1a   1b

Figure 1a. Benjamin Franklin's thirteen character traits for his daily self-improvement program. From top to bottom, in his own words and spelling:

1. TEMPERANCE. Eat not to dullness; drink not to elevation.
2. SILENCE. Speak not but what may benefit others or yourself; avoid trifling conversation.
3. ORDER. Let all your things have their places; let each part of your business have its time.
4. RESOLUTION. Resolve to perform what you ought; perform without fail what you resolve.
5. FRUGALITY. Make no expense but to do good to others or yourself; i.e., waste nothing.
6. INDUSTRY. Lose no time; be always employ'd in something useful; cut off all unnecessary actions.
7. SINCERITY. Use no hurtful deceit; think innocently and justly, and, if you speak, speak accordingly.
8. JUSTICE. Wrong none by doing injuries, or omitting the benefits that are your duty.
9. MODERATION. Avoid extreams; forbear resenting injuries so much as you think they deserve.
10. CLEANLINESS. Tolerate no uncleanliness in body, cloaths, or habitation.
11. TRANQUILLITY. Be not disturbed at trifles, or at accidents common or unavoidable.
12. CHASTITY. Rarely use venery but for health or offspring, never to dulness, weakness, or the injury of your own or another's peace or reputation.
13. HUMILITY.

Original chart and explanation by Benjamin Franklin reproduced with kind permission from Arc Manor, Rockville, Maryland.

Figure 1b. Thirteen character traits as they appear in Rabbi Menahem Mendel's nineteenth-century classic *Sefer Heshbon Ha'Nefesh*. From top to bottom, translated from Lefin's Hebrew into Franklin's English:

Menuḥah (tranquility)   *Anavah* (humility)   *Niḥuta* (temperance)
Savlanut (moderation)   *Tsedek* (justice)   *Emet* (sincerity)
Seder (order)   *Kimuts* (frugality)   *Prishut* (chastity)
Akshanut (resolution)   *Zrizut* (industry)
Nikiut (cleanliness)   *Shtikah* (silence)

Ḥeshbon Ha'Nefesh for the Twenty-First Century

Rabbi Joel Padowitz, MBA, CFA

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Rabbi Joel Padowitz, MBA, CFA, is a successful entrepreneur who has been involved in adult Jewish education for nearly twenty years, specializing in the interface between traditional Judaism and modernity. He is the founder and CEO of Palladium Capital Advisors, LLC, a boutique investment bank that has facilitated approximately half a billion dollars in private placements and acquisitions. He is also the founder and CEO of Jew IQ, LLC, which develops mobile applications, content, and curricula for Jewish education and travel, including most notably the Israel App, Israel's most popular travel app. He is an award-winning speaker and writer whose articles have been published widely and whose books include *Triumph and Tragedy: Journeying through 1000 Years of Jewish Life in Poland*. Rabbi Padowitz gives regular classes in Talmud, Jewish thought, and Jewish law, and previously served as rabbi for the Aish HaTorah young professional community in London. In addition to rabbinic ordination, he received his MBA from Bar-Ilan University where he finished first in his class. He holds the Chartered Financial Analyst (CFA) designation and was honored at the White House by President George H. W. Bush for "outstanding achievements in science."

Padowitz@FAS.Harvard.Edu

ABSTRACT

Rabbis from Talmudic times until today have stressed the importance of regular ḥeshbon ha'nefesh (self-examination). To the extent that there is a uniform

method employed in the Jewish world today, it is the one described in the nineteenth-century work Sefer Ḥeshbon Ha'Nefesh. *In this paper, I shall explore the surprising origins of the technique presented in* Sefer Ḥeshbon Ha'Nefesh. *Then, applying a contemporary school of psychological thought known as Constructive-Developmental Theory (CDT), I shall clarify why the "classic" method is inadequate in addressing certain self-development goals. I shall describe a technique known as the Immunity to Change Map (ITCM) and explain why a hybrid approach that combines the technique described in Sefer* Ḥeshbon Ha'Nefesh *with the ITCM is not only more effective for achieving lasting change, but also more consistent with traditional Jewish thought. I hope that my suggested hybrid approach will encourage and inspire readers to attempt this enhanced form of* ḥeshbon ha'nefesh.

INTRODUCTION

In what might be described as one of the most unlikely events of nineteenth-century Jewish intellectual history, thousands of Eastern European Torah-observant Jews adopted a behaviorist approach to self-improvement developed by none other than American Gentile polymath Benjamin Franklin. The method, popularized by Rabbi Menaḥem Mendel Lefin of Satanov — who presented it with a veneer of Orthodox authenticity complete with endorsements from the famed Rabbis Israel Salanter and Isaac Sher of Slobodka — came to be known by the borrowed rabbinic term *ḥeshbon ha'nefesh* (self-examination). While the Franklin-Lefin technique proved effective, Constructive-Developmental Theory (CDT), a school of contemporary psychology developed by Dr. Robert Kegan, predicts that it would be ineffective in addressing self-improvement goals that implicate what CDT terms "adaptive challenges." Kegan, along with colleague Dr. Lisa Lahey, developed an alternative technique to address adaptive challenges. They call their technique the "Immunity to Change Map" (ITCM). In this paper I shall employ a close reading of Franklin's autobiography to support the CDT-inspired hypothesis that while Franklin's system facilitated marked improvement in many areas of his behavior, it was simply incapable of helping him overcome his own adaptive challenges, regardless of his resolve. I shall infer from Franklin's own words what his hypothetical ITCM might have looked like and then use the data it reveals to suggest why Kegan's approach might have helped Franklin

where his own system failed him. Based on this specific example, I shall extrapolate a more generalized set of guidelines for employing the ITCM technique to augment the Franklin-Lefin technique. Finally, I shall show why a hybrid approach to ḥeshbon ha'nefesh that combines the Franklin-Lefin and Kegan methods is not only more effective but also more consistent with the traditional Jewish outlook, in the hope of providing an appealing system for Jews today.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN'S "RULES OF CONDUCT"

In his autobiography, Benjamin Franklin recounts his efforts to "live without committing any fault at any time" (FRANKLIN 2008, p. 71). He quickly discovered that the "mere…conviction…to be…virtuous, was not sufficient" to effect behavioral change, because "habit took the advantage of inattention, inclination was sometimes too strong for reason" (ibid.). Resolved to perfect his character, Franklin developed a behaviorist strategy for self-improvement. The crux of Franklin's method entailed a nightly review of his personal conduct and a tally of the number of times his behavior failed to meet his expectations. In total, Franklin committed himself to improve thirteen traits, focusing on one each week, such that every three months he dedicated a week of scrutiny to each. (See Figure 1a, page 110.) Though he admitted to certain failures, Franklin assessed the system overall to be a resounding success. He called the system his "Rules of Conduct" and revealed its details in 1791 with the publication of the second part of his autobiography. Franklin claimed that it was to this "little artifice" that he owed "the constant felicity of his life" and that "being fully persuaded of the utility and excellency" of the method, he hoped it would be widely employed by "people in all religions" (ibid., p. 77).

SEFER ḤESHBON HA'NEFESH EMPLOYS FRANKLIN'S SYSTEM

Franklin's wish came true in circles more distant than he likely imagined. In 1808, Rabbi Menaḥem Mendel Lefin of Satanov, Podolia (modern Ukraine), published his booklet *Sefer Ḥeshbon Ha'Nefesh* ("The Book of Self-Examination"), presenting Franklin's method in Hebrew, accompanied by a dozen rabbinic approbations and sprinkled

with rabbinic and scriptural supports to assure readers of its confor-
mity to Jewish tradition (Sɪɴᴋᴏғғ 2000, p. 146). Lefin admitted that the
method was not his own, saying merely that "[a] few years ago, a new
strategy was developed — a strategy that is a wonderful innovation
in this field [of ḥeshbon ha'nefesh]" (Lᴇғɪɴ 1995, p. 51). Though he
left his source unnamed, his work was undoubtedly appropriated from
Franklin's "Rules of Conduct."[1]

The method, the diagrams, and even the thirteen particular traits
listed in both works are materially identical. Figure 1b (page 110) con-
tains Franklin's thirteen traits translated by Lefin into rabbinic Hebrew.
For example, the following are the thirteen traits Franklin enumerated
in English and beside each is a trait from Lefin's Hebrew list of thirteen:
chastity, פרישות; *cleanliness*, נקיות; *frugality*, קמוץ; *humility*, ענוה; *indus-
try*, זריזות; *justice*, צדק; *moderation*, סבלנות; *order*, סדר; *resolution*, עקשנות;
silence, שתיקה; *sincerity*, אמת; *temperance*, ניחותא; and *tranquility*, מנוחת
הנפש.

In 1845, with the encouragement of Rabbi Israel Salanter — a leading
nineteenth-century rabbi and founder of the Mussar (self-improve-
ment) movement — *Sefer Ḥeshbon Ha'Nefesh* was republished several
times. Perhaps most noteworthy was its publication under the auspices
of the Student Association of the famed Slobodka Yeshivah, complete
with a foreword by its dean, Rabbi Isaac Sher.

Attempts to improve one's character by means of ḥeshbon ha'nefesh
have been a part of Jewish tradition since time immemorial.[2] The
term *ḥeshbon ha'nefesh*, however, had historically been a generic one:
the specifics of the "soul accounting" method either varied from text
to text or were altogether vague. During the nineteenth century, a
number of innovative, less methodological approaches were advo-
cated by Ḥasidic masters such as Rabbi Naḥman of Breslov, Rabbi
Mordekhai Yosef Leiner of Izhbitsa (the Izhbitser Rebbe), and Rabbi

---

1. Sɪɴᴋᴏғғ (p. 134, footnote 3) claims that there was a primary source in which Lefin
    expressed his debt to Franklin, which was cited in Israel Weinlös's "Menaḥem
    Mendel Lefin of Satanov" in *Ha'Olam* 13 (1925), p. 800 (Hebrew). I was unable
    to confirm this source.
2. See, for example, Tᴀʟᴍᴜᴅ *Bava Batra* 78b and *Eruvin* 13b; Baḥya ibn Paquda's
    Ḥovot Ha'Levavot, chap. 8 (*Shaar Ḥeshbon Ha'Nefesh*); Maimonides' *Eight
    Chapters*; and Moshe Ḥayyim Luzzatto's *Mesilat Yesharim*, chap. 3.

Tsadok Ha'Kohen. In fact, it has been argued that Lefin's agenda was intended to specifically combat the emotionally-charged, non-rational approaches of the Ḥasidic masters (Sinkoff, pp. 146–148). Whatever the case, Franklin's system — as promulgated by Lefin — clearly became the preeminent method of ḥeshbon ha'nefesh among prewar Eastern European Jewry.[3] Its adoption was so widespread that his particular method became almost inextricably intertwined with the general term *ḥeshbon ha'nefesh*. After the Holocaust, Lefin's book was among the first Jewish classics to be republished.

INTRODUCTION TO CONSTRUCTIVE-DEVELOPMENTAL THEORY (CDT)

Contemporary psychologist Dr. Robert Kegan has, like Franklin and Lefin, provided popular tools for adult character development.[4] However, while Lefin adopted Franklin's behaviorist approach, equating humans with trainable animals, Kegan is a constructivist, believing we are, psychologically, meaning-making machines. While Franklin held that the key to personal growth is conditioning, which he called "habitude" (Franklin, pp. 72, 82), Kegan believes growth necessitates changing the way a person makes meaning of the world. Kegan developed Constructive-Developmental Theory (CDT) to describe how human development takes place.

CDT distinguishes between two types of cognitive development: informative and transformative. Informative development occurs when we learn new skills or adopt new behavior patterns. Transformative development entails transforming the way one goes about making meaning. Kegan argues that the former ought to be considered mere "learning" or "training," while the latter constitutes bona fide development:

---

3. Youth groups in Podolia (Ukraine) and Galicia (Poland) actually arose dedicated to living according to Lefin's program (Sinkoff, p. 142, footnote 41). See Abraham Ber Gottlober, *Zikhronot U'Masạot*, 2, edited by Reuben Goldberg (Jerusalem, 1976), pp. 197–208.
4. There are, of course, many other psychologists who have created successful methods in the field of human development. To enumerate all of them and their ideas would require a footnote longer than this paper. Perhaps the psychologists closest to Kegan would be Jean Piaget, Erik Erikson, Lawrence Kohlberg, Abraham Maslow, and David McClelland.

"transforming the operating system itself, not just increasing your fund of knowledge or your behavioral repertoire" (Kegan and Lahey 2009, p. 6). Building on the work of Ronald Heifitz (1998), Kegan adopts a nomenclature to differentiate between "technical challenges," having methods of solution known from the outset that can therefore be solved by learning or training, and "adaptive challenges," whose solution entails a method unknown at the outset that can only be overcome through a transformative change that modifies one's mindset with respect to the given challenge (Kegan and Lahey, p. 29).

According to CDT, the conscious self, or "I," does its meaning-making by considering elements in the set of phenomena distinct from itself and reflecting upon their relationship to one another or to the "I" itself. Since the "I" is able to "grasp" and "manipulate" these elements as mental objects, CDT refers to them as that which is "Object" to the self. At the same time, there must always be some mental framework the "I" uses to make sense, or meaning, of the Object. Under normal circumstances, the "I" remains both beholden and blind to this framework. Since its meaning-making ability is subject to the framework, CDT refers to its elements as "Subject."

CDT argues that true development (i.e., of the transformative variety) occurs when that which once was Subject becomes Object. In other words, when we are able to *think about* that which we used to *think with* — when we can consider not just our view of reality, but the lens through which we are viewing it. At that point, our meaning-making (i.e., our quintessential selves according to CDT) does not merely undergo an incremental change. It undergoes a *categorical* change. As meaning-making machines, when that which was Subject becomes Object, we are not just better informed, we are also fundamentally transformed.

CDT would thus make a specific prediction regarding the limitations of Franklin's method. Namely, that while one may be able to overcome many undesired behavior patterns with self-discipline and self-reproach — the tools Franklin and Lefin advocate — behavior patterns that are consequential to that which is Subject to the self will be immune (in the long run) to these tools. In such cases, CDT predicts that Franklin's method will prove an ineffective technique to effect the desired change.

THE IMMUNITY TO CHANGE MAP (ITCM)

Kegan and Lahey developed their Immunity to Change Map (ITCM) to prompt transformative change by providing users with a glimpse of that which is Subject to them. Not unlike looking in a mirror to discover the tinted lenses through which one has been viewing the world, the ITCM reveals subconscious fears, commitments, and assumptions that are encoded in the current "operating system" of the meaning-making machine. When a person is able to mentally manipulate the psychological forces that had hitherto manipulated him or her (i.e., to convert that which is Subject to Object), then that person is finally able to effect transformative change.

Benjamin Franklin claimed that he had employed his system to virtually perfect his character in at least eleven of his thirteen target areas. He was less self-congratulatory regarding the remaining two: "Humility" and "Order." Moreover, while acknowledging the self-referential paradox of professing one's own humility, he nevertheless did confirm having made great strides in that trait as well. It was only regarding "Order" that Franklin found himself "incorrigible" (Franklin, p. 77). It is in Franklin's failed attempts to inculcate "Order" that we find fertile ground to explore the CDT-inspired thesis regarding adaptive change. If we take Franklin's words at face value, there can be little doubt about how hard he tried ("I found it extreamly [sic] difficult to acquire… This article, therefore, cost me so much painful attention") nor how ardently he wanted to reform himself ("my faults in it vexed me so much"). Yet, he simply was unable to change. ("I made so little progress in amendment, and had such frequent relapse, that I was ready to give up the attempt and content myself with a faulty character…" [Franklin, p. 76]).

With respect to Order, it seems that Franklin was simply immune to change, and there, perhaps, is where Kegan and Lahey's technique might have helped. According to them, the first step in overcoming adaptive challenges is producing an adaptive formulation of the problem, i.e., the Immunity to Change Map (Kegan and Lahey, p. 31). The ITCM comprises four sections, or columns. As seen in Figure A, the first column presents a personal change goal that the individual passionately wants to make. In Franklin's case, he was explicit about this: "ORDER:

let all [my] things have their places; [and] let each part of [my] business have its time" (Franklin, p. 72).

The second column comprises a mini-confession of the behavior(s) that the individual does contrary to his or her stated goal. In Franklin's case, perhaps "I often receive people of business at their own hours [even when they conflict with the pre-planned order of my day]" (ibid., p. 76); and "[I find it] extreamly [sic] difficult to [return] things, papers, etc., to their places (ibid.)…[even though] now I am grown old, and my memory bad [and] I feel very sensibly the want of it" (ibid., p. 77). Taken together, the first two columns of Franklin's ITCM might have looked like Figure A:

Column 1 Improvement Goal	Column 2 Doing/not doing instead (Behaviors that work against my goal)
"ORDER: let all [my] things have their places; [and] let each part of [my] business have its time" (p. 72).	"[I] often receive people of business at their own hours [even when they conflict with the pre-planned order of my own day]" "[I find it] extreamly [sic] difficult to acquire [the habit of returning] things, papers, etc., to their places [even though] now I am grown old, and my memory bad, I feel very sensibly the want of it" (pp. 76–77).

Figure A. The first two columns of Franklin's hypothetical ITCM (that which is Object to him)

While Franklin's response to his patently self-contradictory behavior was a redoubling of his commitment to fight his Column 2 behaviors, he reports such an approach yielded little success. Kegan and Lahey would suggest taking a different tack and instead to embrace the contents of Column 2 for the valuable insights they could yield (Kegan and Lahey, pp. 34–35). CDT would characterize the contents of these two columns as things that are Object to Franklin. In other words, he sees what he wants, and he can see what he is doing to undermine it. For Kegan these two columns are part of the agenda he is driving. But what is driving him in these two contradictory directions?

In Column 3 of the ITCM, the user attempts to uncover that which is Subject to him — that is, the hidden psychological commitments to explain why he persists in his Column 2 behaviors despite his commitment to his Column 1 goal. In Franklin's case, these commitments might include the following:

"[I think of myself as a] master who must mix with the world" (FRANKLIN, P. 76).

"Such extream [sic] nicety as I exacted of myself might be a kind of foppery in morals, which, if it were known, would make me [appear] ridiculous [and I am unwilling to appear ridiculous in the eyes of others]" (ibid., p. 77).

"A perfect character might be attended with the inconvenience of being envied and hated; and that a benevolent man should allow a few faults in himself, to keep his friends in countenance" (ibid.)

Column 1 Improvement goal	Column 2 Doing/not doing instead (Behaviors that work against my goal)	Column 3 Hidden competing commitments
"ORDER: let all [my] things have their places; [and] let each part of [my] business have its time" (p. 72).	"[I] often receive people of business at their own hours [even when they conflict with the pre-planned order of my own day]" (p. 76). "[I find it] extreamly [sic] difficult to acquire [the habit of returning] things, papers, etc., to their places [even though] now I am grown old, and my memory bad, I feel very sensibly the want of it" (pp. 76–77).	"[I think of myself as a] master who must mix with the world" (p. 76). "Such extream (sic) nicety as I exacted of myself might be a kind of foppery in morals, which, if it were known, would make me [appear] ridiculous [and I am unwilling to appear ridiculous in the eyes of others]" (p. 77). "A perfect character might be attended with the inconvenience of being envied and hated; and that a benevolent man should allow a few faults in himself, to keep his friends in countenance" (p. 77).

Figure B. The first three columns of Franklin's hypothetical ITCM (an adaptive formulation of his challenge)

The three columns (as shown in Figure B) taken as a whole reveal that Franklin's "incorrigibility" is not the product of moral lethargy or convictional lassitude, but rather of a highly energetic psychological system that produces behavioral stasis only by offsetting powerful (but countervailing) forces presented in Column 1 and Column 3. The internal conflict between one's conscious ambitions, on the one hand, and one's subconscious commitments and fears that oppose them, on the other, gives rise, as Kegan puts it, to "having one foot on the gas pedal and the other on the brakes." Viewed from this broadened perspective, the activities detailed in Column 2 are not as self-defeating as their conflict with Column 1 had initially suggested. Rather, they are actually self-preserving insofar as they protect the Column 3 persona to which Franklin is committed. Considering the "counterproductive" activities of Column 2 with a synoptic view of both the Column 1 and Column 3 commitments reveals precisely why Franklin's technical solution is inadequate. While he may be sincerely committed to living with meticulous orderliness, he is also deeply committed to being accessible, flexible, and likeable (as defined by the contents of Column 3). In other words, the reason why Franklin cannot overcome his problem is not because he lacks the discipline; it is because he wants to embrace both "Order" and its antithesis at the same time!

At this stage of constructing his ITCM, Franklin's predicament has been successfully formulated as an adaptive challenge. The problem now, however, is that the Founding Father has been redeemed from the frying pan only to be condemned to the fire. While before, he might have had false hope in overcoming his Column 2 behavior, in light of his Column 3 commitments, it would seem he has no hope at all! This is where the fourth and final column of the ITCM comes in, providing a potential wedge to disengage Column 1 and Column 3, which now stand at loggerheads.

Column 4 contains what Kegan and Lahey call the "big assumptions." These are the unspoken — perhaps even unrealized — tenets that perpetuate the conflict. In Franklin's case, this might be: I assume that extreme punctiliousness — especially that which is as overt as my notion of Order requires — will incite envy or scorn in my friends and others who will interpret my behavior as small-minded, supercilious, or

one-upmanship, which will ultimately undermine my ability to achieve my other goals. (See Figure C for his complete hypothetical ITCM.)

Column 1 Improvement goal	Column 2 Doing/not doing instead (Behaviors that work against my goal)	Column 3 Hidden competing commitments	Column 4 Big assumptions
"ORDER: let all [my] things have their places; [and] let each part of [my] business have its time" (p. 72).	"[I] often receive people of business at their own hours [even when they conflict with the pre-planned order of my own day]" (p. 76). "[I find it] extreamly [sic] difficult to acquire [the habit of returning] things, papers, etc., to their places (p. 76) [even though] now I am grown old, and my memory bad, I feel very sensibly the want of it" (p. 77).	"[I think of myself as a] master who must mix with the world" (p. 76). "Such extream [sic] nicety as I exacted of myself might be a kind of foppery in morals, which, if it were known, would make me [appear] ridiculous [and I am unwilling to appear ridiculous in the eyes of others]" (p. 77). "A perfect character might be attended with the inconvenience of being envied and hated; and that a benevolent man should allow a few faults in himself, to keep his friends in countenance" (p. 77).	I assume that extreme punctiliousness — especially that which is as overt as my notion of Order requires — will incite envy or scorn in my friends and others who will interpret my behavior as small-minded, supercilious, and/or one-upmanship, which will ultimately undermine my ability to achieve my other goals.

Figure C. Franklin's complete hypothetical Immunity to Change Map

Of course, one's "big assumptions" may be true — but they just as well may be false. Once laid bare on the ITCM, the contents of Columns 3 and 4, which had previously been operating behind the scenes, surreptitiously "driving" Franklin as Subject, can now be viewed and

manipulated as Object. He can test his Column 4 hypothesis with private "experiments" that slowly convince him that his assumption requires modification. Alternatively, he might ultimately confirm his Big Assumption, in which case he can revise his Column 1 goal, which currently fails to portray the full picture of what he really wants. For example, he might modify his goal in Column 1 for Order to allow for unstructured windows of time that would still conform to his notion of orderliness, or he might modify his definition of Order, limiting its applicability to when he is working alone.

THE ADVANTAGES OF AND RATIONALE FOR A HYBRID APPROACH TO ḤESHBON NA'NEFESH

It appears that Franklin's method is a direct and highly effective tool for behavior modification that served Franklin well in almost all cases. However, when it comes to adaptive challenges, using an ITCM may yield better results. Kegan and Lahey readily concede this point:

> We have always told our clients that if they can make the changes they need to by recipe, by willpower, by creating some plan to extinguish certain behaviors and amplify others — like submitting to a diet — then by all means that is exactly what they should do. Nothing we have to offer is as quick and easy as a straightforward technical solution — if it works… The question for one committed to a self-improvement goal thus becomes, "Which approach is the right one to help me overcome my problem?" There is no pat answer. One often cannot determine whether a challenge is technical or adaptive in nature just by looking at it (KEGAN and LAHEY, pp. 37, 38).

It stands to reason, then, that one choosing between Franklin's and Kegan's techniques first ought to try Franklin's simpler, more direct approach. If a technical solution works, the challenge was not adaptive (ibid., p. 38).

Of course, a person's failure to change cannot indicate ipso facto a flawed technique. Franklin himself, though claiming ultimate success, concedes progress was slow and took years (FRANKLIN, p. 76), so we must remain mindful of additional factors that indicate an adaptive challenge. For example, undesired behaviors that had temporarily

diminished but then return stronger than ever would suggest the existence of a hidden, countervailing Column 3-type commitment that is prompting Column 2-type behavior (KEGAN and LAHEY, p. 38). Another reliable indicator that a challenge is adaptive in nature is when a problem itself implicates a fundamental aspect of one's personality or identity (ibid., p. 129).

HOW KOSHER IS THE IMMUNITY TO CHANGE MAP?

Traditional Judaism emphasizes proper behavior down to the finest minutiae. Arguably, action is afforded greater attention than even faith or feelings. It is understandable, therefore, that Jewish literature has historically espoused a behaviorist approach to self-development. For example, the thirteenth-century *Sefer Ha'Ḥinukh* (*The Book of Education*) advises:

> The human being develops according to what he does, and one's heart and thoughts always follow his actions… Even one who is thoroughly evil…if he stirs himself…to toil assiduously in Torah and [its] commandments — even if insincerely — will immediately incline toward goodness, and from insincere [action] will come sincerity, and by virtue of his actions, his drive for evil will die (*Sefer Ha'Ḥinukh*, precept 16).

So it comes as no surprise that Lefin's repackaging of Franklin's wares found warm welcome in Torah circles. Can a more effective version of ḥeshbon ha'nefesh based on Lefin's presentation but augmented by Kegan's ITCM remain fully consistent with the traditional Jewish outlook? I believe it can.

According to the normative Jewish model of human psychodynamics, every individual finds him- or herself at the intersection of two countervailing psychological forces: the superego-like *yetser ha'tov* (the drive for good) and the id-like *yetser ha'rạ* (the drive for evil). See, for example, Rabbi Moshe Ḥayyim Luzzatto's description of this dynamic in *Derekh Ha'Shem* (*The Way of G-d*). Overcoming the drive for evil and to obey instead the drive for good typically presents what would rightly be classified as a "technical" challenge, because the means to a solution is usually known from the outset. Observant Jews have a priori

commitments to study, prayer, and good deeds. The successful fulfill-
ment of these commitments requires "only" self-motivation, discipline,
and practice. Franklin's technique is thus an appropriate strategy to
train oneself to behave in accordance with Jewish ideals.

We should be wary, however, not to conflate this type of "techni-
cal" inner conflict with the "adaptive" inner conflicts addressed by the
ITCM, which do not necessarily have anything directly to do with moral
dilemmas. Consider, for example, Franklin's own struggle between
orderliness and flexibility. To the best of my knowledge, nothing in the
traditional Jewish literature suggests that either approach is objectively
better than the other. To the contrary, some type of balance is probably
the preferred modus vivendi. There is a clear distinction between these
two types of inner conflict:

(1) The technical challenges that may be described as overcoming
the *yetser ha'ra*

(2) The adaptive challenges that constitute the defining or refining
of one's character

The resolution of (1) requires the resolve to fulfill the many Scriptural
and rabbinic mandates exhorting us to choose good over evil. The
resolution of (2) demands something altogether different. The second
requires a more precise, self-reflective understanding of *how* we must
choose to live, according to Maimonides' formulation:

> Therefore the early Sages instructed one to constantly evaluate his
> attitudes, to calculate them, and to align them with the middle path
> so that he will be perfect (MAIMONIDES, *Laws of Attitudes* 1:4).

While it is true that proper action is always of primary importance,
Judaism also expects us to refine our behavior with ever-deepening
levels of understanding (see, for example, TALMUD *Kiddushin* 40a). The
Talmud states that the response of the Jewish People to receiving the
Torah at Mount Sinai, "We will do and we will understand" (EXODUS
24:3) was effective precisely because of the commitment first to do and
then to understand (TALMUD *Shabbat* 88a). The critical second part of
the declaration, however, should not be overlooked: the all-important
commitment to subsequent understanding in order to enhance further

action. This attitude is found in Hillel the Elder's famous encapsulation of Judaism to a prospective convert:

> What is hateful to you, do not do unto your friend. Everything else is commentary. *Now go and study*! (Talmud *Shabbat* 31a. Emphasis mine.)

Hillel captures the paradigm I propose in the relationship between the behaviorist and Constructive-Developmental Theory approaches: we first directly try to change our behavior by habituation, and then, if that does not work, we seek a deeper understanding of the underlying reasons why, so that out of that deeper understanding, we can ultimately act in concert with our ideals.

CONCLUSION

Using Robert Kegan's Immunity to Change Map (if it had been available then) might have helped Benjamin Franklin overcome a particular adaptive challenge when his own system for self-perfection failed him. It is reasonable to assume that people using that same system, as presented in *Sefer Ḥeshbon Ha'Nefesh,* to refine their characters will, like Franklin, be stymied by adaptive challenges. For such people, it is reasonable to assume that augmenting their efforts with an Immunity to Change Map will prove beneficial. Such a hybrid approach is more consistent with the traditional Jewish outlook than the behaviorist method alone. Personally, I have found both Franklin's and Kegan's methods to be powerful tools for my own growth, and I believe the hybrid technique can help many other people as well. As did Franklin, I sincerely hope that my proposed technique will be widely employed by members of all religions, and as a rabbi in the Torah-observant community, I pray that it becomes the preferred method of ḥeshbon ha'nefesh for the twenty-first century.

REFERENCES

Afsai, S. 2011. "Benjamin Franklin, Mussar Maven." *Jewish Daily Forward*. 17 Jan 2011. Retrieved 27 Aug 2014 from http://forward.com/articles/134721/benjamin-franklin-mussar-maven.
Franklin, B. 2008. *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*, edited by C.W.

Eliot, originally published 1791. Rockville, MD: Arc Manor. Retrieved 27 Aug 2014 from http://books.google.co.il/books?id=k9WLIBq12E0C &printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onep age&q&f=false.

HEIFETZ, R. 1998. *Leadership Without Easy Answers.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

KEGAN, R., and L.L. Lahey. 2009. *Immunity to Change.* Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.

LEFIN, M.M. 1995. *Cheshbon ha-Nefesh (1845)*, edited by D. Landesman and translated by S. Silverstein. New York: Feldheim Publishers.

SINKOFF, N. 2000. "Benjamin Franklin in Jewish Eastern Europe: Cultural Appropriation in the Age of Enlightenment." *Journal of the History of Ideas.* vol. 61, no.1, pp. 133–152. Retrieved 27 Aug 2014 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3654046.

The annual ceremony welcoming the return of the swifts to the Western Wall, organized by ornithologist Professor Yossi Leshem of Tel Aviv University. Photo by Ilan Goldstein.