

"And there was evening and there was morning." (1:5)

The Midrash interprets the reference in the pasuk to night and day from a different perspective. "It was night" denotes the activities of the wicked, while "it was morning" is a reference to the actions of the righteous. Hashem asserts that the light is good. It seems strange that the Torah would have to tell us that Hashem favors the actions of the righteous, symbolized by the light. Such a statement is not novel. Certainly, Hashem prefers the activities of the righteous. We do not need a Midrash to teach us this lesson.

The Dubno Maggid, zl, gives a practical exposition of Chazal. People learn Torah and perform mitzvos in different ways with varying attitudes. One can go to a school in order to witness the failure of the greater society around him. The scene epitomizes the breakdown of society. It is so destructive that no good can be derived from the situation. He, therefore, chooses the positive approach of learning Torah and mitzvah observance.

His counterpart may look at the lifestyle of the tzaddikim, the righteous, who devote themselves and their lives to acting positively, to a life of harmony within themselves and in their families. He sees the contentment and happiness, the serenity and satisfaction within their lives and in terms of their achievements.

Yes, there are two approaches: looking at the positive, the approach of light; and the converse, the negative approach, viewing evil in its entirety, including its consequences. They both bring results, but which is preferable? Hashem says in regard to the light: "It is good."