INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR *Bennett H. Greenspon*

TITLE *"The Presentation of Reform Judaism in the Israeli Educational System"*

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [XX]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [X]) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) for Ph.D.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. Y yes ___ no

April 1, 1977
Date

Bennett H. Greenspon
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed Date 7/5/77

Moira Steiner
Signature of Library Staff Member

The Presentation of Reform Judaism in the Israeli Educational System

Bennett H. Greenspon

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for ordination

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
1977-5737

Referee:
Prof. Michael A. Meyer

for my parents and sister

Acknowledgments

Like an Oscar winning film this thesis is a team project. Without the help and advice of the faculty and staff of the Hebrew Union College I could not have undertaken such a challenge. I wish to extend my special appreciation to Mr. Curt Arson and Dr. Michael A. Meyer. Curt's encouragement, suggestions, and company enabled me to begin my work and to give it direction. Professor Meyer acted not only as my preceptor and referee but also as my Rav. His wise counsel, intellectual stimulation, persistent prodding and concern will always be with me. Finally my deepest gratitude goes to my friends and family who gave me strength in moments of despair.

12 Nisan 5737
March 31, 1977

Contents

Digest

One of the prime goals of the Israeli educational system is to create in the Israeli youth a feeling that he is a part of the Jewish people. Through the teaching of Jewish history it is hoped that the child will realize that he shares a common past and destiny with all Jews. Generally, it is within the context of the history curriculum that the student is taught the history of Reform Judaism.

The Israeli public school system is divided into religious and secular sections. Both sectors follow basically the same curricula, though the religious schools stress more "traditionally" Jewish subjects. The teachers in the religious schools are Orthodox Jews.

All high school teachers must have a B.A. degree in the field they are teaching. It is while studying for this degree that most history teachers learn about Reform Judaism. The general historians they study present Reform Judaism as an assimilationist and anti-Zionistic movement; some even portray Reform as being against Jewish peoplehood in general. Unfortunately, these writers do not discuss the later developments that occurred in Reform Judaism.

The history textbooks used in the schools also present Reform in this light. They show the Movement as assimilationist and some even present its leaders and followers as trai-

tors to the Jewish people. One text refers to the Reformers as sinners. Some of the textbooks do discuss Reform Judaism in America and note the philosophic changes that took place in it, but most do not. Nor do the texts adequately demonstrate the role some Reform Jews and rabbis played in the establishment of the State of Israel.

Israeli high school students are cognizant of Reform's early stance with regard to the Jewish State, but they do not know or understand the Movement's overall history. They have little interest in the historical period in which the Movement developed and, because of the nature of the history curriculum, there is not much time devoted to the subject in the classroom. But even if the students do not know Reform's history they do know it exists in the present. They do not believe it is anti-Zionistic or assimilationist and they see its Israeli counterpart as having a place in Israeli society.

Introduction
The Considerations

The relationship of the Western world to the Jews underwent a marked change with the advent of the Age of Enlightenment. Previously the Jews had been looked upon as a pariah people, a people to be scorned and kept separate from the general society. Now the rationalism of the Enlightenment insisted that certain "exception Jews," by virtue of their culture or wealth, be accepted by society. Furthermore, it insisted that the potential for the Jewish community to produce more "exceptions" be recognized. It can be argued that this new perspective was one of the philosophic bases for the emancipation of Jews, the process which at first ameliorated the Jew's civil disabilities and finally made him a full and equal citizen under the law.

The growth of the Enlightenment and the subsequent, sometimes successful, attempts at emancipation changed the complexion of Western Jewry. Judaism and Jewish society had to adjust and realign themselves so they could meet the challenges which were influencing them. Equality of the individual under the law was accompanied by the demise of corporativism and the autonomy which had been enjoyed by the Jewish community. Assimilation and conversion to Christianity increased greatly as the individual Jew, no longer strongly bound to his religion, sought to improve his status in the general society by leaving his ancestral community. The lure of European culture was so great that the individual

often felt compelled to compromise or even abandon Jewish values and practices which he felt were outmoded, cumbersome, or unnecessary.

Jewish religious reforms developed as attempts to come to grips with the new situation created for West European Jewry by enlightenment and emancipation. The impetus for change developed into a movement dedicated to bringing the secular world and Judaism into harmony. Because it conceived itself likewise to be fluid, the movement has continued to evolve.

Yet today some would claim that the Reform Movement is virtually unheard of in the State of Israel. If you were to ask the average Israeli what yahadut mitkademet or tenuat haReformah is, you would receive a blank stare. In the event he understood the terminology, the following statement by Rabbi Jay Kaufman would probably still hold true:

> The Israeli's attitude toward Reform Judaism is mystifying. For reasons difficult to explain, the Israeli seems able to remember only the negative and reprehensible facts concerning Reform Judaism and avoids, or never digests, the positive and the laudable. Anything that occurred in the life of Reform since the early 19th century seems never to have reached the mind of the Israeli, but he remembers clearly every unsatisfactory detail in Reform's early history when the temper of the times created attitudes which are no longer in consonance with our era and, of course, are no longer held by contemporary Reform Judaism.[1]

In an age when Jewish communities around the world are dependent upon one another for survival, a negative attitude, lack of knowledge, or a misunderstanding about a major Jew-

ish movement may be detrimental to the feelings of peoplehood expressed by the members of those communities. Up until the modern era Jews were bound together by a common literature, language, religious outlook, and customs. However now, with the vast majority of Jews unable to read or converse in Hebrew, with the demise of a common theology and practice, the Jew feels bound to other Jews by virtue of the existence of the State of Israel and his own interpretation of the Jewish religion. The Diaspora Jew derives his identity basically from a religious or ethnic association no matter how tenuous. The Israeli derives his identity from living in a Jewish state no matter how secular that state may be. What is important is not the source from which the individual draws his Jewish identity but rather his emotional bond to other Jews.

Now, however, there may be arising both in the Diaspora and the State of Israel an attitude which threatens to erode the feelings of a common peoplehood. Throughout the United States people are beginning to ask: What is it that ties me to the Jew in Israel? For many of them the answer is still: my religion. But some continue to question: If the bond is religion, why do they not consider me a good Jew? I lead a similar life to theirs, yet somehow they consider themselves authentic Jews and frown on me.

Some Israelis, on the other hand, are beginning to identify themselves as Israelis and not as Jews. Among the younger

generation, lacking the sentimental ties of the older generation to the traditional Jewish environment, there is the problem of not being able to identify with much of the Jewish past and with the Jewish people today in the Diaspora.

It is my contention that if Israeli and Diaspora Jews are to continue to have strong feelings toward one another, each must have a knowledge of the other. Each must know about the way the other conceives his Jewishness and how that conception came about. Yet, we have been told that the Israeli knows little about Reform Judaism, a religious movement which has over one million affiliated adherents.

The purpose of this thesis is to attempt an understanding of what the Israeli knows about Reform Judaism and how he interprets it. The study seeks its evidence in the educational media of Israeli society. An examination of these materials, it is hoped, will shed some light on why it is that average Israelis, many of whose philosophic beliefs and practice of Jewishccustoms are similar to those of Reform Jews, look at Reform askance.

I have chosen this manner of investigation because the Israeli, though he may have some first-hand experience with Diaspora Jewry and Judaism, has generally learned about such matters through secondary sources. If he is young or of Afro-Asian origin, he has learned of pre-State or Israel life in Europe through films, books, and television. In school he has learned about the trends in Diaspora Jewish life from

his teachers and through the books he studied. It has been through the mass media that he has become familiar with American Jewish life, with its organizations and its multitude of strengths and weaknesses.

The prejudicial stereotypes Israelis hold of Diaspora Jewry and Reform Judaism have probably come about because of the cultural milieu the Israeli lives in, and not out of direct personal experience. It can therefore be postulated that the mass media of communication (television, radio, newspapers) and educational media (textbooks) play an important role in the propagation of these images and feelings.

Textbooks, for example, are a universal teaching tool. Students spend hundreds of hours pouring over the words and concepts that the authors have presented. While it is highly unlikely that students form prejudiced views solely on the basis of textbooks, it is possible that such books do play a fundamental role in the development of these conceptions. What the textbooks dealing with Jewish subjects say, what they imply, and what they omit are crucial in determining whether Jewish children in the Diaspora and in Israel will develop a positive attitude toward the Jewish people and Judaism. A biased presentation could very easily influence a Jewish student to look askance at a segment of the Jewish people or their heritage.

This study deals with the effect of educational media on Israelis with regard to Reform Judaism. What are the images,

stereotypes, themes and facts presented in Israeli textbook discussions of Reform? What is the Israeli high school student learning about Reform Judaism from his textbooks? Do they treat Reform monolithically or do they distinguish between time and place?[2]

Our perceptions of the world vary. When we are confronted with a specific situation we absorb varying elements. In later recalling the experience one individual remembers certain details while another recalls different ones. One reason for these divergent recollections is that in the process of appropriating or absorbing the phenomenon we subject it to our differing past experiences. Each individual's personal history, combined with interests, habits, likes and dislikes which are distinctly unique to him, color his view of that with which he comes into contact. For example, if as a child he was subjected to an authoritarian method of parenthood, he would react differently to an open classroom situation as a parent than if he had been raised under a more permissive system. And in describing the open classroom to a friend he might describe it as chaotic rather than creative.

In the process of appropriating an experience, and later in the process of attempting to represent reality by recalling the event (often called "modelling"), a common feature comes into play. This feature--distortion--affects the way in which we interpret what we have perceived. It is composed of three elements--false generalization, significant deletion, and mis-

apprehension.[3]

False generalization is the process whereby the participant in an experience allows it to represent the entire category of which it is a part. One example of such a false generalization would be inductive reasoning from a single instance or from too narrow a base. The following syllogism demonstrates this:

> John is a man.
> John is bad.
> Therefore all men are bad.

The reasoning in this argument is faulty because it uses only one example of a man to come to a conclusion about all men. However, as the number of examples increases, the accuracy of this kindoof generalization also increases.

Another type of a false generalizationiis the making of a statement about a totality using a false base as a foundation. An example of this would be the claim that Conservative Jews, those Jews who are members of synagogues affiliated with the United Synagogues of America, observe the dietary laws because most of these temples allow only kosher food to be served in their kitchens. It is not possible to use the institutional behavior asaa base from which to generalize about individuals.

The significant deletion of facts or events when creating a model casts a shadow of doubt over the veracity of such a representation, just as does a false generalization. It does not matter if theddeletion is deliberate or not; if signifi-

cant facts are absent the model is not a true representation. When the historian or news reporter selectively pays attention to certain parts of a debate or story and deletes or ignores other significant elements, his report must be distortive of the phenomenon he is describing. A history of the Jewish people which dwells only upon those events which demonstrate the kindness of non-Jewish Polish overlords while failing to consider those sources which tell of pogroms would be an incomplete and untruthful representation of reality. The newspaperman who reports only the Watergate affair in a review of the Nixon presidency is guilty of presenting an incomplete and perhaps biased account.

The deletion of some elements of experience from a model is necessary if the model is to be understandable. There are too many stimuli for us to absorb them all, but caution must be taken to insure that those stimuli that are deleted are not essential to a true understanding of what is occurring or has occurred.

Misapprehension, the third element of distortion, is the process whereby the interpretation of the event or experience produces something which is not present in the original stimuli. This "eisegesis" calls for the radical reinterpretation of reality. In the realm of psychology we might give the example of the following paranoic conversation:

"Hello."
"Hello."
"How are you?"

"What do you want from me? Why are you being so kind?"

Here the paranoid person has radically reinterpreted the simple question of "How are you?" He has read a new meaning into the phrase, a meaning which was totally out of keeping with the original intent.

Perhaps a more relevant example is in order. Some Reform temples hold a large service on Sunday mornings. This is the major service of the week where the rabbi gives his sermon and the majority of the congregants attend. A misapprehension in interpretation of such an event would be to claim that this synagogue has changed the Jewish Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. The event neither demonstrates nor does it imply that this is the case. To make such a claim requires a radical reinterpretation of the facts.

This discussion on distortion in modelling is important because it explains the process which has taken place in the preparation of written materials on the Reform Movement. The average Israeli has learned about Reform Judaism through secondary and even tertiary sources. In learning about Reform he has thus received filtered information. He has not observed theaactual development of the Movement nor has he participated in it. What has happened is that he has absorbed the representation of a phenomenon which was transmitted to him by someone else. These sources, which act as the Israeli's primary experience, may contain data which has

been improperly appropriated by the author. The data which the student receives may have been subjected to false generalizations, significant deletions, or misapprehension of events.

Some introductory remarks as to thesstructure of this thesis are in order. I begin by presenting a summary of the historiography of Reform Judaism. I do this to provide a standard with which the reader may compare the Israeli texts. The sources presented are those the high school teacher may have studied while working for his university diploma or which he may turn to when preparing his lessons.

Following this presentation we move into another area necessary for an understanding of our subject. The second chapter consists of an overview of Israeli society, with a specific look at the Israeli educational system. Such a study is necessary since textbooks are not written in a vacuum. Societal pressures, historical events, politics, and other forces influence the way in which an author presents his subject. In our discussion of the educational system we provide a brief survey of its history from the founding of the state to the present. We attempt to provide answers to such questions as: How is the curriculum developed? What is the role of history in the curriculum? Who prepares the textbooks? What pressures are brought to bear on the system by the various special interest groups?

An examination of the textbooks used in the Israeli secondary schools is the focus of the third chapter. The sample used to do this study was based on the advice of Jerusalem booksellers who informed me which books had been ordered on a large scale. The analysis is based on the three constituent elements of distortion which are described above. In looking at the texts the following questions are asked. What facts are presented? How does the author model the reality of the Reform Movement? Does he make false generalizations? Does he delete significant data? Does he misapprehend statements and events? In looking at the texts we try to determine if the author is using value judgements or opinions in his presentation which would give appositive or negative view of Reform Judaism.

More specifically we have subjected the texts to the following criteria:

1) Inclusion - Reform Judaism should be included in the relevant areas of history that are discussed in the text.

2) Coherence - The material dealing with the Movement should be concentrated and organized in such a fashion as to be meaningful. The author should avoid fragmenting the material into passing references.

3) Literal accuracy - The facts that are presented about Reform should beaaccurate and relevant. The information that is given shouldnot be misleading or ambiguous.

4) Balance - For the true understanding of a movement

a balance of facts regarding it must be presented. All aspects of the subject, both positive and negative, should be given reasonable attention. There should be no overemphasis of any one aspect of the subject to the neglect of another. (Such a criterion is necessary to prevent a distortion of the subject matter.)

5) Context - An entire range of characteristics of all the various movements should be presented so that no single movement is seen in false isolation.

6) Objectivity - The material presented should be primarily factual and objective. It should not result in the creation of a stereotype. The language should be as free of words with value connotations as possible. The author should avoid editorializations and value judgements.

The final chapter of the thesis is a presentation of some actual knowledge and opinions that Israelis have of Reform Judaism. It also attempts to answer the questions: Where does the Israeli receive his information? It is based on a series of informal discussions with Israelis, on data obtained through a questionnaire that was distributed by the author, and on such studies as Simon Herman's Israelis and Jews.

One last point. This thesis does not hope to solve any problems nor does it desire to prove or disprove any hypothesis. It is an investigation, nothing less and nothing more.

Chapter I
The Historiography of Reform Judaism

The authors of Israeli textbooks which deal with Reform Judaism draw as much from secondary sources as from primary materials. These secondary sources include general Jewish histories and specific histories of Reform Judaism. In order to understand the presentationoof Reform both in the textbooks and by the teachers it is necessary first to examine the presentation which these general histories and histories of Reform Judaism give the Movement.[1]

Heinrich Graetz is the most famous and popular Jewish historian of the last century. His major work, History of the Jews, attempts to present the entire sweep of Jewish history. The last volume of this work is devoted primarily to the German Jewish community and itsiintellectual achievements. He spends little time on the social or economic history of the community, since the importance of history for Graetz is the spiritual and cultural creativity of the Jewish people.

"Graetz was born into an orthodox Jewish family in the German province of Posen where he received the usual traditional Jewish education; the young scholar was forced to pick up whatever secular learning he could on his own. In the course of time, he became disenchanted with the narrow talmudism of his childhood environment, moving first to the modern orthodoxy of Samson Raphael Hirsch and eventually to the positive-historical Judaism of Zacharias Frankel. . . ."[2] From the first, he rejected any exceptia most moderate reform. This

peregrination can be observed in his harsh treatment of old orthodoxy and of the Reform Movement.

In looking at the Jewish society of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Graetz saw a need for change. The Jewish community was "a community which was an object of mockery not merely to the malicious and ignorant, but almost more to benevolent and cultured men; despicable in its own eyes; admirable only by reason of its domestic virtues and ancient memories, both, however, disfigured beyond recognition by trivial observances... . ."[3] Not only was the community a shambles, but the old rabbis did not understand that they were faced with a problem.

Mendelssohn and Wessely, Graetz wrote, contributed to the decline of the old community to which they belonged. They did so not out of maliciousness but because the community's structure was no longer viable. Their goal, which Graetz considered admirable, was to see Judaism "cleansed here and there from cobwebs and fungus growths."[4] But the historian did not look favorably on the generation which followed Mendelssohn. He described its leader, David Friedländer, as a "servile imitator of Mendelssohn,"[5] who had a "feeble mind."[6]

In describing the primarysschool that Friedländer established and its graduates Graetz demonstrated his dislike of the early reformers. The Free School was supposed to be an establishment where Jewish youth could learn both Jewish and secular subjects. But "gradually everything Jewish (Hebrew,

the Bible, the Talmud) was crowded out." The school, Graetz states, indoctrinated its students with the "Berlin spirit," which was one of scepticism and superficial enlightenment. Because of the rationalism which was transmitted, practices which elicited memories of ancient events were eliminated. Graetz's derision can best be seen in the following: "The dearest ambition of the advocates of this movement [Haskalah] was to resemble the Christians in every respect."[7]

Graetz's view of the Hamburg Temple is kinder. He states: "Nevertheless, the achievements of the Hamburg Temple . . . are not to be underrated. At one stroke, without much hesitation, it banished the rubbish of centuries from the synagogue, swept away with youthful impetuosity the holy cobwebs. . . ."[8] Nor does he entirely blame those reformers for the "injury inflicted on Judaism by the aping of foreign customs."[9] But he does not agree with the Reformers' contention that improving the decorum of the service or its aesthetics would bring back those who left.[10]

It is in his view of the Movement's leaders that Graetz's true animosity becomes evident. His views on Friedländer have already been presented and he is no kinder to other men. He calls Eleazar Libermann a "base adventurer,"[11] Aaron Chorin a "tedious talker of superficial culture and mediocre Talmudical scholarship"[12]; he claims that Holdheim would have joined the ranks of Menelaus in Hellenistic times[13]: not only does he attack Abraham Geiger's personality, but he also claims

that his scholarship did not have any lasting effect.[14] It is through these descriptions of Reform's leaders that he paints a negative view of the Movement.

As noted above Graetz opposed any but the most moderate reforms in the synagogue ritual. He states that the confirmation of young men and women was "an idea without meaning in Judaism." Nor does he approve of the addition of German or the elimination of Hebrew from the service. The former is an imitation of the Church and the latter separates the worshipper from the Jewish people.

An Israeli educator or writer who uses Graetz as his major source of information about Reform Judaism would be receiving an incomplete and biased view of it. He would most probably view Reform as an assimilationist, capricious and alien movement led by self-serving and incompetent men who had little love or respect for Jewish tradition. Graetz emphasizes the radical Reformers and even radicalizes those who were of more moderate predilections.

Simon Dubnow is the next major historian who dealt with Reform Judaism in a general history of the Jewish people. Dubnow approaches history from a ""sociological" perspective. However, the sociological perspective he uses is really a national perspective.[15] Because of this he disdains anything which would detract from the nationhood of the Jewish people.

Dubnow notes that there was a need for change at the end of the eighteenth century. There was a group of middle-

of-the-roaders, The Society of Friends, who tried to steer a course between the radicals and the promotors of the status quo of orthodoxy. Because this group did not have a practical program, it failed in its overall goal to eradicate religious fanaticism and to safeguard freedom of conscience for individuals.[16]

Reform Judaism was, for Dunbow, an attempt to adjust to the contemporary style of life and to the demands of a new generation. The movement contained both spiritual and political elements: it was an attempt to achieve the political goal of equal rights and to bring the foundations of Judaism and European culture into harmony.[17] The failing of Reform lay in its attempt to renounce the national elements inherent in Judaism in order to achieve the political goal.

According to Dubnow, the movement went through phases of development. The first stage was the outward reform of the synagogue service. This phase was short-lived and was succeeded by a stage where not only were external reforms called for, but also a new ideology. However, this new ideology called for the elimination of nationhood, which for Dubnow meant the destruction of the people's soul; all that would be left would be a "corpse draped in religious dogmas and laws."[18] The Reformers "committed suicide in a national sense; their contrived reform, plucked from the historical roots, turned out to be stillborn, deprived of a vital blood."[19]

Even though Dubnow does not approve of Reform, neither does he approve of the orthodox movements of the same period, since they, too, fall into the trap of relinquishing the national essence. The presentation of the Movement's development is done in a fair and concise manner, though the Israeli reader would come away with the image that Reform was assimilationist, removing from Judaism that which it could not believe, together with that which it did not wish to believe. Because Dubnow stresses the anti-nationalistic position of Reform and because he does not discuss its change in attitude toward this concept (which occurred after he wrote his history), the Israeli using this work would probably derive a negative opinion of the Movement.

Yehezkel Kaufmann deals only sporadically with Reform Judaism in his book, Gola ve-Nekhar. Most of the material which is related to the Movement is presented in his analysis of the Jewish response to assimilation, of which Reform is just one aspect. Kaufmann states that no faction of Western European, and later Eastern European, Jewry could stand up to assimilation, and that each one wanted to become part of the general culture.[20] This was one of the goals and purposes of the Haskalah: to bring the Jews closer to other nations but not to eliminate Jewish nationality.[21]

Emancipation, which was an offshoot of assimilation and a new messianic dream,[22] brought with it the desire on the part of Jews to "correct" the "blemish" which they bore.

This blemish was the identification of the Jews as a separate nation and a cosmopolitan people.[23] This was one reason that the concept developed that the Jews were unified not by virtue of their nationality but rather by their religion.[24] It was also on account of this desire for equal rights and acceptance that many Jews converted, especially since conversion meant the end of religious coercion for those who no longer accepted Judaism's historical truths or could no longer follow its commandments.[25]

Kaufmann points out that Reform based itself partly on Mendelssohn's thought. It accepted his philosophy regarding religious truths and eternal verities but, Kaufmann notes, it rejected his position on the commandments. Furthermore, it added the concept of mission which was absent from the Berlin sage's thought.[26]

Reform Judaism was not Karaitic according to Kaufmann. Nor was it a true reformation. Reform kept part of the oral law and supported its changes with it. The temple reforms which they carried out were within the oral law. But, Kaufmann reminds us, they viewed themselves as having separated from the Talmud and having returned to the Bible.[27]

While Kaufmann does differentiate the Reform Movement as a distinct entity in the history of the period, an interesting phenomenon occurs when he is describing an aspect of "Assimilationist Judaism." He ascribes to this movement the characteristics that belong to early Reform but does not label them

as such: the removal of the messianic passages from the prayerbook, since they were no longer believable or desirable, the changing of nationally-oriented prayers, and the reinterpretation of the Diaspora into a positive divine purpose.[28]

Why Kaufmann does the above, I do not know. He does see liberal religion as having strength, growing at the expense of old line orthodoxy but losing to the mass of Jews who, though nonreligious, feel a tie to Judaism and to someof its customs. (An example of such a Jew is the Palestinian settler of the 1920's.)[29] Liberal Judaism, according to Kaufmann, is nondogmatic; it hasthe ability for development and renewal. It is an attempt to bring the spirit of the religion and the modern culture into harmony. Because it allows for the search for truth and does not bind the spirit, it is the natural way for religion to develop.[30]

Ben Zin Dinur divides Reform Judaismiinto two entities, both of which grew out of the revolutionary changes that developed due to the sabbatean movement. The traditional value system had collapsed, leading to Jewish self-effacement and acceptance of outside cultural influences.[31] The first might be called "reduced" Judaism, which had little influence on the "spiritual development" of Jewish people andreligion. This type of Judaism responded to the changing habits and customs of its followers by eliminating much of the Jewish tradition. The second type, which had a lasting effect, was Reform Judaism, or Modern Judaism. It is "Judaism as conceived by the

Jew who had adopted modern ways of thought and forms of consciousness, and had made himself familiar with the scientific achievements and philosophical theories of the modern world and tried to fashion his Jewish belief and practice accordingly. To this modern trend in Judaism belong not only the followers of Geiger and his school, but also a long line of distinguished opponents of the 'Reformers,' from Mendelssohn to Zechariah Frankel. . . ."[32] Dinur does not inform us who the bearers of the first trend were.

An Israeli who read Dinur's and Kaufmann's works would find their coverage of the Movement sparse and sporadic. They do not present specific facts nor do they describe events. The Israeli would see one wing of Reform as assimilationist, attempting to shed its national heritage, and another as concerned about its Jewishness. These writers also paint a positive portrait of Reform as a viable religious option for the Jew who wished to live in contemporary society. A view such as this may impress the teacher who is dissatisfied with the religious condition in the State and may influence him to look deeper into Reform.

Shmuel Ettinger is a contemporary Israeli historian who believes in the centrality of territory and nationhood for understanding Jewish history. In his treatment of the period in question he differentiates between the Maskilim and the Reformers.[33] The Maskilim, those who first called for the moving of Jews into non-Jewish society, receive bitter treat-

ment at his hands. One of the points which he repeatedly makes is that the Maskilim, seeing that they did not have the support of the rabbis or the masses, used the civil authorities to coerce their coreligionists into making reforms.[34] He does not point out that the use of outside interference was a tactic common to both the orthodox and enlightened faction of Jewry at that time. Further damage to the image of the Maskilim results from his view that they "accepted and concurred with the theory advanced by anti-Semites throughout history that loyalty to talmudic tradition and observance of mitzvot separated the Jews from their neighbors and prevented them from fulfilling their obligations as citizens of the state."[35]

Reform Judaism, according to Ettinger, was an attempt to allow a man to be a member simultaneously of two distinct groups; the European State on one hand and the Jewish community on the other.[36] It developed in a community which was undergoing ferment, and attempted to help eliminate the barriers which existed between Jew and non-Jew, to bring back to Judaism the Maskilim and the young who had cut their bonds with their religion, and to prevent conversion.[37] It was a reaction to both centripetal and centrifugal forces and also acted as such forces. In the United States it served as a major influence, doing more to strengthen Jewish identity than to weaken it.[38] It was an internal development of Judaism as well as a reaction to external forces such

as the demand by liberal groups that emancipation could only come after reforms were made in the Jewish community.[39]

The concept of a Jewish mission which developed during this period and which gained vogue in Jewish circles was a response to the non-acceptance of Jews by the general culture. The Jew proposed such an idea to prove that he should be admitted to this larger culture. But Ettinger claims that instead of helping the Jew be accepted, as the Reformers wanted, the mission in the eyes of the non-Jewish community became merely another "manifestation of 'Jewish arrogance' and of the Jews' desire to maintain their own separate existence." He also claims that it "prepared the ground for the intensification of anti-Semitic trends."[40] Since this concept of mission is a Reform conception, it may be postulated that Ettinger does not look favorably on this aspect of the Movement.

Ettinger's presentation would leave the Israeli reader with mixed emotions about Reform. On the one hand he would see it as a positive force helping to keep Jews in the fold. On the other hand it was a movement which came about because of external pressures and which placed acceptance into general society above Jewish community. Again the reader would feel Reform was assimilationist and so again the Israeli would hold a derisive opinion.

The historians presented thus far have only dealt with

the Reform Movement in passing, while discussing general Jewish history. Some historians, however, have dealt with the subject more intensely. I shall discuss three of them, those most likely to be read by Israelis. In his book, The Assimilationist Movement in Israel (Tenuat haHitbolelut beYisrael), Y. Zvi Zehavi discusses the Reform Movement as one aspect of the general trend to seek acceptance by general society. But this one movement was the most dangerous for Jewish survival in the nineteenth century. Zehavi holds that all the Jewish battles of that century were fought with and against this Movement which was founded to prepare and strengthen Jewish assimilation.

Judaism, for Zehavi, is a special kind of nation. It is a hybrid composed of national and universal (or religious) aspects: a national-social constitution (chuka) based on the foundations of faith. The entity's national component is based on language, homeland and customs which pass from one generation to another. Judaism's faith aspect is based on a doctrine of creation, on morality, and on a world outlook.[42]

Furthermore, Judaism contains a synthesis within the synthesis. Israel, the land, served both a religious purpose, the Holy Land, and a national purpose, the Homeland. Hebrew was the holy language and the national tongue. The desire for the messiah, which replaced the lack of territory, served not only as a hope for better days for all men

but also as a symbol of the Jewish ingathering of the exiles and the victory of the state. It was this synthesis, preserved by the positive commandments, that prevented assimilation.

Assimilation couldooccur only if the ties between nationhood and religion were broken. And this, according to Zehavi, is what the Reform Movement and the assimilationists did. In order to obtain equal rights, its leaders were willing to give up the original form of Judaism (the synthesis), eliminating the nation and leaving only the religion. The Reformers wanted to establish a new Judaism which turned out to be a "different Judaism, a shadow of the traditional Judaism, a Judaism which contained only universal concepts."[43]

Zehavi tells us that not all of the actions taken by the "reformer-assimilaters" fell under the rubric of assimilation; the attempt at temple reforms and a redefinition of Shabbat observances do not fall in this category. But any attempt to reduce or eliminate Jewish language, education, laws, territorial aspiration or its surrogate (messianism), does. Therefore, in his volume (devoted to assimilationism), he only deals with the latter issues.

Simon Bernfeld wrote his book about the Reform Movement at the turn of the century. His purpose in writing the History of the Reformation in Israel (Toldot haReformatzion ha-Datit beYisrael) was to acquaint the Hebrew reader with the Movement. In his introduction he states that, though

he attempts to be objective in presenting the facts, it should be known that his sympathies lie with the "faithful in Israel." He views negatively any attempt to eliminate national existence or to reduce the feelings of fraternity among Jews.[44] He is a conservative in his approach toward religion and its practices, especially where it helps support the existence of the people, since a barrier is needed to help preserve the nation.[45]

Yet Bernfeld recognized that a change in Jewish society was necessary. The economic situation called for such a change or the nation would suffer. The rich would leave and the lower classes would be subject to abject poverty. Furthermore, the spiritual structure was also in disarray. Services were an anathema to the cultured; prayers were in need of change; children required education. Bernfeld notes that the illness was there, but he believes that the remedy which was administered failed.[46]

Reform was one of the cures that failed. It was an attempt to bring the escaping youth back to Judaism which many mistakenly believed would work.[47] The reforms which the early Reformers attempted to institute were imitations of Christian services. The imposition of these reforms gave Reform Judaism a Protestant character. Even later religious reforms failed. For example, Bernfeld views the Hamburg Temple of his own day as still persisting, like all the other new synagogues in Germany. But it is devoid of

spirit.[48] Reform was a historical movement which no longer functioned but whose influence still continued.

One of the reasons that Bernfeld frowned upon Reform, aside from his traditional and nationalistic tendencies, was his feeling that there was really no need for religious reforms of the type that the Reformers proposed. The people did not feel the burden of the religious practices. It was the rabbis who wanted to bring religious practices into conformity with the everyday life of the general society.[49] It was the rabbis, not the people, who preached the destruction of the Israelite nation and who distanced themselves from Judaism.[50]

David Philipson was a graduate of the Hebrew Union College and a staunch advocate of the classical Reform tradition. His position is demonstrated clearly in his work, The Reform Movement in Judaism, which paints the most favorable picture of Reform. Indeed, the book is more of an apology than an historical interpretation. He justifies the Reform Movement more than he explains it.

Unlike Ettinger who pointed out that the Reformers and Maskilim would use the civil authorities to impose reforms, Philipson stresses that it was the orthodox who used state power to repress the Reformers. Unlike most of the historians reviewed above, who looked askance at the separation of nationhood from Jewish identity, Philipson views this development positively. Whereas the other historians may

have looked askance at the Reformers, Philipson admires their personalities and lauds their work.

Philipson's book would be valuable to the Israeli educator in that, unlike the other studies, it presents lengthy excerpts from the minutes, proceedings, and communications of the time. Unlike the other writers, Philipson also discusses in some detail the early movement in America.

Reform, for Philipson, is a response to the new situation of the Jews. It grew out of an admissible desire of the Jews to enter the general society. He sees Reform as shattering the fetters which ghetto Judaism had placed around the true spirit of the religion; it is a reinterpretation of the prophetic ideals, an advancement over the nationalistic, legalistic and ceremonial forms of Judaism.

One problem with Philipson's book is the dogmatic and self-righteous manner in which he presents his material. He introduces his own opinions anddoes not allow for the continued development of Reform thought beyond his own ideas. His Reform has become an orthodoxy. Perhaps an example will help illustrate this point.

Classical Reform thought claimed that Judaism was a religion and not a nationality. Therefore, Jews were members of a religious community and not a nation; the nation had ceased withtthe destruction of the Temple by the Romans. This is Philipson's position. Philipson cannot allow Zionism to tarnish Reform. He states: "Though a number of Reform

rabbis and writers are sympathetic with Zionism, the new national movement among Jews, there can be no manner of doubt that the position stated in the text expresses the true philosophy of the Reform Movement."[52]

An Israeli reading these last three works would again find Reform assimilationist. He would see Philipson's arguments as polemics against the orthodox. While he might agree with charges Philipson levels against the old traditions and community, he would certainly not agree with Reform's answer. For the Israeli, especially the secularist, the important aspect of Judaism is the national and not the spiritual (which is basic for Philipson). Thus he would agree with Bernfeld's and Zehavi's positions.

In sum, the secondary historical sources would impress on the Israeli educator an unfavorable image of Reform. He would see the phenomenon as an unnecessary and perhaps traitorous course taken by a segment of the Western European Jewish community. But on the other hand he would see that it did influence and preserve Jewish life in the United States. The secondary sources do not cover the changes which occurred in Reform Jewish philosophy and practice. As Israeli reading these histories would assume that Reform Jews still are anti-Zionistic and that they reject national traditions.

Chapter II
The Israeli Educational System

The Israeli educational system is the formal environment in which the Israeli student learns about Reform Judaism. The pressures which affect the system percolate down and influence all those who use or provide its services. In essence the Israeli educational system is a cluster of school systems each operating somewhat independently from the others. This chapter's purpose is to describe how this system came into existence and how it functions. Such an undertaking is necessary if one is to comprehend the use of the different curricula and textbooks in the Israeli schools.

Education and learning have always been prime values in Jewish life. From the Biblical age to the present day the Jew has attempted to fulfill the injunction: "And you shall teach them diligently to your children." When asked to relate all of Judaism while standing on one foot, Hillel concluded his answer with the charge, "Now go and study."

In the Jewish people's early history education was a parental task. The child's father taught him Torah. If he had no father he was expected to teach himself as soon as he was able. But the reality of life was that many could not teach themselves nor their children. Toward the end of the Second Temple period the High Priest Joshua ben Gamala instituted a change in the customary educational system. He established a series of schools throughout the country

in the various cities and provinces where boys from the age of seven and older could learn from teachers.[1]

Joshua ben Gamala's school was the paradigm of the cheder, which served as the backbone ofJJewish education through the centuries of dispersion. This institution, which might be considered the equivalent of an elementary school, concerned itself only with traditional Jewish subjects: Bible, Talmud, and their commentaries. The language of instruction was the vernacular; Hebrew was not taught as a living language,though it was occasionally used as a medium of communication.

The Jewish community also maintained another set of schools called yeshivot. These schools, based on the rabbinic schools of ancient times, concentrated their attention and emphasis on the intensive study of the Oral Law. The community took it upon itself to feed and clothe a student who, though lacking in financial resources, had the capacity and the desire to immerse himself in the intricacies of the Talmudic text.

These institutions served European Jews as the primary vehicle of Jewish education until the period of the Enlightenment. At this time there arose a demand from parents that the educational system be changed. They insisted that the time had come to teach children secular as well as religious subjects and to utilize either French or German as the language of instruction. These malcontents were no longer satis-

fied with following the traditions of the past. New schools were developed to answer these new needs. As the Enlightenment spread eastward, so did the demand for new kinds of schools.

Jewish education in modern Palestine initially followed the traditional cheder-yeshiva pattern. In 1856, however, the pattern underwent a change with the founding of the Laemmel School in Jerusalem. This institution was modeled after the German schools of its time and used German as its language of instruction. The next fourteen years saw the establishment of more non-traditional schools in the land. A school for girls, named after Evelina de Rothschild, was founded in 1864; an agricultural school was established in Mikveh Yisrael in 1874; a boys' school opened its doors in Haifa in 1880. All of these schools provoked the opposition of the religious sector of the Jewish community. In fact, the Laemmel School was placed in cherem before it even opened its doors.[2]

As the population of Palestine grew, so did the number and strength of the Jewish schools. But even so, the schools' teachers had to combat a lack of guidance as to what they should teach. It was not until 1891 that a syllabus for the first four years of elementary school appeared. This was later superseded by an eight-year program, designed by Dr. Tourov of Jaffa, which in turn was refined in 1923. This refinement served as the official educational syllabus until 1953.[3]

Palestine was under Turkish rule when the first modern Jewish schools were established there. The Ottoman government administered the area with the "millet" system. Under this system each religious community enjoyed autonomy over its internal and personal affairs as long as its actions did not contravene any Turkish orders or statutes. Each of the communities--Arab, Christian and Jewish--maintained its own educational system.

When the British received the League of Nations' mandate to take over the governing of Palestine, they continued the "millet" system. However, they changed the language of instruction in the Government schools to Arabic. (These schools were called Government schools because they received government funding. In reality they were Arab schools.) In 1927 the British Mandatory Government ruled that the Jewish schools would also be eligible to receive public funds. Yet the financial aid granted was a mere pittance. The Jews, who contributed seventy per cent of the mandatory's revenues, received only forty per cent of its expenditures in return. The Mandatory government spent over one third of its budget on police and prisons; it spent six per cent on agricultural projects and seven per cent on education. Of the seven per cent spent on education the Jewish community received only twenty per cent, or 1.4 per cent of the entire budget. While investing so little money on Palestine, the mandatory government managed none-

theless to import capital from this underdeveloped area to London.[4]

The Jewish schools underwent a quantitative as well as qualitative development with the expansion of the Yishuv. The teachers of the period realized that they were not only the purveyors of a tradition and a past butalso the "creators of a Hebrew culture and terminology."[5] Hebrew was no longer a dead language, nor was the people homeless, and so the desire arose to establish truly Hebrew schools, and not mere copies of non-Jewish ones.[6]

Whether this desire was fulfilled isnnot in the purview of this chapter. But it is important to note that the schools were successful inthat parents sent their children to them. The Jewish government of the Yishuv had no authority to compel school attendance, yet ninety per cent of all children did attend elementary school. Only in towns which had a large number of ultra-orthodox Jews, a mixed Arab and Jewish population, or no local Jewish council with taxing authority did a significant number of children fail to enroll in these schools.

The Jewish school system in Mandatory Palestine was divided into sub-systems called trends. This division only affected the elementary schools since the secondary schools were under private control. Each of the trends protected the ideology of the parent organization in its educational institutions. In turn each of the trends had its interests

represented in the National Council and the Zionist movement's councils by its supporting parent organization. This political leverage enabled the trends to operate independently with a minimum of interference. Each trend had its own board of supervisors to determine what curricula and methodologies would be used. The hiring and dismissal of faculty, administrators, and other staff was conducted by internal committees as was anyaappraisal of the school or its staff. This autonomy was further strengthened by the rule that only inspectors from the same trend could inspect that trend's schools.[7]

The "general" or "national" trend was the first and, originally, the most powerful trend. It was controlled by the secular Zionists. This group felttthat nationalism should be stressed in the schools. They believed that religious orthodoxy and socialism were sectarian movements and served to separate the Jewish people. Bible was taught in these schools as the common literature of the Jewish people, but Talmud and prayers were ignored. As a result of this curriculum children grew up knowing little or nothing about Jewish religious life.[8]

The negative reaction ofmmany Zionists to theirresults of the general trend's educational philosophy, coupled with the desire of the religious Zionists to propagate their fervent beliefs,lled to the establishment of the "religious trend" in the 1920's. Founded by the Mizrachi, who wished

to bring up a generation of "Torah-true" Jews, this trend attempted to perpetuate the traditional "Jewish way of life," with all of its concomitant prayers, customs, rituals and observances. Theseschools were modeled after the reformed cheder of Eastern Europe. While the traditional cheder taught only Jewish subjects, such as Bible and Talmud, the reformed cheder also taught secular subjects. A further reform could be seen in the language of instruction, where Hebrew was used for teaching the secular subjects.[9]

The third trend to develop in the Mandatory school system was the "labor trend." Following the ideology of the workers' movement, it substituted socialism for religion and claimed that a new Jewish way of life was developing and could be found in the spirit of chaluziut. The goals of an educational system, it was felt, should betto give ideals and reality to this new social order. This trend soon exceeded the religious trend in attendance.[10]

Another Jewish school system also existed in the Yishuv. It served the children of the Agudat Yisrael movement, an ultra-orthodox group which refused to associate with the secular Zionists. The schools established by the Agudat Yisrael followed the traditional cheder pattern of teaching only religious subjects.

When the British Mandate over Palestine expired in 1948 and the British left the area, the new Stateoof Israel in-

herited a fairly extensive education system. The system ranged from kindergarten through the university and was composed of both public and private institutions. It had a common language of instruction and a staff to implement its goals. But the State also found itself heir to the system's problems. The British had left a system without any central direction, suffering from financial instability and lack of planning.

One of the first acts of the new state was the passage of the Compulsory Education Law. This legislation declared that all children would be required to attend school through the eighth grade or until they reached the age of fourteen. It also had provisions in it for the education of children over the age of fourteen who had not completed the minimum requirement. The state decided to maintain the Yishuv schoolssystem until such time as the State could develop a national organization.

Early in the nation's history it could be seen that the trend system was a divisive and inefficient method of delivering a needed service. The new country needed a vehicle to unify and train its people in citizenship while efficiently using its limited resources. An example of the inefficiency and divisiveness of the trend system can be demonstrated by looking at the situation in Rishon LeTziyon during 1951. Here the town's three schools and nine teachers educated approximately one hundred and fifty pupils. One hundred of

the students attended the labor school which had a staff of four. The Mizrachi school and its teacher served nine pupils. Finally, the Agudat Yisrael school had four teachers and between forty and fifty students. Thus, one town had three schools whose teacher-student ratios ranged from one teacher to ten pupils to one teacher and twenty-five pupils.[11]

A proposal that the trend system be eliminated and a unified school system be instituted elicited a strong negative response. This response was vociferously expressed from the right by the religious parties and from the left by the socialists, represented by Mapam. Mapai, the large labor party, began to countenance such a proposal since its educational system had become the dominant trend. Furthermore, because of an ideological weakening of Mapai's membership and the merger of the general trend's teaching staff with the Histadrut, it had more to gain from such a unification than did the other parties.[12]

After a long and protracted series of battles, a compromise solution was offered. In brief, this solution called for the division of the Israeli schools into three groups: Exempted, Recognized, and Official. In the "official" category there were two subdivisions: Mamlakhti (State) and Mamlakhti-dati (State religious).

Political convenience led to the establishment of the classification of the exempted school. The State opted to

have little or no control over these institutions except in such minor areas as sanitation and statistical reporting, because it does not fund them. Generally, these schools are the ones operated by the various foreign governments and missions in Israel. Originally, the schools of Agudat Yisrael belonged to this category but they soon became "recognized," subject to minimal standards in the area of curriculum, and thus became eligible for government funding.[13]

The establishment of a governmental system is supposed to have eliminated the trend system. It has done so to an extent. While separate "labor" and "general" trends no longer exist, having been merged, the "religious trend" can still be seen. This was permitted since it was felt that religion is sufficiently important and apolitical to permit some separation. The religious sector, while its schools are classified as "government", exercises authority over their schools in basically all maters except administration and finances. But even in the secular state schools the residues of the trend system can be detected. This is especially true in the kibbutz schools where a strong socialist labor philosophy is still espoused and taught by kibbutzniks who have been trained at the kibbutz teacher colleges (which have the status of state institutions).[14]

The religious and kibbutz schools demonstrate the role that special interest groups play in the Israeli political arena. A special interest group can influence Israeli govern-

mental decisions if it has a political power base to use for leverage. Without this base a special interest group can do almost nothing. The secular Zionists' "general trend" disappeared into the labor trend, in part, because the political parties which supported it lost a significant amount of their political strength. In the present day curriculum, oriental studies are increasing because the Oriental community has become more vocal and conscious of its political power.

A brief overview of the role the religious parties have played in government decisions regarding the reform of the educational system might demonstrate this point further. The religious establishment of Israel, whose highest authority is the Rabbinical Council, feels that it is only by virtue of the Jewish religion that the Jewish people survived exile from their homeland and kept alive the ideal of the Jewish state throughout the years of dispersion. It feels that Israel can be a Jewish state only if the Torah and the halakha serve as the basis for its legal system and cultural orientation. In order to promote these views effectively the National Religious Party has consistently associated itself with the ruling party in the government. Indeed the ruling Labor Party has been the ruling party only because of this coalition. Thus the secular party, in order to keep its position, has had to make concessions to the religious sector. These concessions have strengthened the re-

ligious establishment and have led to the passage of legislation which has been contrary to the desires of the secular majority of the country's population.[15]

The dual government school system is a result of the concession that the ruling party, Mapai, had to make the religious parties. As stated previously, the desire for a unified system similar to most Western societies arose out of the desire to unify the new state's diverse immigrant population. The government felt that the trend system, if used in the machanot ("immigrant camps"), would create a divisiveness among the inhabitants of these temporary centers. However, the government also knew that many of the new olim ("immigrants") were religious and would desire and need a religious education for their children. To fulfill this need the government instituted optional religious classes, whichccould be taken along with the normal governmental offerings.

This early attempt to institute a type of unified educational system in the immigrant camps failed in early 1950 when the religious parties charged that pressure was being applied to religious parents, coercing them to have their children take only secular subjects.[16] The religious parties insisted that this coercion must cease. Hapoel HaMizrachi stated that if it continued, it would withdraw from the Government Coalition. The Religious Bloc insisted also that religious education be offered to all children and that

the religious bodies control all camp education. They claimed that their motives were not political but religious, since anything less than a truly religious education was the equivalent of "conversion" from Judaism; and so they were only attempting to save the souls of their children. Mapai countered with the contention that the Mizrachi wanted control over all the immigrant children and that it, Mapai, would not permit such control.[17]

The governmental crisis came to an end with a proposal that called for the holding of a referendum in each camp asking the residents what type of education they desired. This proposal was later withdrawn when a compromise was reached which provided religious education to the Yemenite camps and both religious and secular for all other camps.

In December of the same year the religious parties charged that Mapai had violated the March compromise. Mapai, they claimed, had restricted, oppressed and failed to offer religious training to the immigrant camps' religious residents. Furthermore, they called for the extension of the camp educational system (without the violations) to the new maabarot, where the olim were being resettled.

An interesting phenomenon occurred two months later in February 1951 when the Ministerial Committee on Education report was approved by the government but opposed by the Religious Bloc. The Committee's proposal called for the establishment of religious schools in Yemenite camps and in all religious areas where they did not already exist. It also

stated that a religious representative should be present during the registration process in the camps.[18]

The Religious Bloc opposed this proposal because it did not specify that the religious schools would have to be Mizrachi or Agudat Yisrael. This report thus gave tacit approval to the new religious schools which Histadrut had begun establishing. These schools, the religious parties contended, were not truly religious: neither the faculties nor the curricula were religiously oriented. The proposal in general was seen as another attempt on the part of Mapai to prevent the establishment of true religious institutions. Mapai countered these charges by arguing that a new immigrant should have the right to choose the type of education he wished for his children once he had settled and acclimatized himself to the new environment. For this right to be viable a series of options had to be available to the immigrant no matter where he settled in the country. Furthermore, Mapai argued, just as the immigrant should have the option of choosing between a religious and secular school, he should also have the option of choosing between varying types of religious institutions.

The Committee's report was brought before the entire Kenesset where it was rejected. This rejection precipitated the fall of Ben Gurion's government in February 1951. However, in the negotiations for the next coalition the religious parties agreed to join the government and agreed to

support the committee's call for educational reforms.

A year later, in December 1952, the government presented the following policy to the Kenesset. It called for the implementation, within a year, of

> a program for a national system of education in all elementary school which will be implemented not later than the beginning of the next school year. The program will be based on the following fundamentals: the abolition of school trends based on parties and organizations; the determination of minimum obligatory requirements on all schools; guarantee of religious education to all children whose parents desire it; recognition of parents' rights to a specific direction in education under the direction and the supervision of the Ministry of Education, provided the minimum requirements are adhered to.[19]

In 1953, the Educational Reform Act, which eliminated the four trends throughout the country, passed the Kenesset, establishing the present structure of the Israeli elementary educational system. By the late fifties the government began to consider including secondary schools which had been under private sponsorship in the system. One of the demands the National Religious Party placed on Mapai in 1959 was that this expanded system would be patterned after the elementary system.[20] Thus when the new secondary school system went into effect it had separate religious units controlled by the N.R.P.

The Israeli governmental school system is a highly centralized bipartisan entity. Its program is based on ". . .the values of Jewish culture and the achievements of science, on

love of the homeland and loyalty to the State and to the Jewish people, on practice in agricultural work and handicraft, on pioneer training, and on striving for a better society built on freedom, equality, tolerance, mutual assistance and love of mankind." These goals were clearly influenced by the "labor trend," especially in calling for a new social order and the stress on halutziut and agriculture.[21]

Religious state education is basically the same as secular state education except that it attempts, through its curriculum, to inculcate the student with the importance of God and Torah for the state and the world in general. Aside from curricular changes, the major distinction between the two systems is that the religious institutions are staffed by religious (Orthodox) personnel.

In the elementary schools centralization can be seen in the role played by Ministry of Education. The ministry supervises every aspect of the elementary school's program, determining what happens in every school. It approves all textbooks (written by the Ministry's staff or by individuals either privately or under Ministerial contract); it prepares and enforces minutely detailed curricula. Rules concerning the discipline of students and their promotion as well as detailed time tables are promulgated by the Ministry. Representatives of the Ministry direct the elementary teachers, implement pedagogic experiments, and administer the final examinations.

The secondary school system, however, is not under such stringent supervision. Until recently, as has been noted, these schools were independently controlled, as many still are. The entry of the government into this area has caused a great deal of growth in an already rapidly expanding area. At the inception of the State there were forty secondary schools of varying types in the country, with approximately 10,000 pupils; by 1956, there were 174 institutions with an enrollment of approximately 25,000; and by 1970, the number of institutions increased to 192 and an attendance of about 58,000.[22]

Even when secondary education was not required, the government made attempts to encourage attendance. In 1964, over half of the 14-17 year old age group attended such schools, and recently, with the new educational reforms extending compulsory education to tenth grade, this percentage has grown. There are discrepancies in the attendance rates, however, between the Afro-Asian and European communities.

Students who wished to attend secondary school prior to the new reforms usually did so after completing the eighth grade. They were required to take an exam which was known as the seker. This test was designed to determine if a student had the capacity for higher study. The test also served as the basis for determining if a student was eligible for state aid. A student who achieved a certain score and whose family income was below a specified level was

eligible to participate in a graduated tuition policy and to receive supplemental aid to help defray the cost of textbooks, transportation and other necessities. In 1957, sixteen per cent of Israeli high school students were the recipients of state aid. By 1965-6, this percentage had climbed to sixty-five per cent, with 35,000, or fifty per cent of recepients, not having to pay any fees at all. This program has continued to expand to the present time.

The government's authority over secondary schools was, until recently, derived from the Education Ordinance passed by the British Mandatory Government in 1933. This legislation required the registering of such schools but not their licensing. This lack of authority can be seen in the curriculum proposed by the Ministry of Education in 1956. It states: "Our program is to be seen as an experimental proposal." The curriculum, however, did become the norm for the schools since the bagrut, or matriculation exam, is based on it and because the students of schools that followed it were eligible for state aid. The schools soon discovered that they were more attractive to parents if they followed this proposal. Thus the Ministry's authority arose from economic reasons rather than from legislation.

The curriculum, which was designed for four-year academic schools (as opposed to technical or agricultural institutions), covered a variety of subject areas and called for the establishment of a series of tracks within the schools.

It was felt that by offering the student a variety of programs on varying levels in the areas of the humanities, social sciences, naturalssciences, oriental studies, and agriculture, etc., that the students' individual needs and the society's needs could best be fulfilled.

The desire was for a curriculum which would help produce an enlightened young Israeli, who had knowledge of both general and Hebrew culture and who could integrate this knowledge with his life. In order to achieve this, the Ministry declared that the students would be instructed in the following areas: the language and literature of the people (including the Bible and the Oral Law), a foreign language, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and civics.

The curriculum proposeda schedule of class hours to be spent in each area of instruction and what content should be taught. However, the Ministry realized that its suggestions were extremely broad and so it warned that no school or teacher should attempt--nor should they feel the necessity--to teach everything in the syllabus. In its proposal the Ministry suggested that only the amount of material necessary for the treatment of an area as a scientific discipline and suited to the needs of the students be presented. It also called for time to be spent on the "emotional needs" of the student, i.e. physical education, music, and art.

The curriculum, which is based on a thirty-two week calen-

dar with classes meeting six days a week, is fairly uniform for all students during the first two years of high school. A typical ninth grade schedule might be:[24]

Subject	Hours
Hebrew Language and Literature	5
Bible and Talmud	5
History, Geography and Civics	5
English	5
Mathematics and Science	11
Misc.	6

Over the first two years the following breakdown in the curriculum occurs:[25]

Arts and Humanities:		45
First foreign language	10	
Bible	6	
Hebrew Literature	10	
Oral Law or Talmud	4	
Second foreign language	4	
History	7	
Geography	4	
Science:		19
Math	8	
Physics	4	
Chemistry	3	
Biology	4	
Non-Academic Areas:		12

During the last two years of a student's education there is a greater concentration in the subjects which are related to the track he has chosen. A typical twelfth grade schedule

in the secular trend is:[26]

Subject	Track	
	Humanistic	Scientific
Hebrew Language & Literature	8	4
Bible and Talmud	7	4
History, Geography & Civics	6	2
English	5	5
French or Arabic	4	
Mathematics and Science		15
Misc.	4	4

The Bible is seen as the core of the humanistic curriculum presented in both trends. The religious schools spend more time teaching Bible and Talmud than the general state schools. They use the hours generally set aside for music and art for these religious subjects.

One of the goals of State education in both trends is to develop bonds between the student and the Jewish people. A major path towards achieving this goal is through the teaching of Jewish history. The teaching of history is not new in the field of Jewish education. It was informally taught in the cheder and yeshivah through the study of the Bible and Talmud, and after the development of modern schools the Biblical and the Second Temple periods were presented as separate subjects. In many schools general history was added to the curriculum when discussing the aforementioned periods. The entire spectrum of Jewish history began to be taught in Jewish schools with the spread of Zionism. The question of whether Jewish or general history should be emphasized in Jewish schools in Palestine was answered when the Herzlia

Gymnasium declared that Jewish history should be taught within the context of the history of the other nations.

The goals of history instruction in Israel are broad and idealistic. The secular schools call for it to give the student a vision that the culture of man is the result of the combined effort of the Jewish people and the nations of the world. It calls for a proper understanding of the roles played by all the nations in the development of this universal culture (especially by the Jewish people) and claims that one of the goals of such education must be to instill in the student the desire to want to work together with others for peace and brotherhood.[27]

Furthermore, the Ministry states that the teaching of history should implant in the heart of the student a consciousness of the nationhood of the Jewish people, strengthening the feeling of a shared destiny. The student should develop a love for the Jewish nation whereever its members are found and he should have spiritual bonds with all Jews. One of the more important goals of such instruction is the creating of a consciousness and sense of responsibility in the student toward the State of Israel, its needs and its future.

The final goal in the teaching of history is to provide the student with the necessary tools and knowledge so that he may look at society and its problems and understand them. Then he should hopefully use these tools in the attempt to develop solutions to the problems.

In order to achieve these goals the Ministry recommends that the student be given a general knowledge of the historical events that affected the Jewish people and the world in general. This general knowledge should stress the development and the interdependence of the events and the nations. The course of study should cover the present reality of Israeli society with its cultural and political aspects and the factors which led toiits development.

The religious schools follow basically the same goals except that they have added a theological outlook to the subject matter. One of the basic principles of this system is "to foster as a fundamental outlook the recognition that human history, and in particular, the history of the Jewish people (Am Yisrael), is the work of Providence." The religious curriculum states that Jewish nationhood is based on religious outlook and a single traditional mode of life as well as on a common fate. In discussing the State of Israel the curriculum's goals stress that the State is essential for the nation's continued survival (as does the secular curriculum) but also that the State itself is the result of God's providence, and any effort to serve it must be performed in consonance with the Torah and its commandments. Finally, the religious curriculum recognizes the need for the individual to examine society and to attempt to develop solutions to problems, but it stresses that there are limits to human understanding andaability.

The material covered in the curriculum is broad. The four years (three years if in a scientific or speciality track) spent studying history expose the student to the sweep of history from the pre-historic age to modern-day Israel. Contemporary events are sometimes discussed in class but generally they emerge in the "social hour," a type of freewheeling discussion period.

The ninth and tenth grade curricula call for the presentation of general and Jewish history from pre-historic times and the dawn of civilization through the Renaissance. In the three hours a week available to the ninth-grade teacher, general history (such as Greek, Roman, and Egyptian), Jewish history (the Conquest, First and Second Temple periods, etc.) and their relationship must be taught. In addition to secular history the tenth-grade student also studies history of Islam and the Jew's status in the Moslem world; a substantial amount of time is expended analysing the condition of Jewish life in Europe during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

In the eleventh grade students begin to specialize in specific tracks. Those students who take a scientific track complete their history requirement and cover world and Jewish history from the seventeenth century to the present. Students who opt for a humanistic or social studies track pursue the same material but in greater depth. Much of

twelfth grade (humanistic and social tracks) history concentrates on the Yishuv, the Zionist movement, and the world events related to their development.

It should be noted that the Ministry of Education has recently begun to revise the entire history curriculum. The proposed curriculum for the elementary schools has been accepted and is now in the process of being put into operation. The curriculum for the secondary schools is still being prepared. It has been accepted in principle by the secular schools but has not received the sanction of the religious school system.

Under a new course of study, which will not be based on a straight chronological presentation, the tenth through twelfth grades will focus on selections from a series of twenty-four subject areas. Only three of these areas will be required: The Revival of Jewish Nationalism and the Rise of the State; The Major Jewish Communities in Recent Generations; and The Arab-Israeli Conflict. To date only one of these required areas has had the learning material prepared for it (the Arab-Israeli Conflict); the second unit (Nationalism) is under discussion. Only two of the elective areas have had material prepared for them and two more subjects are now being prepared by the Ministry's staff.

Reform Judaism would be taught under this new system primarily in the required area of Major Jewish Communities where the class would discuss aspects of Jewish identity.

Under the current system Reform Judaism is taught in either the eleventh or twelfth grade. Some schools, particularly the religious schools, fail to cover the Movement at all. In the religious schools the avoidance of the subject is easily understandable as it is contrary to the system's explicit philosophy. Some secular schools may not approach the subject because of the teachers' or principals' opposition to it. In others the Movement is seen as an expendable subject because it is not covered by the bagrut. In other schools the pressures of time and the volume of material which has to be taught preclude any detailed examination of the subject. These schools generally expect the student to read the appropriate pages in the textbooks for an understanding of the phenomenon. However, some teachers find that Reform Judaism is sufficiently important to warrant discussion in the classroom and even to justify inviting a guest speaker to address the class. Several of the Israeli Reform rabbis noted that they had been invited to speak to high school classes in the major cities and on some Kibbutzim.

Chapter III
The Textbooks

The history of Reform Judaism, essentially in America, is seldom taught in depth in the Israeli secondary school. When asked if they had discussed Reform in their history classes, several Israeli high school students responded negatively. Rabbinic leaders of the Israeli Reform Movement mentioned that they believed that Reform was taught in the high schools but that it was approached in a negative manner. One Israeli-educated rabbi said that he remembered that as a child he left the classroom hating Reform and looking at it as something evil. One teacher in a religious high school said that he did not even discuss Reform when dealing with nineteenth century Germany.

In a survey prepared for the American Jewish Committee, Reuven Surkis notes that twenty-one high school teachers reported that they spent "a great deal of time" discussing the Reform Movement; forty-four teachers reported that they spent "some time" on the subject; and one hundred and forty-seven stated that they spent "hardly any or no time" in the classroom with the topic! Surkis' question dealt primarily with the American Reform Movement, and the responses reflect this fact. Yet the American Reform Movement is only one part of the entire movement, and if it is ignored, it is probable that the European branch is similarly overlooked. Furthermore, as Surkis noted in an interview, the terms "a lot of

time" and "hardly any or no time" are relative. Some teachers would consider an hour or two spent on the subject as more than sufficient while others would consider such an expenditure of time as totally inadequate. A Reform rabbi might feel that a week should be spent on German reformers while an Orthodox rabbi would feel that no time should be expended on such personalities.

If classroom time is limited and the subject matter of Jewish history so expansive that it cannot be adequately covered through the lecture-discussion method, how does the Israeli student learn it? The primary method used by the teacher to disseminate information, not touched upon in class, is the assignment of a textbook reading. The value of such a method without the reinforcement of discussions or lectures on the material is dubious. But it is the method used in Israel and in most modern educational systems.

This chapter will look at the various textbooks used in the Israeli secondary school system and attempt to relate what they present with regard to Reform Judaism. The books which have been examined are used in both State (mamlakhti) and State Religious (mamlakhti dati) schools. Moshe Auerbach's book has been written for the Agudat Yisrael schools; Yekutiel Friedner's work is used only in the State religious schools. The remaining works are used in both public systems.

Although the Reform Movement did not begin until the

nineteenth century, yet it may be informative and beneficial to an understanding of how the textbooks treat Reform if we look at how they view the period prior to it. How is the eighteenth century and the Enlightenment presented by the texts and their authors?

Dr. Moshe Auerbach, an Orthodox rabbi, sees theJJewish population prior to the Enlightenment as separated from the non-Jewish world. He notes that economic intercourse between the two societies was increasing, but that even so the Jews continued to follow their traditional way of life. "Therefore, the Haskalah Movement did not at first affect them."[2]

But, Auerbach tells us, the controversy between Rabbis Emden and Eybeschütz weakened the respect the younger generation had for the rabbinic leadership of the time and led to a "decline in the honor for the Torah."[3] This generation began to listen to ". . .men, scholars in their own eyes, who said that good was evil and evil was good, and thus tempted and seduced the young Jews."[4] Hoping to appoint themselves as the younger generation's leaders, these instigators "dared to degrade the scholars of Israel and their teaching."[5] These seducers were, I believe, the Maskilim, and the teaching they brought with them was the Enlightenment or the Haskalah. Auerbach does not look favorably on the Maskilim, because their teaching, which soon spread throughout Western Europe, endangered the "holy inheritance

[tradition] which protected Israel through the ages of the Diaspora."[6]

Whereas Auerbach spends little time discussing the socio-economic causes which may have led to the spread of the Haskalah and the desire for equal rights in the general society, Ephraim Shemueli does. He, too, notes that the Emden-Eybeschütz controversy led to a decline in the honor given to the rabbinate, and to the weakening of the formerly powerful effect of the cherem.[7] The younger generation no longer held the "old spiritual leadership" in esteem. But Shemueli stresses that there were other factors. The "Tolerated Jews" and the "Exceptional Jews" wanted equal rights not only from the state but also within the Jewish community itself.[8]

These special Jews had been touched by the general enlightenment which swept through Germany at that time. Shemueli tells us that business connections had exposed them to their non-Jewish neighbors and that non-Jewish customs, songs, and dances had begun to appear in the Jewish quarter and in the ghetto.[9] Some of these Jews hired non-Jewish teachers to teach their children foreign languages. "The breaking of the yoke of the Torah stemmed also from a desire to reform the Jewish community way of life."[10]

The term "breaking the yoke of the Torah" gives us an indication of Shemueli's Tendenz which, I believe, is traditional. This is further borne out by his use of the term

"God Fearers,"[11] or reverent, when he is discussing the orthodox community and its opposition to those who wished to leave the fold of traditional Judaism (a desire which, according to Shemueli, rose with the social and economic progress of the new time).

Drs. Michael Ziv and Jacob Toury consider the rise of the middle class in the general society to be a major cause for the economic improvement of the Jews. This, as well as the Jews' role in supplying armies and in manufacturing, led to greater contact between the Jew and non-Jew. These authors also see the Jewish life of the period as spiritually impoverished and empty. These factors led to the spread of the Enlightenment in the Jewish society.[12]

In the most detailed history of Jews, which is examined in this chapter, Solomon Horowitz informs us that the Jewish community's autonomy began to shrink during the period of the enlightened rulers. The community became a public body which was responsible for raising taxes and religious affairs. He notes, like the other writers, that the rabbinate suffered a decline during this time; and also that there was a general rise in the Jew's economic status.[13]

These external changes led to interal changes in the spiritual life of the Jew, according to Horowitz. "The solid faith in every letter of the Torah grew faint. . . ." The Shulchan Arukh and the cherem were no longer regarded as they had been in the past. Parents began to teach their

children the vernacular and some parents, though few, entrusted their children to non-Jewish teachers. Jewish and non-Jewish children associated with each other more and more frequently. Many of the younger generation not only began to resemble their gentile neighbors in appearance but also in actions. They and their friends would go for trips and consort in taverns.[14]

This ferment in the Jewish community brought about by the Enlightenment gave rise to a cultural crisis in Israel. This crisis, Horowitz states, "threatened to destroy the foundations of the nation's existence as a separate entity among the nations."[15] It is in this phrase that Horowitz presents a theme which will be present in many of the texts: the uniqueness and nationhood of the Jews. Like many of the authors discussed in the previous chapter, Horowitz frowns upon any process that threatens the nationhood of the Jewish people. He plays upon the student's strong feelings toward nationality by saying that such processes diminish independence of the Jewish people.

Shmuel Ettinger likewise describes the general trends in the Jewish community discussed above. He notes that by the end of the end of the seventeenth century Jews were beginning to resemble their non-Jewish neighbors.[16] And yet, even though contact between the two groups increased in the economic realm, their social and cultural lives still had "a definite religious nature" which kept them

separate. However, the walls between the two communities began to break down and the social intercourse increased between the upper-class Jew and the enlightened gentile. This contact led to a convergence of the two cultures, and eventually it filtered down to affect the general Jewish populace. Because of these increased contacts, Ettinger tells us, the Orthodox rabbis softened their traditional opinions on Christianity: ". . . Christianity was no longer idol worship"; it was now a "religionssuitable for gentiles." And in the Sephardic community the concepts of the chosenness of Israel, the coming of the Messiah, and the redemption were being questioned.[18] The Enlightenment's philosophy was rationalism. This type of thought pattern also affected the Jewish community. Many of the Jews who associated with the non-Jewish community began to deprecate the "historical values" of Judaism which they felt had become outmoded. And so by the end of the eighteenth century conversion from Judaism increased. But Ettinger points out that such a conversion was in reality caused not by faith or belief in Christian dogma but by encounter with the principle of the Enlightenment.[19]

The Mendelssohn and His Disciples

The Haskalah, or the Jewish Enlightenment, has been viewed both positively and negatively by Jews and Jewish historians. The textbooks reflect this dichotomy of views. Horowitz notes that Mendelssohn, one of the first enlighteners, is

both cursed and blessed by those who describe him and his work.[20] Regarding the Haskalah itself Ziv and Toury state:

> Until this day there are those who claim that the yielding of Western Jewry to the Enlightenment was one of the greatest tragedies which stirred up the Jews since the destruction of the Second Temple. But on the other hand there are those who see in the Haskalah the beginning of a rejuvenation of Judaism as accombined spiritual and politicalfforce.[21]

Perhaps the character most associated with the Haskalah was Moses Mendelssohn. Mendelssohn was born in Dessau and at a young age went to Berlin to continue studying with his teacher David Fränkel. Mendelssohn became the model of the "exceptional Jew." He was renowned in both gentile and Jewish circles.for both his personality and his philosophical discourse.

All the textbooksexamined indicate that Mendelssohn was an Orthodox Jew, or at least the follower of tradition. One text states that he went to Berlintto "drink from the wells of the Enlightenment," a statement which is erroneous.[22] Mendelssohn's philosophic beliefs are briefly presented in some of the texts. The presentation of these concepts is accurate as are some of the observations made by the authors about his philosophy. Auerbach, for instance, correctly notes that, while Mendelssohn himself followed the tradition, his disciples did not. Because he did not pay attention to the behavior of his students or the education of his sons, most of them became unfaithful to Judaism. Their failure to follow the tradition, they felt, was acceptable to

Mendelssohn's philosophical framework because the customs were not part of the "fundamentals of faith."[23]

Ziv and Toury note correctly that Mendelssohn's explanation that Judaism was a rational historical religion did not answer the question of why a Jew should follow the religious obligations of the tradition. Thus Mendelssohn's disciples began to abandon the customs and folkways of Judaism. Furthermore Mendelssohn's interpretation gave his students the opportunity to strip Judaism of its nationalistic characteristics. The separation of the religious from the national paved the way for one to leave the Jewish society and enter the mainstream of life.[24] As noted previously, the act of a Jew leaving the Jewish society is looked at negatively by Israeli high school youth. Thus, the overall reaction of the Israeli student to Mendelssohn's philosophy would be unfavorable.

The view which Mendelssohn presented in his book Jerusalem, stated that coercion should only be used by the state; this view, according to Ettinger, led to the weakening of the autonomous Jewish community.[25] This too would probably be looked at negatively by the Israeli, since the autonomous Jewish community ensured the survival of the Jews as a separate nation.

Mendelssohn's goal was that of the Haskalah. He desired to break down the barriers that separated the Jew from the non-Jewish society in which he lived.[26] Mendelssohn and the

other Maskilim believed that through educational reform this goal could be achieved. One of the first attempts at educational reform was his translation of the Bible and his accompanying commentary.

All of the textbooks reviewed dealt with this topic. Auerbach notes that the Biur was a means to teach German to the Jewish masses and for this reason it roused the opposition of the rabbis. He notes, also, that the younger generation who used the Biur began to accept its explanations, which for the most part followed rabbinic tradition, as the true meaning of the text. And therefore they began to disparage the explanations of the rabbis.[27]

Ziv and Toury apprise the reader that the translation had two purposes. Mendelssohn hoped to renew the bonds between the German Jew and the Bible and to spread the German language among the Jews. The words used here by the authors in describing the second goal are interesting to note: "the penetration of the German language into Jewish homes."[28] Is the word חדירה a negative or positive word? I believe that it is negative; it gives the impression that something unnecessary was forced upon the Jews. Yet these authors also give the Biur a positive interpretation, since they claim that in Eastern Europe it helped spread classical Hebrew.

The most negative view presented by a text regarding Mendelssohn's translation comes from Yekutiel Friedner. Friedner, an Orthodox Jew, looks at the translation as sole-

ly an attempt to teach German to the Jews:

> He [Mendelssohn] translated the Torah into literary German, a language which only the educated understood. Generally the purpose of a translation is to aid in the understanding of the Torah. Here the goal was different. The Jews of Germany still knew the Torah well. It was only literary German that they did not know.[29]

Mendelssohn attempted to reform Jewish education and society by eliminating Yiddish, teaching German, and by bridging the gap between Jew and non-Jew.[30] If such actions are seen as inappropriate, what is the view taken of his disciples? Here again the textbooks' reactions vary.

Auerbach claims that Mendelssohn's disciples did not want to "find a way to unite Judaism with the Enlightenment," but rather wanted "to place the Enlightenment in the stead of belief in the Torah of God."[31] According to Auerbach, the rabbis opposed the activities of Wessely (whom he refers to as a good disciple of Mendelssohn[32]) because of his tendency towards the Enlightenment, and because of his support for the Edict of Toleration issued by Joseph II. Here Auerbach lauds the Orthodox establishment by stating that they understood the true meaning of the Kaiser's plan and that Wessely and the Maskilim did not. The rabbis feared that the reforms proposed by the government would undermine the traditional base of Judaism. "It stood to destroy Talmudic education and to turn the young generation into uneducated Jews."[33] Auerbach states that the schools which were established under this system fulfilled the fears of the rabbis.

If Auerbach views Wessely in a partially favorable light, he disdains Homberg. Homberg, according to this author, not only supported the government's Edict but took it upon himself to educate a generation which was distant from Torah, willing to assimilate, give up its religion, and convert to Christianity.

But it is Friedländer whom Auerbach disrespects the most. "In Berlin David Friedländer caused havoc with Judaism." The school he founded taught the children in such a manner "that they would grow distant from Judaism and resemble the gentiles. The graduates of this school later became the leaders of assimilation in Germany. . . ."[35]

Mendelssohn, Ziv and Toury inform us, distanced himself from the Edict of Toleration "because he saw in it a great temptation to convert."[36] But his students, as already noted, did not. In describing Wessely's pamphlet, Divre Shalom v'Emet, which supported the Edict, the authors state: "He even suggested that the scope of education be narrowed."[37] The key word in understanding the authors' feelings is found in the use of the word "even," which gives Wessely a radical, destructive image.

The schools established by the Maskilim are frowned upon by Ziv and Toury. They are seen as tools for the assimilation of the Jewish community into German society. This is especially true of the schools in Prussia, which the authors feel helped pave the way for the conversion of the younger generation.

Friedner's textbook is the most critical of Mendelssohn's followers and their activities. He claims that the Maskilim saw the learning of secular subjects only as a key for entering into general society. Their demands that Hebrew learning be continued in the schools hid their desire for assimilation and thus made the results of this movement even more devastating.[38]

In discussing Wessely's Divre Shalom v'Emet, which supports Haskalah and the Edict, Friedner tells us that it could be called "shav" (שׁוא). Shav in Hebrew means nothingness or falsehood.[39] Thus his pro-Orthodox bias is again brought to the fore.

The true purpose of the Edict, according to Friedner, was to bring about the assimilation of the Jews. The Austrian government of the 18th century hoped to eliminate the singularity of the Jews and to change their life style.[40] The Edict was just one more way of achieving this goal. Thus Friedner looks negatively upon any one who supported such policies. Hence he opposes Homberg and Wessely.

Friedländer is also attacked by Friedner. He states that, after Friedländer failed in his request to Teller, "he began to work in Reform." After 1812, Friedländer attempted to change the life style of the Jews and the order of the service.

In 1778, Friedländer established a school for the poor, which, according to Friedner, taught German in addition to

Hebrew and a little Bible; pupils in the upper grades principally studied secular subjects. The Oral Law was not studied. (This, considering Friedner's religious outlook, was an educational travesty.) Friedner informs us that from this school "men went out and completed the laboroof the Maskilim, either by their active conversion to Christianity or by their activity in the area of Reform. . ..." The purpose of Reform was "to turn Judaism into Christianity."[41]

Finally Friedner disparages the Maskilim because of the persecution of the Orthodox. He claims that the Maskilim had the government of Westphalia pass laws which prevented Jews from praying in synagogues other than Reform ones. While it is true that Jacobson as head of the Consistory prohibited minyanim, the charge that he instituted "hunts"[42] against Jews who studied traditional texts and worshipped in the traditional way is an exaggeration.

Shmuel Ettinger also does not regard Mendelssohn's disciples positively. He believes that their activities attacked the principle of Talmud Torah, which had been a time-honored value in Judaism. He, also, feels that their schools were instruments for assimilation.[43]

In discussing the rabbinic response to Wessely's tract, Ettinger states:

> In essence the reactions were principally against the audacity of this layman, who was not a rabbi or a Jewish scholar, and who gave himself the authority to adjudicate the problems of Israel.[44]

This description relays a slightly negative view of Wessely.

It is not clear if the rabbis considered Wessely an audacious layman or if it is Ettinger.

Homberg is also portrayed negatively by Ettinger. Ettinger claims that the school system which Homberg administered in Austria was "a trap."[45] By labeling the school system as a "trap" Ettinger has made it appear that Homberg was involved in anti-Jewish schemes.

Both the Maskilim and the Orthodox community called upon the secular government for support of their mutually incompatible goals. Ettinger stresses that the Maskilim used government pressure. He explains that the Enlighteners turned to governments for aid when they ran into opposition from the rabbis and the masses over even simple reforms. This turn to the government alienated the Maskilim from the mass of Jewry.[46] The negative image is further enhanced by Ettinger's noting that governments wished to weaken the autonomy of the Jewish community.[47] Thus, like Ziv and Toury, Ettinger has us react negatively to those who aid non-Jewish forces.

Religious reforms, which to this point had not been discussed by the authors, are given a brief treatment by Ettinger. He informs us that the "first Maskilim suggested changes in the tradition and religious customs as a first step to change the way of life of the Jews."[48] By the 1790s, Ettinger tells us, there was a feeling in the Haskalah movement that there was no reason to observe the commandments.[49] This view led to the further alienation of the masses from the

Maskilim and also to the famous Friedländer request to Teller.

The Westphalian reforms which took place in public worship in 1807 were done with the support and sanction of the civil government. Ettinger informs us that in 1812 Friedländer suggested that the prayers be recited in German, and that the remembrance of Zion in Jerusalem should be removed from the prayer book, since Prussia was a Jewish homeland, and since it was incumbent upon the Jews to pray for its wellbeing. While such a statement is based on fact, it leads to a negative image of early Reform. The Israeli who is extremely nationalistic looks at the anti-nationalistic Friedländer with disapproval.

Shlomo Horowitz also sees Friedländer in an unfavorable light. He regards his offer to Teller as an act of treason towards the Jewish people.[50] Friedländer, according to him, was a member of a group of Maskilim who, in exchange for equality, were willing to "pay any price including the giving up of the positive precepts, the Hebrew language, and the hope for redemption."[51] Homberg was also a member of this group.[52]

The second group of Maskilim, which included men like Wessely and Dubnow, were men rooted in Judaism. They were "attached to Judaism with all their hearts but they wanted to cleanse and purify it from its dross and add all the good and pleasant of the secular world to it."[53]

Wessely, however, as previously noted, supported the Edict of Toleration. This was why he wrote his polemic, according to Horowitz: to dissipate the fears of the Orthodox who rightly felt that the Edict was given for the purpose of assimilation.[54]

Horowitz's text is an example of the importance of language. In discussing Wessely's tract Horowitz states that the pamphlet stirred up opposition in the camp of the Orthodox, "which saw in its words definite heresy."[55] There is no doubt left in the reader's mind that it is the rabbis and not Horowitz who feel that the work is heretical. This is not like the statement in Ettinger where the question must be asked: Did the rabbis frown upon Wessely or was it the author of the textbook?

What then is the general impression of the Enlightenment given by the texts? The Orthodox texts, such as Auerbach and Friedner, seem to imply that with the spread of the Haskalah the knowledge of Hebrew declined and assimilation increased.[56] Both of these have negative effects on the Israeli reader. Furthermore, they feel that the Haskalah's destructive activities and the subsequent emancipation changed the organizational structure of the Jewish community and removed its autonomy.

> The Jews ceased to be a closed autonomous society. They associated with the gentiles and thus it was not difficult for them to break the yoke of the Torah and the Commandments.[57]

But even writers like Ziv and Toury hold that Haskalah brought with it an increase in assimilation, mixed marriages and conversions.[58] This negative evaluation is reinforced by the authors' claim that there was a trend in the Haskalah to separate from Jewish tradition andnnationhood of Israel. But these authors also see a positive result of the Enlightenment: the revitalization of the language and renewal of interest in the nation's past, both of which served as a foundation for national revival and Zionism.[59]

Horowitz sees the Haskalah as a major change in the history of the Jews. It symbolizes the end of the difference between the nations and the Jews; the freeing of the individual from community pressure; the end of the rigid rule of the rabbinate and the change in Jews' life style.[60]

Ettinger sees the movement as hated by the masses but important because:

> It uncovered the root of the serious problem, which was for the time being the problem of a significant part of the nation, and afterward for the whole nation--How can a Jew continue to exist as a Jew in a society based on universal rights and obligations? How can a Jewish community exist in a society which is not divided into corporations, that is, classes and strata each of which has its own laws and customs?[61]

Thus the Maskilim attempted to find solutions to the problems of state service, separate language and different ideals that separated the Jews from the general society.[62]

The Paris Sanhedrin

The Paris Sanhedrin which Napoleon called into session in

1807 is important to this chapter since most of the texts stress that its members were non-Orthodox Jews.[63] They also show that the Orthodox opposed the Sanhedrin as well as the changes which it proclaimed.[64]

Jacob Katz and Moshe Hershko state that Napoleon called the Sanhedrin in order to eliminate the differences between Jew and non-Jew.[65] The members of this body, they report, were either rabbis who held positions in the large communitiesoor were rich householders.[66] In describing the head of the Sanhedrin Katz and Hershko state: "The Chairman of the Sanhedrin was attached to Judaism with all his heart . . . ."[67] But their overall discussion of the Sanhedrin is not favorable to it. They seem to view it as a rubber stamp body for Napoleon and his wishes. Katz and Hershko state that the body fulfilled the emperor's desires and declared that a Jew is still a Jew even if he married out of the faith.[68] Though this is true according to Jewish law, the Israeli would see such a statement as negative, since the act of mixed marriage is looked upon by the Israeli public as an act of betrayal against the Jewish people.

One aspect that both Horowitz and Ettinger bring out with regard to the Sanhedrin is that it was one of the first times when Judaism was viewed as a religion and not a nation.[69] This view later became a major concept in early Reform and is associated with assimilationism by the Israeli.

The Rise of the Reform Movement

Why was there a desire for religious reform among the

Jews in the late 18th and early 19th century? One of the primary causes was the Jews' desire to achieve equal rights and be accepted into the mainstream of society.

Katz and Hershko correctly note that the barriers between the Jew and the gentile began to crumble and that many Jews desired to resemble their neighbors externally. In doing so they ceased to practice the accepted customs of their community and began to discard their religion. Many of these Jews became ashamedoof their Judaism and attempted to escape it by conversion.[70]

But, Katz and Hershko continued, there was also ferment among those who decided to stay in the community. The Western states in which they lived had already accepted the principle of freedom of conscience for the individual with respect to religious beliefs. The leaders of the community were disturbed because they discovered that a contradiction existed between the accepted prayers and customs of the community and their own aspirations. No longer did they believe in the prayers for the redemption of the people by theirreturn to Zion. Therefore, they suggested eliminating this concept from the prayerbook.[71]

Friedner thinks that the Haskalah gave rise to two different paths. The first path led to conversion and the second path led to Reform. Many Jews who followed the first path did so not out of philosophical or ideological commitments but in order to be accepted by the general society. According to

Friedner, such Jews were willing to "betray" their nation and to exchange their religion for a "bowl of lentils."[72]

Friedner's animosity towards early Reform is best demonstrated by the following statement:

> Those who travelled the first path were cut off from the living tree of the nation; they converted. Those who travelled thessecond path attempted to wound the tree itself, to destroy it and uproot it by changes. Their goal was to liken Judaism to the form of the Christian religion. These are the men of Reform.[73]

Friedner believes that the Reform Movement did not reform any aspect of Judaism but rather destroyed whatever it touched. He states, ". . . in the end they arrived at the situation where they did not know what else to destroy or, in their own distorted language, what 'to reform'."[74]

The general impression given by the textbooks, then, is that Reform grew out of the Jews' desire to be accepted by the general society and to be emancipated. The reformers hoped that the revision and modernization of the tradition would help bring them full citizenship and social acceptance.

The First Religious Reforms

Israel Jacobson was the first Jewish leader who can be associated with the institution of actual reforms. In 1801, he opened a school in Seesen where he introduced a Reform service. In 1810, he instituted a Confirmation Service at the new synagogue in the same city. But by 1815, the hasty

reforms he had introduced in Westphalia had been repealed and he had moved to Berlin. There he began a service with revised prayers in his own home. He also utilized a choir and a sermon in the vernacular in this home worship service. His hope was to make the prayers more pleasant and civilized, and to remove some of the distinctions between the Jews and the gentiles. But most importantly he hoped to attract those members of the younger generation who had left the synagogue back to Judaism.[75] A service similar to his was instituted in a second Berlin home.

The Orthodox community opposed these services and asked the government to prohibit worship anywhere but the established synagogues. It is interesting to note that no text refers to the Orthodox community's request to the government. Horowitz informs us that the reformed services were prohibited because the government sensed a revolutionary deistic trend in them.[76]

A common theme stressed in analyzing Jacobson's work is that he used government pressure to institute the Westphalian reforms. Another theme is that he desired, as did other reformers, to harmonize Jewish ritual with Christian forms. We have seen this in Friedner's statement but it can also be found in other texts. Ettinger writes:

> Jacobson aspired to adapt, as much as possible, the external ritual forms to those of the Protestant Church.[77]
>
> They reformers wanted to harmonize the forms of the synagogue to the gentile church and they even imitated them by the installation of an organ in the house of prayer. . . .[78]

In 1818, the Hamberg Temple was dedicated and services were held utilizing a new prayerbook, an organ, and choir. Prayers were recited both in the vernacular and Hebrew; a sermon was delivered in German. And though the number of worshippers at the Temple was small, the Temple nevertheless stirred up a major controversy in the Jewish community.[79]

Of the textbooks which discuss the Hamberg Temple only Ettinger gives it an unbiased treatment. He notes that the prayerbook had more extensive changes than the Berlin service on which it was based. It eliminated references to the coming of the Messiah and the return to Zion. He notes also that almost the entire rabbinate opposed the Temple reforms. Surprisingly, he states that the point of the controversy was not the reforms, which had some basis in halacha, but rather the reformers themselves. "The main anger was against the young maskilim who dared to take the authority upon themselves to teach halacha and to change the laws and customs of Israel, which were sanctified by the holy tradition."[80]

Horowitz states that the controversy over the Hamberg Temple did not prevent "the triumphal march of Reform," that even though the rabbis had castigated the reformers, calling them "scoundrels," other cities followed the example of Hamberg.[81] But such statements are not value judgements by Horowitz. It is in his statement, "this was the first Reform synagogue which resembled the ritual of the Lutheran Church,"[82] that he makes an unequivocal value judgement. By

comparing the Temple to the Church, Horowitz creates a negative impression of Reform for the high school youth.

Friedner's anti-Reform bias has already been established. In describing the Hamberg Temple he refers to the services and reforms as arbitrary and to the Reformers as "scoundrels." He echoes the same attitude which the Orthodox exhibited in their polemical literature.[83]

Finally, Katz and Hershko give an unfavorable view of the Temple and its reformers when they state that "the great leaders of Jewry recognized that the Reformers utterly strayed from the path of Judaism."[84] Such a phrase leads the reader to believe that it is an uncontested fact that the Reformers were wrong and the Orthodox rabbis were right in opposing their views.

The Rabbinical Conferences

The first stage of Reform Judaism was concerned with external reforms in such areas as prayers, ritual and personal customs. During its second phase its ideology began to develop. This development took place in an unsystematic manner. Perhaps it is because of this lack of definite goals that the Reform Movement is so misunderstood in Israel.

For example, Ziv and Toury note that the assimilationists were very willing to change Jewish laws and customs. In order to support these changes they developed the concept of the Mission of Israel.

> The supporters of assimilation claimed that the mission of Israel was to spread the truth of the

> Torah and the morality of the Prophets among the nations; and therefore it is incumbent upon them to be dispersed among the gentiles.[85]

Immediately following their discussion on the assimilationists, the authors introduce Reform Judaism, stating that it was founded to harmonize Judaism with its environment. This juxtaposition of movements supports the feeling that Reform was assimilationist.

The radical position of the assimilationists described above was, in fact, only one of many which were taken in the Reform camp at this stage of its history. Moderates and conservatives argued over mild reforms and both groups argued with the radicals over major ones. Even the radicals could not agree with each other. In discussing the Berlin Reform Congregation, which was founded in 1845, Horowitz notes that Holdheim, one of the radical reformers, called for "the need to reform the reforms." He also mentions that the radical innovations of the Berlin Congregation did not take hold in Germany, but that they did strike roots in America.[86]

A primary reason for the wide range of views and practices in the movement at this time was the lack of a central authority. To combat this chaos, anarchy and divisiveness, a series of rabbinical conferences was held in Brunswick (1844), Frankfurt (1845), and Breslau (1846).

The textbooks present basically two views on the conferences. Horowitz, who mistakenly calls them synods, states that they were called into session to debate seriously different

questions in the controversy and to agree on a way to achieve the needed reforms.[87]

Ettinger also states that the Reformers looked to the conferences as a source of authority. Furthermore, one of the purposes of the first conference was to confirm the decision of the Paris Sanhedrin.[88] Horowitz and Ettinger both note that the prestige of the conferences declined when Frankel left the second conference protesting the debate over the use of Hebrew in the liturgy.

Contrary to Horowitz and Ettinger, Friedner gives an extremely biased view of the conferences. He refers to them as the "councils of the wicked," drawing upon the symbolism of the first Psalm. In discussing the Orthodox rabbinate in opposition to the rabbinical conferences, Friedner further compares the Reformers to the Karaites and states that they were never to enter "the congregation of God."[89]

The Major German Reformers

The Rabbinic Conferences and the spread of Reform were made possible by the appearance of university-trained rabbis who were open to religious reforms. Perhaps the most famous of these Reformers were Abraham Geiger and Samuel Holdheim. (Zachariah Frankel, generally considered the founder of the Conservative Movement, is regarded by the textbooks as a Reformer who separated himself from the Reform Movement and the radical changes which were proposed by the Conferences.)

Abraham Geiger, who may be seen as the father of the Reform Movement, is portrayed by Horowitz as a moderate who opposed arbitrary changes in Jewish practices. He therefore wanted to find some scientific basis on which to make these changes. For him this basis was the historical study of Judaism and its customs.[70]

Horowitz presents Geiger as an ideal example of the new generation of rabbis who joined Jewish tradition and general culture together. While Geiger had radical ideas, according to Horowitz he did not put them into practice in his congregation. Horowitz also presents him as a German of Mosaic persuasion.[91] He does the latter in a factual manner without a disparaging tone.

If Horowitz presents Geiger's image neutrally, he fails to do so with Samuel Holdheim. Holdheim, according to this text, was not only more radical than Geiger, but he lacked the "depth of thought and noblemindedness" of Geiger. His philosophy caused revolution in Jewish life. Horowitz notes that Holdheim served as an example for other radical reformers. His negative attitude reflects itself in the adjective he uses to describe Holdheim's philosophies, e.g., "destructive."[92]

Ziv and Toury only briefly discuss Holdheim and Geiger. They refer to the latter as a moderate reformer. The former they call a radical reformer and state that he wished to equate the laws and worship of Judaism with the practices of the mainstream society.[93] Friedner does not discuss these men in his

presentation.

Wissenschaft des Judentums

Concurrent with the rise of Reform Judaism there appeared in Western Europe another Jewish movement called Hochmat Yisrael, Wissenschaft des Judentums, or the Science of Judaism. Many of the leaders of this latter movement were involved in reform of Jewish religious practices. Some of the scholars, like Zunz, though favorably disposed toward Reform in the initial stages, later separated themselves from Reform efforts, preferring immersion in their scholarly endeavours. Others, like Geiger, were very much a part of both movements and left contributions to each.

Ettinger, in his textbook, tells us that following the Congress of Vienna in 1814 Germany entered a reactionary period. The time was marked by an increase in anti-semitic literature from the educated classes. The proliferation of such literature led the Maskilim to believe that the reason for the Jews' non-acceptance into European society was that non-Jews "did not know the history or the true essence of Judaism." Thus there arose two phases of Jewish reaction to the period after the Congress of Vienna. The first attempted to adjust Jewish customs and practices to those of the general culture. The second wished to "show the 'beauty of Shem in the tents of Yaphet,' that is, to present to the nations the riches of Jewish spiritual creativity." In order to achieve this goal it was felt necessary to institute a

scientific search into the sources of the customs and literature of Judaism. It was this search which served as the foundation for the scientific study of Judaism.[94]

Horowitz states that Hochmat Yisrael was a twin sister of Reform. It developed because the Reformers wanted to change the complexion of Judaism. The scientific study of the religion would enable them to determine what they should accept or reject from the past. It was the hope of these men that such study would help bring the younger generation back to Judaism by showing them that Judaism was not a stagnant religion without any beauty. Like Ettinger, Horowitz informs us that the supporters of this movement were also driven by forces outside of the Jewish community, namely, the desire to be accepted by the general society, and hence they wished to spread an understanding of Judaism.[95]

Ziv and Toury, and likewise Katz and Hershko, stress the external pressures which Wissenschaft attempted to alleviate. Katz and Hershko state that the scholars hoped to "seal the mouths of Judaism's detractors."[96] Ziv and Toury also reiterate the claim that one of its prime goals was to help the scholars find support and a defense for Judaism in the battle for equal rights. But they state it was also to help prove that Judaism was changeable and adaptable to the exigencies of time.[97] This last explanation repeats Horowitz's contention that the desire for reform was one of the prime motivations for the development of this phenomenon.

Returning to Ettinger, he too devotes attention to the relation between Reform and Wissenschaft. He informs us that Leopold Zunz wrote his work, Sermons in Israel, to show the government that there was no Jewish basis to its prohibition of edifying sermons in the synagogue. The Jews had always utilized the sermon, even the vernacular. In summarizing Zunz, Ettinger states: "Despite the tendencies of Zunz's studies they have not lost their scientific importance. . . ."[98] How should one read this statement? Is its connotation positive or negative? I believe it is the latter. The reader is being told that in spite of Zunz's reasons for undertaking Jewish scholarship the results of his work had some positive value. The directions and tendencies Ettinger is referring to is Zunz's early desire for reform.

Geiger, according to Ettinger, gave Hochmat Yisrael new energy. He combined his desire for reform with scientific study in order to find an objective basis for the former. By analyzing and investigating the historical development of Judaism, he hoped to discover its essence. Geiger's view, we are told, did not strengthen appreciation of the tradition but it did provide the stimulus for critical study of the history and literature of Israel.[99]

An entirely negative approach to Wissenschaft is presented by Friedner.[100] He holds that some of the "assimilationists," who were struck by the national romantic spirit of the times, "remembered that they belonged to a nation with

a glorious past. . . ." And so in order to remain equal to the non-Jewish community which was investigating its own past, the Jews began to write their own history.

> But, when they began to concern themselves with the history of our nation they saw that every page of our history said: 'Keep the Torah and the Commandments.' . . . But instead of our historical truths, which were faithfully handed down from generation to generation by our holy scholars, they introduced fraud, distortions, into their books--heretical and deceitful words.[101]

Friedner makes only a slight distinction among the scholars. "Not all of those who occupied themselves, during this time, with the history of our people were unfaithful to the Torah and the Commandments. There were among them several who followed the path of God and did not truly arrive at heresy. But even they distorted the facts and undermined foundations."[102]

The alleged distortion of facts, for Friedner, is serious but it is not the prime reason he attacks such scientific study. His prime motivation for disavowing Wissenschaft is that it misleads the people and causes them to stray from the orthodox way of life. "Not only did they [the scholars] sin, but they caused others to sin. And not only did they cause destruction in their own day but even today the poison of this heresy penetrates the history books of secular writers."[103]

Our overall impression is that the treatment given to Wissenschaft des Judentums by the textbooks is accurate,

stressing that its formation was a result of both external and internal forces. However, the emphasis on its being a reaction to the antisemitic literature of the nineteenth century may lead the Israeli youth to see it as another attempt by the Jew to pave the way toward assimilation.

European Reform: A Writer's Overview

Perhaps the best method of summarizing the manner in which Israeli textbooks present Reform Judaism in Europe is to offer Horowitz's conclusions on the Movement. Horowitz feels that the price paid for emancipation was high, for it led to the Jewish community's imitating their neighbors and thus blurring its own Jewish image. It meant assimilating, losing its autonomy, reforming its religion until it could no longer be recognized, and losing members through conversion. He tells us that Judaism would have, in all likelihood, disappeared had there not been the rise of antisemitism and Zionism.[104]

Horowitz notes that Reform spread through Germany "building new synagogues upon the ruins of the old." But even as it gained victory it was being weakened. The spread of liberalism gave the Jews civil rights which in turn robbed Reform of one of its essential propelling forces: the desire to reform religion so that Jews would be looked at as equals.[105] Also, in the course of time, the thinkers who had been the

architects of the Movement faded away and were replaced by "little foxes," laymen who were ignorant of religious matters and who were concerned only with the external ritual.[106] (It is interesting to note that the term "little foxes," which comes from the Song of Songs, is a derogatory term, thus giving later Reform a more negative appearance.)

In presenting his summary of Reform, Horowitz makes the following observations: Reform was different from the Protestant Reformation in that it was not a rejection of papal authority or dogmas. The movement was created with the practical goal of giving Judaism a form which would "endear" it to the general society, facilitate emancipation, and thus help impede the conversion of the younger generation.[107]

He holds further that Reform succeeded only in a small area (Friedner believes it was a big city Movement) and that where it did take root it had much opposition. Like Friedner, Horowitz relates that Reform was an upper class phenomenon. He further contends that, except for a brief time in the 1830s, the Movement was unconcerned with the true problems of Judaism, namely, the principle of faith, and concerned itself only with external matters. Though Reform managed to save many from conversion, it lacked the spiritual richness of the old Judaism and was not strong enough to sustain the spirit of the younger generation who did not convert. What it gave to this generation was a Judaism without nation-

ality, weak, and subject to philosophical attacks.[108]

Horowitz's summary ends on a disparaging note. He reiterates his feeling that the prime reason Reform started was to enable the Jews to receive civil rights. He believes that the Jews of this period felt that anything which prohibited the achieving of this goal was superficial.[109]

The author does note, however, that in the United States Reform played a more positive role. There the Movement enabled Jews to withstand assimilation and to plant new roots in a new continent without forgetting their Jewish rights, even if the Reform which took hold in the United States was more radical than its European counterpart.[110]

Reform Judaism in America

The number of German Jews who migrated to the United States increased dramatically after the continental revolutions of 1848. Many of these Jews were disposed toward Reform Judaism, as were some of the young rabbis who also immigrated to the New World. But religious reform was not new to the American Jewish community. Already in 1824, the Charleston community had experimented with some aesthetic changes in the synagogue service such as using the vernacular in prayers and hymns and praying with uncovered heads. But this congregation existed only for a short period of time. Most reforms which took place in the United States occurred in the German congregations in a slow, unsystematic manner. Congregations elimi-

nated prayers such as those for the sacrifices or the Babylonian academies from their rituals because they felt they were unnecessary.

However, around the middle of the nineteenth century, the reforms initiated by the rabbis became more common and extreme. Those of the more radical congregations came to be known as Classical Reform. It was not until the second half of the twentieth century that Reform began to return to tradition, albeit in a modified form and with a definite Reform philosophic approach. But at no time was there a uniformity of opinion in American Reform Judaism.

The Movement contained those who believed in Biblical criticism and those who opposed it; Zionists and anti-nationalists were members of the movement's constituent organizations, and members of each group espoused their own views. The platforms of 1885 and 1937 served as guiding principles for the American movement but were not binding on any Reform rabbi or Jew.

Only three of the textbooks reviewed for this paper dealt in any detail with American Reform Judaism. The other texts either ignored the subject or covered it in a sentence or two. Friedner for example notes that after 1840 the number of German Jews emigrating to the United States increased and among them were many reformers. According to him, the reformers found the United States to be open area in which to spread their "destructive work" because there was no tradi-

tion of community or the study of Torah, and so it was easy to "disseminate their false ideas and to establish Reform synagogues in the nation's cities."[111]

Ettinger tells us only that the Reform Movement spread in the United States especially after the failure of the revolutions of 1848, that in 1869 the first conference of Reform rabbis was held in this country, and that the Board of Jewish Delegates joined the Reform movement.[112]

Ziv and Toury report that the Reform Movement was one of three trends in the United States and that it was distinguished by its desire to make changes in the Jewish way of life. But they also inform us that the other branches of American Jewry likewise made changes and that the differences between the three progressively diminished. One interesting comment these authors make is that American Jewry would probably have totally assimilated had it not been for the massive immigration of East European Jews which began in the 1880s.[113]

Horowitz begins his discussion of Reform Judaism in America with Isaac Mayer Wise, who, he informs us, immigrated in 1848 (in reality 1846), and who became the dominant personality in American Judaism during the last century. Wise dedicated himself to the creation of an American Israel, "a Judaism rooted in the new continent and adapted to its way of life." Noting Wise's skills as a teacher, preacher and organizer, Horowitz states that he began to bring his desire to fruition after he was appointed to be the rabbi in a Reform synagogue in Cincinnati, Ohio, a city which became and still remains

the center for Reform Judaism in the United States![114]

Wise, according to Horowitz, originally favored moderate reforms, and it was in this spirit that he issued the prayer-book, Minhag America. But in time he became more radical and eventually aroused the opposition of Leeser and of the Orthodox community. Because of this opposition to his reforms, "all of his attempts to establish a general organization for all American congregations were for nought." But Wise did succeed in founding the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Hebrew Union College which he headed and which produced an entire generation of rabbis and community leaders.[115]

Continuing his discussion of Reform in America, Horowitz notes that Wise's movement wanted to expand and include all American Jewry. The movement did not achieve this goal because it became increasingly more radical and fell under the leadership of men such as Einhorn, "who was expelled from the rabbinate and forced to flee first from Germany and then from Hungary because of his revolutionary ideas concerning the religion of Israel. . . ." But in the United States his ideas found acceptance.[116]

Horowitz tells us that Einhorn, who brought his opposition to the Talmud to these shores and who revived the argument over the meaning of the Messiah, had his work continued by Kaufmann Kohler. Kohler, who succeeded Wise as the president of the Cincinnati seminary, believed that American Jewry

had to shed its "Oriental form" and become American in its spirit and appearance. He felt that Hebrew should not be used in the prayer service since it was not understood by the mass of American Jews. Kohler also called for the elimination of the prayers for the "Return to Zion" from the liturgy since they no longer represented the beliefs of the people.[117]

Einhorn and Kohler were the forces behind the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh Conferences, even though Wise was the chairman of the latter. Horowitz holds that under their leadership the Conferences abandoned the "fathers of Reform," who had claimed that Judaism had no fundamental beliefs or dogmas, by declaring that there were certain principles which they and Judaism held to be true. Horowitz summarizes the Pittsburgh Platform--which he quotes Kohler as saying was the "Declaration of Independence of American Judaism"--and tells us that it led the rabbis who wanted moderate reforms to separate and establish the Conservative movement.[118]

Horowitz does not return to the Reform Movement in this volume of his text. He notes in volume III that the Pittsburgh Platform had stripped Judaism of its nationhood, and left it "pale and weak" by removing the positive precepts, so that it was like Protestantism in Jewish clothes, no longer appropriate for Reform which now had in its ranks descendants of East European Jewry. Thus in 1937 the Columbus Platform was adopted.[119]

The Columbus Platform, Horowitz tells us, showed the shift of the Reform Movement and its rabbis toward Zionism and their return to rabbinic ritual. He notes that Stephen Wise and Abba Hillel Silver, and soon most reform rabbis, became Zionists. After the founding of the State of Israel this change in Reform attitude grew even stronger. But Horowitz also notes--correctly--that there were some adherents of Reform who opposed these new trends and who remained anti-Zionistic, wishing to preserve Reform in its "purity."[120]

Horowitz briefly discusses the Sunday School, which he considers a Reform phenomenon. Such schools meet on days when the student is not enrolled in regular school. We are told that when the schools first started the children were taught how to read Hebrew, a little Bible, and history. The instruction, Horowitz continues, was in English, and in the "spirit of assimilation." After the Columbus Platform, the atmosphere of this type of school improved, according to the author, though its limited amount of time still did not allow it to be very successful.[121]

Overall, Horowitz treats the Reform Movement in the States in a fairly impartial manner. He does, as noted above, make some factual errors. For instance, he states that Stephen Wise was the rabbi of Temple Emanu-El in New York, which is not the case.

However, Horowitz demonstrates to the reader that the Movement did have some very prominent Zionists in it (Silver and Wise) even as it had a strong anti-Zionistic trend. One

point of criticism in this regard is that he does not note that other factions of American Jewry also had their anti-Zionistic components. One other difficulty arises in that the Columbus Platform is discussed in the third volume of a three-volume set where it is likely to be passed over by the student since it is printed in a subsection of a chapter, and in extremely small print.

Shimshon Kirschenbaum is the author of two textbooks used in both types of Israeli high schools. The time span covered by the books is from the end of the nineteenth century to the present. Because of this there is little discussion of Reform Judaism in Europe. In one text, in fact, the only mention of European Reform is a statement which says that, because the liberal trends in Judaism had taken over the control of the Jewish community, the Jewish community had been weakened.[122] This same text, which is an abridgement of Kirschenbaum's History of Israel in Our Times, mentions the Conservative and Reconstructionist movements when discussing American Judaism but ignores the Reform Movement entirely.[123]

In his more extensive work Kirschenbaum does discuss Reform Judaism in America as well as the other trends in Judaism. But the author looks askance at such trends since their existence weakens the influence of religion and prevents the establishment of a unified Jewish administrative body; each of the religious trends is concerned primarily

with its own members and organizational needs.[124]

Kirschenbaum informs us, as do most of the textbook authors, that the German immigrants brought Reform to these shores. But he also informs us that the Movement was joined by those Russian immigrants who became economically successful in this country. The Reform Jews were not attached to the ritual or the customs of the religion but instead "stood for the fidelity of Judaism to the principles of pure religion."[125] "They wished to abolish the customs and precepts of Judaism which emphasized the national Jewish character."[126]

While Horowitz informs his readers that many Reform Jews in America were anti-Zionistic, and Katz tells his readers that the assimilated Jews did not agree with Herzl's position,[127] neither specifically writes that the Reform Jews worked actively against the establishment of a Jewish homeland. Kirschenbaum does. He informs us that they opposed the formation of a Jewish National Home during the time of the Balfour declaration and that they did not support the attempts of the Peace Conference to acquire equal rights for national minorities. They declared in their conferences that they were Jews according to their religion and Americans in their nationality.[128]

Kirschenbaum writes that the Reform Movement came under the spiritual influence of the Russian Jews and began to change its attitudes towards Zionism. But he states that this change only came about because the leaders of the Movement realized that Reform no longer had any chance of influencing the general

Jewish population in this country. Thus, "its American Reform's leaders recognized their failure and arrived at the general conclusion that they had to change the principle of the authority of the synagogue in Jewish life and to investigate anew the relationship to fundamental Jewish values."[129] As a result of this change in values the Reform rabbis attempted to bring about a revival of historic Judaism "through the observance of holidays and national customs." He also informs us that these rabbis demonstrated their concern with regard to the social and economic conditions of American life.[130]

The result of Kirschenbaum's presentation of Reform in America is a negative feeling toward the Movement. One gets the impression that it was an assimilationist anti-Zionistic movement. The Central Conference of American Rabbis did issue a statement which was negative toward the Balfour Declaration, but only because the Declaration stated that Palestine was to be the National Homeland for the Jews. The rabbis opposed this wording because they felt that there should be no single "homeland," that a Jew should be allowed to live whereever he desired. They did, however, welcome the British government's opening the Middle East to Jewish immigration. The Reform Movement did not, as a movement, actively fight the Balfour Declaration. Furthermore, Kirschenbaum leads us to believe that Reform Jews were not concerned with the civil rights of their brethren in Europe. He claims that they opposed the

efforts of the Peace Conference. What he fails to note is that many of the leaders of the Conference were American Reform Jews such as Louis Marshall (a member of Temple Emanu-El in New York).

One also receives the impression that Reform was a selfish movement which underwent change only to save itself. No mention is made that the leadership may have changed its philosophic beliefs out of true convictions or because of a change in the intellectual climate of the times.

Kirschenbaum does attempt to show that Reform thought in America was not static, that it did change. He demonstrates this even further when discussing the Sunday School. He notes that in the beginning the schools reflected the leadership of the Movement and were anti-nationalistic and anti-Zionistic. But when the Movement's philosophy changed, so did the approach of the school. Hebrew became more important, as did Jewish history, which was now taught as the history of a "living nation." But Kirschenbaum ends his discussion of the Sunday School by noting that it does not really succeed in giving the student a good education because of sporadic attendance and the lack of sufficient instructional time.[131]

Ephraim Shmueli writes with a nationalistic and Zionistic Tendenz. Unfortunately the volume in which he discusses Reform Judaism in Europe was not available to this writer. However, sufficient material was available on his presentation of Reform in the United States.

According to Shmueli, the German Jews who emigrated to

the United States did so for political and economic reasons.[132] Some who came to the New World had been educated at the rabbinical schools in Broslau and Berlin where they had acquired a liberal outlook on Judaism, an outlook they brought with them.[133] Since the East European Orthodox rabbis had very little influence in this country at the time the German immigration was taking place, most of the American Jewish communities followed the path of Reform.[134]

Isaac Mayer Wise is recognized by Shmueli as "the central pillar of American Judaism during this period."[135] He was a rabbi and a preacher in the "spirit of Reform" and because of his influence many congregations followed his religious prescriptions. Shmueli informs us that he founded the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Hebrew Union College and that his influence continues because of these institutions, and the fact that he had many disciples.[136]

One of Wise's goals, according to Shmueli, was to preserve Judaism among the new immigrants. But he tells us that the Judaism which Wise wished to preserve was "Judaism as he understood it."[137] Quoting from a letter Wise wrote, he demonstrates Wise's concern with the Shabbat and shows us that Wise ran into opposition from the Orthodox, an opposition Wise felt was undeserved.

In discussing Wise's opponents, Shmueli makes an interesting statement. He tells us that "the love of Torah and Israel, which burned in Rabbi Sabato Morais's heart, inflamed the hearts."[139] The statement is important since no comparable

statement is made about Wise. Morais is made to appear as acting out of love for Jewish tradition and Wise is portrayed as actingoon his own initiative and for the sake of his own interpretation of Judaism. Even though Morais believed that not all of the commandments were ordained by God, Shmueli tells us that the rabbi opposed the work of the reformers. Shmueli immediately goes on to say that most congregations followed Reform.[139]

We are told that there were a few radical congregations among the ranks of those who followed Reform. These congregationsodeclared that Judaism was a "church" (religious body), denyingothe nationhood of the Jews. He quotes the famous line "America is our Israel, and the city of Washington is our Zion." In keepingowith this view these congregations eliminated the prayer of the ingathering of the exiles from the prayerbooks.[140]

Shmueli proceeds to describe the service in a Reform synagogue. He tells us that they used instruments to beautify the service and a choir which had male and female members with no differentiation between Jewish and Gentile members. "Most of the prayers in these congregations were spoken in the vernacular and bareheaded." He informs us that the second days of the festivals were eliminated in these congregations, and that services were mostly moved to Sunday.[141] Without a doubt this last statement is true. However, it is negative to Reform because it attempts to demonstrate to the Israeli youth

that Reform Jews tried to imitate their Christian neighbors.

Shmueli has a negative view on what is known as Classical Reform (though he does not use the term). He holds that the Reform Movement, as it developed in the United States, came to be dominated by a "particular religious philosophic outlook" which "led to assimilation".[142] He feels that the Pittsburgh Platform, which was prepared under the spiritual guidance of Kaufmann Kohler, "came to destroy the fundamentals of Judaism which had been accepted through the generations." The "outlook" contained in the Platform continued to exist in the Reform Movement until 1937, when the Columbus Platform was adopted.[143]

The Columbus Platform cancelled the Pittsburgh Platform, according to Shmueli, and today the majority of Reform rabbis are Zionists. But he adds that the "outlook of the assimilationist rabbis of the eighties performed its work. . . ." He feels that because of these rabbis and their outlook, Jewish national schools were not established and there grew up a generation of Jews estranged from the Jewish nation and its holy possessions.[144]

Shmueli returns to the American Reform Movement in the sixth volume of his multi-volume work. Here he attempts to explain why the movement reversed its stance in the Columbus Platform. The Pittsburgh Platform was no longer able to satisfy the needs of the Reform Jew. The earlier platform and its writers had "made the religion of Israel into

a pale and superficial intellectual faith."[145] The platform, he continues, was "opportunistic and yielding both in the rules of religion and in community rules."[146] And once again he reiterates that they brought up many Jews who were alienated from their Judaism.[147]

But, Shmueli continues, in the time since the Pittsburgh Platform was written there was a change in the intellectual and theological climate. New ideas and beliefs about men and God, nations and communities developed. The new liberalism was different than the old liberalism of the previous century.[148] Furthermore, the people who made up the Reform community had changed. The majority of them were the descendants of East European Jews. These Jews, Shmueli tells us, felt a common bond to all Jews: they felt that they shared a common fate. "Political and spiritual Zionism conquered their hearts . ... ." Because of Zionism they demanded a more positive expression of their Jewish existence not only for the present but also in the future. There was now a desire for the spiritual in Reform which came from the influence of Hassidism, tradition, and Christian theology. Nor does he fail to record the new emphasis the rabbis placed on traditions, customs and practices. But he notes that the platform continued to stress the value of prophetic Judaism over rabbinic Judaism; that the customs of the religion were subordinate and incidental to its prophetic vision.[149] While the author seems to present this in an unbiased way, one receives the impression that he would like

to see a greater return to the customs and practices of traditional Judaism.

Shmueli tells the reader that the Columbus Convention did not arrive at a consensus that "Israel is one nation whose center is in the Land of Israel. But the battle over this principle is raging in the ranks of the Movement." He then reiterates that the majority of Reform rabbis are Zionists. The author thus informs the reader that American Reform was at one time anti-Zionistic but that its position has changed. One major difficulty with his presentation is that it leaves the reader feeling that most Reform rabbis hold that the Land of Israel is the center of Jewish life, a statement which would be hard to support.[150]

In general Shmueli's treatment of the subject appears to be balanced. The strongest point in his presentation is that he demonstrates Reform as a dynamic, not a static Movement. He shows the reader that what was true about the Movement in the nineteenth century may not be true today.

A General Analysis

In the introduction to this thesis a series of questions was presented. These questions formed the basis for the presentation in this chapter. In looking at the textbooks and their content it was discovered that the subject of Reform Movement was included in most of the works and that it was discussed in the relevant chronological and topical areas of Jewish history.

The material that the texts presented was concentrated and organized in a fashion that made it fairly meaningful. Except for one instance (Kirschenbaum) the authors did not fragment the material and disperse it throughout the texts. However, it may be more beneficial for an understanding of the subject if Reform Judaism were discussed in certain areas such as support for the establishment of the State of Israel.

Most of the material which the texts present is factually accurate. However, at times some of the facts are misleading and slightly ambiguous. In as much as the facts are relevant to the subject matter the texts would have to be judged as literally accurate.

One of the categories of analysis the texts were subjected to was that of balance. Reform Judaism, if it is to be understood by the Israeli high school student, needs to be presented in a balanced manner. All aspects of it must be presented, and nooone area should be overemphasized. Unfortunately the texts on the whole do not present a balanced picture. The Movement is seen as stopping in the nineteenth century. Some of the texts do demonstrate the fluidity of the Movement but most show it as a monolithic non-changing philosophy. Furthermore, the texts seem to emphasize the Movement's anti-nationalistic position, while at the same time ignoring Orthodoxy's similar opinion.

Reform is often shown in false isolation. As noted above, it is often held up as the opponent of Zionism while the other

movements' opposition to Jewish nationalism is glossed over. The Reformers and Maskilim are portrayed as seeking secular government support against the Orthodox while the latter are portrayed as refraining from such action. This presentation takes the movements out of true historical context.

Our final criterion was that the material on the Movement should be objective. It should not result in the creation of a stereotype. Except for the problems outlined above, this is the case with our materials. But, the objectivity of the texts is damaged by the use of value-laden language by the author and his own editorializing.

The question remains: Does the presentation of Reform Judaism as it appears in the textbooks influence the Israeli to have a favorable or unfavorable view of the phenomenon? Judging from the material we have examined, my conclusion would be that it leads to a negative image. But it is the purpose of the next chapter to prove or disprove this impression.

Chapter IV
The High School Students[1]

In a recent survey 62 per cent of the Israeli high school students sampled reported that they were interested in the problem of religion and the State of Israel.[2] The same survey showed that 68 per cent felt that their being Jewish as well as Israelis tied them to the Jewish people all over the world.[3] Yet many observers of the Israeli scene have commented on the apparent lack of religiosity and Jewishness among Israeli youth. They argue that orthodoxy is alienating the younger generation and that a modern type of Judaism must be developed on Israeli soil, a Judaism that will answer the spiritual and practical needs of a modern generation.

One of the groups searching for this new interpretation of Judaism and attempting to gain a foothold in Israel is the Movement for Progressive Judaism or HaTenuah Yahadut Mitkademet. The Movement is affiliated with the World Union for Progressive Judaism and is therefore associated with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The latter organization raises funds for the Israeli movement in the United States and is seen by some as the parent of Yahadut Mitkademet.

The purpose of this chapter is to see how Israeli high school students perceive Reform Judaism both outside and inside Israel. This chapter is not intended to be detailed analysis of these perceptions, nor does it purport to be a well documented sociological study. It is only a beginning

which suggests the need for the Israeli Movement for Progressive Judaism to commission a study to discover what the Israelis think and feel about the Movement.

A brief word as to the organization of this chapter is in order. The material presented here follows the general pattern of a questionnaire which was distributed to thirty-three Israeli high school students. Like the questionnaire, it begins with a brief summary of who the students are, what customs they practice, and their opinions on specific options. Following this, it deals with the pupils' responses to a series of questions about Reform Judaism. This section in the questionnaire asked the student if he believed Reform Judaism was a reaction to assimilation or rather led toward it: if Reform imitated Christian customs; if Reform favored or opposed Zionism? The final portion of the interview schedule was designed to determine the students' knowledge and sentiments about Reform Judaism in the State of Israel, and the responses to these questions conclude the chapter.

The data contained herein was obtained by the writer during the summer of 1976. The writer personally approached thirty-three high school students and asked them to complete a questionnaire. A non-scientific procedure for obtaining the sample was followed. Ten of the students were found at a gathering of the Movement for Progressive Judaism's youth group; five more were interviewed in Jerusalem while they attended a youth conclave; the remainder were approached at

random either in Jerusalem or in Tel Aviv. While most of the students were from major population centers, where there are Reform congregations, five of the respondents hailed from rural communities. In addition to being asked to complete the list of questions, some of the students were interviewed individually or quizzed in a group setting.

The students were asked to classify themselves as either religious (dati), traditional (masorti), or secular (chiloni) Jews. I have chosen to translate dati as religious instead of orthodox since several of the students themselves made this distinction. Also, this translation follows the precedent set by Simon Herman in his study on the Jewish identity among Israeli youth. They were to define these classifications themselves since it is possible that a secular student may be a traditional student in someone else's view, and a student who classified himself religious may be secular in the eyes of an ultra-orthodox Jew. Ten of the students saw themselves as religious; fifteen of them viewed themselves as traditional, and eight fell into the secular classification.

The number of students defining themselves as religious is out of proportion to the national average in Israel. It is an anomaly. But one must look at the questionnaire further. Only four of the dati students stated that they were shomre shabbat. One student originally responded positively to this question and then changed his answer with the comment:

"In the orthodox manner, no." This answer would tend to demonstrate that the students have internalized the religious communities' standards. They have accepted the orthodox interpretation of shomre shabbat as the norm, and if they do not follow this standard they will not classify themselves as Sabbath observers.

None of the students who viewed themselves as secular classified themselves as shomre shabbat. Of the fifteen who classified themselves as traditional Jews nine felt they observed the Sabbath; one felt he did so partially and five did not observe it at all.

The question of keeping kosher evoked more positive responses than the question of Sabbath observance. Six of the religious students said that they observed the dietary laws as did twelve of the traditional students. Only one of the secular students followed kashrut. While almost all of the respondents (32) felt that a Jew should practice Jewish traditions only nineteen of them felt that a Jew should necessarily keep the dietary laws. One respondent, it is interesting to note, who did not keep kosher himself, felt that others should do so. When asked why he felt that way, he could not give an explanation.

Seven students, when they were asked their opinions and feelings about a Jew outside the State of Israel who married a non-Jew, responded that it was the Jew's own affair. However, twelve of the students viewed such a Jew negatively

and twelve others frowned upon him but said they could understand his actions.

But while the students may understand and even accept a Jew's out-marrying, they cannot countenance his converting or assimilating. Such an act is seen as a betrayal of the Jewish people. A person born a Jew expected to remain faithful to his birthright. One respondent said "I am a Jew because I was born a Jew and therefore I must observe some Jewish traditions. If he [the Jew outside of Israel] was born a Jew then he must stay a Jew." Thus it is not surprising that nineteen of the students, looked negatively, at the Jew who assimilates and that twenty-one of them looked similarly at a Jew who converts. Six of the students said that it was up to the individual Jew's conscience if he wanted to assimilate or convert; and three of them replied that they could understand the Jew who would convert or assimilate but they did not agree with his position.

In his study Israelis and Jews, Simon Herman discovered that 36 percent of all the students he questioned disapproved of a Jew outside of Israel converting to another religion. Thirty percent of his sample responded that they disapproved but understood such an action. It would appear that the students sampled in this survey, as compared to Herman's, are more concerned with the preservation of the Jewish people and the Jewish religion and therefore their greater opposition to conversion. It is interesting to note that this study found

the percentage of students opposed to such actions comparable to the results Herman obtained from religious youth. His study showed that sixty-five percent of religious students opposed a Jew's converting while this survey demonstrated sixty-three percent opposing such an act.[4]

The study of Jewish history is a requirement in Israeli high schools. Therefore, it is not surprising that all of the respondents reported that they had studied nineteenth-century European Jewish history. Some students said that they had studied the subject only superficially in class, or that since they were not interested in the subject they paid little attention to the material.

When asked specifically about their having studied Reform Judaism, 23 students responded that they had discussed the movement. Surprisingly, of the nine who claimed that they had not studied the subject at all, two were students at the Leo Baeck School and two were pupils at Ben Shemen Youth village. Ben Shemen and Leo Baeck have connections with the Reform Movement: both participate in programs where American youths study at their institutions and both receive funds from the U.A.H.C. or its affiliates. The Leo Baeck School in addition is officially affiliated with the World Union for Progressive Judaism. Three of the students had not reached the grade level at which Reform Judaism would have been taught in the schools.

Yet just because something is taught in the schools does not mean that it is taught well or understood by the students.

Therefore some questions about the Reform Movement were asked. In several oral discussions students were queried asttp the identieis of Moses Mendelssohn, Abraham Geiger, and others. While most of the students did not know Mendelssohn's importance several did know that he had translated the Pentateuch into German. Only onesstudent knew who Geiger was: "He was a Reform rabbi." And while mostoof the students recognized the names of Stephen Wise and Abba Hillel Silver, few realized that theywere Reform rabbis. This last item would correspondto the fact that the textbooks when discussing these gentlemen do not note their affiliation to the Reform Movement.

Twenty-six of the students look at Reform as a continuation of Jewish tradition: as a student declared, "they make changes but Judaism has always been changing." Six students view it as a separate sect. One respondent said: "They [Reform Jews] are like the Samaritans, they are Jewish but different." Another identified Reform as a trend within the Jewish community but not as perpetuating Jewish tradition. All but threeoof the students who classified themselves as dati believed that Reform was a continuation ofJewish tradition. Two of the three dati students, who were orthodox in practice and thought, considered Reform a separate sect.

One of the problems Reform Judaism has to overcome in Israel is its anti-Zionistic heritage. When students were asked if they felt Reform was anti-Zionistic, 28 replied in the negative. Some of the students noted that the World Union

had joined the World Zionist Organization. However, almost all the students did know that at one time Reform Judaism was opposed to Zionism. One said: "They wanted to be a part of the nation where they lived and so they did not want to come to Israel. But the orthodox wanted the Messiah so they did not come either."

Not only do the students understand contemporary Reform Judaism as Zionistic and a continuation of the Jewish tradition but they also believe that its followers preserved tradition. Twenty-seven of the respondents assumed that Reform Jews practice Jewish customs. Again the difference between the "self-defined" and "normative" dati student is noticeable. The three students who fell into the normative classification did not believe that Reform Jews followed tradition.

While a substantial majority of the students recognize Reform as a continuation of traditional Judaism and its followers as observing Jewish customs, a substantial minority affirm that Reform ceremonies imitate, at least in part, Christian ritual. Fourteen of the students were of this opinion. The most common area where the students believed this was true in the area of worship. The use of the organ and praying bare-headed were identified as non-Jewish practices. It is interesting to note that among the students responding thus, five were members of the youth group which is affiliated to the Reform Movement.

But even if some of the students imagine that Reform practices may resemble non-Jewish customs (one student claimed

several Orthodox practices resemble Christianity) they do not sense that Reform leads to either conversion or assimilation. Twenty of the respondents held that Reform Judaism did not lead a Jew to assimilate. One normative dati student responded that "Reform does not lead to assimilation but rather assimilation leads to Reform." A few of the students were unsure as to Reform's affects, and seven speculated that it might be a contributing factor to the Jews' assimilation.

The Israeli mass media periodically reports on the state of Jewish religious life in America. One topic commonly reported on is the trend toward mixed marriages. As one Israeli Reform rabbi stated, "Jews praying in synagogues are not news, mixed marriages are." Furthermore, the Orthodox establishment is always publicizing the Reform rabbi's role in such nuptials. The students appeared confused as to the role the Reform rabbi plays in mixed marriages. Fourteen of the students believed that a liberal rabbi would not perform such a ceremony; fifteen did not know if he would or wouldn't and only three thought that he would.

In answering the last question one student noted that in Israel Reform rabbis cannot perform marriages. When asked if Reform rabbis should be given permission to perform marriages in Israel the overwhelming majority replied affirmatively; twenty-five students said yes and only five responded negatively. Two of the negative replies came from the dati group.

Up to this point, the questionnaire concentrated its attention on the students' understanding of current Reform Judaism

and its adherents. In a question designed to determine the students' knowledge of Reform origins, the pupils were asked if Reform was a reaction to assimilation. Sixteen of the respondents affirmed that the Movement began as a response to the Jews' absorption into the general culture. One said, "It started to preserve the people and the religion." Eight of the students did not feel that the phenomenon was an outgrowth of the move into European society. This question served as a referent to the earlier question on whether Reform led to assimilation. It demonstrated that there was no correlation between the individual student's conceptions of current and past Reform.

Realizing that the students' primary area of concern and experience centers around the State of Israel the questionnaire turned to this scene. The Halacha is generally judged by the students, except the datiim, as being inflexible and unresponsive to the needs of the present. On the other hand they ascribe flexibility to Reform. Yet this latter characteristic is not always admired. One girl responded that "Reform is too flexible." Another student stated, "It seems you can do anything you want." Finally, an Israeli who spent considerable time in the United States said, "I've been involved with Reform Judaism and Jews for over four years and it is so flexible that I still don't know what it stands for."

But even if the Israeli youth do not know what Reform stands for, they do know that it exists. All of the respondents

had heard of Reform Judaism and all of them had heard of Yahadut Mitkademet. And they differentiate between the two. Twenty-two posit the Reform Movement as different from Yahadut Mitkademet; eleven presume them to be the same movement. Of those who classified themselves as religious the majority (six) judged the movements identical. This may be because they see orthodoxy as in one camp and every other form of Judaism as in the opposing camp.

The members of the Reform youth group tended to differentiate between the two movements. They deemed one as the American phenomenon and the other as the indigenous movement. These results may possibly demonstrate that the students were attempting to psychologically validate their own positions by arguing that they were not the same as the Reform Jews who pray bareheaded and inter-marry. Having internalized the Israeli religious establishment's negative image of Reform Judaism, they may be trying to avoid an association with the American movement.

Finally all of the respondents except two felt there was a place for Yahadut Mitkademet in Israel. However, 27 percent of the students did not believe that there was a place for Reform Judaism in the Jewish State.

It would appear then that Israeli high school students do recognize the existence of Reform Judaism. They do not view it negatively but neither do they really understand it. They are confused as to its origins but know that it is not

the same now as it was a century ago. It is something some of the students are interested in because they want to live their lives Jewishly but not in the orthodox fashion as they neither believe in the latter system nor find it fulfilling.

Summary

This thesis has dealt primarily with four subjects: general Jewish historians, the Israeli school system, Israeli high school textbooks, and Israeli high school youth. It has attempted to unify these diverse entities by examining their relationship to Reform Judaism.

We have seen that the general historians viewed Reform as assimilationist and anti-Zionistic. These impressions were also echoed in the textbooks. The Israeli school system which is highly nationalistic could be expected to stress this negative point to its students. It apparently, however, does not do so. The pupils, as we have noted, realize that Reform had a period when it was anti-Zionistic but most of the students recognize that this phase has passed.

The students also appear not to be influenced by the texts and the general historians in that they do not hold an overall unfavorable image of Reform. They recognize that the Movement has changed and even go so far as attempting to distinguish between its constituent members.

There is one correlation that must be made. The students do not possess much factual material on the Movement. Why? The first reason, I believe, comes from the structure of the school system. Reform Judaism is not taught in depth because, I feel, it has a checkered past; it is not understood by the teachers; and school administrators may be attempting to avoid a political confrontation with the religious parties.

The second reason for this lack of understanding is due to the Israelis' lack of interest in galut movements. The diaspora is a negative force in Jewish life according to most Israeli youth, so why bother studying its movements? This is reinforced by the teachers, who also do not understand Reform Judaism, or who see it the way the secondary sources do. Because of this attitude, the teachers do not spend much time on the subject.

One of the major problems the teacher has with regard to Reform Judaism is that he does not know about the Movement as it exists today. Therefore he teaches the Reform of the past as he learned it in school and from the general historians. If this is the case then the students' impressions of the movement should be negative. But this is not so. It would appear then that the students have received their impressions from some other sources. What these sources are, I donnot know, but they may well be the contemporary mass media.

It seems apparent that if Reform Judaism is to grow in Israel, and if there is to be a greater understanding among Israelis as to American Jewish life, a concerted effort must be made to improve the sources of knowledge about these phenomena. The textbooks will have to be revised to show that Reform is not monolithic in thought. The Zionistic positions of the Movement will have to be presented in the texts and

in other media so that the Israeli will know that Reform has not separated itself from the rest of Am Yisrael. And finally, Yahadut Mitkademet will have to assert its independence from the diaspora movement while at the same time demonstrating its ties to it.

Notes

Introduction

[1]Jay Kaufman, "An Unbiased Look at Reform Judaism," In the Dispersion, II (1963), p. 35.

[2]See Lloyd Marcus, The Treatment of Minorities in Secondary School Textbooks (Washington: Anti-Defemation League of B'nai B'rith, 1963) for a discussion on the role of textbooks and their content.

[3]Richard Bandler and John Grinder, The Structure of Magic (Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1975), pp. 5-18, 57-107.

[4]See Marcus, p. 5-10 and passim.

Chapter I

[1]When preparing the lectures, high school teachers use the books described in this chapter and those described in Chapter III. See Reuven Surkis, "Teaching About American Jewry in Israeli High Schools: Report on a Two-Year Study" (Jerusalem: The American Jewish Committee, 1976), p. 16.

[2]Michael A. Meyer, Ideas of Jewish History (New York: Behrman House, Inc., 1974), p. 217.

[3]Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1956), V, p. 292.

[4]Ibid., p. 371.

[5]Ibid., p. 397.

[6]Ibid., p. 417.

[7]Ibid., p. 416 f.

[8]Ibid., p. 565.

[9]Ibid., p.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid., p. 568.

[12]Ibid., p. 569.

[13]Ibid., p. 681.

[14]Ibid., p. 626.

[15]Meyer, Ideas, p. 34.

[16]Simon Dubnow, History of the Jews, trans. Moshe Spiegel (South Brunswick: Thomas Yoserloff, 1973), IV, p. 650.

[17]Ibid., V, p. 74.

[18]Ibid., V, p. 88.

[19]Ibid., V, p. 94.

[20]Yehezkel Kaufmann, Gola veNekhar (Tel-Aviv: Dvir Co., 1930), p. 48.

[21]Ibid., p. 11.

[22]Ibid., p. 45.

[23]Ibid., p. 185.

[24]Ibid., p. 6.

[25]Ibid., p. 23.

[26]Ibid., p. 31.

[27]Ibid., p. 32.

[28]Ibid., p. 74.

[29]Ibid., p. 249.

[30]Ibid., p. 242.

[31]Ben Zion Dinur, Israel and the Diaspora (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969), p. 83.

[32]Ibid., p. 131.

[33]Shmuel Ettinger, "The Jewish Community in Western and Central Europe," in H. H. Ben-Sasson, A History of the Jewish People (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), p. 787. See also Shmuel Ettinger, "Ideological Changes in Jewish Society in the Nineteenth Century," in the same volume, p. 839.

[34]Ibid., pp. 784, 787.

[35]Ibid., p. 784.

[36]Shmuel Ettinger, Toldat Am Yisrael: MeMahapechot 1848 ad leHakamat Medinat Yisrael, ed. Shalom Bar-Asher (Jerusalem: Akadamon, 1966), p. 102.

[37]Ettinger, "Jewish Community," p. 788.

[38]Ettinger, Toldot, p. 106.

[39]Ibid., p. 103. See also Ettinger, "The Struggle for Emancipation in Western and Central Europe" in Ben-Sasson, History, p. 809.

[40]Shmuel Ettinger, "Integration into the Non-Jewish World in the Nineteenth Century," in Ben-Sasson, History, p. 832 f.

[41]Y. Tzevi Zehavi, Tenuat haHitbolelut beYisrael (Tel-Aviv: Luria, 1942), p. 23.

[42]Ibid., p. 3.

[43]Ibid., p. 24.

[44]Simon Bernfeld, Toldot haReformatyion haDatit beYisrael (Warsaw: Achiasaf, 1923), p. iii.

[45]Ibid., p. iv.

[46]Ibid., p. 60.

[47]Ibid., p. 80.

[48]Ibid., p. 148.

[49]Ibid., p. 130.

[50]Ibid., p. 113.

[51]David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1967), p. 5.

[52]Ibid., p. 438, n. 27.

Chapter II

[1]Joseph S. Bentwich, Education in Israel (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1965), p. 6.

[2]Ibid., p. 7.

[3]Ibid., p. 13.

[4]Aharon F. Kleinberger, Society, Schools and Progress in Israel (London: Pergamon Press, 1969), p. 18 ff.

[5]Ibid., p. 31.

[6]State of Israel, Hatzaot leTokhniyot Limud beVeit haSefer haTikhon (Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture, 1956), p. 10.

[7]Kleinberger, Society, p. 35 f.

[8]Bentwich, Education, p. 24 ff.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid., p. 25 f.

[11]Ervin Birnbaum, The Politics of Compromise: State and Religion in Israel (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1970), p. 162.

[12]Kleinberger, Society, p. 120.

[13]Ibid., p. 117.

[14]Ibid., p. 129.

[15]Birnbaum, Politics, p. 68.

[16]Ibid., p. 121.

[17]Ibid., p. 124.

[18]Ibid., p. 127.

[19]Ibid., p. 173.

[20]Ibid., p. 244.

[21]Kleinberger, Society, p. 123.

[22]Ibid., p. 192.

[23]State of Israel, Tokhniyot, p. 11.

[24]Bentwich, Education, p. 89.

[25]Kleinberger, Society, p. 205.

[26]Bentwich, Education, p. 89.

[27]State of Israel, Tokhniyot, p. 35.

Chapter III

[1]Reuven Surkis, Teaching About American Jewry in Israeli High Schools (Jerusalem: The American Jewish Committee, 1976), p. A-3.

[2]Moshe Auerbach, Toldot Am Yisrael (Jerusalem: Yeshurun, 1971), p. 139.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ephraim Shmueli, Toldot Amenu beZeman heChadash (Tel-Aviv: Yavneh, 1960), p. 178.

[8]Ibid., p. 177.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid., p. 178.

[12]Michael Ziv and Jacob Toury, Divre haYamin haZeman heChadash (Tel-Aviv: Yavneh, 1976), I, p. 144.

[13]Shelomo Horowitz, Kitzur Toldot Yisrael be'et haChadasha (Haifa: Bet haSefer Ri'ali, 1971), I, p.8f.

[14]Ibid., p. 11.

[15]Ibid., p. 12.

[16]Shmuel Ettinger, "HaTemurot beHanhaga ha'atzmit beMercaza shel Eropa ubeMa'aravah. Tzmichat haHaskalah," in Michael Ziv and Shmuel Ettinger, Divre haYamim: haZeman heChadash (Haifa: Yuval, 1974), III, part 1, p. 313.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Ibid., p. 314.

[19]Ibid., p. 317

[20]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 15.

[21]Ziv and Toury, Divre, p. 104.

[22]Ibid., p. 106.

[23]Auerbach, Toldot, p. 141 f.

[24]Ziv and Toury, Divre, p. 107.

[25]Ettinger, haTemurot, p. 319.

[26]Jacob Katz and Moshe Hershko, Yisrael veha'amin (Tel-Aviv: Dvir Co. Ltd., 1972), III, p. 95. See also Ziv and Toury, Divre, p. 105.

[27]Auerbach, Toldot, p. 142.

[28]Ziv and Toury, Divre, p. 107 f.

[29]Yekutiel Friedner, Toldot haDorot haAchronim (Jerusalem: Yeshurun, 1968), p. 50.

[30]Katz, Yisrael, p. 95. See also Ziv and Toury, Divre, p. 106.

[31]Auerbach, Toldot, p. 143.

[32]Ibid.,

[33]Ibid., p.144.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Ibid., p. 145.

[36]Ziv and Toury, Divre, p. 111.

[37]Ibid., p. 108.

[38]Friedner, Toldot, p. 49.

[39]Ibid., p. 208.

[40]Ibid., p. 46 f.

[41]Ibid., p. 51.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Ettinger, "haTemurot," p. 321.

[44]Ibid., p.324.

[45]Ibid., p. 320.

[46]Ibid., p. 319 f.

[47]Ibid., p. 324.

[48]Ibid., p. 322.

[49]Ibid., p. 323.

[50]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 35.

[51]Ibid., p. 17.

[52]Ibid.

[53]Ibid.

[54]Ibid., p. 19.

[55]Ibid.,

[56]Auerbach, Toldot, p. 145.

[57]Friedner, Toldot, p. 47.

[58]Ziv and Toury, Divre, p. 112.

[59]Ibid., p. 108.

[60]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 9.

[61]Ettinger, "haTemurot," p. 320.

[62]Ibid.

[63]Friedner, Toldot, p. 39.

[64]Ziv and Toury, Divre, p. 142.

[65]Katz, Yisrael, p. 100 f.

[66]Ibid., p. 101.

[67]Ibid.

[68]Ibid.

[69]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 26. See also, Ettinger, "haTemurot," p. 323.

[70]Katz, Yisrael, p. 106.

[71]Ibid., p. 107.

[72]Friedner, Toldot, p. 122.

[73]Ibid.. p. 49.

[74]Ibid.

[75]Ettinger, "haTemurot," p. 323.

[76]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 59.

[77]Ettinger, "haTemurot," p. 323.

[78]Katz, Yisrael, p. 108.

[79]Ibid.

[80]Shmuel Ettinger, "HaTemurot beChevrah haYehudit, beHash Kaphoteha ubeArgonah ad Shenot ha-80 shel haMeah ha19," in Michael Ziv and Shmuel Ettinger, Divre haYamim: haZeman heChadash, III, part 2 (Haifa: Yuval, 1976), p. 323.

[81]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 59.

[82]Ibid.

[83]Friedner, Toldot, p. 53.

[84]Katz, Yisrael, p. 108.

[85]Ziv and Toury, Divre, p. 206.

[86]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 64.

[87]Ibid., p. 61.

[88]Ettinger, "HaTemurot beChevrah haYehudit," p. 339.

[89]Friedner, Toldot, p. 123.

[90]Ettinger, "HaTemurot beChevrah haYehudit," p. 338.

[91]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 60.

[92]Ibid.

[93]Ziv Toury, Divre, p. 207.

[94]Ettinger, "HaTemurot beChevrah haYehudit," p. 340 f.

[95]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 76.

[96]Katz, Yisrael, p. 108.

[97]Ziv and Toury, Divre, p. 207.

[98]Ettinger, "HaTemurot beChevrah haYehudit," p. 341.

[99]Ibid.

[100]Friedner, Toldot, p. 123.

[101]Ibid.

[102]Ibid.

[103]Ibid.

[104]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 10.

[105]Ibid., p. 65.

[106]Ibid.

[107]Ibid., p. 66 f.

[108]Ibid., p. 67.

[109]Ibid.

[110]Ibid.

[111]Friedner, Toldot, p. 232.

[112]Ettinger, "HaTemurot beChevrah haYehudit," pp. 340, 350.

[113]Ziv and Toury, Divre, II, p. 165.

[114]Horowitz, Kitzur, p. 194.

[115]Ibid.

[116]Ibid., p. 204.

[117]Ibid.

[118]Ibid., p. 205.

[119]Horowitz, Kitzur, III (1973), p. 105.

[120]Ibid.

[121]Ibid., p. 106.

[122]Shimshon Kirschenbaum, Toldot Yisrael beDorot haAchronim (Tel-Aviv: Mishlav, 1976), p. 142.

[123]Ibid., p. 150.

[124]Shimshon Kirschenbaum, Toldot am Yisrael beDorenu (Tel-Aviv: Omanuth Co. Ltd., 1965), p. 138.

[125]Ibid., p. 140.

[126]Ibid.

[127]Katz, Yisrael, p. 230.

[128]Kirschenbaum, beDorenu, p. 140.

[129]Ibid.

[130]Ibid.

[131]Ibid., p. 144.

[132]Shmueli, Toldot, IV (1969), p. 91.

[133]Ibid., p. 93.

[134]Ibid.

[135]Ibid.

[136]Ibid.

[137]Ibid.

[138]Ibid., p. 94.

[139]Ibid.,

[140]Ibid.

[141]Ibid.

[142] Ibid., p. 94

[143] Ibid.

[144] Ibid.

[145] Shmueli, Toldot, VI (1973), p. 177 f.

[146] Ibid.

[147] Ibid.

[148] Ibid.

[149] Ibid., p. 178.

[150] Ibid.

Chapter IV

[1]I had originally hoped, also, to interview a number of teachers to determine their opinions about Reform Judaism and their methods of teaching the subject. Unfortunately, I was not able to achieve this goal. I did speak to two teachers who told me that they did not discuss the Movement at all in their classrooms because they taught in religious schools. A third educator told me that she covered the Reform Movement by inviting in a Reform rabbi for a class session.

[2]Shulamit Levy, Eliyahu Louis Guttman, Arachim veAmadot shel haNoar haLomed beYisrael (Jerusalem: haMachon leMechkar Chevrati Shimushi, 1974), p.219.

[3]Ibid., p. 244.

[4]Simon N. Herman, Israelis and Jews: The Continuity of an Identity (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1971), p. 255.

Appendix

שאלון

ארץ לידה _____ בתה____ כי"ס ממלכתי_____ ממ"ד____

מגמה: כי"ס דיאלי_____ מקצועי____ חקלאי____ קיבוץ____ אחר_____

אני מגדיר את עצמי כ: דתי_____ מסורתי_____ חילוני_____

האם את(ה) שומר(ת) שבת? כן____ לא_____

האם את(ה) שומר(ת) כשרות? כן____ לא____

האם לדעתך חשוב ליהודי לשמור על המסורת היהודית? כן____ לא____

האם חשוב ליהודי להקפיד על כשרות? כן____ לא____

מה דעתך על יהודי מחו"ל שמתחתן עם לא יהודיה?

זה ענין שלו____ חיובי____ שלילי____ שלילי אבל אני מבין____

האם היית מסובל(ת) להתחתן עם מי שאינו יהודי?

כשום אופן לא____ כן בתנאי שיתגייר____ כן כלי הסתיגויות____

מה דעתך על יהודי שמתכולל?

זה ענין שלו____ חיובי____ שלילי____ שלילי אבל אני מבין____

מה דעתך על יהודי שהמיר דתו?

זה ענין שלו____ חיובי____ שלילי____ שלילי אבל אני מבין____

האם למדת את תולדות יהודי אירופה במאה האחרונה? כן____ לא____

האם למדת על התנועה הרפורמית ביהדות? כן____ לא____

האם לדעתך הרפורמה מהווה המשך של יהדות מסורתית____ או כת נפרדת____.

מהי עמדת התנועה הרפורמית לגבי הציונות? בעד____ נגד____ איננני יודע____

האם יהודים רפורמיים מקיימים מנהגי יהדות? כן___ לא___ איננני יודע____

האם טכסים רפורמיים מהווים חיקוי לטכסים נוצריים? כן____ לא____

איננני יודע____

האם התנועה הרפורמית מוכילה אל ההתבוללות? כן___ לא___ איננני יודע___

האם בדרך כלל רב רפורמי מוכן לכהן סכם לנשואי חערוכת?

כן____ לא____ איננני יודע____

האם התנועה הרפורמית היתה חגובה נגדית להתכוללות? כן____ לא____ לא יודע__

האם לדעתך עונה ההלכה על צרכים של חיים מודרניים? כן____ לא____

האם לדעתך בישת התנועה הרפורמית במישה? כן____ לא____

האם את(ה) מכיר(ה) את המונח "יהדות מתקדמת"? כן____ לא____

האם יש הבדל בין "יהדות מתקדמת" ו"התנועה הרפורמית"? כן____ לא____

האם נכתת פעם בתפילה תפורמית בישראל? כן____ לא____

האם יש בית כנסת רפורמית בסביבתך? כן____ לא____ איננני יודע____

האם לדעתך יש לתת רשות לרב רפורמי לכהן בטכס נישואין בישראל?כן____ לא____

האם יש מקום לתנועת הרפורמית בארץ? כן____ לא____

האם יש מקום ל"יהדות מתקדמת" בארץ? כן____ לא____

תודה!

Bibliography

Auerbach, Moshe. Toldot Am Yisrael: meTekufat Churban Bavit Rishon ad Yamenu. Jerusalem: Yeshurun, 1971. III, 1.

Ben-Sasson, H. H., et al. A History of the Jewish People. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Bandler, Richard, and Grinder, Joh. The Structure of Magic I.: A Book About Language and Therapy. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1975.

Bentwich, Joseph S. Education in Israel. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1965.

Bernfeld, Simon. Toldot haRiformatzyion haDatit beYisrael. Rev. ed. Warsaw: Achiasaf, 1923.

Birnbaum, Ervin. The Politics of Compromise: State and Religion in Israel. Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1970.

Braham, Randolph L. Israel: A Modern Education System. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Budd, Richard W., Thorp, Robert K., and Donohew, Lewis. Content Analysis of Communication. New York: McMillan Company, 1967.

Corenthal, Phyllis. The Holocaust: The Portrayal of Non-Jews in Jewish History Textbooks (1930-1950). Master Thesis, Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1976.

Davis, Moshe. The Emergence of Conservative Judaism. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1962.

Dinur, Ben Zion. Israel and the Diaspora. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969.

Dubnow, Simon. History of the Jews. Trans. Moshe Spiegel. IV-V. South Brunswick: Thomas Yoseloff, 1971-3.

Eisnstadt, S.N. Israeli Society. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967.

Encyclopedia Chinukhit. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture and The Bialk Institute, 1961-7.

Encyclopedia Judaica. Jerusalem: The McMillan Company, 1972.

Ettinger, Shmuel. Toldot Am Yisrael: meMahpeikhot 1848 ad leHakamat Medinat Yisrael. Ed. Shalom Bar-Asher. Jerusalem: Privately Printed, 1966.

_____. Toldot Am Yisrael: meYeme haAbsolotizm ad Mahpeikhot 1848. Ed. Shalom Bar-Asher and Yishyahu Gafni. Jerusalem: Akadamon, 1967.

_____. Torat haEzrachut. Tel-Aviv: Karni, 1964.

Fein, Leonard J. Politics in Israel. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967.

Feuer, L.I. "Reform Judaism and Zionism." Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel. Ed. Raphael Patia. New York: Herzl Press/McGraw Hill, 1971.

Friedner, Yekutiel. Toldot Am Yisrael veUmot haOlam: meTekufat haMahpeikhah haTzirfatit ad leMilchemet Sheshet haYamim. Jerusalem: Jeshurun, 1968.

Graetz, Heinrich. History of the Jews. V. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1956.

Guttmann, Julius. Philosophies of Judaism: The History of Jewish Philosophy from Biblical Times to Franz Rosenzweig. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1964.

Herman, Simon.N. Israelis and Jews: The Continuity of an Identity. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 1971.

Horowitz, Shelomoh. Kitzur Toldot Yisrael beEt haChadashah. 3 vols. Haifa: Bet haSefer haRiali, 1967-71.

Israel, Central Office of Information, Ministry of Eduation and Culture. Israel Government Yearbook. Eds. Reuven Alcalay and Mordekhai Nurock. Jerusalem: 1970-71.

Israel, Ministry of Education and Culture. Hatzaot leTokhniyot Limud beVeit haSefer haTikhon. Jerusalem: 1956.

Katz, Elihu and Gurevitch, Michael. The Secularization of Leisure: Culture and Communication in Israel. London: Faber and Faber, 1976.

Katz, Jacob. Emancipation and Assimilation: Studies in Modern Jewish History. London: Gregg International Publishers Ltd., 1972.

_____, ed. The Role of Religion in Modern Jewish History. Cambridge: Association for Jewish Studies, 1975.

_____. and Hershko, Moshe. Yisrael vehaAmim: Toldotehem meYeme haMahpeikhah haTzarfatit vead haKamat Medinat Yisrael. Tel-Aviv: DVIR, 1972.

Kaufman, Jay. "An Unbiased Look at Reform Judaism." In the Dispersion, II. (1963).

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. Gola veNekhar. II. Tel-Aviv: DVIR, 1930.

Kirschenbaum, Shimshon. Toldot Yisrael beDorot haAchronot. Jerusalem: Mishlev, 1976.

_____. Toldot Am Yisrael beDorenu. 2 vols. Tel-Aviv: Omanuth Co., 1965.

Kleinberger, Aharon F. Society, Schools and Progress in Israel. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1969.

Levy, Shlomit and Guttman, Louis. Arachim veAmadot shel haNoar haLomed be Yisrael. Jerusalem: The Israel Institute of Applied Social Research, 1974.

Liebman, Charles S. "Religion and Political Integration in Israel." Jewish Journal of Sociology, XVII, No.1 (June 1975).

Marcus, Jacob R. Israel Jacobson: The Founder of the Reform Movement in Judaism. 2d ed. rev. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1963.

Meyer, Michael A. Ideas of Jewish History. New York: Behrman House, Inc., 1974.

_____. The Origins of the Modern Jew: Jewish Identity and European Culture in Germany 1749-1824. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967.

Petuchowski, Jacob J. "Abraham Geiger and Samuel Holdheim--Their Differences in Germany and Repercussions in America." Leo Baeck Yearbook. XX (1977)

Philipson, David. The Reform Movement in Judaism. Rev. ed. New York: KTAV, 1967.

Plaut, W. Gunther. The Growth of Reform Judaism; American and European Sources to 1948. New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1965.

_____. The Rise of Reform Judaism; A Sourcebook of its European Origins. New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1963.

Rudavsky, David. Emancipation and Adjustment; Contemporary Jewish Religious Movements Their History and Thought. New York: Diplomatic Press, 1967.

Sachar, Howard Morley. The Course of Modern Jewish History. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1958.

Shmueli, Ephraim. Bet Yisrael uMedinat Yisrael. Tel-Aviv: Yavneh, 1966.

_____. Toldot Amenu biZeman heChadash. 7 vols. Tel-Aviv: Yavneh, 19 -1973.

Surkis, Reuven. "Teaching About American Jewry in Israeli High Schools." Jerusalem: The American Jewish Committee, 1976.

Toury, Jacob. Yeme haBeinayim vehaZeman heChadash. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1970.

Wright, Gertrude and Knox, Holly, eds. Impressions of Education in Israel. Washington: The George Washington University, Institute for Educational Leadership, 1972.

Yadlin, Aharon. "Chinukh haDor haTza'ir leachar haMilchamah," in Israel and the Jewish People During and After the Yom Kippur War. Ed. Moshe Davis. Jerusalem: haSifriya ha-Ziyonit Publishing House of the World Zionist Organization, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1975.

Zehavi, Y. Tzvi. Tenuat haHitbolelut beYisrael. Tel-Aviv: Privately Published, 1942.

Ziv, Michael and Ettinger, Shmuel. Divre haYamin haZeman heChadash. 2 vols. Haifa: Yuval, 1965.

_____ and _____, and Landau, Jacob M. Divre haYamim: Toldot Zemanenu. 2 vols. Haifa; Yuval, 1966.

_____, and Toury, Jacob. Divre haYamin haZeman heChadash. 2 vols. Tel-Aviv: Yavneh, 1976.