Journal of Unschooling and Alternative Learning, 2021, Vol.15, Issue 30

What is so Alternative about the Alternative Education in Israel? The Scale of 11 Challenges set by the Alternative Education None-Mainstream

Prof. Arie Kizel (PhD)
Dept. of Learning and Instructional Sciences
Faculty of Education
University of Haifa

Abstract

The Israeli education system consists of public state schools and an alternative education system. This article reviews the unique characteristics of the alternative educational frameworks and analyzes the challenges they pose to the traditional and conservative state education system. The text offers a distinction between "Alternatives in education" vs. “Alternativeness in education” based on Ivan Illich others.

Keywords: Israeli education system, Alternatives in education, Alternativeness in education, Challenges of Alternative Education None-Mainstream

Introduction

The research field of alternative education in Israel is relatively new. It presents us with research, also academic one, of the existing frameworks, showing themselves as alternative or educational spaces to which some or other components that choose to call themselves "alternative" have penetrated or pretend to penetrate. Nonetheless, alongside the "creativity" and "innovation" and now also the "meaningfulness"—"alternative" has become a banal and worn-out buzzword, one which demands us to stop and examine it carefully. I want to start our journey by asking the question: what is so alternative about alternative education?

Before we move ahead in my endeavor, a relatively complicated one, to answer the question I took upon myself, I would like to define—in quite an inclusive manner—the traditional education systems, mainly but also in what we call the western world. These frameworks, also referred to as humanistic, pretend to set the person in the center and offer him the idea that education and its practices will lead to growth, development, and transcendence—towards what is good. Education is, therefore, the elevator that takes a person from a lower rank (of "not knowing" or "unable") to an upper level (of "knows," "capable," "worthy"), if you please. There, in that upper level, for example, according to Plato, he knows what he does not know. He also loves wisdom, also gets out of the cave.

He has proven capabilities since he overcame his voluptuous soul, transcended the sovereignty; though he still does not reach the ideal, he is on his way there. And there is a way towards "there." It's a specific one, can be reviewed and examined. There lies excellence, which is a worthy purpose. This purpose rejects dogmatism and the harmonious and proportional development of a full range and variety of human capabilities—physical to artistic. Education, therefore, is the realization of moral virtue. According to those who claimed throughout the

history of educational philosophy, its realization can be achieved by shaping the character and training it until it becomes second nature. According to Aristotle (1999), education is essential to men not because it is useful and not because it is necessary, but because it is one of the beautiful and appropriate things for a free human being.

History will summon upon the classical education these or other such twists. In summary, it demands from every person to develop and expend his personality by reference to the hierarchy that determines what is virtuous in action, thought and creation, while promoting rational thinking, moral behavior, and the ideal of human essence (Apple, 1999).
These principles lie in the base of Israeli education and, unfortunately, give the schools—as a bureaucratic institute and as a human space—the legitimacy to label people and rank them.

The Israeli Education System: A Diverse Cultural Tapestry

The Israeli Education is a complex system. Generally, the state is the owner and supervisor of the public state education from kindergarten (ages 5 – 6) to the 9th grade. The state also supervises high schools (10th to 12th grade) which are usually owned by municipalities, foundations, and other entities.

The state's supervision of education is carried out as part of the State Education Law and is divided into several sectors: general Jewish sector, Jewish-religious sector, Arab sector (that encompasses the Christian and Muslim population) and the Druze and Circassians sector. The non-Jewish sectors conduct their studies in Arabic. Both their textbooks and the matriculation exams are in Arabic, and they teach Hebrew as a second language. In addition, there is an Ultra-Orthodox Haredi Jewish sector (called "independent education") which is mostly religious and has only little, if any, general studies depending on the type of the Ultra-Orthodox Jewish faction.

All the Public-State sectors are subjected to a curriculum which is generally unified with room for some modifications. The Jewish Public-State Religious Sector will conduct prayers at school and will heighten religious studies, while the Arab and Druze sector will give more extensive room to the History of the Arabs under the supervision of the ministry of education. The ultra-Orthodox Jewish schools are not committed to the full curriculum of the state and are independent in choosing the content they will learn. Many of them do not require their students to take the matriculation exams.

In all the sectors there are children who learn in special education frameworks (either in separate schools or in special classrooms within regular schools) (Kizel and Orland-Barak, 2020).

The Traditional Educational Discourse in Israel

Today, in Israel, as around the world, nonetheless, it seems that the power of the school stems from the fact that it's an institution of economic value. Meaning, this institution retains children at relatively low rates (labeled "free" or "semi-free"). At the same time, their parents are required by the country (dare say: the kingdom) to earn a living that will reasonably sustain them (dare say: through reasonable debts in banking institutions within the kingdom or elsewhere.) It's no wonder, therefore, that the educational discourse in Israel in the past few years was centered on the cost of summer camps in schools, suggested by the former minister of education, who promised to shorten the summer vacation and to extend more and more (as much as possible) the school year. In the sense of "we will keep your children at a low cost, and your work will cost you dearly."

This discourse does not discuss, for a long while, the quality of education, let alone its contents. Education, therefore, comes up to upkeep, an action of human storage—sometimes in a more friendly face of the innkeeper and sometimes in a less familiar face.

Schooling frameworks have been given many justifications: from transferring knowledge, instilling tradition, preserving the hegemony, nurturing warriors, assimilating culture, to more down to earth presences such as institutions of fun and pleasure, a social institution where you learn how to get along with others, and even to essential institutions essential for obtaining a high-school diploma "because what can you do? *C'est La vie,*" according to a student quite in tune with that nationwide reality.

But beyond the criticisms thrust upon state education, it has succeeded and continues to be successful in holding to three powerful vertices through which it shapes the public's consciousness for many years. If not to say, to numb consciousness, mainly the vertex of "I, the school, know what is learning."

State education, therefore, is the landlord of "scholarship" and holds the public franchise both practical and conscientious—to name a subject "learner" and eventually to determine who is and mainly what is "a successful subject;" this triangle of three powerful vertices: "learning is school," "school determines who is a student or learner," and "school determines who is successful" is the grand celebrated success of the education I called here state, traditional or governmental education. In short—school. Hence, teachers in Israel officially are no longer called teachers but "education employees." The purpose of hiring them has become clear and limited.

"Alternatives in education" vs. "Alternativeness in education"

From now onwards, I would like to suggest that anyone or anything that does not support this position will be labeled in Israel as “alternatives in education.” Meaning that every stream or educational act or even educational philosophy denying these three basic premises: (1) the school has the sole right on the license or franchise on learning and, (2) therefore, determines its shape, (3) and determines who is a learner and his success—becomes the alternative.

Alternativeness in education is, therefore, different than alternative education in Israel. The latter contains the frameworks which want to challenge, sometimes fully and other times in part, the foundations of the regular, traditional, conservative, state education. And this challenge can be varied. Thus, Rami (pseudonym), a teacher in a school of alternative nature in the Western Galilee where I visited alongside students from the Division of investigating Alternatives in Education (of my department in our university) said:

> The question of alternativeness is a one of degree and perspective… the group that established this school wanted something different from what children were used to creativity, choice, small groups. This is the repertoire of the different education, the other education.

Here you have an example of alternative education. Its definition: being different, other. What is that difference? What is that otherness? It is not always clear; in my opinion, it is not clear to the alternativists. I would not argue here that they do not define themselves as an alternative. They do.

For instance, see how Rami defines “being different:” school is a community of human beings in which all the different components are partners in building the life in a community that translates itself to all aspects of school-life starting with the decision-making process to other things." I would try to follow his definition: different and other can sometimes be the same thing

but is characterized by one alternative element—a process in which all the community members are partners. Meaning different and other is, in fact, community. The need of communities and people in Israel, and not just in Israel, to be the landlord of education, meaning school can eventually become one which contains regular classes, regular schedule, the Ministry of Education's curriculum, but is alternative in one aspect—the answer to the question "to who does this place belong?"

Alternativeness here challenges the question of ownership. The state is not the Owner, say the people at the specific alternative school, but not just there. They claim: we are. This, of course, is not true, but as Rami says, "the question of alternativeness is a one of degree and perspective."

Therefore, it is a question of classical relativism, if we, at this place, say that we are alternative—we are alternative.

I wish to suggest an additional answer to Rami's perspective. Alternativeness in education today is also people's ability to establish themselves, something that will enable them self-realization. This is entrepreneurship style 2021 if you please. They want to be pioneers, specifically in education. They want to do it by themselves. In Israel, "to be a pioneer" (*Halutz*, in Hebrew) is a myth from the days of the establishment of the State of Israel (1948) and even before. Pioneers (*Halutzim*) were the first settlers and were admired by others because they dared to do (for example, to establish villages) actively and not waiting for the Messiah to come and save them. Activism was one of the main central issues in the Jewish national movement (Zionism) from the 19th century.

Suppose the state of Israel embraces this alternative position. In that case, that includes, as aforesaid, just a request for a process—and transform it into an all-state process—it can

preserve the state education under a blossoming alternativeness. Not just to maintain but to hold them.

It seems that many communities of parents want only one thing—belonging. And one more thing—therapeutic belonging. As for the rest they are willing “to buy” it from the state because, in the end, they also believe in the state’s educational product and believe that the state knows “what is learning?,” “what a learner is?” and “what a successful learner is?”

Hence, it is an alternative education but not an alternativeness in education as I tried to define it. In other words, it is the same store, but it is not part of a significant cooperation or market net, instead of a neighborhood store, a cozy one. People in the alternative school up north in Israel actually want to feel well. If it feels good to them or it is right in their experience—it works. And it’s even alternative. This school can also have a slogan, a real alternative one (or at least this is what those who suggested it think): to feel good in the other and different school (which in the small print is "actually the same").

Then why Rami and the other people in the alternative school say: "we have great liberty in our system. Each individual will feel – both teachers and students a great deal of freedom?" In my humble opinion, the facts do not indicate that. However, their feelings indicate otherwise. Hence, working on feelings or mainly the sense of belonging—without a fundamental and substantial change in the contents or forms of learning (therefore: practices) is the feeling of alternativeness. And for feeling people today are willing to pay good money. Emotions can be branded, and in a flash, they become a brand that has even a symbol, smell, and feeling. A better feeling, of fun, of something that cannot be defined in words, and therefore I would try two words that sound alternative to me—different and other.

The freedom of these alternativists is not challenging the system regarding decisions we used to call critical pedagogical choices (what to learn, when to learn, and mainly whether to learn); however, in Rami's words: "The individual's desire to be heard." And in a moment of candor, two other students told us: "We go to the teachers and tell them we have a problem, and they solve it for us. It is nice."

The alternatives in the educational process are a feeling of expression vis-à-vis contradiction, and a feeling of therapeutic space in the face of major authority. These alternativists, but probably not just them, actually have a pretty regular school and they even don't know it; yet they live feeling it is alternativeness. They fulfill a dimension of pleasure, happiness, and self-fulfillment.

They even claim to be entrepreneurs; according to them, they create a coalition of entrepreneurship. They talk about the feeling of freedom that infects everyone, confronts the alienation, and seeks to express voluntary groups as part of the manifestation of concern and caring. But in fact, they are not rebels, especially not against the three powerful vortices of traditional education.

The principal of that school says that "we have highly complex meaningfulness. It summons opportunities—an interaction, an intimate and familial sensation." Hence, it is not clear why these elements are the alternative ones, while the rest are entirely traditional, not highly traditional. Therefore, the conclusion is that part of the alternative education provides a critical casing, but a casing nonetheless.

The Alternative Education Systems in Israel

It was not always like this. During the 1980s, voices of open dissatisfaction with the education system began to be heard in Israel. One of the main voices was that of the progressive

education representatives who established the first Democratic School in Hadera in 1987. The group was led by Yaakov Hecht who claimed that the Israeli education system does not allow the teachers, students and parents a dialogic and authentic expression (Kizel, 2013). Regarding teachers, these parents claimed that the hierarchical nature of the Israeli education system hinders teachers' professional development and the ambient of freedom and dialogue as is expressed in the philosophy of John Dewey, Martin Buber and others. The first Israeli democratic school put its emphasis on the students and the educational vision that heightens their need for freedom as a catalyst for development. This opened an educational discussion regarding the need for a different kind of teacher training, one which emphasizes teachers' ability to develop their professional identity and their personal vision thus empowering them.

The outcomes of these progressive voices were the establishment of dozens of democratic non-state schools in Israel with teachers who had not been necessarily trained in the regular teacher training frameworks. Some of them didn't even have a teaching diploma, but were tested according to student's and parent's satisfaction, as well as their collaboration among the school staff. These schools were only partially supervised by the ministry of education and were partially funded by the parents. At the same time other schools were established in Israel under the title of "open-dialogic schools;" the most prominent one was Meitar school in the Carmel Forests near the city of Haifa. This school emphasized the personal development of students but also of teachers. It contested the conventional "industrial" system of teacher training and went against its authoritative and anti-dialogic conceptions. In his book "MEITAR –Education as a dialog" (1998: 28), Dan Lasri, the school's principal criticizes teacher training in Israel: "In the day-to-day process of education it is easy to fall back upon prejudice, upon habits we acquired from our environment and from global fashions quite mechanically. We seek to take

responsibility out of dissatisfaction with the state of the world today and our state within this world."

In one of his articles on his website "The Dialogical Academy," Lasri expressed a strong criticism made by many parents at the time: "Judging according to its distribution, the familiar teaching array is highly successful. All over the world we find almost the same framework: a teacher standing in the front of the classroom, students sitting behind him, he speaks most of the time and they are mostly silent. Do we learn like this? Probably not, but perhaps "learning," to begin with, is not the issue, and is not why the array has become so successful. This array contains many aspects of foreign work—a place where matter consumes the spirit, form takes over the essence and people lose their courage."[i]

Following these trends during the late 1980s the Democratic Institution in the Seminar Hakibutzim College in Tel Aviv was established. The institute placed much emphasis to programs such as "educational greenhouse" which sought to move the center of power from a centralistic teacher training to the empowering of the teacher and the groups of teachers while stressing the development of a personal initiative and personal freedom for creativity. This plan's vision underscored that the greenhouse for social-educational entrepreneurship is a programmed aimed at training educators that operate out of democratic values and worldview, who are critical thinkers, whose educational identity is evolving, and seeking to create a change in the educational sphere.[ii]

The progressive voices in the educational sphere during the 1980s sought to move the emphasis in teacher training from the "training of a teacher" (who transfers materials, who reaches educational achievements and success in exams as preparation to the future) to "the development of teachers who are social entrepreneurs, activists, who have a clear identity on

change-generators and leaders," as can be seen in the words of Hadas Leket, a humanities and democratic education student in Seminar Hakibutzim, that appears in the college website. Unlike parents from the progressive and open-dialogic education (and those who supported home schooling in Israel) other communities of parents began to rise and to express dissatisfaction from the Education System, claiming it is old-fashioned, outdated, neither innovative nor groundbreaking; and not technologically-enhanced. These parents expressed dissatisfaction from the low scholarly achievements of students in Israel, as was surfaced in international examinations. As a result, the Israeli association of Community Centers founded a division for community schools whose purpose was to create a stronger partnership between parents and teachers in order to better the dialogue between them. The model chosen to sound these voices was called "Parent Leadership." The dialogue led by these parents wished to change the dialogue with the teachers from being an "oppositional defiance" to an "active collaboration seeking to initiate a change." Schools parent leaderships, and class parent leaderships aimed to give a voice to those parents who wanted to make a change amongst the existing teachers. These parents also voiced their dissatisfaction with the Ministry of Education and demanded change in teacher training in order to make them a significant social force within the Israeli society, mainly with regards to scholarly achievements.

According to Anat Geffen-Sarig (2004, p. 4), these initiatives serve those parents with a high level of educational consciousness, who wish to educate their children in a unique framework as they see fit. The uniqueness, be it pedagogical or ideological, is the basis for the establishment of the schooland what gives it legitimacy.

The alternative education in Israel along its history did challenge the fundamental points of public, traditional, conservative education: the democratic schools in Israel (Hecht, 2005)

placed a harsh mirror in front of the traditional–state education, and determined, following Rousseau (1979) and Dewey (1916), which a person learns all the time even if he is not part of a learning framework structured by adults.

Democratic schools in Israel severely criticized the alienation based on single-age learning, which encloses young people within groups chosen for them (with whom to learn) and suggested multi-age and sometimes multi-layered. It came out against the premises of Piaget's (1972) developmental psychology. It assumed that a person could make more significant strides than the developmental stages enclosed for him using the professional jargon of professionals and professionalism, mostly of educational psychologists and entire theories that turned into whole institutions of formative hierarchy (meaning—educational counselors and the tracking, which Israel has been blessed with, throughout its existence, more overtly at times, and more covertly today). The democratic schools also came out strongly against imposing the orderly curriculum and suggested replacing it, giving the learner choices, and involving him in the learning process.

The alternative streams that corresponded with the democratic schools gave it and took from it, suggesting a partnership not in a therapeutic but an essential manner. It is not a partnership when I find it convenient, but a partnership that summons sharing, a call for responsibility.

The question is not "do you participate?" The answer is "you must participate because it is yours, because it is a democracy because you are part of it," and also: "you participate in spaces you feel discomfort or and an inner rebellion." This partnership or participation wants to stem from a lack of consent and existential discomfort because it wants to create a situation in which this place called "an education community" is a not a place without thorns—you

sometimes need to walk through a painful field, one that bothers you, that annoys you, that makes you leave your comfort zone and safe zone; one that makes you look, shout, scream, and if possible even to identify and change your mind.

This is, of course, the ideal; and its implementation, unfortunately, manifested itself in other forms in Israel, such as a selective and elitist education, which separated those with privileges from the unprivileged, thus making the Thorn field into a pleasant bed of roses where we encounter "people like us" who agree with us.

The main alternativeness in these democratic schools streams lies in the question do we even need to study, therefore, in the consent that sometimes you do not need "to learn" or the child/adolescent can decide not "to learn" (even for long periods) and s/he is the one who chooses what to learn (and not the state) and most of all with whom s/he learns.

Radical democratic schools alternativeness in Israel has also been challenged throughout the years by the mere question "who is the successful person?" and it came out against, theoretically at least, against the position that an entity external to the learner – be it the National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation or the parents/teachers or any other arbitrary examination industry – be the one to determine for the learner if he is worth anything and mostly—how much he is worth. Just as the words "insufficient" are unfounded, they have become, nonetheless, a labeling and tormenting grade.

The anthroposophical schools in Israel draw their educational structure, historically, from the Waldorf education. In Israel, it does not challenge the state education foundations. Yet, it suggests a series of practices that are too simple a challenge (not to say too convenient one) for the educational, moral, and public industrialization system. It even suggests a process of educational dialogue on issues of human development, and in this matter, it creates a space for

growth and immediately closes it; providing a place of honor (rather extensive one) for the significant adult/teacher who will walk alongside the child for many years providing him not just with spiritual and physical provisions; but also to instill in him meaningfulness held by, preferably of course, by the adult/teacher.

Therefore, the same adult does not only groom s/he is also the one who decides. In Waldorf education school, and as a result, the answer to the three vertexes of power enabling an alternative deviation—who determines what is learning, who decides what the learner is, and who determines which of the learners is successful—is foretold and quite banal, meaning, completely un-alternative.

These are only two examples, but the alternative education in Israel had many and diverse faces over the years. Dani Lasri's Meitar, the democratic schools, Waldorf education schools, the bilingual education, Montessori education, Kedma School, and of course, the diverse forms of home education and homeschooling.

The Scale of 11 Challenges the Alternative Education

Its main characteristics, in different ways and practices of form and content, challenge the state-public education, according to what I would like to call here *the scale of 11 Challenges the Alternative Education sets to the state-public education*:

Challenge 1: the challenge of single-age learning—by creating multi-age alternatives in a highly creative manner.

Challenge 2: challenging the structure of learning in fields of study which sanctifies a rigid structure, for example, by attaching it to a system of evaluation throughout the

years, for instance, by thematic learning across disciplines, multi-disciplinary learning or interdisciplinary learning.

Challenge 3: challenging the structure of learning in a regular school year divided into semesters by forming an alternative system that suggests learning in periods using periodic projects or learning throughout one period.

Challenge 4: the challenge of learning within the boundaries of a school sanctifies educational homeroom classes, gyms, and laboratories, by providing extensive or restricted learning spaces outside of the classroom or even outside the school, some more natural than others.

Challenge 5: challenging group learning, which in Israel sanctifies the organic group as part of group formation throughout the years and as part of an Israeli ethos of group/military building and building a nation by providing individual or virtual learning frameworks.

Challenge 6: challenging the curricula of the Ministry of Education, which justifies the learning of a skeleton-based curriculum that underwent only a few fundamental changes throughout the existence of Israel; this by providing alternative contents which contain courses on subjects that are entirely unaccounted for in the curricula.

Challenge 7: challenging the structure of the school, which uses justifications based on developmental psychology and social integration—that is usually divided into elementary, junior-high-school and high school by creating a growing educational community in one compound which will supply stimuli despite the age differences; stemming from the recognition that multiple ages hold a human, educational, and pedagogical strength.

Challenge 8: challenging examinations or assessments, which are external to the learner that sanctifies the structure of the Israeli and international examination system, mainly the system of matriculation exams and the preparation for the industrialized academic world; this by creating diverse assessments, dialogical, shared, alternatives (alternative assessments).

Challenge 9: challenging the relationship between the educational staff and the learners in the schools; that in Israel sanctifies the teachers as the authorities who lead the student, who seemingly strengthen the student's self-esteem, who establish clear and necessary boundaries for him; by creating dialogical frameworks (parliament, mentors, joint committees) that wish to prevent the alienating hierarchy between students and teachers, that are not afraid of fluidity in the interpersonal relationship between older-younger people and vice versa.

Challenge 10: challenging the national narrative as leading (or enslaving) the education system to traditions; by embracing a multi-perspective set of values, that has room for national, social, ethnic, gender, and other values.

Challenge 11: challenging the perception of "the adult figure desired by the system" which is part of the “requirement model” by creating frameworks where "the person builds himself" and "plans his learning" (alongside Zvi Lamm’s principle/logic of individuation) and as part of the “model of support,”

Hence, this is a current overview of alternative education also in Israel that I would like to offer:

Against any form of "institutionalized" learning – unschooling.

Against institutionalized learning in schools – Home Education.

Against institutionalized learning in schools (but not against it at home) – Home Schooling.

Against institutionalized learning in schools– Open Education (Meitar, The Dialogue Academy, Dani Lasri).

Against curricular learning in schools – Democratic education/Progressive Education (to this or another extent) – Democratic schools in Israel.

Supporting this or another stream – ultra-orthodox education, Anthroposophical Education, Montessori Education, etc.

Against the narrative separating Jewish, Palestinian, and other populations – Bilingual Education.

Experimental alternative frameworks within the state/ classic education –the Ministry of Education’s Division of Experiments.

It is Alternative but not Alternativeness

Any alternative framework challenges state education creatively and differently. Frameworks and practices moved along the years from a complete, sharp, negative challenge to a partial, moderate and positive challenge. The motivations behind those challenges are numerous: from ideological initiatives to political objections, from national reasons to cultural claims, from social status motives to peripheral rebellion (Gur-Ze'ev, 2010).

However, these do not meet the theoretical framework to which I refer as "alternativeness in education." In contrast to alternative education, this wants to ask the fundamental questions that are not asked, those presented by Ivan Illich (1971) in his book *Deschooling Society* as well as John Holt (2004) in many of his writing. Especially *How Children Fail?* Illich was challenged into the discussion on school by Everett Reimer (1971) in his book *School is Dead: Alternatives in Education* which also challenges the fundamental question about school's structure and education.

Illich (1971), who nowadays is defined as a radical; (radical as many of us like to call everyone willing to delve into the central and deepest pains of education in a broader sense), claimed that general education was lost because it was subjected to the school authority. Then he set the first goal – a philosophical one: education will benefit if it is confiscated from the school authority.

And why is that? Because school nurtures the ever-growing dependence of the poor in institutionalized welfare through psychological impotence and inability to save them, so he said. If I may, I would like to add that: school victimizes students (and teachers) the victims. It victimizes them because it makes them psychologically impotent—that they cannot do without

it—while what they need is a mechanism to emancipate them from education and the self-consciousness it creates in each of the learners and at the same time in their parents and teachers (Kizel, 2016).

Alternativeness in education can raise at this point the question—why does the school create these mechanisms? We can turn to Nietzsche in this context according to him as a person's ability to order decreases, thus his desire for someone to give orders, harsh orders—a passion for a god, a king, for status, for a doctor, for a priest, for a religious principle, for a partisan conscience increases. It is an acute, permanent illness that attacks willpower. Hence, school represents a person's willpower not to be a unique and one-time wonder. If you will, school attacks the idea of "Be yourself! All your actions, your thoughts and desires up to this point – are not yourself."

Years later, Emanuel Levinas ([1972] 2006) will claim that western metaphysics created wholeness and will launch a fight for the possibility to deviate from it in favor of individuation. This is the same individuation that is eliminated in schools by the idea of forming a collective, which by definition and by nature does not enable the person to be himself.

The same collective, Levinas ([1972] 2006) will argue, also does not enable the person to be alert for the summon made by the other. This summons, which is not a choice (like choosing where to volunteer as part of the 10th-grade personal responsibility program) but one which awakens the ethics in men, which is immediate, which is not instrumental, which does not need to be learnt and taught, there is no need in merit scores or assessment certificates in the local school's Friday's lineup.

Therefore, alternativeness challenges the central concern of traditional education—or at least the distortion of the starting condition of traditional education—cataloging, labeling, and

promoting men under an orthodox education (Ricci & Pritscher, 2015). Under the same categorization and labeling, men is a defective creature (a sinner since birth, if you will), and therefore he is insufficient, barely sufficient, almost good and so on.

His human flaws need to be clinically addressed in traditional education. Just like the clinic took over the entire public discourse, it also took over traditional education in all its aspects and set cataloging, labeling, caring, supportive, and embracing language, which was meant to face one challenge—to which we referred to as the "entrapment triangle"—to enable the professional (some would say hegemonies) forces to preserve their control over learning, on determining who is a learner and mainly who is a successful learner.

Therefore, Alternativeness in Education—and not Alternative Education—will ask (and yes, asking a question is embarking on a journey, and it's legitimate, even if the system encourages us to look immediately for answers and its better if they are short, one-dimensional and "real") why does the school deprive us of the power to control learning? According to Illich (1971), why does it create a more incredible illusion upon which the system of education is based, meaning that learning is a result of teaching? Why do most people acquire most of their knowledge outside of school and are still locked inside school doors?

However, a question more significant that an alternative educator will ask is: why is learning shaped by the school, and therefore, our students think that learning is school, and the teachers are convinced that teaching is school? Thus, alternativeness in education breaks the paradigm of learning equals the school. And as a result, learning does not have to be taught or molded into schools; many educators might view this claim as betraying my enlightenment, as Illich claimed, yet enlightenment in itself is fading away in schools now; and who if not we know that is true about our school.

The theoretical framework of researching alternativeness in education (unlike the research of alternative education) needs to be driven by an attempt to challenge the language, turn it into opposition to the traditional education's triangle of entrapment, to undermine it and its foundations.

This framework would require exposing the roles in education: monitoring, sorting, indoctrination, and learning. Following Illich's footsteps, it needs to defy three assumptions that on which there is an only little dispute about today (especially on behalf of homeschooling and unschooling trends which are very restricted in Israel): children belong to school, children learn just in school, children can only be taught in school and can only succeed through school.

To that, I would like to add, that nowadays alternativeness in education needs to challenge parents on those issues and, therefore by its definition, it will be anti-state, anti-traditional, anti-national or anti-religious, or at least post-state, post–traditional, post-national and post-religious.

Alternativeness in education would have to challenge "institutionalized wisdom," stating children need school and cannot do without it. Of course, this institutionalized wisdom, according to Illich (1971), is a result of the school, which gives birth to the teacher as a guardian, preacher, and healer. Today, school added to each of these roles more embracing names, if you like: a significant adult, state, accountability, school support, as well as other terms that wish to fixate the school and tighten its grasp on our minds as "something we cannot do without."

I want to conclude following Illich (1971) and claim that alternative education, as aforesaid, are frameworks or ideologies; however, alternativeness in education wished to oppose: the myth of institutionalized values that lead to endless consumption, to the belief that stuck to learners—that learning has no horizon, and has no hope, except for a set of quantitative values which measure the person and at times even his body.

Illich (1971) claimed that personal growth is an unmeasurable quality, and it is a growth in a disciplined agreement that cannot be measured by any criteria nor by any school programs, and also it cannot be compared with the other's achievements. According to his view, people who have been taught to measure everything allow unmeasured experiences to slip away. For them, what cannot be measured becomes secondary, dangerous. There is no need to rob them of their creativity.

He added that teaching has made them forget how to "take their own" actions or "be" with themselves, they do not appreciate what has been done or what can be done, and that school merges the increase in the humiliating dependence on the teacher with the rise in a false sense of power, so characteristic to the student who decides to go on and teach all the nations how to save themselves.

References

Apple, M (1999) What counts as legitimate knowledge? The social production and use of reviews. *Review of Educational Research*, 69(4), 343–346.

Aristotle (1999). *Metaphysics*. Green Lion Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Gur-Ze'ev, I (2010) *Diasporic philosophy and counter education*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Hecht, Y. (2005). *Democratic Education: A Beginning of a Story*. Tel Aviv: Keter (Hebrew).

Geffen-Sarig A. (2004), *Do it yourself: Civic entrepreneurship as a strategy for innovation in Israeli education policy*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University (Hebrew).

Holt, J. (2004). *Instead of education*. Boulder: Sentiment.

Lasri, D. (1998). *Meitar: Education in a Dialogical Spirit*. Beer Sheva: Center for Futurism in Education, Ben Gurion University in the Negev (Hebrew).

Illich, I. (1971) *Deschooling Society* https://web.archive.org/web/20081121191010/http://ournature.org/~novembre/illich/1970_deschooling.html"

Kizel, A. (2013). "The philosophy of social segregation in Israel's democratic schools." *Philosophy Study 3* (11), 1042–1050.

Kizel, A. (2016). Pedagogy out of fear of philosophy as a way of pathologizing children. *Journal of Unschooling and Alternative Learning, 10*(20), 28–47.

Kizel, A. & Orland-Barak, L. (2020). From Traditional to Dialogical-Reflective Teacher Training: The case of Teacher Education in Israel. In: James W. Fraser & Lauren Lefty (eds.) *Teaching the World's Teachers*. Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 199-225.

Levinas, E. ([1972] 2006). *Humanism of the Other*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Piaget, J. (1972). *The psychology of the child*. New York: John Wiley.

Reimer, E. (1971) *School is Dead: Alternatives in Education.* New York: Anchor Books.

Ricci, C., & Pritscher, C.P. (2015). *Holistic pedagogy: The self and quality-willed learning*. New York: Springer.

Rousseau, J. J. (1979) *Emile, or On Education*. New York: Basic Books.

Biography: Dr. Kizel is the President, International Council of Philosophical Inquiry with Children (ICPIC) akizel@edu.haifa.ac.il

[i] D. Lasri, The Dialogical Academy (in Hebrew) http://www.dialogit.org/archives/1559

[ii] From the greenhouse website (in Hebrew):http://www.democratic.co.il/%D7%AA%D7%97%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%99-%D7%A4%D7%A2%D7%99%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%AA/%D7%9E%D7%A1%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%9D%D7%90%D7%A7%D7%93%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%99%D7%9D/%D7%94%D7%97%D7%9E%D7%9E%D7%94%D7%9C%D7%99%D7%96%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%AA-%D7%97%D7%99%D7%A0%D7%95%D7%9B%D7%99%D7%AA/