these questions not as representatives of a particular ideological orientation within the Jewish community, but as academic Jewish educators who are called upon to understand contexts and alternatives and not simply to prescribe them.

I should like here to address the issue of commitment and non-commitment. I shall do so, both in retrospect, as it appeared to our Jewish Values curriculum writers, and presently, as a
series of questions that invite further thought and research.

Two Stories

Concerning the question of Jewish “commitment” and “non-commitment,” two stories, one relatively modern, the other genuinely classic, come to mind. The more recent one, as related by G. N. Schlesinger,1 goes as follows:

There was, once, in the days of the Yeshiva of Volozhin, a group of Jewish students in Berlin. They were severely affected by the enlightenment and were troubled with great religious doubts, which, of course, they discussed with much vehemence. Finding themselves unable to resolve the questions of Jewish faith to their satisfaction, they decided, in the interest of fairness, to send one of their group to the Yeshiva in Volozhin for two years. Perhaps he, after studying the sources and sitting at the feet of great scholars and authorities, would come upon satisfactory solutions to their problems. And so, an intelligent and studious young man went to the yeshiva for two years and immersed himself completely in that life. Upon his return to Berlin, his friends greeted him eagerly and asked:

“Well, how was it?”

“It was wonderful,” he replied. “These two years have probably been the best of my life.”

“Do you now have answers to all the questions we had?”

“No, I have answers to none of those questions.”

“What, then was this all for?!”

“But I have no more questions left, either…”

The basic thrust of this, perhaps apocryphal, story is reminiscent of the thesis suggested by D. Z. Phillips in his book, Religion With Explanation. Phillips denies that religious beliefs are hypotheses which might turn out to be false, that there are questions to which such beliefs are the right (or wrong) answers. Rather,

we are held by them, captivated by the picture they

present... No contradiction is involved between the believer and the unbeliever; they just have different pictures, different perspectives. The atheist who denies the existence of God does not contradict the theist who puts his trust in God. He is 'rejecting a whole mode of discourse' rather than expressing an opposite view within the same one.

And so, (w)e cannot stand outside a religion to judge it... our beliefs are not so much propositions about reality, they are part and parcel of a way of life which involved such things as prayer, worship, praise and penitence.2

The story of the former maskil-turned-yeshiva-bachur suggests that the “turn” from non-commitment to commitment is a religious affair in which “belief” replaces “non-belief” vis-a-vis a particular religion or culture, and that, like most conversions, it entails leaving the world of one comprehensive language for that of another one. The model intimated by this story clearly has certain attractions: it offers a simple and straightforward prescription; moreover, under the right circumstances it often works to the satisfaction of the educator. But it also raises particular problems. Though sundry institutions and teachers dedicated to chazarah b’teshuvah do what the model requires gladly and well, we are not sure whether, once its philosophical ramifications are understood, the model will be considered morally and spiritually acceptable to most Jews. Certainly, it reflects neither the wealth nor the variety of modern Jewish commitment — a cardinal consideration for educational academicians — nor does it point in the direction of a consensus among educators concerning plausible and fair practice. Yet we should not write off our bachur from Velozhin and we shall come back to him later.

First, however, let us look at our second, impeccably classic, story. The reference is to Hillel and the three proselytes who, after being turned away by Shamai, came to him “and he converted them.”3 Clearly, we have here a paradigmatic story of several persons who moved from “non-commitment” to “commitment.” The Talmudic sugya reads as follows:

---

3 Shabbat 31a.
A certain heathen came before Shammas and asked him, 'How many torot do you have?' 'Two,' he replied, 'The Written Torah and the Oral Torah.' Said the heathen, 'I believe you concerning the Written one, but I do not believe you concerning the Oral one. I want you to make me a proselyte on condition that you teach me the Written Torah.' Shammas rebuked him and threw him out in a rage. He came before Hillel who converted him. The first day, Hillel said to him, 'aleph, bet, gimmel, daled.' The next day he reversed it. (Calling an aleph a daled, etc.) The heathen said to him, 'But yesterday you did not say it so to me.' Hillel said to him, 'Are you not relying on me? Then for the Oral Torah you may also rely on me.'

On another occasion it happened that a heathen came before Shammas and said to him, 'Make me a proselyte on condition that you teach me the entire Torah while I am standing on one foot.' He drove him away with the builders' measuring-stick which was in his hand. He came before Hillel who converted him. Hillel said to him, 'That which is hateful to you, do not do unto your fellow man. This is the entire Torah; the rest is commentary — go learn it.'

On another occasion a heathen was walking behind the schoolhouse, and heard the voice of the teacher saying, 'And these are the garments which they shall make: a breastplate, and an ephod' (Exodus 28:4). He said, 'For whom are these?' They said to him, 'For the High Priest.' Said that heathen to himself, 'I will go and become a proselyte in order that they should make me a High Priest.' He came before Shammas and said to him, 'Make me a proselyte on condition that you make me a High Priest.' He drove him away with the builder's measuring-stick which was in his hand. He came before Hillel, who converted him. Hillel said to him, 'Is a king ever appointed who does not know the strategies of kingship? Go now and study the strategies of kingship.' He went, and began to study the Scripture. When he came to the verse, 'And the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death' (Numbers 1:51) he said to Hillel, 'About whom was this verse said?' He answered, 'It includes even David,
King of Israel.' Whereupon the heathen reasoned a for-
tiori concerning himself. 'If concerning Israel, who are
called children of the Almighty, who in his love for them
has called them Israel, my son, my first-born' (Exodus
4:22), the verse says, 'And the stranger that cometh nigh
shall be put to death,' — 'a mere proselyte, who comes
with his wallet and stick, so much the more so!' He came
before Shammai, and said to him, 'Am I then capable of
becoming a High Priest?' Is it not written in the Torah,
'And the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death?'

After some time the three of them met in one place. They
said, 'The impatience (kopdanut) of Shammai sought to
drive us from the world; the gentleness (anvetanut) of
Hillel brought us in under the wings of the Divine Pre-

cence.' He came before Hillel and said to him, 'O gentle
Hillel, may blessings rest upon your head, for bringing
me under the wings of the Divine Presence.'

In some ways the two stories are similar. In both, the non-com-
mitted person "doesn't understand;" he or she doesn't know how
"the system" works, and therefore asks the "wrong" questions.
Also, both stories introduce us to learners who have a certain
interest and are somehow "open:" the non-committed in these
stories, even when asking the wrong question, is asking some
question. And, in each of the stories, someone who was an "out-
sider" ultimately demonstrates that he has become an "insider."
In the first case, he no longer has any questions; in the second
case, he shows an ability to solve his problems in the language of
the tradition.

However, there are significant differences as well, and certain-
ly the Talmudic story is richer. Let us mention several of its
distinctive features:

a. Having asked the "wrong" question, the person "at the
gate" can be dealt with in (at least) two discrete ways: he
can be answered "honestly," that is, told "the way it really
is" — with full regard and reverence for the integrity of the
subject-matter and be, literally or figuratively, chased a-
way. Or, he may have matters explained to him in a
manner that clearly does not represent the way "insiders"
understand things, yet is conducive to growth and prepares
the learner to “confront” the subject matter when he or she is ready for it, and has grown into it.
b. The person being initiated is, when possible, informed about some “essence” so that he is enabled to make sense of Torah and Judaism through associations and nomenclature which are familiar and comprehensible. What the proselyte is told about the “regulation” which is the entire Torah,
4 “the strategy for kingship,” or Judaism as (ostensibly) Written Torah alone, does not correspond to the way “it really is” as far as Hillel is concerned. (We can readily picture Shammai scoffing, with great “authenticity,” at the very idea of an “essence” of Judaism.)
c. Each proselyte is encouraged to “go and learn” and then discovers for himself, as Hillel thought would happen, that learning Torah is surprising and enhancing.
d. Concluding the three individual stories, of three very characteristic people, we are told there was a meeting, and a meeting of minds, among them. The individual development of the three, quite startlingly, has a group aspect. The three proselytes get together “in one place.” Perhaps it is at a minyan, at the shuk, scouting for a beautiful etrog, or in a Bet Midrash. We don’t know, but it must have been somewhere in the sphere of Torah for them to strike up a conversation about their experiences with Hillel. It is there they find themselves “speaking the same language.” When they note that Shammai “sought to drive them from the world,” obviously the reference is to the “world” of Torah and not to our planet Earth; they fondly recall how Hillel “brought them under the wings of the Divine Presence.” Plainly, they have become insiders, “committed” — each in his own way, yet sharing the good fortune of a common teacher who understood that some quest was hiding behind their disparate and somewhat bizarre questions and demands.5

The modern context in which our problem is being discussed seems more complex and variegated than that of Hillel and

5 Ibid., p. 39.
Shammai. In our “modern world” we can find non-commitment, a state of being outsiders vis-a-vis a Jewish normative universe of discourse, not only among heathens but also among Jews. Moreover, there is serious controversy, even among committed Jews, as to what commitment actually entails and which commitments are currently worthy and viable. Ours is a situation in which a plurality of commitments appears just as plausible as does disdain for all possible ones. And so, there are contemporary Jewish commitments which would have been totally unthinkable to both Shammai and Hillel, such as those secular ones which claim to manage very well without normative relationships to any texts whatsoever.

The “Non-Committed” and Jewish Values

In order to gain maximal illumination from our two stories of initiation and commitment, we need to understand more clearly what commitment and non-commitment signify, not only in our tradition, but in our time. In deliberations conducted by the Jewish Value curriculum group on this issue, several sets of concepts proved useful to us.

First, we drew the distinction, suggested by Fox, between underlying principles and operative ideals as aspects of culture and education. Fox sees principles as the ground for “order, coherence and meaning;” we have used the term to refer to basic beliefs about the nature of reality, knowledge, and value. As for ideals, we understood them as patterns of aspiration and behavior, as social and personal patterns that “translate” principled assumptions about reality and value into concrete forms of human life. That is, given specific principles, or basic assumptions and beliefs, the matter of ideals may be formulated thus: What is the life of actual human beings mandated by these principles and flowing from them?

Let us spell out this relationship between principles and ideals by way of several illustrations relevant to the Jewish tradition as subject of — and source for — the traditional philosophy of

---

education. The Jewish tradition, through its foundational texts, articulates the principles that there is a God who has created the world and communicates with humanity about the nature and purpose of this world and of human existence with it — and that He has done so particularly and uniquely in the corpus of Torah.7

On the basis of these principles, which human traits and behaviors are congenial or “logical?” How should people relate to the world? What constitutes an ideal society based on Torah and what are paradigms of virtuous persons who “live by” it? What is the ideal of “learning Torah” that follows from the (principled) status of Torah as God’s communication to mortals, as a charge and as a “gift?” How shall the belief-reality (i.e., the principle) that God created humanity in His image be “translated” into specific ideals, such as the “norm” of conferring dignity upon people, or cultivating esteem and self-esteem?

We have also had recourse to the conceptual distinction that has been drawn by Peters and Oakeshott8 between language and literature, that is, between the basic structures and patterns of a culture on the one hand, and the ways in which individuals express things and themselves within that language-culture, on the other. The Jewish tradition has — or rather, is — a language in which certain words, actions and attitudes make distinctive sense, inviting and making possible the specific fellowship of Jewishness by building particular modes of communication. The “language” both says distinct things and states universal sentiments and ideas in its own way. In this language there is a Tanach but no Old Testament; there is a wish that children attain “to Torah and maasim tovim,” that they be menschen rather than “simply” mature. And, of course, there are many ways of “doing” Torah and “growing” in it — many literatures through which individuals may articulate, affirm and establish


the language.

Finally, and consequentially, our discussions took into account that every culture and every educational enterprise that socializes children into a "language" presents them with discrete hero-types, or models of virtue and self-actualization — persons who represent the culture "at its best" and who are thus considered worthy of admiration and emulation.

Our discussions about these conceptual frames helped us to delineate diverse, albeit overlapping, types of "non-commitment" among modern Jews, explained as follows:

1. It makes obvious sense to think of the "non-committed" as those who do not accept the principles of the tradition as expressed and taught in its sacred texts. That is, what we may call the theology of classical Judaism does not define the principled "world" in which the "non-committed" live. Their principles are generally the self-understood (non-Jewish) ones of their cultural environment, and they see no meaningful or even possible connection between these received and accepted (Christian and secular) principles and those expressed in the Jewish tradition. They may find the beliefs of Torah, Talmud and midrash quaint or dull, primitive or exotic. But whatever the case, they refuse to consider this Jewish "cluster" of principles a genuine option for thinking about things, as a possible way of "seeing" reality, knowledge and value, as philosophical foundations for a good life.

2. The "non-committed" may also be defined as those who don't accept the ideals that have been drawn out of these principles or are declared in the texts themselves, to "naturally" follow from them. That is, they are not committed to the life of Judaism of which, for example, study of Torah is an integral part. It is possible that these "non-committed" persons accept some or all of the principles but they see no way or reason to carry them into the realm of operative ideals.

3. A third way of seeing the "non-committed" is as those who don't know the language. When they hear it spoken, they don't understand what is being said; they don't know how people speak it. So they are not even aware of what "commitment" is. This way of viewing the matter is often more
comforting to educators than the situation warrants. For “non-commitment” seen thue seems easily cured; all that must ostensibly be done is teach the language.

4. Non-committed persons who know the language or much of it, but refuse to trust it, may well be perceived as more problematic, and some would say, perverse. For these are persons who don’t believe that the language of Judaism can be utilized to generate worthwhile literature. This “non-committed” view implies that while texts and traditions may be worth researching, they are not inherently enhancing.

5. As a result of the above, singly or in the composite, the “non-committed” do not consider the hero-types of the Jewish tradition worthy of careful study as paradigms of noble living.

The above may set parameters for commitment as well. The committed person is “inside” the principles, however interpreted; he or she views the good society and the good life within the framework of the ideals, though they may be diversely understood. He or she speaks the “language” of the Jewish tradition and, “trusting it,” actually makes literature which constitutes the significance of his/her life in that language.

* * *

The similarities between the young man at Volozhin and the proselytes of Hillel, as well as the differences between them, should now be somewhat clearer. We may assume that the Berlin band of enlightened young people had been raised in the language of Judaism, but had become acquainted with new principles and ideals which led them to question Jewish ones, and thus to raise doubts about whether the Jewish language was still worth speaking and worthy of their loyalty. The one of their group who went to Volozhin found there that the Jewish language was vital and all-pervasive, and functioned as the natural medium of everyone’s literature. This strengthened his bond to that language to such an extent that “he had no more questions.” The thrust of the story is that the “problem” of principles arises not when other principles seem more cogent but when another language, in which foreign principles and ideals reside, becomes more power-
ful, attractive or pervasive. The *yeshiva bachur* became “committed” not because he thought through intellectual problems, but because he joined another fellowship, where the language was that of Jewish tradition and not that of Berlin “high society.”

As for the proselytes, they not only spoke the “wrong” language, thereby bewildering and angering Shammai, but they also, perhaps because of this, articulated confused notions about principles and ideals. In the first two cases, Hillel relates to their principled requirements, albeit somewhat deviously, and then sends them on the way mandated by his ideal which, to him, makes the deviousness justified. They are told to study Torah. And so, we may assume, they learn the requisite principles, ideals and language. As for the third proselyte, he too is told to learn Torah and thus he discovers that his personal aspiration is ludicrous in his new language. And so, all three find themselves in Hillel’s “world” of language and literature. Having started with their questions, whatever they were, he has guided them onto a road of development and discourse where questions of truth are indeed dealt with epistemologically and axiologically, but which reaches its climax in a common language, in fellowship.

**Between Hillel and Modern Jews: A Bridging Theory**

And yet, as noted above, we cannot, as academically oriented Jewish educators, be as unambiguous about the substance of commitment as the *bachur* or the sage. Our curriculum group was aware of the fact that there are many views in contemporary Jewish society about “the tradition of Torah” even for those who profess a serious and “committed” relationship to it. We did not consider it our task, at the Hebrew University, to adjudicate the disagreements or to synthesize the views of how the “language” of Torah actually functions or which “literatures” are legitimate expressions of the language. Our aim was to enable pupils to read, if possible “in depth,” some texts of Torah through a curricular approach which presents it on its own terms, as scholars understand these terms: as a universe of principles, ideals, language, literature and personality-ideals, that is, as a universe of value. In addition we sought to create some conceptual tools and pedagogic circumstances, particularly through teacher training, whereby this study would be made intelligible and existentially challeng-
ing, and would encourage pupils to search out further learning experiences.

It is in light of these aims that we insisted that materials and units eschew a reductionism which makes the Torah say what children already know and what teachers find unproblematic. Conversely, the materials were designed to help teachers make the ideas and issues of the biblical, Talmudic or midrashic texts accessible. Therefore, too, we considered problematic and ultimately unacceptable those approaches that did not adequately present the text and the normative thrust inherent in them; which distorted them, for either ideological or pedagogic reasons, or which, because of their pristine “Shammaite” authenticity, were incomprehensible to “non-committed” modern readers. We have dealt with such unacceptable approaches to teaching Jewish values elsewhere.9

During the years of our work on the Jewish Values project, we made considerable progress in clarifying the nature of commitment and even in examining diverse expressions of such commitment. Nevertheless, we experienced difficulty in formulating the theoretical basis of that universe of (diverse) commitment. We agreed that a pluralism of commitment required some “core universe”10 which was accepted by all “committed” teachers, but a clear theoretical statement of that “core universe” and its relationship to the “partial universes” of differing ideological groupings among contemporary Jewish educators eluded us. We could indeed say that we didn’t want reductionism, incomprehensibility, and a denial of the normative “self-understanding” of the classical Jewish texts. We could and did say that our aspiration was that texts be taught “seriously” but this was often perceived, with some justice, as a slogan. We could and did insist that our materials consist only of teachers’ guides precisely because the students’ guides had to be written in each school, by the school’s own teachers, in line with its own world view. However, on the

10 “…most modern societies…have a shared core universe, taken for granted as such, and different partial universes co-existing in a state of mutual accommodation…” Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1967), p. 125.
ideological level this demand incorporated a claim that the teachers' guides were neutral with regard to the varying conceptions of commitment current in the Jewish world. Educators in the field could question that and demand that university-based educators be clearer on the theoretical bases of a plurality of commitment in Jewish Values education. This demand was sometimes explicitly stated. More frequently it was implicit, specifically, whenever we were accused of "really" being Orthodox, or Conservative, cultural secularists or simply subservient to the savants of Wissenschaft.

The stories with which we began and our discussion of them in general theoretical terms indicate that it is not difficult to locate the meaning of commitment within our tradition. It appears necessary, however, to have more extensive recourse to general philosophical thought to coax out of our own tradition a "handle" on valuative pluralism for education. Why this recourse to "general" thought is both legitimate and necessary, I have attempted to explain briefly in another paper. Here I should like to suggest a congenial theory, to replace or at least supplement the rather murky concept of "seriousness" which we have utilized to find a ground for consensus in teaching Jewish texts in our Jewish Values curriculum.

The theory I have in mind is that of Alasdair MacIntyre, in his book After Virtue, which, perhaps paradoxically, deals extensively with theory of virtue and value. MacIntyre sees three stages in the logical development of the concept of virtue, "and each of these stages has its own conceptual background."

The first stage requires a background account of what I shall call a practice, the second an account of...the narrative order of a single human life and the third an account...of what constitutes a moral tradition. Each earlier stage is both modified by and reinterpreted in the light of, but also provides an essential constituent of each later stage...

*Practice* is defined as,

---

13 Ibid., pp. 186-187.
...a coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realized in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the ends and means involved, are systematically extended.\textsuperscript{14}

Thus, all fields of organized endeavor qualify as "practices" while specific, even skilled, activities in isolation from their "field" do not. The work of an historian is a practice, as is music and architecture, but reading a history book or bricklaying are not. Doing the dishes or throwing a ball back and forth with one's child would not qualify, but such endeavors as educating, maintaining a household, building a family and playing football, would.

The ultimate aim of practices is to attain to the goods which are inherent in them, which can be attained in no other way. For example, the real purpose of playing chess is to master and enjoy the game. However, it is likely that before there is intrinsic enjoyment and mastery, there will be playing for such extrinsic awards as candy for children or prestige, status, and money, for adults. What characterizes the extrinsic rewards is that they have no necessary relationship to chess whatsoever, whereas the intrinsic reward cannot be gained by any other activity or practice. It follows that extrinsic rewards are scarce, like "winning a prize," while intrinsic rewards are generously available to all who partake in the practice. However, to gain these internal or intrinsic rewards, it is necessary to understand and become proficient in the practice. According to MacIntyre, "A practice involves standards of excellence and obedience to rules as well as the achievement of goods. To enter into a practice is to accept the authority of those standards and the inadequacy of my own performance as judged by them." Thus, one must subject his/her own "attitudes, choices and preferences and tastes to the standards which currently and partially define the practice." Though practices have a history and are therefore not immune from criticism, MacIntyre says that,

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 187.
...nevertheless we cannot be initiated into a practice without accepting the authority of the best standards realized so far. If, on starting to listen to music, I do not accept my own incapacity to judge correctly, I will never learn to hear, let alone appreciate Bartok’s last quartets. If, on starting to play baseball, I do not accept that others know better than I when to throw a fast ball and when not, I will never learn to appreciate good pitching let alone to pitch.\textsuperscript{16}

Thus, it is clear that practices involve communities, comprising all those who engage in a practice. The community includes those who learn how to do it from others and those who teach it — and all those who then do it (and hopefully, enjoy it) together. As for virtue, we may now give the definition that relates to practice. In the words of MacIntyre,

A virtue is an acquired human quality the possession and exercise of which tends to enable us to achieve those goods which are internal to practice and the lack of which effectively prevents us from achieving any such goods.\textsuperscript{16}

There are specific traits without which the communities of practice cannot function with integrity. For example, chess, like most practices, requires honesty; most require some humility, few can do without courage. And, since practices do have histories, the people involved in them require a relationship to past practitioners and a sense of continuity.

The second stage of virtue is what MacIntyre calls “the unity of a human life.” We cannot, he claims, understand any activity without having an idea in which context it should be seen, what its “setting” is. Each of us, if he or she lives a life of sense and cumulative meaning, sees his/her life as having a beginning and an end. We wish for our acts and attitudes to constitute a whole story, as free as possible from the discontinuities which rob us of our identities, and which, at the least, make us capricious. Thus, “the unity of a virtue in someone’s life is intelligible only as a characteristic of a unitary life, a life that can be conceived and calculated as a whole.” In part, I am the author of my “story” but I am also a character in a story. Part of the meaning of the unity

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 190.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 191.
of life is that "I can answer the question 'What am I to do?' only if I can answer the prior question of what story or stories do I find myself a part?" "I am part of a story of others and they, of mine. The good for me is 'how best I might live out that unity — bring it to completion.' It follows that "to be the subject of a narrative that runs from one's birth to one's death is...to be accountable for the actions and experiences which compose a narratable life." Yet, once again, the narrative of my life is intertwined with that of others, as a rich plot has more than one character. Now, therefore, with the aid of the conception of practice, we come upon the idea of the unity of life as signifying a good life. The good life is a whole and worthy "story" given its unity by steadfast adherence to the virtues which inform the practices.

This brings us to the third stage, which constitutes the consciousness of striving not only for a unified life, a meaningful personal story, but also for a history. "...I inherit from the past of my family, my city, my tribe, my nation, a variety of debts, inheritances, rightful expectations and obligation. These constitute the given of my life, my moral starting point." What I am, therefore, is in key part what I inherit, a specific past that is present to some degree in my present. I find myself part of a history and...whether I like it or not, whether I recognize it or not, one of the bearers of a tradition.

"Traditions, when vital, embody continuities of conflict" and "a living traditions...is an historically extended, socially embodied argument, and an argument precisely about the goods which constitute that tradition." Since they "continue a not-yet-completed narrative," living traditions "confront a future whose determinate and determinable character...derives from the past." And it is in this tradition that practices develop and the individual's "story" is related.

The theory reviewed above may, of course, invite controversy as well as varying degrees of assent. I dwell on it as a congenial

17 Ibid., p. 216.
18 Ibid., p. 217.
19 Ibid., p. 220.
20 Ibid., p. 221.
21 Ibid., p. 222.
22 Ibid., p. 223.
illustration of the uses of general theory in Jewish educational thought. Now, in conclusion, I shall try to apply it to our problem of commitment and non-commitment, and the meanings of these terms in a pluralistic Jewish world, with specific application to the Jewish Values curriculum conception.

Volozhin, Hillel and Contemporary Commitments

If it is true that the language of a culture is the ground of its various practices, and that its most comprehensive and central practices point most clearly to the character of the language, then we can say that our bachur from Volozhin moved back into the language by anchoring himself in one of its most central and cherished practices, limmud Torah. Let us envision his Berlin friends annoyed at him, which was very possibly the case. We can presume that they found it difficult to put up with such a facile dismissal of the questions that had previously perturbed him. The new certitude he displayed seemed "unreliable," it was a break in the unity of his life, an "irresponsible" indifference to a previous chapter in his story. This was perhaps especially exasperating, for they were very much a part of that (previous) story and felt that a "character" of the common narrative had "walked out on them." The bachur could, and perhaps did, reply that he had recovered his tradition, and was again "plugged into" a greater narrative than that of his personal life. But, they might answer, the third stage cannot be divorced from the second. The continuity of conflict in a living tradition is an integral part of that perennial story. In the words of MacIntyre "...when a tradition becomes Burkean, it is always dying or dead."

Now, let us take another look at Hillel and our proselytes. It seems plausible to say that the "outsiders" who asked principled questions, about revelation and regulations, were asking about the unity of life, about the organizing principles of "the good life." Hillel, in MacIntyre's terms, may have been saying to them:

First things first. We begin with practices and the virtues that attend and sustain them. Indeed, I shall give you some answers, because you are adults, and you have narrative needs dictated by the stories in which you have

23 Ibid., p. 222.
lived until now. But I assume that you find something faulty with the story-line in which you find yourselves. You seem to feel that, as authors and characters, you are in the wrong story. Behind your question is the desire to enter 'our' story. That is a weighty decision, for it means cutting yourselves off from other characters and other authors. But I shall perform a formal act which places you within our story, in this and in past generations. I shall convert you. But then you must enter the practices. Afterwards, you'll catch the story-line and understand the moral tradition within which we tell our stories. That story line, as you will discover, is held together by the Torah, and a central practice of that story is limmud Torah. Go and learn.

(As for the proselyte who wished to become a High Priest, his situation was, in principle, no different. He stated, much more simply, that he wanted to "switch stories." In learning how to do so, he discovered not only King David, a prominent non-priest of the tradition, but also the capacity to criticize Shammai — for not explaining the "grammar" of the story properly. Note his outcry: "Am I then capable of being a High Priest?")

Hillel, as previously noted, had greater confidence than most moderns in the stability of the moral tradition and in the unity of the story which, after all, had the Creator of all characters as its "senior Author." Hillel also knew how the practices and virtues were linked to the innermost meaning of the plot. Can there be commitment to Jewish practice, unity of life, and moral tradition without such certainty?

On this there are differences of opinion among contemporary Jews and our educational work moves between the diverse positions and seeks to bridge them. We have been positing that it is possible to envision and establish a Jewish values curriculum that is based on a paradigm of practice that can speak to various types of Jews, to a conception of the unity of life that can be partially shared and to a consciousness of a moral tradition that unites, through informed deliberation of valuative dilemmas, more than it divides on valuative priorities and prescriptions.

The practice of this common enterprise, in our terms, is, at least and always, study of Torah. The practice has a history and has undergone, especially in our time, profound crises, but it is still
considered focal by almost all who think of Jewish existence as having anything to do with practices. The history of this practice, of learning, exposes us to view theology and exegesis; this enriches the practice for it invites learners to competence and at-homeness in its cumulative assumptions and methods. As for the crisis, it raises questions about the relationship of commitment and inquiry, about the specific parameters of the practice, and about the intellectual and spiritual virtues presently required of practitioners. Our curriculum declares that despite all crisis and controversy, it remains possible to state an historically continuous conception of the practice and to teach “readiness” for it; and, moreover, that there is no specifically Jewish virtue that can be fostered without such a conception.

Furthermore, despite a multitude of blurred letters and broken sentences in the story of modern Jews, (as worldview and/or as norms) broad common lines, existential and programmatic, do emerge from study of sources, though we believe that they should be seen and studied together with issues in contemporary Jewry. Jews, in the words of Rabbi Soloveitchik, do have a common destiny and fate. Nor is the continuity of the story necessarily disrupted by moral deliberation or even conflict, if the conflict is placed within the tradition, within a larger story of “controversy for the sake of Heaven.”

Yet we should not oversimplify or romanticize. The discussion itself, in the face of the contemporary world, informed by competence and the inherent rewards of practice undertaken “for its own sake,” may be the only common language we have. But if we could achieve that much, namely, practice moving towards a unified life within a fabric of Jewish culture, it would be much more than most Jews are presently capable of — because they don’t know about it. Were they to learn it, they would discover many, often hidden, principles and ideals. They are likely to find

24 Note the importance of Bible study in non-religious frameworks of Jewish education. For a discussion, see J. Schoneveld, for example, The Bible in Israeli Education (Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976), chapters 4 and 6.

25 The Hebrew University’s Melton Centre curriculum writers are presently working on teaching units in Contemporary Jewry. We believe that the unity of modern Jewish life will not be well served by a Jewish education based only on text study.

that this language is rich in potential literature, but they will have to see it and experience it before they believe it. Trust in a language is not engendered, for modern people, by exhortation. This language then, may certainly constitute a core universe for Jewish education.

This language is not exactly the same one which very many "non-committed" Jews believe is incapable of generating worthwhile literature. It is also not quite the language of Hillel and Shammai. After all they could tell us quite unambiguously what to do to achieve virtue; they could delineate with great precision the substance of the good life, and explicate what exactly in the moral tradition is perennial and normative. The language of the Jewish Values project cannot do that.

Our language, however, does state that Jewish commitment requires a willingness to embark on some practices which are weighty with history and fellowship, with learning as an indispensible one. It does posit that value-virtues are inherent in these practices and that they are capable of weaving Jewish "narrative models" of a good life which are responsible and meaningful. And it does assume that there is a moral tradition and a history which frames the narrative of each Jew who takes being Jewish as a cultural given and as a challenge.

That is considerably less than what Hillel had in mind and it might have made the bachiur from Volozhin squirm. Indeed, the formulation is more minimalist than what I, as a traditional Jew, am happy with. But that's what we have, or rather, what we, as academic Jewish educators may, on the basis of our analytic art, propose.

It is one of the paradoxes of education that systematic guidelines for action can often be more clearly stated after the practical activity itself is already under way, and that it is the activity itself which makes theory more intelligible and useful. Before Jewish Values units were written and taught, we tended to speak of "commitment" rather vaguely, in terms of "seriousness" and an "a priori authority of texts." If we can now attempt to be a little bit more precise in conceptualization, we owe a large measure of

---

27 It is our view that if classical learning, in either religious or secular forms is presented as the only common practice of Jews, the result will be, even in cases of success, a form of scholasticism which undermines the wholeness of Jewish life.
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FROM OUGHT TO IS:
ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF JEWISH
VALUES EDUCATION TO JEWISH LIFE

David Resnick

Introduction

It is a truism bordering on the banal that what ails modern, non-Haredi Jewish education lies not inside the school, but in the ambivalence of the surrounding social context. While most of the parties involved in the struggle acknowledge that fact, there have been few serious programmatic responses to it. The Teaching Jewish Values project of the Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, is a notable exception. In this paper, I will attempt to place this project in its larger context, considering, in particular:

— what “Jewish values” means to the community;
— what “Jewish values” means for Jewish education;
— disjunctions in Jewish values education;
— steps toward bridging the gap.

A key presupposition of this paper is that education for values in Jewish schools (as with all required curricular areas) is conditioned upon a reciprocally supportive relationship between the school and the surrounding community. The breakdown of this relationship accounts for many of the problematics of Jewish values education and, indeed, of Jewish education, in general.

Hopefully, this paper itself is a first step in bridge-building, and it is undertaken despite the fact that crucial groundwork has not been laid. For example, the philosophical and curricular analyses of what Jewish values means for Jewish education has barely begun. Still, the Jewish Values project is en route, and I consider myself privileged to be participating in that journey.

* My thanks to Professors Charles Liebman and Michael Rosenak for their thoughtful comments on an early draft of this paper.

1 For example, see Jeffrey Schein, "'Genesis' and 'In Their Footsteps': An Evaluation of Two Programs in Moral Education Designed for Jewish Schools" (Ph.D. diss., Temple Univ., 1981).
What "Jewish Values" Means to the Jewish Community

The ambivalence which characterizes much of how modern Jews view themselves carries over to their perception of Jewish values. David Schoem,² for instance, writes about the parents of children in the suburban, American supplementary Shalom School:

The largest number of people defined their Jewish attitudes and values in terms of what were not their values by rejecting the values of those who were not Jews.³

This via negativa left most of his informants unsure of the specific nature of their Jewish values. Some asserted that they lived according to Jewish values, but were unable to specify them. Others thought that Jewish and American values were identical (The Golden Rule), while still others thought they were in conflict (e.g., acquisitiveness).

Jonathan Woocher,⁴ who has studied American Jewish civil religion, and the religious dimension of the public polity, rather than personal or synagogue life, found that civil religion affirms the ambiguity of American Jewish life. Thus, two of the seven major tenets of civil Judaism stand in tension:

— the importance of Jewish survival in a threatening world, and
— the virtue of integrating fully into American life.

Another of the seven tenets, the enduring value of the Jewish tradition, speaks directly to the community's conception of Jewish values. Woocher reports positive growth in the polity's attitude toward the Jewish religious tradition in the post-World War II era. It is not enough that Jews survive; their Judaism must survive, too. Thus, American civil Judaism has itself become more "religious," for example, by advocating and sponsoring Jewish study and religious observance. Indeed, this has resulted in the polity's (i.e., federations) increased financial commitment

³ Ibid., p. 65.
to the importance of substantive, including denominational, Jewish identity.\(^5\)

The content of the Jewish tradition which civil Judaism advocates, however, is necessarily vague, given the polity’s prime concern with community-building:

The tradition which it endorses is both “homogenized” and “pluralized.” Civil Judaism focuses on the unobjectionable, primarily ethical, dimensions of the tradition. Of necessity, its “Jewish tradition” represents a kind of religious common denominator, general principles of moral behavior, generalized affirmation of a modicum of ritual.\(^6\)

For our purposes, it is the emphasis on Judaism as primarily ethical values which is of special interest. Three dimensions of this ethical conception of the Jewish tradition are noteworthy.

First, the specificity of the religious tradition is muted in civil Judaism: “Torah and halakhah appear as the ‘tradition’ and ‘heritage’; mitzvot are ‘Jewish values.’”\(^7\)

Second, Jewish values are extracted from the tradition and given a life of their own: “what it means to be Jewish [is] to be part of a people with a proud tradition and enduring values, values which can be embodied in the life of the modern Jew and the modern Jewish community.”\(^8\)

Third, the uniqueness of Jewish values (and therefore their power to foster Jewish identity and continuity) is unclear to an important segment of the communal leaders included in Wooscher’s study. At least one-third of the respondents agreed with the questionnaire item, “Jewish values are basically the same as those of all religions.”\(^9\)

Thus, while Jewish values are central to civil Judaism they tend to appear in vague or universalized forms.

Perhaps the classic datum demonstrating American Jews’ conception of Judaism as universal ethics is the response of Sklare’s suburban sample to his query, “for a Jew to be a good Jew” which

---

6 Ibid., p. 83.
7 Ibid., p. 145.
8 Ibid., p. 96.
9 Ibid., p. 110.
of these twenty-two items must he do. The gulf between the first ranked item ("Lead an ethical and moral life") and the last ("Observe dietary laws") could not be more striking. A portion of the results is reproduced below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Lead an ethical and moral life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Accept being a Jew and not try to hide it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Support all humanitarian causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Promote civic betterment and improvement in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Know the fundamentals of Judaism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Be well versed in Jewish history and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Observe the dietary laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There may have been some change since Sklare collected these data nearly two generations ago, but the essential approach "to being a good Jew" has not.

In sum, the conception of Jewishness which emerges from this brief selection of sociological research is one which makes Jewish values central to modern Jewish life. Nonetheless, most Jews are uncertain as to what Jewish values are, and whether or not they are unique to Judaism. This ambivalence — centrality yet unclarity — will have significant educational implications.

**What Jewish Value Means for Jewish Education**

In the previous section, we took a brief look at Jewish values from the perspective of the Jewish community. In this section, I will outline the role of Jewish values in Jewish education, from two different perspectives:

— the importance of Jewish values to the Jewish education community (parents, school personnel, etc.), and
— what "Jewish values" means for the Jewish school.

---


11 Ibid., p. 322.
Jewish Values and the Jewish Education Community

Two studies looked at the aspirations of those involved in Jewish education. Gerald Stone and Neil Newman\textsuperscript{12} polled most of the constituents involved in a Reform supplementary school: faculty, parent, members of the Board of Education and junior high students. They were asked to rank-order twelve goals. A partial list of their findings follows (the lower the mean score, the more important the goal):\textsuperscript{13}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Mean Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Identity</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual development</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of knowledge</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to Israel</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious practice</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish communal life</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew language skills</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stone and Newman concluded that "the most active and concrete goal categories [e.g. "religious practice and observance," and "Hebrew language skills"] received low ratings while the more passive and abstract categories [e.g. "Jewish identity" and "ethics"] ranked relatively high."\textsuperscript{14} While parent goals were not analyzed separately, the researchers did find some discrepancy between the goals of school personnel on the one side, and students and board members on the other. For example, faculty ranked "acquisition of cognitive knowledge" higher than the other two groups.

In his study, Arnold Lasker sent questionnaires to parents of children enrolled in all eight of the Jewish elementary schools in a New England city, which included both day and supplementary

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 49.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 49.
schools of all three denominations. He asked them to rank-order nine goals for the future lives of their children. A partial listing of his findings follows (the higher the median score, the more important the goal):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A sense of belonging to the Jewish people</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A high regard for the value of the Jewish heritage</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A background in Jewish knowledge</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A life which conforms to Jewish ethical standards</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observance of Jewish religious practices</td>
<td>1.8 (last)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harold Himmelfarb summarizes Lasker's findings, concluding that "the respondents have a greater preference for feeling and knowledge items than for actual behavioral items... there is a significant proportion of parents who are generally inconsistent in their motivations."

About 100 of the 624 parents who strongly desire that their children think well about their Jewish heritage are less concerned that the children should know what that heritage is.

These findings accord well with those of Stone and Newman, making ethics the highest ranking Jewish behavioral goal.

On the other hand, Ronald Reynolds did not include Jewish ethics in his study of the ambiguity of curricular goals in the supplementary school. Still, his conclusion that parents' preference for ambiguous educational objectives serves to overcome their own unfocused or conflicting views of Judaism, confirms the general situation portrayed here. Finally, Haim Donin found a consensus among Jewish school principals of widely different

17 Ibid., chapter 2, p. 6.
persuasions, that instilling ethical and moral norms is a central educational goal. Their conception of these norms was an admixture of the universal and the particular, e.g., be a good citizen, value courage, help Jews in distress.

The broader Jewish community (referred to in the previous section) focused on Jewish values and ethics as a way of addressing its ambivalence about Jewish identity, since values have the virtue of being universally respected and accepted (e.g., The Golden Rule). However, the values preferred are not those which demand distinctive behaviors (e.g., the low ranking of kashrut in Sklare’s data). That same approach has been demonstrated in the data from within the school community. Parents prefer generalized goals for Jewish education (“feel part of the Jewish people”), with ethics ranked high. Specific behavioral goals are less favored. Indeed, the preference of teachers for “acquisition of cognitive knowledge,” as compared with the preferences of students and school Board members, points to a disjunction to which I shall turn shortly.

What Jewish Values Means in the Jewish School

In previous sections I’ve attempted to show how the concept of Jewish values is a key factor (albeit an ambiguous one) in how modern Jews understand their own Judaism, as well as being an important goal for the Jewish educational community. I now want to sketch three different ways in which Jewish values are understood within the school itself. A comprehensive analysis of how the term is used is beyond the scope of this paper, and is fraught with difficulties of its own:

The general disregard in the contemporary discussion in Jewish education about “values/moral” education, of the plurality of perspectives (curricular, instructional, Jewish, ethical, philosophical, etc.) necessary to fully understand the phenomena of Jewish “values/moral” education, makes it something of an intellectual feat to isolate the

curricular sense of what it means to have a program in "values/moral" education.\textsuperscript{20}

1. Judaism is Jewish Values

This approach has both tactical and ideological foundations. The tactical basis builds on the consensus which exists in the community on the importance of "Jewish values." Therefore, this approach seeks to strengthen the educational enterprise by delivering what the community says it wants. Unfortunately, this approach is often unsophisticated in its conception, and ineffective in its delivery. Thus, the principal of the Shalom School in Schoem's study states:

The curriculum is solid. I am extraordinarily proud of it... We teach the sources. I refuse to go along with all the modish courses that come along every year... We're giving them the best quality. We are teaching values. The whole curriculum is value-oriented.\textsuperscript{21}

But, as Schoem comments, this value-oriented curriculum was hardly implemented in the classroom:

The curriculum underwent major changes in its movement from the printed page to the teacher's instruction. Not only was there disagreement and reinterpretation of what was written, but there was considerable unauthorized individual curriculum development and goal-setting within classrooms.\textsuperscript{22}

The Melton Centre's Teaching Jewish Values project also endorses this approach, though its implementation could hardly be more different from that of the Shalom School.

The concept of Judaism as value-ideas — principles which demand translation into action in concrete and mundane circumstances — can be stated in terms that are universal enough to speak to the pupils general sense of reason and morality at the same time that they are learning something specifically Jewish which is new and

\textsuperscript{20} Schein, "'Genesis' and 'In Their Footsteps,'" p. 5.
\textsuperscript{21} Schoem, "Ethnic Survival in America," p. 147.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 153.
challenging... Of course, there are drawbacks to and dangers in this approach as well. Value-ideas and their application are part of Judaism, but they are not, for most Jews, all of it.\textsuperscript{23}

The conception of Judaism as "Jewish values" enabled the Jewish Values project to address a number of its challenges simultaneously through "the identification of subject-matter that will be communicable to pupils, acceptable to the teacher, and congenial to the environment within which we are working.\textsuperscript{24}

2. Jewish Values are One Part of a Jewish Education

This is perhaps the dominant mode in contemporary Jewish education. Jewish values are one important part of Jewish education, but other strands are priorities, too, e.g., Jewish knowledge and Jewish community. Barry Chazan has analyzed six contemporary American approaches to Jewish moral education; two of which are particularly relevant here.\textsuperscript{25} He cites the 1977 Interim Outline for a new Reform curriculum which appears to have a dual emphasis: socialization into Jewish life, and the teaching of Jewish values/ethics. Chazan finds that the goal of Jewish values education in this curriculum is separate from the study of Jewish classical texts, events, and symbols. The net effect is a sense of Jewish values in their universal, prophetic garb, as applied to contemporary problems. At the other extreme, the 1978 United Synagogue Curriculum despairs of significant achievement in values education, but without abandoning it entirely:

There is absolutely no evidence to indicate that any educational procedure which we use will result in a predictable and/or measurable change in the value patterns of our students... The best we can do is convey

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., p. 75.
information and provide accessible model teaching behavior, in the hope that it will be copied.26

3. Jewish Values are Irrelevant to Jewish Education

This is not a denial of Jewish values, but simply a focusing on other issues as being most critical to Jewish education. A key concern is often group identification and association. In the same article Chazan shows how, ironically, Jewish values clarification may have had more to do with trying to foster a generalized Jewish identity, than instilling Jewish values per se.27

Each of these approaches attempts to address the challenge of Jewish education in its own way. It is to a fuller description of that challenge which I now turn.

Disjunctions in Jewish Values Education

A most impressive aspect of the Jewish Values project is Michael Rosenak's introductory volume, Teaching Jewish Values: A Conceptual Guide. It presents a detailed diagnosis of Jewish education's curricular malaise, together with a rationale for the Jewish Values curriculum as a response to that malaise. I will summarize Rosenak's analysis, then show how it accords with prevailing sociological understandings of the problematics of modern Jewish life. In the following concluding section, I will place the Jewish Values curriculum alongside other possible responses to the malaise.

Rosenak sees the basic disjunction in Jewish education as being "between the subject matter and the environment."28 Either classical Jewish texts are seen as totally out of touch with and irrelevant to modern Jews' lives or their message is so universalized as to seem banal and unauthentic. The Jewish Values curriculum is an attempt to recapture both authenticity and relevance, while working within the bounds set by the environment, i.e., not openly challenging the life-style of students and parents. This

27 Chazan, "Study and Moral Action."
28 Rosenak, Teaching Jewish Values, p. 28.
tightrope act is particularly dizzying since the Jewish Values curriculum defines "Judaism as value-ideas — principles which demand [italics added] translation into action in concrete and mundane circumstances." Still, the curriculum selects from the particularity of classical sources (authenticity) those issues and values which can address the questions and concerns of the contemporary world (relevance). Thus, the curriculum designers determined that the only realistic course of action was to fine tune the subject-matter, rather than intervening to change the environment.

Particularly telling in this regard are the curricular units on halakhah and chagim. The curriculum is commendably noteworthy in including a unit on halakhah despite the difficult issue of authority which it raises. Still, the curriculum selects halakhic issues which are unlikely to engage the students in their own personal lives, e.g., capital punishment, torts, tzedakah, and (in the area of ritual) the concept of "vain prayer." In the holiday units, too, the emphasis is on selected themes in the holiday, rather than on contemporary observance. In fact, each holiday is studied via the Biblical book with which it is associated (Shavuot—Ruth, etc.). The Jewish Values curriculum succeeds in raising issues relevant to the students' lives, and does so through the genre of the tradition which speaks the language of authority (halakhah as opposed to aggadah). Nonetheless, since this curriculum does not direct the students to translate the principles into their own lives, it leaves undisturbed the disjunction between subject matter and environment.

In sociological terms, as Nathan Glazer has suggested, the disjunction is a problematic relationship between Judaism ("subject matter" in educational parlance) and Jewishness (the actual lives of Jews in the "environment"). Glazer sketches the range of contemporary responses to this dilemma:

The Williamsburg Hasidim offered no usable model or example, but they were an example of how a community of practice evades the issues of reconciling Judaism with Jewishness — they are both one, as before the 19th century they typically were. I gave as a weaker example

29 Ibid., p. 74.
of efforts to create communities of practices the Hebrew-speaking Jewish camps of the Conservative movement, even weaker the effort of modern Reform to establish a minimal level of practice, recalling the traditional Jewish round of life, as against Classical Reform.\textsuperscript{31}

The recent concern of Jewish sociologists has been not so much with the continued existence of the Jews, but with the quality of their Judaism:

To refuse to [become more explicit and conscious about the incompatibility of integration and survival] will mean the continuing redefinition of Judaism, to the point where its existence is meaningless in any traditional sense.\textsuperscript{32}

The dilution of Judaism in the face of the disjunction between subject matter and environment manifests itself, in Jewish education, in the two most common strains of curricular disass, as described by Rosenak:

1. \textit{Judaism as Historical Resource}... the subject matter is consciously changed to take into consideration the sensibilities of pupils and of their environment.\textsuperscript{33}

2. \textit{Let's Talk About Something Else}... candidly abandons classic subject matter for other matters of more interest to the child and the community... [redefining] subject-matter as whatever speaks to the immediate concerns and needs of Jews.\textsuperscript{34}

While both approaches have ostensibly achieved relevance, they have done so at the cost of authenticity.

So much for commonplace reactions to the disjunction in Jewish education. Before turning to an analysis of other possible responses, it is worth restating the ideal relationship between Judaism and Jewishness, subject-matter and environment, as expressed in general cultural terms by Clifford Geertz:

The force of a religion in supporting social values rests, then, on the ability of its symbols to formulate a world in

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., p. 282.


\textsuperscript{33} Rosenak, \textit{Teaching Jewish Values}, pp. 30-31.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., p. 32.
which those values, as well as the forces opposing their realization, are fundamental ingredients... religion, by fusing ethos and world view, gives to a set of social values what they perhaps most need to be coercive: an appearance of objectivity. In sacred rituals and myths values are portrayed not as subjective human preferences, but as the imposed conditions for life implicit in a world with a particular structure.\textsuperscript{35}

Geertz defines the essential role of religion as fusing ethos (the life of the community as actually lived) with world view (the normative, classical self-conception of a culture). The formal presentation of cultural values (in school, but also in family and public rituals) should both reinforce, and be reinforced by, the tenor of daily life suffused with those same values. The reciprocal support need not be perfect or unceasing. But there must be sufficient reciprocity to make credible the linkage between ideal values (the "ought") and daily life (the "is").

It is no accident that Geertz's examples of how this process works, when it works well, are usually drawn from pre-modern, non-Western cultures. For the essence of modernity — particularly for minority sub-cultures suspended in Western, non-traditional environments — is the breakdown in the mutual reinforcement between ethos and world view. In terms of Jewish education, that means the school is promoting a vision of reality which the students simply never see in their own lives, nor in the surrounding culture. The disjunction is like an out-of-focus movie, which students are able to tolerate for a short time, but then tune out as the meaninglessness of the enterprise becomes palpably uncomfortable. In the words of a parent in Schoem's school population:

\begin{quote}
I guess if there weren't so many pressures and directions — what with work and bills and taxes and weeds — we might sit down with books and read about Judaism. But, hell, we'd rather watch the Super Bowl.\textsuperscript{36}
\end{quote}

The Jewish Values project is one attempt to refocus Jewish education by reconnecting ethos and world view. In the next


\textsuperscript{36} Schoem, "Ethnic Survival in America," p. 61.
section, we take another look at the Jewish Values project, and at several other recent attempts at refocusing.

**Steps Toward Bridging the Gap**

Educational responses to the breakdown in the link between the secular, modern *ethos* and the Jewish world view and between the school and society have generally been of two main types: attempts at integration, and compartmentalization.

First we'll take a brief look at examples of each of these strategies. Then we'll examine the uniqueness of the Jewish Values curriculum approach.

**Integration**

Although adapting Jewish life to secular, Western life-styles has been the strong but invisible undertow of modern Jewish life, explicit models of integration are difficult to identify. Instead, integration has been the implicit strategy of most contemporary Jewish education, in the attempt to show how Jewish life and American life are two sides of the same coin. "Values education" has been a central aspect of these attempts, since it is a denominator common to both cultural spheres. Yet, as the force of the general cultural milieu waxed, the distinctiveness of the Jewish values message waned. This process was demonstrated at the social level in Wooker's research, and educationally in Rosenak's two most common forms of curricular malaise, "Judaism as historical resource" and "Let's talk about something else."

Perhaps the most explicit attempts at integration have been the calls for curricular integration, particularly in Jewish day schools.\(^37\) The bifurcation between Jewish and secular studies is viewed as educationally and psychologically unsound, and attempts are made to "integrate" the two domains of study. Bennett Solomon\(^38\) has documented the multiple uses of the term "curriculum integration," including the telling point that it some-

---

37 See Bennett Solomon, "Curricular Integration in the Jewish All Day School in the U.S." (Ph.D. diss., Harvard Univ., 1979).

times means not only the melding of curricular materials, but indeed the fusing of American and Jewish ways of life. Solomon points out that at least part of the impetus for curricular integration in the day school, is to allay parental fears that Jewish parochial education will insulate their children from mainstream American life.

Ironically, on sociological grounds, the scales should have been tipped in the other direction. Liebman has argued that integration, both educational and social, has resulted in assimilation.39 While Jews may wish to promote both group identity and social integration, the cultural imbalance of power dictates that the latter prevails. Liebman calls for a return to compartmentalization as a survival strategy for Jewish life, not because he sees that as Judaism’s central message, but because integrative strategies abet cultural erosion, rather than retarding it.

**Compartmentalization**

A compartmentalized approach embraces the modern world, even as it regards Jewish life as “holy other,” to be kept distinctive and separate from ordinary life. Compartmentalization is both a worldview and a social strategy. Some of the great, even if partial, successes of modern Jewish education are based on the principles of compartmentalization.

Sheldon Dorph’s 1984 critique of the partial success of the Ramah camps is in line with our analysis.40 While enriched Jewish camp life did have some differential impact on teenagers, particularly as projecting an ideal Jewish life style, its implementation in Jewish life back in the city was minimal. Hopes for more substantial transfer were probably unrealistic, says Dorph, given “the discontinuity in the living pattern of the education community.”41 Ramah’s success as a youth community neutralized, to a great extent, its impact on the total Jewish community. Dorph’s prescription for change is nothing less radical than the restruc-

41 Ibid., p. 87.
turing of the adult Jewish community, rather than focusing on
children's schooling alone. His call for adult family education and
the creation of rich Jewish living contexts is not an abandonment
of compartmentalization, but a hope for expanding the dimen-
sions of the Jewish compartment.

Bernard Lipnick's book, *An Experiment that Works in Teenage
Religious Education*, came in response to the acknowledged fail-
ure of the standard three-day-a-week supplementary school to
foster positive Jewish feelings, let alone cognitive attainments.
The plan was to mold a group of sixth graders into what could be
called a *havurah*: what "Jewish life in Graceville no longer sup-
plied, they supplied for themselves." The experiment succeeded,
at least to the extent of creating "a small cohesive social enclave,
in which the student locates himself psychologically and emotion-
ally..." Indeed, much of the success is attributable to its having
been an enclave, marked off from the rest of the community. In
addition (as in Rosenak's two strains of curricular disease already
cited), Jewish content had largely, though not exclusively, been
replaced by Jewish socializing.

The form of curricular disease which Rosenak calls "Business
as Usual" is another example of compartmentalization:

> The tradition — the texts, beliefs, and practices of Judaism — are taught as though there had been no crisis in Jewish life, as though the pupils and the community accepted the authority of its norms, though they none-
theless, due to some ignorance or weakness, apparently fail to live by them... the teacher is aligned with the subject matter against the pupils and their environment, though the confrontation is not admitted.

Rosenak contends that this is a form of curricular disease, and
indeed some strains may engender boredom and acting-out a-
mong the students. But, in more benign forms, this may be
compartmentalized Jewish education at its best. While it is true
that the environment does not support what is taught, some
schools may succeed in creating an attractive alternative environ-

42 Bernard Lipnick, *An Experiment that Works in Teenage Religious Education*
43 Ibid., p. 104.
44 Chazan, "Study and Moral Action."
45 Rosenak, *Teaching Jewish Values*, p. 29.
ment, which presents an authentic form of traditional Jewish study. Since the approach is compartmentalized, there is no direct attempt to change the student's (or family's) lifestyle.

Finally, some researchers have advocated compartmentalization as the cure for what ails Jewish schools. In his study of Jewish schools, Samuel Heilman revealed their discontinuities with the larger Jewish cultural context.46 He carries the Dorph/Lipnick response one step further, by positing year-round learning enclaves: "a controlled learning environment where there is cultural continuity between the world inside of it and the one outside of it, they must have their own campus."47 Yet, since the number of parents willing to enroll their children in such residential learning environments is certainly small, this can hardly be considered an adequate response to the large-scale problem.

While integrative strategies have not met the expectations of their supporters, the partial successes of compartmentalization also have their defects. The Jewish Values curriculum offers a new strategy, what might be termed "competitive disequilibrium."

Jewish Values in Competitive Disequilibrium

Integrative strategies aim at overcoming the tension between Jewishness and Judaism by striving to create a new, unified culture. Strategies of compartmentalization abandon bridging the gap; some even deepen it. The Jewish Values curriculum conceptualizes the educational dilemma differently, responding with a benign form of Rosenak's fourth, and last, form of curricular disease, "Holy, but not for Thou."

The tradition is admitted to be normative and to demand commitment. However, the teacher presents this normative framework to his or her pupils on the assumption that they are outsiders. Torah is normative but not for them... the tradition should be known... its influence on our present-day culture should be acknowledged, and... we should consider ourselves culturally bound to — but not by — it.48

48 Rosenak, Teaching Jewish Values, p. 30.
The Jewish Values curriculum approach is, so to speak, to acknowledge the unbridgeability of the gap, while engendering an appreciation of both its sides. More correctly, it is an attempt to deepen the appreciation of the Jewish point of view, since the surrounding Western cultural tradition needs no defense. The curriculum is warily wise of its inability to change lifestyles and outlooks directly, and aware of the allergic reactions such attempts are likely to engender. Therefore, it presents Judaism undiluted, but as an elixir not for current use. The curriculum judges that the most it can hope to accomplish is to gain the intellectual respect of students (and parents), leaving open-ended whatever effect the curriculum is to have on the students' Jewishness. The curriculum does not offer a new integration of the two world views. Rather, it hopes to create a healthy tension between them, until such time as a more enriched adaptation becomes possible.

Thus, the curriculum embodies the dilemma of modern Jewish life, rather than trying to resolve it. Its writers are too modern to opt for compartmentalization. Yet, they are also committed to the compelling distinctiveness of Judaism, so they avoid attempts at integration which invariably serve up an anemic, rather than authentic, view of Judaism. To be successful in the long-term, however, the Jewish Values project must be the prelude to structured experiences which will have impact on Jewishness (e.g., family education), rather than limiting itself to refining students' understanding of the tradition, albeit a more sophisticated understanding than they are likely to encounter in other curricula. While impacting on Jewishness may be beyond the bounds of the Jewish Values project, the community should be sensitized to the limits of school-based experiences in influencing long-term Jewish identity and commitment, so that the opportunity for programming for those goals will not be lost.

In this sense, the Jewish Values project is priming the pump to change the deadlock between "is" (ethos) and "ought" (world view), by enriching the students' appreciation of the "ought." Perhaps there is little more that educators can do. The hope — though not yet the plan — is that such an enriched appreciation of Judaism will, under positive future conditions, carry over to heightened Jewish life. Let us hope that concerned leadership,
educational and communal alike, have the foresight to help make that transition possible.

**Summary and Conclusion**

Writing in 1901, a correspondent for the paper *Ha-Dor* described the disjunction between the traditional Russian *heder* and the surrounding society:

> The *heder* as we know it today poses a real threat to Judaism. Whatever a child sees and hears and learns in his *heder* is so far at variance with what he sees and hears and learns outside it that as a matter of course he will abandon tradition when he finally escapes from the moldy atmosphere of the *heder* into the light of the real world.\(^4^9\)

It is, perhaps, half-consolation that today’s Jewish schools are no worse than those of the old country. Both schools faced the dilemma of trying to communicate a classical religious tradition, in the modern, post-religious era.

I have tried to show how American Jewish schools have addressed the disjunction, at two different levels. First, they have adopted the surrounding community’s commitment to Jewish values as the central curricular message of Judaism. “Values,” as an idea responds to the community’s ambivalence about its own Jewishness, by balancing the demands of particularism and universalism, without distinctive behavioral requirements.

Second, while values are a key dimension of the content of the curriculum of the Jewish school, educational enterprises have opted for one of two overall strategies for relating to the disjunction between the secular culture in which students live most of their lives (“ethos”), and a distinctive Jewish “world view.” The dominant, though implicit, strategy has been integration, in which the two domains are portrayed as completely melded. A universalized form of Jewish values usually figures prominently in such an approach. Strategies of compartmentalization emphasize the immiscibility of the two domains, refusing to dilute what they see as an authentically distinctive Jewish approach.

Neither strategy has been totally successful; both struggle with the sobering wisdom that an educational house divided against itself cannot long endure. The Jewish Values project has raised compartmentalization to a new level of sophistication, by delivering both an authentic view of Judaism (the coercive, “ought” dimension of a world view), while at the same time showing its relevance to the students' lives (“is”). The approach remains compartmentalized because it does not undertake a translation of the “ought” into the “is.” Still, it goes as far as a school-based curriculum can, by preparing the intellectual ground for subsequent life-style changes. To realize its full educational and philosophical potential, however, the curriculum should seek an expanded sphere of influence, such as family education sessions where the support for life-style changes can be mobilized.
SHOULD WE TEACH JEWISH VALUES?

Barry Chazan

I. The Affirmation of Teaching Values in Schools

The teaching of values is popularly regarded as one of the important missions of schools. Politicians, pedagogues, and parents are accustomed to regarding schools as important agents in the transmission and promulgation of great social and personal values. The role of schools in teaching values particularly comes to the fore when there is some crisis in society — Sputnik in the 1950s, the civil rights struggle in the 1960s, drugs in the 1970s. At such moments, schools are expected to devote great time and effort to the subject of teaching values so as to correct the ill or evil in question.

There is, of course, no agreement as to what is meant by “teaching values” or how one does it. The concern for teaching values has spawned an extensive theoretical and practical literature around such questions as: What are values? Are they social or individual? Are they principles or practices? How do we teach them? Who should teach them? What materials should we use?

A range of answers has been given to these questions by such twentieth century theorists as Emile Durkheim, John Dewey, Lawrence Kohlberg, Louis Rath, Merrill Harmin, Sidney Simon, Carol Gilligan, and John Wilson and the disagreements among them are many and intense. However, they all share the belief that the activity of teaching values is in itself inherently valid and legitimate for schools.

II. The Affirmation of Teaching Values in Jewish Education

Champions of Jewish education are quick to indicate that the

---

1 For an analysis and comparison of several of the major twentieth century schools of moral education, see Barry Chazan, Contemporary Approaches to Moral Education (New York: Teachers College Press, 1987).
concern for teaching values has been a legacy and linchpin of Jewish education throughout the ages. They point to numerous examples in Jewish tradition — from the education credo in the Shema to Rabbi Israel Selenter’s comprehensive approach to teaching morality — as verification of the preoccupation of Jewish education with the subject.

The traditional Jewish concern for moral education also extends into contemporary Jewish education:

— The Reform movement in the United States has been producing texts and educational materials about teaching values since the 1940s.3

— The establishment of the Melton Research Center in the 1960s by the Conservative movement’s Jewish Theological Seminary was closely linked to the concern for values education.4

— In the 1960s the Torah U’Mesorah movement developed a project in teaching Jewish values called the Fryer Middos Curriculum.5

— In the 1970s several Jewish educators and communal workers began to experiment successfully with the application of the values clarification approach to Jewish education.6

— In the early 1980s the Hebrew University’s Melton for Jewish Education in the Diaspora launched a major high school program in teaching Jewish values.7

During the past decade we have witnessed several attempts to apply Lawrence Kohlberg’s cognitive-developmental theory and

---

2 Michael Rosenak, Teaching Jewish Values (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora, 1986).

3 One of the classic texts of this genre is Helen Fine, At Camp Kee Tov (New York: UAHC, 1961).

4 A Program for Jewish Education (New York: Melton Research Center, 1983).

5 The Fryer Middos Curriculum (New York: Torah U’Mesorah).


7 The conceptual framework of the project is spelled out in Rosenak, Teaching Jewish Values.
pedagogy of moral education to Jewish education. Finally, over the past three decades there have been a plethora of doctorates, articles, and conferences focusing on the subject of teaching values and Jewish education. Thus, both traditional and contemporary Jewish education join the general education tradition in loudly and definitively affirming the central responsibility and role that schools should play in teaching values.

Against Teaching Values in Schools

There is another voice on this subject. It is a rather quiet, albeit persistent, voice which raises doubts about the entire enterprise of teaching values in schools. Advocates of this approach suggest, for various reasons, that the activity of teaching values is neither a legitimate nor valid activity for schools, and therefore should be avoided at all costs.

This approach is not the brainchild of malevolent or machiavellian rogues; it is a thoughtful theory advocated over many centuries by a small but impressive collection of well-meaning and highly committed individuals. Members of this group include such figures as the Russian writer Leo Tolstoy, the Spanish anarchist Francisco Ferrer, the American utopian Robert Owen, the Latin American reformist Paulo Friere and the Israeli writer S. Yizhar.

These various skeptics share doubts as to the place of moral education in schools; however they present widely divergent reasons for their reservations. In fact, there is a rich continuum of arguments that have been presented against the enterprise of teaching values in schools.

In this paper, I should like to turn to the "skeptics" to help us wrestle with the question as to whether we should teach values in Jewish schools. Specifically, I propose to do the following:

---


9 These efforts are summarized in the first chapter of Friedman, "Comparison of Moral Reasoning."

10 I call this group of theories "the anti-moral educationalists." Chazan, "Against Moral Education" in Contemporary Approaches.
1. To examine several of the prominent arguments against teaching values in schools.

2. To utilize these arguments in attempting to determine whether or not we should teach values in Jewish schools.

3. To present an alternative to teaching Jewish values in Jewish schools.

An Ideological Caveat

The possibility that we should not teach Jewish values in Jewish schools may sound like a heresy. In raising this question I am motivated neither by maliciousness or nihilism. Rather, I am inspired by many of the great "anti-moral educationalists" who were people who fervently loved values and children. Some of the skeptics were motivated to question the essence of the activity because of their commitment to the philosophical principles of doubt and questioning. Others were motivated to raise the (unthinkable) question because they loved children so much they wanted to make sure that they would not be misused or manipulated by adults.

I would like to believe that well-intentioned questioning is inherent in the great tradition which underlies Jewish education and that, if done "for the sake of Heaven," to question the assumed is often a virtue rather than a vice. Hence, to ask whether we should teach values should be seen in the context of the love of values and children rather than as their denial. It is part of the philosophical, human, and Jewish quest for basic principles and beliefs.

Three Categories of Reservations about Teaching Values

The many arguments against teaching values can be organized according to the following categories:

— Philosophical
— Sociological
— Educational
Philosophical Reservations

Philosophical reservations about teaching values focus on theoretical and logical arguments against teaching values in schools. There are two main philosophical reservations:

1. The Epistemological Reservation.
2. The Manipulative Reservation.

The Epistemological Reservation

The epistemological reservation about teaching values says that we do not definitively know which values are true or not, and education should only teach what we know to be true.\(^\text{11}\) According to this position, while values are very important, they are not truths of the same order as facts in chemistry, physics, or even history. Therefore, it is precarious and even immoral for a Jewish school to teach that a child should keep kosher, observe Shabbat or believe in God if we do not definitively know whether these things are true or not. Schools and teachers can influence children greatly—if Miss Cohen tells her preschool class that Jews believe in the world to come, little Adam takes her words very seriously. Whether there is a world to come or not is just not clear; thus to teach values in Jewish schools is to tamper with children’s minds and to transmit speculative things as conclusive. Such an activity is out of bounds according to the epistemological argument, not because it may not succeed, but precisely because it might. It is a great immorality, says this argument, to impose half-, non-, or unknown truths on children.

The Manipulative Reservation

Throughout the history of education, there has been a voice which has regarded any form of intentional manipulation of young people as anti-educational. According to this approach, education should be about helping people grow, choose, and decide, and any attempt to manipulate or control their choices is indoctrination.

and not education.\textsuperscript{12} Indoctrination is the attempt to control the beliefs of others in certain particularly sensitive belief areas, s.g. religion, morals, and politics, whereas education is the concern with helping young people grow and preparing them to make their own decisions. The manipulative reservation about teaching values suggests that the teaching of values is not about ‘teaching’ in the sense of transmitting knowledge or stimulating reflection, but rather an attempt to control the minds and fix the behaviors of our charges. Teaching Jewish values, according to this argument, really means inculcating or imposing values. These critics are not opposed to values; on the contrary, many of them believe that a life of value is the kind of life we should live; however, they suggest that the teaching of Jewish values is objectionable when it becomes the attempt by certain adults to determine children’s values.

Some critics claim that Jewish education is particularly susceptible to this corruption, and they suggest that many rabbis, Hebrew school teachers and Israeli \textit{shlichim} are really concerned with manipulating their charges’ lifestyles rather than with helping them to chart their own course.

\textbf{The Sociological Reservation}

Sociological reservations are rooted in the view that the realities of contemporary Jewry and contemporary Jewish education militate against any serious investment in teaching values in Jewish schools. These reservations encompass:

1. The Pluralistic Reservation.
2. The Ownership Reservation.
3. The Structural Reservation.

\textit{The Pluralistic Reservation}

The pluralistic reservation says that the most striking charac-

\textsuperscript{12} This approach is most clearly represented by R.M. Hare, “Adolescents into Adults,” in \textit{Aims in Education}; For a comprehensive discussion of the concept ‘indoctrination,’ see I. Snook, \textit{Indoctrination and Education} (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).
teristic of the Jewish people today is the fact that if there are two Jews in a city they build three synagogues — one they go to, one they don't, and one for the split-off congregation that is sure to develop. The Jewish people today is a collection of subgroups, subideologies and different points of view. There are Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, Israeli, Diaspora, Ashkenazic, Sephardic, egalitarian, feminist, traditional, neo-Orthodox, left-wing Conservative, right-wing Conservative, haredi, haredi-Zionist, haredi-anti-Zionist Jews — and I know I have insulted many people by not including them in my list. Every book on Jewish sociology begins and ends by telling us that the most prominent characteristic of contemporary Jewry is its pluralism.

What values does one teach in a pluralistic Jewish world? Do we teach that Jews keep kosher? Most don't. Should we teach that Jews are people who live in Israel? Most don't and don't intend to. Should we teach that Jews believe in God? What do we do about Ben-Gurion and Golda Meir and many more like them? The pluralism of the Jewish people and of Judaism today almost completely paralyzes us from making any cogent generalizations about contemporary Jewish values, and it often leads to such weird situations as that described several years ago by David Schoem, where, in many Hebrew schools, we find non-religious Israelis preaching in broken English to non-observant Conservative children in suburban American communities that Jews are people who keep kosher and don't ride on Shabbat!¹³ There seem to be few or no values that we can call "Jewish values" in the sense that they are held by most Jews or even by most views of Judaism. Indeed, there may be no such thing today as "the Jew" or "Judaism" or "Jewish values" with capital J's.

If this is so, we have three choices:

1. Don't teach Jewish values.
2. Continue to look for some basic common values.
3. Teach the values of your specific denominational group (Orthodox, Conservative, Zionist, etc.).

Option 1 upsets us because we are educators who care very much about teaching values. Option 2 leads to a fairly pareve and nondescript kind of Jewish education. Option 3 leads to the

rampant denominationalism which threatens to rip us apart from within.

The Ownership Reservation

The issue of teaching values was, in many ways, clear in traditional Jewish and non-Jewish education. There were a set of contents or values whose authorship was known and accepted, and these values were regarded as true and binding (truer than physics or chemistry). The explication of these values was in the hands of learned or inspired people (rabbis, teachers, priests, gurus) who by the dint of their knowledge had the authority or position to teach. In former times, the ownership of values education was clearly centralized and ensconced in the hands, cloaks, and mantles of specially endowed or trained religious teachers who were the keepers of the faith.

Today Jewish education is in the hands of a "board" — of the synagogue, the federation, the bureau of Jewish education or the day school. Indeed, the two most prominent characteristics of the implementation of Jewish education today are:

1. It is local and non-centralized.

2. It is owned by either the clients or the non-professional leaders of the community.

On the whole, Jewish education professionals are the employees of boards who have the power to determine policy, content, and even methods. This structure of voluntary lay ownership is one of the hallmarks of contemporary Jewry and it is an impressive achievement. It has produced remarkable examples of involvement and commitment, and offers the possibility of a genuine democratization in Jewish life.

The price paid for lay ownership is that the teaching of Jewish values — like many other Jewish contents — is potentially in the hands of the good-willed, but unfortunately often ignorant lay Jewish world. If the board wants school to be two days a week, it will be two days a week; if they say six, it will be six. If they want to throw out Hebrew, out it goes (if the principal objects, out he or she goes). The commercial for Hebrew National hot dogs which says that Jews are responsible to a higher authority is not the
case with Jewish education today, because the higher authority is the lay committee.

Whereas the epistemological reservation about teaching Jewish values says that we do not know what values are true, and the pluralistic reservation says that there are too many Jewish values to choose from, the ownership reservation says that we have lost all authentic authority to determine what values to teach.

The Structural Reservation

The structural reservation says that whether there are or are not agreed-upon, true, or legitimate Jewish values doesn’t matter; there is no practical possibility of engaging in this activity within the constraints of contemporary Jewish schools. This argument says that the structure of Jewish schools today does not provide the opportunity for any possibility of success in teaching Jewish values. We do not have the right teachers, enough time, or enough years to teach values in Jewish education, so it’s better not to start. According to this position, teaching values requires:

— time,
— supportive parents,
— a social environment that reinforces the values,
— teachers who believe in the values.

None of these conditions exist in Jewish education. Hence, many critics of this camp echo Carl Bereiter’s belief that perhaps the best we can do in schools is either teach some basic skills or do some good babysitting.¹⁴ This position draws much strength from research in general education which points to the futility of good-willed ventures in education that have no chance of succeeding. Maybe we should set our goals lower and focus on creating wonderful and warm Jewish settings which would teach some basic Jewish skills and make children happy to be Jewish rather than reaching for unattainable objectives.

Educational Reservations

The third category of reservations says that the enterprise of teaching values is precarious because of the realities of schools, teachers and classrooms. There are three reservations in this category:

1. The Developmental Reservation.
2. The Instructional Reservation.
3. The Evaluative Reservation.

The Developmental Reservation

This reservation is rooted in contemporary developmental approaches to personality which suggest that identity, character, and self are formed by a gradual and lengthy process which takes many years and which may never be fully completed. Kohlberg talks about six stages of morality, Erikson talks about eight ages of identity and values clarification describes seven dimensions of the valuing person. Moral development, according the these approaches, does not follow the input-output model of business in which a variable is introduced into some prior condition, and observable change is then recorded. Personality development is a much more gradual and non-determined process which evolves over time and place.

One of the most striking characteristics of Jewish education is the little time we have for it; for over 80% of Jewish children, formal Jewish education is delimited by the years of eight to thirteen at the most. During the critical period of adolescence, the majority of young Jews do not receive any formal Jewish education. What all this means is that there is essentially no possibility of engaging in a developmental approach to Jewish values education, whereas psychologically, the only kind of educational approach that matters in the sphere of teaching values is the developmental. We simply do not have access to the developmental span needed to attain any significant achievement in Jewish moral education, and if we have limited resources we had better invest in attainable educational tasks.
The Instructional Reservation

Most of the major contemporary theories of moral education emphasize the centrality of the teacher to the process of moral education. Values clarification sees the teacher as a critical catalyst; Kohlberg's teacher should be a philosopher-king; Wilson's teacher is a kingless philosopher; and for Noddings the teacher models caring. In each of these cases, the teacher (rather than curriculum or setting) is ultimately the central resource in the process of moral education, and without appropriate teachers it is extremely difficult to talk about doing moral education.

Much of the preoccupation of Jewish education in recent years has been with the crisis of the profession of Jewish teacher. The Jewish world has expressed increasing reservations about the level of Jewish knowledge and commitment of the classroom teachers who are teaching its young; while the level of pedagogic skill of teachers in Jewish schools may be on the rise, research and experience leave us with the uncomfortable feeling that the number of teachers who have Jewish knowledge and embody Jewish values is on the wane.

Teaching Jewish values requires sophisticated pedagogic skills and deep Jewish commitments, say these friendly critics, and we simply do not have the staff to do this job at the moment. Maybe some day we might be able to develop such a staff, but at the moment one should not have the hubris to believe that we can do serious Jewish education with the staff that we have. Thus, once again, perhaps we have to reorganize our thinking, and plan to confront some of the many other tasks in Jewish education which can be handled with the forces we have.

The Evaluative Reservation

Let us say there is agreement on what Jewish values are, on the legitimacy of teaching them to children, and on how to do it; in such a case, are there any more possible reservations one might have about doing it? A last group of straggling critics comes along and says: Yes, we still think that the enterprise of teaching values

in Jewish schools is futile, because years of experience and research in Jewish and general education show that it just doesn't work. From Hartehorne and May to Coleman and Jenckes, the critics suggest that we have seen that schools have little effect on students' values. Schools have proven themselves effective in such areas as the transmittal of knowledge, skills, and some social behaviors, and sometimes they have also proven to be effective conduits for socio-economic advancement. However, according to these critics, we simply don't have much proof that they succeed in values development. The operative conclusion once again is that schools should invest in what they do well and refrain from things that they seem to be less good at.

The Reservations Taken Together

We see that there are three main categories of reservations about the enterprise of teaching Jewish values: philosophical, sociological and pedagogical. The philosophic reservations are rooted in epistemological questions about the nature of knowledge and truth and axiological questions about imposition and manipulation of the minds of others. The thrust of these reservations is that teaching certain kinds of "subjects," e.g. values, is precarious and questionable because these spheres of human life ultimately belong to the individual's own choice and should not be dominated from without.

The sociological reservations revolve around the pluralistic and heterogeneous nature of the Jewish people today. This diversity is positive in that it presents many options for being Jewish and also invites a great sense of participation and ownership by all sorts of Jews in Jewish life; it is a very accessible and anti-elitist kind of Judaism. At the same time, the diversity of Judaism is very problematic for teaching Jewish values because it either invites sectarianism and denominationalism (all you can teach are the values that your specific group holds) or a paralysis from effectively doing Jewish values education (because beyond horror at the Holocaust and amazement at the creation of Israel there are very few things most Jews hold in common). Thus, the sociological criticism implies that we really cannot teach Jewish values today; instead what we can and should do is to create sociological Jews.
The third body of reservations is rooted in the educational complexities of actually teaching values, and it suggests that contemporary Jewish education simply does not have the minimal resources necessary to engage in this activity. The problem is neither philosophical or sociological; we know what to teach and we can deal with diversity; we simply don't have the teachers, the time, and the resources to do the job that needs to be done.

All of the reservations about the teaching of Jewish values that have been discussed are not a denial of the importance of Jewish education. There are many other tasks of Jewish education which can and should be engaged in, according to the reservationists, such as:

- Jewish skills training;
- the development of Jewish literacy;
- the experiencing of pleasant Jewish feelings and events;
- the meeting of exciting Jewish role models;
- the study of traditional Jewish approaches to value issues;
- the collective celebrating of Jewish moments and life-cycle experiences.

Thus, one can be critical about the possibility of teaching Jewish values in schools without negating either the importance of values in Jewish life or the value of Jewish education.

**Should We Attempt to Teach Values?**

In light of the many reservations we have just discussed, let us return to our original question. Should we teach Jewish values in contemporary Jewish schools? There now seem to be three possible answers to this question:

1. For all sorts of philosophical, sociological and educational reasons, teaching Jewish values is not really a desirable or viable part of Jewish education today, and all things being considered, we would be better off not engaging in it.

2. We should teach values in Jewish schools since all of the arguments raised against the activity can be answered and rebutted.

3. Teaching Jewish values is a very complicated activity for philosophical, sociological, and educational reasons, and if
you are interested in engaging in it, be aware of several pitfalls and problems.

I believe the third answer is the correct one.

The first answer correctly argues that there are some hefty arguments against teaching values, but arguments against something need not imply its rejection. Indeed, the first answer seems to me too quickly to capitulate to the naturalistic fallacy, and in doing so too facilely to reject the values teaching enterprise.

The second answer is too simplistic and casual about the philosophical, sociological and educational critiques which cannot be easily or definitely answered. If the first answer is too quick to reject, the second answer is too quick to accept.

The third answer affirms teaching values as a part of Jewish education — but it says that it is a much more serious and complicated activity than is often assumed. Consequently, if we are going to attempt to engage in the teaching of values, we must do so with some basic conceptual and educational pre-conditions; otherwise, we might be better off not engaging in the activity. Indeed, there is merit to the claim that if there are not enough necessary conditions for engaging in teaching Jewish values, which would offer some reasonable promise of success, we might better invest our efforts in other important areas of Jewish education.

What are those basic necessary conditions? In the final section of this paper, I shall describe six criteria which I would suggest are minimal and necessary for doing values education in contemporary Jewish schools.

**Toward a Theory of Teaching Jewish Values**

1. **The Text**

While Judaism has meant many things throughout history, it has unequivocally been related to a lengthy, rich, and diverse oral and written legacy; i.e., it is a culture or civilization which has created a rich literary heritage of texts, sources, books and primary documents. Teaching Jewish values in Jewish education should be very much related to the confrontation with and exegesis of these primary documents. The very act of the study of the docu-
ment is a moral act and an exercise in Jewish character education,\textsuperscript{16} and therefore text study is one of the cornerstones of a Jewish approach to teaching values.

This obviates the need for us to create hypothetical moral dilemmas; the Tanach is a fascinating and adequately contemporary resource for such situations. We are not really in need of more secondary and tertiary books which distill "the great values of Judaism" from admittedly difficult primary sources into easy-to-read, big-print coffee table volumes. We must, as Barry Holtz has suggested, go back to the sources. This task is not easy, and there is room for creative curricular work to facilitate the process.

While it is true that texts do not carry the same weight for all Jews (for the very traditional community the texts are divine in origin; for the liberal community they are great human religious documents; for the secular community they are great national texts), they do play a role in the experience of most Jews throughout the ages. Even if all Jews have not known the texts, the many diverse notions of Judaism (with some exceptions) have regarded our great texts as a critical dimension of the Jewish experience. Thus, in the approach that is herein being suggested, the texts become a unifying rather than divisive force in the contemporary Jewish world. Text becomes a common legacy and common subject of study for all Jews.

2. "A Bag of Virtues"

Several of the major twentieth century schools of moral education have taken strong stands against the notion of imposing a fixed set of moral behaviors (a "bag of virtues") on children. These critics raise some very important points about the nature of the "bag of virtues" and the problems of imposition; however, I do not think that we can deny the fact that the notion of "Judaism" as an "ism" — a worldview or a life perspective — has over time and place implied a corpus of virtues or values that have been regarded as indispensable to being Jewish. There has been disagreement in past and present as to the content which is definitive: the Zionists say it encompasses living in Israel and speaking Hebrew;

\textsuperscript{16} Elliot Dorff, "Because Study Leads to Action: The Use of Text Study to Teach Morality," \textit{Religious Education}, vol. 75 (March/April 1980), pp. 171-192.
the Reform say that it is spirituality and morality; the Orthodox say it is halakhah. It seems to me that all of the various "Judaisms" that exist (with the possible exception of sociological Judaism) say that Judaism involves some "bag of virtues." Part of the task of teaching Jewish values is to identify the most basic and agreed upon virtues — e.g. study; Klal Yisrael; Breiz Yisrael — and to make them linchpins of our values education. In teaching Jewish values we should be interested both in developing a reflective valuing process in the young, as well as in confronting them with some values that seem to be central to the Jewish experience. Thus, a second minimal dimension of teaching Jewish values is a value content or "bag of virtues."

3. The Learner

The phrase "teaching Jewish values" is linguistically incomplete; its full form is "teaching x to y" where "x" equals Jewish values and "y" equals the name of some child (Shai, Tali, Danny). The child is a central actor/actress in the drama of Jewish values, and any approach to teaching values must treat the learner with dignity and seriousness. Too much of teaching Jewish values has been rooted in great love for Judaism and Jewish values, and much less passion and affection for children. If you do not believe that children are active and dynamic forces in their own values education, then, however knowledgeable or pious you may be, you are not really equipped to teach Jewish values. Believing in Jewish values is not an adequate condition for teaching them; you must also believe in children.

4. The Dialectic

Perhaps the most prominent tool of the teacher of Jewish values is the question and/or the dialectic. Ultimately, the teaching of values is about raising the question, not giving the answer, and as we have learned from generations of great pedagogues — Hillel, Socrates, Akiba, Rashi, St. Augustine, Heschel — the skill of questioning and of building dialogue is probably the critical pedagogic skill that needs to be learned in this sphere. The question has at least four functions in teaching values:
It introduces relevant issues;
— It stimulates styles of reflective valuing processes;
— It links one to a valuing tradition and community;
— It summarizes and gives a sense of order to the confused world of values.

To learn how to question and how to facilitate good value discussion is the fourth minimal condition for teaching Jewish values.

5. The Teacher

Much of what we have said so far points to the need for a very special kind of teacher for the enterprise of teaching Jewish values. This is not an area that can be taught by anyone, and it might be that many of today’s Jewish educators are well-equipped for some tasks — but not for teaching Jewish values.

What are the necessary qualities of the teachers of Jewish values? That is for another very lengthy paper, but briefly I would cite four traits which I believe should characterize such a person:

1. He or she must have access to the Jewish sources.

2. He or she must believe in and live some form of a Jewish value life (needless to say the number of mitzvot a person performs is only one form of Jewish value life).

3. He or she should exemplify the process of being a valuing person and should be concerned with developing this process in the young.

4. He or she must both love and like children and not regard them as animals to be tamed, babies to be sat for, or passive clay to be formed. He or she must see them in Amichai’s terms “as something else” — as unique beings upon whom “God has had great mercy.”

6. The Value Community

Jewish values education cannot take place in a vacuum; it is not something that happens only in the classroom. The school, the

synagogue, the Jewish community center, the federation and the entire community should be "kehilot kodesh" — holy communities — which live by and reflect Jewish values. It is very clear from much educational theory and many years of educational practice that the attempt to teach Jewish values in the classroom will be trite and worthless if the Jewish community of which we are part is not prepared to be a living embodiment of the virtues that we propose to teach.

Conclusion

The subject of teaching values has had a renaissance in general education in the second half of the twentieth century. Jewish education has traditionally been greatly concerned with this area, and there have been some reaffirmations of that emphasis in contemporary Jewish education. With all the good will that may exist towards the subject, there are some serious philosophical, sociological and educational doubts about its viability. Jewish education should only get involved with this area if it can guarantee a set of critical minimal conditions; otherwise, all the good will in the world will not help.

For much of the twentieth century the Jewish people has been preoccupied with a horrendous and heroic struggle for survival; this is a battle which has demanded great effort, resulted in great loss, and been won at great expense. It is time to turn our attention to another — and no less important — battle: the struggle to be a "mamlechet kohanim and goy hadosh" — a people that lives by values and proposes to teach them to its young.
THE CHILD'S UNDERSTANDING OF
THE AGGADIC LITERATURE

Howard Deitcher

Professor Nechama Leibovitz often tells an amusing anecdote about her education work in the Israeli Army. She recalls asking a group of lieutenants to open their Bibles and locate the story in which Abraham smashes his father's idols. The soldiers feverishly leafed through the Book of Genesis, eager to show their renowned teacher their extensive knowledge of Scripture. They became increasingly frustrated as they failed to find the story that they remembered so vividly from their early education.

Finally, one soldier looked bewilderedly at Professor Leibovitz, and asked her if the Bible they were currently using was the same edition as the one they had studied at school.

This intriguing account raises three fundamental questions which strike at the very core of teaching Bible in the Jewish elementary school.

— Why did the adult soldiers believe that the midrashic tale of Abraham smashing his father's idols could actually be found in the biblical text itself?
— What implications does this hold for teaching the Bible in elementary schools?
— What other models are available for teaching these midrashic stories which might alleviate some of the confusion which surfaced in the above anecdote?

In this paper, we shall address these questions by focusing on the issue of using aggadic literature as an educational tool, by outlining some of the goals inherent in teaching this material, and finally, by presenting an approach that will maximize the impact of this material within the elementary school curriculum. In formulating our approach, we will examine social, developmental and educational theories which help us better understand this subject.
The Aggadic Literature

Originally, the *aggadot* were told to the people during the public homily which was linked to the reading of the Scriptures in the Synagogue. In that sense, the *aggadot* were intended to address themselves to a wide audience, including simple folk and children, who could not formulate exegetical questions in an abstract or theoretical way. In order to best meet the needs of this heterogeneous population, the Rabbis decided to present their ideas in a narrative format, including many parables which would be most clearly appreciated by those assembled. This conscious attempt to popularize the *aggadah* among the masses was successful and served to endear the Biblical message to the people. The masters of *aggadah* attracted large audiences as “they drew the hearts of men like water.” The Talmud records that Rabbi Abahu and Rabbi Chiya bar Abba once came to a place where R. Abahu expounded *aggadah* and R. Chiya bar Abba expounded legal lore.

All the people left R. Chiya bar Abba and went to hear R. Abahu expound *aggadah*, so that the former became very upset. R. Abahu then said to him: I will give you a parable. To what can it be compared? To two men, one of whom was selling precious stones and the other various kinds of small ware. To whom will the people hurry? Is it not to the seller of various kinds of small ware?

It is clear that R. Abahu attempted to console his colleague by belittling the importance of *aggadah*; but the fact remains that the master of the *aggadah* drew the larger audiences. Bialik portrayed the contrast between the two worlds of *halachah* and *aggadah* in the following way: “(To the average person) *halachah* wears an angry frown; *aggadah* a broad smile. The former is quick, tempered, stern, hard as iron — the attribute of justice; the latter is generous, easy going, smoother than oil — the attribute

---

2 *Chagiga* 14a.
3 *Sotah* 40a.
of mercy.” In formulating the *aggadot*, the Sages were attempting to “impart moral and religious instruction, to teach us how to live, rather than to supply dry factual information of a geographical or genealogical nature, for example. Indeed they express surprise at verses which seem to supply merely historical information.”

A. A. Halevy suggests that the *aggadot* instruct through two levels of meaning, one overt and the other covert. The overt level deals openly with the simple meaning of the biblical text and the understanding of the larger issues in the biblical narrative, while the covert explores in a more intricate way larger contemporary questions which could be traced to the biblical text. The Aggadists took full advantage of the covert form of interpretation in order to address problems that the members of their generation were struggling with. As an example of this form, the rabbis discuss Noah’s coming out of the ark, but the discussion implicitly presents differing attitudes toward the liberation of Israel from foreign oppression: “Noah said: Just as I entered the Ark only with permission [from God] so I will not come out except with permission. R. Judah bar Ilai said: If I had been there I would have broken it [the ark] and come out.” It is clear that the homilists employed this covert form of understanding to extrapolate and preach to the masses on critical issues of the day.

---

4 Julius Siegel, *trans.*, *To the Aggadah* (Hebrew), (New York: Block Publishers, 1934).
6 A.A. Halevy, *Sha’arei Ha’aggadah* (Tel Aviv: Dvir Publishers, 1982), p. 10; See also Daniel Boyarin, *Intertextuality and Reading of Midrash* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), chapter 1, for a more detailed comparison of these two approaches.
7 For a more exclusive discussion of this point, see Heinemann, “The Nature of the Aggadah,” p. 49.
8 *Genesis Rabbah* 34:4.
The Aggadah as Story-Form

One of the unique features of the aggadic literature that we are discussing is its storylike structure. The aggadot that we are describing are framed in a story form that "can fix the affective meaning of the events that compose it....The story blends the disparate events that compose it into a unit of some kind; then stories fix meaning in some way; and the kind of meaning they fix, which is in turn to some degree definitional of stories, is 'affective.'"\textsuperscript{10}

The notion of storytelling and its potential educational impact has been greatly researched and documented, with a special emphasis on its benefit for the development of young children.\textsuperscript{11} Egan has correctly argued: "We are a storytelling animal; we make sense of things commonly in story form; ours is a largely story-shaped world."\textsuperscript{12} Perkins has shown how story-forms allow students to grow and mature in a most effective way. "Students are able to identify themselves with people, events, and ideas beyond face-to-face contacts; and eventually to show concern for problems larger than those they can solve at first hand."\textsuperscript{13}

At this stage, we will investigate some of the unique features of the story-form and proceed to show how the aggadic literature can best be used to achieve certain key goals in Bible education. In discussing the unique appeal of stories to young children, Kieran Egan has outlined four key components of a story-form that are critical for a child's understanding.\textsuperscript{14} These include: story rhythms, binary opposites, affective meaning, and metaphors and analogs. The first component, story rhythms, refers to the fact that a story is a linguistic unit that introduces boundaries

\textsuperscript{12} Egan, \textit{Primary Understanding}, pp. 96-97.
into its format. Within the story, as within a game, the world is limited and the events can be more easily grasped.

In this sense, the Midrash will oftentimes clarify the boundaries of the biblical story. The *aggadah* will clarify, embellish, or elaborate on the biblical story, in a way that will make the story rhythm more clearly defined and comprehensible.  

The second characteristic of this form is that it is the concept of binary opposites. In Egan’s scheme, the romantic stage is the development of rationality and imagination; and takes root during the ages of eight - fifteen. At the beginning of this stage, the child is aware of the notion of opposition, or lexical conflict. The early romantic stage child is familiar with quite a few specific oppositions, and learns more about the concept of binary opposites through exposure and struggle with mediating concepts. Egan’s example refers to the child’s familiarity with the concepts of hot and cold. The eight-year-old child is ready and curious to explore the concepts of cool and warm. The story form will provide this opportunity in a host of different ways. In the aggadic material, one of the most common manifestations of this principle is the examination of the biblical figures.

One of the unique qualities of the Midrash is that it brings the plights and difficulties of the biblical heroes closer to the life of the reader. It drastically cuts the distance between the reader and the life of the Bible. It succeeds in helping the learner better find his place in this world, and in showing the relevance of these biblical experiences to the life of modern man. The Midrash adds a new dimension to our understanding of the text because it fills in some of the gaps which the text omits. It provides us with more details; it more carefully analyzes the characters and their behavior; and it responds to some of the literary ambiguities in a creative and refreshing way.  

The use of *aggadah* is one of the means which enables the child to gain a greater sense of how Jews throughout history found or sought answers to the existential questions facing them. The

Midrash seeks to enrich our understanding of the biblical figures in the following ways:

— It adds to our knowledge of a particular personality. 18
— It sometimes correlates the identities of different biblical figures. 19
— It cites certain common traits and describes events that often happen to parents and children. 20

Each of these items also serves to broaden our knowledge and helps us draw parallels between different periods of Jewish history that show the organic nature of its development. One of the critical features characterizing the aggadic literature is the clear focus on the human characters and their human traits. The biblical characters become much fuller and richer, and more rounded through the aggadot that are recorded about them. 21 The aggadah provides us with glimpses into the thoughts, feelings, and desires of the biblical characters through the following textual descriptions: actions, speech, appearance, the comments of others, and the author's comments. The aggadah is replete with examples which highlight both the accomplishments and the shortcomings of these figures. In this sense, it highlights and refines the concept of logical conflicts by enabling the student to see and appreciate the complex nature of human behavior.

It is clear that the aggadic literature oftentimes triggers a discussion of this type. As Nechama Leibovitz has written:

It is commonly believed, and especially in those circles that are not familiar with our classical biblical commentaries...that these [commentators] attempt to justify the actions of our forefathers and their deeds, that they

18 For instance, Potipher's wife's personality becomes fully embellished in the Midrash. This description is totally absent in the Biblical text. See Tanhuma on Genesis 39:7 and Midrash HaGadot on Genesis 39:14.
19 For instance, Ketura as referring to Hagar (Genesis Rabbah 61:4) or the children of Korach referred to in the Book of Psalms as the descendants of Korach son of Yitshar (Midrash Tehilim 44:1). See Yitschak Heinemann, Darkei HaAgadah (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1970), for a thorough discussion of this point.
20 For instance, the same attitude of quiet complacency which Rachel displayed, according to the Midrash, when Laban gave her sister away, is also shown by her descendants Benjamin, Shaul and Esther (Esther Rabbah 6:12).
attempt to rationalize the [forefathers'] actions at any cost. And there is no greater mistake [that can be made]. Beginning with the rabbinic midrashim, and especially in them, and until the end of the Middle Ages, we find great liberty taken in criticizing [the actions of] the biblical characters, and these [characters] include the greatest and most revered leaders of our nation. All their actions are scrupulously reviewed.22

In discussing the idea of etory characters, perhaps the strongest tools available to the young child for making sense of things are in the affective and moral realm. "Children grasp the world...by means of such concepts as good and bad, and all the variants of these, with joy, sorrow and anger, with love and hate, with fear and security, and so on."23 By portraying the characters in their full and most developed sense, the aggadah shows how the whole self is composed of a panoply of traits and how these pieces reflect a true and realistic picture of human development. This is part of the unique appeal that the aggadic literature extends to the young reader. It provides him with an opportunity to explore the complexities of human nature, and the contradictions of human behavior that are an intricate part of life.

We endorse Luken's comments:

We often have the superior notion that children are too immature to recognize what makes a whole human being, or to see how people can be one thing at one time, and become something else with the passage of time or events. Also, we falsely assume that children have neither experience nor the training to relate to fictional people and their differences....Children can catch many of human nature's subtleties. They care about human beings, are sensitive to them, and can know them.24

The aggadic portrayal of the biblical figures compels the active reader to engage in the process of understanding their actions and behaviors. It adds flavor and detail to the binary opposites in the biblical text. Thus, when the young student studies the story

about Joseph and his brothers, he doesn’t get a full picture from the biblical text of what triggered the great sense of hate and resentment that the brothers felt towards Joseph. On the other hand, the Midrash fills in the ‘gaps’ with the following account:

In spite of his scholarship there was something boyish about Joseph. He painted his eyes, dressed his hair carefully, and walked with a mincing step. These foibles of youth were not so deplorable as his habit of bringing evil reports of his brethren to his father. He accused them of treating the beasts under their care with cruelty — he said that they ate flesh torn from a living animal — and he charged them with casting their eyes upon the daughters of the Canaanites, and giving contemptuous treatment to the sons of the handmaids Bilhah and Zilpah, whom they called slaves. For these groundless accusations Joseph had to pay dearly. He was himself sold as a slave, because he had charged his brethren with having called the sons of the handmaids slaves, and Potiphar’s wife cast her eyes upon Joseph, because he threw the suspicion upon his brethren that they had cast their eyes upon the Canaanite women. And how little it was true that they were guilty of cruelty to animals, appears from the fact that at the very time when they were contemplating their crime against Joseph, they yet observed all the rules and prescriptions of the ritual in slaughtering the kid of the goats with the blood of which they besmeared his coat of many colors.26

From this portrayal, we gain a fuller and more rounded description of the relationship between Joseph and his brothers. We invite the youngster to engage in a study about why the brothers felt so bitter toward their younger sibling. The Midrash provides us with a critical understanding of Joseph’s behavior and offers a more complex picture of the biblical story. We have refined the student’s ability to distinguish between the binary opposites of good and bad. We have helped him acquire a more realistic and colorful understanding of human behavior.

The third characteristic of the story form is entitled affective meaning. Egan posits “that stories explore affect and feelings in the character portrayals. They generally grant the reader ‘the

25 Genesis Rabbah 84:7.
satisfaction of being sure how to feel about events and characters.' This attraction and its satisfaction seem to be felt keenly by children.\textsuperscript{26} This is accomplished through several avenues. By putting events together in stories we generate particular causal schemes. This in turn shows us certain types of patterns and rules, which may prove helpful to the youngster in understanding certain affective reactions.

Another means for reaching this end is through an examination of motives: what allowed the particular character to act in a certain way, to experience a certain feeling? Damon has documented how eight-year-old children understand intentionality. The child is keenly interested in exploring "reasoning in action," what motivates certain story characters to behave in a certain way. Damon shows how this is a crucial stage for the youngster's affective maturation, and can best be learned through stories.\textsuperscript{27}

The aggadic literature probes the motives and intentions of the biblical characters in a host of different ways. The Rabbis analyzed the actions, thoughts, dialogues and dreams of the characters in order to gain some insight about what prompted certain types of behavior.\textsuperscript{28} The aggadah exposes the reader to the inner feelings of the biblical characters. In so doing, we are offered a deeper understanding of what prompted a certain human feeling or reaction. The biblical account informs the reader that after sending the messengers to his brother Esau, "Jacob was greatly afraid and was distressed."\textsuperscript{29} The aggadah offers the reader a possible explanation about the source of Jacob's fear and distress.

Jacob bore in mind the promise of God, that He would bring him back to his father's house in peace, yet the report about his brother's purpose alarmed him greatly. A pious man may never depend upon promises of earthly good. God does not keep the promise if he is guilty of the smallest conceivable trespass, and Jacob feared that he might have forfeited happiness by reason of a sin committed by him. Moreover, he was anxious lest Esau be

\textsuperscript{26} Egan, \textit{Primary Understanding}, p. 102.


\textsuperscript{28} See Hulevy, \textit{Shaarei Ha'Aggadah}, pp. 4-10.

\textsuperscript{29} Genesis 32:8.
the one favored by God, inasmuch as he had these twenty years been fulfilling two Divine commands that Jacob had to disregard. Esau had been living in the Holy Land, Jacob outside of it; the former had been in attendance upon his parents, the latter dwelling at a distance from them. And much as he feared defeat, Jacob also feared the reverse, that he might be victorious over Esau, or might even slay his brother, which would be as bad as to be slain by him. And he was depressed by another apprehension, that his father had died, for he reasoned that Esau would not take such warlike steps against his own brother, were his father still alive.  

Egan's final characteristic of story forms focuses on metaphors and analogs. C.S. Lewis describes "the sequence of events in stories as only really a net whereby to catch something else." Lewis argues that a main delight of the best stories is their creation of unique and new feelings, sensitivities, perceptions, and ideas, by an intoxicated immersion in other worlds. The world of metaphors and analogs broadens the learning experience for the young student, by exposing him to various symbols and analogies that he may not otherwise encounter. It stimulates his inherent fascination with the world of fantasy — a topic so commonly ignored in primary education. And, finally, it allows the young child to engage in the art of solving bonnes a penser. This term was coined by Levi-Strauss, and refers to "good things to think with." Egan argues that "literacy is a set of bonnes a penser as well as having the utilitarian values which are so obvious." Bonnes a penser accompany the developing child throughout his learning experience. The educator must assume the responsibility to identify the specific bonnes a penser for his students, and provide them with the skills and knowledge which will allow them to expand this mind set. Metaphors and analogs are one ideal tool to accomplish this goal. They introduce new forms and contexts, and attempt to forge associations with known ones.

30 Genesis Rabbah 92:4.
31 C.S. Lewis, Of This and Other Worlds (London: Collins, 1982).
32 See Egan's discussion of this point in Primary Understanding, pp. 121-122.
33 Ibid., pp. 11-46.
35 Egan, Primary Understanding, p. 52.
Several research studies have been conducted to determine how children understand metaphors and other forms of symbolic language. In an early study, Howard Gardner, who has published some of the leading research in this field, showed the need to distinguish between alternate forms of metaphors and their comprehension at varying stages of child development.  

These studies led Gardner to conclude that we must differentiate between two major forms of metaphors: visual or sensory metaphors, which focus on physical resemblance, and psychological-physical metaphors, which liken psychological characteristics to physical objects. Very similar results were obtained in a later study by Johnson.

Children between the ages of six and fourteen were asked to explain the following sentence: "After many years of working at the jail, the prison guard had become a hard rock that could not be moved." The six-, seven- and eight-year olds favored two types of interpretation. They usually said things like: "The prison guard worked in a hard rock prison," or "the guard had muscles hard as a rock." Thus, they either rephrased the sentence so that the topic and vehicle were associated rather than equated, or they noted an aspect in which a person and a rock could be physically similar. However, by age ten, most children were able to articulate the psychological meaning of the sentence, explaining that the guard was cruel and unkind.

Finally, Alvan Kauffler, who has conducted preliminary research on this topic in relation to teaching the Midrash, concluded: "Not only do children group reasonably valid meanings (of metaphors used in midrashic literature) when presented in a classroom learning context, but they are also able to grasp stories and their meaning on a level other than cognitive analysis."

An Approach to Integrating Aggadic Literature into the Curriculum

At this stage, we will offer an approach which attempts to integrate many of the points covered; we will also react to certain methods used in the elementary school which, in our view, minimize and even distort the impact of aggadic study. Three basic points will illustrate the goals of our approach, with reference to its educational impact on the learning process, and its advantage over other approaches.

First, we maintain that the aggadic literature fulfills many of the religious, educational and psychological needs of the child and therefore must be taught at an early age. This is in contrast to those who have claimed that Midrash should not be taught until a student has reached the age of twelve. The advocates of this theory believe that the younger child tends to confuse the biblical text and the Midrash and therefore the price of teaching the Midrash is too high. This point of view considers the teaching of the aggadah to be reductionist and a potential obstacle to the child's religious growth. Furthermore, some of these people claim that children under the age of twelve cannot fully comprehend the symbolic language used in the Midrash and that the possible misunderstanding of this material is more dangerous than not teaching it at all. This approach encourages the teacher to teach the child a "clean text" without any aggadic interpretation whatsoever.

In response to this view, we recall the survey of research which appeared in the previous sections of this paper. We posit that the aggadic literature can be a critical component in the religious growth of the child and in his/her appreciation of the biblical text. At the same time, though, and as we have pointed out, we are aware of the child's cognitive-developmental limitations and would carefully weigh which aggadic pieces should be taught and in what context.

The second basic notion of our approach is that the aggadic texts should be regarded as a form of biblical commentary and taught accordingly. This contrasts with an accepted way of "introducing" Midrash into the curriculum with the teacher telling

39 Shlomo Goldsmith and his disciples in Jerusalem have been among the most outspoken advocates of such an approach.
the children aggadic stories as part of a unit on Jewish heroes and
role models. While according to this approach, the child will
thereby identify with the acts of these great personalities and
attain a sense of cultural-historical pride which the Midrash
openly provides, we reject this method and believe that the
midrashic text is a direct response to some question raised con-
cerning the biblical text and narrative itself, and therefore ought
to be presented in that context. This is the precise process and
dynamic of how the Midrash was in fact compiled. As Heinemann
has argued, “The bulk of Talmudic-Midrashic aggadah does not
stand by itself but rather serves the Bible, explicating and elab-
orating it.”

The rabbis did not tell these stories in a vacuum, but rather
linked each one to a particular text. It is true that there are no
uniform guidelines which establish the formal relationship be-
tween the text and the Midrash; however, this only serves to
broaden its scope and forces the reader to examine the texts
carefully and to forge a relationship between the two. Further-
more, as part of our attempt to develop “close readers” and “active
readers,” we should expose the students to aggadah in this
manner, and help them view this medium as a form of biblical
exegesis. We maintain that the aggadic literature will aid the
student in probing the text to a deeper level of understanding.

Finally, we will address the issue of the child’s faith develop-
ment and his/her questioning of the veracity of the biblical text.
When the Midrash is presented as a form of biblical commentary,
it appears to us that questions relating to faith development will
receive much more accurate and convincing responses. In explor-
ing the symbolic message of an aggadah, we are able more
effectively to address many of the religious and theological ques-
tions that are generally posed in Bible study. In this sense, the
aggadot are presented as a form of commentary and interpreta-
tion rather than a canonized biblical text.

The third element of our recommended approach will be the
proposal of conceptual categories which can help us determine

Yaakov Halperin, "He’erot Metodiot L’Limud Ha’Aggadah B’Bet Ha’Sefer,"
Hed Hakhinukh 1-3 (1941), p. 63.
42 A.A. Halevy, Shaarei Ha’Aggadah, Y. Heinemann, Darkei Ha’Aggadah,
chapter 1; Avraham Kariv, Misod Chachamim, pp. 13-94.
which aggadic texts should be taught to children. This model will help us evaluate the various aggadic anthologies for children which are currently being used in various schools and their philosophical underpinnings. Oftentimes, the criteria used for selection are vague and lack any form or consistency.

Our model consists of three categories, but each text selected must also be examined from an educational, psychological, and religious vantage point as discussed in the earlier sections of this paper. The first category of Midrashim has been labeled: Midrashic Enrichment (ME). The goal of ME is to complement the description provided in the biblical text. This fills certain factual gaps in information and enriches our understanding of the biblical story or personality. On the whole, it appears as though the main characters in the Bible are adults, and we have scant references to their childhood experiences. Research on children's literature has shown that children prefer literature which focuses on child or childish characters and their typical feelings and preoccupations. They also seem to exhibit a much clearer identification with these figures and display more empathy and understanding of their actions. Moreover, because children use the Bible as a vehicles for learning more above themselves, it assumes a dynamic role in their moral and religious development.

Here, the ME category of aggadot can serve as a bridge between the world of the Bible and the world of the child. The aggadic literature speaks to the child in a more direct way which can nurture his or her personal development and sense of Jewish identity.

The ME literature provides us with a glimpse into Abraham's upbringing or Isaac's reactions during the trek to Mount Mor-

43 See Rivka Elitzur, Al Avot V'yeladim (Tel Aviv, 1963).
47 Genesis Rabbah 38.
iah. It is this form of aggadah that informs us of the different childhood lifestyles of Jacob and Esau or how Moses grew up in the house of Pharaoh in Egypt. These are but several examples of how the ME literature describes the childhood experiences of our Biblical heroes and enriches our understanding of them.

A second category of Midrash has been called: Midrashic Response to Textual Challenges. The MRTC helps the reader understand certain biblical ambiguities or apparent inconsistencies. The challenges which the Midrash comes to address can be linguistic, historical, or logical. An example of the MRTC is the verse from Genesis 4:8, in which we are told "And Cain said to Abel his brother...and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him." There is a clear linguistic question here which children of ages eight and above are able to spot on their own. The Midrash attempts to describe the contents of the conversation between the two brothers and its implications for our understanding of the first case of murder in human history.

We have called the third category of midrashic commentary: Midrashic Response to Value Dilemmas. MRVD heightens our sensitivity to various moral, ethical, and value dilemmas which we encounter in the Bible and provides us with different rabbinic responses to these challenges. These commentaries are similar in form and intent to those stories that Gareth Matthews has called "examples of philosophical whims." According to Matthews, these types of stories "invite us to consider situations different from our everyday experience...to participate in what philosophers call 'thought experiments' (gedanken experiment). Thought experiments are often a good way to trace conceptual connections and ruminate on philosophical puzzles." Each of these three categories highlights the unique role of aggadic literature in the child's study of Bible and heightens his or her sensitivity to the complex nature of the biblical text.

In conclusion, this paper opened with certain philosophical,
religious, theological, and psychological questions about aggadic literature and how it is — and ought to be — taught to children. We continued to trace some of the unique traits of this literature and how they influence our children. Finally, we have presented an educational model which claims to address these concerns and emphasizes the potential impact of aggadic literature in the teaching of Bible. In so doing we have attempted to confront some of the practical challenges of teaching from a theoretical base. This was in the hope and conviction that each one of these approaches can enrich the other.
THE ACTUALIZATION OF JEWISH IDENTITY: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Gaby Horenczyk

In *Arrival and Departure*, Arthur Koestler describes Peter's conflict, as he is forced to choose between following his loved-one to America or joining the Royal British Air Force in the war against the Germans. At the last minute, Peter abandons the ship which was to have brought him to America, determined to act according to his principles. At that moment he felt, "...[an] experience of supreme peace which seemed to emanate...from the very core of his self." This supreme experience of tranquility seems to stem from the congruence between Peter's behavioral decision and his deep internal need to actualize his ideological identity, which is central to his self-perception.

The concept of actualization of identity has been addressed by philosophers and psychologists. The Humanistic school of psychology adopted the concept of "self-actualization" as a basic tenet of its theory. Rogers maintained that human beings are motivated by an internal drive to develop their capabilities and talents to their fullest. He believed that the tendency toward self-actualization, that is, to fulfill, strengthen, and expand the basic self, is a primary human motivation. Maslow also thought of self-actualization as the pinnacle of development and satisfaction of the needs embedded in the very essence of humanity. The need for self-actualization is a "growth" need, perceived by human beings as enjoyable and challenging, and its fulfillment,

* I wish to thank Professor Mordecai Nisan for his incisive guidance on the research presented in this paper and for his constructive comments on the ideas raised in the article.

according to Maslow, leads to a state of personal well-being and positive self-evaluation.

We believe that in addition to the need of each individual to actualize his⁴ general identity, he is also inclined to actualize those personal and social identities perceived by him as central aspects of his personality. In other words, we submit that in addition to — and as part of — the attempt to fulfill their general identity, human beings also seek to grant expression to the different components of their identity. As the actualization of the general identity brings with it personal well-being, so the actualization of those social and personal identities which comprise the individual's self may, in our opinion, bring about positive feelings and enhancement of self-evaluation. This idea is similar to the motivational basis of the Social Identity theory postulated by Tajfel.⁵ This theory attempts to explain the numerous findings which point to the tendency to prefer in-group members and to discriminate against out-groups, even when the division into groups is purely arbitrary, as by the toss of a coin. According to Tajfel, the enhancement of the individual's social identity is the central motive for the discriminating behavior (even when this identity is lacking meaning, such as belonging to the "heads group" or the "tails group"). The theory further maintains that since social identities are perceived as part of the general personal identity of the individual, the enhancement of a certain social identity contributes to the enhancement and the strengthening of the general personal identity. If we look at the discriminating behavior as a form of actualization of social identity, then we may expand Tajfel's motivational hypothesis and contend that the enhancement of a social identity of the individual serves as an important motive for the actualization of that identity, leading to the strengthening of the personal identity, that is, to the enhancement of self-evaluation.

The ethnic and national identity is one of the social identities which an individual may feel a need to actualize. The "primor-
dialist" approach in anthropology proposed that a human being has a basic need to belong, and that primary ethnic and national ties have "an ineffable, and at times overpowering coerciveness in and of themselves." According to this view, the tendency to actualize ethnic and national identity is deeply embedded in the essence of the human social experience. Therefore, the primordialist approach has no need to explain ethnic needs and behavior in terms of psychological motivations (such as the enhancement of social and personal identity).

On another level, we may posit a motivational explanation for behavior which leads to the actualization of the ethnic and national identity in terms of the "sense of obligation." In the context of academic motivation, Nisan suggested that the individual's awareness that in certain circumstances a given behavior is desirable and appropriate may serve as a motivational force upon his behavior.

The contention regarding the existence of desirable behavior presents a reason for action and applies motivational pressure upon the individual to behave accordingly.

According to this view, the individual may at times perceive social and cultural expectations as desirable and legitimate demands. The behaviors which constitute actualization of national identity may be perceived by the individual as desirable, and thus the awareness of a national duty may provide a reason for activities of actualization.

We will now deal with the tendency of the Jewish individual to actualize his national (or ethnic) identity, and we will summarize results obtained in three studies designed to examine various aspects of the actualization of that identity. Following this, we will discuss several possible implications for Jewish education in the Diaspora raised by the view presented herein and by the findings of our research.

The first issue addressed in these studies deals with the in-

fluence of the actualization of Jewish identity on the self-evaluation of the individual. Many researchers have shown an interest in the relationship between self-esteem and the level of Jewish identification of American Jews (that is, the extent of Jewish involvement of a religious, social, cultural, or philanthropic character). A large proportion of these studies were based on Kurt Lewin's ideas regarding the importance of belonging to an ethnic group for the proper development of the individual. Lewin contended that a clear and stable social ground is necessary for an individual's security and identity. The results of various studies do in fact point to a positive relationship between the extent of the individual's Jewish identification and his level of self-esteem: to the extent that the Jewish individual evidences more Jewish involvement, he tends to maintain a higher self-evaluation. From their findings, most researchers conclude that a high level of Jewish identity contributes to the psychological adjustment and self-image of the individual; stated in terms of the actualization of identity, it would appear that continued actualization of Jewish identity (reflected in a high level of Jewish identification or involvement) influences the Jewish individual's enhancement of his self-evaluation. However, one should exercise caution when positing causal conclusions on the basis of correlational results regarding the relationship between Jewish identification and self-evaluation, since we cannot dismiss alternative explanations, such as the possibility that it is positive self-image and a high level of self-assurance which facilitate Jewish involvement, and not the other way around.

From an existentialist viewpoint, which emphasizes the importance of the actualization of social identities, Sartre also discussed the negative psychological consequences of non-acceptance of Jewish identity. According to Sartre, authenticity

in the Jewish individual requires that he “...live to the full his condition as a Jew,” while the lack of authenticity is his intent “...to deny it or attempt to escape from it.”10 Sartre believed that the lack of authenticity in a Jewish individual would bring him to adopt negative behaviors as “routes of escape.” One such route would entail the acceptance of the negative opinions of the out-groups regarding his group, thus creating an “inferiority complex.” The Jew who does not actualize his “Jewish condition,” or his Jewish identity, may, according to Sartre, find himself alienated from himself, acting as a different person.

In light of these contentions and findings regarding the positive link between Jewish identity or involvement (as a stable and consistent pattern of behavior) and an individual’s self-image and psychological adjustment, we have chosen in our research to focus on a single activity of actualization of Jewish identity and to examine its effect upon the individual’s self-evaluation. Our primary hypothesis stated that an act of actualization of Jewish identity would be perceived by the individual as enhancing his sense of self-satisfaction, while non-actualization behaviors would be seen as lowering that sense.

The contention regarding the existence of a need for the actualization of Jewish identity raises the following question: what are the limits of this need? In this study, we examined a partial answer to this question. According to our hypothesis, an individual with a Jewish identity would tend to compute a sort of “balance of Jewish duty” based upon his recent behavioral commissions and omissions relating to this duty. Activities of actualization of the identity raise this index, while non-actualization lowers it. The level of the balance of Jewish duty at a given moment will influence the individual’s decision whether to behave according to his Jewish duty in a situation of conflict between demands stemming from this duty and from an important opposing motive. An individual whose balance of Jewish duty is relatively positive will tend to allow himself to forego an additional behavior connected with that duty, in contrast to the individual whose balance is negative. This model assumes the existence of the perception of a “limited Jewish duty” among most people who maintain a Jewish identity: the contention is that

most people do not demand of themselves that they behave according to their "ideal" Jewish identity in each situation, but rather allow themselves certain deviations from this duty, as long as these do not endanger their positive self-perception (personal and Jewish). The level of the balance at a certain moment is, in our opinion, one of the primary principles for the computation of the extent of the deviation from the ideal Jewish duty which will be allowed at that moment.

We contend that actualization of national and Jewish identity is one of the areas of behavior to which the principle of "limited duty" is applicable. This principle stems, in our opinion, from the individual's recognition of the legitimacy of various duties and needs (such as moral duty, national duty, needs of self-actualization, and so forth), and from the fact that these needs and duties may at times conflict with one another. Wishing to achieve equilibrium between these needs and expectations and to arrive at a "balanced identity," in which the inclinations toward the actualization of the differing identities will be in harmony with one another, the individual adopts the principle of "limited duty" or "limited actualization" of the central duties and identities of his personality.

This approach, developed by Nisan\textsuperscript{11} in relation to moral behavior, includes the concept of "moral balance."\textsuperscript{12} In fact, the findings of Nisan and Horenczyk showed that moral behavioral decisions and moral judgment of behavior were influenced by perceptions regarding the moral balance of the individual performing the behavior.\textsuperscript{13} In their studies, subjects tended to allow an individual who had previously behaved in a moral manner to behave in an immoral manner. They tended to be less severe in their assessment of the moral actions of this individual, and to think that he should feel less guilt as a result of his behavior. In the studies which will be described below, the principle of the

---


"balance" was examined with regard to the actualization of Jewish identity, and the study further tested the influence of a previous actualization of that identity upon behavioral decisions regarding further actualization of Jewish identity and upon the value judgments of behaviors not in accordance with Jewish duty.

Description of the Research and the Main Findings

In the first two studies, the effect of the actualization of Jewish identity on self-evaluation and on behavior in subsequent situations was examined through the use of questionnaires, comprising eight stories. Each story had two parts. In the first part, protagonists who behaved (or declined to behave) so as to actualize their Jewish identity (such as participation in a demonstration for Ethiopian Jewry) were presented. The actualizing or non-actualizing behavior was either voluntary, that is, of the protagonist's free choice and decision, or forced (e.g., "all of the children were required to participate in the demonstration"). Thus, each story had four protagonists:

- a protagonist who voluntarily actualized his Jewish identity;
- a protagonist who was forced to actualize Jewish identity;
- a protagonist who chose not to actualize his Jewish identity;
- a protagonist who was prevented from actualizing his Jewish identity.

In the second part of each story, the same figures appeared in situations occurring several days later, in which the protagonists deliberated whether to act for the sake of a Jewish cause (e.g., helping to distribute a new Jewish newspaper) or to respond to a personal preference (such as going to a party).

In order to present the various questions which served to examine the research issues, we will describe the first study and then note the differences between the first study and the second. In the first study, two of the four protagonists were presented in the two parts of each story (for example, the one who voluntarily actualized his Jewish identity together with the one who voluntarily chose not to actualize his Jewish identity). The influence of the actualization of Jewish identity on self-evaluation was examined in some of the stories through two questions which
appeared after the first part. In these questions, the subject was asked to choose which of the two protagonists felt more comfortable and which felt more self-satisfaction as a result of his behavior (of actualization or non-actualization of his Jewish identity). The questions presented after the second part of each story were designed to examine the effect of previous actualization of Jewish identity (as described in the first part) on a number of aspects of the protagonists' behavior in the subsequent situation which also entailed actualization of Jewish identity. In some of the stories, we examined the influence of previous actualization of Jewish identity on the respondent's willingness to allow the protagonist not to actualize his Jewish identity in the new situation. In terms of "limited actualization" or "limited duty," the influence of the protagonist's balance of actualization of Jewish identity on the subject's willingness to allow him to deviate from the "ideal actualization" was examined. The subject was requested to choose between the two protagonists (who differed in their actualization, or non-actualization, of their Jewish identity in the first part of the story) and to indicate to which of the two protagonists would he be more inclined to allow non-actualization of his Jewish identity in the new situation. In other stories, it was noted that in the end, both protagonists decided not to act in accordance with their Jewish duty (for example, both of them decided not to help with the distribution of the new Jewish newspaper and decided to go to the party), and the subjects were presented with two questions of evaluation of the behavior: "In your opinion, whose behavior was less acceptable?" and "In your opinion, which one of them ought to feel more guilty?" In the study, six versions of the questionnaire were included, so that for each story, all six possible combinations (of two of the four protagonists) appeared.

The questionnaires used in the second study were similar in their structure and content to those which were presented in the first study. However, while in the first study two of the four protagonists were presented and the subject had to choose among the two according to what was requested of him by the various questions, in the second study only one protagonist (out of the four) was presented, and the subject was asked to relate to that protagonist in his answers, without comparing him to any other figures. Thus, for example, after the protagonist had been forced
in the first part of the story to participate in a demonstration for Ethiopian Jewry (forced actualization), the subject was asked to express his opinion, to what extent the protagonist would feel self-satisfaction as a result of his behavior; the respondent was asked to record his answers on a five-point scale (ranging from “he was very dissatisfied with himself” to “he was very satisfied with himself”). This study also included a number of versions, so that for each story the four protagonists appeared in different versions.

The subjects in the two studies were 340 American Jewish day school students, almost equally divided between the sexes, and ranging in age from 15 to 18. The sample included students from the different religious movements, although primarily from the Orthodox and Conservative denominations. In general, the results of both studies consistently supported our two primary hypotheses:

a. The respondents tended to ascribe greater self-satisfaction and a greater sense of comfort to the protagonist who had actualized his Jewish identity, in contrast to the protagonist who had not actualized that identity. This finding, therefore, points to a connection between actualization of Jewish identity and self-evaluation.

b. We discovered a greater willingness to permit omission of behavior in accordance with Jewish duty to the protagonist who had previously actualized his Jewish identity, than to the protagonist who had not actualized that identity. If we assume that the willingness of a person to allow non-actualization of Jewish identity to another individual serves as a certain indication of the willingness to allow himself to deviate from the “ideal actualization,” then the results obtained provide support for our contention regarding the influence of the “balance of Jewish duty” upon the individual’s decisions regarding the actualization of Jewish identity.

In both studies, however, we found a very weak effect of previous actualization of Jewish identity by the protagonists in the stories on the subjects’ value judgments regarding subsequent behavior not in accordance with Jewish duty. For example, the subjects revealed almost no tendency to evaluate the behavior of non-actualization of Jewish identity performed by the
protagonist who had previously not actualized that identity, more severely than that of the protagonist who had previously actualized his Jewish identity. It would appear that the balance of Jewish duty exerts a greater influence upon behavioral decisions (as expressed in the willingness to allow non-actualization in the future) than upon value judgments regarding actions connected with that duty.

Furthermore, we found almost no significant relationship between the volitional component of the behavior and the various aspects of the actualization of Jewish identity which we explored. For example, we expected that self-satisfaction attributed to the protagonist following voluntary actualization of Jewish identity would be higher than that attributed to the protagonist who was forced to commit that actualization. In regard to the connection between extent of “choice” and the balance of Jewish duty, we anticipated that the willingness to allow behavior not in accordance with the Jewish duty would be greater when the previous actualization was voluntary, in contrast with a previous forced actualization. We based our prediction on the assumption that the element of decision within the voluntary choice would be perceived as contributing to the positive evaluation of the actualization on the one hand, and as adding to the negative evaluation of the non-actualizing behavior on the other hand. Our findings suggest that when evaluating the effects of the activities of actualization on the self-perception and on the balance of Jewish duty of the protagonist, individuals do not make such a distinction between voluntary and forced actualization (or non-actualization). Possible educational implications of this result will be discussed later.

The third study involved 120 adolescents, equally divided between the sexes, at a summer camp sponsored by the Conservative movement in the United States. Their ages ranged from 15 to 17. The subjects were randomly divided into three groups:

1. The “actualization of Jewish identity” group — the subjects were told that they were being approached as part of the preparation of an educational unit on Jewish identity, and that some of the answers which they provided would be included as examples in that unit. They were requested to write brief essays about positive aspects of their Jewish
identity (such as, "What makes me proud about my Judaism?");

2. The "non-actualization of Jewish identity" group — in this group, the subjects were also told about the curricular project on Jewish identity; they were presented with the same questions as the previous group, but with regard to their American identity;

3. The control group — the project on Jewish identity was not presented to them, and they were not requested to write any essays.

In the second stage of the study, some of the subjects received a questionnaire for the evaluation of Jewish and personal identity, composed of four scales: two scales for the evaluation of personal identity and two scales for the evaluation of Jewish identity. In the third stage, all of the subjects of the study received an additional page, on which they were requested to note their willingness to give of their free time for a personal interview regarding other aspects of their Jewish identity. Each subject was requested to indicate whether he was willing to volunteer for this activity, and, if so, how much time he would be willing to devote to the interview (from 15 to 45 minutes).

While the previous two studies dealt with the subjects' perceptions regarding the effect of the actualization of Jewish identity on self-evaluation and on behavior in subsequent situations which also involve actualization of that identity in another person (the protagonist in a story), this study examined these effects of the actualization of Jewish identity in the subject himself. The effect of the actualization of Jewish identity on self-perception was examined by comparing the level of self-evaluation between the groups (as measured during the second stage of the study). While the differences which we found were relatively small, we did detect a consistent pattern across the four scales: the self- and Jewish evaluation was somewhat higher among the subjects who had actualized their Jewish identity than among the subjects who had not been able to actualize that identity. This additional finding lends some support to our contention regarding the relationship between the actualization of Jewish identity and self-evaluation.

The differences between the groups in willingness to volunteer
for an additional activity connected with their Jewish duty — and in the amount of time they were willing to devote to this activity — enable us to examine our hypothesis regarding the effect of the “balance of Jewish duty” on behaviors of actualization of Jewish identity. The findings obtained support our contention: subjects who had written essays about their Jewish identity (that is, had actualized that identity) were less inclined to volunteer for an additional activity of actualization of Jewish identity, than were other subjects. It would appear that the previous actualization raised their balance of Jewish duty and allowed them to deviate from their Jewish duty in the new situation. Among those subjects who did agree to be interviewed, the subjects who had previously been unable to actualize their Jewish identity (“non-actualization” group) evidenced a greater willingness for volunteer activity, in contrast with the control group. (Willingness was measured by the number of minutes which they were willing to allocate to the interview.) It would appear that for the subjects who were requested to write about their American identity, the lack of opportunity to actualize their Jewish identity (which had been “heightened” by the participation in the project dealing with that identity) adversely affected the status of their balance of Jewish duty, markedly increasing their motivation to actualize their Jewish identity in the new situation.

In sum, the results of the three studies included in this research support the two basic hypotheses regarding the effects of the actualization of Jewish identity:

a. Actualization of Jewish identity tends to have a positive influence on self-evaluation;

b. According to the prediction derived from the view of the “limited Jewish duty” and from the model of an “balance of Jewish duty,” prior actualization of Jewish identity tends to lower the individual’s willingness to actualize that identity in a new situation.

Educational Implications

In a well-known Hasidic story, a village boy, who knows neither how to read nor to write, begins to play his flute during the ne'ilah prayers of Yom Kippur. For this boy, playing the flute was his
only way to express his inner need to pray. Such internal needs, of differing intensities and kinds, are present within each individual, and these tendencies seek expression or actualization. Sociobiologist David Barash called these needs the “whisperings within” which guide an individual’s behavior, even if they do not present themselves within his awareness consciously or clearly. However, while Barash refers to the genetic component which influences the individual’s behavior, we wish to relate to those “whisperings within” whose source can be found in the personal and social identities of the individual.

In our research, we dealt with the whispering which stems from the national or ethnic Jewish identity of the individual. In his address to the members of the B’nai Brith Organization, Freud expressed this whispering well. He told his audience that he had always been a non-believer who had endeavored to suppress any national fervor, believing this to be negative and unjustified. Yet,

...there remained enough other things to make the attraction of Judaism and Jews irresistible — many dark emotional forces all the more potent for being so hard to grasp in words, as well as the clear consciousness of an inner identity, the intimacy that comes from the same psychic structure...¹⁵

We believe that the person who is aware of his Jewish identity is inclined to actualize that identity. In the studies summarized above, the effects of the actualization of Jewish identity on self-evaluation and on subsequent behavior of the individual were examined. Below, we will attempt to raise briefly a number of points regarding the implications of our contentions and our research findings for the field of Jewish education. To this end, we will relate primarily to Rosenak’s enlightening Teaching Jewish Values: A Conceptual Guide, in which he discusses the difficulties faced by the various attempts to inculcate Jewish education to Diaspora youth and presents the principles of an educational perspective intended to cope with these difficulties.¹⁶

Rosenak’s point of departure for his analysis of the educational situation is that the large majority of Jewish students in the Diaspora lack motivation to learn a “Jewish language.” Without an a priori Jewish commitment, he contends, Jewish education essentially becomes the marketing of a commodity. According to our perspective, which states that the Jewish person who is aware of his Jewish identity will be inclined to actualize that identity, we could qualify Rosenak’s assumptions to a certain extent and suggest that even without strong Jewish commitment on the part of the students, the marketing of the Jewish commodity is done on a certain “psychological ground” which may predispose the student toward its adoption. In other words, we believe that the tendency to the actualization of Jewish identity in a student may generate in him an inclination to take an interest in Jewish themes, to the extent that he perceives these as providing an opportunity for the actualization of his identity. Jewish students, therefore, may have a weak motivation to learn a certain “Jewish language,” but we believe that a considerable proportion of them maintain a basic motive to express their Jewish identity, and this motive may be channeled toward an interest in specific Jewish content.

If, in fact, there is such a psychological tendency among Jewish youth to seek avenues of expression of their Jewish identity which will lead to its actualization, then how do we explain the difficult situation of Jewish education in the Diaspora. Rosenak summarizes the essence of the picture of Jewish education when he states that “...most teaching of Judaism, by almost any standard and for most pupils, does not succeed.”

A partial answer to this question may be that the “whisperings within” are not enough, and that there is a need to turn those whisperings into a clear and conscious voice so that the individual will guide his efforts toward searching for appropriate avenues of actualization. In other words, in order for the individual to act in accordance with his need for actualization of Jewish identity, he must recognize or become aware of that need. Stryker, for example, contends that the more prominent the social identity in the structure of the individual’s self (thus occupying a more...

17 Ibid., p. 21.
central position in his awareness for greater periods of time) the stronger the tendency to seek out ways to confirm this identity.\textsuperscript{18}

Transforming the pre-conscious whisperings into a clear and discernible voice may be one of the important tasks of the Jewish educator in the Diaspora. The goal of this educational task is to guide the student to an in-depth examination of his Jewish identity and his need to find an expression for this identity. Based on information regarding the connection between the actualization of Jewish identity and self-evaluation, the educator may direct the student's attention to positive aspects of the actualization of his Jewish identity to which he had not granted sufficient attention. We are dealing with the student's coping with his Jewish identity, with its existence (at times repressed) and its complexity. A discussion of Jewish identity must deal with the attitudes which Jewish youth hold regarding their Judaism; these relate to the significance which the student attaches to the fact of his Judaism, to the psychological needs which this fact may engender in him, to the extent of the "necessity" of this identity within the structure of his self, and so forth. Most of the educational programs which deal with students' views regarding their Judaism deal primarily with an examination of Jewish identification, that is, with an analysis of the manner of expression (values and behavior) and the various avenues of Jewish involvement available in today's Jewish reality. We believe that these two tasks complement one another, such that the "psychological" clarification of the various aspects related to Jewish identity will serve as a preliminary stage, preparatory to the more "sociological" examination of the possible avenues of Jewish identification. Fein suggested a number of questions which are worthy of examination by comprehensive research, but it would appear to us that these questions could be included in the personal inquiry which the student will perform regarding his own Jewish identity:

We need to know, fundamentally, what being Jewish means to those who call themselves Jews, what it means in terms of intellect, in terms of belief, in terms of

emotion, and in terms of behavior. And, in this same context, there is a whole series of questions we should like to ask: Is being a Jew important? Is it costly? It is pleasant? When is it relevant? And then, how do you go about doing it?¹⁹

Among Fein's questions, there are those that deal with Jewish identity, and there are those that are concerned with Jewish identification. Some of them appear as issues for personal clarification within existing educational programs which deal with Jewish identity (for example, Rosenak and Shkedi's *Teaching Jewish Values*²⁰) while others may contribute additional aspects to the student's coping with his Jewish identity. For the Jewish educator, the desired outcomes of such a discussion would include increased consciousness and prominence of the need for the actualization of the Jewish identity and the activation of this motivational force toward an interest and involvement in Jewish themes.

The issue of the actualization of Jewish identity may serve not only as an explicit topic for discussion in an educational situation (formal or informal) but may also be an additional component in the discussion of other Jewish educational themes. Thus, for example, when discussing the question, "Why Hebrew?," one could discuss the function which the Hebrew language has fulfilled and may fulfill in the future as an actualization of the individual's Jewish identity. Such a perspective on the "actualizing function" of Jewish behavior and content may contribute, if only to a small extent, to the attractiveness and relevance of educational messages for students. In relating to the attitude of American Jews to religious events and rituals, Silberman contends, "for many American Jews, attending a Seder or lighting Chanukkah candles is an ethnic far more than a religious act; it is a way of asserting cultural and national identity rather of obeying God's law."²¹

Recognition of this fact may lead to a new answer to Rosenak’s question: “How could Judaism be shown to be important, educative?”22 Jewish themes, the suggested answer would reply, could be important and educative because they may provide the Jewish individual with the tools for actualization of his Jewish identity, with avenues for the expression of his personal uniqueness and his national or ethnic belonging. This message does not relate to the “eminent truth” of Jewish content, or to its sacredness, but neither does it negate them. This perspective emphasizes the use which the individual may make of these themes for the purpose of the actualization of his personal inclinations, the source of which is his inherent Jewish identity. Yet, it would appear to us that in order for the student to be able to receive and understand this message, it is necessary to first clarify his Jewish identity and those motivational forces which it entails.

This attempt to “market” Jewish themes by presenting them as avenues of actualization of social and personal identity is in an opposite, although not opposed, direction to Rosenak’s perspective on the wording of the Jewish educational language. Rosenak believes that the educator must present Judaism as a language of “value-ideals,” which are, “...principles which demand translation into action in concrete and mundane circumstances.”23 This language presents Judaism as a world view which encompasses all of the areas and dimensions of the life of the individual. The “value-ideals” approach appeals to the students’ values of rationality and morality and shows how these may find appropriate expression in Jewish tradition. This educational strategy involves a transition from the “universal” to the Jewish, thus offering specific Jewish answers to perennial universal questions: “Judaism...is both universal — thus readily communicated — and particular. Therefore, the former can lead to the latter.”24

Our suggested educational strategy emphasizes the relevance of Jewish content for the purpose of the satisfaction of the tendency of the student to actualize his Jewish identity; it begins at the opposite “side,” attempting to lead from the personal to the particular, the Jewish. While according to Rosenak the student’s membership in a universal ethical and rational community is

23 Ibid., p. 74.
24 Ibid., p. 77.
taken as a given, and it is that membership which may instill in him the motivation to learn about his Judaism, we see the individual as belonging to his Jewish community, and his inclination to actualize the identity which stems from that membership as a possible motivating force for Jewish education in the Diaspora. Moreover, the movement from the personal to the particular is made while the universal perspectives are in the background. According to the cognitive-developmental view in psychology, the student already grasps the universal; the child, in the course of his coping with the reality which surrounds him, constructs for himself universal perspectives and adopts them. According to this perspective, the structuring of these universal values represents the advanced stage of the cognitive development of the student, and thus, the theory will find it difficult to understand the possible movement from the universal to the particular. The suggested movement from the personal (the inclination toward actualization of Jewish identity which is part of the individual) to the particular (his interest in specific Jewish content) is better rooted in psychological theory, which in our opinion may provide a complementary strategy for the inculcation of Jewish content to youth in the Diaspora.

In concluding, we wish briefly to relate to the educational implications of two additional issues addressed in this research. The first issue relates to the role of volition in the actualization of the Jewish identity. In two of the studies we tested our hypothesis, according to which the subjects' perspectives regarding the effect of the actualization upon self-perception and upon behavior in a later situation would be different according to whether the actualization was forced or voluntary. It would appear that the finding that the subjects did not draw a distinction between voluntary and forced actualization (or non-actualization) of Jewish identity bears far-reaching implications for the field of Jewish education. However, it is necessary to distinguish here between the sociological and psychological explanations of this finding. According to the first, the results reflect a given situation among the population represented in the sample of subjects in this study: these adolescents do not differentiate between voluntary and forced actualization (or non-actualization), and it would appear that the very performance of the actualizing behavior serves as the primary factor (and quite nearly the sole factor) in
the evaluation of the act and its results. In other words, these adolescents relate to the actualization of Jewish identity in a manner which to a great extent ignores the intention of the actor and is based almost entirely on the outcome of the behavior. If we regard such a phenomenon as negative, the sociological explanation may focus on the specific Jewish educational experiences of these youths, viewing those experiences as largely responsible for the inception and continuation of such a perspective toward Jewish education among the students.

However, it may be that we are dealing here with a deeper psychological phenomenon, according to which the tendency toward the actualization of national and Jewish identity is satisfied by the very actualizing behavior, so that the question of volition and intent is of little or no value. Such a perspective would be largely congruent with the primordial view of the actualization of Jewish identity, according to which the inclination toward actualization is essentially a pre-conscious force which seeks satisfaction, while conscious components (such as intent) are not essential to the process of the actualization. The possible implications of such a psychological interpretation are complex and not unambiguous. We are not contending here that the educational goals must be "chained" to the psychological inclinations of the students, completely in accordance with them. However, it does appear to us that it is desirable for the educator to be aware of the students' tendencies to relate to the actualization of Jewish identity more from the perspective of the outcome of the behavior rather than in terms of volition and intent.

Finally, from the perspective of limited Jewish duty and balance of Jewish duty, we wish to bring an encouraging message to the Jewish educator. According to the perspective of limited duty, the individual does not constantly demand of himself, in every situation, behavior which is in accordance with the ideal duty, but rather allows himself to deviate from this duty as long as such deviations do not threaten his positive self-perception. In his attempts to give expression to the various identities (personal and social) which comprise his self, and to arrive at a generally "balanced" identity, he tends to limit the actualization of certain identities for the sake of the actualization of others. In other words, rather than allowing certain whisperings to turn into shouts, while other whisperings remain unheard, the individual
strives for "vocal harmony" among the forces for actualization which exist within him. Behavior according to Jewish duty is one such voice, an expression of the actualization of internal whisperings, rooted in the individual's Jewish identity.

However, we do not believe that limited duty can exist without the perception of the ideal duty. The individual must recognize the existence of the standards which bind him, so that he will be able to allow himself to deviate from these standards without endangering his positive self-perception. There are areas, such as the area of morality, in which it is the child who, with the support and guidance of society, reaches a sense of the ideal duty (according to the cognitive-developmental model). On the other hand, there are areas in which society is almost solely responsible for the presentation of the ideal standards connected with a certain duty. We believe that the position of Jewish duty on this continuum is different for different children, as well as for different aspects of that duty. (For example, it may be that the perception of Jewish ethnic duty is more "natural" to the child than Jewish cultural duty). In any case, it would appear to us that the representatives of socialization must present the child with the ideal duty, and they must not grant legitimacy (or normative validity) to the child's or adolescent's perception of limited duty.

With regard to Jewish education, the educator is one of the primary agents of the ideal Jewish duty, and she must present the ideal standards of actualization of Jewish duty to her students. On the other hand, the results of our research support the existence of an "balance of Jewish duty," which is one of the principles according to which the individual allows himself to deviate from the actualization of the ideal. This may explain, at least in part, the common situation in the Diaspora in which students' actual Jewish behavior is substantially lower than the standards inculcated by their Jewish educators. However, the educator's perception of her role as agent of the ideal duty, together with the awareness of the student's tendency toward limited actualization of that duty, may ease the sense of frustration which the educator feels when confronted with this disparity. Our perspective claims that some of the students' behavior which is not in accord with their Jewish duty may not result from a lack of adequate familiarity with this duty or from the fact that the students do not perceive this duty to be incumbent upon them; we
suggest that the reason for the deviation from the ideal actualization, in such cases, can be found in the motivational principle of "limited duty" activated by students with regard to the actualization of their Jewish identity. In addition, the perspective of limited duty, with its assumption regarding the necessity of the perception of the ideal Jewish identity even for the purposes of limited actualization of that identity, may point to the positive value importance of the educator's persistence in her endeavors to transmit Jewish messages at high standards, even when the students do not necessarily reflect these standards in their behavior.
RECENT TRENDS IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF JEWISH EDUCATION: CHAZAN, ROSENAK, AND BEYOND

H. A. Alexander

It has been the litany of articles since the first decades of the century that Jewish education is troubled. Many of these discussions involve technical matters such as how to fill vacant professional posts, how to attract youngsters to Jewish schools, and how to improve instruction in the schools to which we hope to attract them. These are undoubtedly important questions, but answering them requires that we address even more basic questions about the very purposes of Jewish education. Unfortunately, questions such as this are not only left unanswered, they are too often left unasked. Many who do think about Jewish education, spend their time thinking about how to put out fires. Few are asking why the fires continue to rage despite repeated attempts to douse them. I want to argue that one main reason is not technical; it is conceptual. Jewish education is troubled not only because we do not always do it well, but more importantly because we do not have an adequate conception of what it means to do it well. One question in need of attention, therefore, is not how we can better educate Jews today, but rather what it means to do so.

Barry Chazan\(^1\) and Michael Rosenak\(^2\) have devoted considerable attention to this sort of query by pioneering the application of techniques from contemporary educational philosophy to Jewish education. Their efforts are to be applauded as insightful attempts to professionalize Jewish educational thought. Yet, they both inherit problems from the respective philosophical methods they employ, which are indicative of an educational malaise reaching beyond the confines of Jewish life. I will argue that this malaise calls for what Robert Nozick has dubbed a “philosophical

---

explanation.” The search for such explanations can lead to the application of new philosophical methods and assumptions to our current Jewish educational dilemmas, and in turn, to the more generic pedagogic and cultural problems of which they are but a special case.

Let us begin by examining the scholarly context in which Chazan and Rosenak have worked.

I. Philosophy and Jewish Education

By formulating our query about being educated as a Jew today in terms of meaning, I have intended to imply that this is a philosophical and not an empirical question. An understanding of what it means to be an educated Jew is not to be found by administering a statistical survey to determine who thinke what about Jewish education. Such a method might produce an interesting answer, but to another question. To inquire about the meaning of something is to pose a query of a different sort. Unfortunately, philosophers disagree over precisely what sort of query this is.

The Debate over Analytic Philosophy in Education

According to the analytic school, questions of meaning are questions about the way in which language is used. On this view, my puzzle about the meaning of being educated as a Jew today is to be solved by determining those circumstances in which we would say that a Jew today was better educated, and those situations in which we would say that he or she was not. We are to discover, in other worde, the criteria that govern our use of the expression “better educated Jew today.” The philosopher of the analytic school will offer no official pronouncement as to what ought to happen as a result of this analyeie. From this vantage point, “philosophy leaves everything as it is,” or so writes Ludwig

Wittgenstein, a father to the methods of ordinary language analysis.

According to philosophers on the European continent who are concerned with questions of human existence, queries concerning meaning are about the structure of experience rather than ordinary language. On this view, my puzzle is to be solved by describing how being an educated Jew has been experienced, both historically and within contemporary consciousness. Philosophers of this bent tend to be more willing to make normative judgments about what educators ought to do. As a result, this sort of discussion is often associated with normative traditions in philosophy.

This debate is but a skirmish in a long-standing battle between two ways of thinking about the nature of philosophy that have dominated the field since mid-century, the analytic versus the normative. Philosophers of education have been no innocent bystanders in this debate. In 1947, Donald O'Conner published a scathing critique of the normative school of educational philosophy in his *Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. As the field sm-smerged in the fifties and sixties, two figures took leading positions, R.S. Peters of the University of London and Israel Scheffler of Harvard. Both emphasized the analysis of educational concepts as a key to understanding the pedagogic process.

In the opposite camp were those led by Harry Broudy who claimed that educational philosophy ought to address the actual needs of teachers in classrooms. This could best be accomplished through a review of traditional philosophical positions such as idealism, realism, and scholasticism concerning such issues as the nature of knowledge and the meaning of life, with an eye toward how they would translate into the curriculum. Also in this camp were a growing number of educational existentialists such

7 Israel Scheffler, *The Language of Education* (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1960); See also *Conditions of Knowledge* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).
as Van Cleve Morris⁹ who sought to apply the doctrines of their own school to pedagogy. Among the most significant contributions of the educational philosopher, according to this camp, is the determination of curricular goals.

**Analytic and Normative Philosophies of Jewish Education**

With the publication of Rosenak's *Commandments and Concerns*, the field of Jewish education is in possession of attempts to apply the approaches of both schools to its concerns. In the mid-seventies, Barry Chazan brought forth his *Language of Jewish Education*, which was the first (and for the time being, only) book-length attempt to apply the methods of the analytic school to Jewish educational thought. In that volume, Chazan addressed some of the issues that had become the hallmark of analytic philosophy of education including an analysis of the concept of Jewish education, the moral dimensions of Jewish education, and the relation between Jewish education and indoctrination.

In his more recent effort, Rosenak offers a work of which the normative camp would be proud. He begins by carefully placing the current state of Jewish education into an historical context as a way of highlighting the real problems that Jewish educators face in the practice of their craft. He then offers interpretations of several central philosophers of Judaism and translates their insights into responses to the problems which his historical analysis has brought to the fore. He concludes with an extensive discussion of how his interpretation of the current moment in the history of Jewish educational thought can help educators better understand the problems they face every day. Although this is no practical compendium for the Jewish educator, there is little doubt that Rosenak's stance is normative, if tempered by an awareness of the need for what he calls deliberation.

Unfortunately, each of these discussions can be charged with the sins of the traditions of educational philosophy that they embrace. To see why, it will be useful to examine what both Chazan and Rosenak have to say about the state of Jewish educational thought, the goals of Jewish education, and the content of the curriculum.

II. Chazan's Analytic Philosophy of Jewish Education

The State of Jewish Educational Thought

Chazan begins his analysis of the language of Jewish education with a survey of contemporary approaches to Jewish educational thought. This historical-descriptive perspective involves exposition of historically important Jewish thinkers, schools, and ideologies. Normative-synthetic philosophy is a second approach. It is concerned with the development of a comprehensive philosophy of Jewish education based upon systematic Jewish theology. The task of the educational philosopher, according to this school, is the application of the Jewish thought of such luminaries as Buber, Kaplan, and Heschel to the problems of educational practice. Both the historical and normative approaches to Jewish educational philosophy, according to Chazan, tend to offer shallow philosophical discussions focusing too heavily on practical concerns and not enough on rigorous argument.

Another sort of educational thought found in the literature is called meta-philosophy. This involves second order, self-reflexive activity focusing on the task of the educational philosopher. There is too little of this sort of work within Jewish education, according to Chazan, in part because there is little genuine philosophical discourse in the field.

In addition to these more philosophically oriented doctrines, Chazan points out that much of contemporary Jewish educational thought is expressed in terms of educational theory. Within the Jewish sphere this is characterized by a rootedness in theoretical conceptions of Judaism; dependence on sociological, historical, psychological, and philosophical sources; and a focus on the prac-

11 For example, see Immanuel Etkes, Rabbi Israel Salanter and the Beginning of the 'Musar' Movement (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1984); Also, Judah Plich and Meir Ben-Horin, Judaism and the Jewish School (New York: The American Association for Jewish Education, 1966).
tical operation of schools. This way of thinking about Jewish education is not philosophical in character, however, nor are more loosely connected ideas about Jewish education such as discussions of dropout rates and teacher shortages. What is missing in all of this, according to Chazan, is a “developed philosophy of Jewish education whose subject is Jewish educational concepts, whose method is analytic, and whose objective is clarification.” What is missing, in short, is an analytic philosophy of Jewish education.

The Goals of Education

To develop such an approach, Chazan begins with an analysis of the concept of goals in Jewish education. First, he distinguishes between four different functions that educational goals can serve.

— Descriptive goals involve historical statements about what Jewish education has traditionally attempted to accomplish or sociological statements about what significant portions of the Jewish community currently think about it.

— Prescriptive goals articulate what Jewish education should accomplish irrespective of what empirical studies tell us that it has aimed to do.

— Explanations offer understandings of the causes that lead to specific educational ends.

— Stipulations identify the ways in which particular individuals intend to use the concept of goals in Jewish education when they write or speak about them.

Next, Chazan discusses the range of educational goals.

— Principles are those systematic philosophical principles which underlie educational goals.

— Ideals are the ultimate ends toward which children should be educated. These are based on philosophical principles.

— Proximate ends operationalize ideals in concrete situations.

13 For example, see Jack J. Cohen, Jewish Education in a Democratic Society (New York: Reconstructionist Press, 1964); Also, Joseph Schwab, “Memorandum on Policy for Jewish Oriented Schools,” Conservative Judaism, vol. 18, no. 3 (Spring 1964).
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— *Means* are the materials and programs we use to accomplish these proximate ends. According to Chazan’s own goal, “Jewish education should deal with the confrontation of the Jewish child with Judaism to enable him ultimately to make a rational, autonomous decision whether to accept or reject that tradition.”

Chazan’s argument for this goal is found in his analysis of the concept of indoctrination. Indoctrination is considered by many educational philosophers to be the antithesis of the concept of education because it undermines the autonomy and rationality of the student. It has not always been clear, however, precisely why this is so. Chazan outlines three standard accounts of the pejorative connotations of indoctrination:

— The *method argument* holds that indoctrination refers to how students are taught, in particular to the manipulation of instruction so as to ensure the acceptance of a particular belief.

— According to the *content argument*, the problem with indoctrination is that it involves instruction concerning doctrines whose validity is uncertain because they are not supported by sufficient evidence. On this view, religious, moral, and political instruction are paradigm cases of indoctrination because they involve disagreements that cannot be resolved by reference to evidence.

— The *intention argument* objects to the idea that all religious, moral, and political instruction is indoctrinary, and attempts to account for the problems with the method argument by reference to the intentions of the educator. If the intention of manipulating the evidence by the educator in a particular lesson is to undermine the autonomous, rational choice of the student, then it is to be counted as indoctrination.

Chazan argues that no one of these arguments alone adequately accounts for the pejorative connotations of indoctrination. Sometimes, the use of one-sided instructional methods can foster autonomy. Even scientific and mathematical contents involve

---

16 Ibid., p. 55.
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assumptions that are undetermined by evidence. And sometimes, it is appropriate for educators to have intentions that sidestep the rationality of the child. Learning language, for example, involves accepting rules and definitions that are arbitrary. A more promising account of indoctrination, therefore, would suggest that it "encompasses certain types of intentions, contents, and methods."19 In particular, it may be defined "as the attempt to authoritatively impose on others beliefs and belief systems whose acceptance really should be dependent on the agent's own free and rational acceptance." However, according to this view, religious (as well as moral and political) education is not a paradigm case of indoctrination provided that methods and contents are employed with the intention of fostering rational discussion of religious propositions. This, Chazan claims, is the sort of Jewish educational goal he is proposing.

Curriculum Content

Chazan suggests that this goal can be accomplished by addressing moral, religious, and national aspects of curriculum content in Jewish education. Moral education involves instruction in socially acceptable behaviors, moral rules that can be used in deciding which behaviors are acceptable, moral dispositions which foster the consideration of such rules, methods of effective moral thinking, or techniques of clarifying values to which the student already adheres.20 No one of these approaches is sufficient to account for the enterprise of moral education. "Ultimately, moral education is the constellation of all five approaches, since each emphasizes an important dimension of the moral sphere."21

Religious education involves confronting institutional, functional, and experiential aspects of religion. It becomes dysfunctional when "one constituent element is dealt with at the expense of the religious experience as a whole."22 Religious and moral education overlap, therefore, because they share concerns about social control and standards of behavior. They are not identical,

19 Chazan, Language of Jewish Education, p. 70.
20 Ibid., pp. 78-85.
21 Ibid., p. 86.
22 Ibid., p. 23.
however, and Jewish schools ought not restrict their curricula to either the moral or the religious sphere. When they do, they are in peril of ignoring essential dimensions of the Jewish heritage. Nationally, Chazan reviews six approaches to teaching Israel in Jewish schools.\textsuperscript{23}

- The affective approach is concerned with stimulating positive attitudes toward Israel.
- The cognitive approach focuses on factual knowledge.
- The peoplehood approach emphasizes the development of a sense of kinship with the Jewish people.
- The philanthropic approach prepares youngsters to help Israel when they get older.
- The Israel-American approach uses the teaching of Israel as a way to verify the common values that Israel and America share.
- The religious approach views Israel as a dimension of Jewish religion.
- Finally, the aliyah approach attempts to motivate students to emigrate to Israel.

There are three perspectives about the meaning of Israel in contemporary Jewish life in which these approaches might be grounded.\textsuperscript{24}

- The geo-political ideology views Israel from the vantage point of world politics.
- The religious ideology understands Israel as an expression of rabbinic tradition.
- The ethnic ideology argues that Israel is an expression of Jewish peoplehood.

Ultimately, Chazan suggests that each of these approaches and ideologies ought to have a place in our thinking about how to teach Israel, though we need to be quite self-conscious about the degree to which we emphasize one over another and the reasons why we do so.\textsuperscript{25}

In sum, Chazan argues for the development of an analytic philosophy of Jewish education. The consequence of such an analysis is a non-indoctrinary conception of the goal of Jewish

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., pp. 98-108.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., pp. 108-118.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., pp. 115-121.
education that entails confrontation with the Jewish heritage as preparation for making rational choices concerning adherence to it. This view is justified on the basis of an analysis of the conception of indoctrination and involves including moral, religious, and national dimensions in the curriculum of the Jewish school.

III. Rosenak’s Normative Philosophy of Jewish Education

The State of Jewish Educational Thought

Rosenak also begins his discussion with an assessment of the current moment in Jewish educational thought. He distinguishes between normative-ideational and deliberative-inductive approaches to educational philosophy. The former begins with ideals about which actions are good and which knowledge valuable. The latter does not view the educated person as one who stands “under a roof of imposed values,” but rather as “one who is equipped to solve problems.”26 According to John Dewey, the father of this doctrine, education begins not with ideals but with problematic situations. Traditional beliefs, values, and knowledge are brought to bear in resolving such difficulties. Thus, education does not merely transmit culture across generations for its own sake; culture is transmitted so that it can be transformed to meet the felt needs of those who take possession of it.

Jewish education, according to Rosenak, has historically followed the normative doctrine. But the two are not mutually exclusive, for the deliberative approach offers a process for responding to crisis in order to preserve the normative tradition. “The normative tradition must always remain visible, even in times of crisis,” he writes, “if Jewish religious education is to refer to a historical and cultural entity; the deliberational approach must be called upon if Judaism is to remain in the world.”27 The difficulty is that since the Enlightenment and the Emancipation, this heritage has not been operative for increasing numbers of Jews. Rosenak sees this as a problematic situation to be resolved through Deweyan deliberation. First, he considers philosophical, cultural, and theological dimensions of so-called secular responses to the crisis of normative philosophy of Jewish education. This

26 Rosenak, Commandments and Concerns, p. 21.
is followed by religious responses to the issues raised within each of these dimensions.

Philosophically, the secularists insist that Jewish religious education tends toward indoctrination in that it "leans to authority rather than freedom" and "mitigates against autonomy."28 Culturally, they claim that religious Jewish education is ineffective at strengthening Jewish loyalties because most Jews are secular. Theologically, they hold that it is dysfunctional because it teaches nothing of personal use to children in life. Indeed, it can even alienate children from the intellectual and cultural worlds of their parents.

Rosenak articulates responses to each of these secularist claims in behalf of religiously-minded Jewish educators. Religious education is not necessarily indoctrinary, he argues, because "what is justly labeled indoctrination is largely dependent on convictions about truth, knowledge, and "the good."" Nor is it necessarily the case that religious education is ineffective at fostering Jewish loyalties. On the contrary, theologians such as Soloveitchik have argued that a religious perspective can offer important correctives to secular culture. Finally, the dysfunctional character of religious education may signal the need for a more plausible conception of what it means to do it well. This, Rosenak claims, is the main purpose of his study.

The Goals of Jewish Education

Rosenak's concept of religious education attempts to take account of two perspectives on religion: the outsider's view, developed according to the assumptions of secular scholarship; and the insider's view, developed according to his understanding of traditional Jewish religious belief and practice. The former is encapsulated in what Rosenak calls implicit religious experience, the importance of which even many secularists admit. The latter is expressed by means of the concept of explicit religious experience, which is necessary if an historical tradition is to continue in some recognizable form. "Explicit religion deals with existential en-

28 Ibid., p. 61.
29 Ibid., p. 80.
counters, occasioned by looking within and up in an attitude of faith; it connotes reverence, openness, and search for meaning.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 112-113.} This becomes Rosenak's main theme, the integration of implicit and explicit religious categories into contemporary Jewish education as a response to the problems posed by Enlightenment and Emancipation.

Rosenak illustrates these two dimensions of religious experience by an exposition of what he calls "theology of Jewish education," by which he appears to mean the discussion of the educational implications of theological writings. The explicit dimension of Jewish religion is found in the writings of Liebowitz, Breuer, and Soloveitchik. He writes,

> In this theology, scientific inquiry is not denounced or rejected, but it is normatively neutralized and placed in subservience to revealed religious truth.... Explicit religious thought does not...fetter the mind, yet it demands the service of God as institutionally presented to the individual as a measure of...belonging.\footnote{Ibid., p. 141.}

Ornstein's and Frankel's text *Torah as Our Guide* is used as an educational illustration of this doctrine.\footnote{Walter Ornstein and Hertz Frankel, *Torah as Our Guide* (New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1960).}

A perusal of the text yields the conclusion that the authors view the religious tradition as a normative one that is to be imposed on the learners. To them, such an imposition constitutes authentic education, allowing Jews to achieve the heights of significant life.\footnote{Rosenak, *Commandments and Concerns*, p. 142.}

The implicit dimension of religious experience is illustrated through examinations of the thoughts of Buber, Bergman, Kook, and Heschel. These thinkers see religion as a response to the human condition. They emphasize the importance of feelings and experiences over (though not necessarily at the expense of) norms and dogmas, and tend to be highly critical of the impersonal and often inhumane character of modern technological society. "Paradoxically, the implicit religious thinker, open to the secular world, may be more of a severe critic of it than an explicit colleague. The
latter, having ‘put the world in its place’ is often content to meet it on a technological, seemingly non-valuative plane.”

A pedagogic example of this approach is found in the Bible curriculum of The Jewish Theological Seminary’s Melton Center. In these materials, “the general world is seen and appreciated as one in which reasoning is fostered in learning and intrinsic to it.” Jewish tradition is to be discovered, according to this view, not only as “the culture of a historical community but also a cogent system of responses to human questions about the ultimate. For the Jewish child, it is hoped, this historical deliberation will be perceived as a worthy focus of profound study and of reasoned identification.”

Rosenak argues that both of these dimensions are essential to Jewish religious experience. The goal of Jewish religious education on Rosenak’s view, therefore, must involve initiating students both to “a theological model that ‘is defended at all costs’” and to theories that ensure that this model’s truth “will be maintained in light of the human experience of truth and goodness in all contexts...The model is ‘from heaven’...But the principle of implicit religion is intrinsic to the model itself, for the model is doomed without it.” And “just as explicit religious teaching is attuned to the normative-ideational orientation in education, so is implicit religious teaching congenial to the deliberative-inductive one.”

Thus, Rosenak’s dilemma can be restated as follows: Explicit Jewish religious education has a normative philosophy of education,

but it is not convincing to most Jews in the modern age. Implicit religious education can be shown to be...relevant to the modern person...But it has no normative philosophy of education beyond what amounts to a commitment to existential virtues...Jewishly speaking, this commitment lacks specificity and religious depth.
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The task of a theory of Jewish religious education in our age, therefore, is to overcome this dilemma.

**Curriculum Content**

This is to be accomplished through the very substance of the educative process, the curriculum. The content of Rosenak’s curriculum is neatly summarized by the titles of the two central chapters dealing with his “theory of teaching.” One is called “Educating the Loyal Jew: Theory of Explicit Teaching,” and the other, “Cultivating the Authentic Jewish Individual: Theory of Implicit Teaching.” In the first of these chapters, Rosenak attempts to “translate” the perspective of explicit Jewish theology into what he calls the sociological characteristics of the community into which the student is to be initiated. Explicit educational theory, he writes, “is concerned with socialization into tradition and community. It stresses, in religious life, the importance of reverence for and loyalty to forms of shared significance.”

The cognitive framework for the assumptions and norms of the community is constituted by the texts of tradition, by Torah. The child is taught *Chumash*, *Talmud*, *Midrash*, and fixed prayer because they are sacred literature; that is, the authorized literature for learning the ‘language’ of ‘objective’ reality, the “world” transmitted through tradition.

If the theory of explicit teaching is conceived in terms of communal sociology, implicit teaching takes a psychological form. And if the major sociological contribution to education has to do with initiation, the main contribution of psychology involves communication. “In the former case, the theory is designed to get young people ‘on the inside’ of a cultural language; in the latter case, it is to make the educator appreciate and consider to what extent children, because they are children, live in a different

40 Ibid., p. 217.
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cognitive and affective world." He follows Schwab in arguing that alternative psychological theories need to be used eclectically. No one theory offers a complete view of the child. Taken together, however, they can help to guide us in molding the materials of explicit culture to respond to the life circumstances of the child. In so doing, we help to foster a sense of "authenticity" within him or her.

In sum, Rosenak sees the central problem of modern Jewish education as a confrontation between Jewish religious culture on the one hand and modern secular culture on the other. Most Jews prefer the latter; the Jewish religious educator is anxious to introduce the former. This is to be accomplished, Rosenak argues, by recognizing that traditional Judaism speaks to universal human needs. The public tradition of the Jews he calls explicit religion. The need to which that tradition responds is called implicit religion. Instruction in explicit religion breeds loyalty. Exposure to implicit religion leads to personal openness and openness to the gentile world. The challenge for today's Jewish educator, then, is to seek "the elusive norm." That is, to demonstrate in thought and practice how traditional Jewish norms can respond to a human condition that transcends the confines of modern culture and touches the depths of our souls.

IV. Philosophy in Jewish Education Reconsidered

Analytic and normative philosophers have both complained about one another in ways that are played out in the writings of Chazan and Rosenak. The analysts claimed, for example, that the language of existentialists and others influenced by the philosophy of the continent was incomprehensible. Second, they claimed that normative philosophers of education merely watered down phil-

osophical theories for educators rather than engaging in original philosophical discourse. This led to nonrigorous and unoriginal academic work. Third, they claimed that the study of philosophy had failed historically to answer the so-called big questions of life. Professional philosophers would do well, therefore, to restrict their efforts to the examination of queries about which they have a genuine contribution to make. Finally, the analysts claimed that philosophers ought not to be made responsible for the goals of the school. To be sure, philosophers have a contribution to make to deliberations concerning educational aims, especially when it comes to clarifying the language and logic of such deliberations. However, philosophers have no special expertise with which to resolve genuine political debates about the character of the culture parents wish to transmit to their children. In a democratic society, it is the political process and not the philosopher that should be called upon to resolve such differences.44

Opponents to the analysts had their own parallel set of complaints. Linguistically, they argued that, if the style of continental philosophy was obscure, the style of the analysts was dry, emotionless, overly technical, and accessible only to the professional philosopher. To the practicing educator, it was a mystery. Methodologically, they claimed that the efforts of the analysts produced results that were all too often superficial, ahistorical, and atheoretical. Analysts, they claimed, were unable to penetrate the deeper meaning of educational experience. Finally, normative philosophers complained that the analysts avoided the important questions to which educators need responses such as the nature of the good life into which children are to be initiated and the aspirations toward which educational institutions ought to strive in order to do so.45

**Chazan’s Analysis Reconsidered**

From the analytic perspective, Chazan produced a readable volume. On the whole, the language is precise and distinctive and arguments clear. There are, however, a few notable exceptions

---
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where Chazan’s linguistic analysis is less clear or his argument less cogent than could have been the case. For example, the distinction that he makes between historical-descriptive and normative-synthetic philosophy of education is not altogether successful.\(^6\) Indeed, he even refers to the task of each category as involving educational translation of some of the same authors. Ostensibly, the difference between the two groups has to do with when the philosopher under consideration lived and wrote. From the educational point of view, however, this does not seem to make much of a difference. In both instances, the task of the educational philosopher is the same, reworking the philosophical ideas of others so that they can be used by educators. These two groups, therefore, would be better discussed under a single rubric. This is the more common designation within the literature of educational philosophy.

In another connection, Chazan’s analysis of Jewish educational goals could be tightened up.\(^7\) He suggests, for example, that people sometimes use the term goal to refer to the cause of something. He does not make sufficiently clear, however, precisely how a goal can be understood to be a cause. Nor does he offer convincing evidence that this is a meaning attributed to the concept in everyday use. More importantly, were this in fact a common use of the term, it would be appropriate to offer a correction to such a usage because it confuses two logically distinct concepts. A goal, for example, is an intentional concept. It involves an end which an actor intends to accomplish. Causes, on the other hand, need not involve intentions. In fact, at least according to one standard account,\(^8\) causes involve statistical covering laws dealing strictly with observable behaviors rather than mental states such as intentions. Having a goal, therefore, is not the same as having a cause. Goals involve intentions that can help us to understand a willful dimension of human activity that cannot be accounted for by reference to causal laws. This sort of caveat is absent from his discussion.

Chazan also includes the concept of an educational means

---


\(^7\) Ibid., pp. 42-56.

under the rubric of the range of goals. Although he does not confuse the concept of a meane to accomplish something with the end to be accomplished, the heading under which this discussion falls might lead to such a confusion. More importantly, the relation between meane and ends in education is not altogether simple. The like of Dewey and Peters, for example, have viewed education as intrinsically valuable. The processes by which truly educational aims are accomplished, according to these views, are themselves ends. Thus, the difference between means and ends in education can become blurred. Indeed, Peters even questions whether educators need to have aims at all.

Traditional Jewish sources also suggest a sense to which the study of Torah is intrinsically rather than instrumentally valuable. According to some approaches to Jewish education, therefore, it is also likely that this distinction could be problematic. Any discussion of the range of Jewish educational goals needs to take account of these complexities in ways that Chazan has not.

Moreover, after this careful analysis of the functions and range of goals, Chazan does not tell what sort of goal it is that he is advancing. Is his non-indoctrinary approach descriptive or stipulative? Is he advancing a philosophical principle, an ideal, a proximate end? Even more disappointing is the fact that, aside from his analysis of indoctrination, Chazan advances no argument supporting his view about the goals of Jewish education. As an analytic philosopher, Chazan was not obliged to advance a position about the educational goals. It would have been quite sufficient to have cleared up some confusions about whether religious education is necessarily indoctrinary or whether it always involves moral education. In fact, given the analytic pred-
ilection for description over prescription, it is somewhat surprising that Chazan advances a normative view at all. In this respect, he seems to have ignored the complaints of his analytic colleagues against normative philosophy.

Nevertheless, having made the claim that Jewish education should be a form of non-indoctrinary eduction which has religious, moral, and political commitments, he is obliged to tell us why it should be so. Yet, the most that Chazan's analysis will yield is that, if we agree that indoctrination is bad, Jewish educators shouldn't do it. He does not offer an adequate argument as to why Jewish educators should not indoctrinate, why what he calls confrontation does not involve indoctrination, or why there must be religious, moral, and political aspects to Jewish education. I agree with Chazan, for example, that Jewish educators should not indoctrinate. There are important philosophical reasons why this is so.

One account might run as follows. The point of indoctrination is to undermine the will of the student, that is, to move the student to accept certain beliefs or values, or to perform certain actions, without freely choosing to do so. But, if we hamper students' free will, we weaken the extent to which they can be held morally responsible for their own behavior, since they have not in fact freely chosen to behave as they do. Indoctrination undermines the very possibility of moral discourse, therefore, because it challenges the concept of free will without which moral responsibility is meaningless. This argument has important connections to rabbinic conceptions of morality as well. If Maimonides is correct that rabbinic Judaism accepts a radical view about the freedom of human will, and if it is also correct that indoctrination undermines the will of the student, then an indoctrinary form of Jewish education would be incomprehensible. One could not, on this view, at once indoctrinate and advance the cause of rabbinic Judaism. To do the former would undermine the latter. Unfortunately, this sort of argument is sorely lacking in Chazan's analysis.

Finally, Chazan discusses both the approaches to teaching Israel in diaspora classrooms and the ideologies that might in-

54 See especially, Chazan, Language of Jewish Education, pp. 56-56.
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fluence such approaches. Yet, he never fully develops the connections between these approaches and ideologii. What, for instance, is the difference between an approach to teaching Israel and an ideology about the meaning of Israel in Jewish life? According to one way of thinking about educational philosophy, the approach to teaching should flow directly from the ideology. Although Chazan rejects this view, he never tells his reader precisely how the approaches he describes are in fact related to the ideologies he discusses.

These difficulties could all be addressed within the analytic framework. From the normative philosopher's vantage point, however, the flaws in Chazan's analysis are more difficult to overcome. Although the language is not overly technical or inaccessible to the non-philosopher, the analysis never seems to be able to get beyond the surface of the issues addressed. The techniques of ordinary language analysis seem especially well suited for surveying the terrain of a field. Thus, Chazan offers excellent surveys of various approaches to such fields as Jewish educational thought, the goals of Jewish education, and the teaching of Israel. However, he rarely delves beyond the survey to confront substantive educational issues. What would it mean for a school to follow Chazan's confrontational, non-indoctrinary approach to the goals of Jewish education? How would this approach differ from some of the alternatives? Other than it being non-indoctrinary, what are some of the advantages of this doctrine? What are some of its disadvantages and how would he respond to them? For example, why are we to suppose that after confronting the Jewish heritage and rationally considering the appropriate issues and alternatives, the majority of students will not decide to abandon Judaism. Were this to be a regular occurrence, Chazan would be hard pressed to claim his approach fostered Jewish education. Chazan neither raises nor responds to such questions.

In addition, the normative philosopher might also complain that Chazan's discussion is ahistorical and atheoretical. Consider his analysis of the approaches to teaching Israel. Each of these approaches grows out of a certain historical or theoretical background that is important to its understanding. The cognitive and
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affective approaches, for example, are influenced by traditions of American educational thought rooted in Bloom's well-known taxonomy of educational objectives that makes a rigid distinction between fact and feeling in the practice of pedagogy. This distinction has been challenged by educational scholars as diverse as Israel Scheffler and Elliot Eisner. Without some background, it is difficult to evaluate whether these are actually as different as Chazan represents them to be. The peoplehood approach is rooted in the ideological assumptions of cultural Zionism, the philanthropic and American-Israeli approaches in conceptions of Israel-Diaspora relations dominated by what Jonathan Woocher has called the civil religion of American Jews. Without more background, this analysis becomes too facile and simplistic. Deeper historical and theoretical perspective, on the other hand, allows for a richer understanding of the ways in which different approaches complement and conflict with one another. Such a discussion would have better prepared us to evaluate Chazan's assertion that all of these approaches must be taken into account in teaching Israel; for it is not altogether clear that each of these is compatible with every other.

Finally, the normative philosopher might challenge Chazan to come clean as to the vision of the good life he is defending. With all of his discussion of indoctrination, confrontation, choice, and reason, it is clear that Chazan has embraced a version of the very open secular society that Rosenak sees as problematic for Jews. Here Chazan's position as an analytic philosopher stands in the way of his using the very tools of analysis that he finds so useful in advancing the most central cause of his educational creed, the role of Jews and Jewish education in modern liberal society. If reason is such a powerful tool, why not put it at the disposal of a conception of the good life and the good society into which young


people are to be initiated. This too, unfortunately, is absent from Chazan’s analysis.

In sum, from an analytic perspective, Chazan offers a clear and competent, if occasionally flawed and thinly argued, account of the language of Jewish education. From a normative point of view, however, the volume is superficial, atheoretical, and unreflective concerning the most vital issues that educational philosophers ought to address such as the nature of the good life.

Rosenak’s Normative Philosophy Reconsidered

Rosenak’s discussion, on the other hand, almost appears to suffer from the opposite maladies. From the normative point of view, the document is anything but superficial. Rosenak’s is the work of a widely read scholar who displays an impressive facility with a host of educational topics. The book is full of interesting flashes of insight such as the affinity between Deweyan deliberation and what Rosenak calls implicit religion. Dewey’s interest in rooting education in personal experience offers a natural starting point for fostering the religiosity of the child. It also contains rich discussion of numerous theological writings the educational implications of which had not previously been systematically considered in print. In addition, by illustrating these examinations with discussions of concrete curricular examples, Rosenak provides an important forum for the scholarly discussion of curriculum materials in Jewish education which is new and important. Finally, he addresses an undoubtedly central issue of contemporary Jewish education, the impact of secularism on attempts to transmit Jewish religious culture across the generations.

This having been said, from the analytic perspective, this book is no easy read. The language is too often vague or imprecise.
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Sometimes it is downright difficult even for the professional philosopher. Consider but two crucial examples, the distinctions between normative and deliberative educational philosophy and between explicit and implicit religious experience. By the first distinction, it is not clear whether Rosenak intends to differentiate between: (1) ways of doing philosophy of education, (2) doctrines about what education means or ought to accomplish, or (3) approaches to educational practice.

1. If it is to philosophical methods that Rosenak is referring, then his discussion of the normative approach conforms to a commonly accepted practice among educational philosophers. It is not clear, however, what it would mean to use deliberation or induction as a method to advance a philosophical argument. Philosophy is usually characterized by deductive logic. Induction is more characteristic of empirical science. Dewey and Schwab were both advocates of the deliberative process in educational planning and practice, but it is not clear that either used deliberation as a philosophical tool to advance the case for using it educationally. On the contrary, Dewey’s philosophical method was a pragmatic one; it focused on the consequences of ideas for practice. Schwab’s method of analysis took on mors of a rationalist (deductive) bent.

2. If it is to a specific doctrine that Rosenak is referring in this distinction, then it is clearer to me what he means by deliberation, but his understanding of the normative approach becomes confusing. Usually, the notion of normative educational philosophy refers to the discussion of a host of incompatible positions such as perennialism, essentialism, and reconstructionism. Indeed, Dewey’s experimentalism which forms the basis of deliberational methods, is one doctrine usually discussed by normative philosophers of education. As Chazan’s analysis illustrates nicely, moreover, there are also many normative approaches to Jewish education. It is difficult to understand what Rosenak means, therefore, when he writes that “explicit Jewish religious education has a normative philosophy of educa-

66 Ibid., pp. 15-25.
67 Ibid., pp. 112-114.
tion. Of which normative philosophy is he speaking, Heschel’s, Buber’s, Soloveitchik’s?

3. Finally, Rosenak often talks as if he has instructional methods in mind when he uses this distinction. For example, he speaks of the affinity between implicit religion and Deweyan deliberation. But if he is speaking of an instructional distinction here, it is not at all clear why we should call this a difference in educational philosophies. Perhaps the difference to which Rosenak is pointing involves a differentiation between didactic and discovery pedagogies. These methods undoubtedly involve divergent philosophical assumptions. However, the differences between them are not only, or even primarily, philosophical. They also involve such empirical issues as how children develop and how subject matter is best taught.

A second distinction used by Rosenak that is sometimes ambiguous is that between explicit and implicit religion. Does explicit religion refer only to publicly observable behavior such as ritual prayer? Or does it include matters that are not observable in the public eye such as beliefs, feelings, and attitudes? And which behaviors or beliefs are to be included. On one hand, it would seem that any explicit practice of a religious community might be included under this rubric. On the other hand, he often speaks of explicit Jewish religion as the traditional practice of certain Orthodox groups. But Reform Judaism also involves specific explicit tenets. Moreover, Rosenak also talks as if explicit Jewish religion conflicts with modernity. Can there be no explicit modernist Jewish religion according to Rosenak?

Similarly, when he writes of the openness of implicit religion, it is not clear to what Rosenak is claiming the religious person is to be open. Sometimes, this concept is used as the mechanism according to which traditional (read Orthodox) explicit religion is to be made accessible to secular Jews. So openness in this connection means being open to secular culture. Other times, it refers to universal inner experience to which religion responds. And this,

68 Ibid., p. 168.
69 Ibid. He even refers to the deliberational alternative as an approach to “educational discourse and practice,” p. 21.
70 Ibid. See, for example, the subtitle to a summary section in the chapter entitled “Being both Loyal and Open: Seeking the Elusive Norm,” p. 268.
as he rightly points out, is often an experience that is an anathema to secular culture. Here openness means being open to certain internal religious experiences to which secular culture is not always hospitable. This confusion is complicated further when we take into account that some forms of explicit Jewish religion have already incorporated within themselves aspects of both universal religiosity and secular culture. For example, Conservative Judaism prides itself on being able to synthesize traditional Judaism and modernity. One expression of this has been the incorporation of women into the liturgical leadership of the synagogue. Thus, the explicit religion of many Conservative synagogues combines certain elements of feminism drawn from secular (or at least non-Jewish, general) culture with traditional ritual behaviors. According to Rosenak, is this explicit or implicit religion?

Methodologically, the analytic philosopher would also be disappointed with Rosenak's arguments. Sometimes important claims remain without defense. For example, Rosenak bases his discussion of explicit and implicit religion on the theological positions of the likes of Liebowitz, Breuer, and Soloveitchik on the one hand and Buber, Bergman, Kook, and Heschel on the other. But why are we to accept the positions of these theologians? Indeed, how are we to accept positions from such a conflicting array of thinkers. Rosenak might respond by claiming that these were only intended as illustrations. Even so, a good deal of his normative position rests on these illustrations. The reader has a right to ask why these and not others?

When Rosenak does engage the reader in logical analysis, the results can be disappointing. Consider his response to the charge ostensibly made by the secularists that religious education is indoctrination. He writes that:

The claim that all religious education is indoctrination deserves a respectful hearing. Yet, it must be borne in mind that the boundary line between education and indoctrination is determined by philosophical judgments with regard to the nature of learning, the child, authority, and value. And educators in democratic societies, despite their different viewpoints, do attempt to

71 Ibid., pp. 198-203.
arrive at some consensus to ward off totalitarianism that is abhorrent to all of them.\textsuperscript{72}

This is a surprisingly relativistic response for so normative and Jewishly traditional an educational thinker as Rosenak. He clearly preserves the pejorative connotation of indoctrination as morally problematic. Indeed, in an earlier essay on the subject he does so quite explicitly. Yet, he argues that the morally repugnant character of indoctrination is relative to philosophical assumptions about knowledge, truth, and the good. As he puts the point, "every educational system has unverifiable principles, standards of loyalty and cultural continuity, and models of ideal personality."\textsuperscript{73} The unstated implication of this claim is that we should not criticize one set of assumptions on the basis of another.

In fairness, Rosenak does advance a set of criteria in that earlier essay to which he does not allude in this connection, according to which we are permitted to criticize educational theories.\textsuperscript{74} Yet, he offers no reasons as to why these criteria are preferable to Chazan's method, content, and intention arguments. Indeed, according to Rosenak's own critique of those arguments, even his theory of indoctrination is based upon certain assumptions. Why are Rosenak's assumptions better than any others? If it is true that every educational system has assumptions that are immune from criticism according to the assumptions of other educational systems, then what is true for the secularists is right for them, and what is true for the religionists is right for them. In short, Rosenak's position is faced with a paradox. If his critique of the secularist claim that religious education is indoctrination is right, then it is wrong, because the secularists must also be right.\textsuperscript{75}

Although Rosenak does not hesitate to put before us his vision of the good life for Jews and the role of education within that life,

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., pp. 79-80.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., pp. 135-138.
in the absence of a clear understanding of the basic concepts of 
his position, and without a rigorous defense of the theologians 
upon which he relies, or a coherent differentiation between religious 
education and indoctrination, it is difficult to assess the 
genuine contribution of this important volume. Ironically, with 
all of Rosenak's commitment to what he calls the normative 
philosophy of Jewish education, there is a sense in which his final 
position is very much like Dewey's, who held that societies have 
the right to impose their visions of the world on children, provided 
that the end in view is to empower them to transform that vision 
one received to suit their own felt needs. Yet, one wonders 
whether Rosenak is prepared to accept the consequence of this 
stance that once culture has been transmitted to a new genera-
tion, it may become so radically transformed that its connections 
to the traditions of the past are more genetic than substantive.

V. Beyond Analytic and Normative Philosophy of Jewish Education

Although each of these positions suffers from failures to live up 
to the expectations of its philosophical camp, the more troubling 
problem is that even when Chazan and Rosenak perform their 
tasks as analytic and normative philosophers well, the results are 
disappointing. Even when Chazan's analysis of the ordinary 
language of Jewish education is clear and convincing, it seems 
unable to do more than offer a superficial, if also valuable, survey 
of the accepted use of educational language; and even when 
Rosenak is at his best in the application of Solovitchik or Buber 
to education, we are left with the question, why Soloveitchik or 
Buber and not Spinoza or Jacob Frank? Neither method, it seems, 
is able to adequately answer the question with which I began, 
namely, what does it mean to be educated as a Jew today? 
Chazan's analytic method sees this primarily as a linguistic issue. 
However, our everyday language does not seem to give expression 
to the deeper problems involved in that issue. Rosenak's norma-
tive method sees this as an issue of the modern Jewish experience. 
Yet, Rosenak's analysis based on modern Jewish thought ends up,

76 See John Dewey (1902), "The Child and the Curriculum," in The Child and 
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like much other modern thought, in the quagmire of relativism. Why have these methods failed?

One reason may be that the normative-analytic debate in educational philosophy has run its course. At least some of the objections of each camp to the opposition were correct. Despite their best efforts to remain descriptive, for example, the analysts could not help but work on the basis of assumptions about the nature of the good life that education is to serve. Yet, as Chazan's writings so clearly illustrate, these assumptions are all too often made uncritically, without the sort of rigorous argument we would have expected from the analysts.\(^77\) Even when their conceptual analysis is clear and significant, moreover, we are left with a lingering question about how this analysis should impact the practice of educators. This may account, in part, for the sense of superficiality that remains; for pressing issues are not only left unresolved, they are too often left unidentified. Normative philosophers such as Rosenak, on the other hand, have not shied away from commenting on what educators ought to do, but they have too often done so without adequate argument and without sufficient reference to recent developments in the field of philosophy.\(^78\) We are in need, therefore, of a rigorous form of philosophical analysis in education which recognizes that the question of what it means to be educated is, in the final analysis, a normative question about the vision of society we are prepared to pass on to our children.

Another reason for this failure may be that Chazan and Rosenak are both so enmeshed in the problematic conditions of modern educational thought, that their methods themselves become symptoms of the very concerns to which we are attempting to give expression. Both Chazan and Rosenak assume that the central question of Jewish educational thought involves how to be Jewish in a modern world defined by the Enlightenment and the Emancipation. Chazan accepts this assumption implicitly by adopting a philosophical methodology that explores communal assumptions about the meaning of language; for it is no doubt the case


that for most Western Jews during the past century, modernity has been central to their conceptions of being educated. Rosenak makes this assumption explicitly and structures his argument as a response to the problems that modernity has posed to Jewe and Judaism. Yet, what neither seems to have noticed is that modernism itself is now in a period of crisis.

To quote Richard Bernstein, "we are witnessing...the playing out of an intellectual tradition." 79 Richard Rorty calls it the Cartesian-Lockean-Kantian tradition. 80 This tradition has both epistemic and political aspects. Epistemically it held that humans can have direct access to knowledge about the world within the confines of space and time by means of that combination of sense experience and the principles of logic we call science. Bernstein calls this the thesis of objectivism. We might call it the principle of enlightenment. Politically, it assumed that it would be possible to create a society that was neutral with respect to religion, ethnicity, and race. This we might call the thesis of universalism or the principle of emancipation. These are among the most crucial assumptions of the modern age, and they have been under increasing attack among intellectuals for more than half a century. Since Einstein, philosophers of science have been challenging the idea that scientific knowledge is as objective as was previously thought; and since the rise and fall of fascism in Europe, political theorists have been questioning whether it is possible for social institutions to remain as religiously and ethnically neutral as we once hoped they could be. The end result is a period in the history of the West that accepts a radical plurality of personal lifestyles and beliefs and that seems unable to grasp onto any ideas of common value to be passed on to children.

The question for many young Jews in this radically pluralistic society is no longer how to be Jewish. It is rather, why be Jewish, indeed, why be anything at all? And this is a very different sort of query indeed. Nor is this merely a parochial or Jewish question. It is rather symptomatic of much larger cultural issues having to do with the very nature of the evidence we will permit

into civilized discourse and the very heritage we are prepared to transmit across generations.

We need only consult the recent best seller by Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*, to realize that educational leaders are in a quandary over what schools ought to teach.81 Bloom places the blame for this quandary at the doorstep of relativism — the idea that truth is a function of framework and that no framework is better than any other — and responds by reasserting a conception of cultural knowledge that tends toward absolutism — the idea that there is only one truth and one framework within which it is confirmed. We are trapped, it seems, between rampant relativism on the one hand, which legitimates so much that its stamp of approval becomes meaningless, and reactions against relativism in the form of absolutism on the other, which is intolerant of diversity.

Plato put the problem this way long ago in *Theaetetus*,

if what every man believes as a result of perception is indeed true for him; if, just as no one is to be a better judge of what another experiences, so no one is better entitled to consider whether what another thinks is true or false...where is the wisdom of...setting up to teach others.82

Bloom takes this dilemma as the basis to dictate a very narrow curriculum. Religious fundamentalists, gentile and Jew alike, take it as their cue to reassert their own absolutist doctrines. I would hope that a deeper understanding of the nature of knowledge to be transmitted across generations would generate a more balanced perspective.

What is called for, it seems, is another way to look at the problem of what it means to be educated, a different approach to educational philosophy. One such approach is concerned with philosophical explanations. Robert Nozick describes how philosophers have often been concerned with questions of the general form: How is one thing possible, given (or supposing) certain other things? How is it possible that there is a God, given evil in

---


the world (Voltaire’s question)? Or the reverse, how is evil possible, given an omnipotent, omnificent God (Job’s question)? How is synthetic, necessary knowledge possible, given Hume’s skeptical arguments (Kant’s question)? And, how can there be stable meaning, given constant change in the world (Plato’s question)?  

Our Jewish educational query can be conceived in this way. How can being educated as a Jew have meaning in today’s Western society, given the influence of various versions of cultural absolutism such as religious fundamentalism on the one hand, which admit no cultural diversity whatsoever, and cultural relativism on the other, which admits so much diversity that the concept of a cultural or religious heritage tends to lose all meaning? This, of course, is a special case of the more general question of what it means to be educated at all, given the influence of relativism and absolutism. Yet, if I am correct about the demise of objectivism and universalism (a claim that I have only asserted but not supported in this essay), then the general question can only be answered by reference to specific cases such as this.

In such cases, explains Nozick, what we want to know is not so much why the first clause is true, but rather how it can be given a second clause that appears to exclude such a possibility. We want to know, for example, not whether God exists, but rather how to make sense of God’s existence given evil in the world. Similarly, putting the question in this way assumes that there is some sense to being educated as a Jew today; we want to know not whether being educated as a Jew is meaningful, but rather how it can be given the tendency toward absolutism on the one hand and relativism on the other. Nozick’s method begins, in other words, with an explicit normative assumption about the value of Jewish education. Its objective is to provide a theory that can help to make sense of that assumption given certain conditions. To show how one thing is possible given another is to show how things fit together, to provide deeper explanatory principles. Nozick calls these deeper principles “philosophical explanations.” One could characterize this new approach to educational philosophy, therefore, as a search for philosophical explanations.

According to this view, the meaning of Jewish education today

---

84 For a more detailed discussion of the problem of absolutism and relativism in curriculum theory, see Alexander, “Liberal Education and Open Society.”
is dependent upon a deeper explanation of how there can be any meaning to transmit at all — Jewish or gentile, linguistic or existential — given the relativistic and absolutist turns that seem now to have been the inevitable outcomes of modern thought. What is called for, in other words, is a theory of education that looks beyond the dichotomies of modernity, beyond the principles of enlightenment and emancipation, a theory that can explain why Judaic (and other) commitments merit transmission according to a different set of assumptions. This may be the challenge of Jewish educational thought in a postmodern age. It is a challenge that lies beyond the scope of this essay. Taking up this challenge, it is hoped, will enable us to address such vital questions as why Jewish education might be valued, what its purposes might be, and how thinking clearly about it can influence not only the transmission of Jewish culture, but transmission of culture in general. Philosophy, according to William James, is actually nothing more than a stubborn attempt to think clearly about things that matter, and to paraphrase that famous rabbinic dictum, nothing matters more than Jewish education.


86 Philosophy, wrote James "is at once the most sublime and the most trivial of pursuits. It works in the minutest of crannies and it opens out the widest vistas. It 'bakes no bread,' as has been said, but it can inspire our souls with courage; and as repugnant as its manners, its doubting and challenging, its quibbling and dialectics, often are to common people, no one of us could get along without the far flashing beams of light it sends over the world's perspectives...But the one thing that has counted so far in philosophy is that a man should see things, see them straight in his own peculiar way, and be dissatisfied with any opposite way of seeing them." In "The Present Dilemma in Philosophy," Pragmatism and the Meaning of Truth (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), pp. 10-12.

87 Mishna, Peah 1:1, "These things have no measure...and the fruits of these are enjoyed in this world while the principle remains for the world to come....But the study of Torah outweighs them all."
Section II

CURRICULUM AND THE TEACHER
THE TEACHER'S ROLE
IN CURRICULUM REFORM

Isa Aron

What is the appropriate role of the teacher in the process of curriculum reform? Should curricular materials be "teacher-proof," as many argued in the 1970s? Or, alternatively, should teachers be seen as shapers of the curriculum? These questions are perennial; they arise with each wave of curricular innovation, and each new curriculum tends to answer them a little differently. For example, the UAHC curriculum, To See the World Through Jewish Eyes, provides teachers with objectives and an outline of suggested activities, but assumes that teachers will write their own lesson plans. In contrast, the Melton Holiday and Mitzvot curriculum provides teachers with fairly detailed "scripts" to follow. The Jewish Values curriculum seems to take a position somewhere between the two, though individual units vary as to their explicitness.

Behind each approach lies a series of assumptions, both ideological and practical, about who teachers are and how much guidance they require. The curriculum writers are likely to have certain opinions of teachers' abilities, based on past experience; in addition, they are likely to have certain beliefs about the ideal teacher and the role of such a teacher in curricular reform. Rarely, however, are the curriculum writer's assumptions articulated in a rigorous and systematic way; nor are they typically grounded in empirical research. This is not surprising, since the field of research on teachers is relatively new and is perhaps the most fertile and exciting area of research in education today.

Research on Jewish teachers is even newer. Our knowledge of who teaches in Jewish schools is still largely anecdotal. Discussions of the qualities of the ideal Jewish teacher have just begun to gather momentum. This paper focuses on the philosophical and empirical underpinnings of two competing conceptions of teaching — profession and vocation. Drawing on the rapidly growing body of research on teaching in secular education, I examine the
implications of each of these conceptions for curriculum development and the organization of schools.

**Teaching as a Profession**

If one unifying theme could be found for the vast and ever-expanding literature on public school teachers, that theme would be professionalization. Study after study has analyzed the professional shortcomings of teachers. Proposals abound for upgrading the professional training of teachers, and, more radically, for the restructuring of the profession itself.

In the field of Jewish education as well, discussions of the Jewish teaching profession have begun to gather momentum. For example, the proceedings of a national conference on the status of Jewish teachers, held at Brandeis University in 1986, were published under the title To Build a Profession.¹ In 1987 a special issue of Jewish Education featured a symposium on Jewish teachers. Federations throughout North America have begun to deal with the issue of personnel in Jewish education; a dominant theme in their deliberations has been the need to upgrade the professional status of teachers.²

The notion of the teacher as a well-trained and well-respected professional has long been one of the cherished ideals of all those concerned with Jewish education.³ In this section I examine this ideal more closely: what are the hallmarks of a professional? Are teachers professionals? Should they in fact be professionals? What are some of the barriers to upgrading the teaching profession?

¹ Joseph Reimer, ed., To Build a Profession: Careers in Jewish Education (Waltham, Ma.: Brandeis University Press, 1987).
What is a Profession?

Most educational commentators agree that teaching is, or at least ought to be, a profession. Few, however, attempt to define this term; those who do, find that the concept is, to quote Morris Cogan, "shrouded in confusion." The most common way around a definition is to contrast a profession with other, presumably inferior, endeavors. Thus, "professional" is held to be the opposite of "amateur" — that is to say one who is either untrained or unsalaried. Alternately, "professional" is taken to be the opposite of "crafts-person," i.e., one whose practice is not grounded in theory or science. Finally, the term "professional," used as an adjective, sometimes connotes altruism or a higher calling, in contrast to "commercial."

Cogan suggests that the ambiguity and imprecision surrounding the term is not accidental, and may be quite functional, for the title "professional" often serves an exhortative, laudatory function. One reason for the undifferentiated use of "profession" may be found in the efforts of many persons and groups to secure to themselves the values clustering around it by simply preempting the title.

Since Cogan's article was written, the literature on professionalism has grown exponentially, and the "sociology of the professions" has become a subfield of its own. Surveying this "scholarly tsunami," Bruce Kimball identifies two criteria which sociologists have taken to be the hallmarks of professionalism — legitimacy and autonomy. Legitimacy refers to the special knowledge and expertise to which professionals lay claim; autonomy refers to the control which professionals exert over the ways in which their services are rendered. To be considered a profession, Kimball argues, members of an occupation group must meet both of the following criteria:

6 Ibid., p. 47.
8 Kimball uses the term "authority," but "autonomy" is the term more frequently used by other writers on this subject.
— they must possess a specialized body of knowledge that distinguishes them from the non-professionals in the field; and,
— they must, as a group or a guild, have the power to shape the conditions under which their work is done.

Some examples may help clarify these criteria. At one extreme, medical doctors are clearly professionals, having specialized academic training and (collectively through their professional organizations) a good deal of control over how medicine is practiced. In contrast, workers on an assembly line may have a certain expertise, but this expertise is not based on a theoretical body of knowledge; furthermore, they have little control over the circumstances under which they work.

In between the two extremes lie a vast array of occupation groups which meet one criterion better than the other, and whose professional status is unclear. Those engaged in business, for example, meet the criterion of autonomy very well, since they contribute to the shaping of the conditions under which they work. In their effort to meet the criterion of legitimacy leaders of the business community have developed business schools and MBA programs, which offer courses in the "sciences" of management, marketing, and administration. A converse situation may be seen in the nursing profession. Like doctors, nurses derive their expertise from medical science; and like doctors, their legitimacy is beyond question. Unlike doctors, however, nurses have very little control over the way in which hospitals are organized; their lower professional status is indicative of their weaker authority.

The Legitimacy of Teachers

"Those who can't do, teach, and those who can't teach, teach education." At the root of this old adage lies an assumption, shared by many, that anyone can teach. After all, everyone has spent hours and hours in classrooms of all sorts, and been exposed to a variety of models of teaching. If one knows a certain subject, surely one can teach it. And, if anyone can teach, why should teachers be considered professionals?

The widespread perception that good teaching may require experience and innate talent, but not any codifiable knowledge,
is seen by many as the most serious challenge to the professional standing of teachers.\(^9\)

To counter this perception educational researchers and policymakers have sought to demonstrate that good teachers operate from a firm knowledge base. Lee Shulman, perhaps the foremost proponent of this view, summarizes this position in the following manner:

The claim that teaching deserves professional status is based on a fundamental premise: that the standards by which the education and performance of teachers must be judged can be raised and more clearly articulated. The advocates of professional reform base their arguments on the belief that there exists a 'knowledge base for teaching'—a codified or codifiable aggregation of knowledge, skill, understanding, and technology, of ethics and disposition, of collective responsibility— as well as a means for representing and communicating it.\(^10\)

While few researchers or policymakers in secular education would quarrel with the goal of upgrading the teaching profession, either from within (in terms of better training) or from without (in terms of setting benchmarks for accomplishment), a number have questioned the feasibility of such an endeavor, on several counts. After two decadee of research, the "scientific basis" of research on teaching amounts to little more than a small number of low-level, common-sense generalizations regarding effective teaching techniques.\(^11\) While Shulman, who employs a different research paradigm, hopes to overcome the narrow technological


bias of previous researchers,\(^{12}\) his work is too preliminary to serve as the sole basis for professional legitimation.

Even were the components of "teacher knowledge" more clearly delineated, developed, and corroborated, would good teaching be directly related to knowledge acquisition? Noting the special way in which personality enters into teaching, some researchers caution against an undue emphasis on knowledge alone.

As Lightfoot states:

> It is difficult...to disentangle teacher character from teacher competences. The teacher is deeply engaged in his work as a whole person because an effect is required on the student as a whole person.\(^{13}\)

And as Sykes further elaborates:

> Education...possesses neither a codified body of technical knowledge nor a clear technology nor a small set of measurable outcomes. Rather, special and ordinary knowledge are freely mixed, teaching styles and the solution of core problems are heavily dependent on personality and consequently are idiosyncratic, and outcomes are multiple, protean, and intangible.\(^{14}\)

**The Autonomy of Teachers**

The second hallmark of a professional is autonomy, i.e., the ability to control the circumstances and terms under which one's service is rendered. Once again a comparison with doctors, who have a great deal of autonomy, may be helpful. Individual doctors may establish their own office procedures and fees schedules, and collectively they set policies for hospitals, medical schools and various public health organizations. Of course, in a complex industrial society such as our own, most professions are subject to some regulation; a variety of laws and conventions set the parameters within which medical practitioners must operate.

One might, at first glance, assume that teachers, too, have a

---

\(^{12}\) Shulman, "Knowledge and Teaching," pp. 3-4.


good deal of autonomy. Teachers teach behind closed doors, and within certain limits they can establish their own set of classroom procedures and rules. Though they may be given a curriculum and/or a textbook, they can decide themselves just how the subject at hand ought to be taught.

A closer look, however, reveals that the situation is more complicated, and that most teachers operate under constraints more onerous than those of other professions: unlike the clients of the doctor or lawyer, students do not come to school voluntarily; conversely, teachers have relatively little choice as to who their students will be. In other fields professionals themselves define and promote the services they offer, but in teaching it is the society at large which dictates its expectations to teachers. Major policy issues in education are usually decided through a political process involving school boards and commissioners (or, in the case of Jewish education, lay people and rabbis), very few of whom have extensive professional training. At the school level, policies are usually set by the principal or administrators, few of whom act in consultation with teachers.\(^\text{16}\)

What can be done to promote teachers' autonomy? How, despite the inherent constraints in the work situation of teachers, can this aspect of professionalism be enhanced? Researchers attempting to answer this question\(^\text{16}\) have focused on that intangibles but altogether critical factor, the "culture" of a school. Why do some schools foster teacher autonomy while others, with equally competent teachers, render teachers powerless? After years of trying to account for the differences by enumerating discrete factors which serve as "independent variables," researchers have begun to take a more holistic, anthropological look at schools.\(^\text{17}\) They argue that many elements combine to create that unique configuration of shared beliefs and practices which is a school's

---


\(^{17}\) Frederick Erickson, "Qualitative Methods in Research In Teaching," in *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, (1986).
culture. This culture serves as a filter for all attempts at changing the status of the teacher's.  

The challenge facing the advocates of professionalization through greater autonomy is that this cultural “screen” makes it difficult to isolate the set of ingredients which are the key to transforming a hierarchical and bureaucratic staff structure into what Roland Barth calls “a community of leaders.”  

Throughout the United States a number of experiments have been undertaken whose purpose is to grant public school teachers more autonomy, either individually or collectively. Concurrently, these experiments are being studied, in an effort to identify the common characteristics of those programs which are most successful. As these experiments progress we will obtain a better picture of both the conditions and benefits of expanded autonomy for the teacher.

**Legitimacy and Autonomy Reinforce One Another**

Though the two hallmarks of professionalism — legitimacy and autonomy — have been discussed independently, it is clear that in actuality they are closely related. Legitimacy serves as the justification for autonomy: the members of a profession are granted control over their practice on the assumption that they, having sole possession of the special knowledge in their field, know best how their practice should be conducted. Autonomy, in turn, allows professionals to establish the standards of legitimacy. Most *bona fide* professions are self-regulating; criteria for membership and methods of evaluation are set by the members themselves.

This is, in essence, the bargain that all professionals make with society: for occupations that require discretion and judgment in meeting the unique needs of clients, the profession guarantees the competence of members in

---

18 Myrna Cooper, “Whose Culture is it Anyway?” in *Building a Professional Culture*.

19 Roland S. Barth, “School: A Community of Leaders,” in *Building a Professional Culture*.

20 Ibid., chapters 8-10.
exchange for the privilege of professional control and standards of practice. \(^{21}\)

**Teaching as a Vocation**

Is the term "professional" rich enough to embody all that we mean when we think of excellence in teaching? If all teachers were to be fully professional, according to the criteria of legitimacy and autonomy, would we be satisfied with the result? The current debate on teachers has focused so narrowly on their professional standing that these questions have rarely been asked. If, however, one were to think of one's most memorable teachers, "professional" would probably not be the only (or even the first) adjective one would use to describe them.

Good teachers, as Jane Roland Martin has stated, "are shapers not only of their students' knowledge, but also of their students' lives." \(^{22}\) While knowledge is certainly a necessary ingredient of good teaching, it is not the only one. Following Dwayne Huebner, I have used "vocation" as a metaphor for this aspect of teaching.

The Latin root of *vocation* refers to a call or summons... To have the vocation of teacher is to permit oneself to be called by children and young people... (It) is to participate intentionally in the unfolding, or perhaps collapse, of this social world. \(^{23}\)

To view teaching as a vocation is to focus on that aspect of teaching that goes beyond training and expertise to the core of the teacher's being. For *vocational*, as opposed to *professional*, teachers, knowledge and autonomy may be important, but only in the context of their ultimate purpose, their reasons for teaching.

Different teachers are "called" to teaching for different reasons. For some it is a desire to work with children, to nurture and care for developing minds and hearts. For others the continuation of a community or a tradition is the ultimate goal; they teach in order

---

to bring a new generation "into the fold." In religious education, one finds a third group of teachers, "called" to teach in the sense implied by the original meaning of the term vocation — by strong religious feelings.

Each of these motivations suggests a different characteristic of the ideal teacher: First, the teacher should be a caring person. Second, the teacher should be an integral member of the community into which the student is being brought. Third, the teacher should be a spiritual role model.

The Teacher as a Caring Person

Research on teachers has consistently shown that they tend to value the intrinsic rewards of teaching over the extrinsic rewards, which is not surprising, since the extrinsic rewards of teaching are rather limited.24 High on the list of intrinsic rewards is the teacher’s perception of having "reached" students, of having made a difference in their lives. The following excerpt from the letter of an experienced teacher to her former student exemplifies this feeling:

Ultimately, teaching is nurturing. The teacher enters a giving relationship with strangers, and then the teacher’s needs must give way to the students’ needs.... My days are spent encouraging young people’s growth.25

By reflecting on one’s own experience as a student, one can probably remember vividly certain teachers who seemed to care about students in a special way. These are teachers who took an interest in their students as people, not just as takers of tests or writers of essays. In her book, Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education, Nell Noddings describes this quality:

When a teacher asks a question in class and a student responds, she receives not just the ‘response’ but the student. What he says matters, whether it is right or wrong, and she probes gently for clarification, interpretation, contribution. She is not seeking the answer

but the involvement of the cared-for. For the brief interval of dialogue that grows around the question, the cared-for indeed “fills the firmament.” The student is infinitely more important than the subject matter.26

The phrase “fills the firmament” is borrowed from Martin Buber, and echoes Buber’s concern with relationships in which there is genuine encounter and dialogue, relationships in which people meet one another as “Thou”s, rather than “It”s.

Noddings argues that the overriding purpose of all schools ought to be the development in young people of the ability to care for each other and for the world around them. “Teaching is a constitutively ethical activity. It is a moral type of friendship in which teachers and students work together to achieve common ends.”27 This is not to say that the learning of subject matter is not important, but that subject matter must be taught in a way that enhances, rather than diminishes, care.

Is it possible for a teacher to care for an entire class of students? How can a teacher meet all these students as “Thou”s, rather than “It”s? Noddings’ reply is that it is, of course, impossible to care for every student every minute, but that this type of caring is neither necessary nor appropriate. A large part of the student’s day is rightfully taken up by his or her interaction with materials or with other students. When, however, the student does interact with the teacher, that encounter must be characterized by caring:

[The teacher must] be totally and nonselectively present to the student — to each student — as he addresses me. The time interval may be brief but the encounter is total.28

If we value caring as a quality, and if it is important to us that teachers be caring individuals, then at least three things must happen. First, we must begin talking about caring a great deal more than we have. We must state quite explicitly that caring for children is one of the most important qualifications for a teacher to have. We must validate the superior social commitment of

teachers in general, as well as individual instances of caring in teaching. Second, we must take a close look at how schools are structured, and the ways in which these structures promote or inhibit caring. Is there time in the schedule for teachers to interact with students more informally? Is it feasible for a teacher to stay with a group of students for more than one year? Third, and most important, we must care for and about teachers. School boards, principals, parents and members of the community at large must extend themselves to teachers, and encounter them in the way we would like them to encounter students.

The Teacher as an Integral Member of a Community

The ideal environment for the education of children would be a homogeneous and well-integrated society, a society in which family, school and a web of civic and religious organizations were interwoven, each reinforcing the values and norms of the other. Historians and anthropologists have spent a great deal of time debating whether or not such harmonious societies have ever existed, in any time or place. Clearly, however, few communities of this sort have survived industrialization, modernization, and the other forces that have shaped contemporary American life.

In our own time the institutions most naturally suited to enhancing the process of education are embattled. Social mobility has all but eliminated the extended family. The rising rate of divorce, along with the entry of an unprecedented number of women into the work force, have sapped the strength of the nuclear family. Social and religious organizations of all kinds face stiff competition from both work and leisure activities. As a result of the mass-media and mass-marketing, America as a whole has become more homogeneous than ever before; but this surface homogeneity has come at the expense of the integrity and vitality of local communities.

Against this background, many of the innovations in public schools over the past three or four decades can be seen as attempts to have the school assume functions which were traditionally fulfilled by the family, church, or other local organizations. Head Start, moral education and sex education are but some of the programs introduced into schools in an effort to compensate for the waning influence of the family.
Thus, the school, whose original mandate was limited to formal instruction, has increasingly been asked to take on a larger and more elusive educational function, which, following Westerhoff's analysis, might be called "enculturation." However, the typical school, which is organized according to age-graded and self-contained classrooms and adheres to a subject-oriented curriculum, may not be the appropriate vehicle for teaching students values and attitudes in more than a superficial way. With the exception of a small number of exemplary programs, schools have not been particularly successful at "enculturating" students.

The expectation that the school will somehow cure social ills has filtered into the Jewish community as well, where education is seen as "the key to Jewish survival." Indeed, the need to have Jewish schools perform functions which relate more closely to "enculturation" than to instruction is even more urgent in the Jewish community. From the outset, Jews in America were deeply ambivalent about the extent to which they wished to identify as Jews, and practice the rituals and traditions of "the old country." The immigrant generation had the luxury of choosing if and when to activate rituals and customs which lay dormant within them. Successive generations, not having been steeped in these traditions from childhood, have had fewer resources to draw upon. To make matters worse, social mobility has largely eliminated the ancillary agents of Jewish enculturation, the extended family and the Jewish neighborhood.

The children currently enrolled in Jewish schools, who are predominantly fourth and fifth generation Americans, receive little Jewish education at home. In a recent study of supplementary school students conducted by the Board of Jewish Education

of Greater New York, only 19% of the respondents indicated that either they or their parents attend synagogue services on Shabbat or on holidays other than the High Holidays. According to the report, in only 61% of the students' homes does someone light Shabbat candles, even occasionally. While one might expect students enrolled in day schools to come from homes with a richer Jewish environment, the impressionistic data collected by many educators suggests that this is not always the case, especially in non-Orthodox day schools.

If Jewish education has any chance for success, we must consider very seriously the differences between instruction and "enculturation." We must acknowledge that instruction in a subject matter (be it mathematics and literature or Hebrew and Bible) is predicated on some prior enculturation, which provides both the motivation for learning, and opportunities for its consolidation. Students in public schools, for example, have daily opportunities to see adults using language and computation skills; in addition, even the youngest have some conception that success in school is connected to success in adult life. In contrast, Jewish students rarely see adults praying, speaking Hebrew, or reading the Bible; nor is competence in these areas linked to future success in the secular world.

If Jewish education is to be taken seriously, if the survival for which it is the supposed key is to be cultural and spiritual, rather than merely demographic, Jewish schools must be restructured and reconfigured to become agents of "enculturation." They must become places which model, for young people, what it means to be Jewish. In short, they must become communities.

What would it take to turn the Jewish school into a community, to change its orientation from instruction to "enculturation?"

Elsewhere, I have outlined five steps which such a transformation would require, including the involvement of parents at all levels of the school's operation and the creation of many more

---
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opportunities for informal learning. Of the five steps, the most relevant to this paper is the one that requires a school which wants to be the core of a community to have teachers who are deeply involved in that community.

The Teacher as a Religious Role Model

It would be difficult to find anyone who would argue that teachers in Jewish schools ought not to be religious role models. But what do we mean by religious? And what is a role model? These are questions which must be answered before we can discuss how important it is that our teachers have this quality, and how this quality can best be encouraged by the school.

Contemporary writers on religion, such as William Alston and Clive Beck, have pointed out that the phenomena which most people call “religious” are so varied as to elude straightforward, stipulative definition. They offer, in place of a definition, a view of religion as the confluence of a number of religion-making characteristics; any particular religion would have some, but not necessarily all, of these characteristics. Clive Beck offers this type of definition, but focuses on the religious person, rather than the religious tradition. A religious person, according to Beck, is one who typically:

— has a system of supernatural beliefs;
— engages in rituals and other practices related to those beliefs;
— is associated with a tradition of such belief and practice;
— participates in a community committed to this tradition;
— derives from the tradition a worldview, and
— a relatively complete way of life.

The virtue of this definition is that it accommodates the variety of ways in which people can be said to be religious. One person, for example, may not believe in God, but may still practice the rituals associated with a certain religious tradition; according to this definition, that person would still be considered religious. A second person might believe in God, but might practice the rituals

of several religious traditions, and might not be involved in a community committed to any of these traditions; that person too, would be considered religious. Of course, not all of these ways of being religious will be acceptable to all Jews, a point to which I will return, after a discussion of religious role models.

"Role model" is a sociological term, which has rapidly become part of everyday vocabulary, because it points to a factor in contemporary life which had no parallel in more traditional societies. In the hypothetical homogeneous society discussed in the previous section, children would form their notions of what makes a successful adult from observing their relatives and neighbors. In such a society the number of potential "roles" to which one could aspire would be quite limited; the roles assumed by one generation would probably be attractive to the next. Changes in contemporary society, however, have eroded the viability of certain traditional roles, such as housewife and shopkeeper, and contributed to the creation of new roles, such as working mother and office worker. A young person growing up today faces a confusing array of possible futures — some traditional, some current, and some of which are as yet unknown. In this context the child's potential role models go far beyond family and neighbors to embrace public figures of all sorts, including even virtual strangers.

In contemporary Jewish life, the role of the teacher is critical, because teachers, along with rabbis, youth group leaders and counselors, are often the only Jewish role models available. As the evidence of the demographic studies and ethnographies discussed above indicates, the number of Jewish activities that marginally affiliated families actually perform is quite small.\textsuperscript{39} While roughly 75% of American Jews celebrate Hanukkah, Passover, and the High Holidays in some fashion\textsuperscript{40} and while as many as 85% affiliate with some Jewish organization at some point in


\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
their lives, a much smaller percentage live a life that might be considered religious, by any of Bseck's criteria.

If Jewish education for the children of the marginally affiliated is to be anything other than an exercise in futility and hypocrisy, Jewish teachers must serve as models for how one can lead an involved and attractive Jewish life.

In the words of Jonathan Omer-Man,

A religious person today is a person who has made certain choices; and a teacher of religion is a person who has made certain choices and whose task is to educate young people who face an even wider range of choices... The student has to be taught to make certain profound existential choices as an individual, and to live with these decisions in circumstances that are not always easy. In order to do this, the teacher has to present himself as a role model, as a person who has made such choices, and with whom the student can identify.

It is important to note that not all of the role models for living a full and committed Jewish life need be religious. Some may be more oriented towards the cultural, ethnic, or secular-Zionist aspects of Jewish life. However, to the extent that a predominance of Jewish schools are synagogue-based, and that many of those that are independent still include religious subjects in their curriculum, one would expect a large number of teachers to serve as religious role models.

What kind of religious role models do we expect Jewish teachers to be? Do we expect them to believe in God? To observe a minimum set of rituals? To have a particular world view? These questions cannot be answered without reference to the particular school. Some schools, especially those affiliated with the Orthodox movement, may expect their teachers to adhere closely to a set of beliefs and a code of practices. Others of a more liberal persuasion may allow, and even value, a plurality of belief and practice, hoping to offer their students a variety of ways of being

a committed religious Jew. All schools ought to consider these
questions seriously, and to attempt to articulate the types of
religious commitment they will expect from their teachers. All of
them ought to think seriously about the way in which the struc-
ture and policies of the school promote or inhibit the teacher's
religiosity.

How Professional and/or Vocational are Jewish Teachers?

Truly exemplary teachers, the teachers imprinted in our memory
or featured in movies, see their work as both a profession and a
vocation. Like Jaime Escalante, the hero of the movie Stand and
Deliver, they cook for their students while coaching them on the
fine points of calculus. Like Eliot Wigginton, the originator of the
Foxfire project, they have strong roots in the community, but are
ready to travel far and wide to promote and refine a new method
of teaching. Like my son's Hebrew teacher, Amy Walk, they are
both relentless in their search for the best methods and deeply
involved in the lives of their students.

To what extent are Jewish teachers professional? To what
extent are they vocational? To what extent can we enhance the
sense of vocation among the professionals, and improve the pro-
fessional skills of those who are "called" — but untrained? And
what of the teachers who fall into neither category? These ques-
tions, which are critical to both school improvement and cur-
riculum reform, can only be answered by an extensive research
effort.

I would like at this point to explore briefly the implications of
the foregoing analysis for the process of curricular innovation.
The professionalism of the teacher is, of necessity, a critical factor
in determining both the format in which a curriculum is pre-
sented and the nature of the training which is offered. A teacher
who has both legitimacy and autonomy, for example, can and
should be an active partner in curriculum design. A teacher who
meets neither criterion requires both more training and more
explicit guidance.

The problem is, of course, that teachers in different schools, and
even different teachers in the same school, are likely to vary
greatly in terms of both legitimacy and autonomy. How can these
variations be taken into account in the process of curriculum
design? I would imagine that the authors of the Jewish Values curriculum had many interesting debates on this issue; it would be valuable to have a record of those debates. Even more valuable might be some carefully monitored experiments based on different formats and different modes of training.

The extent to which teachers vary in their sense of vocation is also relevant to the process of curricular reform, and this is an area in which we know very little. Would a teacher for whom caring, membership in the community, or religiosity is paramount, be more or less likely to adhere to the curriculum writer's intent? One could imagine a sense of vocation serving as a powerful positive force in enhancing the curriculum. Alternatively, a sense of vocation might serve as a screen or filter, resulting in significant distortion. Here, again, some record of changes in the curriculum as it is taught by various types of teachers might prove enormously helpful.

Clearly, a great deal of research is called for to help us understand the degree of professionalism and "vocationalism" of teachers in Jewish schools. As a quantitative beginning, the Los Angeles Teachers Census has provided valuable data. However, quantitative research is most powerful in combination with qualitative research modalities such as interviews and actual classroom observations. A pilot study of this kind has already begun, and my intention is to engage in much more qualitative research in the coming years. Following Lee Shulman's notion of a "union of insufficiencies," we expect that a research program of this type could yield a wealth of information for curriculum planners.


SCHOOL-BASED ADAPTATION OF CURRICULUM: CONSIDERATION OF JEWISH VALUES CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION*

Asher Shkedi

In 1979 The Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora of The Hebrew University of Jerusalem started a new educational program called Teaching Jewish Values. As Michael Rosenak stated, this program was intended to educate the non-religious student through the reading and discussion of Jewish sources. This paper presents the reasoning which underlined questions of curriculum development and implementation and which guided the people involved in this program.

It consists of two parts:

a. Considerations in determining the role of the teacher in the curriculum development process; and

b. Considerations — and the framework for deliberation — in the process of involving the teacher in curriculum development.

A. The Teacher's Role in Curriculum Development

To understand the relevant curriculum issues, it is necessary to study the literature in the area of general curriculum development. Our attention should be focused mainly on the place of the external developer and the school teacher in the curriculum development process.

* This paper presents part of the research done for the author's Ph.D. dissertation at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. The author wishes to thank Professor Joseph Lukinsky for his guidance and support.

The 1960s and 1970s

The role of the teacher has been an issue ever since curricula began to be written outside the school rather than by teachers themselves. When curricula were written in each school, the place of the teachers in the process was, by and large, guaranteed. When the task of curriculum writing (part or all of it) was transferred to external institutions, the possibilities of curriculum development by teachers became limited. The teacher's role in curriculum development became a serious problem, whose roots can be traced to the curriculum reform in the United States of the 1960s. This was a time of renewal and development in the field of curriculum studies.

Following the shock of the Soviet Union's Sputnik launch at the end of the 1950s, a number of curriculum development projects were initiated. They were organized around charismatic people who were, in most cases, subject matter experts. Interested mainly in issues of subject matter, they intuitively developed materials with an eye to improving the competence of classroom teachers through their use and implementation of the curriculum. According to their approach, the teacher was to execute a curriculum written by someone from the outside. The objectives, the learning activities, and the elements of evaluation were designated by the expert curriculum developers. Their major aim was to raise the level of subject mastery among the students, the developers' immediate target population. The teachers were asked to carry out the curriculum with maximum fidelity. Many of the curriculum developers of the 1960s considered their task completed the moment the teachers' and students' guides were published.

Many curriculum developers regarded curriculum as planned learning experiences — based on the naive assumption that it is indeed possible to plan in advance a learning experience for the student. The first comprehensive evaluation of the curricula of the 1960s came as a shock to the curriculum developers. The data collected raised some very crucial questions, as illustrated in the following two examples:

---

Goodlad and Klein examined 158 classes in 67 different schools and found few teachers using the learning materials as the curriculum writers had intended. For example, while the curriculum developer proposed the “experiment and discover” method, most of the teachers used materials for factual memorization. This distortion of the new curricula turned them into traditional means of learning and teaching. The authors thus concluded their study with the following statement:

One conclusion stands out clearly: Many of the changes we have believed to be taking place in schooling have not been getting into classrooms; changes widely recommended for the school over the past 15 years were blunted on the school and classroom door.5

Another book that has stimulated educators was written by Sarason. In his book, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, Sarason reflects on the failure of the curriculum wave of the 1960s and deals with the question of why school innovation failed. He describes the frustrations entailed with teaching a new math curriculum in the following sarcastic remark: "...the curriculum reformers have been quite successful in achieving their goal of substituting one set of books for another."4

Disappointment at the failure of the curriculum reform wave led educators to reconsider the teacher’s role in curriculum development. The curriculum developer now understood that while adoption of a curriculum is decided upon by educational administrators, teachers are key in the process, as they actually use the new materials in the classroom setting.

Thus, the focus of attention in the curriculum field changed in the 1970s to curriculum implementation, which then became a major concern of educational systems.5 The main questions addressed were: What happens to a curriculum when it is actually implemented in the classroom? What is the teacher’s function in this process? Two main approaches to curriculum development

evolved, both of which related seriously to the role of the teacher in the process. Both varied from the 1960s curriculum approach in the different roles they suggested for the teacher.

A. *Teacher's fidelity to the curriculum:* This approach sees the teacher as the active operator and implementor of the curriculum. His/her function is very crucial in the implementation stage but not in the writing stage. The curriculum experts develop guidelines and materials and do the in-service training. All of their effort is focused on helping the teachers understand the curriculum in order to carry it out with maximum fidelity.6

B. *School-based curriculum:* The main element of this approach is that the teachers write their own curriculum. In most cases, curriculum writing occurs in one school or as a joint project of several schools.7

Each approach makes certain assumptions about what teaching is and how teachers can best improve their work. The first approach sees the teacher as a technician who can understand curriculum, master its content and exploit it fully. The second approach sees the teacher as a creative person capable of comprehending teaching content, developing the curriculum independently and carrying it out in a classroom.

**The Approach of Teacher Fidelity to Curriculum**

This approach sees the published curriculum materials and guidelines written by the experts as the final product. Teachers are asked to use the curriculum with maximum fidelity, but in contrast to the approach in the 1960s the supporters of this method give the teacher a crucial place in the curriculum process. They now understand that curriculum implementation is more a function of people than of technology. In reassessing teacher training needs they have learned that even the "best" educational practice is unlikely to fulfill its promise in the hands of an inadequately trained or unmotivated teacher.8 Hence, the curriculum develop-

---


ers are trying not to bypass teachers, but rather to train them more carefully. Development of a large system of in-service training for the new curriculum has increased the amount of published materials for the teacher. The stage of implementation becomes an important step in curriculum development.

The adoption of the fidelity approach brought about a change in the method of curriculum evaluation. While the 1960s curriculum was evaluated by comparing results to objectives, the fidelity approach adopted an evaluation system in several stages, which examined the curriculum process from its inception through the process of transmission from the teachers to the students. 

We decided that there are at least five distinct curricula with varying perceptions within each classification: ideal, or what some planning group has proposed as an alternative; formal, or what some controlling agency has prescribed; perceived, or what teacher (and others) think it is; operational, or what can be observed, at least in its outward manifestation; and experienced, or what the student relates to.

The main purpose for this kind of evaluation is to limit, as much as possible, the gap between the curriculum developers' intent and actual curricular matters, by making the developer aware of such gaps in order to improve the final product. On this point, there is a huge difference between this development approach and that of the 1960s. The developer will thus change the curriculum as many times as is necessary until the curriculum is effectively teachable, and the loss between the stages of the process is reduced.

Paradoxically, the over-sensitivity of the developers to the function of the teachers in the process and their efforts to help them as much as possible, reveal the weakness of the fidelity approach. Is its real purpose to achieve fidelity in carrying out the
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curriculum without any losses due to individual interpretation? It seems that the answer to this question is — absolutely not.

As stated by Fullan, “even teachers who had received special training in summer institutes over several weeks showed variation in their use of curricula...”\(^{12}\) Furthermore, curriculum studies of the 1970s clearly concluded that it is impossible to expect a completely faithful implementation of the curriculum.\(^{13}\)

Teachers tend to interpret the curriculum, consciously or unconsciously, in their own way and to connect it to their teaching in ways different from those originally intended by the curriculum writer. Educational realities and research findings both point to the central place of teachers in the curriculum process. They cannot be ignored, programmed or connected to a program directed by others.

**The School-Based Curriculum Approach**

Another reaction to the failure of the curriculum reform wave was the decision to give teachers an almost exclusive role in curriculum development. Educators adopting this view felt it impossible to write curriculum from outside the school, as teachers are not simply mechanical transmitters of educational ideas planned and written by others. Even the attempts to correct the curriculum several times did not totally close the gap between the teachers (implementors) and the external experts (developers).

A comprehensive study conducted by the Rand corporation focused on the issue of the teacher’s place, attitudes and behavior in innovational projects. The study clearly concluded that outsiders cannot change a school program without the strong involvement of school staff. There is no substitute for the intelligent participation of the teacher in curriculum improvement. Furthermore, outside experts, and not the school staff, have to undergo significant changes if they are to be effective partners in school

---


projects. The results of this study were confirmed in other research. In conclusion, the teacher's central place in the process of curriculum development was affirmed.

Involvement in the process increases the teacher's commitment to the final product and develops a sense of intense involvement. Teachers are motivated to take on the extra work and other personal costs of attempting change in the belief that they will improve as teachers and that their students will benefit. Furthermore, in this way they are more likely to use the product in their classrooms.

The clearest statement about the role of teachers in curriculum development is given by Schwab:

Curriculum is what is successfully conveyed to differing degrees to different students, by committed teachers using appropriate materials and actions, I repeat: What is successfully conveyed...by those involved in the teaching of a specifiable and known group of students...who will differ from time to time and place to place.

The school-based curriculum arose as a contrast to the approach which suggested the development of a "teacher-proof" curriculum and, accordingly, it would suggest the education of a "curriculum-proof teacher" — an autonomous, independent and creative teacher who plays a central role in curriculum development.

---
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The school-based curriculum movement aims to take the role of curriculum development from the external curriculum center and give it to the teacher in the school. The outside experts will remain as consultants, since it has become very clear that teachers need external agencies able to provide them with the resources, skills and understanding they need, if they are to take responsibility for developing the curriculum. The supporters of this approach are quite sure there is no other way to refresh the curriculum field. As Kelly explains, "...this is the only way of ensuring that curriculum change is in fact curriculum development. The only satisfactory curriculum development is likely to be school-based curriculum development..."\(^{19}\) The bottom line of the "school-based curriculum" approach is the focal point of all curriculum development — the teachers, who must take the responsibility of curriculum development into their own hands.

The question of the values inherent in the "school-based curriculum" is not a subject for debate. Nevertheless, the idea of taking the task of curriculum writing away from external experts and giving it to teachers raises some difficulties. Eisner\(^{20}\) points out the difficulty of expecting teachers to produce curriculum materials on a satisfactory academic level. On the other hand, he is aware of the potential of teachers for writing their own curriculum (as mentioned above) and therefore considers the whole question as one of values judgement. Another criticism of "school-based curriculum" is that the results become less accessible to many teachers. This view, however, can be rejected for being too limited in its grasp of the problem, and assumes a tendency to "reinvent the wheel" rather than to learn from others.\(^{21}\)

In order to solve these problems, there are those who suggest that a subject-matter expert should be appointed to lead groups of teachers in their curriculum work. This option raises a problem because as Schwab warns, it is very easy for the subject-matter

---


specialist to oversaw the group and impose the character and structure of his or her own discipline as the correct model for the curriculum. The subject-matter specialist may prevent teachers from expressing themselves independently. For this reason and others, Schwab suggests that the curriculum expert should lead the team whose duty it is to conduct both the deliberation and the total process.

The key point at issue here is the teacher's acceptance of the need to assume sole responsibility. The research on this issue has yielded ambivalent findings. Many studies clearly indicate that increased participation in curriculum decision making holds little or no attraction for classroom teachers, who reveal little satisfaction when they take part in this effort. Silberstein reports on a survey of science teachers in Israel showing about 90% of the teachers preferred using prepared curriculum materials to creating curricula themselves. They would then choose those materials appropriate to their needs.

There are other studies identifying positive outcomes, both personal and organizational, of teacher participation in curriculum development in the broader organizational setting. In this case teachers were primarily interested in decisions closely related to their classroom work and a majority felt involvement when they were able to offer their knowledge of what works and what doesn't work in the classroom. Many teachers specifically mentioned that their presence on curriculum committees increased their knowledge of the subject area. Above all, participation in curriculum-making groups raised their self-esteem and gained the respect of their colleagues.

The contrast between the studies' results leads us to believe that most of the teachers prefer using a prepared curriculum rather than developing one themselves. As mentioned in the

study by Leithwood, teachers' responses indicate that complete, varied and well-organized curriculum guidelines save them time, take the worry out of the sequencing of topics and provide reliable and trustworthy tests. The positive values of school-based curriculum decline in light of some of the basic obstacles mentioned above. Even those who maintained a positive attitude to participation in a curriculum writing team connected it to curriculum activities closely related to their classroom work. Taking into consideration that participation in curriculum development demands a great deal of time, it is unrealistic to expect teachers to develop curriculum by themselves.

An Alternative Approach: School-Based Adaptation of Curriculum

Seymour Fox suggests — in reaction to the critique of curriculum development centers, on the one hand, and the obstacles to school-based curriculum on the other hand — that every school adapt a suggested curriculum for its specific requirements. According to Fox this solution takes into consideration the knowledge, authority and expertise of the central institution for curriculum development as well as the needs of every school and teacher. In a similar vein, Connelly and Ben Peretz argue that the term “implementation” is inappropriate to what should exist in the school and therefore it should be replaced by a term such as “adaptation.” This term shifts the teacher's role from that of implementor to that of decision-maker and independent developer. The idea of adapted curriculum rather than implemented curriculum assumes two equal partners taking part in the process: teachers and other school staff, and the experts of central institutions for curriculum development.

The ideas of adaptation and partnership build upon the findings of a Rand corporation study. The study suggests a strategy for innovation entitled “collaborative planning” characterized by equal input from teachers and external persons. According to the study, only a collaborative strategy generated the necessary broad based support from teachers and principals as well as from external institutions. Even the strategy of “grass roots planning” devised by teachers or by school-based project staff failed to produce results.\(^{28}\)

The incorporation of teachers into the central professional curriculum team is reported by Young and also by Connelly and Ben Peretz.\(^{29}\) There are, however, at least three weaknesses in this approach:

- Even when half of the people on a curriculum team are teachers and the other half experts, the partnership is not a real one, even if the teacher feels some kind of advantage.
- The work of the central curriculum team takes a great deal of time and focuses on long term goals. Most teachers suffer from limited time and prefer to put their efforts into their day-to-day classroom needs.
- Most teachers feel out of their element with such work. In other words, participation in the central team is an option for only a minority of the teachers. For most, the project remains the same as any external curriculum. Furthermore, no evidence exists that teachers prefer such a curriculum over others.

We therefore suggest a strategy of curriculum development which has the potential to truly incorporate all the teachers in the process of curriculum development, i.e., \textit{school-based adaptation of curriculum}. Connelly suggests dividing the curriculum process into two distinct stages.\(^{30}\) The first stage belongs to the “external” developers whose task is to develop curriculum and educational materials. Their products will provide a system of educational alternatives to the teacher. The external developers will demonstrate the reasoning supporting their choice of materials in the

\(^{28}\) McLaughlin and Marsh, “Staff Development,” pp. 73-74.


\(^{30}\) Connelly, “The Function of Curriculum Development.”
process of the curriculum development, and list, based on empirical evaluation studies, possible uses of the program.

The point where the external developer concludes is the starting point for the second stage: that of user development of curriculum. According to Connelly, the teachers' role is to make important decisions such as choice of content, suggested method of instruction, and adaptation of the curriculum for their practical needs. Connelly thus suggests optimal use of the differential characteristics of each partner in the curriculum process: the teachers and the external experts. Support for this approach is found in the works of Fullan and Pomfret, Silberstein, and Fox. All of them maintain that the principal role of teachers in curriculum development is to take curriculum materials and guidelines and to adapt, change and supplement them according to real pedagogic needs.

We now return to the question raised at the beginning of this paper — what is the appropriate process for developing a curriculum of "Jewish Values." We have come to the conclusion that the process which we call "school-based adaptation of curriculum" is the best way to both initiate new curriculum and encourage innovation in the school. This process is implemented through collaboration between external developers on one side and teachers and school staff on the other, with each participant in the process having his/her own role. The system works as follows: External experts develop a basic curriculum unit composed of educational ideas and curriculum suggestions. These curriculum units are for the teacher and not for the student. The suggestions are explained in detail so that the teacher does not deviate from the intentions and objectives of the curriculum writers. The teachers' task is to continue to develop the curriculum by adapting it to the unique educational situation. They can select materials, change supplements and even decide not to use the proposed curriculum altogether. Every decision is based on the schools' and teachers' needs.

---

B. Involving the Teacher in Curriculum Development

We suggest the teachers’ curriculum workshop as a means to implement the teacher’s role in the process of “school-based adaptation of curriculum.” This workshop will be conducted by a professional curriculum leader. In the following pages of this paper we suggest guidelines for deliberation in such teachers’ workshops. We will argue that the appropriate way to conduct workshop deliberation is by relating to the teachers’ thinking in the curriculum process.\(^32\)

The Dilemma as an Expression of Teacher Thinking on Curriculum

Although the term “dilemma” comes from the field of logic, it has become commonly used as a term for describing the problematic situation of choosing among alternatives. Rosenak \(^33\) differentiated between “problem” and “dilemma.” In the former, one faces alternatives but knows which to choose because in a problem situation, one has the capacity to make a choice. In a dilemma the problem is not clear enough, and there is no preferred solution which can conclusively solve the dilemma. Any decision within a dilemma is connected to benefit and cost, and has possible negative consequences. The differentiation between “problem” and “dilemma” is very close to Reid’s distinction,\(^34\) mentioned previously, between two kinds of practical problems: the procedural and the uncertain. What is unique to the educational process is

---


the second type of problem, which presents the teacher with uncertain situations.

Based on the assumption that in the planning process teachers simultaneously take into account several different kinds of factors, we offer the term “dilemma” as being most expressive of the teacher’s state of thinking. The use of “dilemma” is also based on studies by several researchers, even though none limit the focus to the planning process in teachers’ thinking.35

It is of considerable value to find out what these dilemmas are, and to classify them in an effective array, so that they may be used to lead and/or analyze teachers’ curriculum deliberations.

The Dimensions of Teachers’ Curriculum Thinking

Schwab36 argue that any educational thought process is a composite, implicit or explicit, of four “commonplaces”: subject matter (or content), learner, milieu, and teacher. The concept “commonplaces” can be explained in the following way:

They are a set of extremely general terms used for grouping relevant material and guiding our investigation. They point out the places to look for ideas; and if we aim to cover the ground thoroughly we look in all of these places.... What, then, are the commonplaces of education?... Someone (a teacher) aims to teach something (a subject matter) to someone (a learner) in a network of social and cultural environments (milieux)... To ignore any one of them constitutes a failure in perception.... The commonplaces are empty. That is why they are commonplaces rather than simply places. They achieve their


36 Schwab, “The Practical 3.”
generality by emptying themselves of content so they are available for use in all educational circumstances.\textsuperscript{37}

Assuming that teachers' curriculum thinking is expressed in its essence by dilemmas, we would want to develop a system of dimensions based on Schwab's commonplaces. Each dimension represents a cluster of dilemmas which relate to the commonplaces. Any planning decision by the teacher is an expression of the relationship between the teacher's point of view and the other commonplaces, content, students, and milieu. When a teacher thinks about the curriculum process he/she does not consider the commonplaces separately, but always thinks in combinations of two or more. Dilemmas arise because the points of view which play a part in the teacher's thinking are not always consistent with each other. The dimensions of teacher curriculum thinking can thus be defined as sets of dilemmas arising from the confrontation between the teacher's point of view and one or more of the other commonplaces.

We suggest that in a framework of deliberation for a teacher's workshop in the context of "school-based adaptation of curriculum" there always remain two commonplaces in any teacher's curriculum decision. One is the teacher him or herself and the other is the content. It is clear why the commonplace "teacher" is present in any process, but it is necessary to explain why "content" is also permanent.

The term "content" relates to any outside formal information which the teacher faces in the planning process. There is the content of the disciplines, and pedagogical and curricular content. Teachers encounter these types of content through reading the teachers' curriculum guide and other books, or through direct contact with experts. A teacher who tries to adapt a suggested curriculum finds him/herself considering at least two commonplaces: the teacher him/herself and the content of the suggested curriculum. In the process of adapting curriculum to a real class situation any of the teacher's curriculum decisions should keep in mind the suggested content. Therefore, any of the dimensions of a teacher's curriculum thinking results in a dilemma between the

teacher's point of view on the one hand and the content on the other, or between the content and another two commonplaces.

We suggest three dimensions of a teacher's curriculum thinking:

— the teacher's dilemmas vis-a-vis the content;
— the teacher's dilemmas vis-a-vis the content and the milieu;
— the teacher's dilemmas vis-a-vis the content and the students.

The following examples enable us to explain the educational situations in terms of tensions, conflicts and dilemmas. They represent each dimension separately. We do not intend to portray a complete picture, or even to suggest a taxonomy of each of the dimensions, but to explain our idea through classical situations taken from educational literature.

The Teacher's Dilemmas vis-a-vis Content

Leithwood and McDonald mention the contradictions in teachers' intentions during planning. According to their research, 80.2% of the teachers indicated that they tried to meet their own needs for independence, freedom and flexibility. On the other hand, they found that 46.9% of the respondents indicated some need for curriculum guidelines, formal tests and grading policies.

This illustrates the dilemma situation arising from the tension between the teacher as a person, with his/her own goals, and the suggested teaching content. While on the one hand teachers want to maintain and express their independence, freedom and flexibility, on the other hand they seek to adhere to the external content provided by the guidelines. How does a teacher face this dilemma? Obviously, there is no one solution. When facing the two poles of the dilemma, in some cases teachers prefer to be supported mainly by the guidelines; in other cases teachers prefer their independence. In most cases they will try, through a process of consideration, to find a balance between the two poles. The degree to which either pole is stressed depends on the specific teacher, the content and the whole educational situation.

As another illustration, imagine the following situation:

The summer workshop took place in an atmosphere of tension and pressure... The pressure and tension stemmed not only from being in a group learning situation with peers but also from the scary knowledge that in several weeks they would have to teach the new math to their pupils... The more anxious they became the harder they worked to try to master the material, all the time asking themselves that if they were having difficulty what would their pupils experience?39

Teachers face two contradictory options. They may continue with the "old" familiar content, or, may opt for trying the innovative program. This dilemma is difficult since the teachers do not know if the new program will be better than the old which supposedly worked well. At the same time, they know that the new program is recommended by authoritative experts. Most find their way through some combination of the two options, sometimes preferring more elements from the new programs, in other cases taking fewer. Depending upon the teacher, the content, and the educational situation, the degree of adoption of elements of the new program will vary.

The Teacher's Dilemmas vis-a-vis the Content and the Milieu

The following example relates to dilemmas connected to the milieu outside of the school. Every educator faces the reality of the difference between the general education received through simply living with others and the education offered by the school. Families, community, the neighborhood, religious organizations, television broadcasters, and so forth, constitute the elements of "life education." These various institutions mediate the culture in a variety of pedagogical modes and through a range of technologies for the recording, sharing, and distribution of symbols. In most of these institutions, education is incidental while in school, education is intentional. There is often conflict between what educators are trying to teach and what is learned from the ordinary business of living. This situation raises dilemmas.40

39 Sarason, The Culture of the School, p. 42.
The teacher tries (or is even asked) to transfer culture and values which often conflict with surrounding society. A teacher who works seriously and consistently can find him/herself at "war" against society, families and even the pupils themselves. The extreme alternative is to surrender and deal with something else. Between these two poles there are many options. Each teacher faces the dilemma and always solves it, with regard to his/her attitudes and the specific educational situation.

The following is an example taken from inside the school milieu:

Teachers act within a school system which has its own culture and rules. They often find themselves in conflict with the system, a situation which interferes with their educational work and upsets their equilibrium. For instance, teachers are commonly resentful of the amount of material they are expected to cover, especially when their worth as teachers is judged according to this criterion. This is an unacceptable demand if teachers are expected to bring children to a certain academic level. Each teacher is aware of and disturbed by the fact that he/she lacks the time to provide the quantity and quality of help needed to the students who may otherwise fall by the wayside. How do teachers face this dilemma?

This dilemma has two poles.

— One is to absolutely ignore the school system's demands and to focus all attention on the pupils.

— The other side of this dilemma is to be consistent with the school system, and let the pupils pay the price. The reasonable teacher combines the two approaches regarding the specific situation in each case.

Teacher's Dilemmas vis-a-vis Content and the Students

It is the conventional wisdom that elementary teachers are child-focused and secondary teachers are subject-matter focused. In reality the dichotomy is not so simple. Indeed, unlike the elementary teacher, the secondary teacher is a specialist — specially trained and licensed for the purpose of teaching a specific dis-
cipline. The elementary teacher receives general pedagogic training. Although both live in at least two worlds, the world of subject matter and the world of education, living in two simultaneous worlds creates a dilemma. The dilemma is in deciding where to place emphasis in working with pupils. "The question becomes: Am I primarily a teacher who is concerned with the mastery of academic content or am I primarily a social worker concerned with the pastoral care of my students?"\textsuperscript{41}

Some deal with the dilemma by deciding to strictly identify themselves as carriers of knowledge. Others prefer to ignore the formal discipline and ask only one question: What is best for the child? Most teachers will find their educational course by following (consciously or unconsciously) Dewey's advice: "It is necessary to get rid of the prejudicial notion that there is some gap in kind between the child's experience and the various forms of subject matter that make up the course of study."\textsuperscript{42} Translating Dewey's ideas into practical experience causes the teacher to find his place, every day and in almost every teaching decision, between the two poles of the dilemma.

As for other examples, even when teachers are satisfied with the amount of content they have to teach and see the educational potential of the subject matter, they are faced with other types of dilemmas. Teachers usually have too many children in class and it seems impossible to reach everybody. Having to deal with groups of students and, at the same time with each child as an individual causes teachers to face a serious dilemma: They can be loyal to the subject matter and teach it to the class as one unit, ignoring individual needs. On the other hand, they can decide to meet the need of every child with a consequent loss of subject matter and neglect of all the material necessary to achieve mastery.

\textit{The Workshop Leader}

It is unrealistic to expect teachers to take their appropriate place in workshop deliberation without the direction of a professional

\textsuperscript{41} Lieberman and Miller, Teachers, Their World and Their Work: Implications for School Improvement (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984), p. 46.

\textsuperscript{42} J. Dewey, Experience and Education (New York: Collier Books, 1902), p. 96.
leader. The leader of the workshop plays the central role in this process. The progressive education movement casts teachers as professionals who would rebuild education almost singlehandedly. The problem is that teachers receive little real help and cannot carry out the expected task.\textsuperscript{43} To conduct workshops for school-based adaptation of curriculum requires a leader with a broad understanding in the field of curriculum development, a knowledge of group dynamics, the ability to build up the professional confidence of teachers, and knowledge in the subject matter of the curriculum.

Both Schwab\textsuperscript{44} and Fox\textsuperscript{45} envision a framework for deliberation by professional teams engaged in curriculum development. The leader, the chairperson of this team, is a curriculum specialist.

It is he who reminds all others of the importance of the experience of each representative to the (curriculum-making) enterprise as a whole. It is he, as chairman, who monitors the proceedings, pointing out to the group what has happened in the course of their deliberation, what is currently taking place, what has not yet been considered, what subordinations and superordinations may have occurred which affect the process in which all are engaged.\textsuperscript{46}

The role of the leader in school-based adaptation of curriculum is similar in its importance to the role of the leader in a professional team, but quite different in function. The main role and expertise of the leader is in the way he/she conducts the teachers’ deliberations in the workshop.

Teacher deliberation must be based on the dimensions of teacher curriculum thinking. The leader takes care that each of the dimensions arises during the deliberation, encouraging teachers to expose their thoughts and facilitating their input into the process. He/she monitors the proceedings, pointing out to the group what has happened in the course of their deliberation, what is currently taking place, and what has not yet been con-

\textsuperscript{44} Schwab, "The Practical 3."
\textsuperscript{46} Schwab, "The Practical 3," p. 505.
sidered. As leader, he/she moves the deliberations toward the purpose of adapting the curriculum and producing a product which can be taught.

In dealing with two participants, (the external expert who writes the basic curriculum and the teacher who adapts the curriculum to his/her needs), the leader is, in some respects, an intermediary. He/she should be able to manage the workshop through correlating the teachers’ point of view and the curriculum’s original intentions. Therefore, the leader should be a curriculum expert, who understands the concepts of curriculum development. He/she should keep in mind the original conception of the curriculum, so that it isn’t lost in the course of the deliberations.

The leader should also know the subject matter of the curriculum quite well and be competent in pedagogical processes. These two functions, subject knowledge and pedagogical expertise, are very important as they are the content of the curriculum. In spite of this, we argue that the first two functions of the leader, (being an expert in teacher deliberation and curriculum development), are much more crucial to the process. We come to this conclusion because the subject matter and the pedagogic process should be presented by the curriculum documents (teacher’s guide and student materials). In contrast, there is no substitute for the leader’s expertise in curriculum development processes and in the capacity to lead teacher curriculum deliberation. In the case of subject matter and pedagogic processes, it is even possible for someone in the group of teachers to be more expert than the leader. The leader, however, as the chairperson of the workshop can involve each participant according to his/her subject matter competence and pedagogical expertise.

One more function in a school-based adaptation of curriculum is technical. Teacher workshops require many technical elements, supplying materials and copies to the team, design, and so on, as well as timetables organizing workshops. Everyone who knows school culture well understands that without this function the whole structure will fall. The leader need not be in charge of the organizational functioning, as any responsible teacher is capable of doing this.

We have tried to describe some elements of the leader’s role. Many questions have not been solved in this description, such as:
Who is the workshop leader? What is his/her special expertise? From where does he/she get his/her expertise as a teacher curriculum leader? How does the leader manage the teacher deliberation? How does he/she assure the active involvement of each teacher while remaining confident that the original curriculum's intention will be carried out? Some of these as well as other important questions have been dealt with in another work.47 Others still lack clear answers and require more study and experience.

Even though it is premature to arrive at a final detailed conclusion we are introducing and experimenting with teachers' workshops in school-based adaptation of curriculum in many Jewish schools throughout the world. We seem to be on the way to finding an appropriate kind of partnership between an academic curriculum center in Jerusalem, and schools, teachers and principals throughout the Jewish Diaspora.

47 A. Shked, "Teacher Participation in Curriculum Development: A Case Study of Workshops for Teachers of Jewish Values" (Hebrew) (Ph.D. diss., The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1987).
MAKING ‘THE PRACTICAL’ REAL:
THE EXPERIENCE OF THE MELTON
RESEARCH CENTER IN CURRICULUM
DESIGN (English Abstract)

Barry W. Holtz

This article explores the relationship between curriculum theory and reality of curriculum design as exemplified in the work of the Melton Research Center at the Jewish Theological Seminary (New York). The Center’s work in curriculum for Jewish education has been based on theoretical explorations by Joseph Schwab and Seymour Fox, and this article begins by examining Schwab’s article “The Practical 3: Translation in Curriculum” and Fox’s “A Practical Image of ‘The Practical’” to see the outlines of this approach to developing curriculum. We focus in particular on the two major aspects of the theory:

— the need for a curriculum “deliberation” among representatives of the “four commonplaces” of education, and
— the crucial importance of testing materials in the field before their final publication.

We then turn to the actual experience of the Melton Research Center in attempting to implement “The Practical.” First we look at the difficulties inherent in actualizing the deliberation process. We describe the ways that the Center modified Schwab’s original concept of the deliberation in order to make it more workable in the field. We describe a model termed here “deliberation in absentia” and the resulting importance of the role of the “curriculum specialist” in adapting Schwab’s theory. The article attempts to outline both the advantages and disadvantages of this modification.

In addition we examine one point that appears to us overlooked in Schwab’s and Fox’s writing: the important role of the curriculum writers. We show the way that the writers had a major impact on the direction of the curriculum and the reasons why the writers became the ideal trainers during the implementation
phase of the project. The writers also played a crucial role in observing the curriculum while it was being tested.

This point leads us to the second major thrust of the article: the experience of the Center in testing materials in the field. Schwab's emphasis on testing is well-founded, as demonstrated by our own work in implementing curriculum into the field. In this article we focus on one curriculum project of the many that the Center has developed in order to exemplify some of the results of the testing process. The attempt here has been not to include every example of revision that was made between the "experimental edition" and the final version, but rather to look at certain key findings.

We outline four different types of changes that were implemented after testing, areas that may have been overlooked or misunderstood in the original writing of the materials, and that the testing helped to clarify and influence: a) the problem of the amount of time needed for teaching the individual lessons; b) problems with the teachers in the field, including issues related to general pedagogic competence and ways that teachers resisted or rejected certain aspects of the curriculum; c) misunderstandings about the nature of the students; and d) resistance sometimes displayed by administrators or parents.

The article concludes with comments about the issue of "scientific testing" of materials and argues that such testing is often a good deal closer to reading and interpreting texts than it is to experiments in a laboratory.
Section III

IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN THE FIELD
TEACHING JEWISH VALUES AND TEACHING JEWISH TEXTS IN A MELBOURNE JEWISH DAY SCHOOL

Michael Gillis

This paper discusses the history, nature and impact of a particular curriculum innovation in a large community day school in Melbourne, Australia. These observations are offered as the notes of a curriculum practitioner on work which is far from complete. Thus, this paper is itself a part of the process. One great advantage of school-based curriculum development is that any idea, viewpoint or suggestion can very quickly be turned into a small-scale educational experiment; therefore, this paper is also the record of many such experiments. What happened in our school, however, began with a large-scale experiment in Jewish education and involved adapting a program developed by a central curriculum provider — the Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora of the Hebrew University. The changes that have taken place over the past seven or eight years, however, cannot be all be subsumed under the heading of the implementation of the particular curriculum, Teaching Jewish Values. One suspects that documentation of curriculum innovation always tends to tidy up the loose ends of reality, such as the idiosyncratic moves of individuals and the decisions made due to administrative expedience. Descriptions tend to be very rational with everything proceeding systematically from stage to stage — until the curriculum is revealed to be not all that it was supposed to be, and then the hindsight team moves in to demonstrate its theoretical shortcomings and its failure to anticipate the vicissitudes of the workaday world of real teaching in real schools.

In this case the loose ends simply cannot be tidied up. First, Teaching Jewish Values, as Seymour Fox is fond of pointing out, is not so much a curriculum as an experiment in curriculum. Second, we are not describing a large educational system where the particulars of individual settings are less significant when we look at the whole system. In this instance the experiment was conducted in one school in a very specific setting. Third, the
record will show that the curriculum was only implemented in part. The response to initial difficulties was to deviate not only from the curriculum units as such, but often to deviate from the whole approach of the curriculum. Furthermore, there was a point at which the program was formally withdrawn. Some of these difficulties stem from the attempt to direct the program from a curriculum center so far away from the teaching center.

What are described as loose ends might be perceived simply as the failure of the program. This paper argues that despite many difficulties and shortcomings, Teaching Jewish Values as a whole cannot be dismissed as a failure in this school. It has changed the way in which lay leaders, administrators, teachers, students and parents think about Jewish learning in the school. It continues to affect the curriculum of the school and indeed it will be suggested that in some ways the school has itself developed new curriculum in the spirit of Teaching Jewish Values while offering a useful critique and an extension of it.

The Setting

The school is very large with some 2,500 students from kindergarten through grade twelve. The school was created in 1948 against the historical background of the aftermath of the Holocaust on the one hand and the emergence of the State of Israel on the other. The period immediately before and after the Second World War saw a large influx of refugees from Europe, mainly from Poland, who brought with them an intense Yiddishkeit which had to confront the economic and cultural pressures of Australian life. The prime agency for cultural preservation and continuity chosen by this community was the Jewish day school. The day school movement proved phenomenally successful with estimates of about 70% of school-age children attending Jewish day schools, which range in their ideologies from Haredi to religious Zionist, to secular Zionist to Yiddishist. Why the schools in Melbourne have been so successful is yet to be fully researched. The effectiveness of the schools as agencies for deepening and strengthen-

* For a discussion of changes in the Melbourne Jewish community as the background to the establishment of Jewish day schools see Peter Medding, From Assimilation to Group Survival (New York: Hart, 1989), pp. 97-105.
ing Jewish identity however, has been questioned.\textsuperscript{1} Our school was founded under the auspices of the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies and was seen from the outset as the general community school. The religious orientation of the school is an official orthodoxy of a type prevalent in Britain and the Commonwealth apart, perhaps, from Canada. This means that while there is no real expectation of halakhic observance on the part of students and their families, all school-based religious life is run on Orthodox lines, i.e., in terms of worship or the rabbis invited to address students. The school works with the Torah Department of the World Zionist Organization which recruits emissary teachers and provides other educational services. To avoid any charge of sectarianism the school describes its aim as providing an education based upon "traditional Judaism taught in a modern way;" compulsory religious practice is kept to a minimum. The proportion of \textit{halakhically} observant students is scarcely significant, with the vast majority expressing their attachment to tradition through such means as lighting candles on Friday nights, occasional synagogue attendance, and not eating pork. Attachment to Israel and memorialising the Holocaust are two other expressions of identification which probably speak louder to our students than elements of traditional Judaism.\textsuperscript{2} Most students do not see formal Jewish study as particularly important and this is expressed in their lack of commitment and motivation compared to their extremely strong motivation in general studies.

The curriculum consists of four disciplines: Hebrew, Bible, Jewish History and, what principally concerns this paper, Torah \textit{she-be-al Peh}. Hebrew is perhaps the discipline most readily

\textsuperscript{1} John Goldlust, \textit{The Impact of Jewish Education on Adolescents in Jews in Australian Society}, ed. Peter Medding (Melbourne: Macmillan, 1973); Barry Chazan, "Jewish Schooling and Jewish Identification in Melbourne," \textit{Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Division of Jewish Education in the Diaspora, 1980}. Chazan moderates Goldlust's negative view of the impact of Jewish schooling but is nevertheless very conservative in his own estimate of its impact. The evidence is that since this survey there has been a further weakening of Jewish identification among the student body. This is attributable to the following factors: 1. an increasing proportion of third generation Australian students; 2. the removal of more religiously committed pupils to other schools; 3. a decline in the popularity of Jewish youth movements.

\textsuperscript{2} This is borne out by a survey of Jewish behaviours conducted by Barry Chazan for the article referred to in the previous note.
accepted by students. It offers no ideological problems and is respected as a language discipline although its compulsory study in the higher grades is resented by many students and their parents. Bible has always been an important part of the curriculum although different approaches have been employed in its teaching. Currently the practice is to teach Bible using Hebrew as the language of instruction. No formal evaluation of this policy has yet been made; some teachers perceive an improvement in the students' Hebrew while some students complain that they get very little out of it. To some extent because of the constraint of using Hebrew as the language of instruction, the teaching of Bible often does not go much beyond factual retelling of the content and the restatement of some class discussion of ideas. Jewish history is taught in a very condensed way which makes for a concentration on facts. Many students see Jewish history as more 'relevant' than their other Jewish studies subjects. I will delay a description of the fourth discipline as it is the focus of this paper.

The teachers of these subjects are:

— emissaries of the Torah Department who have an institutional and personal affiliation to religious Zionism;
— former Israelis who tend to have strong feelings for Israel but a far weaker attachment to religious or even traditional Judaism, and;
— Australian-born teachers whose degree of religious affiliation as well as their level of Hebrew and Jewish knowledge vary.

The Jewish studies curriculum is divided between the Hebrew subjects of Hebrew language and Bible on the one hand, and Jewish History and Torah she-be'al Peh on the other. The emissary teachers and most of the former Israelis are concentrated in the former while the latter are taught principally by local teachers or those who are perceived as such, even if they were in fact born elsewhere. This division is to some extent a result of knowledge, skills and training but it is also an expression of values. The issue is which subjects are first of all, "serious," and second, which are the ones likely to have real impact on the students. The debate is a valid one but when the claims of one side attempt entirely to exclude those of the other there are negative results which were clearly felt in the implementation of Teaching Jewish
Values. The description above does not take into account variations and changes which developed after the seven year period (1982-1989) with which this paper deals. It serves as a very general portrayal of the setting in which certain educational processes took place. Particular changes will be referred to in the course of the paper.

Teaching Judaism: The Dilemma

While Hebrew and Bible were the hard core of the curriculum from the school’s foundation, periodically the question as to where the rest of Judaism fitted in was raised. One solution was to integrate the teaching of the festivals and other elements of Jewish living into the Hebrew and Bible syllabus. At other times an additional subject which dealt with Jewish religious knowledge was introduced. At one time an Orthodox department head decided that the straight teaching of texts such as Mishnah was preferable. The solutions were manifold and for the most part short-lived. Teaching “living Judaism” proved the most intractable problem for Jewish studies. The problem of relevance was expressed here in its severest form; for example, what is the relevance of teaching how to search for hametz to people who are going to make no such search? Thus the response to the need to teach the Oral Tradition of Judaism oscillated at different times from the purely theoretical study of Seder Zeraim to the entirely practical but irrelevant study of practical Jewish living.

Teaching Jewish Values

In 1981 the school’s lay and professional leadership first encountered the Teaching Jewish Values project. The then principal of the school was looking for a means to overcome the standard malaise of Jewish education: that students found their Jewish studies boring and irrelevant and were therefore behaving badly and achieving poor results. The Teaching Jewish Values curriculum was presented by serious scholars and educational practitioners as a means of teaching classical Jewish texts and their ideas in a way which was both authentic to the tradition and likely to be relevant to students. I will argue that, without any sug-
tion of deception, what took place was a mekah ta'ut — a transaction made in error.

Teaching Jewish Values and the Problem of Subject Matter

In the introduction to Teaching Jewish Values: A Conceptual Guide, Michael Rosenak describes how the Tarbut School in Mexico City approached Melton with a similar problem to that presented by our school: "The problem was that the pupils at [the] school saw no point in their Jewish studies; Jewish matters were simply not meaningful or interesting to them." The solution requested by the school and provided by Melton was the development of programs in Israel studies and contemporary Jewry. In the course of the collaboration two problems emerged. The first was that the Jewish people cannot be studied without studying Judaism; the second was that Judaism as taught in Tarbut was the nostalgic teaching of folklore with the students not sharing the nostalgia. The primary motive for Teaching Jewish Values was the notion that the teaching of the "relevant" subject areas was shallow, inauthentic and inadequate unless complemented by an understanding of "the assumptions and values of classic Judaism." The need for Teaching Jewish Values arose from the needs of subject matter. The presenting problem then became how to make those assumptions and values accessible to the students.

The problem at Tarbut School may well be compared to the debate in Israel concerning the appropriate attitude towards Jewish classical sources and Judaism in the non-religious sector of education. Marc Rosenstein shows both the various points of view on this question and the failure to find a satisfactory solution. Teachers and political leaders considered what should be the place of Talmud, how to find meaning for the concept of halakhah and so on.

The major difference between those deliberations and our problem here is that in Israel it was conducted by men and women


steeped in the texts of the tradition yet also engaged in the revolutionary process of creating a “new Jew.” Our discussion is set against a background of ignorance and indifference. In our school the problem was similar to the problem of student motivation which gave rise to the first phase of curriculum innovation at Tarbut. The curriculum solution offered in Melbourne to solve the problems of student attitudes was originally devised to solve a problem in the presentation of subject matter which was the focus of the second phase of innovation at Tarbut.

In the short term then it should have been predicted that Teaching Jewish Values would create more problems than it would solve. Teachers and students would have to acquire new skills, to face new and difficult materials, and to overcome long-held prejudices about the nature of classical Jewish learning. A school already engaged in such learning might find the new approach helpful immediately, but where the introduction of such learning was itself an innovation it was bound to encounter difficulties.

Thus the school in Melbourne was not acquiring a solution but rather another problem, albeit a worthwhile one. Perhaps it is part of the politics of curriculum innovation that it is bought and sold as aspirin when sometimes it is in fact designed to cause a headache. The criteria for success and failure become distorted and in order to overcome the headache the original treatment is abandoned or modified, despite the fact that the headache was really a necessary side effect.

The Primacy of Texts

Teaching Jewish Values shows an overriding commitment to the confrontation of value questions in a Jewish way through the means of the text. With the exception of Jewish Identity, which had its genesis outside the project, every unit makes studying the text the means of encountering Jewish ideas. Quite possibly a curriculum in Jewish values makes many lay leaders (and no doubt some educators) think of the ideal program which avoids the stringencies of traditional Jewish learning, norms and dogma but succeeds in transferring by some osmotic process what we all believe in, Jewish Values; like the rabbi who was warned not to sermonise about Shabbat, kashrut and family purity but to talk
rather about "Judaism." In fact Teaching Jewish Values offers no such thing. It says the only way to find out what Judaism has to say is to read its primary texts. For one thing "Judaism," per se often says nothing, but Rabbi Akiva, Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua say a great deal. Further, the form in which ideas are expressed is often more significant than any specific point of view. The overview, paraphrase, or merely presenting the "bottom line" would miss the point.

The reasons why interpretation of texts must be at the core of the teaching of Judaism are beyond the scope of this paper. One reference to Gershom Scholem’s article, "Revelation and Tradition as Religious Categories in Judaism" is sufficient to point out a direction: "In any case, truth must be brought forth from the text. Commentary thus became the characteristic expression of Jewish thinking about truth, which is another way of describing the rabbinic genius."\(^6\) One suspects that this article, along with Simon Rawidonwicz’s "On Interpretation"\(^8\) were never far from the minds of Teaching Jewish Values writers and planners.

The Language of Judaism

Michael Rosenak’s A Conceptual Guide devotes considerable attention to the question of the study of texts as a means of learning a language, an idiom for thinking and speaking of things which are Jewish. His formulation, "as educators, we wish to present Judaism as a ‘language’ which has particular cultural assumptions through which one can communicate and relate to ideas, situations and other people,"\(^7\) is worth noting. Rosenak then discusses the question which every language teacher faces — how do you teach idioms which have no obvious equivalent in the learner’s own language? By conceiving of Judaism as a language many of the religious and ideological difficulties inherent in the teaching of these texts, because of their normative thrust, can be overcome. The criterion for success becomes not the student’s conforming to a particular norm, but rather making use of terms such as, mitzvah, teshuvah, tzedakah or lashon ha-ra in his/her
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\(^7\) Rosenak, Teaching Jewish Values, p. 35.
deliberation about value questions with an awareness that these terms can only be used according to an interpretation which the texts can bear. However, these two elements, the centrality of the text and Judaism as a language (they are, of course, two sides of the same coin), make this a most difficult program. The curriculum writers can ease the way by their selection of material and its presentation but if taught in its true spirit it is bound to be difficult for both teachers and students especially if they have never done it before.

Implementation in Our School

In discussing implementation in our school it is important to respect the pressures and problems we faced and not to judge glibly with the benefit of hindsight. A second preliminary remark here is that this does not pretend to be an exhaustive account of a long and complicated process. It is rather the impressions of one who came afterwards to pick up where others left off. It reflects my own general impression of the history of Teaching Jewish Values in the school, and a review of written records and conversations with some of the players. A third point that could be raised concerns the issue of who should teach Teaching Jewish Values. This paper is not intended to deal with those problems but focuses rather on the curriculum and the learners.

From the outset it was perceived that the students were resistant to text study. To make matters worse they seemed reluctant and/or unable to engage in the discussion of ideas. As these two activities comprise just about the entire program, inability to do them constituted a serious obstacle. Various explanations were offered at different times, ranging from the Australian character to the school’s predominantly frontal lecture style of teaching. All these theories had a measure of truth. Not enough attention, however, was given to the problems caused simply by doing this very difficult and very new thing. The problem was contained to a degree by a process of retreat from the original form of the units. Often texts were pared down to a minimum. They were smoothed out in order to read in a way more comprehensible to students. The weakness of curriculum by “remote control” became apparent with the University struggling to maintain the spirit of the curriculum while having to bow to what were perceived by the
school as the inescapable forces of reality. The question of relevance became the predominant concern and the solution to the problem became more a matter of topics than of method. The very heart of the program was threatened. The emphasis shifted away from the values deliberation arising out of texts to the development of new units concerned with contemporary Jewish life and the symbols and rituals of the Jewish life-cycle. Of course there were still texts, some of the elementary units remained fairly close to the original and no doubt there was a desire to progress and return to more of the original program, although the demands of adapting materials for immediate needs precluded much forward planning.

The concept of relevance is worth some discussion. Students tend to make charges of irrelevance against their Jewish studies. By irrelevance they usually mean that it is either unnecessary for their progress to the next stage of their education or careers, or that it is of no practical use. Of course, if they are actually interested in the learning this complaint is not heard. The charge is made, however, that our students tend not to be interested in anything unless it either serves the purposes mentioned above or is fun. “Relevant,” for the Teaching Jewish Values writers meant talking about things that are evidently important: What is the “good life?” Why is the world the way it is? Relevance for them meant something more like Israel Scheffler’s description of the true task of education: “Its primary task is not to be relevant but to help form a society in which its ideals of free inquiry and rationality shall themselves become chief touchstones of relevance.” The solution to relevance offered by studying contemporary Jewry is insufficient because, although worthy in itself, it fails to deal with the question of texts and the language of Judaism. It is like solving the problem of teaching chemistry which bores students by teaching them history which they enjoy. The problem with the life-cycle is that the more it is practical the less concerned it is with deliberation about texts.

A major source of discipline problems in Jewish studies (and therefore a major barrier to learning) is the students’ demand for immediate gratification. Highly motivated and able students in other areas have become te’unei tipuah in the area of Jewish

studies. The student is normally prepared to accept that he or she will have to endure a period of confusion and uncertainty before mastering a skill or body of knowledge. If the confusion persists the student will first blame him or herself rather than the teacher and the subject matter. In Jewish studies if all is not immediately coherent and clearly understood the teacher is accused of inep-
titude and the subject of being not worth mastering. The hero of the movie *Stand and Deliver* had it easier than many of our Jewish studies teachers.

The obvious solution is to make everything clear and simple; to anticipate every possible difficulty and confusion and to smooth it out before it happens. As the students are not in fact *te'unei tippuah* they are likely to find the result obvious and banal. The other solution, to make everything the subject of open-ended discussion with the text being referred to but not serving as the focus of the deliberation, leads students to devalue the subject as mere chat and the exchange of opinions. The usefulness of these solutions to the problem of deferred gratification is thus often only short term.

After four years the program had nevertheless achieved a great deal. First of all it still existed. Second, new approaches to the problems of Jewish education in this setting had been adopted. One substantial innovation was the institution of the teacher's workshop. Making time available for teachers to study and prepare material helped develop a more professional approach to Jewish studies teaching. The idea of the workshop may seem obvious enough but its implementation in a large and busy school with no history of such planning and collaboration, was an important and lasting change. It would not now occur to anyone to introduce any serious change without such workshops. The rela-
tionship with Hebrew University had extended and deepened the vocabulary of Jewish education in the school. The achievements of Teaching Jewish Values, however were not universally acknowledged. Its fiercest opponents in the school had not been won over and its success was not a matter of clearly established fact.

A Program in *Torah she-be-al Peh*

With the arrival of a new principal came a new solution. The Teaching Jewish Values curriculum as it was practiced in the
school was open to two charges. First, that it did not offer a comprehensive study of Judaism; and second, that its approach to text study was not rigorous or serious. In response, however, we can assert that Teaching Jewish Values never attempted to offer a comprehensive program. The second charge was more plausible in the light of the way in which Teaching Jewish Values had been developed in the school. A new program was introduced which made use of an anthology of rabbinic material with a sprinkling of more contemporary material in English. The classical material was presented in the original Aramaic or Hebrew. The program shared with Teaching Jewish Values a desire to have students deliberate upon value and philosophical or theological issues arising from the text. Its tacit critique of Teaching Jewish Values was not in its basic philosophy but that Teaching Jewish Values was too selective in the scope of its subject matter, too meagre in the study of primary texts and too elaborate in its didactic apparatus. The new program sought to impress students by its very rigour and seriousness. Where Teaching Jewish Values had selected texts and topics which dealt with issues likely to be of interest to students, the new program assumed that even less obviously appealing topics such as the structure of brachot or the details of kashrut can be studied through primary sources and be shown to reflect a Jewish world view.

The amount of text was also justified by the need to equip students with the skills needed to become independent Jewish learners. In reality neither Teaching Jewish Values nor the Torah she-be-al Peh program were adequate for developing such mastery. The sheer variety of texts studied along with their piecemeal presentation and thematic arrangement put this aim of textual mastery beyond reach. In the Torah she-be-al Peh program the students were never presented with a complete Talmudic sugya and so it cannot be argued that students learned to read the Talmud. A more realistic aim in this respect is that students gain some grasp of the function of different parts of Jewish literature, e.g. to really know the difference between halakhah and aggadah. Given the frequent difficulty of persuading students that the Mishnah and the Mishneh Torah are quite different books, with a thousand years of history between them, if we achieved a general grasp of the genres of Jewish sources, Dayeinu!
The issue of mastery is an important one in all the programs discussed. Students are entitled to ask, and we ought to ask ourselves, what are the skills and what is the specific body of knowledge that we teach? The answer “to read and deliberate about classical Jewish texts” is insufficiently recognisable as a discipline. This can create problems of motivation for students who depend upon some clearly defined criteria of achievement and progress.

The new program had a strong negative impact upon students. Increasing the amount and difficulty of text study did not increase the students’ readiness to engage in it. Many of the teachers were inadequately equipped to handle the material. The lasting achievement of the Torah she-be-al Peh program was to restore the issue of the text to its central place. A major lesson of this episode is that in curriculum one must accept the problems of others but need not accept their solutions. Thus, in the original implementation of Teaching Jewish Values it proved difficult to teach texts and the solution was a reduction of the emphasis on texts. This solution may be criticised and replaced by a different strategy but the problem it aimed at solving remains a fact of life.

A New Program of Torah she-be-al Peh

After a year the material was withdrawn and this writer was given the task of devising a new program for Torah she-be-al Peh to be taught in grades eight, nine and ten. The immediate need was to find some teachable material for this purpose and we initially turned to the material that was taught under the name of Teaching Jewish Values. In the course of 1988, units were adapted from this material, from what was taught in the Torah she-be-al Peh program which followed it, and from completely new material. This work is still in progress. The only printed material is the student booklets with the teachers’ guide provided orally through workshops. It is hoped that written teachers’ guides will be produced in the near future.

This material is of interest here because it is written in the spirit of Teaching Jewish Values; that is, it attempts to achieve the aims set out in A Conceptual Guide. At the same time, the new work is also quite different from most of the existing Teaching Jewish Values units. Comparing Teaching Jewish Values
units with the new work suggests a critique of them. This is not to say a counter-critique is not possible. Some of the original Teaching Jewish Values writers might charge us with spiritual barrenness in that we have not dealt sufficiently with fundamental existential questions. Our claim would be that our approach is both sufficiently true to Teaching Jewish Values and well-adapted to use in our school that the price is worth paying.

The Language of Torah she-be-al Peh

The language of Torah she-be-al Peh is not readily accessible to students, or for that matter to the modern reader. When we select those choice sections which speak forcefully and with immediacy they are not truly representative. We do well to remember Bialik's description of Tractate Shabbat in his great essay, "Halakha and Aggada,"

There are one hundred and fifty double pages in Tractate Shabbat and one hundred and five in Eruvin, and in both there is next to no Aggada; for the most part they consist of discussions and decisions on the minutiae of the thirty-nine kinds of work and their branches, and on the limits within which it is permitted to carry on the Sabbath. What the Sabbath candles are to be made of; what a beast may be loaded with; how the limits may be jointly fixed — such are the questions discussed. What weariness of the flesh! What waste of good wits on every trifling point! But when I turn over those pages and see the various groups of Tannaim and Amoraim at work, I say to myself that these whom I see are in very truth artists of life in the throes of creation. Such mighty spiritual work as this, ant-like and giant-like at once, work performed for its own sake and out of boundless love and faith, could not be done without inspiration. Every one of those men did his own part of the task according to his own bent and inclination, and all of them bowed before an overmastering higher will...Every question, every challenge, every limitation and definition is but a new piece added to the mosaic, another bit of the pattern, which had to be put in because without it the whole could not have been what it must be. And the
result of all this tiresome work of Halakha is — a day which is wholly Aggada.  

The rabbis are not only to be characterised by the poetry, grandeur and irony of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua disputing the source of halakhic authority but also in the fact that they thought the tanur shel akhnai worth arguing about in the first place. Further, the great moments of theological or moral insight in fact have their impact precisely because they are embedded in a context which seems remote from such universal concerns; they are thus brief but brilliant reminders that to those engaged in it the halakhah is not mere lawmaking.

How do we bring students to this material without losing them in a sea of Talmudic technicality, making the insights banal by lifting them out of context, or distorting the material to make it seem to say what we believe will impress students. Teaching Jewish Values developed ways of selecting and presenting sources while avoiding these pitfalls, although not with an equal degree of success in every case. Some of the problems will be described below leading to a description of one example which suggests a way round while preserving the basic objectives intact.

Implicit and Explicit Meanings

The text must be a focus of curiosity to the students either because they wish to know what it says about something that concerns them or because something about it is strange or incongruous. If the text yields up all that it has to say immediately and explicitly addresses the issue in a clear and unambiguous manner, then it is of little value as a text for our pedagogical purposes. We do not find any Teaching Jewish Values units which use the Kitzur Shulhan Arukh as a text. On the other hand the meanings we wish to extract from the text must be available without too much elaborate or arbitrary interpretation; the meanings should not be too implicit.

If too much work is required to extract the possible meaning the student is less likely to feel that the text is the real source of
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significance. At a seminar at Hebrew University on the Jewish Values unit on the Book of Ruth, it emerged that Rashi’s commentary on the first verse (Rashi says that Elimelech was punished because, as a rich man and the leader of his generation, he left for Moab to escape demands upon him at a time of famine) was crucial to the unit and yet seemed arbitrary to the students. It seems that students were not expected to accept Rashi as an authority but were to see his words as a reasonable interpretation of the text. By notions of exegesis familiar to us from elsewhere in Rashi and Midrashic sources his interpretation of the individual verse is reasonable and it certainly provides coherence to the story as a whole. Our students, however, know nothing about Rashi and if they had a grasp of the story as a whole we probably would not need the unit altogether. This is one case of the interpretation being insufficiently explicit. Teachers are likely to inform the students that Rashi is right or else confuse the students into accepting it.

Sometimes this problem manifests itself across an entire unit when the curriculum piece is structured by an argument which links a number of texts. There is a danger that the links are not seen by students as emerging from the texts and thus need to be explained by the teacher. With curriculum, of course, such a problem may strike before the curriculum reaches the students if the teacher does not have a strong sense of how the argument is borne out by the texts.

There is often a great gap between the plausibility structures of the curriculum writer and teacher on the one hand, and the

10 The terms “implicit” and “explicit” are being used here in a different sense than used by Michael Rosenak in his Commandments and Concerns where the terms characterise two different modes of religiosity. On the other hand the distinction drawn here does relate to the dichotomies described by Rosenak between implicit and explicit religion and normative and deliberative approaches to education. The fact is that Judaism comprises a predominantly normative tradition with an underlying deliberative strain which is not usually expressed explicitly. The deliberation is thus a tentative approach to the explicitly given norm. Jewish implicit religion is thus a personal commentary on an explicit and normative text. Except to fellow seekers of the inner meaning of the given norm, it tends to seem arbitrary. As Rosenak points out, the relationship between the normative and deliberative in Jewish education should be dialectical. This makes it difficult to find a starting point to explore the normative text with students who have no a priori commitment to the normative demands of the text.
student on the other. The writer is committed to the texts and receives a strong sense of aesthetic and intellectual pleasure from perceiving a possible connection between texts, or between texts and the real world. The text is saved, as it must be, from irrelevance. The students (and sometimes teachers) are skeptical towards the text. Their attitude is, "prove to me that the text has something to say!" Merely possible readings mean nothing to them because they have no motivation to find meaning. It is thus essential for the curriculum writer to ask him or herself all possible questions from the students’ point of view as if the most gifted student were constantly nagging "is that necessarily so?" One way of describing this is in terms of the hermeneutical categories of pshat and drash, which can be distinguished by saying that pshat is that interpretation which aspires to the objective or "true" meaning, while drash is concerned and satisfied with possible meanings. This kind of curriculum must deal in pshat.\textsuperscript{11}

This issue is related to one of the central themes of Jewish thought, ta’amei hamitzvot, or the reasons for the commandments. Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, in his The Halakhic Mind draws a distinction between Maimonides’ approach to mitzvot in his Guide for the Perplexed and his treatment of the issue of reasons for the mitzvot in the Mishneh Torah.\textsuperscript{12} Whereas in the Guide, Maimonides attempts definitive and exhaustive explanations of the mitzvot, in the Mishneh Torah he treats the mitzvah as an objective given, with the reason only a tentative suggestion of the possible subjective correlative to the objective datum of the mitzvah.\textsuperscript{13} The reason is an attempt to reconstruct the religious or ethical moment behind the mitzvah but the subjective attempt remains subordinate to the objective fact of the mitzvah itself. Rabbi Soloveitchik regards the approach of the Mishneh Torah as the more religiously meaningful. The explanation cannot help the

\textsuperscript{11} The question of students’ understanding or willingness to attempt an understanding, reflects problems in the field of hermeneutics. The controversy between such figures as Hans Georg Gadamer, E. D. Hirsch, Jr. and Stanley Fish over how understanding is achieved, what are the prerequisites for understanding and what is the test of its validity, may prove illuminating in the discussion of the place of the text in modern Jewish education.


\textsuperscript{13} Rambam, Mishneh Torah, Hilkhot Teshuvah, ch. 4.
outsider for whom the objective datum of the mitzvah is not an a
priori accepted norm.

In *A Conceptual Guide*, Michael Rosenak turns this argument
on its head, arguing that Rabbi Soloveitchik’s approach can be
used to legitimize a less than complete translation of norms into
values since the tradition itself believes that such a translation
can only be incomplete. While this argument is valid as a
defence against the traditionalist argument that any selection or
partial treatment of the norms is an unjustifiable distortion, it
does not help us in the classroom when the teacher or student feels
that the translation into values is unsatisfactory or far-fetched.
One answer is to switch the text so that, for example, Rabbi
Soloveitchik’s *On Repentance* becomes the text rather than the
text of Maimonides’ *Laws of Repentance.* There are many argu-
ments against doing such a thing; the Heschels, Kooks and
Soloveitchiks should inform our curriculum at this level, but not
themselves take center stage. It may be that Rabbi Soloveitchik,
despite the fact that he seems to offer such riches in the sphere
of translating norms into ideas, is of little help to us in this kind
of curriculum because of his insistence on the predominance of
the objectives given of the halakhah. Our students are unwilling
to grant this degree of reality to the norms of the halakhah. When
these ideas are taken out of their original philosophical and
homiletical context they can seem overly elaborate and without
justification.

Sometimes these problems arise because of the nature of the
disciplines involved. That is to say, what is considered a good
argument in Talmud or in theoretical physics or philosophy or
theology may not fit the student’s (or teacher’s) uninitiated com-
mon sense notions of what a good argument is. In that case the
curriculum writer must judge how far the student can be led into
a new structure of thought and what steps need to be taken to
make him ready. More often, however, the difficulty is not tech-
nical but springs from a different existential orientation to the
text.

The curriculum must be tested by relentless, and sometimes
even mischievous, questioning. Take, for example the unit *Intent
to Kill*, which receives substantial discussion in *A Conceptual
Guide*. The unit argues that while pagan societies provided means

of compensation or replacement for the life of a murder victim, the Torah provides only for the death penalty, which is a statement of the Torah's view of the sanctity of life. This high value set on human life leads the rabbis to consider even the inviolability of the murderer's life which must be weighed against the accountability of the criminal and the preservation of society. This led to a tendency to limit the circumstances in which the death penalty is applied. The gifted student who has sat silently for a whole year with a fixed but cynical grin speaks up.

The whole thing can be read differently. It is true that the approach of the Torah is an enormous moral advance over the pagan societies of that time, and yet the Torah is itself primitive in its application of the death penalty to all kinds of crimes including minor infringements of cultic regulations, leading on occasion to the massacre of entire cities. The rabbis, informed by a more humanistic spirit, used the exegetical means at their disposal to reduce the emphasis on the death penalty even to the extent of virtual abolition. This is a story of the moral development of a religious tradition towards the humanistic norms I take for granted. Because the rabbis had to maintain the immutable legitimacy of the revealed word of God they had to have recourse to elaborate techniques of interpretation to argue their case. This is now only of antiquarian interest as we can now conduct the same discussion on a higher level without this theological and scriptural baggage.

We may wish we had more such students! To be fair to the unit this aspect of it is unlikely to give rise to this kind of challenge and the texts do deal with the issue in a way which is likely to be helpful in focusing and informing student discussion. The argument is brought as an example of the kind of question the curriculum writer address in order to avoid allowing his or her own assumptions about texts to influence a curriculum aimed at students who do not share those assumptions.

Another form of the problem is when the text reflects a basic Jewish value but precisely because the value is so fundamental it is only reflected and not stated. An example from Intent to Kill is the relationship of the idea of free will and therefore responsibility with the need to establish that the murderer's action was
in fact willed. This idea which lies at the core of ethical mono-
theism is not stated in the texts but they all rest upon this
assumption. If, as is suggested in A Conceptual Guide, this is a
central theme of the unit, can we rely on the student to see it as
directly related to the text? The bulk of what will be said is not
said in relation to the text. For adults it is often impressive when
a great deal is said about a short text as it conveys a sense of
depth, but younger students tend to feel that the text is being
overburdened with what we have to say. Again, this will be
exacerbated by the teacher who does not have a full grasp of the
relationship between the text and the idea. A further danger
which some Teaching Jewish Values units run is that when some
quite subtle insight into the text is arrived at it is drowned out by
extraneous material introduced to help make the text relevant.
The unit on Ruth began with a story of devastating horror which
showed up the lack of care people have for one another in a
modern city. It is difficult then to bring into high relief the gentle
acts of kindness of the Book of Ruth. Much care must be taken
that the extraneous material only supplements the text and does
not supplant it. Again there is a gap between the writer and the
student. The writer is impressed, for example, that the midrash
suggests theories which point towards Freud and Marx on the
source of conflict. (See the unit, The Midrash and the Modern
World.) This reaffirms the timeless value of the text. Young
students, however, are not so impressed and may well feel that if
Freud or Marx said it so much more completely why turn to the
midrash? Our revised curriculum tried to ensure a proper balance
between the explicit and implicit meanings of texts. It took
care to use extraneous material to reinforce the value of the text.
As much as possible it sought to show the texts not merely as
being concerned with value questions but as positively useful in
dealing with these questions. This immediately leads to another
major consideration. What are the appropriate questions with
which the curriculum should be concerned?

What are the Right Questions?

Teaching Jewish Values is based on the premise that in order to
make the tradition and its texts relevant it must be shown to
relate to the students’ questions. As Michael Rosenak writes, “we
believe that a curriculum about Judaism should address matters that teachers and pupils see as important.” Jonathan Cohen writes in his chapter of A Conceptual Guide: “In order for Judaism to become accessible, fresh and meaningful to pupils, we must aid them in discovering the questions the tradition has already provided.” (This idea, derived from A. J. Heschel, seems to us more relevant to Teaching Jewish Values than Rabbi Soloveitchik.) Teaching Jewish Values is thus committed to showing the tradition as relevant and helpful in answering students’ pre-existing questions. Thus the question of what are the students’ questions is crucial to the whole exercise. It is of course the case that not all the students’ real questions are posed by them in a direct way, and they may need to be teased out. If the first problem of Teaching Jewish Values in Australia concerned the actual study of texts, then a close second was the problem of the material not seeming to match the students’ real questions and concerns. In fact some teachers doubted if the students had any questions at all. Whatever the psychologists might have said, students did not respond with spontaneous recognition when the ‘big’ questions were raised:

— the relationship between knowing and doing;
— the just society and my part in it;
— personal responsibility;
— can a person change?

Students seemed comfortable with and committed to the values of affluence and economic achievement that they were familiar with. It is as if the curriculum required a prior curriculum aimed at making students recognise these questions as their questions. Teaching Jewish Values assumes that these questions are present, or at least almost present, and the tradition is then presented as a response. This problem may well be one associated with particular cultural milieux. It may also be associated with changes through time in the adolescent culture of the West.

A solution to this problem is to focus on questions and dilemmas which are immediately arresting and dramatic in the eyes of students. There are dangers to this approach. One is that there can be a tendency to choose dramatic topics only to find that

16 Ibid., p. 84.
Jewish sources are not particularly useful in contributing to the debate. For example, Judaism and the nuclear threat: obviously Judaism advocates peace and deprecates war. Destroying the whole world is clearly in violation of the principle of yishuv ha-aretz. The problem is, however that both the armers and the disarmers share these values; their debate is about how to achieve them. The sources can provide no more than a Jewish rhetoric to discuss the issue. This may be valuable but there is often a lack of authenticity when Jewish values and sources are used to justify why one should adopt a particular political point of view or social attitude. A second danger is that by avoiding the big existential questions the opportunity to share Jewish philosophical and religious insight is lost.

Of these two dangers we made a great effort to avoid the first. The texts should not be used merely as triggers to stimulate discussion. Such an approach is bound to distort the texts and to lead away from them. Teaching Jewish Values is not about discussing values in a Jewish context with a bit of Jewish flavour provided by a few sources. We were prepared to run the second danger because no matter how important the questions there is no meaning to them unless they are perceived as questions; the Haggada cannot begin without a question. We hoped that some of these more profound existential questions would emerge as we went along even if we did not address them directly.

The New Program

The new program contained elements of Teaching Jewish Values units, and topics from the Torah she-be-al Peh program such as ecology and lashon ha-ra, but with the kind of pedagogic framework provided by Teaching Jewish Values. There were also new units on medical ethics as well as a revision of the life-cycle material to bring it more into line with the Teaching Jewish Values conception. The following example serves to demonstrate the approach we adopted. Under great pressure to pull together material in a short time we decided to introduce a unit on Jewish medical ethics. Issues such as euthanasia and abortion are public issues constantly debated in the media. They present dramatic dilemmas involving questions of life and death. They are issues upon which there are well developed Jewish positions which offer
clear alternatives to other viewpoints. We also anticipated that
the Jewish insights on these questions would surprise students.
In short, these were questions where an understanding of Jewish
sources would help students define their own point of view. A
mitigating factor against dealing with these topics is the com-
plexity of halakhic deliberation upon them. We knew of a unit
produced by a commercial Jewish curriculum publisher on med-
cal ethics and under the pressure of the moment assumed it would
do the job. On closer examination it proved wholly inadequate. It
provided short extracts of sources on the basis of which students
were to resolve dilemmas. The sources were not always even
relevant and there was no attempt to show the process by which
the Halakhah considers such questions. Thus, by chance, we
found ourselves creating an entirely new unit. The first problem
was to simplify the halakhic deliberation without distorting it
unduly. There is by now a wealth of secondary material on these
questions which was invaluable in directing us to the appropriate
sources with suggestions as to how to read them. There was much
distilling work to do as the student could not be given difficult
secondary material with many footnotes. Sometimes the result
was that the initial writing concentrated too much upon moving
the student efficiently through the topic, paying insufficient at-
tention to how best to get the student involved. This was often
improved by teachers in workshops. Among the teachers were
those who were dedicated, creative and also themselves involved
with the material as highly committed learners. Too often work-
shops subside into pedestrian preparation rather than a locus of
genuine reshaping and remaking. A real workshop can be an
exhilarating experience both for the writer and the teachers
involved.

Let us focus on one small section of the unit concerned with
abortion. First we engaged students in a discussion of the issue
from two extremes of the debate:

— Abortion is murder, and;
— Abortion is like any other operation to remove an unwanted
  or diseased organ. (We used newspaper articles for this
  purpose.)

Then came the always difficult and dangerous transition to the
Jewish sources. The key lesson sought to show that:
— feticide is not considered homicide by Jewish law;
— Jewish law gives priority to the mother's life over that of the unborn child;
— the grounds for giving the mother's life priority are variously interpreted, and these interpretations can make for rather different applications of Jewish law in cases of abortion. ¹⁷

The initial lesson plan dealt with these questions in a systematic way but one of the teachers pointed out that this approach was likely to lose the pupils before reaching the interesting part of the argument. It was suggested that Mishnah Oholot 7:6, which was originally in the middle of the lesson, should be placed at the beginning. The Mishnah reads:

If a woman is having difficulty in giving birth one should cut up the foetus inside her and extract it limb by limb because her life has priority over its life. If most of it has emerged one may not touch it as we do not push away one life for another. ¹⁸

The Mishnah could not be more direct and dramatic in its approach. It is immediately striking, even offputting, to students who do not expect Jewish sources to be this "real." Further, the Mishnah makes two simple and concise value statements: "her life has priority over its life" and "we do not push away one life for another." After this all the rest is commentary: Why does her life have priority? Under what circumstances can this priority be enforced? What is the definition of a life?, etc. This text is arresting to the students, it is a rich foundation for further discussion, and as Mishnah it is the foundation text for the Jewish law on abortion. The students are now ready for a more technical investigation of the issues. The first question we tackled was why her life has priority. Two interpretations were studied; that of Rashi and that of Rambam. These two views serve as the basis for the lenient and the strict tendencies respectively in subsequent responses on abortion. Rambam's is the more complicated interpretation based upon the law of the "pursuer." The law of the "pursuer" (rodef) creates a duty for a third party to intervene to save someone being pursued with homicidal intent even by kill-

¹⁸ Mishnah, Oholot 7:6.
ing the "pursuer" and even if the "pursuer" is below the age of criminal responsibility. Rambam regards this law as the rationale for the Mishnah. This in turn allowed a discussion of the principle of due process with the exception of the "pursuer" as well as the application of the "pursuer" case to abortion. Rashi, by contrast justifies the mother's priority on the simple grounds that the fetus is not a human being (lav nefesh hu). Rambam's rationale can only be used in the case of serious threat to the mother's life whereas Rashi's reasoning makes possible a broader application of the principle of a mother's priority over her unborn child.

The rest of the unit was based upon the observation that most abortions are not sought because of obvious life-threatening situations. A number of scenarios were described. Students were invited to discuss their own views on each case. The textual consideration of the cases was through the responsa literature. This posed two problems; first, the students needed a grasp of the history, scope and function of responsa and second, because we would be using only short extracts students would not see how a responsum is argued and how it uses earlier sources. Students were therefore given a brief description of the responsa literature. They were also given the full text of one fairly straightforward responsum with guided questions to enable students to perceive its structure, style, mode of argument and use of sources. They then considered extracts from responsa on abortion which could be related to the practical cases. The outcome for students was to see that:

- through responsa the Oral Tradition has been able to develop and respond to new questions.
- even late responsa find the original sources relevant.
- the Oral Tradition does not necessarily offer a single unified response. Most of the teachers tested the students with an open book test. The students read a press report of a speech given by the Chief Rabbi of Britain to the House of Lords on the subject of abortion. He presented a Jewish understanding of the issue but did not quote sources. Students

20 Rashi, Sanhedrin 72b.
21 Jewish Chronicle, 1 April 1988, London
were asked to find the justification in the sources for the Chief Rabbi's statement.

Conclusion

We have attempted to show the way in which involvement with the Teaching Jewish Values program has affected curriculum development in our school. With some reservations about the approach of certain units we believe that Teaching Jewish Values has succeeded in developing ways of making the classical sources of the tradition relevant to "cognitive aliens" without distortion of the sources to the extent that their translation can be regarded as inauthentic. The issue of the "language" of Judaism is a central concern and the usefulness of values deliberations as a means of teaching the language to those who neither recognise its sanctity nor acknowledge its norms, is reaffirmed by the Australian experience. What remains is to refine the techniques and to enlarge the repertoire. As the Teaching Jewish Values project comes to the end of its development phase it is important to consider how subsequent experiments, developments and experiences may be effectively shared in the future.
THE COMPUTER AS TUTEE: THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPUTER PROJECTS IN THE RABBINICS CURRICULUM — AN EXPERIMENT THAT FAILED

Mark Smiley

Introduction

The dissertation upon which this paper is based provides methodological direction for the reflective introduction and implementation of new methods in Jewish education.¹ These deliberative procedures, derived in part from Schwab's writings, provide direction for evaluating new methods for the purposes of educational implementation and as a safeguard against mindless adoption of unsuitable innovations.

The proposed methodological directions may be summarized as follows:

— The evaluation of new means in Jewish education should be concurrent with the improvement of practice.
— The analysis of educational means should be concurrent with the analysis of ends.
— This analysis or deliberation must treat both ends and means as mutually determining one another.
— The adoption of new means must include deliberation and experimentation in its early stages.
— Evaluation of new means should determine the possible consequences and impact of the new means in terms of the various commonplaces: the community, the subject matter, the teachers, and the students.
— Educators must analyze new means in terms of possible outcomes and side effects, and in the context of their respective philosophies of education.
— The description of experiments with new means should
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include the deliberation with respect to problems of implementation as well as accounts of success.

— The evaluation should decide whether and how to proceed with further experimentation with the new means.

To illustrate these evaluative directions, a case study was presented examining various modes of computer applications in the rabbinics curriculum of a Conservative day school. Taylor's "Tutor, Tool, Tutee" model\(^2\) provides a useful framework for understanding the various modes of educational computer applications. In the dissertation, pre-programmed educational software applications (i.e., Tutor) were evaluated for their potential impact on the rabbinics curriculum. This evaluation was undertaken against the backdrop of a detailed analysis of the goals of instruction for the teaching of rabbinics in the Conservative day school. In this paper, I will describe and evaluate three student-prepared computer projects of the "computer as tutee" type in an attempt to illustrate some of the deliberative procedures needed in adopting new means for Jewish education.

"The computer as tutee" requires the student to teach the computer. Thus, the student must learn to program in order to communicate with the computer. The student, by understanding the area that he is trying to teach, will learn something about how computers work and how his or her own thinking works. The "tutee" mode emphasizes education as a process — the manipulation of an understanding of facts rather than their acquisition. Since such projects require prior competence, they help to develop further mastery of subject areas. This mode of computer application creates the possibility for new experiences of both the subject area and the technology.\(^3\) For example, children could develop computer programs that tutor younger students in arithmetic operations, that drill students on French verb endings, that simulate the game of "Monopoly," or that draw maps.

The educational claims of "tutee" mode supporters have found justification from many different areas of educational discourse.

---

3 Ibid., pp. 4-6.
Advocates of independent learning projects, problem solving, process versus product education, and thinking skills have found the “tutee” mode attractive.

Claims of the educational benefits of “the computer as tutee” have been supported by reports of the positive experiences of many educators and programmers with the new technology. Many teachers and students have been captivated by the computer and have invested large blocks of time exploring it. Indeed, enthusiastic teachers, parents, community people and students have reported their excitement with the new technology.

Analysis of this literature provides little conclusive evidence on the potential of the “computer as tutee” for Jewish education. Yet the work of Papert and his LOGO programming language coupled with my interest in integration in Jewish education provided me with the theoretical underpinnings to experiment with the “tutee” mode.

Seymour Papert claims that the LOGO programming language, a “tutee” environment, provides a vehicle for revolutionizing education. There are two major aspects of the “problem-solving”


tutee rationale: the first draws mainly on Dewey's reflective thinking and the second on Piaget's epistemology of learning.

Dewey's teachings on "intellectual growth" have been cited by major proponents of the computer as "tutee." In Dewey's experimental school, he attempted to provide children with problems and projects that would encourage thinking. To Dewey, thinking was the key to intelligent action (as opposed to impulsive or routine action). Dewey's reflective thought requires thinking as well as doing. Worthwhile activity would give children the opportunity to formulate and test solutions to problems; that is, to practice the thinking process. The results of such practice would serve as guides for future experience. Indeed, the process of computer programming was understood as providing a framework for reflective thinking.

Advocates of "tutee" projects also assert that Piaget's stages of cognitive development can be manipulated. In fact, Papert claims that the LOGO environment will allow children to "concretize" formal operations well before Piaget's threshold of 11 to 12 years. He writes:

The child will learn to manipulate, to extend, to apply projects, thereby gaining a greater and more articulate mastery of the world, a sense of power and a self-confidently realistic image of himself as an intellectual agent. Stated more simply, I believe with Dewey, Montessori, and Piaget that children learn by doing and by thinking about what they do.

The experience of LOGO programming is understood as a means to inculcate thinking skills. The students learn about problem-solving processes by the necessarily explicit nature of programming as they articulate assumptions and precisely specify steps in their problem-solving approach. In addition to these claims, advocates of teaching programming argue that this process best educates for computer literacy i.e., the teaching of the potential and the limits of computer use in our society. Thus, advocates believe not only that the "tutee" mode allows children

to learn traditional subjects in a deeper way and provides the opportunity for the development of problem-solving skills, but also that it encourages an exploration of the computer's potential and its societal implications.

Although many of the educational benefits of the "project" method have been cited by advocates of the computer as "tutee," most "tutee" case-studies have failed to overcome the traditional difficulties associated with the project mode. These include: an instrumental relationship between knowledge (and skills) and social concerns, children choosing activities at low cognitive levels, projects which overemphasize individual concerns and ignore common and social purpose, and the danger of neglecting to extrapolate general ideas from project experiences.12

For Jewish educational purposes, I was motivated by the possibility that "tutee" projects could bring the child into an integrating process. Building on Lukinsky's suggested directions for the implementation of "integrated" studies, this experiment considered whether the meta-learning implications of creating an environment which encourages inquiry and exploration could instill important long term attitudes.13

Although there exist conflicting conceptions of integration, most day school educators include integration as part of the raison d'être of the modern day school movement.14 Lukinsky encourages Jewish educators to find means by which to encourage students to engage in an integrating process, which would encourage "a genuine dialogic tension" between the knowledge and methodologies of general and Jewish studies. For his part, Lukinsky offers a means to integrate the competing and evolving truths of

integrative studies is to preserve the integrity and authenticity of both general and Jewish studies. He writes: "Each would challenge the other at its best."

Clearly, the "computer as tutee" represents an important research focus. This conclusion resulted in the following experiment which attempted to evaluate the curricular implications of the innovation.

An Experiment in Jewish Day School Education

Criteria for Integrative Projects

Having considered the claims of the literature and the realities of Jewish educational practice, the following criteria were developed for the implementation of experimental "tutee" projects.

1. It was determined that tutee projects had to be designed as an alternative to other educational activities. This criterion was based on an understanding that children possess different learning strategies and styles. To facilitate allowing children a degree of choice, "tutee" projects had to be accompanied by some other form of project such as a creative writing assignment (e.g. poem, song), or a research report. This approach also allowed for a degree of comparative assessment of computer projects in terms of time allotment, costs, and additional resources.

2. The second criterion required that the implementation add a significant dimension to the subject matter and not be a trivial application of the technology. This requirement was considered in terms of both the Judaic studies content and the level of programming difficulty. Although alternative assignments were provided, it was hoped that the new technology could illuminate some aspect of the process of Jewish study.

3. Projects should require a suitable level of difficulty in the problem solving activity. The rationale of this criterion stemmed from the belief that a good programming problem stimulates interest and therefore additional effort.

4. Projects should be designed to make students aware of being engaged in an experimental activity. Students are to function as scientists, exploring the educational potential of computers in the rabbinics curriculum. Indeed, a number of students conceived and implemented their own "tutee" projects.

These four criteria are not meant as a prescriptive checklist, but rather as principles for evaluating implementation in deliberation. Indeed, the extent to which various projects meet these criteria will serve as a framework for the assessment of the suitability of the computer in the rabbinics curriculum.

The Setting

The experiment has four distinctive settings:

— The Judaic studies classroom which incorporated computer "tutee" projects as part of the ongoing curriculum;
— The computer science class, where Judaic studies examples were incorporated as part of the problem set involved in learning new computing skills;
— Recess and lunchtime, when the computer room was open for volunteer use, allowing for some additional enrichment experimentation;
— The home, which served as a setting for the programming activity. It was hoped that the availability of additional time for student involvement plus parental interest might assist the overall experiment.

I served as the teacher of both computer science and rabbinics at the Solomon Schechter Day School. The 7th grade student population was familiar with introductory BASIC and LOGO programming languages. In addition, the school was situated in a high socio-economic community near a number of major computer firms. Indeed, a number of parents worked in the computer industry. As a result, the percentage of students with home computers was very high.

Project #1: Shofar Simulation

i. Educational context

This activity was an enrichment activity to the curriculum that was carried out by three students during the recess period in the computer room. The project was to write a program which would simulate the blowing of the shofar on Rosh Ha-Shanah.

The project was a good programming problem, as it required students to master the mathematical relationships involved in the shofar blowing procedures and utilize that information together with the sound capabilities of the computer. In addition, the programmer was required to use procedural constructs. These constructs in programming allow for multiple use of a set of instructions and save the programmer the need to continually provide new codes for the same activity. In LOGO, the procedural aspect of programming is emphasized. Good programming practice requires labeling each procedure with a clear title that allows other users to identify the purpose of the procedure. For example, a procedure which averages a set of numbers should be called AVERAGE or AVG and not B. In this context, the Shofar program provided an unusual overlap of the educational goal of clear procedural program writing with an aspect of the subject matter.

This project coincided with classroom work on the Jewish New Year and the study of the shofar. However, the curricular emphasis was on Sa'adiah Gaon's ten reasons for its blowing. Although some attention was given to the types of shofar blasts and their order, the focus was on the different reasons for and interpretations of the Shofar practice.

ii. A description of finished products

The following reproduction of the main procedure will illustrate the potential educational benefits of this enrichment project.
The main procedure is as follows:

TO SHOFAR

TEKIAH SHEVARIM TERUAH TEKIAH
TEKIAH SHEVARIM TERUAH TEKIAH
TEKIAH SHEVARIM TERUAH TEKIAH
FREEZE 90
THAW
TEKIAH SHEVARIM TEKIAH
TEKIAH SHEVARIM TEKIAH
TEKIAH SHEVARIM TEKIAH
FREEZE 90
THAW
TEKIAH TERUAH TEKIAH
TEKIAH TERUAH TEKIAH
TEKIAH TERUAH TEKIAH-GEDOLAH
END SHOFAR

This main procedure is executed by the computer in a linear manner. A glance at the main procedure SHOFAR reveals its almost exact parallel to the English translation of the shofar service found in the High Holyday Prayerbook. This similarity suggested that the program could provide a means for reinforcing student knowledge of the structure of the shofar service.

iii. Log reactions to the individual products

The students who carried out this project were engaged in a suitable learning activity. They were required to master the mathematical relationships among the shofar sounds and manipulate the BEEP, NOBEEP, and WAIT functions of the computer. This required a great deal of problem-solving activity through trial and error and concurrent debugging procedures.

iv. Early evaluations and impressions

Although it was felt that the project was a good programming problem, the mathematical aspect of the shofar blowing seemed almost trivial. In addition, it remained unclear whether any educational benefit was derived as a result of the need for the programmer to reach an almost exact duplication of a Prayerbook text in the main procedure of the program. In spite of these observations, the program was enthusiastically received by the entire class upon its presentation. However, this project helped

identify the potential overreliance of computer applications on the mathematical relationships found in Jewish practice.

In addition, I noted that many other children preferred to play with the real shofar. They were able to represent the various notes in a suitable hands-on experience. Indeed, the choice of educators to use the computer in similar educational situations may have motivated Davy to describe the LOGO environment as “autistic in quality, impoverished sensually, emotionally and socially.”

Project #2: The Hanukkah Project

i. The educational context

In its Judaic studies context, this project involved a sugya in Tractate Shabbat concerning the lighting of the Hanukkah candles.18 The braita, after outlining two alternative solutions, focuses on the dispute between the schools of Shammai and Hillel who argue respectively that each day of the festival must be represented by descending or ascending numbers of candles from one to eight. The sugya offers two separate sets of reasons for the dispute, each of which requires interpretation through inquiry.

It was anticipated that the computer program, would be a means to better understand the dispute and the available interpretations. In addition, it was hoped that the graphical nature of the work might inspire new insights and interpretations.

From a programming point of view, the project was a rich one, allowing for various applications of the graphics component of LOGO and requiring the introduction of additional programming constructs not yet used in any applications. For example, the project involved the use of procedures that required passing parameters. This construct could allow the program to be written in a brief but efficient manner. In addition, the project demanded that the student be familiar with the Cartesian graph nature of the screen and the skill of moving the electronic pen to certain spots on the screen.

18 See also John Davy, "Mindstorms in the Lamplight," Teachers College Record 85(4) (Summer 1984), pp. 549-550.
19 Shabbat, 21b.
A major educational goal in teaching this sugya was to understand the dispute between Bet Hillel and Bet Shammai. The programming task was to create a procedure that would represent the final lit version of either Bet Shammai or Bet Hillel. For example, entering "Bet Shammai 1" should result in a computer drawing of a hanukkiyyah with eight lit candles, while "Bet Hillel 4" should produce a graphic of a hanukkiyyah with four lit candles.

ii. A description of finished products

Below is an illustration of one computer simulation.

The computer flashed:
* WELCOME TO THE ELECTRONIC HANUKKIYYAH
* TYPE IN THE SCHOOL DESIRED (HILLEL OR SHAMMAI), followed by,
* THE NUMBER (1-8) OF THE DAY OF HANUKKAH DESIRED
I typed in *SHAMMAI 1

The computer drew:

![Diagram of a hanukkiyyah with eight lit candles]

The computer asked:
* WOULD YOU LIKE TO TRY AGAIN? (Type Yes or No)
I typed:
* YES

The computer flashed:
* WELCOME TO THE COMPUTER HANUKKIYYAH
* TYPE IN THE SCHOOL DESIRED (HILLEL OR SHAMMAI), followed by,
* THE NUMBER (1-8) OF THE DAY OF HANUKKAH DESIRED
  I typed in: *HILLEL 7
  The computer drew:

![Image of a menorah]

The computer asked:

* WOULD YOU LIKE TO TRY AGAIN? (Type Yes or No)
  I typed:
  *NO
  The computer responded:
  *THANK YOU FOR USING THE ELECTRONIC HANUKKIYAH

### iii. Log reactions to the individual products

Most of the students achieved some working program that simulated the hanukkiyah. However, after its implementation, the project did not fulfill its integrative pedagogic goal. The time needed to complete the computer projects exceeded the time needed to complete the inquiry into the rabbinic text. Therefore, the students could not use their computer art projects to help them in their inquiry concerning the reasons for the difference of opinion between the school of Shammi and Hillel.

This situation has been noted as a problem of other "tutee" projects in Jewish education: the project turned out to be mainly
a computer project rather than an attempt to illuminate or explicate an aspect of the text. The assignment did not provide opportunity for new insight, but rather was limited to the review of the content of the text.

Project #3: The Kosher Machine

i. Educational context

The kosher machine project was an enrichment activity. The students were studying texts from Tractate Hullin and suggested that the computer could be an excellent tool for applying the rules of kosher and organizing a data-bank of kosher products. The lead programmer suggested that the program simulation have two alternative methods of identifying whether a product was kosher. The first method would check the computer number on the packaging against an already generated list of approved products. If the product was not on the approved list, then the computer would ask that all the listed ingredients be entered into the computer and checked for kosher.

The desired results of the program would be to inform the user that:

- the product is definitely kosher;
- the product is definitely not kosher;
- the computer is not sure — go ask a rabbi.

In the context of Judaic studies, the programming problem was intended to introduce the student to modern problems involved in kosher, including the investigation of certain chemical compounds and synthetic derivatives. In addition, it would enable the student to review forbidden species of animals and current heksher labeling procedures.

The design of this “tutee” project was problematic. The then-current state of regulations governing ingredient labeling did not clearly distinguish whether ingredients were dairy or meat. This limitation prevented the programmer from creating a simulation that determined whether an unidentified product was kosher.

The early recognition of this programming problem raised a number of important educational computing issues, including the
suitability of presenting children with computing problems that did not solve themselves perfectly. Computer projects usually are aimed at teaching an aspect of logical structures and the potential of the technology. In this context, the kosher machine project would have been a good problem-solving activity. However, the best solution by the students would be to arrive at an understanding that the computer application is untenable, rather than proceed to a computer application.

The educational message that students would learn in treating the problem unsuccessfully was considered. Clearly, the limitations of the computer would be illustrated to the programming team, thus revealing certain limitations of machine intelligence as opposed to human reasoning. On the basis of this important message the decision was made to allow students to go forward with this project.

ii. Log reactions to the individual products

The project was tested in an alternative educational setting and as a result was modified for implementation in the day school. In the alternative setting, it was found that the project required a great deal of preparation until the discovery of the programming problem. The participants found this experience frustrating and somewhat deceiving. Although they had been confronted with the desired educational experience, some remarked that programming projects should always lead to potentially successful activities. Indeed, the experience lacked the positive results (i.e. a running program) of computer projects.

A General Evaluation of the Curricular Experiment

Above, I suggested that the evaluation of new educational methods should determine possible consequences and impact in terms of the various commonplaces: the community, the subject matter, the teachers, and the students. Let us briefly report some of this type of deliberation.
The Child

It is important to note that only a small percentage of the student population participated in the experiments. Also, although many girls participated in the optional and directed projects, the majority of participants were boys.20

Of the participants, some children developed elementary programming skills, as reflected in their ability to apply programming constructs to new problems. Others gained a familiarity with programming constructs but could not carry out independent projects. Moreover, some students gained a sense of computer literacy i.e. the ability to recognize both the possibilities and limitations of computer use. Indeed, this may have been the most significant educational outcome.

The impact of the experiment on the learner in terms of the overall Judaic studies curriculum is more difficult to evaluate. Since the computer experiments were used in approximately five per cent (9/180 classes) of the Rabbinics classes in the school, it is difficult to identify the specific effects of this educational means on the goals of instruction.

Moreover, the question arises regarding the extent to which any observed effects are generated by the introduction of an innovation per se (i.e. the Hawthorne Effect), rather than by changes in the effectiveness of classroom practices. In general, distinguishing the effects of different variables on student attitudes and performance represents a difficult methodological problem. For example, was the original excitement discussed in the shofar project a result of the educational situation in which students are encouraged to choose varying types of assignments or simply the uniqueness of computing?

Finally, this evaluation cannot identify whether those involved in the computer activity were able to appreciate the subject matter in a new or richer way. In fact, academic achievement as reflected in grades did not show any difference between computer users and non-users. However, a small percentage of children

motivated by the availability of projects did show an improvement in their overall performance.

Hawkins and Sheingold observed that in the LOGO environment programming tended to increase students' collaborative efforts. This trend was also observed in the day school experiment. Indeed, the sharing and consultation were particularly impressive as they usually occurred outside the classroom setting, during informal parts of the day such as lunch or recess.

The Teacher

The effect on teachers and teaching can be evaluated only on the basis of the observations of one teacher involved in the experiment. However, many of these observations have been corroborated by others' reports on the use of the computer in their classrooms.

The teacher using "tutee" projects received positive feedback from students, administrators and fellow teachers. Students were curious about how and why a Judaic studies teacher would be utilizing a new technology that even the general studies teachers had not yet implemented.

Fellow teachers and administrators were curious about the implications of the new teaching approach. Many belittled their own level of technological literacy and were appreciative of a colleague who was familiar with the latest educational innovations. Both general and Judaic studies teachers were anxious to observe some of the innovations and offered important critical insights into the projects.

For teachers, the computer projects seemed to encourage alter-


native lesson designs, in particular the use of group and individual projects that could be carried out both in school and at home. However, it is difficult to determine whether these new classroom approaches were motivated by the introduction of the computer projects, or the educational philosophy of the teacher. I suspect the latter. Indeed, since many other types of projects were part of the classroom experience, it is possible to conclude that computer projects "fit" comfortably with the teaching style and approaches of the classroom educator.

However, it became clear that the expertise needed to supervise the creation of "tutee" projects may be beyond the desirable requirements in the training of even our most committed teachers.

The Community

The parent body voiced their approval that the school had taken the challenge of computer technology seriously. Computers dotted the school, and teachers and students grappled with their significance in various implementations.

The "tutee" projects received notice from parents, school officials and other members of the community at large. Although the school already had a high profile in the community and had implemented many innovative programs, the computer innovation in particular received considerable attention in the parent community.

Many parents were especially interested in the computer applications, including the "tutee" projects in the Judaic studies curriculum. Some offered their computer expertise, while others expected the computer educator to serve as a consultant for home computing.

This community perceived itself as a leader in educational standards and innovation. At a time when the computer industry was creating an impression of a dire need for computer literacy, the school had already begun to explore the educational potential of the new technology for Jewish education. The availability of trained personnel provided the school with the means to implement and evaluate various aspects of computer applications.
The Subject Matter

The critical examination of "tutee" projects suggests a number of serious challenges in terms of the Judaic studies subject matter. First, the "tutee" projects were not educationally vital to the main themes and skills involved in the Judaic studies units. For example, even the hanukhiyyah project that dealt with the content of the sugya was itself only a small aspect of a unit that covered many different sugiyot. Although it was hoped that the project would provide a new means for interpreting and understanding the text, in reality it only dealt with a small technical aspect of the text. While this new educational method has been identified as an aid in explicating text, its implementation as a means should not be overemphasized.

Second, there are significant limitations involved in computer simulations in terms of the goals of rabbinics education. For example, in the shofar project the computer could be used to assist the student in learning a certain formula, in order to promote an appreciation of the underlying structure and content of the shofar service. However, the computer could not provide the means to appreciate the values aspect of the lesson. The power of the beautiful explanations of the importance of the shofar could not be addressed in the computer simulations. Rather, the computer could only identify specific information or quiz the students on it.

Such a limitation suggests that the computer in the "tutee" mode deals with what Whitehead calls "inert facts."23 This inert fact or information is divorced from deeper meanings and concepts. The computer thus moves the Jewish educator away from the plane of values and meaning into the realm of information and application. Indeed, this observation has been recently made by Davy. He writes, "even the most goggled-eye computer enthusiasts scarcely argue for computers as tools for affective or moral education." It should be noted that there are some positive implications of "tutee" applications in terms of the subject matter. The computer applications also revealed that certain aspects of the tradition have logical (and therefore programmable) structures which can be investigated and understood. In addition, the

kosher machine project illustrated that the "tutee" mode provides an educational experience for reflection on the limitations of modern technologies.

An important by-product of this experiment was isolating the need for ongoing curricular deliberation on the theme of the significance of technological progress in a Jewish world view.²⁴

Conclusions

Our experimentation with "tutee" applications arose from the desire to use computers concurrently to teach about three distinct elements — the technological world, the values of the tradition (subject matter) and the problem solving process.

Currently, the studies evaluating "tutee" projects rarely incorporate all three elements. BASIC programming stresses problem-solving with little emphasis given to content areas of the school curriculum. The LOGO environment merges the teaching of mathematical and problem-solving elements, although according to some critics, divorced from the world of value and mystery.²⁵ Our analysis revealed that "tutee" applications can possibly provide an educational experience where all three elements are involved.

Only one project involved all three elements with varying degrees of significance. The kosher machine project was a serious lesson on the meta-issue of technology and society stemming from a problematic aspect of translating a less significant Judaic studies problem into programming language.

In terms of the subject matter of rabbinics, the computer projects did not open up new levels of meaning. They did provide a way of organizing information, which seemed to interest some of the students. Furthermore, the "tutee" projects allowed us to consider learner attitudes to the role of technology and its relationship to the world. This is a means which can challenge the students on conceptual, problem-solving and meta-issue levels.

This evaluation of computer projects in a 7th grade Oral Law curriculum reveals that the new technological device offers limited practical opportunities for enhancing the curricular goals. As

²⁵ Sherry Turkel, The Second Self.
the Conservative day school continues to adopt a Jewish values approach to the teaching of rabbinics, the computer will be even less suitable for experimentation in this curricular area.

In conclusion, assertions in general education regarding the suitability of new means must be examined in terms of the needs of Jewish education, through discussion of the importance and ultimate meaning of new means. This form of educational deliberation may best serve as a safeguard against unreflective adoption of unsuitable fads and innovations. Indeed, Jewish educators must view the evaluation of new means as an opportunity for reflection on their ultimate goals.
Section IV

ANALYSIS OF APPROACHES AND OF CURRICULA
This study first documents the importance attributed to the study of Jewish thought among both religious and non-religious educators in Israel and the Diaspora. Jewish thought is seen by prominent educators to play a role in the cultivation of certain traits of the ideal Jewish personality. Among those traits: "observance with a view to intention (kavanah)," "search for truth by way of reason," "intellectual integration," "Jewish identification in relation to basic Jewish value-concepts," and a "reasoned commitment to an absolute morality."

Despite many publicistic "statements of aims," however, attempts at curricular organization in Jewish thought have remained at the level of syllabus, anthology or textbook. They have also been largely sporadic and often short-lived. Almost no familiarity with competing definitions of the discipline in the world of scholarship is revealed in the educational publications surveyed.

Writers of educational materials are either university scholars adapting their discipline to what they perceive as school reality, or experienced teachers summarizing their experience in very specific educational settings. None seem to be conversant with literature on curriculum-building as such.

What follows is a selective survey of attempts made to standardize the study of Jewish thought in Israeli high schools. Each attempt is shown to have:

1. A hidden conception of the discipline.

2. A hidden view as to the difference between the academic study of Jewish thought at universities and the educational presentation of Jewish thought at the high school level.

3. An implicit "diagnosis" of the ills of Jewish education, as well as a conception of the "therapeutic" role of Jewish thought in curing those ills.
4. Unreported principles governing the selection of sources from the wealth of "Jewish Thought Literature," and of ordering them for purposes of instruction.

Among the efforts discussed briefly in light of the above four issues:

For the religious school system:

1. Shaul Yisraeli's textbook: *Perakim Bemachshevet Yisrael*, emanating from his experience at Midrashiat Noam.

2. Proposals by Dov Rappel of Kibbutz Yavneh and Bar-Ilan University.


4. Proposals made by Michael Rosenak for the teaching of Jewish thought in religious schools.

For the non-religious school system:

5. The program suggested by Eliezer Schweid in response to his experience at the Hebrew University high school.


7. The anthologies compiled by the Center for the Teaching of the Humanities and Social Sciences (directed by Joseph Dan) under the rubric *Parshiot Iyyuniot Be'etoldot Yisrael*.

8. The Jewish Thought Project of the curriculum division of the Ministry of Education (also chaired by Joseph Dan).

At the end of the paper, reference is made to the Jewish Values Project of the Melton Centre, which, despite many shortcomings, is shown to have:

1. A conscious conception of educational "illness," "diagnosis," and "cure."

2. A conscious conception of the gains and losses pursuant to a "translation" of the corpus of Jewish tradition from "subject matter" to "subject matter for education."

3. A conscious reconstruction of the "discipline" for purposes of education—without the presumption of exhaustiveness.

Finally, the study opens two central issues for further research:

1. What is Jewish thought? A trans-historical perennial Jewish theology? General philosophical effort with a Jewish
“coloring”? A form of biblical commentary? Jewish intellectual or ideological history? Is consensus among educators about certain texts enough for the definition of a discipline? It is proposed that the great scholars in the area of Jewish thought be consulted for guidance in these matters.

2. How is the discipline — however defined in an academic sense — to be “translated” for purposes of education? How must the subject matter be modified in order to play a role in the education of a defined species of “ideal Jewish personality?”
JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY:  
THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STUDY UNIT IN  
TRADITION IN THE “TARBUT-JERUSALEM”  
PROGRAM, 1974-1983 (English Abstract)  

Rafi Sheniak

The “Tarbut-Jerusalem” educational project began in 1973, between the Tarbut Jewish Day School of Mexico and the Hebrew University’s Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora.

The main objective of the project was to develop a new curriculum that would solve the school’s most pressing problems — the pupils’ lack of motivation in Jewish studies and consequently, their lack of preparedness for life in a mostly non-Jewish society.

Two new subjects were created to address these issues: “Contemporary Jewish Life” which dealt with the pupil’s daily life; and “Israel Studies,” learning about Israel as the center of a relevant educational perception.

As time went on it gradually became clear that these courses could not deal with the problem without teaching Judaism per se. A new subject began to emerge which dealt in tradition. The underlying assumption of the initiators was that Jewish values have meaning, even to those not committed to Jewish religion. This field developed gradually, in a number of stages, with many units on several subjects (Oral Law, festivals and the Bible, Jewish philosophy).

The unit on Judaism and Christianity began as a subject within “Contemporary Jewish Life,” to address the daily problem of life as a minority in the culture of a Christian majority. The concept, however, was developed by the staff working on the materials on Tradition. This was typical of our difficulties in general in our search for a unique way of developing curricula. Problems arose due to the physical distance, as well as the mental and ideological gap between the school and the university, and the problem of presenting the subject of “tradition” in a suitable, relevant manner.

Development was accompanied by written proposals for ex-
peridental classes, sending feedback to the university, rewriting and re-experimenting. At the same time, teachers did refresher courses in Jerusalem and in Mexico, a workshop on curriculum was held at the university, and a teachers' workshop was held at the school at which teachers were chosen and trained as shlichim. Eventually, five subunits were developed within the subject of The Faith of Israel, as a solution to the Christian challenge: The Oneness of God; Missionizing and Conversion; Messiah in Judaism and Christianity; Jewish Values and Christian Values; Political Independence and Jewish Nationality.

Changes were made throughout in approach, content and method. A major change was that instead of being organized according to disciplines, units were organized according to subject. Another change was that instead of using an approach that tried to avoid apologetics, an approach was utilized that viewed apologetics as part of its educational perception.

Despite all the changes that took place and despite the experience gained in the field, the new curriculum created is still difficult to use. It is necessary to continue to process the material and make it available for teachers everywhere.
VALUE EDUCATION IN A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY: EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT AND CURRICULAR CONTENT IN JEWISH SCHOOL SYSTEMS IN INTERWAR POLAND
(English Abstract)

Shimon Frost

Polish Jewry during the interwar period, a community of three and a half million, represented a unique case of a pluralistic Jewish society in the ideological-social sense. Three main educational groups (the Orthodox, secular and bilingual school systems), in addition to a number of sub-networks, maintained school systems on the elementary and secondary levels, teacher training institutions and boarding schools.

This paper's premise is that values education does not exist in *abstracto* but rather reflects a particular world view. From this vantage point, this study will examine curricular content and the underlying values which informed the educational climate in the different types of Jewish schools. These values have been grouped in three clusters:

1. Educating towards an ideological-social and political awareness.
2. Educating for civic responsibility, a sense of personal dignity and productivity.
3. The dialectic between "here" and "there," i.e. between an educational thrust predicated on building a Jewish future in Poland or a future outside of Poland, notably in *Eretz Yisra'el*.

Orthodox education, which was predominantly of the *haredi*-Aguda variety, steadfastly insisted on the preservation of the past in form and content. This school system was characterized by impermeability to (and from) modern society and the most minimal exposure to general culture.

Consequently, this sector ignored "the new pedagogy" as this term was understood in those days. Concepts like "educating for
productivity" for "self dignity through work" were not values of
great importance to the network of schools. Nor did aliyah to
Erets Yisrael figure importantly as an issue.

In this respect, the haredi-Aguda school system differed sharply
from the much smaller Yavneh network of schools. Although
Orthodox in outlook, Yavneh reflected a Zionist view associated
with the Mizrachi movement. Yavneh schools upheld a degree of
openness to modern life which expressed itself in the curricular
domain as well. For this reason, the student's future, occupationally
and socially, became the school's concern and led the network
to establish trade schools on the secondary level. Yavneh schoole
educated for "Torah and Labor" and for aliyah to Erets Yisrael.

The two secular networks of schools, Tarbut and Tzirho, re
ected the views of secular Zionism and Bundism respectively.
Their "secularism" expressed itself in different ways: in the Tar
but schools there was a recognition of the inherent value of
Tradition; the curriculum included traditional texts, though it
eschewed religious instruction. Tzirho schools, on the other hand,
maintained an absolute and consistent negation of anything religious
or traditional, concentrating on Yiddish and its literature and
seeking to cultivate a Jewish folk awareness and classe consciou
ness.

Both secular trends upheld the prevalent "new pedagogy,"
maintaining essentially pedocentric schools, emphasizing social
and political commitments and civic responsibility. The "produc
tivity" issue figured high among the educational priorities of both
systems. For the Tarbut schools, this was part of the Zionist
educational thrust in preparation for aliyah; in the Tzirho schools,
the emphasis was on developing in the student a sense of self
worth (from work) and pride in the working class.

The bilingual schools, which were mainly secondary schools,
served a predominantly middle and upper class constituency. In
these schools, the language of instruction was Polish with the
exception of the Judaic subject matter areas which were taught
in Hebrew. The overriding social climate was Zionist. Neverthe
less, the leading drive was Polish acculturation and socio-cultural
mobility by means of the state-recognized matriculation diploma
which could lead to university studies.

Of all networks of schools this trend was ideologically the least
engagé and consequently was the most cautious and hesitant in educational matters.

Seen against Rosenak’s assertion that the criteria through which values achieve acceptability are authenticity and relevance, the Jewish school systems in interwar Poland would appear to be an educational framework which was value oriented, committed to and aware of its aspirations, and working hard towards implementing them.
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