

Jewish Values in A World of Change: The Role of Jewish Communal Service

RABBI AHARON LICHTENSTEIN, PH.D.

Director of Yeshiva Har Etzion, Jerusalem, Israel

Quite apart from the sense of relative security which religious faith and trust instill, the feeling of rootedness inherent in identification with a historical tradition makes current change seem less threatening. By placing the ephemeral within the context of the permanent, it provides a firm psychological anchor . . .

DEFINITION of the role of Jewish communal service vis-a-vis Jewish values in a world of change should presumably best begin with the presentation and analysis of those values proper. To adopt that course, however, is to confront, at the very outset, one of the prime difficulties besetting the modern Jewish community: the lack of consensus concerning the nature and substance of contemporary Jewish existence. With respect to many potential readers, therefore, such a presentation runs the risk of incipient opposition before its message has even been integrated. There are Jews whose hackles are raised by the mere mention of an avowedly Halachic position. Nevertheless, I opt for an ideological opening, and this not only in submission to the dictates of logic and methodology (not to mention simple honesty), but out of the deep-rooted conviction, admittedly itself part of the traditional credo, that, whatever its short-term divisive impact—for which there is surely abundant historical and contemporary evidence—Torah ultimately constitutes a genuinely unifying element in Jewish life; perhaps, in the final analysis, the only unifying element. So I trust that even readers who cannot subscribe to its total *weltanschauung* will bear with me until the conclusion of the essay, and hopefully discover that it can nevertheless provoke thought and per-

haps even provide a measure of direction.

Jewish values exist at two levels. In one sense, Judaism demands the perfection of universal values, moral and/or religious. In another, it posits new categories, broaching novel and largely particularistic demands. Sinai constitutes both the culmination of an antecedent historical process and a wholly fresh departure. On the one hand, the Rambam concludes a sketch of the gradual proliferation of *mitzvot* with the phrase, "until Moshe Rabbenu came and Torah was completed through him"¹, clearly suggesting that Torah built upon existing historical, and presumably axiological, foundations. On the other, the Rabbis describe the Sinaitic "entry into the Covenant" as an act of conversion², to be therefore perceived in light of the Halachic dictum: "A proselyte who converts is regarded as a newborn child"³. Practically speaking, Halacha is of course equally normative, whether defined as the optimal means of attaining general human goals or as a way of realizing specifically Jewish ones. Philosophically, however, the difference between the two perspectives—and, consequently, the dialectic-

¹ *Mishneh Torah, Melachim 9.1*

² See *BT, Keritot 9a*

³ *BT, Yehamot 22a*

cal relation between them—is quite significant.

The universal values themselves break down into two categories, the moral and the religious. Bestriding both is the primal concept of *tzelem E-lohim*, “the human face divine” (in Milton’s phrase)—faith in the dignity and the sanctity of man in both moral and metaphysical terms; and, concomitantly, in the worth and meaning of life. This faith finds normative expression in God’s mandate to Adam, who is put “into the garden of Eden to develop it and to keep it”⁴, i.e., is charged with enhancing and preserving the world he inhabits. This dual call to creative endeavor and sociohistorical responsibility translates, practically, into a clear work ethic; and work, in one form or another, is a cardinal Jewish value.

Judaism proper, however, begins not with Adam but with Avraham; and his universal message is clearly and prophetically defined by Yeshayahu: “Hearken to Me, ye that follow after righteousness, / Ye that seek the Lord; / Look unto the rock whence you were hewn, / And to the hole of the pit whence ye were digged. / Look unto Abraham your father, / And unto Sarah that bore you.”⁵ The “passion for righteousness” (as Arnold aptly conceived “Hebraism”) and the passion for God; social justice—comprehending not only legal deserts but the outreach of Avraham’s hallmark, *hesed*⁶, to the needy and the underprivileged—and radical monotheism; that is

the patriarchal legacy to mankind, to be ideally implemented through Torah existence.

Our particularism, too, springs from Avraham. He is, after all, a convert, and, following his conversion, begins to build a people.⁷ It is only at Sinai, however, that we attain mature national fruition; and it is there that two new related elements, henceforth cardinal Jewish values, enter the picture. The first is Torah, the content of revelation proper, whose study and perpetuation then become a central Jewish concern. The second is Israel, a covenantal community forged by axiological commitment no less than by historical destiny; and its preservation, too, assumes primary significance.

With Siani, the panoply of cardinal Jewish values is largely completed, although the entry into Eretz Israel—conceived as the focus of divine immanence, as the matrix of national existence, as the locus of historical and eschatological fulfillment, and as a unique social and perhaps even metaphysical entity—subsequently obstrudes an additional element, partly instrumental and partly intrinsic. Henceforth, the Jewish world, personal or collective, rests upon fairly constant foundations: the sanctity of man and the sanctification of life; responsibility to preserve and enhance the human environment; the religious quest for God and the moral quest for a just and compassionate society; commitment to the study and observance of Torah and to the physical and spiritual sustenance of the community of Israel, as both a covenantal and national entity.

⁴ *Bereshit* 2:15

⁵ *Isaiah* 51:1-2

⁶ The term is not readily translatable. It denotes both excess and loving kindness, and is generally used to describe empathetic *caritas*, based upon the breaking down—or at least, the lowering—of interpersonal barriers, and manifested in benevolent aid, not necessarily financial, to one’s fellow, be he sick or poor (see *BT, Sukkah* 49b).

⁷ The sequence of Avraham’s circumcision as an act of conversion (signified by the change in his name, reflecting a new identity) just prior to Yitzchak’s birth, and presumably as a condition to it, is surely no coincidence; see *Bereshit Rabbah* 46:2.

But if the basic values have, within the central tradition, remained relatively constant, their implementation, and, at times, their interpretation, have not. Modes, emphases, priorities, all, have been subject to the ebb and flow of historical currents. Even within a seemingly rigorous Halachic regimen, there is far more flexibility than meets the eye, especially, that of an outsider.⁸ With respect to some of the most critical decisions in a person's life, the choice of a mate or a career, for instance, there are no definitive Halachic norms. Or again, while certain familial obligations are clearly and rigorously mandated, the structure and character of domestic relations remain largely a matter of personal choice. Nothing dictates whether a father to a Prussian is *paterfamilias* or a chummy mentor. Likewise, at the communal plane. In one context, education may stress the communication of knowledge; in another, the inculcation of commitment. Physical survival takes priority in one generation, spiritual growth in the next. Each hour has its own call, and the vicissitudes of history require flexibility with respect to both strategy and tactics.

The proper perception of change is thus essential to the intelligent direction of private conduct or public policy. It is important, however, that the nature and scope of change be properly evaluated, and the tendency to exaggerate needs be resisted. Any traditionally oriented world-view is inclined, almost by definition, to the classical position that, fundamentally, human nature and human society remain, in Hooker's celebrated phrase, "general and universal," and Judaism is no ex-

ception. It recognizes the significance of change, yet holds that it is generally overshadowed by constancy; and it insists that we must discriminate between profound and meaningful change and mere superficial difference.⁹

Nevertheless, with respect to our own times, the feeling that we are being swept along by currents of genuine and accelerated change persists. It is probably difficult for us, as contemporaries, to assess this feeling. In part, it is no doubt the result of our nineteenth-century legacy of historical consciousness; and, to some extent, it is true that even denizens of what retrospectively appear to have been eminently stable periods often saw their work as marked by transition if not disintegration. Allowance for these factors having been made, however, the perception of exponential change persists; and I, for one, am inclined to accept it.

The patterns of change are multifaceted and of varying scope and duration. At one level, we are still being buffeted by the cultural forces which have gradually secularized much of the West over the last three centuries. With respect to the Jewish community, these have increasingly led to weakened commitment, as many of its scions—first in Europe but, more recently, among Oriental Jewry as well—have run the gamut from secularization, through assimilation, and to the point of intermarriage. At a second, we are still under the impact of specific twentieth century developments, primarily, the Holocaust, on the one hand, and the gestation of a renascent Jewish state, on the other. At yet a third, we are confronted by possibly still inchoate trends affecting the contemporary scene

⁸ I do not refer to possible change in the normative substance of Halacha but to differences resulting from optional factors and modes of realization.

⁹ This perception may, of course, itself vary. In all likelihood, the sense of change was keener in biblical times than subsequently. Nevertheless, the generalization holds.

proper. These are both external and internal. Among the former, the most significant, at least, as regards North America, is the diminution of Jewish political and possibly economic power.

In relative terms, the Jewish community is now less influential than it was a decade or two ago, and the opportunities open to its members are more limited, and the potentially ominous ramifications are obvious. Among the latter, one might cite the ferment concerning the status of women, declining birth rates, the growing incidence of divorce, the proliferation of "blended" and "reconstituted" families, and the gradual aging of the population—all general phenomena but with particular implications for the Jewish world. Of more singularly Jewish developments, perhaps the most significant is increased polarization, the result of both the constriction of the overall base through attrition and assimilation, on the one hand, and the constriction of horizons in many quarters, on the other. All this, of course, quite apart from more general socio-economic and cultural factors such as rapid technological revolution and possibly radical changes in the mode of communication. In sum, the feeling that ours is indeed a world of relative rapid and substantive change is therefore soundly based.

Given this context, how might we best conceive the role of contemporary Jewish communal service and what direction can one offer its constituents? I am inclined to open with an admitted conservative counsel: Don't lose your head. Given the pervasive sense of rapid change, it is all too easy to lose one's balance and one's bearings, to be overwhelmed by the razzle-dazzle of social gimmickry and the welter of pseudo-scientific jargon. But, precisely because of the scope of current change, the last thing the Jewish world needs is the

substitution of glitter for substance or the pursuit of novelty at the expense of basic values. These remain pretty much what, historically, they have been; and, for our purposes, they can be succinctly distilled into the twin aims of serving God and servicing Jews. That is, of course, a religious formulation and the first component is barely palatable to the consistent secularist. But for him, too, Jewishness, however he defines it, is presumably not just a sociological but an ideological category—indeed, the historical and philosophic source of many of his most cherished humanistic values; and he, too, is confronted by the dual challenge of integrating and inculcating that axiological complex and of helping his brethren.

Moreover, both purposes are, to an extent, related, inasmuch as, on the one hand, aid to a fellow-Jew is geared not only to sustaining him as an individual but to enhancing the viability of the Jewish community as a whole; and, on the other hand, as many have reluctantly come to recognize, Jewish communal survival, even in purely sociological terms, is directly linked to spiritual commitment. In pursuit of these goals, the ability to adapt, resourcefully and imaginatively, to change is crucial; but on the condition that, in the process, we don't erode our feel of the values proper. And we should, once again, ware of luxuriating in the exaggerated sense of the presumed uniqueness of our own situation, over and above the singularity of every historical era. We ought, rather, bear in mind that it is precisely the combination of resourcefulness and commitment which has stood Jewry in such good stead throughout the ages.

Our two primary aims, the social and the ideological, are, then, intimately and reciprocally linked. We help preserve our people by enriching its spir-

itual fiber; and part of that fiber is the empathetic readiness to help. Today as ever, therefore, the first priority of Jewish communal service should be enhancing the very sense of community, as opposed to individualism, on the one hand, and universalism, on the other. This entails, initially, a return to primal values: work and responsibility. These, conceived not only as instruments of self-realization but also as avenues to helping others, are both grounded in the altruistic impulse and serve to reinforce it. As such, they stand opposed to the pleasure principle which in recent decades has so pervaded Western culture and, through it, Jewish society as well.

The "work ethic" is a bit *passé* in our changing world, and many Jews tend to regard it as a Puritan relic. In this respect, however, Puritanism's self-image as "the new Israel" is right on the mark. Work, contrasted not with study (that is simply a specific and higher labor)¹⁰ or enriching leisure (what the Greeks called *skole*) but with pleasure, is as previously stated a cardinal Jewish value and one which we should encourage as a means of deepening the sense of giving and sacrifice. Concomitantly, we should strive, by precept and example, to tone down the pleasures of opulence. The sybaritic self-indulgence, complete with *glatt kosher* junkets, which has become a way of life for so many who can afford it and an aspiration to those who can't, stands radically opposed to Jewish tradition and experience. We should recognize that fact and be ready to act upon it. And we should recognize, too, the profound Jewish truth that ultimately self-fulfillment proper is largely attained through *hesed* and community. That, as Lionel Trilling aptly noted, is the clearest sense of Hillel's celebrated

dictum: "If I am not for myself, who is for me? (But) if I am for myself alone, what am I?"¹¹

A second manifestation of altruism is even more personal. In an age in which its very status has become an issue, we should encourage Jews not only to raise a family but to raise a large one. Neither personal convenience nor presumed universal interest can provide a rationale for merely maintaining the status quo. Whatever the current global merits of zero population growth, for post-Holocaust Jewry it is an intolerable canon. We cannot eradicate the enormity of Auschwitz but the least we can do as a nation is to "replace" (how frighteningly inhuman the term but imperative nonetheless) its victims. Whatever the career cost, and however parents divide it, a large family constitutes a desideratum in Jewish life today. And here, too, we should, with the means at our disposal, promote not only the responsibility of parenthood but its self-fulfilling joys. An early Jewish source has attested to them amply. In response to the divine promise, "Fear not, Avram, I am thy shield, thy reward shall be exceeding great", Avram asks poignantly, 'O Lord God, what wilt Thou give me, seeing I go childless?'¹²

The emphasis upon community contrasts, as previously indicated, not only with individualism but with universalism as well. Conceptually, this in no way entails the renunciation of *hesed* as a catholic category. Just as the rejection of individualism as an ideology does not negate the value of self-fulfillment but rather presents a different mode

¹¹ *Abot* 1:14

¹² *Ber.* 15.2. The J.P.S. version, following the Vulgate's *ego vadam absque* renders "seeing I go hence." However, I prefer the interpretation of the Rambam, *ad locum*, that the statement refers to present desiccated loneliness rather than to future barren demise.

¹⁰ See *BT*, Sanhedrin 99b

of attaining it, so the rejection of universalistic doctrine does not entail apathetic insensitivity to mankind but rather posits a different way of progressively relating to it. In practice, however, there is no denying the fact that a centripetal thrust tends to minimize if not deaden concern for outsiders. As such, it does often compromise the ideal of *hesed*.

Nevertheless, given our present situation, I see no alternative to turning inward. The combination of rising assimilation and declining power mandates increased concern for specifically Jewish needs—spiritual, physical, and emotional. Despite the best humanitarian intentions, we cannot escape the pressure of priority. “Many are Thy people’s needs, and their wit limited,” intones the *piyut*, and that aptly describes our current station. Whether certain communal manifestations of our collective generous impulse had been in order a generation ago is perhaps debatable; that most can no longer be afforded is not. At the same time, we should make an educational effort to contain insidious effects of creeping insularity. The notion, altogether too prevalent in some circles (albeit perhaps not those likely to read this paper), that the concerns or even the suffering of mere *goyim* are irrelevant to us, cannot be countenanced. Avraham Avinu and Mosheh Rabbenu, at any rate, thought otherwise.

The question of priorities arises, of course, with respect to purely domestic needs as well. It confronts us in two related areas: the choice of values and the choice of population. Ideally, to be sure, Jewish institutions should foster the whole gamut of cardinal Jewish values, all the more inasmuch as those values constitute an organic whole. Practically, however, some must be preferred over others. In determining precedence, the nature of a particular

setting must obviously be considered. No single institution can address itself equally to all aims, although in defining its own focus it should bear in mind the total context. From an overall perspective, therefore, decisions must be made at two levels. First, to what extent should single-purpose institutions be developed at the expense of multifaceted ones, and which? Secondly, with respect to the latter—I refer primarily to community centers—what is the overriding aim and what, relatively, secondary?

I do not pretend to offer pat solutions to such questions, but I would very much urge that they be approached both axiologically and pragmatically, with vision that can define general national priorities while yet allowing for local variables. We can hardly equate Lawrence, New York with Lawrence, Kansas. Broadly speaking, however, in assessing the role of Jewish communal service today, I would assign top priority to the deepening of Jewish identity and commitment. Would that the situation were otherwise, and that communal entities could provide already deeply committed Jews with necessary services. Unfortunately, however, in most places, that, for the foreseeable future, is the ball game. Between helping a Jew cope with his problems or satisfy his desires and keeping him Jewish, there is not much room for choice. This may appear to entail the precedence of collective over personal needs, and to some extent it does. It should be borne in mind, however, that from a traditional perspective, Jewish identity itself is a most precious boon.

This is not to suggest that all Centers should be primarily concerned with overtly inculcating commitment. That is, on the whole, better left to schools and synagogues. However, they should strive to create a climate conducive to

commitment, one in which it should clearly be regarded as a desideratum. They should, at the very least, instill a basic sense of belonging. At present, that sense is less easily attained than a generation ago. Mere presence within a Jewish setting no longer suffices; youngsters, in particular, need to be actively engaged as Jews. Gone are the days when basketball and arts and crafts provided an effective barrier against intermarriage.

Given the ambient freedom adolescents enjoy within the general culture, its danger is so pervasive that only meaningful Jewish experience can contain it. That requires positive content—not necessarily “religious”, narrowly speaking, but a clear and conscious call to act and exist as part of the Jewish people, and a feeling of the moral and spiritual challenge of that existence. Here again, the readiness to give should be both developed and tapped. Jewish communal service provides to those in need. Upon those presumably not in need, it can bestow the very sense of giving and belonging, thus both realizing a profound Jewish value and imbuing a feeling of Jewish confraternity.

The need for priorities obtrudes upon the selection of target population no less than upon the choice of values. To which age group, socioeconomic stratum, or spiritual level should Jewish communal service address itself primarily? Presumably, no sector should be wholly ignored, but emphases can obviously vary, and here again, numerous variables should be weighed. Nevertheless, some policy guidelines can be suggested, with an eye to both private and public interests. Traditionally, Jewish communal service, at least in North America, has been oriented, like American culture generally, toward the young. In the light of current demographic trends and projections,

that orientation is open to serious question. The increase in the proportion of the aged, combined with the fact that their social and economic needs are often greater than their grandchildren's, surely calls for some restructuring.

Nevertheless, we should beware of excesses. In establishing priorities, we need to consider not only the socioeconomic factor as an individual concern but the Jewish element, regarded as both a personal and a communal need, as well. Service to a “senior citizen” is mandated by *hesed*, and as such is enormously important; but its impact upon the quality of his Jewish commitment is, on the whole, relatively minimal. With respect to the young, however, insofar as service to them molds their Jewish identity, it assumes an entirely different dimension. Relating to this age group, a community center services not only Reb Israel but *klal Israel*; and this fact should be assigned significant weight in deciding upon the allocation of energies and resources.

At the same time, we should take heed lest we lapse into the glorification of youth which is so endemic to much current Western culture but so alien to Judaism. Respect for age is deeply rooted in Jewish tradition and sensitivity to its character a moral and religious value to be instilled collectively. We cannot expect every older person to sing, with Browning's Rabbi Ben Ezra, “Grow old along with me! The best is yet to be.” But we can strive to impart a sense of dignity and purpose to life's twilight and to imbue concern and respect for it in all. In this educational effort, communal institutions, which service both ends of the age spectrum directly and can develop an integrated approach to their needs, can play a significant role. Indeed, we should strive to relate to both groups simultaneously

through imaginative initiatives which could challenge the young to service the old themselves—thus helping not only to bridge the collective generation gap, but also to provide for those in need and to educate towards a life of *hesed*. Moreover, we could thus deepen the sense of community and enable the youngsters to realize that, for all that they may help their seniors, there is so much which they can receive from them.

With respect to age groups, I have suggested that priorities be determined not only on the basis of mundane physical and/or emotional need but with an eye to personal and public spiritual interest. Similar considerations obtain with respect to choosing between more or less committed target populations. Jewish communal service should be primarily oriented to meeting the greatest spiritual need, to reaching those on the periphery of our world, whose contact with Jewish educational or religious institutions is tangential at best, the multitude of marginal Jews for whom a community center may be the last barrier to assimilation. Agencies geared to responding to specific needs, vocational guidance, family counselling, and the like, should obviously be equally oriented and accessible to all; but institutions such as Centers which initiate programs and provide facilities with structured communal goals should maximize their efforts where the results are apt to be most critical.

Clearly, much thought needs to be given to the likelihood of prospective success. In some cases, the emphasis upon servicing the marginally committed may be unwarranted as resources and energies might be wasted upon them and better spent elsewhere, and we also need to beware of spreading ourselves too thin. In principle, however, their needs should take precedence over those of others less in dan-

ger and better able to fend for themselves.

Coming from an Orthodox rabbi, this may appear to be strange doctrine indeed. But can we responsibly entertain any other? To be sure, we invest substantially in institutions of higher learning, knowing full well that the resources and energies devoted to their enrichment and embellishment could conceivably save some marginal Jew from spiritual disaster. However, those ensure and enhance our collective existence in a way that community centers cannot. They add a cultural dimension, develop leadership, and posit a standard of excellence. Hence, if we are to sustain the quality of our spiritual life we cannot neglect them out of purely quantitative considerations. The role of communal service is quite different, however; and, in defining the scope of its activity, precedence should indeed be given to Jews who, precisely because they are *not* likely to enhance the quality of our collective spiritual life, can derive maximal benefit from it.

If, in one respect, Jewish communal service focuses upon a particular segment of the community, in another, it relates to the Jewish world as a whole. I refer to its role as a possible unifying force. Broadly based and not necessarily identified with any particular sector, its institutions can help mold our sorely fractured society in one of two ways. First, they can meet, albeit separately, the specific needs of various groups—be these more genuinely special, such as classes with a given ideological orientation, or the allocated use of essentially general facilities, such as those of sports or music. This is of course a rather limited unifying mode, but within our present situation, even the moderate interaction resulting from the common use of a single complex is not to be denigrated.

Beyond that, however, communal institutions can provide a focus and a forum for truly cooperative activity and, at times, perhaps for constructive confrontation as well. In this connection, the relation to Eretz Israel—the land, its people, and its state—can play a significant role. Through it, one can transcend parochial concerns and relate, horizontally and vertically, to the Jewish people as a whole; and, despite the lamentable decline in Zionist commitment during the last decade, it is still the object of a broader consensus than almost any other major concern in Jewish life, and this situation is likely to continue for the foreseeable future. Moreover, the unifying force of a relation to Israel is built around positive content and is not the result of an emasculating blandness whose “unity”, beyond a certain point, is simply not worth the candle.

The relation to *klal Israel*, as a concept and a reality, brings us back to Jewish identity and commitment and to the role of the community center as an educational force. A Center is not, of course, primarily concerned with education in the narrow sense of the term. It should, however, be concerned, first, with what the Greeks called *paideia*—the enhancing of powers, the enrichment of personality, and the orientation to values. Secondly, it can contribute to learning proper. The study of Torah has traditionally been a major Jewish value; and even where that, strictly defined, is not feasible, the acquisition and internalization of Jewish knowledge, more broadly conceived, remain significant. A community center can advance it in two respects. It can simply offer classes in different areas and for various age groups, with particular emphasis upon adult education, especially for the many who are beyond the reach of schools or synagogues or have become disaf-

ected with them. In this regard, the growing interest in informal education and the projected increase in leisure time, offer an opportunity and a challenge. Beyond that, however, a Center should strive to develop an openness to learning, to create a climate within which it is regarded as a value and respect and appreciation for it to be cultivated.

Finally, in a world of change the role of Jewish communal service includes developing the capacity to deal with change itself. It can effect this in two ways: first, by transmitting the knowledge and the skills to cope with specific changes and by providing a proper perspective upon the phenomenon in general. Current social trends clearly intensify the need for the former. In one area, rapid technological development has greatly exacerbated the problem of vocational obsolescence and raised the possibility of widespread middle-age career shifts. In another, as various factors have converged to intensify stress within the structure of the family, divorce has increasingly been sought as a solution, even in long-term marriages. And of course, a more positive development, the rising actuarial curve has broadened the need for guidance in dealing with the blessings and traumas of longevity.

With respect to perspective, we are concerned not so much with increasing the numerator as with decreasing the denominator, not so much with teaching people how to climb the mountain as with enabling them to see it is only a hill. In this regard, Jewish identity and commitment can be of great significance. Quite apart from the sense of relative security which religious faith and trust instill, the feeling of rootedness inherent in identification with a historical tradition makes current change seem less threatening. By placing the ephemeral within the context

of the permanent, it provides a firm psychological anchor; and the knowledge of a measure of underlying stability which it conveys confers the inner strength to confront change without being overwhelmed by it. This is doubly true with respect to Jewish history, whose tortuous path attests so eloquently to the ability to withstand the vicissitudes of change.

And therein lies a moral for institutions no less than for individuals. Surely, Jewish communal bodies cannot be obtuse to change. They must sensitize antennae to perceive and even anticipate it, and they must manifest the wisdom and the courage to cope

with it, flexibly and imaginatively. At the same time, they must, as I have emphasized, beware of losing their bearings—of being frightened by mutation, of being tempted by faddishness. A committed Jew does not quite proclaim that *plus ca change, plus c'est la meme*. But he senses that change should be perceived, if not *sub specie aeternitatem*, then at least within the context of a long and trying history. That knowledge gives him the strength to deal with its challenges, confident that, if our vision remains clear and our basic values sound, we shall overcome.

Communal service professionals from Jewish Communities around the world will gather in Jerusalem in 1985. Your participation will promote better worldwide exchange and understanding of all professional concerns . . . as well as help you improve your quality of service.

