



The Peoplehood Papers 10

April 2013 | Iyar 5773

Peoplehood in the Age of Pluralism

How Do We Embrace Pluralism
While keeping Us Whole?

The Peoplehood Papers 10

April 2013 | Iyar 5773

Peoplehood in the Age of Pluralism

How Do We Embrace Pluralism

While keeping Us Whole?

Peoplehood in the Age of Pluralism
How Do We Embrace Pluralism While keeping Us Whole?

The Peoplehood Papers 10

Editor: Shlomi Ravid

Sponsored by the Commission on the Jewish People, UJA-Federation of New York

Design and Production: Stephanie & Ruti Design

Printed in Israel 2013

Published by the Center for Jewish Peoplehood Education

publications@jpeoplehood.org

Varda Rafaeli

1956-2013



We are dedicating this issue of the Peoplehood Papers to the memory of Varda Rafaeli who was a member of the publication's editing team and instrumental to its development. Varda was a founding Fellow of the Center for Jewish Peoplehood Education and a pioneer in the field of Jewish Peoplehood. Most of her professional career was dedicated to the enhancement of the connections between Jews. It began at the American Jewish Committee where she created delegations of Israelis that explored the American Jewish Community and developed educational materials that brought the Jewish American story to the Israelis. Her participation in the Wexner program that followed was only a natural next step in her journey to engage with the Jewish people. She returned from it to assume the role of the director of JAFI's Israeli Society Unit responsible for exposing young Israelis to world Jewry. Here the focus of the work was the development of college programs dedicated to engaging future educators with Jewish Peoplehood.

When, later on, the International School for Jewish Peoplehood Education of Beit Hatefutsot - the first entity to formally address the challenge of Peoplehood education - was created, Varda joined the founding team. She was involved in the creation of new educational content and materials and coordinated the work of the global task force on Peoplehood education. Last but not least she was a natural partner in the launching and development of the new Center for Jewish Peoplehood Education that was created

two years ago. Varda was instrumental in co-writing the Task force report as the first attempt to frame the field of Peoplehood education, in editing educational materials, in teaching and in initiating the Tool Kit for Peoplehood Education.

But more than her formal biography can tell us, Varda was unique as she exemplified what we would hope to see in the individuals that make up the Jewish collective. Varda cared passionately about everything Jewish and her curiosity and desire to learn were endless. Her passion for Jewish Peoplehood was translated into a deep sense of commitment to the Jewish enterprise – a commitment that was expressed through action, entrepreneurship and unlimited devotion to the cause.

As it relates to the topic of this issue, Varda's Peoplehood was immersed in a deep commitment to pluralistic Judaism. Perhaps this was a natural expression of someone who grew up in a home with strong Revisionist roots and ended up a peace activist who actively opposed the occupation. Varda knew how to disagree while respecting her ideological opponents. While being both knowledgeable and opinionated her manor when interacting with conflicting opinions was always respectful and gentle. More than that, she treated all human beings, regardless of background and professional status with the same level of respect and dignity.

Varda was a passionate, engaging and inspiring teacher who saw her teaching as a "shlichut". She was also a thorough researcher and thinker who was both open to new ideas but very pedantic as it relates to drawing new conclusions and ideas. A true "talmida chachama".

More than all of the above says, she was a true "mentsch" with a touch of nobility, that is somewhat missing in today's world. The world after Varda's passing is definitely less good. She will be sorely missed by her friends and colleagues. As one of them, Dave Matkowski, wrote us : "Perhaps most importantly, Varda exemplified - whether consciously or organically - the principle that peoplehood works best when the people in question, whatever their differences, are personally likeable. With her easy smile, natural empathy and generosity of spirit, Varda made a sense of belonging to any people that included her an inviting prospect. It was a privilege to know and to work with Varda, and her untimely passing is a loss to the entire Jewish family. May her legacy continue through all whose lives she touched".

Our only consolation is that we will be continuing the work that was so important to her and that her smile will be with us as we make progress in improving this world through the strengthening of our people.

Shlomi Ravid

From the Editor

Shlomi Ravid

This issue of the Peoplehood Papers set out to explore the potential for developing some kind of synthesis between Jewish Peoplehood and Pluralism. There is no doubt that sustaining a sense of Peoplehood in an age framed by the value of pluralism presents a real challenge. Jews today differ on core Jewish issues. Sustaining a sense of commonality in that environment becomes increasingly complex and yet denial is not an option as the tensions are not just at our door step - they have entered into the house. For that matter we approached contributors who are in the "trenches" of practice and asked them to offer their perspectives, solutions and strategies. Some of them focused on analyzing the issue. Others on realigning education in various settings and age groups in order to address the challenge. Still others offered new perspectives on how we should view and address pluralism. There is also an analysis of the unique situation in Israel. What was most encouraging was the consensus between the writers that if approached properly pluralism can actually enrich and contribute to Jewish Peoplehood.

Defining the challenge

Larry Moses frames the challenge at hand very eloquently: "over time, we have come to realize that our differences are profound and enduring, and that as a people we would be naïve to believe that these differences could be subservient to an all-embracing sense of what binds us as a people. If indeed we find ourselves in an "age of pluralism," then we are well-served to engage in a sober assessment of how we can reconcile our widening diversity with the near dreamlike sense of oneness that resonated so strongly in prior decades". Moses concludes that "developing a capacity to "engage" Jews who are different around a sense of the common good is our renewed struggle. We have far to go in Jewish life to transform a culture of competition into a culture of commonality. But we are not new to this challenge, and we are capable of rising to it, as we have over countless centuries."

Charles Edelsberg from the Jim Joseph Foundation recognizes the importance of both the concepts of Peoplehood and Pluralism. He has a real issue with the fact that "While there are myriad efforts to define peoplehood, to my knowledge no single, commonly accepted definition has gained currency". As is relates to Pluralism he notes that: "In various parts of the Jewish world, there is no commitment to pluralism. In these cases, difference is rejected, change disavowed, and innovative expressions of contemporary

Judaism disdained.” Pluralistic Judaism in Edelsberg’s eyes “could ultimately fail to bring together diverse Jewish peoples around what is common, shared, hallowed, and quintessential in Judaism”. This raises for him the question of: “what other conditions, along with pluralism, must be present to establish a strong peoplehood?”

Can Education Provide an Answer?

Michal Muszkat-Barkan discusses the challenges of teaching through a pluralistic lens against the background of her upbringing in an Israeli Orthodox school. In defense of Jewish unity her teachers “protected” her from exposure to alternative Jewish perceptions. However as Muszkat-Barkan points out, the emerging paradigm in the Jewish world is increasingly pluralistic. This means that closing the doors and windows on alternative perceptions is wrong as a way of preparing for life. Furthermore, using her own words: “Reframing the aims of Jewish education to enhance a pluralistic approach to Jewish identity can lead to a richer and more realistic sense of Jewish peoplehood and contribute to the renewal and deepening of our covenant and Jewish solidarity.”

Tal Gale from the Diller Teen Fellows program proposes the educational journey to raise leaders of pluralistic Judaism: “Affording teens the unique opportunity to explore their Jewish identities by exposing them to the diversity of Jewish expression and experience which is today’s reality is to invite them to venture on a collective Jewish journey. Doing so requires courage on their part. If this approach is successful, the next generation of Jewish leaders may break down today’s barriers and help redefine a Jewish People strengthened by diversity”.

Beth Cousens notes that the sense of being part of a people is anything but intuitive for American young adults. “Yet, younger Jews do develop relationships with Jewish communities and with Jews different from them. They find Jewish communities to which they can belong, rooted in personal attachments. In their attachments, they provide a new understanding of peoplehood, suited to the pluralistic Jewish condition and to the world that younger Jews will lead.” The sense of belonging does not transcend: “us” does not exist for the entire Jewish people, but each student feels part of a community, one in which they feel comfortable and that they can call their own”. Cousens concludes that we should view Peoplehood as a process rather than an outcome in this current context.

Rabbi **Jessey Gross** who leads an outreach project in Baltimore sees pluralism as an engine for engaging her participants and at the same time as a way to enhance Jewish Peoplehood. Or in her words: “Anyone and any community seeking to engage with and learn about different ideas and attitudes as it relates to Jewish commitments and Jewish life is surely engaged in holy pursuit of Truth. Our goal should not be sameness. A Jew

unwilling to hear opinions different from his/her own stands in the way of becoming a stronger Jewish people. The strength of our people will dictate the ability to live out the blessing that we are to be a light unto other nations but also bolster the foundation upon which Judaism and our ancient tradition can continue to flourish and grow”.

**Pluralism
of Substance**

Rabbi **Elie Kaunfer** calls for a pluralism of substance as a means strengthening Peoplehood: “In our collective work to engender feelings of peoplehood, I would advocate for a more focused approach to pluralism: a pluralism of substance. In this model, the key to peoplehood isn’t pluralism per se, it is education. Only through education will Jews develop a deeper attachment to their Judaism. Critically, education doesn’t lead to cookie-cutter people with identical Jewish values. It may in fact lead to deep differences among Jews. However, when those Jews encounter each other in pluralistic settings, they will be able to debate the core issues, as opposed to finding commonality in surface issues”.

Anat Barber takes the challenge of pluralism a step further. Pluralism, she claims, is applied mostly towards those who accept the pluralistic “rules of the game”. “We need instead to understand Pluralism as the need to learn about the multiplicity of Jewish voices, including those who see themselves as ultimate truth and reject ours”. According to Barber “The organized Jewish Community has over the last three decades disengaged from value driven conversations with these communities mostly because the Haredi community is non-compromising in their ideals. In fact what we have done (on both sides) is ended the very conversation which we need in order to maintain our sense of Jewish connection and Jewish Peoplehood.” Her solution is: “It is time to confront the wide gamut of Jewish plurality with a lens toward understanding our distinctions with respect and exploring our shared heritage. We need to understand that having conversations with someone different from you does not grant each other legitimacy, it simply means you care enough about each other to engage. Through this kind of exploration and understanding of the many different voices of Jewish community, we can actually come to a deeper sense of Jewish Pluralism”.

Shuki Taylor from YU’s Experiential Education Center reminds us that as we try to measure the success of our educational work on pluralistic Peoplehood we should be aware of the diversity of the perspectives our students share. “Pluralism celebrates the legitimacy of the Jewish community’s diversity. Peoplehood nurtures this community’s diverse commitment to the Jewish collective enterprise. Fostering this sense of commitment and belonging requires that, as educators, we embrace the full spectrum of perspectives the Jewish people subscribes to. In the age of Pluralism, we must be mindful of the fact that learners harbor a variety of different beliefs. The ways in which

learners feel belonging and demonstrate commitment to the Jewish collective will vary greatly”.

For **Stephen Hazan Arnoff**, the director of the 14th St. Y, “there is also a kind of cultural pluralism that offers paths to Jewish meaning. These paths navigate old tensions between Jerusalem and Rome as well as personal and communal urges. For people already immersed in personal and communal meaning “doing in Rome as the Romans do” – experiencing and shaping meaning through popular music like me, for example – this means thickening the peoplehood experience through connecting Jewish identity with the power of general culture, not by finding ways to shed or replace it”.

The Pluralism of Israel

Rabbi **Naamah Kelman** offers a short history of the Israeli religious pluralism struggle from the days when the Israel Religions Action Center of the Israeli Reform Movement - Hamerkaz Le'Pluralism was founded in 1986. She concludes her historical scan with the following: “Today, pluralism promotes just this, no “Jew” is an island, we desperately need each other, each stream has strengths to bring to the table and we can learn from each other. So pluralism has the potential to strengthen peoplehood. That is the challenge facing us. With nation building behind us, with most Diaspora communities living in safety and affluence, it is time to create these meeting points of safe and fruitful cross-fertilization and dialogue”.

Rabbi **Uri Regev** focuses on the damage to the sense of Peoplehood brought about by the lack of religious pluralism in Israel. He points to an inherent conflict between Israel's unifying role for the world's Jews and the fact that its current laws discriminate against “the overwhelming majority of the next generation of the world's Jewish community”. This contradiction, according to Regev, undermines the whole notion of Peoplehood. His conclusion is: “If Jewish peoplehood is based on an emotional and intellectual connection, mutual responsibility and solidarity, we must work to shape Israel as a Jewish and Democratic state, which embraces all shapes and shades of Judaism in Israel and in the Diapsora and does not alienate them”.

In conclusion this exchange while only beginning to grapple with a very complex issue, provides room for optimism for those who care about both Peoplehood and pluralism. All of the contributors while being well grounded in the field of Jewish education felt that pluralism can actually enrich and strengthen Jewish Peoplehood. Not that integrating them will be an easy process, but if well thought through, planned and implemented, it promises a more nuanced, sophisticated and deep sense of Peoplehood. One that not only reflect the current reality but also holds the promise of a richer approach to our Jewish commonality.

Table of Contents

Jewish Peoplehood and the Biblical Landscape	10
Stephen Hazan Arnoff	
The Challenges of Building Pluralistic Jewish Peoplehood:	13
Towards a Different Kind of Pluralism	
Anat Barber	
Peoplehood as Process	16
Beth Cousens	
Pluralism and Peoplehood	21
Chip Edelsberg	
New Directions in Jewish Leadership: Pluralism	23
Tal Gale	
Sowing Diversity in Fields of Jewish Peoplehood	26
Jessey Gross	
Toward a Pluralism of Substance.....	29
Elie Kaunfer	
The Pluralism of Pluralism in Israel: A Brief History.....	32
Naamah Kelman	
Jewish Pluralism Revisited – Rising Above Conflicting Truths	35
Larry Moses	
Pluralism and Peoplehood: Jewish Education Between Protection and Exposure.....	38
Michal Muszkat-Barkan	
A less Spoken About Angle: The Threat Israel Presents to Jewish Peoplehood.....	41
Uri Regev	
Jewish Peoplehood in the Age of Pluralism: The Challenge of Measuring Success.....	45
Shuki Taylor	



Jewish Peoplehood and the Biblical Landscape

Stephen Hazan Arnoff

Recently my family and I were in Rome for thirty-six hours on our way to Jerusalem. As we approached the Coliseum – a first time visit for us all – the core text was obvious, Bob Dylan’s “When I Paint My Masterpiece:”

*Oh, the streets of Rome are filled with rubble
Ancient footprints are everywhere
You can almost think that you’re seein’ double
On a cold, dark night on the Spanish Stairs...*

*Oh, the hours I’ve spent inside the Coliseum
Dodging lions and wastin’ time
Oh, those mighty kings of the jungle, I could hardly stand to see ‘em
Yes, it sure has been a long, hard climb...*

While I am rock and roll obsessive, my academic training is in classical rabbinic text and culture. This means I have a lot of rabbinic texts and contexts under my belt. The portfolio of rabbinic teachings and stories specific to experiencing Rome and its cultural influence through Jewish eyes is large, colorful, and memorable. But while these stories may have outlined the cultural footsteps I humbly imagined walking in, musical references still filled my thoughts. Tom Waits came next:

*No justice here, no liberty
No reason, no blame
There’s no cause to taint the sweetest taste of blood
And greetings from the nation
As we shake the hands of time
They’re taking their ovations
The vultures stay behind
In the colosseum, in the colosseum
In the colosseum tonight*

And then there was Bruce Springsteen's "Wrecking Ball," a song premiered on the eve of the demolition of the modern-day Coliseum of the Meadowlands, "where the blood is spilled, the arena's filled, and giants played their games."

My job for nearly fifteen years has been leading Jewish communal institutions. A big part of that job is making Jewish texts useful to people for whom they are otherwise not immediately accessible or important. There are many good ways to do that. One of them is blending personal meaning derived in general culture with the voices of tradition.

My own experience of gleaning meaning – whether in Jerusalem or Rome or, on most days, somewhere in between – is that traditional texts and feelings of belonging to the Jewish enterprise are made stronger when intertwined with contemporary cultural voices and perspectives. This includes hearing Jewish meaning in the most unexpected places and ways. What is true of individual experience is true of experiencing Jewish Peoplehood on a communal level as well. Another beloved musical voice has parsed this idea.

In 1992 Leonard Cohen discussed with the *Jewish Book Review* a line from his song "The Future." Asked to explain the words "I'm the little Jew who wrote the Bible" Cohen said:

As I get older I feel less modest about taking these positions because I realize we are the ones who wrote the Bible and at our best we inhabit a biblical landscape, and this is where we should situate ourselves without apology. The biblical landscape is our urgent invitation and we have to be there. Otherwise, it's really not worth saving or manifesting, or redeeming, or anything.

I have been thinking about this biblical landscape a great deal in context of Jewish communal work lately. Much of the conversation about Jewish peoplehood work is narrowed by being limited to the most obvious kinds of immersive Jewish experiences – Birthright Israel, day schools and residential camps, or membership in a synagogue. These points of connection and many others surely offer potential for deepening a sense of Jewish belonging and mutual responsibility.

But there is also a kind of cultural pluralism that offers paths to Jewish meaning. These paths navigate old tensions between Jerusalem and Rome as well as personal and communal urges. For people already immersed in personal and communal meaning "doing in Rome as the Romans do" – experiencing and shaping meaning through

popular music like me, for example – this means thickening the peoplehood experience through connecting Jewish identity with the power of general culture, not by finding ways to shed or replace it.

In “Dear Diary” Leonard Cohen praises his own journal – the murmurings of his own heart, his own personal Rome and Jerusalem – as a transcendent sacred text in and of itself:

*You are greater than the Bible
And the Conference of the Birds
And the Upanishads
All put together...*

*Dear Diary
I mean no disrespect
But you are more sublime
Than any Sacred Text*

*Sometimes just a list
Of my events
Is holier than the Bill of Rights
And more intense*

The goal of a Jewish educator should not be to remain in the sublime, deeply personal experience Cohen describes, but to build upon it, recognizing that only by facilitating a community comprised of individuals of rich, meaningful experience will Jewish communities be compelling enough to want to join.

Navigating peoplehood requires a multidimensional, pluralistic map to the biblical landscape – Cohen’s poetic parsing of peoplehood. This is the place where meaning and connection emerge as personal and communal, ancient and contemporary, and belong to both Rome and Jerusalem. In educational terms, creating a map for Jewish experience with this kind of color, depth, and resonance is akin to painting a masterpiece.

Dr. Stephen Hazan Arnoff is Executive Director the 14th Street Y in New York City, home of LABA: A Laboratory for Jewish Culture, and a post-doctoral Tikvah Scholar at New York University.



The Challenges of Building Pluralistic Jewish Peoplehood: Towards a Different Kind of Pluralism

Anat Barber

In the field of epistemology, the study of knowledge, Pluralism is understood to mean that the more data points or opinions you have on a given topic the deeper a sense of understanding you will emerge with of that topic. The multiplicity of voices actually remain distinct from one and other but exploring each approach allows the seeker to gain a deeper understanding of the issue at hand.

In the case of Jewish Peoplehood as we seek to exhibit a greater sense of understanding of what connects us and consequently a greater sense of connectedness, we too often use a language of pluralism which undermines this very goal. In most Jewish conversations about pluralism it is used to convey a sense religious pluralism built on the foundation that all Jewish narratives are true Jewish narratives and that none holds more weight than any other. However if we are trying to cultivate Jewish Peoplehood which is inclusive and celebrates shared values then we have already undermined our goal by excluding Jewish groups whose views are built on the a set of assumptions seen as ultimate truths, not relative truths. In order to honestly build a sense of Global Jewish peoplehood we actually need to discard the traditional narrative of Pluralism as having many truths, because the writers of this narrative have opened the door only to those who share their own basic core values. We need instead to understand Pluralism as the need to learn about the multiplicity of Jewish voices, including those who see themselves as ultimate truth and reject ours, as a means to help us further refine and deepen our Jewish understanding regardless of your own religious approach.

Currently the sense of connectedness between Jews of distinct backgrounds and opinions is attenuated, but still exists. This connection is most evident when different Jewish groups are angered and hurt by the vitriolic and insult-laden speech with which we address one and other. If in fact we were totally disconnected from each other we would have no reaction. Still, this is hardly a vision of connectedness and Peoplehood

that we want to endorse. As a community architect I see our work needing to focus on cultivating opportunities to experience and connect with Jewish People who are dissimilar to us and by extension with Jewish Peoplehood. It is our role to provide the respectful and appropriate language for the conversations which need to be had. We need to cultivate communities where respect and tolerance are ever-present through language, culture and policy and where a desire for *klal Yisrael* encourages the conversations which will foster it. At the core of our ability to do this will be re-centering ourselves on our shared value system and shared textual history including the most fundamental elements of *Torah*, *Derech Eretz* (respect of others) and *Gemilut Chasadim* (acts of loving kindness).

A truer sense of Jewish Pluralism would be better served by a value system which encourages a multi-cultural approach in which different voices are acknowledged and celebrated and in which true open dialogue between Jews of different opinions can occur. An approach such as this would require a high level of respect and tolerance for one and other and could only be achieved if we truly are committed to learning about "the other". In reality, the way we can maintain a sense of connection to each other, which is one of the ultimate goals of Jewish Peoplehood is by respectfully acknowledging our differences and disagreements through ongoing conversation with each other, rather than ignoring them and pretending they don't exist. Further understanding of our respective viewpoints, will allow us to identify those areas where our core Jewish values overlap.

For too long, we have shied away from conversing about the things we perceive as differentiating us, and as a result we have distanced our selves from each other on a more existential level. That has brought us to the current situation where Jewish Peoplehood can feel tenuous at best. We have become two parallel communities, those who believe in Pluralism and those who do not. The recent elections in Israel and the most recent New York Jewish Population Study clearly illustrate the growing Haredi communities domestically and internationally. The organized Jewish Community has over the last three decades disengaged from value driven conversations with these communities mostly because the Haredi community is non-compromising in their ideals. In fact what we have done (on both sides) is ended the very conversation which we need in order to maintain our sense of Jewish connection and Jewish Peoplehood.

Granted, this conversation is not without difficulty. The focus of our work on Jewish Peoplehood should be on learning our shared past and respecting the different interpretations thereof. It behooves us to re-engage in deep Jewish textual learning so that we can articulate our respective narratives and convey them respectfully to others. Ultimately our shared cultural, textual, linguistic and religious history will become

the corner stone of conversations of this nature and ultimately of rebuilding Jewish Peoplehood. I saw this play out acutely during the inaugural speech of Knesset member Ruth Calderon. During her *drash* on a passage in the *Talmud* she was interrupted by a fellow knesset member from a religious party. Granted they are very different in their approach to religion and politics, but the Talmud gave them a shared platform on which to converse. To her credit Knesset member Calderon welcomed his comments as the beginning of an ongoing chevruta. Similarly engaging Orthodox and Ultra-Orthodox communities with civic enterprise within our communities and in the State of Israel will further provide the shared set of Israeli experiences to inform conversations which can lead to truer manifestation of Jewish Peoplehood in the State of Israel.

It is time to confront the wide gamut of Jewish plurality with a lens toward understanding our distinctions with respect and exploring our shared heritage. We need to understand that having conversations with someone different from you does not grant each other legitimacy, it simply means you care enough about each other to engage. Through this kind of exploration and understanding of the many different voices of Jewish community, we can actually come to a deeper sense of Jewish Pluralism. This will be a Jewish Pluralism in the epistemological sense such that through these deep conversations wherein we learn about many different Jewish approaches, we will also gain a deeper understanding of who the Jewish people are and what unites us.

Anat Barber is the Planning Director in the Commission on the Jewish People at UJA-Federation of NY.



Peoplehood as Process

Beth Cousens

When I interviewed twenty-seven year old Charlie as part of research on adults in their twenties and thirties and their Jewishness, we sat under a poster of a scene from *Ulysses* that he found in Ireland while exploring his mother's family's roots. I asked him about his relationship with the non-Jewish parts of his identity, and in response he raised Philip Roth's ideas about Jews and otherness: "You know, American Jews driving themselves to neuroses with their otherness or their conflicts. ... It's something I can't identify with." Why Philip Roth, I asked? "Him envying that non-Jewishness and seeing that as something totally different than you are. I mean, I realize there are differences but ... his characters seem to perceive non-Jews as alien in a way that I definitely never have.... There is a difference ... but ... it's a difference you can talk about, it's a difference you can deal with." To Charlie, non-Jews are not that dissimilar from him. "Us" and "them" doesn't exist for Charlie; by extension, he also explained, Jews are not inherently aligned with him. If peoplehood is a sense of "underlying unity," a sense of "us" that "transcends time and personal acquaintance,"¹ peoplehood is not something that feels intuitive or sensical to Charlie.

Charlie is not unusual among his peers. Raised without occupational, social, or structural segregation, with all professions, neighborhoods, and social opportunities open to them, in a socio-cultural environment that privileges multiculturalism, and in a socio-political environment with increasing diversity due to immigration, many younger (Jewish and other) adults see no dividers between "us" and "them" and, as a result, nothing that ties "us" uniquely together. A sense that each Jew stood at Sinai, that we each contribute to and are part of the collective memory of the Jewish people, is, without intervention, lost to many younger Jews.

This is in large part because many younger Jews are not comfortable with ideas about inherent loyalties and unities, to Israel, to the Jewish people, or to any community

1 Shlomi Ravid. "What is Jewish Peoplehood? And is it the Right Question? From Defining Peoplehood to Creating Peoplehood Capital." *The Peoplehood Papers* (United Jewish Communities, 2007).

or country.² But it is also because younger Jews were raised in the American Jewish world described in Jack Wertheimer's *A People Divided*,³ a world where the Jewish people is inherently fractured. For younger Jews, a pluralistic Judaism is not part of the modern condition; instead, Judaism comes in fragments, with infighting and radical differences between sub-communities. For some, this Jewish pluralism leads to feelings of inadequacy, to feeling judged by other Jews – which exacerbates feelings of distance from the Jewish people writ large.

Yet, younger Jews do develop relationships with Jewish communities and with Jews different from them. They find Jewish communities to which they can belong, rooted in personal attachments. In their attachments, they provide a new understanding of peoplehood, suited to the pluralistic Jewish condition and to the world that younger Jews will lead.

At Home and In Exile At Anytown Hillel, I interviewed four college seniors about their experiences with Hillel and with Jewish life during their years on campus. These seniors are more Jewishly connected and experienced than typical Jewish students: Among them, they have years in day school, family Shabbat dinners, and trips to Israel. In exploring how Hillel has influenced their feelings of peoplehood, I asked them about their sense of belonging to Jewish community on campus, to Jewish communities more generally, and to the Jewish people as an entity. As they answered, they began to bring nuance to my questions.

First, they noted, “There are two ways of seeing Jewish community: my communities and the larger Jewish community.” “Jewish community,” to them, is their own Jewish community; one student mentioned her high school, her home synagogue, as her places of belonging. She contrasted these communities with the larger Jewish community, where she feels less comfortable.

Another student continued this idea, “[Jewish community is] the one place I know I will always belong. But it also can make me more mad than anything else in the world. and it does on a daily basis.” She suggested:

2 Kleinman, Max L., Terrill, Marc B., Cousens, Beth, Levine, Eric. “Confronting the Tensions: Jewish Community Building in the 21st Century.” *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* vol 83 no 2-3 (Spring 2008): 125-139; Steven M. Cohen and Ari Y. Kelman. *Beyond Distancing: Young Adult American Jews and Their Alienation from Israel* (The Andrea and Charles Bronfman Philanthropies, n.d.).

3 New Hampshire: Brandeis University Press, 1993.

There are different parts. You sort of have to find a place where you belong. I have, but what makes me upset is when the different groups within the larger community don't accept each other. We can be worse to each other than we are to any other community.

Another student added:

Yeah. I feel the most distance from this community when I feel like I'm refusing to choose a certain group that will put distance between me and the community

I asked, Will you ever feel a sense of belonging to the larger people? A student answered:

Well, when you say the Jewish people, there's so many versions of that. I don't think anyone can be fully connected to the Jewish community. Even the most "ultra-orthodox" person.... they're not connected to the 98% of Jews who are living full Jewish lives but who don't subscribe to that.

These students demonstrate the extent to which Judaism and Jewish community, for them, are multifaceted. They are angry at some parts of the community, but that does not mean they feel that they do not belong wholesale; at the same time, they see parts of the community as not belonging to them, and, in turn, they do not seek to feel a part of the entire community. For these students, Jews comprise a community of communities, or, more accurately, a series of groups overlapping and distinct, to which Jews simultaneously belong and feel excluded. Like Charlie, "us" does not exist – or, "us" does not exist for the entire Jewish people, but each student feels part of a community, one in which they feel comfortable and that they can call their own. Significantly, a sense of belonging to the Jewish people does not extend from this sense of belonging to one community. In these students' minds, Jews are too different to allow this.

Being in Relationship As part of a larger research project on Jews in their twenties and thirties,⁴ I spent ten days in Israel with a group of Boston-based adults, participants in a Temple Israel outreach and education project for this population. Most had not been to Israel before. As a group, they were often inquisitive of their surroundings and even skeptical. They critiqued Independence Hall for being too focused on the story of the Jews at the time and leaving out any details of 1920s Arab Israel; similarly, they cringed when the group's guide made assumptions about their relationship to Israel or to the Jewish people (saying, for example, "This is your

4 Beth Cousens, "Shifiting Social Networks: Studying the Jewish Growth of Adults in Their Twenties and Thirties." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, 2008.

country, too.”) They were reflective skeptics: Before internalizing something said to them or something they saw, they often asked themselves, Does this feel true to me? What is there to be curious about here? What will I accept, and what will I examine?⁵

On the almost-last night of the trip, participants spent Shabbat with Temple Israel's sister synagogue in Haifa. We went to prayer services and were hosted for dinner and general socializing by some of the younger adults in the congregation and community. Boston trip participants mixed happily with Haifa residents, in groups of two and three, packed into the apartment, the noise level growing throughout the evening. Ultimately, later, participants would say that their time in Haifa was one of the best parts of the trip. Dena commented that she “had never met an Israeli who was” like her before, who she wanted to “hang out” with. The participants thought they could live in Haifa; it seemed to them like where they belonged.

Despite or alongside their skepticism, in Haifa, participants saw themselves in Israel; they came to be able to envision themselves in the country. They felt truly comfortable in that living room and had a mirror in their Haifa peers. This personal, peer encounter helped them begin to see a place for themselves within a construct of Jewish community. After this experience, like their counterparts in Anytown Hillel, they still would feel uncomfortable in some Jewish spaces or with Israel's decisions. But their feelings of being at home helped them make a commitment to Israel being a part of them, personally and emotionally. Their connection to Israel became rooted in the entirety of their experience, their debate and their comfort, and the contrast between the two. In this contrast, their feelings of peoplehood became both/ and – discomfort and attachment – rather than either/ or.

Peoplehood as Process Participants in this Israel trip demonstrate the importance of localized Jewish community that Anytown Hillel students raise. It may be that in a disunified Jewish world, we cannot expect that all Jews will feel responsibility for the other. Belonging requires too much comfort, and Jews can be too different from each other to allow that comfort. But through localized connections, commonalities can be identified, and feelings of peoplehood can grow out of relationships that are built.

5 The term “reflective skeptic” is Stephen Brookfield's. It refers to a learner's intuitive and automatic propensity to examine ideas for one's own truth. *Developing Critical Thinkers: Challenging Adults to Explore Alternative Ways of Thinking and Acting* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987).

Participants in this Israel trip also demonstrate that while younger Jews push against “us,” they are willing to be in a place to push. Discomfort is the corollary to attachment. Relationships grow within a larger context of debate, of personal struggle to find one's place, with the present Jewish people and with the Jewish past and future. Peoplehood, then, becomes an ongoing dialogue – even a tense dialogue – with Israel, the Jewish people, and the Jewish narrative. This is the essence of being in relationship, unity aside: Peoplehood is a process, not an outcome, and it involves being present, showing up. The project of peoplehood is to be in the middle.

Beth Cousens, PhD, is a consultant to Jewish educational organizations.



Pluralism and Peoplehood

Chip Edelsberg

While I eagerly accepted the invitation to reflect on how the Jim Joseph Foundation's philanthropy emphasizes pluralism within a peoplehood context, it turns out to be a problematic proposition.

First, the concept of peoplehood is itself nebulous. While there are myriad efforts to define peoplehood, to my knowledge no single, commonly accepted definition has gained currency. Even Jim Joseph Foundation professionals themselves do not agree on the meaning of peoplehood. Nor is the Foundation professional team of the same mind when individuals are asked to describe the degree to which peoplehood is integral to one's Jewish identity.

Second, the Foundation's Board of Directors has not formalized any position on funding peoplehood. In fact, transcripts of past Board Meetings do not reveal that the Foundation's funder, Jim Joseph *z"l*, ever discussed "peoplehood," *per se*. Mr. Joseph did refer occasionally to "pluralism." He also was fond of challenging his advisors to "find young Jews wherever or whoever they are...and educate them."

It is in this spirit that the Foundation forged its approach to philanthropy – an approach that encompasses the core idea that diverse expressions of Judaism are valuable and legitimate. The Foundation has a vision of increasing numbers of young Jews choosing to engage in ongoing Jewish learning and seeking to live vibrant Jewish lives. It is an expansive vision and one that construes education broadly.

This view results in Foundation funding across the denominational spectrum to organizations that, in their own words, expressly seek to engender Jewish peoplehood. We also partner with funders who invoke peoplehood as one of their animating values. The topic of peoplehood is often present in conversations between Jim Joseph Foundation professionals and Jewish educators, rabbis, and CEOs and Board Chairs of organizations funded by the Foundation. Many of these individuals actually *prescribe* peoplehood as a key cornerstone of a prosperous Jewish future.

Yet we have come to realize that peoplehood is neither a word nor a concept that represents a fundable idea around which Jim Joseph Foundation grants can be structured. True – we understand community as a transcendent force in Jewish life. Yes – we observe that learning experiences that fortify collective Jewish identity and responsibility strengthen the bonds between Jews. Of course we see how the Torah and its teachings, Israel, the Holocaust, and Jewish holiday and family rituals bring together Jewish people in celebration or acts of memory or religious observance that unite a people.

But, with all its burgeoning individualism, the Jewish people are still populated by homogeneous sects that repudiate other Jews. In various parts of the Jewish world, there is no commitment to pluralism. In these cases, difference is rejected, change disavowed, and innovative expressions of contemporary Judaism disdained.

We are inclined to contemplate peoplehood as a fundamentally social phenomenon. It draws Jews into personal connection with one another in pursuit of shared meaning and purpose. In this regard, we imagine that peoplehood can be an antidote to the potential anarchy of so many Jewish “sovereign selves.”

It seems to us that pluralism may be a necessary but insufficient condition for establishing a credible peoplehood agenda. Pluralism as it is examined from multiple perspectives in the book *Peoplehood: Change and Challenge* makes a strong case that “Jewish peoplehood will be unable to flourish in the context of any extremist view...” (Prell, “Against the Cultural Grain: Jewish Peoplehood for the 21st Century,” pg. 124). But in and of itself, pluralistic Judaism could ultimately fail to bring together diverse Jewish peoples around what is common, shared, hallowed, and quintessential in Judaism.

In essence, I am answering the original question by inferring another: what other conditions, along with pluralism, must be present to establish a strong peoplehood? The concept of pluralism is an integral component of the Foundation’s vision and the philanthropy that it pursues. By contrast, lacking a consensually agreed upon definition of peoplehood, it is implausible for me as a grantmaking professional to seek funding opportunities solely in its name.

Chip Edelsberg, Ph.D is executive director of the Jim Joseph Foundation, which seeks to foster compelling, effective Jewish learning experiences for young Jews in the United States.



New Directions in Jewish Leadership: Pluralism

Tal Gale

What will be the future of the Jewish People? This question remains unresolved in a time when there is more freedom and choice than ever in history to express Jewish identity individually and collectively.

Ironically, today's freedom to be Jewish, a constant aspiration of the Jewish People, now presents itself as one of the greatest challenges facing us. How can the opportunity to connect to Judaism through diverse channels threaten the future of the Jewish People?

Young Jews today are asking themselves: What does it mean to be Jewish? Who is a Jew? And even, why be Jewish? These questions are not new; similar self-questioning characterizes Jewish history and are a defining character of the Jewish People. In fact, asking these questions is critical to perpetuating the Jewish People.

Our current challenge is not how to answer these questions but in what context. Today these questions are being answered not by the Jewish People as a whole but in isolated groups with diverse defining features including different streams of Judaism, geographic and socio-economic realities and others.

Having worked so hard to create communities that support different ways of Jewish life, Jewish leaders are reluctant to engage in dialogue. Why this reluctance? One reason may be demographics. In his essay, "American Jews in the New Millennium," Jonathan Sarna writes, "In the 21st century, it is safe to predict, the American Jewish community will shrink both absolutely (the number of Jews will decline) and also relatively (the percent of Jews within the total US population will also decline)". He continues to note that "the Jews of England have already witnessed such a decline."

With this decline, communities fear losing members and becoming irrelevant. This fear, real and understandable, endangers the future of a united and strong Jewish People.

An extreme example lies in the understanding of Jewish life in America and Israel, whose collective Jewish population is more than 80 percent of world Jewry. Jack Wertheimer, author of *A People Divided*, writes: "The international solidarity of Jews will suffer as Judaism in America and Israel, the two largest centers of Jewish civilization today, diverge, making it harder for Jews in those two environments to respond sympathetically to each other."

The ability to engage in dialogue and respond to each other sympathetically and empathetically is critical to ensuring the future of a united People. This dialogue does not imply that individuals and communities need to forgo their identities and beliefs, rather that this dialogue can strengthen the larger community of Jews worldwide.

The Diller Teen Fellows Program offers a unique, pluralistic platform for dialogue about the future of the Jewish People. The Program's participants are emerging teenage leaders identified by 16 participating communities in the United States, Canada and Israel. Each community selects 20 teens with strong leadership skills and interest in issues of Jewish life in their communities and the potential to inform future Jewish life in their communities. The goal is that each teen group represent the diversity of Jewish life of their community including different schooling (secular versus religious), degrees of religious affiliation (Orthodox to unaffiliated) and ethnic, socio-economic and geographic backgrounds.

Most of these teens, motivated to take on leadership roles in their schools, synagogues or youth movements, come to the program having experienced Jewish life through the lens provided by their immediate surroundings. Brian Greene, Executive Director of the Westside JCC in Los Angeles and Supervisor of the local Diller Program writes, "In our community the Diller program has been instrumental in establishing a sense of Jewish Peoplehood and pluralism. It is the only program of its kind that attracts a diverse cross-section of the community and creates an environment of respect for participants' differences. The program gives teens a chance to emerge from their Jewish "box" and explore what it means to be a part of the Jewish People."

During the 15-month program, teens are challenged individually and collectively to better understand different expressions of Jewish life in their community, their country and globally. Intentional and comprehensive study of the diversity comprising modern Jewish life is critical in their development as leaders. However, it is their "experience" and "exploration" of this diversity that differentiates the participants from their contemporaries. This is accomplished by diverse means including celebrating Shabbat together, experiencing other Jewish communities and international Peoplehood experiences. Smadar Bar-Akiva, Executive Director of the World Confederation of Jewish

Community Centers, notes, “The Diller Program represents a wonderful opportunity for connecting teens from North America and Israel. Diller teens and young adults get to participate in a program that brings them together and creates a common agenda in a very intensive, long-term, thoughtful and meaningful way.”

Affording teens the unique opportunity to explore their Jewish identities by exposing them to the diversity of Jewish expression and experience which is today's reality is to invite them to venture on a collective Jewish journey. Doing so requires courage on their part. If this approach is successful, the next generation of Jewish leaders may break down today's barriers and help redefine a Jewish People strengthened by diversity.

Tal Gale, Co-Director of Diller Teen Fellows, North America / Israel



Sowing Diversity in Fields of Jewish Peoplehood

Jessey Gross

My Shabbas dinner table last week was the setting in which an interfaith couple and an Orthodox couple spent the majority of the evening talking about their shared love of farming and agriculture, as well as, the discovery that the two men originally knew each other from having attended the same Jewish day school as children. Thank God for Shabbas dinner tables like this!

I was recently hired to work in the Baltimore Jewish community as a community outreach rabbi. My task is to engage unaffiliated Jews in their 20/30's who are hesitant to walk through traditional doors despite the fact that many of them have positive attitudes towards Jewish tradition. While the efforts are varied, the main foundation upon which we are building Jewish community in downtown Baltimore is imbued with a commitment to diversity as a necessary value for growing sustainable, relevant and meaningful community.

Participants come from various backgrounds and embody different opinions and ideas about how they desire to participate Jewishly. Our gatherings welcome this diversity and demand an openness to hear others and learn from differences in order to better understand our own beliefs and commitments. I understand my role as a Jewish teacher to model such values.

Diversity is good: for the crops and for the Jews.

As my Shabbat dinner guests could articulate, agricultural best practices teaches us that a field sown with only one crop is more susceptible to infestation and disease than one planted with variety of crops. While traditional Judaism has something to say about how we mix our seeds, the point about increased stress on the crops is important. To grow our Jewish selves only in fields of those like us we also stand to be threatened when confronted with questions we have not yet anticipated and fail to explore because they may not be relevant to our way of doing things. However, when we plant ourselves alongside those who are different, we stand to grow and strengthen our own roots while

also enriching the ground in which we are planted. We can learn about differences and in some cases arrive at different conclusions than we might have had we never been exposed to ways and approaches different than our own.

Rav Kook writes about the pursuit of Truth in the introduction to *Ein Ayah*, his commentary on *aggadah* in the Talmud. Truth, he says, can only be revealed when we gather a multiplicity of ideas and methods and understand them in relationship to one another. It is this interconnectivity, this cross-referencing, Rav Kook teaches, that brings peace into the world.

My work as the Director of Charm City Tribe stems from a commitment to being a convener of conversations and learning opportunities that demands attention to diversity of ideas and opinions presented by the broad spectrum of Jewish identification. It is my conviction that we best understand our individual selves as Jews when we are confronted with many, not just one, ideas for how we might engage.

One example of a program that stands to be ongoing in our community is titled “4 Rabbis, 5 Opinions”. Just as the joke might begin...An Orthodox, Conservative, Reconstructionist and Reform rabbi walk into a bar...it’s true. The topic: to discuss how four different Jewish teachers, but more importantly, Jewish individuals, relate to *mitzvot* and to share the ways in which choice, commandedness and commitment to peoplehood inform that relationship. The rabbis involved agree it is a model of collaboration not often present in our community and vital in our efforts to engage those currently skeptical of entering into formal Jewish spaces.

While we each feel strongly about our own ways of doing things, we acknowledge that these public conversations serve as a model for the types of conversations we hope to engage young adults, as well as, other members of our communities. If we can show it is possible to both hold strong convictions and an appreciation for other interpretations of Jewish tradition we invite others to follow suit. Upon reflection of the recent event, one Jewish professional remarked, “this is not happening anywhere else in our community but I wish it would!”

When I am in a community with people who use different hermeneutics to understand Torah than I do and have different guiding values and norms for how they identify Jewishly I am required to communicate and articulate my own Jewish ideas and commitments differently. It requires careful thought, intentional language and the willingness to hear the same process of learning and thought from someone who arrives at different conclusions than I. Willingness to engage leads to increased knowledge and provides us with the information to know not only what we do commit to and why but

also what we *do not* commit to and *why*. By arming ourselves with knowledge of such things we build our confidence to stand firmly in our beliefs while also exercising the value of understanding and honoring other beliefs that present themselves under the umbrella of Jewish peoplehood.

I agree with Rav Kook. We do not become resilient by dismissing each other and casting out others because they think differently than we do. All the more so when we dismiss the Torah that helps to support the various ideas and opinions presented. Anyone and any community seeking to engage with and learn about different ideas and attitudes as it relates to Jewish commitments and Jewish life is surely engaged in holy pursuit of Truth. Our goal should not be sameness. A Jew unwilling to hear opinions different from his/her own stands in the way of becoming a stronger Jewish people. The strength of our people will dictate the ability to live out the blessing that we are to be a light unto other nations but also bolster the foundation upon which Judaism and our ancient tradition can continue to flourish and grow.

Rabbi Jessy Gross works as the Director of Charm City Tribe in Baltimore, MD. She is passionate about helping to strengthen Jewish identity and community in the places she lives and works.



Toward a Pluralism of Substance

Elie Kaunfer

Does pluralism help or hurt the goal of fostering feelings of peoplehood? It depends on what we mean by “pluralism.”

Pluralism is a difficult concept to define. In the March 2006 edition of *Sh'ma*, Susan Shevitz helpfully distinguishes between “coexistence pluralism” and “generative pluralism.” In the former, “people and groups holding different positions can still work toward shared goals.” In the latter, “Jews need to encounter people and ideas that are different from their own...and generate new approaches that draw from a multiplicity of perspectives.”

On the one hand, it seems one must maximize pluralism to increase feelings of peoplehood. After all, if I do not feel welcome, or tolerated, by my Jewish brother, than how am I supposed to feel a deep bond with him? Jews are a diverse bunch, so if, in Shevitz’s language, we are to coexist, and work toward the shared goal of a vibrant Jewish people, we must allow for people to “hold different positions.” Certainly if we are to rise to the level of “generative pluralism,” we must not just tolerate, but seek out, a “multiplicity of perspectives.” The more perspectives that are represented, the more Jews feel included in the project of Jewish peoplehood.

But on the other hand, there is a cost to pluralism in the quest for strengthened peoplehood. Jack Wertheimer pointed to one danger in his 2006 essay, “All Quiet on the Religious Front?” He writes: “American Jews...have concluded with great self-satisfaction that the magic bullet is ‘pluralism,’ a fine ideal that simply avoids confronting differences by celebrating them. American Jews who disagree can ignore one another when the issues are too uncomfortable, and agree to meet only when the issues are uncontroversial and therefore safe.” (p. 24).

Can I really feel connected to other Jews if I know, deep down, that we aren’t surfacing the core issues that divide us? Strong feelings often lead to strong bonds. If peoplehood is modeled on the image of a family, which family is ultimately stronger: the one that brings conflict out in the open, or the one that keeps interactions limited to the

surface level? Granted the former is riskier, but, when managed well, engenders real relationships.

I would like to raise one other concern with pluralism, namely: the assumption that all “different positions” are on a level playing field. Indeed, this assumption, when in fact true, is very powerful. Having participated in a number of explicitly pluralistic Jewish environments (Dorot, Wexner, Harvard Hillel), I have experienced robust conversations around core aspects of Jewish identity and values. In the best of circumstances, these connections have truly been generative, in Shevitz’s categorization, and made me re-examine my own positions on numerous fronts. I have felt closer to the Jewish people *because* of its diversity.

However, what was distinctive about these environments was that the Jews involved had a deep grounding in Jewish identity and education. They had arrived at different conclusions, but were able to hold a sophisticated conversation.

But too often today, the push for pluralism, often in the service of Jewish peoplehood, is one that makes no demands on the participants’ education and sophistication regarding the basic questions at stake in pluralistic conversations. The result is that pluralism has often come to be synonymous with blind affirmation of one’s Jewish identity, regardless of its content or depth. Instead of encouraging a path toward deepening identity, pluralism celebrates the status quo.

Ironically, this attempt at being welcoming, in the name of a pluralism of acceptance, weakens feelings of peoplehood. Ultimately the bond between someone who can express a deeply grounded Jewish identity and someone who cannot is weak. People who have no common ground, beyond a vague attachment to the identity “Jewish,” are not able to have a meaningful, critical engagement with each other. It should be noted that unlike the criticism that Wertheimer offered of pluralism, which focused exclusively on American Jews, this criticism extends to the many Israelis who also have trouble articulating their Jewish identity beyond a sense of nationalism and connection to calendar or Hebrew. When it comes to articulating the deeper reasons for being Jewish, most Jews – Israelis and Americans – are often at a loss. And that inability is a long-term challenge to fostering deep feelings of peoplehood.

In our collective work to engender feelings of peoplehood, I would advocate for a more focused approach to pluralism: a pluralism of substance. In this model, the key to peoplehood isn’t pluralism per se, it is education. Only through education will Jews develop a deeper attachment to their Judaism. Critically, education doesn’t lead to cookie-cutter people with identical Jewish values. It may in fact lead to deep differences

among Jews. However, when those Jews encounter each other in pluralistic settings, they will be able to debate the core issues, as opposed to finding commonality in surface issues.

Prof. Jonathan Sarna once remarked: “Orthodoxy bet the house on education – and won.” Imagine a world where not just the Orthodox, but the entire Jewish people, bet the house on education. In that world, the substantial differences between Jews would be no less, but the depth of their positions would be so much greater. And the encounters between them could lead to significant “generative” results.

A peoplehood that is based on thin and broad points of unity is one that is doomed to fail. But a peoplehood that is based on the encounter between deeply educated Jews – representing a wide range of positions – is exciting. It is that challenge – a challenge of mobilizing around deep education – that is ours to take on.

Rabbi Elie Kaunfer is executive director of Mechon Hadar (www.mechonhadar.org), and author of *Empowered Judaism: What Independent Minyanim Can Teach Us about Building Vibrant Jewish Communities* (Jewish Lights)



The Pluralism of Pluralism in Israel: A Brief History

Naamah Kelman

Israel has enshrined an anomaly of Jewish History. The establishment of a state rabbinate which is Orthodox, on the one hand and a political system that gives disproportionate power to the Ultra-Orthodox minorities combine to make matters of pluralism and religious Jewish diversity a political and legal issue. The Jewish Diaspora is diverse and pluralistic by definition in matters of religious choice because the government is uninvolved. The North American reality is such that the denominations live and let live, while in Israel the struggle for Jewish identity and meaning happens despite the state's involvement. And yet, Israel embodies "peoplehood", for there is no where else where one may not find the different religious denominations but the rich selection of Jews from every possible ethnic background lives and breathes here. This piece will look at pluralism from the point of view of religious pluralism.

Increasingly pluralism serves as the latest buzzword for Jewish identity. Yet it can also serve as a not so secret code for inclusivity. Does the word "pluralism" have more meanings than one and therefore a safe place for "agreement" because everyone understands it from their perspective? Or has it been an effective but divisive tool to advance certain interests? I ask these questions because the word itself is shifting in meaning. These changes in meanings reflect a brief and interesting history of religious pluralism in Israel.

In the late 1980's pluralism in Israel meant one thing: creating a more level playing field for non-Orthodox Judaism particularly the fledgling Reform and Conservative Movements here. When the Israel Religions Action Center of the Israeli Reform Movement was founded in 1986 to promote Liberal Judaism in Israel, its Hebrew name was : Hamercaz le'Pluralizim" (Center for Pluralism). The Israelis did not have a clue to what that word meant and they got calls concerning medical ailments and public safety matters. Over the years, the Center became known for its path breaking advocacy work in matters of Religious freedom and choice for the non-Orthodox. Issues of marriage, burial, and conversion were brought to public discourse through the Supreme Court cases arguing

for alternatives, choice and recognition of Reform and Conservative options. The 90's witnessed important decisions regarding the status of the non-Orthodox streams; and "pluralism" became identified with this fight. In fact, for some Israelis "pluralism" was associated with divisiveness. Why were the local denominations insisting on creating conflict, with our Diaspora counterparts agitating as well? The conversion issue, in particular, has repeatedly provoked the fury of North American Jewry, drawing lines in the sand regarding "who is a Jew" and "who is the rabbi who determines Jewishness?"

Since the founding of the state, Israeli Jews lived in the binary universe of secular/Orthodox, you were one or the other. All matters of personal status (marriage, divorce, conversion, burial) were handled by the Orthodox Rabbinate. The non-Orthodox movements have taken on the Orthodox monopoly paving the way for secular and even modern Orthodox to reconsider the status quo.

Parallel to these legal and political battles, the flowering of secular institutions taking back classical text study and venturing into ritual and prayer began to bud. Here, "pluralism" tended to focus on renewed dialogue between Orthodox and secular. "Pluralism" provided the much needed "cover" to allow for serious exploration of secular Israelis to grapple with traditional sources and Orthodox Israelis to wrestle with secular culture. A myriad of "pluralistic" institutions and organizations were founded. In some of these frameworks, Reform and Conservative were deliberately excluded. For some, these denominations continued to represent foreign imports and therefore irrelevant to Israel; for others, Reform and Conservative were too marginal to Israeli society to have a place at the table. Whether included or not, both movements have become increasingly "sabrah" and their slow and steady growth have made them significant points along the map of Israeli Jewish Renaissance. In other words, pluralism has become a force for Jewish renewal and creativity; which should hold great promise for fueling a sense of peoplehood. When we all share Jewish sources and create Jewish culture, the Israel/Diaspora divide is challenged.

The past two decades have witnessed a remarkable shift and breakdown of the dichotomy of secular/Orthodox. There is a great deal of fluidity (another buzzword) and young people, in particular, are exploring different ways to express their Jewishness and Israeli-ness. Now, denominationally based institutions are attracting secular and Orthodox students. At Hebrew Union College, the Reform Seminary and academy in Jerusalem, we are opening "pluralistic" programs. While the Rabbinic program is undergirded with Reform ideology, we are training religious leaders who may or may not serve Reform Institutions. The majority will of course, but we are keenly aware that there are Israelis who do not seek denominational affiliation. More importantly,

programs training educators and spiritual caretakers in a variety of settings are bringing Israelis of all walks of life together.

Now "pluralism" is offering another meaning. With an open tent approach, everyone needs to be around the table without being judged or feeling defensive. To paraphrase Abraham Joshua Heschel (who paraphrased John Donne), "no denomination is an island", we all need each other. Heschel had inaugurated the era of interfaith dialogue by re-writing Donne's statement, "No man is an Island" with "No religion is an Island." Today, pluralism promotes just this, no "Jew" is an island, we desperately need each other, each stream has strengths to bring to the table and we can learn from each other. So pluralism has the potential to strengthen peoplehood. That is the challenge facing us. With nation building behind us, with most Diaspora communities living in safety and affluence, it is time to create this meeting points of safe and fruitful cross-fertilization and dialogue.

The Israeli Religious Action Center ("Mercaz Le'Pluralism") has recently changed its Hebrew name. It is now the "Center for Religion and State." Callers can easily identify its purpose and "Pluralism" has been restored to its proper place away from politics to be used as an educational and cultural tool for embracing diversity while keeping us whole.

Rabbi Naamah Kelman is Dean of the Hebrew Union College in Jerusalem.



Jewish Pluralism Revisited – Rising Above Conflicting Truths

Larry S. Moses

The dominant narrative of Jewish peoplehood in the decades after the Holocaust and the advent of the modern State of Israel was summarized in the phrase “we are one” – an understandable but complicated concept. This notion of an overarching Jewish solidarity was forged out of a mixture of staggering victimization and unprecedented empowerment, and fueled Jewish identity and community development for the generations who came of age during the last half of the 20th century.

As the son of a survivor of Auschwitz, I grew up alongside an Israel that seemed both heroic and redemptive. I embraced the preciousness of each Jew regardless of differences and the oneness of the Jewish people as nothing short of articles of faith.

And yet, over time, we have come to realize that our differences are profound and enduring, and that as a people we would be naïve to believe that these differences could be subservient to an all-embracing sense of what binds us as a people. If indeed we find ourselves in an age of pluralism, then we are well-served to engage in a sober assessment of how we can reconcile our widening diversity with the near dreamlike sense of oneness that resonated so strongly in prior decades.

A personal recollection: I once attended a lecture by the late Israeli statesman Abba Eban on the Mt. Scopus campus of the Hebrew University. Eban lauded the achievements of the Jewish people but lingered on one area in which he found us lacking: we have forgotten how to disagree with each other. He stated that Jewish life now lacks a ‘culture of dissent’, and that we need to discover anew how to disagree with each other without impugning evil motives on the other. The notion of creating a culture that can withstand dissent and can contain differing and even contradictory positions brings us to two fundamental questions: How can Jewish peoplehood thrive in an age of pluralism? How can our differences somehow strengthen rather than weaken us?

John W. Gardner, in his remarkable book *On Leadership*, writes on the theme of fragmentation and the common good. Gardner addressed the pluralism of American democracy, but translating his ideas to Jewish peoplehood is not at all contrived. In a pluralistic society there are many leadership pyramids, many competing interest groups, and, as Gardner put it, “the war of the parts against the whole is the central problem of pluralism today.” From Gardner’s thinking we learn that the idea of pluralism has consequences: “A society that is not undergirded by some shared values and held together by some measure of mutual trust simply cannot survive. Pluralism that reflects no commitments whatever to the common good is pluralism gone berserk.”

Pluralism, therefore, necessitates a “workable” agreement around the common good, a unifying factor that enables the diverse parts of a society and people to function around larger needs and purposes.

In this sense, as Diana L. Eck of the Harvard Divinity School and others point out, pluralism is different than diversity, though the two terms are often confused. Diversity is simply plurality, a condition that is “splendid, colorful, perhaps threatening” as Eck puts it, but nothing more. *Pluralism is active engagement*. More than mere tolerance of differences, it requires participation and knowledge of our differences, and makes room for encountering conflicting and even contradictory truth claims without relinquishing one’s principles. Pluralism is a commitment “to be at the table more than a commitment to anything that comes of the deliberation.”

Jewish pluralism is evidenced throughout American Jewish life – in boards of rabbis, around community commemorations of Yom HaShoah and Yom Ha’Atzmaut, and in Jewish Federations, Hillels, and Jewish Community Centers, for example. Despite the challenges, time and again Jews of differing loyalties have demonstrated the capacity to collaborate on issues of importance to the larger Jewish people. Conversely, the absence of State-sanctioned religious pluralism in Israel remains a gnawing problem for many American Jews and weakens rather than strengthens the fabric of Jewish peoplehood.

Two final points. First, Judaism and the Jewish people have from the outset demonstrated a creative genius for acknowledging and reconciling differences. We were never destined to be a uniform people with one set of beliefs, practices, and priorities. Ours is an interpretative tradition abounding in overlapping arguments and differences. Jews are hard-wired to struggle with those arguments and differences while remaining true to core values and a larger sense of solidarity. Managing our differences and still remaining a people is who we have been for thousands of years.

So to those who say that pluralism is a kind of necessary evil, a by-product of modernity that is somehow unfortunate but imposing, I would counter that Jewish pluralism makes us stronger, not weaker, and that, in any event, it is part of our essence.

Finally, the reality is that some Jews disqualify certain other Jews from the circle of Jewish peoplehood, and some Jews place themselves outside of this circle. *But the vast majority of Jews still see deep meaning in a collective identity, unifying values, and common interests.* The question is, and always has been, how to translate this sense of connectedness into concrete relationships and actions.

The challenge of pluralism in contemporary terms relates to overcoming the fragmentation, competitiveness, and insularity of our movements and organizations, connecting the dots between the diverse segments of Jewish life, and learning how to cross boundaries and create broader relationships. We use ideological and institutional interests as rationales for separating ourselves from others who could otherwise benefit both us and the larger Jewish people. Developing a capacity to “engage” Jews who are different around a sense of the common good is our renewed struggle. We have far to go in Jewish life to transform a culture of competition into a culture of commonality. But we are not new to this challenge, and we are capable of rising to it, as we have over countless centuries.

Larry S. Moses is Senior Philanthropic Advisor and President Emeritus of The Wexner Foundation.



Pluralism and Peoplehood: Jewish Education Between Protection and Exposure

Michal Muszkat-Barkan

I grew up in Israel and studied in a public Orthodox high school. The first time the Reform and Conservative movements were introduced to us during our studies was in history class, when a single lesson was devoted to Jewish responses to modernity. The life of Diaspora Jewry was taught in the context of different waves of Jewish immigration, usually in relation to Jewish persecution. Looking back at my high school studies, they did not give me any actual knowledge regarding the ways in which Jews really live their lives all over the world.

There are also similar examples of curricular lacunae in liberal and secular Jewish education. Both systems often ignore Orthodoxy, treat it as obsolete, or teach about traditional observance in an idealistic or romantic way with no real exposure. Just as important as the question of who is included in our Jewish narratives is the question of who is excluded from our stories.

Studying the Jewish people and Jewish culture as multifaceted entities is not only the reflection of an abstract ideal of Jewish existence. Rather it reflects a challenging reality: in the 2011 New York Study¹ the authors noted that "diversity in the Jewish population is not only large, it is growing". In light of this situation I want to suggest that *pluralism* and *Jewish peoplehood* are increasingly significant concepts.

Examining the pluralistic worldview and the concept of peoplehood raises a potential contradiction: while the notion of peoplehood is based on emphasizing shared fate and destiny, the pluralistic approach values variety, including differences and disagreements. For this reason pluralism may be perceived as a threat to a desired Jewish peoplehood.

1 Cohen; Ukeles and Miller (2012) Jewish Diversity and Its Implications for Jewish Peoplehood:Obstacle or Opportunity Ravid [ed] The Peoplehood Papers 9 p.24-27

Maintaining a sense of peoplehood in an environment of diversity means to develop an active concern for and commitment to those who have beliefs and lifestyles which are often contradictory to one's own.

The teachers at my Orthodox high school in Israel who were deeply committed to Jewish education and to Jewish continuity were busy protecting us - their students. They were concerned that a presentation of Jewish diversity, including liberal streams as legitimate options, might hurt students' faith and observance.

In response to threats of diversity, various reactions have been described². These include deletion (or avoidance) and disrespect towards other Jewish streams, both of which were common in my Orthodox education. Caring for the entire Jewish people, "Klal Israel", was taught as a precious value, but paradoxically the curriculum did not provide actual knowledge regarding the ways in which many Jews live their lives.

Pluralism stems from the context of the open market, where the individual's striving towards the truth may be manifested in various ways and sometimes through opposing arguments. Being a pluralist means recognizing and valuing a world of ideas and practices which are different from one's own, but at the same time holding an opinion and identifying with an ideal or a community. A pluralist not only accepts the variety but is in dialogue with these other approaches as sources of wisdom and insight. Pluralism requires a highly individualistic process of search for one's own way through a series of experiences and choices. Nevertheless, this search is deeply dependent on a dialogue with others: "If authenticity is being true to ourselves... then perhaps we can only achieve it integrally if we recognize that this sentiment connects us to a wider whole"³.

In a forthcoming book on pluralism and Jewish education⁴ the central role of the community in understanding and implementing pluralism is emphasized. Pluralism is always played out within a community. This is where one can negotiate and clarify ideas, norms and boundaries within a specific context.

Thus, pluralism can also act to strengthen the sense of Jewish peoplehood. It can become the guiding principle in developing a sense of belonging and commitment to diverse Jewish collectivities. Introducing the Jewish narrative will then include exposure to the

2 See for example Nisan היהודית הזרות בתפיסת השונות של היבטים חינוכיים של השונות בתפיסת הזרות היהודית in Gillis, Muszkat-Barkan and Pomsom [ed] *Speaking in the Plural: Pluralism and Jewish Education* (Magness) in press

3 Charles Taylor (1992) *The Ethics of Authenticity*, Harvard University Press, Page 91

4 Gillis, Muszkat-Barkan & Pomson, *Speaking in the Plural: Pluralism and Jewish Education* (Magness) in press

shared history and ethnicity of the Jewish people as well as to various current concepts of living a Jewish life.

As a graduate of a public Orthodox high school, my studies did not prepare me or my schoolmates for future encounters with Jewish diversity. This diversity is growing, and is increasingly challenging the sense of belonging to one collective. Unplanned exposure of an unprepared graduate to the Jewish diversity may be confusing and may undermine the aims of the educational system itself. Thus, Jewish education should include a process aimed to expose students to the diversity of Jewish life and belief. This should not be seen as unavoidable, but as an important educational opportunity. The qualities of such a process should be not only intellectual but should also include social and experiential components. It should explicitly emphasize the values of the specific educational system to which the school is affiliated, with empathy and humility towards various other Jewish streams.

Such an educational framework can guide the way in which we expose our students to components of Jewish culture, including those with which we ourselves do not feel comfortable. Enhancing the sense of peoplehood in a world of diverse Jewish identities is one of the greatest challenges to educators from all Jewish streams. Reframing the aims of Jewish education to enhance a pluralistic approach to Jewish identity can lead to a richer and more realistic sense of Jewish peoplehood and contribute to the renewal and deepening of our covenant and Jewish solidarity.

Michal Muszkat-Barkan Ph.D is the director of the department of Education and Professional Development at Hebrew Union College, Jerusalem.



A Less Spoken About Angle: The Threat Israel Presents to Jewish Peoplehood

Uri Regev

Over the years I've come to appreciate the amazing impact that visiting Israel has on visitors from the Diaspora, young and old alike. In Israel, like no other place in the world, they come to travel the country and experience a deep connection to thousands of years of Jewish history. Many visitors speak of feeling like "*mishpacha*" [family] with the countless representations of the world's Jewish dispersions, who have come here from all corners of the earth, either by choice or necessity. In Israel, one feels the wings of Jewish fate and destiny hovering above with an unparalleled presence to anywhere else in the world. A trip to Israel has proven to be a source of existential discovery for so many. Participants often recommit not just to the identification with the Jewish past, but also to building the Jewish future. This type of experience is widely discussed among Jewish community members and leaders alike. What is too often ignored, probably because it is not as pleasant, is the fact that Israel's policies on religion and state, because of their discriminatory, exclusionary, and coercive nature, undermine that very sense of Jewish peoplehood.

As will be explained below, these policies will, for certain, alienate future generations of world Jewry from the Jewish state. They will further erode the interest and commitment of the current generation of Diaspora Jewry from Israel. The unholy alliance of religion and state in Israel is not only distancing Diaspora Jews from Israel, but undermines the rare and precious opportunity to build a cohesive sense of Jewish solidarity and common identity in which Israel plays a constructive role. I sense this seemingly anomalous phenomenon for years, too often feeling disappointed by the conscious preference of Jewish communal leaders worldwide, to engage in damage-control rather than address the heart of the matter. The failure to fully realize Israel's own promise, in our Declaration of Independence, for "freedom of religion and conscience" and for "full social and political equality regardless of religion" presents a major threat to Israel and to the relationship between the Jewish State and world Jewry.

The injustices of religion and state in Israel disadvantage citizens who belong to religious minorities and also effect many citizens on a day-to-day basis. Non-Orthodox conversions, marriages, and civil marriages are not recognized by the state, leaving hundreds of thousands of citizens in legal jeopardy because they cannot enjoy the basic right to marry and start a family in their home country. This is most painfully visible through the 350,000 Israeli citizens who immigrated from the Former Soviet Union, whose mothers are not halachically Jewish and who therefore cannot legally marry in Israel, nor are they able to enjoy the option of non-Orthodox conversions that would be equally recognized under Israeli law. The government discriminates against non-Orthodox rabbis, synagogues, and institutions. Such issues are real barriers when one looks to developing a stronger sense of Jewish peoplehood and solidarity if Israel is to play a major role in such an effort.

I fully grasped the depth of this threat to Jewish Peoplehood when I spoke at a mid-size Jewish community in the United States. At the conclusion of my lecture on the challenges of religious freedom, a prominent local rabbi stood up and connected my words to the reality of that community. He recounted that in their Jewish community, it is estimated that one third of the children were born to two Jewish parents, one third were born to an intermarried couple, and one third of the children were born into families in which one spouse was a Jew-by-choice (most often it is the mother, who goes through a non-Orthodox conversion). Essentially, he pointed out that two-thirds of their community's next generation would not be considered to be Jewish by the State of Israel, or would not be considered Jewish enough to be legally married in Israel. Throughout my many subsequent travels across America, I quickly learned that this observation about the next generation of American Jewry is prevalent in most Jewish communities.

The problem neither starts nor stops in the marriage or "Who is a Jew" arenas. The Women of the Wall and their battle against exclusion from the Western Wall, which is true of all non-Orthodox egalitarian communities, is just another one of many examples. This is clearly illustrated by Israel's Chief Sephardic Rabbi, Shlomo Amar, who famously **declared** that Jews should remain at home on the High Holidays rather than attend a Reform synagogue.

Anyone who thinks that this type of sentiment can be the basis for Israel to build a sense of Jewish peoplehood must think again. Israel's institutional obstacles to religious freedom represent a strong departure from both the country's founding principles as well as the unequivocal **support** that the majority of Israelis demonstrate for these very values.

The gap between Israel's founding principles so strongly supported by the public, and the fundamentalist, anti-pluralistic monopoly of the Orthodox religious establishment,

comes from decades of political horse trading that Israeli politicians from all sides have practiced, trading the dignity and basic liberties of both Israelis and Diaspora Jews in exchange for political spoils and support of the ultra-Orthodox parties.

World Jewish leadership helped perpetuate the problem, preferring to applaud the governing party without challenging them with the tough questions that need to be asked.

There are a few organizations, such as American Jewish Committee and the National Council of Jewish women, who are re-engaging and confronting these issues, but hardly any of the major, non-denominational Jewish federations/organizations have seriously addressed this troubling reality. When the greater Jewish community occasionally takes interest in these issues, such as the "Who is a Jew" case and the phenomenon of gender-separation on public buses or Women of the Wall, they refrain from addressing the core challenge of religious freedom and equality.

The "Who is a Jew" conflict specifically demonstrates how potent Diaspora engagement can be, if it chooses to enter the battlefield. Unfortunately, during the campaign to broaden the definition of "Who is a Jew", world Jewish leadership stopped short of demanding full rights and recognition for the members of their communities who are Jews-by-choice. They chose to withhold the disappointing information from their communities that all of these very Jews-by-choice, now granted rights under the Law of Return, would be treated as second-class Jews and denied the basic right of marriage. They also have not shared with their communities the support that most Israelis (albeit not Israel's politicians) have for their full inclusion and recognition as Jews. They did not speak about how we all have yet to truly achieve our goal of religious freedom in Israel. Once the temporary threat subsided, the organizational leadership stepped back from striving for wider-reaching changes in Israel's policies. One cannot expect a band-aid to heal chronic pains.

If we are to truly view Israel as a source of inspiration for Jewish peoplehood, we must understand where we fell short of our vision for freedom of religion, and that it is incumbent upon us, together, to work to achieve this critical goal. If Jewish peoplehood is based on an emotional and intellectual connection, mutual responsibility and solidarity, we must work to shape Israel as a Jewish and Democratic state, which embraces all shapes and shades of Judaism in Israel and in the Diapsora and does not alienate them.

Israel is the only country among western democracies that practices religious discrimination against Jews. That fact alone is a major hindrance to enhancing a sense of Jewish peoplehood in Israel and around the world. Bringing change to the religious

“status quo” in Israel is long overdue. The welcome shift in the Israeli elections put a government coalition in place that may be more responsive to these grave concerns. The jury is still out as to whether these expectations will be realized, but they will surely happen sooner if Jewish leaders and their communities around the world join Israeli activists and speak up for Israeli politicians to hear: Jewish peoplehood is too dear to us and too precious for the future of the Jewish community and the State of Israel to be sacrificed as a trading chip in the course of Israeli politics.

We can achieve this earnest goal but only when we are willing to talk and act on these issues in a more serious manner. A recent study of hundreds of immersive Jewish service-learning (IJSL) programs, concluded that 92% of these Diaspora youth who have been better educated about Israel’s internal struggles ended up feeling more attached to the Jewish state. They have developed a more serious and meaningful relationship to it. It is time to take our heads out of the sand and stop pretending the problem doesn't exist or is not in our backyard. If our relationship is about partnership in the global Jewish enterprise, then Israel’s exclusion of the overwhelming majority of the next generation of the world’s Jewish community cannot be allowed to fester any longer. Israelis want to see religious freedom and equality fully blossom; World Jewry deserves and supports it. Jewish Peoplehood will erode without it.

Rabbi Uri Regev, Esq., is the head of Hiddush – Freedom of Religion for Israel, an educational and advocacy Israel/Diaspora partnership for religious freedom and equality



Jewish Peoplehood in the Age of Pluralism: The Challenge of Measuring Success

Shuki Taylor

The following paper considers the challenges that emerge when measuring the success of educational initiatives—challenges that are augmented in the context of Jewish Peoplehood education in Pluralistic settings.

Pluralism celebrates the legitimacy of the Jewish community's diversity. Peoplehood nurtures this community's diverse commitment to the Jewish collective enterprise. Fostering this sense of commitment and belonging requires that, as educators, we embrace the full spectrum of perspectives the Jewish people subscribes to. In the age of Pluralism, we must be mindful of the fact that learners harbor a variety of different beliefs. The ways in which learners feel belonging and demonstrate commitment to the Jewish collective will vary greatly.

Bethamie Horowitz, in her "Connections and Journeys," articulates this with great clarity:

"From an organizational point of view, each of the groups that our study identified should be targeted in different ways, in different degrees and for different purposes. Each segment of the population would be better served by a message and intervention strategy designed specifically to meet their needs."

Hence, in order to be successful, the Jewish educator must accommodate multiple denominations and engage multiple viewpoints.

While this approach is extremely important in crafting and running educational experiences, it is equally important in evaluating the success of such experiences. In evaluating success, we must be mindful of our learners' perspectives. Where was our learner before participating on this program? Where did she find herself after having participated? What changed? How did our learner's connection to other Jews and to Judaism change because of her participation on the program? Indeed, the answers to all of these questions will be different for each and every program participant—but

therein lies the beauty of Pluralism and of Peoplehood. Every learner has the ability to enhance his or her sense of belonging and to strengthen his or her commitment. There is no denominational floor and there is no denominational ceiling.

Rabbi Eliyahu Dessler expanded on this concept nearly a century ago in his comments on the verse in Deuteronomy 30:19: "I have put before you life and death, the blessing and the curse; choose life, so that you may live." Rabbi Dessler explains: "*Life and Death* comprise all that a person is 'given'—all the facets of a person's character, his inborn traits and tendencies, his upbringing and environment; all those factors which determine what is called 'life.'" Our task as educators is to measure whether or not we can assist students in recognizing what they call "life" and in choosing "life."

Rabbi Dessler offers this explanation in the context of his broader discussion regarding what he calls the "*behira*-point" – the point at which each individual has free will. As Rabbi Dessler points out, one does not need to exercise free will in order to perform deeds that are already ingrained in one's conscious or charitable acts that one is already accustomed to. Our natural inclinations allow us to make these decisions easily. However, other decisions are harder to make. In each and every person, there is a point at which the forces pulling in either direction are more or less equal and over which one's natural inclination (as determined by background, upbringing and other factors) does not have ultimate control. It is at this point—the *behira*-point—that true choice comes into play.

Our job as educators is to realize that every learner has a different *behira*-point. Moreover, we must realize that each learner's *behira*-point is fluid—that, as Rabbi Dessler puts it, the *behira*-point "*does not remain static in any given individual.*" Our first task as Jewish educators in the age of Pluralism is to recognize each learner's *behira*-point and how this *behira*-point enables the learner to express his or her unique connection to the Jewish people. Our next task is to elevate this unique connection to new heights.

When evaluating success, it is especially important to be mindful of the wide range of starting points learners might have and the wide range of changes they might undergo as a result of a particular program. If we measure the impact of a program by focusing on a specific range of behaviors, we end up excluding participants who already engaged in such behaviors prior to the program or participants who have no interest in ever engaging in such behaviors.

In a recent study¹ of an immersive experience, the following analysis is set forth:

“While the programs seem to have been quite successful in cultivating positive Jewish attitudes, they are less effective in cultivating Jewish behaviors, especially those that take participants outside the norms within which they usually act. This might be because... some participants actually come into programs having reached a ceiling of engagement.”

While the term “ceiling of engagement” is used here more as a statistical term than a philosophical one, I do not believe that it is possible for any learner to reach a “ceiling of engagement”. Peoplehood education, especially in the age of Pluralism, is designed to inspire a large variety of different types of behaviors that cannot be adequately captured by assessing a pre-determined list of behaviors—as broad and varied as such a list might be.

Educators looking to cultivate Peoplehood in Pluralistic settings must focus on developing measurements for success that do justice to these philosophies. These success measurements must account for the diverse and evolving *behira*-points and perspectives that learners of different denominations bring with them. They should account for, be open to and evolve with the wide-array of outcomes that might ensue.

Shuki Taylor is the director of Jewish Service learning and Experiential Education Programs at Yeshiva University.

1 Serving a Complex Israel: A report on Israel-based Immersive Jewish Service-learning (page 71)

The Peoplehood Papers provide a platform for Jews to discuss their common agenda and key issues related to their collective identity. The journal appears three times a year, with each issue addressing a specific theme. The editors invite you to share your thoughts on the ideas and discussions in the Papers, as well as all matters pertinent to Jewish Peoplehood: publications@jpeoplehood.org

Past issues can be accessed at www.jpeoplehood.org/publications

The UJA-Federation of New York cares for those in need, rescues those in harm's way and renews and strengthens the Jewish people in New York in Israel and around the world. **The Commission on the Jewish People** is dedicated to building connections among the diverse elements of the Jewish People and develops and supports efforts to forge linkages among Jews wherever they may live and support Israel as a vibrant, democratic and pluralistic Jewish state.

The Center for Jewish Peoplehood Education (CJPE) is a "one stop" resource center for institutions and individuals seeking to build collective Jewish life, with a focus on Jewish Peoplehood and Israel education. It provides professional and leadership training, content and programmatic development or general Peoplehood conceptual and educational consulting. www.jpeoplehood.org

