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“DISPUTE FOR THE SAKE OF HEAVEN”
Dissent and Multiplicity in Rav Shagar’s Thought
EITAN ABRAMOVITCH

SHIMON GERSHON ROSENBERG (1949–2007), known as Rav Shagar, was one of the most unique and original thinkers in Modern Orthodoxy of our time.¹ His thought—spread through his books and articles, through his teaching in various institutions, and by his influential students—has had a deep influence on religious discourse in Israel. He majorly influenced the Religious Zionist community to which he belonged, but his influence is also felt in the realm of Jewish studies in Israeli universities and in the margins of the Haredi community. In 2017 a selection of his essays was translated into English for the first time and published in the United States, followed by vibrant discussion in various forums.²

Rav Shagar is known for his ability to incorporate in his thinking Chasidic and mystical ideas on the one hand and existential and postmodern philosophy on the other. In this essay I use the term “dispute for the sake of heaven” [machloket leshem shamayim, Mishna Avot 5:17] to present an example for such an encounter. Rav Shagar’s discussions about harmony and dispute, unity and multiplicity, can lead us to some of the central innovations of his thought and at the same time help us situate his teachings in the context of the Religious Zionist community in Israel and the dramatic transitions that it has undergone in recent decades.³

ETERNAL DISPUTE

The Mishna in Avot 5:17 states that “a dispute for the sake of heaven is destined to endure,” and the example it brings for such a dispute is the one between Hillel and Shammai. But what value can there be for a dispute to endure? Why not strive for a
conclusion, for a halachic ruling, or maybe turn to an authority that will settle the argument one way or another? This question is related to a more general and fundamental question: how does a monotheistic religion deal with multiplicity, with conflicts and differences that cannot be settled, both in the philosophical and in the political domains?* 

Rav Shagar thoroughly explores these questions in his writings, but to better understand his discussion, it should be seen in relation to the philosophy of Rav Abraham Isaac Kook. Rav Kook’s philosophy has had a defining influence on the Religious Zionist community in Israel, and it is one of the central influences on Rav Shagar’s thought. Moreover, Rav Shagar explicitly presents his approach as a reaction to Rav Kook and as an alternative to the way Rav Kook’s understanding has shaped the Religious Zionist community in Israel. Therefore, a brief analysis of Rav Kook’s attitude toward this discussion is needed before we discuss Rav Shagar’s point of view.

**RAV KOOK’S HARMONIOUS “SUPREME HOLINESS”**

A core tenant of Rav Kook’s thought is that he strives for harmony and synthesis between different opinions and worldviews. The primary example of this can be seen in his attitude toward the struggles between Orthodox Judaism and modern secular movements such as Zionism and Socialism, struggles that nearly tore the Jewish people apart in his time. Rav Kook saw these struggles as taking part in a dialectic process, one that is destined to lead to a higher level of faith and Jewish self-understanding. In one of his essays he describes the three major ideologies that were clashing in the Jewish society in his time—liberalism, nationalism, and Orthodoxy—and suggests that the truth lies in the synthesis of all three of them in a point of view that he calls “the supreme holiness” [HaKodesh HaElion].

The structure of this argument is characteristic of Rav Kook’s attitude toward the questions posed in the previous section: profound conflicts are meant to lead to a higher perspective, one that will allow for a harmonious synthesis of the underlying contradictions. This Hegelian understanding of history sees every dispute as an intermediary phase leading to its resolution. The dispute might be “for the sake of heaven,” as the Mishna quoted in the previous section suggests, but only if it is resolved and does not endure.

For the purpose of this discussion it is important to note that, according to Rav Kook, this “supreme holiness,” the higher perspective that unites all differences, is not identical to the Orthodox worldview that he identifies with; nevertheless, in this text and others, Rav Kook is speaking as an Orthodox rabbi taking part in the struggles he
is describing, while at the same time looking at this struggle from above, pointing at a synthesis that is destined to be different than the particular trend he is fighting for.

Appreciating the effects of this point of view is crucial to understanding Rav Kook’s influence on the Religious Zionist community. The struggle to hold on to the higher synthesis creates an ongoing inner tension in this community’s self-understanding. On the one hand, it is a religious Orthodox community, and therefore it exists as a particular sector, a minority group, in the Israeli society; on the other hand, it tends to see itself as representing a full synthesis between the worldviews of all other sectors, and therefore it strives to a leading role that will allow it to give every sector its appropriate place. It is a sector that wishes to be more than a sector, a part that wants to be a whole.

A typical example for this tension can be seen in the name that Rav Kook gave to the yeshiva he founded in Jerusalem: The Central Universal Yeshiva [HaYeshiva HaMerkazit HaOlamit]. It is a yeshiva, a traditional Orthodox institution like many others; but at the same time it wishes to play a “central” and even “universal” role by incorporating the different worldviews and aspirations of the Jewish people, thus adopting the point of view of the “supreme holiness” that Rav Kook wrote about.

Over the last few years, this tension is also manifested in the political party representing the Religious Zionist sector—the Jewish Home [HaBait HaYehudi, formerly HaMafdal]. Since 2012, under the leadership of Naftali Bennett, the Jewish Home began aspiring to be more than a representation of its sector; it saw itself fitting to lead the entire Israeli society. In order to do so, the party leaders were willing to include secular and even non-Jewish representatives, and on many occasions they left the political struggles on religious issues to the Haredi parties. In 2019 the inner tension described here was manifested in a splitting of the party: the Jewish Home restored its focus on representing the Religious Zionist sector, and Bennett formed a new party, the New Right [HaYamin HaHadash], no longer representing the Religious Zionist sector and instead aspiring to attract a wider audience.

RAV SHAGAR’S PROPOSAL:
THREE TRANSITIONS

This brief look at Rav Kook’s influence will allow us to understand the context in which Rav Shagar is situated and also to highlight the innovation of his philosophy. As we shall see, although Rav Shagar sees himself as a successor of Rav Kook, he consciously turned to different and even opposite directions.

In one of his essays, written in 1996, Rav Shagar outlines the transitions that he believes the Religious Zionist community should go through, in accordance with his understanding of the spirit of the time:
For Religious Zionism to renew itself, and to leave the straits in which it finds itself, it must change its path significantly. It must give up on its ideology and its quest for harmony. In this sense it is postmodernism, ostensibly so dangerous to it, that can open up new, exciting, paths for it. . . .

Religious Zionism got its path and its drive for harmony from its great teacher, Rav Kook. In truth, he was well aware of the contradictions and gaps torn in the modern world. . . . However, Rav Kook believed that we could mend the tears. . . .

Rav Kook spoke in many places about the ideal of unity and harmony. Even when he describes pluralism, he deals with it in a non-pluralistic manner. He believes that you can find a higher perspective in which everything unites. . . . This position matches the philosophy and social science of Rav Kook’s era. The former believed in the all-encompassing unifying narrative of a single cognitive truth obligating all people. The latter believed it could derive, from the complexity of reality, universal rules that would apply to any society. However, the science and philosophy of today no longer believe this. Today, Rav Kook’s harmonious statements fall prey to a lack of faith; they do not fit with what people call “the spirit of the time,” in the world writ large but also even within our little community. We have lost our faith in unity and metanarratives.

Rav Shagar identifies Rav Kook’s strive for harmony, and the Religious Zionist ideology influenced by it, with the context of the modern search for a unifying metanarrative that will explain everything. Following Jean-François Lyotard and other postmodern philosophers, who defined the postmodern era through the loss of faith in metanarratives, Rav Shagar claims that this kind of thinking has become outdated. Harmonious metanarratives do not hold anymore, not only in the domain of science but also in the Religious Zionist community. Rav Shagar’s conclusion is that this community must go through a deep and even revolutionary transition, which he describes in the following paragraphs. Here we can see how the concept of dispute takes its place in his discussion, following Rav Naḥman of Bratslav:

This postmodern, split mindset sharply raises the question of whether or not Religious Zionism can find a new guiding light: Rebbe Naḥman of Bratslav. Not only did Rebbe Naḥman not believe in mending tears, he even sought them out. Rebbe Naḥman sought out dispute [machloket]. As he says in one of his teachings, dispute creates the empty space [ḥalal bapanui], the only atmosphere in which he could act, and through which he could express his uniqueness that was so important to him. He did not exist in a harmonious world, and he did not believe it was possible to unify opposites. On the contrary, he drew spiritual strength from harmony-less dissonance.
Living as religious people in a modern secular world creates contradictions. Against these contradictions, Rebbe Naḥman did not suggest harmonization like Rav Kook’s school did, which as we have seen can lead to inflexible coercion of contradictory poles. Instead, he proposed the spiritual capacity to live in many worlds simultaneously. . . . The divine infinite can be realized in this world as life lived in multiple worlds. . . . This, to my mind, is the meaning of religious Post-Zionism.9

In these foundational paragraphs, Rav Shagar proposes three simultaneous transitions: from Rav Kook to Rav Nahman, from harmony to multiplicity, and from unity to infinity. According to Rav Shagar, these transitions will turn Religious Zionism to Religious Post-Zionism, a term that points to their political implications.

In order to better understand Rav Shagar’s proposal, we dedicate the following paragraphs to a thorough discussion of these transitions, concluding with their implications in the social and political domains. First, we will take a deeper look at the role of the term “the divine infinite” [HaEinsof HaEloki] in this text. As we shall see, it will also lead us to the transition from harmony to multiplicity.

THE DIVINE INFINITE AND THE POSTMODERN RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

Rav Shagar’s use of the term “infinity” plays a central role in the way he incorporates postmodern philosophy in his thought. We can see this in another essay, where he uses the term to distinguish between the way modern Jewish philosophers dealt with conflicting ideologies and the postmodern way that he proposes:

After all, any system can ultimately be perceived as being directed by a divine hand; any system—even if it is heretical, like Marxism—presupposes an underlying, logical structure to reality, and any order ultimately points to guidance from above. It is at this point that the believer enters, “translates” the logic into the invisible hand of God, and finds his place in the Torah. What is our problem today? Nowadays we discover that there is neither method nor system, so this “translation” cannot take place. The world that we struggle with has no narrative.

Yet even in our own fragmented and relativistic world, “sparks” can be found. Moreover—and here I approach a rather sensitive, profound point—it is precisely the postmodern world that can cultivate an even deeper faith, one of mysticism and concealment. Why is this? When we are in any system or given framework, we are constrained within the finite, and cannot access the infinite directly. . . . Only when the laws of science are broken and a checkered board of many options opens—it is
then that we can see infinite-ness in our existence. We come to understand that that
which exists is the result of one outcome out of millions of possibilities contained
in the Infinite, Blessed Be He. Thus relativism leads to a kind of faith on a mystic
level: at this level, mysticism is not a game or a pretense, but an expression of the
myriad possibilities that are inherent in the Divine. The crisis of postmodernity can
thus break idols and statues—for nothing is absolute but God himself—and bring
us closer to an unmediated encounter with God.¹⁰

These paragraphs portray the transition that Rav Shagar proposes as a shift in the reli-
gious sensibility, one that is based on a different theological attitude revolving around
the term “infinite.” According to Rav Shagar, modern Jewish philosophy is constantly
looking for synthesis because it is based on a religious experience of unity. Its underly-
ing image of God is that of the invisible guiding hand, the one that ensures that in the
end all contradictions will lead to a harmonious unity. The alternative religious sensi-
tivity that Rav Shagar proposes is based on an opposite attitude: its image of God is
that of the divine infinite, and therefore it encounters it in the experience of multi-
plicity, dispute, and conflict.

A modern believer like Rav Kook is struggling to find the point of view from which
he can identify the unity, the logic, the invisible hand that operates behind the conflicts
he encounters. The postmodern believer that Rav Shagar describes, however, prefers
the experience of multiplicity, the inability to reach a final explanation, or to arrive
to the point of view of the “supreme holiness” that Rav Kook strived to achieve. This
kind of believer does not see the world as a unified, harmonious system, but as an open
space in which different and conflicting worldviews exist, and none of them can take
precedence over the others. For the postmodern believer, the effort to develop a finite
worldview that will incorporate all differences is like building an idol. In his view, the
highest religious experience is that of multiplicity, not unity.

FROM RAV KOOK TO RAV NAHMAN:
A DISSONANT MELODY

The transition from unity to infinity and from harmony to multiplicity expresses a deep
shift in the existential disposition of the believer. From the paragraphs quoted in the
previous section we can derive that in Rav Shagar’s view, these transitions are not just
a way to preserve faith in changing times but also a path to a deeper faith, which he
describes as mystical.¹¹ As we have seen, Rav Shagar identifies this alternative disposi-
tion with Rav Nahman of Bratslav and proposes him as a “new guiding light” for the
Religious Zionist community, an alternative for Rav Kook.
Rav Nahman’s affinity for conflicts and disputes can be seen in various aspects of his life and writing, and it has also been a central theme in the research about him. This affinity is specifically manifested in his use of the term “dispute for the sake of heaven” in his book *Likutei Moharan*: “There is a type of dispute that is for the sake of heaven, and that is a very great way of thinking [da’at], greater than the peaceful way of thinking, because this dispute is itself great love and peace.”

Rav Nahman prefers dispute over peace and sees it as a way of achieving a higher religious understanding. In one of his essays, Rav Shagar describes this attitude as the fundamental contribution of Rav Nahman’s torah for the Religious Zionist community:

More than anything else, I learned from Rebbe Nahman that sometimes contradiction and dispute are truer than a harmonious depiction of reality. Rav Kook’s philosophy, which influences us greatly, encourages our tendency to unify and harmonize different ideas, ideologies, positions, and streams. However, Rebbe Nahman’s Torah enables us to understand that this is indeed a lofty spiritual ideal, but not one that is always achievable. In actual reality, it seems more important to know how to learn to live with contradiction, which is certainly truer than false, forced, or violent harmony. This harmony requires stretching or shortening the opposites in order to make them fit into the Sodomite bed of supposed harmony. Our challenge is not to create harmony between conflicting sides or even to decide between them, but rather the ability to live by combining contradictory elements, which persist in their contradiction and disagreement. This combination creates a sort of melody which is composed of dissonances, but which is also exciting, deep, and infinite.

This paragraph portrays the transition from Rav Kook to Rav Nahman in a similar way to the shift in religious sensibility described above, while also adding a musical metaphor. According to Rav Shagar, Rav Nahman teaches the Religious Zionist believer to enjoy a dissonant melody, to see the contradictions a believer in postmodern times faces as a necessary religious experience, not as obstacles in the way of harmony.

Furthermore, this text also adds another aspect to the discussion, one that takes a crucial place in Rav Shagar’s critique of Rav Kook’s influence on the Religious Zionist community: the demand for sincerity. In his actual life, Rav Shagar claims, the modern believer faces contradictions that cannot be solved, and she might never reach the harmonious arrangement that will settle all conflicts. Striving for harmony, like Rav Kook taught, often leads to a denial and repression of external and internal contradictions and might foster insincerity or even false consciousness. Rav Shagar claims that instead of forming a community that will be a living synthesis between Jewish tradition and modern secular ideas, like Religious Zionism aspired to do, their ideology
created a community that is stuck in the middle, unable to fully identify with the tradition it inherited and not fully able to understand the secular ideas it wishes to adopt.

While describing Rav Kook’s harmonious aspirations as “a lofty spiritual ideal,” Rav Shagar maintains that Rav Nahman’s ability to live with contradictions is more suited for the actual situation of the Religious Zionist community. Rav Shagar demands that the believer acknowledge his schizophrenic situation and avoid insincere syntheses. Since such syntheses form the basic structure of the Religious Zionist identity, Rav Shagar’s proposal to postpone them and instead learn to live with the contradictions is far from easy to adopt. We will see that as we move to examining the social and political implications of Rav Shagar’s worldview—the transition to Religious Post-Zionism.

**RELIGIOUS POST-ZIONISM?**

Following our discussion of the theological and existential alternative that Rav Shagar proposes for the Religious Zionist community, we can now turn to its social and political implications.

If we go back to the complicated self-understanding of the Religious Zionist community described earlier, we can now begin to understand what Rav Shagar means when he proposes a shift toward a Religious Post-Zionism. We discussed the inner tension between this community’s basic identification with the Orthodox worldview and the aspiration to reach a higher point of view that incorporates all other conflicting worldviews. In accordance with what he sees as the spirit of the time, Rav Shagar proposes that Religious Zionism let go, or at least postpone, its universal and harmonious aspirations. Instead, he proposes to adopt a different complex: living in multiple worlds without seeking synthesis between them. In another part of the essay quoted in the previous section, he is pointing to the implications of this attitude for some of the central conflicts between the State of Israel and the Orthodox community:

We can maintain multiple worlds side by side within ourselves, unbothered by the fact that we cannot unify them. We can enact this type of existence not just on the personal-cultural level, but also on the social-institutional level. For example, in regard to the state: The solution to the troubling problems of dealing with Reform Jews, civil marriages, etc., lies in separating the political realm, where principles of freedom and equality should reign, from the society and community that need to be more Jewish and halachic. The obvious conclusion is that we must separate religion and state, to some degree. In this way we can bridge the gap between specific ethical values and halachah, a gap that we cannot resolve in the present situation.
Does this necessarily mean that the state is not the realization of the prophets’ dream? No, quite the contrary! To my mind, this can, in some sense, actually strengthen this faith. . . . Creating this separation can enable a religious person to realize certain values that he believes in (such as feminism) within the context of the state, while recognizing that they cannot be fully realized in the religious world without upending halachah’s very existence.16

There are areas where we cannot apply Religious Zionism’s harmonistic approach. For example, some ethical problems cannot be resolved sincerely and without apologetics within today’s religious framework. This is the case with our relationship to non-Jews and the status of women. However, as I claimed, we do not need to resolve them. We must know how to separate our lives as citizens of the state, which exists in a universal and egalitarian world, from the religious, halachic world with the hierarchical and patriarchal conceptions that underlie it.17

To fully understand the implications of the transition that Rav Shagar is proposing in these paragraphs, we should bear in mind what the connection between religion and state means for the Religious Zionist community. From the point of view of this community’s mainstream ideology, the State of Israel was founded only in order to be a Jewish state, one that will unite the religious and national aspirations of the Jewish people. As we have seen, Rav Kook strove to create a synthesis between religion, nationalism, and liberalism; in his view, and in the eyes of his successors, the Jewish state is destined to form the dialectic unity of these conflicting worldviews, a unity that is of a messianic value, “a realization of the prophets’ dream.”

This is the context in which Rav Shagar is discussing the connection between religion and state, a context that explains the careful yet determined tone he is using. The conflict between Orthodox halachah and egalitarian worldviews, manifested in the ongoing debates in the Religious Zionist community about the status of women and of other Jewish denominations, serves in this quote as an example of a conflict that cannot be solved in the present situation without “stretching or shortening the opposites.” Therefore, postponing the dream of harmonious unity and acquiring the ability to live with contradictions, as Rav Shagar proposes, is expressed in accepting a separation of religion and state, at least “to some degree.”

It is important to note that the conflict that Rav Shagar is relating to exists inside the Religious Zionist community and even inside its religious worldview. According to Rav Shagar, modern values like freedom and equality have gained religious meaning in the Religious Zionist worldview, although they sometimes contradict the “hierarchical and patriarchal conceptions” of Orthodox halachah. Therefore, the separation of religion and state is the political expression of the schizophrenic situation of this
community and also a way to live with the contradiction. Rav Shagar is proposing that the Religious Zionist community should restrain its immediate identification with the state and strengthen its Orthodox identity, while at the time relying on the secular state institutions to represent the modern values that are also part of its religious worldview. Paradoxically, Rav Shagar claims, the separation of religion and state will bring it closer to a “realization of the prophets’ dream,” since it will allow for a simultaneous existence of the conflicting worldviews struggling inside the Religious Zionist community. In the end, Rav Shagar is not so far from Rav Kook’s influence: he also sees the State of Israel as a vehicle of redemptive reconciliation, although in a much more moderate and complicated manner.

An excerpt from another essay, originally a sermon for Israeli Independence Day [Yom HaAtzmaut], will allow for a deeper look at the context and motivation for Rav Shagar’s discussion of these issues:

The mystical believer does not see democracy’s multicultural discourse as simply a tool for balancing society’s extremes. For him, this discourse will be accompanied by the wondrous recognition that “all statements are received from Heaven” (Rebbe Naḥman, Lekutei Moharan I 56:9). . . . The world becomes more flexible as it approaches multicultural and multi-national democracy; this is revealed as a possibility for elevating the religious world itself.18

In this text we can see what drives Rav Shagar’s discussion on the separation of religion and state. Unlike other adherents of this idea, he is not driven only by liberal ideology or pragmatic understanding of the contemporary situation. His discourse takes place on a whole other level. The state structure that he promotes is the political equivalent of the religious sensitivity he advocates. For Rav Shagar, the political realm, precisely because it is divided beyond any synthesis, allows for the religious experience of the encounter with the divine infinite. Rather than representing the dialectic unity of all conflicts, like Rav Kook aspired to, the Jewish state that Rav Shagar describes is a domain for the dispute for the sake of heaven, an institution that represents the infinite and colorful multiplicity of the Israeli society.

Furthermore, the political implications of this attitude go beyond the question of religion and state. Later in that sermon, Rav Shagar is relating also to the ongoing conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians and proposes to see it also as a dispute for the sake of heaven:

The fact that the Arab, the Palestinian, lives here and sees this land as his beloved homeland (and it really is his beloved homeland), need not impinge upon my belonging to this land. His existence cannot harm my connection to this stretch of
land itself as my homeland. This is the miraculous land of Israel, wherein “all statements are received from Heaven.” This way of thinking can perhaps enable us to reach a sense of kinship, not through abstraction or reducing different people, cultures, or faiths to one-dimensionally similar things. This is the kinship between those who are different, or even opposed.19

In this text, the transition from modernism to postmodernism, from Zionism to Post-Zionism, leads to a different perception of the land of Israel. Like the state, the land could also be a domain of multiplicity, a homeland for both nations; and again, this solution is also not considered as a pragmatic compromise, but as a way to arrive at a higher religious awareness, even a mystical achievement. The peace that Rav Shagar speaks about is not just a political arrangement. It is a religious peace, based on the complex awareness that he believes that the postmodern era permits.

CONCLUSION

This utopian vision, not yet realized, leads us to our conclusion.

The concept of dispute for the sake of heaven has led us to the fundamental and unique aspects of Rav Shagar’s philosophy. As we have seen, Rav Shagar deals with the conflict between monotheism and multiplicity that this concept implies by providing a complicated theological vocabulary accompanied by a corresponding religious sensitivity, both aimed at creating a new kind of believer.

We discussed Rav Shagar’s project in light of the context in which it was formed: the fundamental influence of Rav Kook’s philosophy on the shaping of the Religious Zionist identity. We have seen how Rav Shagar incorporated concepts and tendencies inspired by postmodern philosophy in his critique of Rav Kook’s worldview and used them to offer an alternative identity for the Religious Zionist community. In order for this community to become Religious Post-Zionism, Rav Shagar proposed a transition from Rav Kook to Rav Nahman, from harmony to multiplicity, and from unity to infinity. These transitions are intended to create a different kind of religious sensitivity, one that enjoys Rav Nahman’s dissonant melody instead of striving for Rav Kook’s harmonious “supreme holiness.”

At the same time, the theological and existential changes that Rav Shagar proposes lead to dramatic social and political implications, ones that affect the foundations of the Jewish state. The transition from Religious Zionism to Religious Post-Zionism is manifested in Rav Shagar’s careful adherence to the separation of religion and state and to turning the State of Israel into a multinational state that will serve also as the Palestinian homeland.
These dramatic implications emphasize the distance between Rav Shagar’s proposal and the actual social and political situation in the State of Israel nowadays. Nevertheless, as Shaul Magid pointed out, the theological and existential transitions that Rav Shagar spoke about are already taking place in parts of the Religious Zionist community. Therefore we can conclude by saying that at least in the community that he addressed, Rav Shagar’s ideas have gained a notable influence, one that might develop in the future.
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