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MANNA Essay  
Rabbi Dow Marmur  Is Zionism part of Judaism?
Rabbi J. D. Rayner
THE DEATH OF RABBI HUGO Gryn saddened a nation. Michael Buerk said as much on the national news. Hugo was a much-loved and universally respected figure who dedicated his life to teaching Judaism as a bridge-building and reconciling force. The Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations decided that, as a matter of Orthodox principle, he could not attend the funeral. Although the leadership of the Reform Movement was saddened by this decision, the public disquiet was not voiced by them but by rank and file members of the community, many of them from Rabbi Dr Sacks’ own United Synagogue.

A memorial service was held at West London Synagogue and, once again, Rabbi Dr Sacks was not present. His absence was in line with the current United Synagogue convention that Orthodox rabbis do not enter the buildings of the Progressive community or take part in their ‘rites’.

Sacks had known and worked with Rabbi Gryn for many years. This and continuing disquiet prompted him to suggest a memorial meeting under the auspices of the secular Board of Deputies, at which he could pay tribute. Once this initiative became public, considerable opposition was expressed by the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations and others to the right of the United Synagogue. It was in response to this pressure that Sacks wrote the fateful letter to Dayan Padwa that was subsequently leaked to the Jewish Chronicle. Sacks attended the memorial meeting. He spoke about the need for peace and unity. He alluded to the pressures that he had been under, to mistakes he had made and he praised Hugo Gryn as a great human being and a significant Holocaust survivor. His eulogy, however, studiously avoided the title ‘rabbi’ and omitted any reference to Rabbi Gryn as a teacher of the United Synagogue was a broad and friend and which reveals itself to be a spiritual figurehead of the entire community.

What is to be done? MANNA can see only three alternatives. First, the Chief Rabbinate could change. It could be transformed into a much more inclusivist body truly capable of representing all sections of the community. This would demand a renunciation of sectarian action, a preparedness to call all rabbis ‘rabbi’ and a willingness to cross thresholds even if attending synagogue services is not possible. Above all, it would require an acknowledgement that, though there are fundamental differences of theology and though Orthodoxy can never legitimise non-Orthodoxy, there is, nevertheless, a shared and mutually respected commitment to Jewish education and to Jewish continuity.

If this is not possible, then the second option is for the Chief Rabbinate to be clearly portrayed and seen for what it has always technically been, namely the Chief Rabbinate of the United Hebrew Congregations, the United Synagogue and others who elect and fund its incumbent. The more limited representational role of the office would have to be made explicit and appropriate means would have to be established (not, we hasten to repeat, by the creation of a rival Chief Rabbinate) for other sections of the community to be represented and speak. The Christian community in Britain has long since adopted this position and it is widely regarded as honestly reflecting the realities and pluralities of life.

The third alternative is to accept that a venerable institution has passed its sell-by date. That may, eventually, be the conclusion, but there are many who would be deeply saddened. Whatever the outcome, it must honestly reflect the community as it is today. And it must be coupled with a genuine agreement, across the community, to maintain a consonance between private and public language and private and public deeds. If people seek to retain illusions, however venerable, and to preserve fictions, however impressive, sooner or later reality will intrude with disastrous effect. We cannot afford, as a community, more disasters like the Padwa letter episode. Without structures which provide for honesty, integrity and fairness, only dissension will rule.
EXT DECEMBER, ZIONIST leaders from all over the world will gather in Jerusalem to mark the 100th anniversary of the first Zionist Congress. It is by no means clear whether this will be an opportunity to initiate a new phase in the history of Zionism, or an occasion to give it a decent burial.

The latter view is widely held in the Jewish world today, not least among those engaged in fund raising on behalf of Israel. The major reason why the future of the Zionist movement is in doubt has little to do with ideology and much with the fact that those who raise the money for the World Zionist organisation – WZO – believe it, at best, to be a poor investment and, more often, an obstacle to normal Israel-Diaspora relations.

With the self-destructive streak of much in Zionist politics, the WZO is contributing to its own demise. Despite changing circumstances, it has retained an anachronistic structure that provides jobs for party hacks. It employs many apparchiks whose only qualifications are that they were not given government jobs.

And several WZO leaders have faced criminal charges of misuse of funds. Those responsible for the raising of these funds have not been amused. Believing that the organisation cannot be tamed, they are taking steps to dismantle it. Nobody will be shedding tears should it disappear to give room for a more appropriate successor.

Judging by his recently published history of Zionist thought, Rabbi David Goldberg is not likely to shed tears if the WZO disappears. But he might be very surprised if another Zionist body came to take its place. For he concludes his eminently readable and highly informative book with the assertion, “Zionism is dead. Long live the State of Israel!”

His conclusion is not based on current internal political machinations but on the more substantive assertion that Zionism has done its job and has become obsolete. He insists that Jews today have, indeed, reason to relate to the State of Israel – but without the baggage of 19th century European nationalism.

Goldberg’s analysis must be taken
with utmost seriousness, especially since those most vociferous in their affirmation of "the Zionist ideal" have now become something of a menace. They tend to believe that Jews must settle everywhere in the Land of Israel, irrespective of political and moral consequences and with no regard for the injustice inflicted on the indigenous Arab population.

Many of them regard Vladimir Jabotinsky, who died in 1940, as their mentor. Jabotinsky's political philosophy includes, in Goldberg's words, "subservience to the overriding concept of the homeland, loyalty to a charismatic leader and the subordination of the class conflict to national goals".

Even if Benjamin Netanyahu is less prone to quote Jabotinsky than the late Menachem Begin, there is much to suggest that those who shape the policies of the present Israeli cabinet act as if they were true believers and faithful disciples of Jabotinsky's conviction that the Jews are, in Goldberg's phrase, a 'superior' race, ready for statehood while the Arabs are not.

But the persistence of these views suggests that Zionism, at least in this version, is not dead, even if some wish it were. For these reasons alone Goldberg's proclamation is highly premature.

Jabotinsky is one of the founders of modern Zionism and Goldberg devotes two chapters to him. Starting with the forerunner of modern Zionism, Moses Hess and concluding with the first and greatest Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben Gurion, Goldberg takes the reader through the contribution of each. He shows how their writings and actions have come to shape the Zionist Movement and why that movement no longer speaks to us now. It is an excellent read. In fact, so excellent that one is tempted to set aside one's reservations and say 'Amen' to every word.

But the temptation must be resisted. There is more to contemporary Zionism than the visions of the early idealists and the distortions of contemporary zealots. At least two other versions come to mind. Both challenge the proclamation of the end of Zionism.

The first is associated with the Jewish philosopher Martin Buber. As one of the founders of 'Brit Shalom', the organisation that, before 1948, advocated a bi-national Arab-Jewish state - to which Goldberg also devotes a chapter - Buber and a number of distinguished scholars and writers were among the few Zionists who took the Arabs seriously.

Though their political platform collapsed when Israel was established, their moral voice is still heard in the land. More and more people may come to listen to it in the years to come, when living side by side with Palestinians turns out to be the only prospect for the survival of both people.

The second version of Zionism that may be gaining popularity, this time in the Diaspora, is associated with Achad Ha-Am, arguably the most important of all Zionist thinkers and the subject of yet another chapter in Goldberg's book.

Achad Ha-Am envisaged the Jewish homeland as the spiritual centre of Judaism. There are those today who believe that now, when the physical security of the state and its Jewish citizens is a reality, its task is to become the focal point for all Jewry. Whereas politics will always divide the Diaspora along Israeli party lines, the cultural and spiritual aspect of the relationship of faith, people and land may become a unifying force in the Jewish world.

Neither of these options is a given. To reaffirm the teachings of Buber, many Israelis will have to revise their disdain for the Arabs and Zionism itself will have to revise its consistent disregard for Palestinian nationalism. And to restate the vision of Achad Ha-Am, religious and cultural pluralism must become a sine qua non in the Jewish world. But without either, not only will Zionism be rendered obsolete but Israel itself will become irrelevant.

Rather than seeking to write Zionism out of the script of Judaism, its students must turn to a thinker like David Hartman of Jerusalem. Hartman is giving shape to a new Zionist direction, removed from organisational irrelevance and anchored in the reality of both Israeli sovereignty and continued Diaspora existence. His notion of a renewed covenant arising out of Torah Erets Yisrael has much to teach us. It provides a bridge across religious and political divides and may help persuade us that Zionism is by no means dead.

Reform Jews may be among those eager to learn and be persuaded. Those who today seek to fuse commitment to Reform Judaism with an affirmation of a Zionism inspired by Buber and Achad Ha-Am and informed by Hartman and others, believe that they can help prevent the obsolescence of Zionism and the irrelevance of Israel.

The intention, expressed in a recent statement by the President of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, to renew the efforts of the American Reform movement on behalf of Progressive Judaism in Israel and to support the Zionist arm, is indicative of renewed commitment.

Similarly, the proposed statement about the link between Zionism and Reform Judaism to be presented at the convention next June of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the North American Rabbinic body, points in the same direction. Whether or not these efforts will be sufficient to counteract the often destructive alliance between Orthodoxy and nationalism remains to be seen.

Whoever is interested in the outcome should read To the Promised Land with great care, both for the lucidity of the presentation and the seriousness of its content - but not without a critical eye. For we must ask the obvious question: if the other movements in Judaism could change so drastically in the last hundred years, why should not Zionism be able to adapt itself to new circumstances and continue to be an essential component of contemporary Jewish life? There are signs that it can - with our help, perhaps it will. The next Zionist Congress will tell us.

RABBI DOW MARMUR, formerly of Poland, Sweden, Iford and Golders Green, is Senior Rabbi of the Holy Blossom Temple in Toronto. Since 'Beyond Survival' he has published a number of books including 'The Star of Return' (1991) and 'On Being a Jew' (1994).
I have recently been reading a book called *The Hidden Children*. Subtitled *The Secret Survivors of the Holocaust*, it tells, in their own words, the stories of those children, who, by a variety of means and in a variety of circumstances, escaped the fate of six million other Jews in Europe and lived to tell the tale.

There is Kirsten, who had to hide her little brother in a suitcase to avoid detection and who was carried through the sewers of Lvov to eventual safety. She is now happily settled in Long Island, USA.

There is Ruth, now a psychotherapist in New York, who was born in Koenigsberg but was taken by her parents to Belgium and placed in a convent to be looked after by nuns.

There is Joseph, formerly Jurek, now a sales manager with "only a hint of a Polish accent", who survived by keeping constantly on the move and who, by dint of his blond hair, did usually pass as a non-Jew.

I had expected to find the book moving, even perhaps, disturbing. I was unprepared for the powerful wave of emotion it was to unleash in me. As I read the stories of fear, courage, cunning and sheer determination to survive, as I acknowledged the lifelong repercussions of those painful and confusing childhood years, I began to understand something long buried in my own childhood.

Those children had been hidden to save their lives. They had been given false identities, encouraged to deny their Jewishness - the alternative was to die in the Camps. It was my great fortune that I did not grow up in the Warsaw Ghetto, nor in a cramped cellar or attic, nor was I ever starving, separated from my entire family, nor in fear for my life. Yet I had also been in hiding.

I spent the war years with my mother and grandmother in a village in Buckinghamshire, to which we had been evacuated from the East End of London. Everyone called my grandmother "The French Lady". I doubt that anyone realised that she was a Russian Jewish immigrant. I remember a huge Christmas tree standing in our kitchen. Perhaps that is where the hiding began.

When the war was over, we moved to the suburbs, where my parents kept a draper's shop.

I definitely knew that I was Jewish. After all, we had a blue and white collection box for Israel on the sideboard. We ate chicken soup, latkes, gefilte fish and knedials. My grandparents still lived in the East End and we visited them regularly, sometimes joining them for Pesach celebrations.

My mother sang to me in Russian and Yiddish, songs I still half remember.

Yet at primary school I stood in morning assembly, gamely mouthing the words of the hymns and sat, somewhat embarrassed in R.E. classes, listening to tales of Jesus. Like many of the hidden children of the Holocaust, I was beginning to experience the first indications of religious identity confusion. If we were Jews and Jesus was a Jew, did we believe in him, or didn't we? Why were we allowed to have presents at Christmas but not to put up decorations? If we were proud to be Jewish, then why did my mother always whisper when she said the word, as if afraid that somebody might hear?

Very early in my childhood, I began to receive the message that it was always best to "fit in", never to make a fuss, to be as much like "the others" as possible. I didn't know why these tactics were thought to be advisable but I adhered to them. Lying low and, if necessary, lying, became second nature.

At the age of eleven, I went to the local high school on a scholarship. My parents were proud but strangely apprehensive. And rightly so.

How I longed to be indistinguishable from the mass of fair-haired girls with their ill-fitting uniforms, their little crucifixes, their lunch-boxes full of cold pork sandwiches and their twinsetted mothers who made Victoria sponge, not cheesecake, when friends came to tea.

But I was all wrong from the start, wrong in every conceivable way. My father, now a tailor - oh, why couldn't he be a bank manager or a solicitor? - had insisted on making my school blazer instead of purchasing it from the official outfitter. As I climbed onto the school bus on my first day, an eleven year old's worst nightmare came true. Everyone else wore a blazer which was ill-fitting and an indeterminate shade of mauve. Mine fitted me perfectly and was quite the wrong colour.

In my first year I was singled out for "elocution", an obvious comment on my vestigial East End Jewish vowels. The French teacher told me that she despaired of my ever learning to speak French, since I could barely speak proper English. The headmistress called me a guttersnipe. My mother told me to tell my best friend that I was Jewish - uttered, of course, in a whis-
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Is it any wonder that I was unhappy at school for many years? From my “friends”, with a few honourable exceptions, I experienced relentless teasing, goading and cruelty, whilst at home I was always advised to keep my head down, my nose clean and never to make myself in any way conspicuous.

I had no means of either understanding or dealing with situation, until, after several years of failing to fulfil the promise of my precocious early years, I suddenly began to fight back.

Now I feel sure that, not unlike the hidden children in Jan Marks’ book, so often successful in adult life as therapists, writers, artists, teachers, my future was mapped out for me during those painful days.

Tired of my “victim” status, I became ferociously determined to succeed, to “show them”, to wreak my revenge on those who seemed bent on crushing me with their prejudices. Determined, too, that I would no longer hide or consent to being hidden.

I knew by now that I was different. I did not yet know that it was a difference of which I could be proud. Instead, I made up my mind to rise above it all, to overcome what I perceived as a disadvantage, to put it behind me. I would be the best in spite of my Jewishness. People would say: “Goodness, I never would have known you were Jewish!” and the words would be music to my ears.

So I studied harder than anyone, rose rapidly to the top of the class, began to shine in various ways. I drove myself mercilessly – a habit I am only now learning to abandon – devoting all my energies to proving that not only was I as good as “the others”, I was better than most of them. Now I didn’t “fit in”, I stood out. But I was no more popular than before and certainly no happier. I had simply managed to exchange one stereotype for another, from the “Jew as victim” to the “Jew as too clever by half”. Much though I made a lot of noise and was increasingly visible in school societies, plays and committees, inside I was still hiding, still afraid, deeply unsure of who I was, of where I came from and of where I was going.

I had no real understanding of the Jewish year, because we did not openly celebrate the festivals or keep the Sabbath. Sometimes we did go to synagogue. But even that filled me with confusion and fear, since I was unfamiliar with the rituals and procedure. We were neither fish nor fowl, not quite English but not proudly Jewish either. And so, wherever I was, I was always in hiding.

With English friends who didn’t “know”, I listened silently to anti-Semitic jokes and comments, made feeble excuses when invited to Midnight Mass and ate the ham sandwiches they offered with guilty enjoyment. Meanwhile, Jewish friends were not to find out that we didn’t fast on Yom Kippur.

I know that I am not the only child of those post-war years to have grown up in such confusion. I realise that, when set alongside the experience of the children whose stories are told in Marks’ book, my sufferings appear trivial and, by comparison, almost comical. Yet the repercussions were profound and, as I see now, far-reaching.

Though apparently successful, both professionally and socially, I have spent much of my adult life attempting to fill the spiritual void which was my uncomfortable inheritance. I inhabited

*The headmistress called me a guttersnipe*
After all, were there not close parallels to be found between the Jews who died in the Holocaust and the Tibetans suffering under a repressive Chinese regime?

a wasteland of the soul, devoid of signposts or distinguishing features, bereft of comfortably familiar landmarks or supportive travelling companions. I always seemed to be on the move, both spiritually and physically, always travelling, more in hope than expectation, and never quite satisfied with what I found when I arrive.

At first I ran away to a Christian retreat centre, where I eagerly studied the New Testament and sought the advice of priests.

Then, in the 70's I attempted aliyah. At one time I might have been interested. Tibetan Buddhism. I had grown up believing that being Jewish could only ever be a disadvantage, a source of pain and conflict. My agonising experience in the Tel Aviv divorce courts had done little to dispel that impression. Confused and in considerable pain, I decided that the time had come to simply walk away from all that darkness, guilt and judgment. So, with very little regret and surprising confidence, I turned toward a saffron-coloured world, where all seemed bright and light, a world in which I believed I could begin afresh with a new identity.

I never disclaimed my Jewishness, believing with a naive sincerity that I could be both a sort of Jewish Buddhist. For a while, I was. Used to hiding, I had now found an effective and, it seemed, foolproof disguise. From being unacceptable, I became "interesting". Tibetan Buddhism, as practised in the West, has a certain cachet, a mystery and allure. At Buddhist occasions one could recognise film stars and other luminaries amongst the devotees.

If I felt a little guilty about the six million who had perished in order to allow me to burn incense and make offerings to colourful Buddhas, then I pushed the feelings down, out of sight, hidden from view.

After all, were there not close parallels to be found between the Jews who died in the Holocaust and the Tibetans suffering under a repressive Chinese regime? And were not many prominent Buddhists formerly Jews? In these ways I reassured myself, and, if I ever felt uncomfortable intoning prayers in Tibetan, I never admitted it to myself or anyone else.

If there were signs of my spiritual disorientation, I failed to recognise or acknowledge them. One day in Berlin, wandering quite unintentionally into the Museum of Holocaust, I stared at the rows of tear-off yellow stars and the photographs of Jews in striped overcoats waiting to board the trains which would carry them to their deaths. When I began to sob convulsively I was both surprised and embarrassed.

Today, with gratitude for the ways in which Buddhism nurtured me as I wandered in my own particular wilderness, with sadness for what I now perceive as the lost years, with regret for all the delusions and denials, I begin to reclaim my Jewish heritage and identity. With a developing sense of pride and a growing confidence, I acknowledge that I was a half-hidden child, now, at long last, coming out of hiding.

SHEILA YEGOR is a playwright and a poet and the mother of two sons. She is the author of Self Portra it and The Sound on One Hand Clapping, both published by Amber Lane Press and Variations on a Theme by Clara Schumann, published by Methuen, and other plays for stage and radio. She has recently returned to Judaism under the guidance of Rabbi Hadassah Davis and is becoming a member of the Bristol and West Progressive Synagogue.
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Following last autumn's 40th anniversary of the founding of Leo Baeck College, MANNA asked the American Reform rabbi and academic, Allen Podet, who has taught at Leo Baeck on a number of occasions in the last 20 years, to give us an outsider's "warts and all" view.
The mix of students at Leo Baeck College is phenomenal, with regard to countries, languages, religious backgrounds, value systems and philosophies.

I found it a challenging task. My first thought was to list the strengths and weaknesses of the institution, the only non-Orthodox seminary in Europe. But sometimes the same things were appearing under both heads.

Faculty: Basically it has a volunteer faculty, with a few exceptions. The core of the instructional staff consists of some 37 rabbis and others in the field, most of whom hold full time posts elsewhere and who also teach at LBC. In America this arrangement has proved disastrous. For one thing, full time congregational rabbis in America can seldom keep up academically with their scholarly colleagues, so the school’s standards begin to abrade. Also, without pay, there is no control, so the administration flounders without leverage.

Somehow, Leo Baeck College managed to avoid that. The level of instruction, from the student’s perspective, in every area which I could check, was consistently equal to what the better schools in America provide and sometimes superior. In large part this is because of the reality factor: the people doing the teaching know precisely what the student will need in order to operate effectively.

From an academic perspective, I am pleasantly surprised to see that the scholarly productivity of the Leo Baeck College faculty, measured by publications of influence, is not inferior to that of my American full time professional professorial colleagues. Of course, there are more of them at Hebrew Union College or the Jewish Theological Seminary. There are some 20 rabbis on the full time staff at HUC, Cincinnati, alone. But the overall quality of product is by and large equivalent from the LBC faculty and arguably superior in certain academic areas.

In fact, professional scholars tend to write for one another, creating a rarified atmosphere well removed from the realities of the field. That is not a problem at LBC, yet the productivity of its best instructors compares well with the best available in other seminaries.

The secret of its strength is the same as its point of weakness, that is, its size. LBC can still rely on the dedication of its volunteers to accomplish that which, at a much larger school, must be purchased. If and when LBC trebles in size it will no longer be able to do that. For now, it is a great boon.

Library: When I knew the Library ten years ago, it was clear that small size hurts. With a pinched budget, limited space and a relatively short period of time collecting books, the LBC Library, generally the heart of such a school, was comparatively deficient. It was adequate for instructional support but not for many areas of research. A serious wart.

Since then, it has acquired the Joshua Podro Library, which is an important research tool and other significant collections. It is a member of the Judaica Conservancy Foundation, giving access to important rare books. All recent acquisitions are online. It is now a valuable and growing research facility, though it is not yet in

Continued on next page
a league with the world class research libraries. I would, in the strongest possible terms, encourage public-spirited people and those concerned with the future to contribute specifically to develop the research resources of the Leo Baeck College Library. It is truly an important investment.

One may ask: how critical is a research library for a school whose students are a tube ride away from the British Museum or the University of London? The answer is that it is important. One can be a guest at someone else's intellectual table but it is also important to be a host. The College needs to develop its own areas of specialisation.

The quality of LBC's librarians, on the other hand, Hyam Maccoby and now Piet van Boxel, is recognised on the international level. For people of such world-famed talent and erudition to be so welcoming and warm to students and colleagues alike is refreshing.

Students: LBC has about 80 students in various programmes, including 17 rabbinic students. It has been able to attract students with the highest qualifications, people who would easily qualify for medical or legal or other professional schools. Indeed, some people with legal and medical credentials have elected to become rabbis there, including its Principal. The best at LBC are as good as the best anywhere and they can expect a great deal more individual attention there than elsewhere. I think they can expect a great deal more toleration of eccentricity as well. That, too, is a function of the small size of the institution. A larger college simply does not have the flexibility to deal with eccentrics, yet we need our eccentrics the way bread needs leavening. The mix of students at LBC is phenomenal, with regard to countries, languages, religious backgrounds and value systems. Yet I have found that the students are comparatively supportive and protective of one another, in sharp contrast to some other places. They do not, of course, always see that.

To put the matter in context, rabbinical training is by nature long and demanding. Most people who can survive it and become effective, successful rabbis could have just as well become successful in law or medicine or accounting. For a Roman Catholic priest, there are sacraments and special powers reserved to the clergy which are unavailable to lay believers. Rabbis, however, are not priests. They pretend to no special powers or special sanctity, at least they are not supposed to, however much some congregants wish that upon them. Sanctity and the service of God are equally available to the rabbi and to the committed lay person but the creature comforts are provided at noticeably different levels. A dedicated Jew can have an altogether full and rich involvement in Jewish life and scholarship without being a rabbi and he or she can do so while providing for spouse and children in a more comfortable and effective manner, generally speaking.

As a result, the rabbinate as a profession is in competition with the other learned professions for top flight people who are willing to undertake the comparative sacrifices involved for themselves and their families. Recruitment is therefore a serious problem for the rabbinate. At some times, the youth

Leo Baeck College Faculty 1996

From left to right (standing): Liz Crossick (Pastoral Care & Community Skills), John Olbrich (Registrar), Dr Esther Seidel (History of Jewish Thought), Rabbi Professor Jonathan Magonet (Principal), Rabbi Alexandra Wright (Hebrew), Rabbi John Rayner (Liturgy), Rabbi Dr Michael Shire (Education).

Seated: Rabbi Dr Charles Middleburgh (Bible), Rabbi Colin Eimer (Hebrew & Practical Rabbinics), Rabbi Sheila Shulman (Contemporary Theology), Dr Joanna Weinberg (Senior Lecturer in Rabbinics), Dr Piet van Boxel (Librarian).
movements and the synagogues themselves and the personal influence of encouraging rabbis may be relied upon to contribute candidates, sometimes more, sometimes fewer. This is healthy growth from within.

At other times, as at the present, a larger proportion of the student body will be drawn from the margins, persons from abroad, people returning to Judaism, converts, or sexual minorities. Many more women are rabbinical candidates now than was the case a generation ago. This is not a condition unique to Leo Baeck College but the British congregations will be slower to accept such rabbis than the academic institutions. The times are indeed changing and many congregations are more willing to consider now candidates that would have been unacceptable in an earlier time. But the change is slow and often painful. Even in progressive American synagogues, it is still easier to place heterosexual males with a strong Reform or Liberal background. That is what many congregations still want. Some rabbis who do not fit that pattern are going into Hillel work as Jewish chaplains at universities and college, or into counselling and youth work, into academe as professors and into other than congregational work. Some LBC products have found placement in foreign congregations. But it is the UK congregations, in the main, that are paying for this training. The problem is greater for Progressive seminaries than it would be for the Orthodox and it is often made worse by the fact that passionate students, seeing themselves in the prophetic tradition as pioneers of social change, welcome confrontational tactics but congregations seldom do. It is for these reasons that the whole issue of recruitment is a worrisome one for the Liberal and Reform Movements.

Liberal and Reform: A unique circumstance is that the College is co-sponsored by the Liberal and Reform movements. Again, this is a function of size: neither movement can afford its own seminary. But the results are pervasive. Since Reform and Liberal Rabbis train together, there is none of the bickering about whose training is superior or more authentic, which one finds in the American non-Orthodox Rabbinate. A sense of respect and understanding were brought to a new height. In my Midrash classes all the students helped one another and learned to depend on one another. Shall they now revert to religious or sectarian insularity? Hardly likely.

Products: It is interesting to note that of the six most recent and important non-Orthodox prayer books in English, three or possibly four are products of Leo Baeck College people. The New Union Prayer Book, for example, readily acknowledges its enormous debt to Service of the Heart and, in the opinion of many, the RSB's Siddur: Forms of Prayer is an unexcelled work of liturgical genius. A leading American rabbi, upon seeing that book in London for the first time, pored over it slowly and asked, "Why did we create our own prayer book, if this was available?" No journal competes with European Judaism in its special work, or provides an insight into the new Europe such as that journal does. Even before it became the official journal of the College, its contributors were overwhelmingly LBC and it splendidly represents progressive European Jewish thought to many Americans.

Personalities: Leo Baeck College has been blessed with leadership which is extraordinary. It is always dangerous to deal with personalities in the assessment of an institution. What happens if a central figure of great leadership and scholarly ability, for example, should decide to up and depart for distant parts?

Yet in a small institution like Leo Baeck College, personalities are disproportionately influential. An assessment which ignores them is hopelessly theoretical. At the risk of offending, then, or of omitting, certain personalities must be mentioned. Reference has already been made to Hyam Maccoby, LBC's sometime librarian, whose work is required reading in my College course. A world class historian, he provides a role model of the gentleman scholar to the students.

Rabbi Professor Dr Jonathan Magonet, LBC's Principal and one of the few full timers, is very much on the front line of world Biblical study. He was publishing material on Biblical synchrony, the new and exciting approach to Biblical study which seeks to identify major patterns of thought and values over many centuries of writings, at a time when almost all American Jewish scholars were still stuck in the old Wissenschaft des Judentums school of detail analysis. He taught us to rise above reductionism, to see the great patterns in the forests, when we were still caught up in nit-picking analyses of trees. How he manages to do this and still run an institution I cannot imagine. To each generation, a few like that are given.

Many more women are rabbinical candidates now than was the case a generation ago. This is not a condition unique to Leo Baeck College but the British congregations will be slower to accept such rabbis than the academic institutions.

Rabbi Dr Albert Friedlander is the Dean of LBC and full time rabbi of the Westminster Synagogue. He is also one of the most productive scholars around. No one works in modern Jewish history, World War II or Holocaust studies who does not know his work. How does he do it?

Rabbi Lionel Blue has made spirituality and, indeed, mysticism, viable options for generations of students. If Leo Baeck students have often been more open to explore the spiritual dimensions of Judaism than their American counterparts, it is largely because of him.

In a larger institution, such persons might be dissolved in the mass. Because they are at LBC their influence is magnified.

Which brings us back to the matter of size, Leo Baeck College's strength and weakness. In a happy circumstance dictated by limited finances, the Reform and Liberal movements have elected to combine their efforts in the Leo Baeck College. This co-operative effort provides an education of flexibility and depth which, in my view, compares well with the best available anywhere.

RABBI DR ALLEN H. PODET is Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies, State University College at Buffalo, New York and Rabbi, Temple Hesed Abraham, Jamestown, New York.
DISTINCTION

RABBI LAWRENCE KUSHNER'S cogently argued and emotion-ally moving article, "Two Jewish Mothers", hopefully dispels any vestiges of homophobia that may still lurk in the individual. The description of his officiating at the 'wedding' of two lesbians confirms what many know - that it is possible for two homosexuals to enjoy a relationship of physical and emotional love that for them is as nourishing and nurturing as the love that exists between two heterosexuals in marriage.

Beyond that, Rabbi Kushner asks us not only to recognise and acknowledge the reality and genuineness of homosexual love but to grant it an equality of status that should find religious expression in the form and content of a traditional Jewish wedding.

There is a clear and colossal distinction between recognising homosexual love and sanctifying it. It must be a matter of supreme integrity and moral consistency that the Judaism we preach from our pulpits, convey in our classrooms and legislate through our literature be the same Judaism we live, teach and preach to our children in the intimacy of our home. Kushner is asking us to look our children in the eye and tell them that in our perception of the Jewish instruction, values, traditions and responsibilities that have sustained our people through time and across continents, it matters not a jot whether they spend their adult life in a heterosexual or homosexual relationship.

As a Jewish parent and a teacher of Judaism, I feel unwilling and unable to accede to Kushner's request, because in so doing I would be diminishing one of Judaism's most profound teachings - the sanctity of loving, heterosexual marriage.

This concept is not merely a footnote in Jewish history, it permeates Jewish ethical and religious literature from its earliest sources to contemporary times. It is always considered a blessing 'ishma', for its own sake, in addition to its potential and the mandate to perpetuate the Jewish people through - giddal banim u-vanot - the raising of children.

Although in today's climate civil law may permit homosexual couples...
to have children either through adoption or artificial insemination, for various societal reasons this option exists for only a few. Consequently, homosexual marriage would inevitably lead to the diminution of the Jewish people, a people already assaulted by a combination of assimilation, non-marriage and low fertility.

Furthermore, Rabbi Kushner claims categorically that homosexuality has 'absolutely nothing' to do with society. Yet while there is not one single determining factor explaining homosexuality, the sciences do recognise the contribution made by society as well as biology and psychology\(^\text{[4]}\). If we accept this possible contributing role of society and if we accept also that "we live in a world where appearances count and where impressions can make all the difference"\(^\text{[2]}\), it would seem to be an act of great irresponsibility to permit and promote "same-sex" religious wedding ceremonies.

Rabbi Steven Katz
London

Note
1. A useful bibliography is cited in Homosexuality and Judaism: The Reconstructionist Position: January 1992
2. C.C.A.R. Responsa Committee. On Homosexual Marriage

**CHALLENGE**

I READ WITH INTEREST THE article by Lawrence Kushner in the last edition of MANNA (No.53) in which he outlines several arguments against homosexuality and goes on to refute them.

Whilst this makes for interesting reading, I do not think it takes the debate on same-sex religious commit-

ment ceremonies any further forward. No matter what the belief of individuals or whether or not they share any of these views, there can be no doubt they share any of these views, there can be no doubt that for the Reform Movement this is not the central issue. The Movement does not, nor should not, concern itself with such spurious comments as "homosexuality is disgusting" or "homosexuality is unnatural".

Judaism does not exist and has never existed, in a vacuum. It responds to change and to challenges, to social influence, to interpretation and to re-examination of ideas. If Progressive Judaism is better at acknowledging this, this is to our credit. It is also to the credit of the Reform Movement and the Assembly of Rabbis that a Working Party has been set up to study, discuss and report on the issues arising when two Jews of the same sex wish publicly to make a religiously based commitment to each other.

And what are these issues? The issues are about what it means to be a Jew and to declare yourself a Jew. In Orthodox Judaism, for instance, I – as a woman – cannot be counted as a Jew in a community of Jews who come together for prayer. As a Reform Jew, I do not believe that I am part of a Movement that also places prohibitions on other Jews. The issues are about what it means for a couple to want to live a Jewish life together and about why some Jews and not others are publicly able to commit to doing this in a religious setting. The issues are about strengthening Judaism through the commitment of couples wanting to create a Jewish home together and finding ways to enable this to happen. And the issues are about two people coming together in love and in spirituality, sharing in the tree of life that we all wish to hold onto and celebrate.

It is these issues and not the spurious prejudices of some individuals, that the Assembly of Rabbis and the Movement as a whole, needs to debate.

Sue Jackson
Redbridge, Essex

**The fundamental objection to homosexual 'marriage' ceremonies is that the only union of two people which can, within the confines of Judaism, be publicly celebrated is that which can, at least in theory, lead to the establishment of a new Jewish family including both a mother and a father.**

**SECT**

IN THE EDITORIAL OF YOUR Autumn issue (MANNA 53), you advance powerful arguments for the proposition that 'Orthodoxy is now a sect'. What you appear to overlook is that Reform, too, is in acute danger of becoming a sect – with one great difference. Orthodoxy is at least a Jewish sect. If practices like that reported by Rabbi Kushner in the same issue become accepted we shall inevitably become a mere 'Politically Correct' sect and one that is indeed 'a different religion'.

Similarly 'entryism' is not confined to Orthodoxy. We appear to suffer from a similar attack by various groups of single-issue fanatics to whom being 'rooted in tradition' has little or no meaning – other than increasing folksy adherence to traditional ritual – as long as their minority views prevail.

What has brought this to the fore is the matter of same-sex 'marriages'. If this is controversial it is only because there are within the Movement those who say either 'what is all the fuss about?' or 'it is bound to come anyway; so why resist it?' To the vast majority within the Movement, that which Rabbi Kushner advocates is nothing less than a hillul hashem.

Rabbi Kushner's argument is based throughout on sociological sources rather than Jewish tradition. Its essence appears to be twofold. On the one hand, modern science has shown that for a small minority of people, homosexual orientation is natural and unalterable and that consequently they must not be condemned for it. On the other, the public approval of homosexual practice constitutes no danger since it will not increase the amount of it.

The first argument can readily be accepted by all of us. We can and should respect all individuals irrespective of their sexual orientation but we should regard it and all sexual practice as private and personal matters. The second argument fails because, as Rabbi Kushner himself admits, in most human beings, their orientation is not fixed, especially during adolescence and can be influenced by 'role models' and by public approval.

But the fundamental objection to homosexual 'marriage' ceremonies is that the only union of two people which can, within the confines of Judaism, be publicly celebrated is that which can, at least in theory, lead to the establishment of a new Jewish family including both a mother and a father. Acceptance by the Reform Movement of same-sex 'marriages' will indeed make the Movement into a sect, or rather into two sects. For there are many among us, including, I suspect, whole congregations who could not then remain within the Reform Movement.

Continued on next page
Rabbi Kushner ends his article by extolling the virtue of having two Jewish mothers. Would he also rewrite the fifth commandment to say “honour your two mothers”? — Dr A.A. Moritz, Cardiff

FAMILY

The article “Two Jewish Mothers” by Lawrence Kushner may have argued eloquently and emotionally for Jewish homosexuals to be accepted as full members of the community. However, it did not begin to justify or legitimise the concept of homosexual marriage within a Jewish context.

The historic values of stable family life are taking a battering in our society largely because of the new morality which is widely touted and accepted — firstly the trivialisation of sex and, secondly, treating as legitimate any decision based on informed choice.

The media and entertainment industries are continuously telling us that sex of any kind with anyone, in any place is good, so long as it is between consenting adults and that no other party gets hurt. The Reform Movement has embraced this credo and out of the window has gone the concept that sex is only fine within marriage and that the ultimate aim is to bring up children in a stable family environment. Once it is accepted that sex is a social activity and a part of the entertainment industry, many of the other building blocks of the traditional Jewish family fall away.

The other modern credo that the Reform Movement has embraced is to endorse someone’s choice if it is informed and does not directly harm another person. However, this libertarian attitude is also not the Jewish approach. We are being assailed on all sides by choices and pleasurable opportunities but, without a positive moral framework, how can people, particularly the young, know how to cope?

The result is that the social fabric of society is in tatters and that family values are fast disappearing. The major failing of the Reform Movement is that it does not have the courage to draw up a set of Jewish values and nail its flag to their mast.

As a result of its laissez faire attitude, the Reform Movement has an enormous body of members who only belong because they wish to be part of a Jewish club but do not know or care about its values.

Homosexual marriage may be fulfilling for the individuals concerned but it is not Jewish and therefore has no place within our community. Marriage and family are the stabilising forces within Judaism. To kick away these planks by encouraging homosexual marriage continues the process of devaluing the concept of marriage and the family unit.

INCLUSION

In our modern world, homosexuality is still a taboo for many people. The thought of discussing it in any forum produces a feeling of unease in which a generational divide is evident. For younger generations, homosexuality is more generally accepted in the society that they know. In the Reform Movement, this unease is clear for all to see. So perhaps our Movement, in particular, should be discussing the issues of homosexuality and same-sex commitment ceremonies. Kushner is right to link them so clearly. We should be accepting the challenge to deal with both these issues and make informed decisions about them.

The Reform Movement in Great Britain is prepared to ordain gay and lesbian rabbis and has done so for the past seven years. It would be untrue to argue that these rabbis do not play a full and equal role in their communities and the same can be said for gay and lesbian congregants of those communities. In other words, most of these Reform Movement members contribute to the Jewish life of our Movement.

It is obvious that gays and lesbians, like most other members of the Movement, have embraced Judaism as a way of living on many different levels from religious to cultural. Our Movement has acknowledged that gays and lesbians are Jews and, therefore, they should have the same rights as the rest of our members. At the present time, because same-sex commitment ceremonies are not permitted within the RSGB, gays and lesbians are not on an equal footing with the rest of our membership. By maintaining this in-

Of course this is not an all-encompassing argument in favour of embracing these ceremonies. Opposition to them comes, most saliently, from those who do not believe the ceremonies can be understood as Jewish marriage. Jewish marriage or kiddushin — setting apart — requires a very specific ceremony. The actual setting apart of the bride by the groom and vice versa in Reform ceremonies, the seven blessings, the ketubah, are all integral parts of a traditional Jewish marriage.

What most advocates of same-sex commitment ceremonies want, unlike Kushner, is not the same as a traditional marriage. That is why they should not be referred to as marriages. Same-sex commitment ceremonies might include components such as a general blessing of the two parties’ love and commitment to each other as well as other similar concepts phrased as a substitute for a ketubah. They would not include the phrase “K’dat Mosheh v’Yisrael” — according to the laws of Moses and Israel — as the marriage ceremony does and, therefore, they would not infringe Jewish marriage law. These ceremonies would not be the same as a marriage but they would allow for expressions of love and lifelong partnership in the presence of a Jewish community.

The other main argument in opposition to these ceremonies is that they make a mockery of the traditional Jewish family. Nevertheless, it is very rare to find a gay or lesbian Jew who is not part of a family network both nuclear and extended. They do not fall outside of this traditional framework. Furthermore, the desire for a commitment ceremony actually reinforces the idea that gays and lesbians wish to stay within the family. Far from being revolutionary or ground-breaking, this idea seems conservative. Same-sex commitment ceremonies are designed to grapple with the contemporary Jewish question of homosexual inclusion in our Movement by fulfilling the need for a Jewish lifestyle, a Jewish home, a Jewish partnership.

Malcolm Cohen
(Merakez Chinuch, RSY Nefzer)

Our Movement has acknowledged that gays and lesbians are Jews and, therefore, they should have the same rights as the rest of our members.
With the compliments of
Neil Benson
and his partners
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COULD MAccOBY BE WRONG?

Graham James

**A PARIAH PEOPLE: THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF ANTISEMITISM**

I CAN CLAIM – JUST – TO HAVE been a university student in the turbulent 1960s. I arrived at the University of Lancaster in 1969. It was a year of disruption and protest. Though we didn’t know it at the time, it was almost the end of an age of student rebellion. When I look back on the strikes and the picketing of university departments, I feel a strange nostalgia for those days in which students were more idealistic and optimistic. I wonder whether I belong to the first older generation to be shocked by the conservatism of young people nowadays, rather than the other way round.

Any “big” theory which relates to Christianity as a whole sounds strangely hollow to Christians themselves.

**Hyam Maccoby’s latest study of the phenomenon of antisemitism reminded me of my student days. I found myself easily persuaded then by the articulate and well researched theses which those with burning convictions presented to me. The problem was that I was sometimes convinced, successively, by two conflicting arguments. Gradually, I learned that large theories did not always accord with experience. That is my problem with Maccoby’s work. It claims too much.**

There is a second reason why Hyam Maccoby’s book reminds me of my student days. It was at Lancaster that I first met Jews. A chaplaincy centre had been built on the university campus. It still stands and consists of three circular and inter-connected buildings. Two of them contained the Anglican and Roman Catholic chapels, and the third, meeting rooms, accommodation for the chaplains, a coffee bar and what were known in those days as “the Jewish rooms”. These contained a kitchen and a place for worship and meeting specifically set aside for the Jewish community. It was during my time at Lancaster that I first experienced the celebration of Passover. The symbolic value of shared premises was considerable and it gradually led to some shared experience.

Even so, as I look back on it, it seems striking how lacking in curiosity we were about our Jewish friends. We listened to the New Testament, read and studied the scriptures a few feet away from the Jewish rooms, without ever making much connection. Shabbat services were advertised alongside the Christian worship in the chaplaincy’s first bulletin. Why was it, I ask myself, that those of us studying the Gospel of John didn’t fall victim to the canker at the heart of Christianity, which Maccoby declares to be so central to the New Testament and deeply embedded in the Christian psyche? Was it simply that our Christian tradition by then had already taken a non-literalist faith for granted? Were we naive? Or did we stigmatise the Jews without even realising it? Or was it that we were simply not very well informed about the nature of the religion we professed and practised? Why were Jews not pariahs to us?

Hyam Maccoby’s new book, *A Pariah People*, repeats arguments which are familiar to readers of his other works. But he turns them into an
all embracing theory. He traces the history of antisemitism beyond Christendom, considers the New Testament evidence, reflects upon the meaning of sacrifice and describes how he believes the Jews became necessary guilt bearers within the Christian scheme of salvation. Their guilt in relation to the death of Jesus was enduring and so they were able to perform taboo functions within Christian society. They were the untouchables and the Holocaust was simply a logical consequence of centuries of antisemitism rooted in the New Testament itself.

Maccoby offers an extensive, and, it seems to me, entirely justified, critique of the early sociologist Max Weber. Weber believed that the Jews turned themselves into a pariah people by adopting a religion which isolated and separated them from the rest of society, following the disaster of the Babylonian exile and the destruction of the Temple. A religion of resentment became the breeding ground for antisemitism. It seems astonishing now, though perhaps not so strange in relation to Weber’s own day, that such a meticulous scholar did not research within Jewish communities at the time and that he did not consult Jewish scholars over the texts which he used. “The result”, says Maccoby, “is a judgement of the Jews and Judaism that is quite false to the tone of Jewish community life.”

While I recognise Hyam Maccoby’s considerable acquaintance with Christians and Christian theology, that is precisely the reaction of this Christian reader to his work. His reading of Christianity is so partial. He recognises that there is a critical reading of New Testament texts current in Christian tradition which interprets them in a way that is not anti-semitic. Yet I cannot escape the conclusion that Maccoby seems to regard this as an aberration, a welcome development surely but one which makes the best of a religion which is flawed, fundamentally mistaken, and relies on the demonising of Jews to enable Christians to be saved.

Maccoby’s theories have not made the serious impact within the Christian Churches that you would expect. Perhaps this is because he fails to acknowledge the enormous diversity within Christianity. The Christianity of fifth century Constantinople hardly bears any resemblance to that of nineteenth century Irish Presbyterianism. The religion of counter Reformation Italy bears little in common with that of twentieth century Adventism in the United States. Christianity is such a cultural chameleon. Any “big” theory which relates to Christianity as a whole sounds strangely hollow to Christians themselves.

Instead of a focus upon the incarnation – which accounts for this cultural diversity, in my view – Maccoby makes much of the theology of atonement. This is understandable since it is so prominent in Christian faith and thinking. The reconciliation of man and God, their at-one-ment, is made through the lives and death of Jesus Christ. Characteristically, however, Christians have had more than one way of understanding this and different views of the atonement have been the source of many intra-Christian squabbles. Common to each of the varying theologies of the atonement, however, is the conviction that God himself is the chief agent of this reconciliation and that man cannot achieve it for himself. It is true that many Christians believe that human disobedience to the divine will has required sacrifice to satisfy God’s anger. Nevertheless it is God himself who provides the victim in Jesus Christ. The focus is not on the human agencies who deliver Jesus up to his death on the Cross but upon the divine initiative. Maccoby, however, regards the damnation of the Jews as “essential for the salvation of Christians”. Certainly, the treatment of Jews by Christians down the centuries has been damnable but not authentic to the character of Christianity itself.

“Well, he would say that, wouldn’t he?” That’s how Jewish readers may respond to me, after the manner of Mandy Rice-Davies during the Profumo scandal. A Christian bishop is hardly inclined to agree with Maccoby’s theory. What makes me convinced that it simply will not do is that it neglects the big discovery by Christians in the latter part of the twentieth century of the Jewishness of Jesus and the Jewish character of much of the New Testament. A random example may be found in the quarterly magazine Anglicans for Renewal. The winter edition of this well produced and attractive magazine aimed at Anglican Christians sympathetic to charismatic renewal – which empha-

The majority of the authors of the New Testament writings were Jews. The explicit recognition of the Jewishness of the New Testament background has done much to change Christian perceptions about Jews and contemporary Judaism. Hyam Maccoby seems to turn the New Testament back into a Gentle book and makes little of its Jewish authorship. It would be immensely destructive if, as a result of his work, Christians came to believe that their own tragic history of antisemitism had its origins among Jews in the first century of the Christian era who believed that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. That is why I read Hyam Maccoby’s work with conflicting emotions. I admire his elegantly expressed and lucid scholarship. I am distressed when I reflect upon the Christian treatment of Jews in most ages of the Church. But I also feel a tinge of fear lest Maccoby’s theory eventually rebounds upon itself and it is argued that, in origin, antisemitism finds a source not least in that early Jerusalem Church and all that sprang from it.

Graham James has been the Bishop of St Germans in the Diocese of Truro since 1993. He was previously chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, serving both Robert Runcie and George Carey. At Lambeth Palace he has a particular responsibility for relationships between the Archbishop and the Jewish community and he continues to take an active interest in the work of the Council of Christians and Jews, as well as serving on the Churches Commission for Inter-Faith Relations.
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IS ZIONISM PART OF JUDAISM?

Rabbi Dow Marmur is one of the leading Reform rabbis of our generation. Born in Poland, he lived for a while in Sweden before training for the Rabbinate at the Leo Baeck College and serving Reform congregations in Iford and Golders Green. For the last decade he has been the Senior Rabbi of the Holy Blossom Temple in Toronto and the leading theoretician of the place of Zionism in Reform Jewish theology. His book The Star of Return (1991) was a landmark publication. He contributed a major essay on Zionism and Progressive Judaism to last Autumn’s issue of MANNA (No. 53).

Rabbi John D Rayner, Emeritus Rabbi of the Liberal Jewish Synagogue in St John’s Wood, London, is one of the leading Progressive Jewish thinkers and scholars. His contribution to the Liberal Movement in Britain since the War has been second to none.

Rabbi Rayner wrote a letter to Rabbi Marmur on reading his MANNA essay and copied it to the Editor of MANNA. Rabbi Marmur replied, likewise sending the Editor a copy. It was immediately clear that an important and stimulating correspondence was emerging which would be enjoyed by a wider audience. With the permission of both authors, we are delighted to publish that correspondence.

Walmington Fold
Woodside Park
London
18th October, 1996

Dear Dow,

I have just read your MANNA essay on ‘Zionism and Progressive Judaism’ (MANNA 53, October 1996) and find myself, on the one hand, admiring your usual brilliant insights, impressionistic generalisations, neat formulations and trenchant aphorisms but, on the other, disagreeing with you quite strongly on some points of such fundamental importance that I thought I would write to you about them.

First, you wrote of Zionism as if it were a monolithic thing, whereas the word surely covers a great variety of things, from a political movement, which you don’t have to be Jewish to support, to a theory of Jewish identity, which I believe to be false.

You will no doubt be reading David Goldberg’s superb new history of Zionism, which shows how various have been the streams of thought involved but also how irrelevant most of them have become. And this is my second criticism—that you speak of Zionism as if it were not only a well defined ideology but a still flourishing one, whereas there are surely strong grounds for thinking that we live in a post-Zionist age. Note the concluding sentence of David’s book—‘Zionism is dead, long live the State of Israel’—which is exactly what I said at the 1970 Conference of the World Union for Progressive Judaism in Amsterdam.

But the chief point I want to make is that in my view it is a fundamental error to treat Progressive Judaism and Zionism as being on a par with each other. For Progressive Judaism is simply Judaism. By that I mean that it seeks, how successfully or otherwise is not now the issue, to be the best possible expression of Judaism for our time. Now Judaism is a religion and religion, by its very nature, is everything or nothing. To put it another way, Judaism is about God, whose will is supreme. Therefore whether Zionism, in whatever sense, is right or wrong, depends entirely on whether it is right or wrong in the eyes of God. Therefore Zionism cannot be put on a par with Judaism: it can only be subordinated to it and judged by it.

Now let me take up some lesser points. You argue that Zionism has become increasingly Jewish. But though it is true that religious Zionism, both Orthodox and Progressive, emerged only in the course of time, the fact remains that most Israelis are as secular and un-Jewish as they have always been. I therefore suggest that your notion of an ever more religiously-Jewish Zionism is largely wishful thinking on your part.

Again, you equate Liberal Judaism with universalism and Zionism with particularism and conclude that each is incomplete without the other. That may be a nice slogan but it is over-simplification. For there have surely always been both universalism and particularism in Progressive Judaism—it is merely that the mixture has varied from time to time—though your assertion that Zionism is rooted in Judaism is only a half-truth, since historically it is more obviously rooted in 19th century nationalism and colonialism.

But what shocked me most is your statement that ‘the Shoah...challenged, perhaps even demolished, Reform’s universalist doctrine’. For it is surely absurd to say that because we have been persecuted, therefore we must stop proclaiming our universalistic ideals. On the contrary, what the Shoah demonstrated is that we and like-minded non-Jews, had not proclaimed these ideals powerfully enough in the preceding times.

What you call ‘Reform’s universalist doctrine’ is the hope—which is the hope of all Judaism—that ultimately good will triumph over evil, together with the affirmation that it is our duty as Jews, not only to hope for that time but to work for it, wherever we are. How can that doctrine be challenged, let alone demolished, unless we reject Judaism altogether? Far from challenging or demolishing it, the Shoah underlined its urgency.

Similarly, you say that ‘Nazism...rendered the great post-Emancipation attempt to distinguish between peoplehood and religion meaningless’. I find it absurd and almost obscene, to suggest that Nazism has something to teach us about Judaism. As for the distinction between peoplehood and religion, how can that possibly be meaningless? They are two perfectly distinct concepts—though how the realities to which they refer are related to each other in the case of Judaism is another matter, which can be endlessly debated.

It also seems to me that you engage in some peculiar semantics when you say that you want to affirm the ‘centrality of Israel’ but end up by endorsing the ‘ellipse’ concept, which is precisely the basis on which the centrality of Israel has been—rightly, in my view—denied.

Finally, I am dismayed by your state-
ment that ‘Zionism saved Reform from oblivion and irrelevance’. Reform is an attempt to restate Judaism in the light of modern knowledge and circumstances. There have indeed been times when most Jews were chiefly interested in things other than the nature of Judaism, e.g., survival and state-building and it is therefore quite true that if Progressive Judaism had kept aloof from Zionism, some of its supporters who were more interested in Zionism than in Judaism would have defected. But ‘oblivion’ is going much too far, for there always been and hopefully always will be, Jews who, though not Orthodox, are primarily interested in Judaism and in getting Judaism ‘right’. How that quest – for the best kind of Judaism – can ever become ‘irrelevant’ is beyond my comprehension.

At any rate, we need first to define our Judaism – which is about God and God’s will for the Jewish people and humanity – and then to consider which aspects of the many disparate phenomena, commonly lumped together under the heading of Zionism, are compatible with it and need to be integrated into it. I am sure you will accept these critical comments in the spirit of l’shem shaym in and I shall be very interested to know – but only when we meet again or when you have nothing better to do with your time – how you would respond to them.

Affectionate regards from house to house,

John

Hillhurst Boulevard,
Toronto, Ontario November 1st, 1996

Dear John,

It seems to me that you are no less in the grip of ideology than I am, or any of us. We just have different ideologies. Yours is rooted in the belief that Progressive Judaism is Judaism and Zionism is not. Mine rests on the belief that each is inadequate without the other in meeting the existential realities of contemporary Jews and Judaism.

Imagine if we could do the following: Choose ten criteria for what you consider to be the authentic Judaism, then test a random sample of members of any of the congregations we serve, or have served and compare the results with a similar test of a random sample of so-called secular Israelis in, say, Haifa. I surmise that your members and mine will not score higher – according to your own scale – than the Israelis, even if the former come to Synagogue on High Holy Days and the latter don’t. I would, therefore, be careful in deciding that my Judaism is the real thing and that of others is not.

I would be even more careful in asserting that Zionism is dead and Progressive Judaism is alive. Your slogan, “Zionism is dead. Long Live the State of Israel!”, with which David Goldberg concludes his most readable book, is indeed striking but the implied attempt to divorce Israel from its Zionist roots is an artificial construct – unless, of course, you believe that Israel is not and should not be a Jewish state. I remain puzzled as to the criteria for this division between Zionism and Israel.

And is it really self-evident that the same cannot be said about Progressive Judaism and the institutions we serve? The Progressive Judaism that its founders know is very different from the one in which you and I are active. Is it not more appropriate to suggest that Zionism has evolved since the creation of the Jewish state? And so has Progressive Judaism. It is dead. Long Live the State of Israel. The quest for pristine forms, as articulated by the founders, strikes me as artificial. Progressive Judaism is not today what it was in 1948, nor is Zionism. But it does not mean that either is dead.

At one point both had Messianic aspirations and tended to understand Judaism from that perspective. The antinomian tendencies of both movements have always been strong. As things stand at the moment, the antinomianism in Progressive Judaism, at least as manifest on this side of the Atlantic, is more likely to kill Progressive Judaism than the behaviour of Israelis will kill Zionism.

I wonder at times if you and I live on the same Jewish planet. You may disagree with my assertion that Zionism saved Reform from oblivion. Yet, it is a fact that, without membership of that corrupt and obsolete World Zionist Organisation, the World Union for Progressive Judaism would have been much more insignificant than it is today. Even the chavurot or marginal Jews in East European and Russian cities, whom we have welcomed as new constituents of the world Progressive movement, are not only largely managed out of Israel but also paid for by Zionist money.

The mighty Reform Movement in the United States has relegated its traditional universalist message to a remote corner, for its subscribers want to be part of k’lal Yisrael, the focus of which they see in Zion, not in Washington. Rabbi Alexander Schindler brought the Reform Movement of the 1980s into prominence not by marching with black leaders but by publicly and frequently embracing Menachem Begin, an arch-Zionist who suffused his speeches with Zionist images and slogans.

All surveys in the realm of Jewish education indicate that the system we provide for our children is the least effective, that ten-year-olds know more Hebrew than thirteen-year-olds, despite the additional three years of instruction they receive in our institutions. On the other hand, a visit to the Jewish state is among the most effective educational tools. Our religious schools may tell the students to “believe” in God. I see little response from those I have taught over the years. On the other hand, many of the youngsters who return from Israel, where they invariably receive a does of Zionism, say that they now feel nearer to God. You may not like it but it may just be so.

There is little to suggest that the services conducted in Progressive Synagogues have that kind of effect on their members, even though they are aesthetically pleasing, “relevant”, use gender-sensitive language and have powerful preachers that urge their congregations to be more universalist than ever after the Sho’ah.

What gives life to our congregations is, to a very large extent, that which binds them to Israel. And what binds them to Israel is not the /czJcz/e/, not even the archaeology but the ideology you regard as obsolete.

Even when our members are dismayed by discrimination against Progressive Judaism in Israel, they would rather stick with “soiled” Zionist ideology than “pure” Progressive Judaism. In real life, they don’t want to give up either. I believe that they – we – can have both.

Quite right. This may not be a logical statement. Nor is it logical to speak of a circle and an ellipse at the same time. It is an idea I gleaned from reading Leo Baeck. He liked to speak about “something twofold”. Gershom Scholem, too, spoke about the continuous tension between seeming opposites as a characteristic of Judaism. To insist that it has to be either the one or the other may be more consistent but it is no less theological – and no more accurate, even if it is argued with a plethora of footnotes.

It is indeed shocking that we have had to learn lessons from the Sho’ah. One of these was the realisation that
we could not afford to "mend the world" unless we secured our own existence and survival. Some critics of Emil Packenheim may find his notion of the 614th commandment - to survive - shocking. Nevertheless, he may be reminding us of a harsh truth of history.

Judaism is a religion, you say. Of course. But is it only a religion? A mirror image of Christianity? Or is it also a religion? And what is the Hebrew for "religion"? I do not recall a biblical word for it.

The covenant that God makes is with a distinct people, Israel, with the promise to bring that people to a specific place of land. History has taught the people of Israel to keep the covenant even in dispersion. But the 20th century has taught me that Diaspora existence alone is barely tenable. Just look at the diminishing number of Jews all around us. And remember the Jews who perished.

No, the Jewishness/Judaism of Israelis is not secure either. Yet, it seems to me that it is we, universalist religious liberals, who are more vulnerable. To call Israelis "un-Jewish" and the tepid assimilated people we minister to as the guardians of the future of Judaism reminds me once again that we live on different planets.

The planet I inhabit is trying to come to terms with this truth and seek a Judaism that combines the sobriety, urbanity and universalist aspirations of Progressive Judaism with the vitality and courage and - yes - tribalism of

The covenant that God makes is with a distinct people, Israel.

Zionism. It seems that we have totally different perceptions of what contemporary Judaism is all about. By arguing out of so very different assumptions there is little chance of agreement, perhaps even of purposeful discussion.

With all good wishes and warmest regards,

Dow

Walmington Fold
Woodside Park
London 6th November, 1996

Dear Dow,

You write as if to an anti-Zionist. But in one sense I have been a Zionist longer than you have, since my days at the Theodor Herzl Schule (in Berlin) in the 1930s. In that sense Zionism was a movement for the re-creation of a large, strong, Hebrew-speaking Jewish community in Eretz Yisrael - which has always been desirable but, through the events of the twentieth century, became a necessity. In that sense Zionism accomplished its purpose in 1948. Hence 'Zionism is dead, long live the State of Israel' - which is not so different from what Ben Gurion said. There is indeed an ongoing obligation to defend, maintain and develop that community and if you wish to say that acceptance of that obligation is what

We must affirm the universal-ethical values of Judaism more strongly than ever.

Zionism is now, that is quite OK with me.

I have to admit that I have some problems with the concept of a Jewish state, since that involves discrimination against non-Jews and cannot bring myself to believe that such discrimination is God's purpose in the long run; but since I am quite satisfied that in the aftermath of the Holocaust it is legitimate to maintain a Jewish majority for the time being, the qualification does not have any present practical implications.

I readily agree that it would not be difficult to prove that secular Jews in Israel are more likely to know Hebrew and to have Jewish grandchildren, than Progressive Jews in the Diaspora. They may even - or may not - express Jewish values better in their daily lives. But of course to make such a judgement would be - quite properly - to judge Zionism, in your sense of the word, by Judaism.

If, for instance, our children became better Jews as a result of visiting Israel, that is fine with me and in no way conflicts with my ideology. On the contrary, as long as what is meant by 'better Jews' is defined by Judaism, it only confirms yet again that Zionism is to be judged by Judaism.

So, in spite of your counter-comments, I still do not see how Judaism and Zionism can be placed side by side, as complementary value systems. To my mind there is only one value-system, namely 'Judaism = the Jewish understanding of what God requires', by which everything, including 'Zionism = the State of Israel', is to be judged. Indeed, to my mind precisely that is what it means to be a Jew and I find it quite hard to believe that you live on a planet where that proposition is not true. At any rate, this would seem to be the key issue on which we must agree to differ.

Now just one or two more points of clarification. I don't disagree at all with Scholem's 'continuous tension between seeming opposites'. But exactly what is that the ellipse implies - not either Israel or Diaspora but both. How that concept can be combined with that of a circle in which only Israel stands at the centre, continues to defeat me.

I was dismayed by your assertion that Zionism saved Reform from oblivion because it is self-evident to me that the validity of Reform Judaism is independent of the State of Israel, even though preoccupation with the political etc. task of establishing and defending the State may temporarily sap some of Reform Judaism's vitality.

I used the words 'absurd and almost obscene' only about the assertion that Nazism and the Shoah have something to teach us about peoplehood and religion, or about universalism and particularism - or indeed about anything except the wickedness of which human beings are capable. And from that fact two consequences follow: on the one hand, that we must 'secure our own existence' (of course we agree about that); on the other, that we must affirm the universal-ethical values of Judaism more strongly than ever: not one or the other but both. Can we really not agree on that?

With fondest regards and every good wish,

John

Hillhurst Boulevard,
Toronto, Ontario December 23rd, 1996

Dear John,

As you know through my hasty fax, the delay in replying to your rejoinder of November 6 is not because I refuse to continue the debate but because of the pressure of other projects in which I have been engaged.

In fact, since my last letter, I learned an important lesson from Hannah Arendt. When, after the publication of her controversial book Eichmann in Jerusalem, Gershon Scholerm wrote her a sharp rejoinder, she encouraged him to publish it, because "the value of this controversy consists in its epistolary character, namely in the fact it is informed by personal friendship". Though even my chutzpah does not go
as far as to compare our exchange to theirs, Arendt's words made me less anxious about controversial correspondence and less alarmed about Tony Bayfield's proposal to publish it in MANNA.

But I still look forward to quiet chats with you, rather than public debate. I value your friendship greatly and miss you a lot. But in the meantime, more comments in response to yours.

Since you assert that Zionism is dead and I believe that it is alive and changing—and in need of more changing—I have assumed that you are no longer a Zionist. I am happy to stand corrected.

As I was only born in 1935, I cannot compete with your Zionist history but I did become an enthusiastic member of the left-wing Borochov Youth in Poland at the ripe age of 11 and have continued to consider myself a Zionist ever since—with one notable hiatus. When I enrolled at the Leo Baeck College in 1957, I came under the influence of Ignaz Maybaum and that included his non-Zionism. Though I remained close to him until his death, I soon returned to the Zionist fold.

I understand that your universalist understanding of Judaism is in conflict with the particularist notion of a Jewish state. But perhaps it is the old universalism of Progressive Judaism that is due for revision.

The notion of an interim Jewish state, which you imply, suggests that we should all look forward to its dismantling. Whereas I am among those who strongly advocate the establishment of a Palestinian state, I presume that you would rather revive the old idea of a binational, or multinational, one. It is, indeed, a noble, Messianic vision. But my perception of Jewish history and of political realities pulls me strongly in the direction of particularism, including nationalism.

I believe that Zionism, together with Progressive Judaism and much else, is Judaism. For me, as you know, Israel means its faith, its people and its land and that they are only separated by external, often hostile, forces. I believe that Progressive Judaism is better at affirming the faith and that’s why I want it to play a part in Israel. But I also believe that Zionism is better at affirming the people and the land and that’s why I want it to be fused with Progressive Judaism.

You are, of course, right in challenging my “Jewish geometry” that speaks of an ellipse and a circle at the same time. In retrospect I should have used a different image to say that I affirm both Israel and the Diaspora but I believe that the Diaspora, to be visible, must look to Israel—much more than the other way round.

I hope that the ellipse will remain intact but I worry about the continued weakening of the Diaspora—demographically and in other ways. The only way in which I can see the Diaspora thrive is—and that’s the paradox—if it sees Israel as the primary focus of the faith, the people and the land of Israel.

Allowing for this and other differences between us, I do, of course, agree with you on the need to continue to affirm universal ethical values, as articulated by Progressive Judaism. I resort once again to Hannah Arendt, whom I understand to suggest that narrative is more accurate than ideology in conveying truth.

Since 1983, when I came to Canada, I have become more engaged in Zionist activity than before. But, at the same time, I am also heavily involved in a whole range of projects that reflect the ethical Jewish values we all share. Having been energised by Zionism, I have become a social activist in the Diaspora.

What in theory may seem like schizophrenia, works well for me in practice. Which only proves the truth of the old saying that you don’t have to be meshugga to be a Zionist but it helps.

With much affection and all good wishes.

Yours ever,

Dow

Walmington Fold
Woodside Park
London

2nd January, 1997

Dear Dow,

Many thanks for your letter of 23rd December and all good wishes to you and your family for the new year that has just begun. I appreciate and reciprocate your friendship and share your hope that we will have opportunities in the future to discuss our theologies privately.

Once again, I will do my best to confine myself strictly to clarifications of my own views as distinct from criticisms of yours.

It seems to me that you have not understood the semantic point I have been trying to make: that the word Zionism can and does mean many things. One, for instance, is the belief that the Jews are a nation having a national culture which comprises, inter alia, Jewish music for the musically inclined and Jewish religion for the religiously inclined. That is a philosophy which I reject and in that sense you can call me an anti-Zionist. Another is the belief that the rebirth of the Jewish people in the Land of Israel is a positive development—the most important of recent Jewish history—which lays on all Jews everywhere an obligation to take an interest in it and to support it in all appropriate ways. That I have always affirmed and in that sense you can call me a Zionist. But it is so obvious and uncontroversial that it seems rather bombastic to call it an ideology.

As regards the future of the State of Israel, I simply hope, because my understanding of Jewish ethics obliges me to hope, for a time when no state will find it necessary to operate a discriminatory immigration policy, whether on a basis of religion, race or any other except a strictly economic criterion. So far as the Middle East is concerned, that could come about in one of two ways. One is binationalism. The other is a federation of Israel, Palestine, Jordan etc., with virtually unrestricted trade, travel and migration between them. As between these options, I have no strong preference. Both are utopian but one or the other could happen sooner or later. In any case, you don’t have to live on another planet to cherish utopian hopes: Jews have been doing it for millennia!

As regards ‘Judaism’, surely the well-established meaning of the word is either (a) the Jewish religion or (b), more generally, the distinctive culture of the Jewish people, suffused as it is with (a). I am quite happy with either usage. But I would insist, first, that (a) is far and away the most important aspect of (b) and indeed the only aspect that gives it ultimate value and secondly, that to speak disparagingly of ‘only’ a religion, as if that left over something of comparable importance, is a kind of idolatry.

Finally, I suppose what ultimately divides us is whether Judaism is capable of surviving, with or without the State of Israel, as a universal religion on a par with Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism etc., as it has done for two thousand years and more. I agree that there are grounds for pessimism in current demographic trends in the Diaspora but the reasons for that require a lot of analysis and have not shaken my faith. As to which view is right, only the future will tell.

Warmest greetings and love from house to house.

John
Martin Slowe
CHARTERED SURVEYORS

Star House,
Grafton Road,
London NW5 4BD
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Interpretation of the New Testament
in terms of the contemporary situation

The objective report in Luke 2.21 is here made a kind of prelude to the later passion. The child is afraid of the dark and resolute circumciser (mohel) and the Hebrew letters on the outer garment (tallit) seem like a denunciation. Altar picture from the Liebfrauenkirche in Nuremberg, made c. 1450 by the ‘Master of the Cloth Altar’.

HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG is an associate at the Institutum Delitzschanum of Judaica in Münster. For some years, he collected Christian texts which demonstrate the anti-Judaism inherent in Christianity. He then realised how much these texts were reinforced by a wealth of imagery in churches and cathedrals. He began to gather examples and, some years later, ended up with an extensive collection.

More than a thousand of these pictures have now been published in The Jews in Christian Art by SCM Press (London, 1996, pp.400, £60, hardback).

His publisher and caption translator, John Bowden, points out how the book demonstrates the “unconscious way in which Christians thought about Jews – usually in a derogatory way – which is all the more terrifying because anti-Judaism is coming out in so-to-speak background details”. Bowden adds that the material leaves one not just with feelings of disgust but with a sense of renewed challenge. “Many of the paintings and statues are still in places which tourists visit in large numbers, indeed, which still form the background to Christian worship. Since iconoclasm is hardly an option, they need to be identified for what they are, brought to wider attention and thus made harmless.”

A small selection of the photographs and captions is reproduced to introduce MANNA readers to this disturbing but important book.
Social and religious denigration, caricatures

An English Jew. The drawing is in the margin of a manuscript which contains a list of sums of money (owed to Jews by various people) claimed by the royal treasury. A note calls the Jew 'Hake' (i.e. Yitzhak or Isaac) but he is not mentioned again within the text, so his identity is unclear. He displays three group characteristics: the beard, only indicated with strokes; the typical hat customary in the region, the peak of which points sharply upwards; and the hooked nose. His apparently dark, evil-looking eye and a kind of forelock are also striking. English document from 1289 (private possession of C. Roth, Oxford).

Rome versus Judea and the Christian appropriation of this theme

The Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, author of the Bellum Judaicum, and Vespasian. As in the medieval Christian legend, Josephus appears as the leader of the Jews and Vespasian is portrayed as a Christian emperor for whom the Jew is writing his work, which was regarded as usefully pro-Christian. Miniature in a Josephus manuscript made between 1181 and 1188 in the Benedictine abbey of Weingarten (Baden-Württemberg).

Interpretation of the Old Testament in terms of the contemporary situation

Samuel's sacrifice at Mizpah; a storm puts the Philistines to flight; Samuel erects a memorial stone (not according to 1 Kings but according to the Chronicle of the World). Note the artistic convention that there are more hats than Jews!

The Christian message and the Jews

Fictitious religious dialogue aimed at conversion, between a rabbi becoming a Christian and his colleague who remains true to Judaism. Miniature in a German edition of the Epistola ad R. Isaac de adventu Messiae quem Judaei temere expectant (Letter of Rabbi Samuel to Rabbi Isaac on the Advent of the Messiah whom the Jews Vainly Await). This is a letter to a colleague allegedly composed around 1072 by a rabbi: in fact it is a work wholly composed by Alfonsus Bonhominis in 1339.

Continued on next page
The Christian view of Jewish religion, customs and life

The Passover. Woodcut in a German Bible printed by Johann Grüninger, Strasbourg 1485.

Interpretation of the Old Testament in terms of the contemporary situation

In an illustration for the Goldener Spiel by Ingold, which appeared in Augsburg (from Günther Zainer) in 1472, a scene is depicted as an example of the dance which is very reminiscent of the Jews dancing around the Golden Calf. The emphatically Jewish dress of a man standing by also points in this direction.

The Jews in Christian legend: The ten lost tribes of Israel; the Queen of the Amazons and the Jews

God imprisons the Jews in the Caspian mountains and only the Queen of the Amazons can get to them. A legend connected with the stories widespread in the Middle Ages about the hiding place of the ten tribes of Israel, lost since the Babylonian captivity (sixth century BCE). This narrative material belongs in the context of the messianic expectations of the Jews. Woodcut in the travel journal of John of Montevilla, who among other things reported fabulous beings and botanical peculiarities in distant lands (animals growing on trees, creatures which were half bird and half lion, apples as big as horses' heads and so on). Picture in the Basel printing by Bernard Richel, c.1481.
The Subversive Bible
Jonathan Magonet

Argues that the Hebrew Bible is both a familiar volume and something other and alien that needs to be addressed in its own terms if we are to understand the challenges it presents to us. Its power comes through in the translations, but its essence remains to be sought in every generation.

May paper £12.50
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THE MIX
FOR A STRONG MATCH

Richard Stone

AT A VERY PRIVATE DINNER with leaders both of the British black community and of the Jewish community, one of our black colleagues asked, “Why are you Jewish people so interested in this work?”

A senior Jewish MP replied, “Because it is right. Because it is needed. Because we want to be useful in passing on just a little of the experience which we have gained, as earlier immigrants than you.”

“Wrong”, a rabbi intervened. “We are interested because this work is in our own interests. Our community can only flourish in a decent society, which respects the rights of all minorities. So attacks on the black community are a direct threat to us. And any flexibility or strength which we can help provide for the black community is a direct asset to us Jews.”

You will not be surprised that the rabbi was Hugo Gryn.

If black people attack Jews and Jewish people are dismissive of black people, the British National Party can stay at home with their feet up, laughing at us as we do their dirty work for them. If Jews attack Muslims and Muslims attack Jews, the BNP are even more delighted. Hugo Gryn was right. No minority can flourish except in a decent society and a decent society requires that all people from the various minority groups, and also from the majority, work together to make it decent. None can do it alone.

For twenty years I was a doctor in Central London. I found myself working with the local Caribbean community in Notting Hill because they were my patients. I found myself working with homeless families from Bangladesh, because they had been placed by the Tower Hamlets local authority in the Paddington area in bed and breakfast hotels. I worked with these people because I was “Dr Stone”.

However, five years ago, I took the advice of Virginia Bottomley when she decided that “it is GPs who must prevent heart attacks”. I decided to prevent my own heart attack by getting out of her service – but I continued working with the Caribbean community and homeless families.

But who was I, working with these groups, if I was no longer “Dr Stone”? I began to suspect that part of the reason I continued was because of my Jewish roots. I found myself increasingly relying upon them and, in the end, I “came out” as a Jew. Now I am “Richard Stone, the Jew”.

In my years as “Dr Stone”, I had built up relationships of trust with people from other communities and I was able to ask one of my Caribbean friends, “What do you think of the Jews?” “Disappointed!”, came the answer. “Ah”, I thought, “I can work on this.” I became increasingly involved in the Jewish Council for Racial Equality and I now Chair this organisation which has spawned a Black-Jewish Forum.

Another quote from Rabbi Hugo Gryn: “The world needs Harmonisers, not Polarisers.” Well, one of the harmonisers I had been working with over the years was a man who came out of the local Caribbean community of Notting Hill. He now is a prominent and charismatic leader of the British...
At Leeds University, there was a move to change the use of a room which was being used by the Muslim students for prayer on Friday evening, and make it into a bar selling alcohol.

black community – and he is also an active member of our Black-Jewish Forum.

In 1995 Louis Farrakhan, in the USA, ran the Million Man March, sponsored by his Nation of Islam. The Nation of Islam in Britain felt it necessary to hold a similar, though very much smaller rally, in London’s East End. Bernie Grant MP decided that he would accept an invitation to speak on their platform, so people like my friend use Of a room which was being used by the Muslim credibility.” I was able to inform my ties if he is to maintain his street political agendas and political necessi-

ever, I recognise that he has his own anti-semites!”
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lowing day which spoke of his denunciation of antisemitism
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often trumpeted by the establishment. I do not deny that this country is still probably better than most others but history tells us that every wave of immigration has been met with hostility and fear.

In the Angel Pub at Islington, there is on the wall a reproduction of a Petition to the Queen. It "begs Her Majesty", as these things do, to do something about the foreigners who are "taking our jobs and taking our homes". The Petition is to Queen Elizabeth I, not Queen Elizabeth II.

This sad reality is matched by the happy reality that all those waves of immigration since Roman times that were opposed at the time, were followed by integration of the immigrants and, ultimately, cultural, political and financial contributions to the life of this country which has made Britain the exciting multi-cultural, multi-racial, multi-religious country that it now is.

Two superb books tell that story. The Peopling Of London can be bought from the Museum of London, which produced it. It is a thick book with lots of pictures and excellent short accounts of all the waves of immigration, right back to Roman times. The pictures alone are encouraging, of Flemish weavers who enriched the clothing of Britain in the time of Edward III in the 15th century. The Huguenot weavers settled in Spitalfields in the 19th and 20th centuries, to be followed by the current inhabitants of Petticoat Lane, the lively families from Bangladesh. There are chapters on the Irish, Germans, Jews, Cypriots, Chinese, Australians and New Zealanders, Arabs and others.

The Commission for Racial Equality recently produced an excellent nationwide version of 'The Peopling of London', calling Roots for the Future, a slimmer volume but also littered with excellent pictures and notes on the various migrant communities, particularly in the dock areas around the country.

I often think that the most dangerous word in the English language is "The". The minute I hear, "The Jews", "The Blacks", "The refugees", "The Muslims", and so on, I am on the look out for stereotypes and in particular the likelihood that the speaker is going to say something bad about the group named. "The Peopling of London' and 'Roots for the Future' tell us there is no such thing as "pure Brit". Each wave of migration into the country is just another wave which is going to follow the same pattern of integration and contribution to the joy of Britain, that is one of our greatest strengths.
ON SATURDAY 27 FEBRUARY 1942, the German authorities planned to round up the last Jews in Berlin, to seize them at the factories where they were forced to work. When many Jews from mixed families and their children failed to return from work at the expected time, word spread that they were held at the Administration Building of the Jewish Community on the Rosenstrasse. Their wives hurried to the building, to make enquiries, to bring warm clothing or food but also to plead for their release.

The demonstration that followed was not organised. Over six days a shifting group of non-Jewish women, with their half-Jewish children, shouted for the return of their husbands and fathers. Machine guns were brought out and trained on the crowd but women continued to press forward from the Underground station. They were joined by non-Jewish relations, brothers and cousins, some of them soldiers on leave and in Wehrmacht uniform. German soldiers could not fire on such a crowd in the centre of Berlin. Instead the guns were dismantled and the demands of the women were met. About 1,700 people were released to their families and 25 who had already been dispatched to Auschwitz were miraculously returned to Germany.

Thanks to German feminists and the memoirs of survivors, accounts of the Rosenstrasse demonstration have been published in German. There has, hitherto, been no account in English. Professor Nathan Stoltzfus pursued the subject. He interviewed many participants and overcame official obstruction and overcame academic indifference to obtain the relevant documentary material. In the context, he uses the word German in the Nazi sense, to indicate non-Jews. This review will do the same. His manuscript, ‘Resistance of the Heart: The Rosenstrasse Protest and the Case of German-Jewish Intermarriage’ rightly won the Fraenkel prize in 1994 and it is good to have it available now as a handsome book, expanded and with photographs.

Charlotte stands in front of her tailoring shop. She is blonde, smiling, demure, an average German woman wearing her work overall. She would be unremarkable but the for the fact that this is 1933 and she has just married Julius Israel, a Jew, in defiance of the Nazi regime. By the time of the First World War, almost 30% of German Jewish men and 21% of women married non-Jews. In 1933, 44% of German Jews who married non-Jews. Stoltzfus reminds us that Jews made up less than 1% of the population and though it might be common among Jews, then as now, marriage to a Jew was not the norm among the population at large. Eleven percent of children of mixed marriage were registered with Jewish communities.

The legislation of 1933 for the protection of German Blood and Honour barred those of Jewish descent and their non-Jewish spouses from state, and subsequently from professional, employment. Many mixed couples went into exile and thus fall outside the scope of Stoltzfus’s book. In December 1942, 16,760 non-Jewish Germans were still living with Jewish husbands or wives. Like Charlotte Israel, they did their best to mitigate the deprivations of their Jewish families and were devastated when close friends and relations were arrested and transport to Auschwitz was miraculous returned to Germany.
It was not unknown for mixed families to lose relatives killed both in the Wehrmacht and in the extermination camps.

the east. Charlotte Israel was one of the women who protested at the Rosenstrasse. Another protester, Mrs. Weigert, was screaming for her eight year old daughter Helga held inside. On the second day of the round-ups, Jews and their children in mixed families were arrested at home, or when they went to collect ration cards. Forty three abandoned children called the Jewish community in search of their parents.

Any account based on oral history provides for certain human interest and anecdote. Yet Stoltzfus’ book is not an easy read. His thesis has always been that the Rosenstrasse demonstration constituted non-violent resistance against the Nazi regime and has been unjustly neglected and dismissed by his colleagues. He supports his case with an account of Nazi policy towards mixed marriages, both before and during the war.

His evidence is that in 1942 the Nazis did indeed determine to send all Jews in mixed marriages and their half Jewish children to the extermination camps, whether or not they were registered with the Jewish community. Prior to the February round up, Jews in mixed households were ordered to register with the Central Jewish Organisation before the deadline of 1 December 1942. In February 1943 the Relief Help Office of the Catholic Bishop of Berlin complied with a request to provide additional figures for every parish. Seven thousand and thirty one Berlin Jews were sent to Auschwitz in the final round up but this was far short of the planned number. Stoltzfus convincingly argues that the non-violent resistance of the women in the Rosenstrasse saved the lives of Jews and ‘Mischlinge’ children of mixed marriages who would otherwise have been killed. He suggests that since Berlin set a precedent for what happened elsewhere, this prevented the deportation of Jews in mixed families from other cities, including Paris.

His picture seems a little too rosy. In September 1944 there were 13,217 registered Jews in Germany, of whom 12,987 were in mixed marriages. But even the Nazis never had complete figures and it remains difficult to ascertain the number and fate of all mixed families in the Holocaust. After the Rosenstrasse demonstration, care was taken not to provoke further opposition by carrying out another mass arrest such as that in Berlin. Implementation was left to local officials. In Wiesbaden, for instance, Jews in mixed families and their children were put onto the final Transport. In Frankfurt-am-Main, expressly because mixed families had friends and relations who were Germans, Mischlinge were arrested individually. Contrary to what is generally believed, some Jewish wives in Christian mixed families were sent to Theresienstadt. Jewish women in mixed families in Italy were deported for extermination, regardless of the children left at home and in some cases half-Jewish children were taken, too. It was not unknown for mixed families to lose relatives killed both in the Wehrmacht and in the extermination camps.

Stoltzfus presents another more fundamental argument: that the determined persistence of mixed Jewish/non-Jewish partnerships and their personal refusal to divorce, only seven percent complied and some of those only in order to continue earning, made it impossible for Hitler to achieve his aim of separating German from Jew and so undermined the basic racial policies of the Nazi State. Germans in mixed Jewish families knew that Jews were normal people just like themselves and that the Nazi image of “The Jew” was pure fabrication.

Progressive Jews have little reason to involve themselves in academic disputes about German antisemitism and definitions of resistance. But we do have in our communities many families with either a parent or extended family who are not Jewish. This book provides at last the information that mixed Jewish couples so badly need about the fate of some families like their own in Nazi Germany. Life in mixed Jewish families is still not the norm. It is rarely reflected in the wider culture or in the public eye. It was a new experience for me to see Resistance of the Heart piled high by the cash desk in Dillons for anyone to pick up. This book for a change portrays mixed Jewish families in a most positive light and, though it recalls life in extreme circumstances, to some degree it reflects the experiences of those of us in such families today.

Progressive rabbis and synagogue councils may take courage from this book. The family solidarity that survived extreme Nazi measures designed to remove those links between Jews and non-Jew will reassure the Progressive community of the rightness of their own determination to include, rather than exclude, Jews with non-Jewish partners. The treatment of mixed families by Jewish communities leaves much to be desired. Non-Jewish wives who accompanied their Jewish husbands into exile or who took appalling risks, found themselves and their half-Jewish children rejected by Jews in Germany after the war. Members of mixed families who lost their lives are still excluded even from Progressive memorial rituals.

Non-Jewish wives who accompanied their Jewish husbands into exile or who took appalling risks, found themselves and their half-Jewish children rejected by Jews in Germany after the war.

Stoltzfus’s often artless case histories carry a warning, too, for our communal authorities. The long Nazi campaign against Rassenschande (racial shame) and intermarriage failed because, within families, people valued each other as individuals and the ties between them proved stronger than the tides or demands of community or state, even when backed by the threat of imprisonment and death. It seems difficult to suppose that rabbinic denouncement of mixed marriage will prove capable of preventing intermarriage, where the Nazi authorities failed.

EVELYN WILCOCK is the author of Pacifism and the Jews (1994). She has written both on nonviolence in the Holocaust and on Jewish mixed families. She conducted the first British Pilot Study of people with one Jewish parent and has initiated a project to document the experiences of ‘Mischlinge’ under Nazism. Her recent academic articles deal with questions of identity in the life and work of Theodor Adorno. She is a member of the Liberal Jewish Synagogue in St John’s Wood.
WHEN MY FATHER, MAX Posner died in 1990, the possession he valued most became mine. It was a book which had been in his family for as long as he could remember - its name in Hebrew, To'ar Pnei Shlomo, which translates as "The Outline of Solomon's Face", meaning Solomon's autobiography. My father knew that it was written by his great grandfather, Rabbi Solomon ben Joseph Posner, who lived and had a business interests in Posen, now Poznan in Western Poland, as well as holding a rabbinate in Lubraniec. He knew too, that the book had been published in 1870 in Krotoschin - home of a famous Jewish publishing family, Monasch, one of whose offspring became governor General of Australia - that Shlomo's eldest son, Moses, had added a commentary. Shlomo was sufficiently distinguished to warrant an entry in the Encyclopaedia Judaica, an extract of which follows:

POSNER Solomon ben Joseph c.1778-1863. Rabbi and author. Posner studied under his father, the Rabbis of Posen and under Akiva Eger and Solomon Zalman of Warsaw and his own uncle, Zeb Wolf Kalfri. He occupied himself mainly with commerce in the city of Lubraniec and amassed great wealth but nevertheless found time for extensive study. He wrote many works, some of which have remained in manuscript. His To'ar Pnei Shlomo (1870) is a valuable and unique book describing his own life and the lives of his forebears as far back as the seventeenth century and contains many details of the civilisation of the period.

The book actually traced the family back to the sixteenth century. But the problem had always been that it was printed in Rashi Hebrew typescript, which was difficult for anyone unacustomed to it. In addition, my father's elder brother had lent it, for the purpose of translation, to an eminent member of the Jewish literary scene, who shortly afterwards disappeared from public life, along with To'ar Pnei Shlomo. Neither was heard of again for some years. Shortly before his death, my father tracked down the gentleman's widow. Incredibly, the lady handed the book back to him - untouched and untranslated.

Attempts at making up for lost time proved abortive. The experts we approached were not conversant with Rashi script, or were taking a Sabbatical, or had emigrated. Soon my father died, other more urgent family problems arose and To'ar P'nei Shlomo was put aside. Then came June 1995. My husband John and I frequent a remote Suffolk village, Westleton, which, in a disused church, houses an incredibly well stocked second-hand book shop. On this occasion, negotiating the piles of books scattered over the floor we came upon a volume entitled "Jewish Luminaries in Medical History". Being both Jewish and medical, we bought it. What we had bought we soon recognised to be the catalogue of a Jewish medical library, collected by three generations of ophthalmic surgeons, the Friedenwalds of Baltimore, USA. As I flicked through the alphabetical list of names, the name "Landsberg" surfaced. My father had told me we had relations of that name - and along with Landsberg came a cross reference, to a name and a person I had never heard of before - Dr Solomon Kaliphari.

KALIPHARI Solomon, 16th century. The family of Kaliphari (Kalifari, Calvarti, Calahorra) came from Calahorra in Spain. In 1570 he became Court Physician of King Sigismund August, in 1578 of King Stephen Bathory.

Friedenwald then refers to the following books:

Mein Lebensbild by Dr Moritz Landsbert and To'ar Pnei Shlomo by Shlomo ben Joseph Posner.

Calahorra is in northern Spain and in the middle ages had a solid Jewish community. This place-name, with regional variations, remains the surname of collateral branches of the family. In Hebrew it was and still is written, KALIFARI. Later research revealed that in the mid-nineteenth century, Solomon ben Joseph and direct descendant of Solomon Kaliphari, was the first to use the place-name Posner, derived from Posen, where his business was established. Mein Lebensbild is a translation of To'ar Pnei Shlomo into German, with annotations by Mortiz Landsberg, rabbi in Liegnitz - also in the province of Poznan - who was a grandson of Solomon ben Joseph by his second son Elijah.

I returned to the Encyclopaedia Judaica. Under the heading CALAHORRA, I found a history and virtually complete family tree, from Dr Solomon down to Shlomo ben Joseph and his offspring, drawing largely on Shlomo's own writings. Like many Jewish physicians of his time, Dr Solomon almost certainly received his doctorate in Padua and also attended lectures by Brasavola, the distinguished professor of medicine at
Ferrara. Liberal Padua admitted not only Jews but dissident Christians such as Lutherans and was a centre of the new, scientific medicine, moving away from the uncritical teaching of Hippocratic and Galenical theories. Solomon's royal appointment probably related to King Sigismund August's mother, Bona Sforza, of the powerful Sforza family of Milan, who would have wanted an Italian speaking doctor. In Cracow can be found the contemporaneous royal edict, in Latin, appointing Solomon personal physician to Sigismund August in 1570 (Balaban 1920), which begins as follows:

"Sigismund August, by the grace of God Grand Duke of Lithuania, Lord and noble of Russia, Prussia, Mazovia and Samogitia. We make this pronouncement which is of importance to all. After investigation, the counsellors of our realm can recommend to us the good work, diligence, learning and experience in the practice of medicine, of Solomon Calahorra, doctor of medicine and citizen of Cracow."

It details Solomon's conferred liberties and privileges, extended to his wife, family and servants and, "we exempt him from all labour and taxes of our realm and the contributions due from the Jews, both obligatory and voluntary". A similar document confirms the appointment to King Stephen Bathory in 1578. Dr Solomon also ran a thriving salt mine in Feltsztyn, Russia. He had five sons and one daughter, Sheva, who married Chaim Luria, son of Solomon Luria, Rector of the Lublin Yeshiva. Solomon Calahorra is referred to as the “Spanish doctor” but the Portuguese literature refers to a Jew, Jacob Calahorra, in 1482 and again in 1487. He was an armouerer in the service of King John II of Portugal, the one who turned down the New World plans of Christopher Columbus. I understand that an "H" in Spanish becomes "F" or "V" in Portuguese and move from Spain to Portugal could explain the change of spelling from Calahorra to Calaforra or Kalifari. Another physician called Samuel Calafe is noted in 1496. This name is tempting suggestive, bearing in mind the spelling variations found in the medievel period.

As for Landsberg, this name was adopted by Elijah (1710-1803), in Landsberg, son of the martyr Arieh Leib Kaliphari, who died of torture after a blood libel in 1736. Elijah was the father of Joseph Landsberg and grandfather of Shlomo ben Joseph. Elijah Landsberg's elder brother, Jacob, retained the name Kaliphari and his great grandson, also a Jacob, was, along with Akiva Eger, one of Posen's most famous rabbis, the teacher as well as uncle of Shlomo ben Joseph, referred to in the original Encyclopaedia Judaica entry. Joseph Landsberg and Jacob Kaliphari were Dayanim to Rabbi Akiva Eger and have been identified as the figures standing with him in a painting of Posen notables by Julius Knorr, exhibited in 1838 and now in the National Gallery in Posen.

At the end of the sixteenth century, one of Solomon Calahorra's younger sons, Israel Samuel, moved to Posen. Through him passes my genetic inheritance. This is the family tree of my branch of the Calahorra's, condensed for the sake of clarity.

### Solomon Calahorra
- 1530-1596
- [Jacob](#)
- [Metzling](#)
- [Joseph Landsberg](#)
- [Solomon Posner](#)
- Max Posner (1905-1990)
- Theresa Posner (now TURK)

### Joseph Landsberg
- 1710-1803
- Rabbi in Landsberg
- Rabbi in Lubraniec
- Rabbi in Posen
- Rabbi in Ozorkow
- Rabbi in Posen d. 1928

### Max Posner (1905-1990)

### Theresa Posner (now TURK)

The final, decisive proof of the Kaliphari connection came when John reminded me there was something else my father had passed on to me – the photograph of his father, Solomon Posner's tombstone of 1928 (Fig.1). This stood in the now obliterated Jewish cemetery of the Silesian town of Konin, where my father was born. Its inscription confirmed my grandfather's lineage, through his father Jacob back to Arie Leib, the tragic Darshan, or preacher of Posen. This is the epitaph:

**SHLOMO ZALMAN son of Rabbi Yacov POSNER of Ozorkow great-grandson and descendant of the Holy Martyr Rabbi Arieh Leibush, Darayan and Preacher of Posen from the family of KALIFARI who was killed for the sanctification of the Divine Name died 28th Nisan 5668**

My father could never have consciously registered the name Kaliphari nor its significance, or he would have spoken to me of it. Unlike some Jews with memories they would prefer to forget, he never attempted to cover his origins and was proud of him family traditions. He left Konin when he was sixteen, at which age paternal reminiscences tend to receive minimal attention and settling, working and marrying in England could have pushed such memories even further back. I had the advantage by now, of...
the translations into English of both *To'ar Pei Shlomo* and *Mein Lebensbild*, as well as literature not available during their lifetime to Shlomo Ben Joseph and Mortiz Landsberg.

Dr Solomon Calahorra’s eldest son, Dr Moses Calahorra, remained in Cracow. He sired a line not of rabbis but of doctors and apothecaries, all of whom documented in local Polish, as well as Jewish, communal archives of the period. This collateral branch sadly also had a martyr, in the person of Moses’ grandson, Dr Mattathias Kaliphari, who was burned at the stake in Cracow in 1663, after Dominican accusation of blaspheming the Virgin. His grandson, Aaron Kalahora, in 1723 became the first Jew to qualify as a doctor at the University in Cracow and he had a son, Dr Mendel Kolhari. The last reference I can find to the Cracow branch is the death of Mendel’s son, Isaac Aaron, in 1834.

The mixture of fortunate chance plus fruitful and sometimes unfruitful hours in libraries and museums produced other items of interest. Among these was the Posen painting with Rabbi Akiva Eger and soon afterwards copies of portraits of Solomon Ben Joseph and his wife, Hinda. (Fig.2, fig.3). My forebears had now begun to step off the printed page and assume their individual personas. The move to personalisation was reinforced when, in an Oxford bookshop, an acquaintance stumbled upon Volume I of Maimonides: *Mishneh Torah*, the first of the set of four begun by the publisher Joseph Athias and completed after his death by his son Emanuel, in Amsterdam in 1707. On the title page in handwritten cursive Hebrew script, its owner’s name, Jacob, son of Shlomo ben Joseph Posner and the date and price he paid on purchasing it from his grandfather’s estate. If this were his paternal grandfather, the volume would have belonged to Joseph Landsberg. This was something else we had to buy. Finally, I heard from a contact in Poland, that in the cemetery of the Rema Synagogue in Cracow, was a tombstone inscribed with the name Kalahora and there we made our way in June 1996.

Few Jews are now left in Poland. Non-Jews, mostly museum curators and academics with an interest in past social and religious phenomena, are the official custodians of the remnants of a fantastic Jewish history. We found the Old Synagogue, dating from the fourteenth century, with its beautifully restored interior and museum in Kazimierz, a suburb of Cracow. Its curator is not only responsible for this complex but oversees the research and repair of the cemetery of the nearby sixteenth century Rema Synagogue, founded by his father for Moses Isserles, the great authority on Halakhah and its interpretation. The Jews were expelled from Cracow in 1495 and resettled in Kazimierz, then a separate town, in which Dr Moses Kaliphari and his descendents lived and had their pharmacies. Many of the ancient tombstones were destroyed during World War II, others vandalised and their inscription obliterated. A programme of replacement, repair and restoration is in progress, although much is lost beyond recall. An inventory and plan of the remaining identifiable gravestones confirmed number 618 as being that of Michal Kalahora, son of Mattathias Kalahora the martyr. Number 618, small and undorned with lions or priestly hands, was one of the first to be replaced after the war. It stands on its original site and is inscribed with the original wording—painful in its uncompromising statement of bare fact, “Herein is Michal Kalahora, son of Rav Mattathias of blessed memory, who was burned for the sanctification of the Holy Name, in Shevat in the year 1663”. We left pebbles to show—I don’t know who—that someone came and stood in the weeds, behind us the crows cawing and the masons at work reshaping our shattered past.

During our time in Cracow, we also discovered that the portraits of Shlomo ben Joseph and his wife Hinda were painted in 1845 and hung in the National Museum in Warsaw. We had no time to visit Warsaw but I corresponded with the Museum from whom I obtained colour transparencies, now become handsome photographs. I was not able to obtain information as to how the paintings were procured by the Museum. Both colour slides bore captions stating that these were the grandparents of Stanislaw Posner, who according to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* was a leading member of the Polish Socialist movement at the turn of the century. This I am following up, with other hints and clues, for the next chapter of my history.

**DR THERESA TURK** has been in general practice for over twenty-five years. Married with two sons and one granddaughter, she lives on Manna Wood Farm in Suffolk and is a regular contributor to MANNA. She would like to acknowledge the help and encouragement she has had with this investigation from Edgar Samuel, lately curator of the Jewish Museum, London and Yissachar Marmostrein, who also made the Hebrew translations.

**Fig. 3: Portrait of Rebbitten Hinda Posner – 1845**
Whenever I go to an Indian restaurant, which is not very often and see ‘nan’ on the menu, I always wonder whether there might be some connection between the name of that oriental bread and the miracle bread of the wilderness, which in Hebrew is not called manna – that form of the word comes from the Septuagint (Num.11:6) – the first translation of the Bible into Greek – but simply man. Since the etymology of the Hebrew word is completely unknown, the theory of an Indian origin is, I suppose, a remote possibility.

Unfortunately, it is not very likely. For the manna of the wilderness was not really bread at all. Although it is referred to in one of the Psalms as lechem shamyiym, ‘bread of heaven’ (105:40), the word lechem there probably means food in general rather than bread in particular and in any case the biblical account describes it as ‘a fine and flaky substance, as fine as frost on the ground’ (Exod.16:13f), which sounds more like Kellog’s Frosty Cornflakes than oven-baked bread.

As a matter of fact, the biblical account is confusing. The Exodus account says that the manna looked like coriander seeds, which is black but was white and that it tasted ‘like wafers made with honey’ (16:31). In the book of Numbers, where the episode is repeated, we are told that the manna had the colour of something called b’dolah’ (11:7), a name which passed via Greek into Latin as ‘bdellium’ and which has been variously interpreted to be a carbuncle, a rock crystal, a pearl or a gum resin. Furthermore, while from the Exodus account one gets the impression that the manna was eaten raw, the book of Numbers...
According to a famous Midrash, the taste of the manna varied from person to person: to children it tasted like milk, to adolescents like bread and to old people like honey.

It is perfectly possible therefore, even likely, that there were occasions during the Israelites' journey through the wilderness when they were short of food and a flock of quails, exhausted from their long flight, settled conveniently in their path and again when an unusually large deposit of tamarisk droppings came opportunistically to their rescue. Out of such incidents, seen as evidence of divine providence, the whole legend would then have grown, namely that by such means God had miraculously sustained the Children of Israel for forty years.

As a matter of fact, some such legend had to be created. According to the Bible, the Israelites of the Exodus numbered 600,000 men. If you add the women and children, that would have amounted to about two million. Of course, that is a huge exaggeration but once you have accepted it, you find yourself having to explain how such a vast number could sustain themselves in wilderness conditions for forty years. There is no way they could have managed that without supernatural support on a colossal scale.

But if that is a reasonable explanation of how the manna legend came about, we are still left with the most important question of all: What, if any, religious lessons, valid for us, can we extract from the biblical telling of it? Let me briefly indicate three.

First, the legend expresses a profound conviction that the journey of the Israelites from Egypt to the Promised Land was no ordinary journey, no common-or-garden migration of refugees such as we have become all too familiar with in our century. No, it was God's will that the Israelites should escape from Egyptian slavery, that they should receive religious instruction at Sinai and that they should establish a monotheistic society in the land of the patriarchal ancestors. Their journey was therefore a providential journey, fraught with immense significance for the whole subsequent history of the Jewish people and indeed of humanity. Can we go along with that perception? I think we can.

Secondly, there is in the story more than a hint of criticism of the prevailing attitude of the Israelites: their fickleness, their lack of faith in the leadership of Moses and Aaron and in God's guidance, their lack of stomach for freedom and their crude materialism. Food and drink are all they seem to care about. Barely a month has passed since they sang their song of triumph at the Red Sea and already they are grumbling: 'If only we had died... in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the fleshpots and ate our fill of bread... ' (Exod. 16:3). Which is why the author of Deuteronomy sees in the manna episode an object lesson teaching us that 'human beings do not live by bread alone' (8:3). Do we go along with this view, that the satisfaction of our physical needs, though necessary, is not everything, that there are higher things in life which also demand our attention? I hope so.

Finally, the manna story provides, if you will excuse the expression, food for thought on the subject of distribution. For it emphasises that there was just enough manna – neither too much nor too little – for everybody. There seems to be an implication that in an ideal world the necessities of life would be distributed on a 'share and share alike' basis. Why then do we have extremes of wealth and poverty in our society, with a tendency for the gap between them to grow ever wider? Because that is how capitalism works and because the redistribution of wealth requires taxation, which the majority of the electorate do not like and which, therefore, neither of the two major parties in this country proposes to increase. Is that as it should be and if not, what is to be done about it? About that, there are no doubt many different opinions among us; but that it is a question we need to consider as we move ever closer to a General Election, will surely be conceded by all.

As for my own thoughts on that controversial topic, see the last issue of this journal (No. 54) which is, of course, as if you didn't know, called Manna!
The Day

Bevin Sealed Haifa

Alan Tyler

In MANNA 54, Alan Tyler began his memoirs of his time as a young lieutenant in the Royal Navy on the Palestine Patrol. He concluded the first part with ‘Exodus 1947’. Now, he carries on with the last weeks of the Mandate.

The Destroyer Chevron, in which I was serving as a young Royal Navy Lieutenant arrived at Haifa in late December 1947. Although partition had already been decided, Britain remained in charge until the Mandate expired and her immigration controls were maintained until the end.

These included naval patrols to seal off the coast. Almost at once we intercepted the illegal immigrant ship Maria Giovanni. She looked beautiful as she approached the coast in winter sunshine with all her sails set, flying the Star of David and her passengers lining the deck. She had been renamed ‘Haganah Ship 29 November 1947’, the date of the U.N. resolution on partition. Following our usual loud hailer broadcast about not resisting, she lowered her sails before sunset and continued under auxiliary engine. No resistance was offered as we boarded and her 700 passengers were, as usual, deported to internment camps in Cyprus.

New Years Day saw one major problem solved, as almost 15,000 immigrants in the Pan York and Pan Crescent, who had sailed from Rumania and been shadowed since entering the Aegean, were escorted direct to Famagusta. The Jewish authorities decided not to risk their lives by resisting boarding and agreed to the diversion. This may well have been planned to divert our attention while key personnel or supplies were slipped in, as we were sent that afternoon to investigate a ship aground off Naharia. She proved to be a schooner called ‘United Nations’, which had crept down the Lebanese coast and beached herself when all eyes were on the two Pan ships. She was one of the few successful blockade runners.

The rest of the month passed quietly on patrol, as immigrant ships were wisely avoiding the winter storms.

We returned to Haifa in April for our last tour of duty. As we approached the city on the 22nd, we were surprised to see boats full of Arabs leaving the harbour. The end of the Mandate was barely three weeks away and Haifa was to be the site of the final British withdrawal. The Commander, British Forces, decided not to intervene in the fight to take over the city which was allocated to the Jews by the partition plan. British troops were withdrawn into the port area two days earlier and when we arrived Haganah had just captured the whole Arab lower town.

Many Arabs fled north by road or by sea, after taking refuge in the port.

Meanwhile, we kept up patrols, as the country behind us disintegrated into civil war. Two days later intercepted the modern Italian motorship Vivara. She had been renamed ‘Haganah Ship Mishmar Haemek’ after a settlement that had been tough to heavy Arab attacks. Following my usual loud hailer broadcast asking them to cooperate, we escorted her 800 immigrants into port. On principle, as usual, she stopped her engines when boarded at the three mile limit, and had to be towed into Haifa, where even at this late stage her passengers were deported to Cyprus. Another two days later we helped intercept what proved to be the last ‘illegal’ – the French trawler Tadorne and her spirited young group of passengers. They renamed her ‘Haganah Ship Operation Kastel’, to mark the capture of that key village on the road to Jerusalem, and painted the new name round her bridge as we watched. After a show of defiance they gave way in the face of a barrage of firecrackers – the usual non-lethal assault – and were boarded without resistance.

We then shifted to the inner patrol to watch out for arms runners and saw the skirmishing ashore marked by curving tracer in the night sky near Tel Aviv. Early in May we lay off Acre to support a British negotiated truce, then went back to the outer patrol. This was not futile since ships could bide their time to approach the coast freely a week later when our authority expired.

French, Italian and other foreign ships had been evacuating their nationals as the likelihood of war increased. A large force of British warships arrived to be present for the end of the Mandate and to protect the withdrawing troops.

On Friday 14th May, the last day of British rule, I went ashore to supervise...
The Star of David flag of the new state was flying all over the town and on the captured 'illegal' ships laid up in the harbour. The best of these were being prepared to join the new Israeli navy.

The collection of stores from the Army base near Athlit, then got out in Kingsway – the main street of the lower town, now Rehov Ha'atzmaut – to sightsee. Suddenly, a convoy approached led by armoured cars and I recognised and saluted General Sir Alan Cunningham, the departing High Commissioner, in army uniform in the central car which was flying his standard. Despite all that must have filled his thoughts, he still returned the salutes of servicemen in the street. I then called in at the Post Office, which was full of soldiers and civilians buying as souvenirs the Jewish National Fund stamps overprinted 'Postage' in Hebrew, that had replaced the withdrawn Palestine stamps. Everything was ending in improvisation as Britain withdrew without any attempt at continuity. The High Commissioner boarded the cruiser Euryalus and at about 11.30 that evening, the British fleet sailed from Haifa. As midnight approached, we six destroyers directed our searchlights to form a cone over the aircraft carrier Ocean and Euryalus drew up from astern with the High Commissioner's flag illuminated at her masthead and General Cunningham standing on the front of her bridge. The Royal Marine Guard on Ocean's flightdeck presented arms and her band played the National Anthem, followed by Auld Lang Syne, as the cruiser passed her. Three cheers were followed by a fourth, as Euryalus drew ahead on her voyage to Malta. The Mandate might have ended in chaos but at least the Royal Navy marked its expiry with dignity.

We all then dispersed along the coast, to cover the withdrawal of the British forces from Sarafand near Jaffa, to the British bases in the Suez Canal area. The first column moved off at dawn and we shadowed it down to the border at Rafah. We went to Action Stations when they came under small arms fire in Gaza, from Arabs who may have thought them the Haganah but they suffered no casualties and we did not have to intervene. We then turned back to cover the final column, which completed an incident-free journey by evening. Our first column had passed the Egyptian Army vanguard as they crossed the border and we saw the smoke rise from their shelling of the isolated Jewish settlements in the Gaza area, as they moved north towards Tel Aviv.

On May 14th 1948, the Jewish National Council proclaimed that the State of Israel would come into being at midnight when the Mandate ended. Next morning the armies of five Arab states crossed the borders in a co-ordinated attempt to crush the new state at birth. We witnessed the Egyptian thrust. Like the others, it was eventually halted short of the main Jewish areas.

We withdrew to seaward overnight and returned to the coast in the morning, to support if need be the small British rearguard waiting near Rafah for stragglers. In the afternoon, an Egyptian Spitfire circled us doubtfully, so we decided to identify ourselves by spreading out a large Union Jack on our forecastle. That night we were recalled to Haifa, as it was rightly thought unwise to keep warships in the war zone without good reason.

The Star of David flag of the new state was flying all over the town and on the captured 'illegal' ships laid up in the harbour. The best of these were being prepared to join the new Israeli navy. Several American ships were flying the flag at their mastheads – the normal mark of respect to the country visited – since the United States had already recognised the new state and ships were bringing in supplies to help the beleaguered Israelis.

The British fleet soon dispersed and we were left with one other to take turns as Duty Destroyer. This began to mean something on May 22nd, when Egyptian Spitfires attacked the airfield at Ramat David in the British enclave, destroying several planes on the ground and killing four airmen. The R.A.F. was waiting when the second attack came in and shot down five of the six Egyptians. It was probably a genuine misidentification as an Israeli airfield but after that we kept our close range weapons manned.

Volunteers and arms were flowing into Haifa to help the Israelis, so British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin's next move was to close the port to all but military traffic. It was argued that this was an evenhanded policy but seemed blatantly biased when the British officered Transjordan army was fighting in Jerusalem and on the West Bank. Bevin thus sealed the only good Israeli port at a vital time for the new state and did not give up Haifa until the 30th June when the last British forces left the country.

ALAN TYLER was born in London in 1924 into a West London Synagogue family. He was confirmed and married there before joining Wimbledon Synagogue, of which he was later Chairman, after retiring from the Royal Navy in 1966. He recently retired from exporting textiles through the family company.
HONEYMOON AND AFTER

Sir,

I support your call for more rabbis (Editorial, MANNA 54). But I doubt if we will find them if we cannot address concerns about the conditions under which rabbis work. I am not referring to adequate pay and time off, where I believe real advances have been made over the years. The real concern is a syndrome which means that rabbis have a “honeymoon” period in a new congregation of a year or even longer, followed by a period of furious criticism. Some survive the storm. Many come to grief as the relationship breaks down completely. I have seen this happen to so many colleagues, in so many different types of congregation, that I cannot believe it is simply due to personality clashes. There is something in the very structure of the rabbi-employer relationship which urgently needs addressing.

Rabbi Dr Michael Hilton
Menorah Synagogue, Cheshire

FAMILY

Sir,

Congratulations to Melanie Phillips on her article in the Winter MANNA (No.54) supportive of traditional values. She bemoans, correctly in my opinion, the contemporary worship of individualism and moral relativism, the erosion of the concepts of duty and responsibility leading to general, though not in every case, to family disintegration which should make Jewish ears prick up.

After thirty-five years in the Reform Rabbinate, I can give some evidence of trends supportive of her thesis. An increasing number of potential brides and bridegrooms gave the same address in their registration papers. Premarital sex amongst young people seems to be freely accepted. Divorce has increased enormously and I became an expert in arranging who sits where at Bar Mitzvahs where there were broken families. I found it more and more difficult to get volunteers especially for social projects, a thesis borne out by the article in the same issue of MANNA by the Chairman of RSGB. Far more concern is shown by parents about their children’s secular education than their religious one, not to mention their own role in the transmission of values.

This state of affairs should be worrying in particular for Reform Jews whose theological position is, for some of its leaders, based on ‘responsible autonomy’. That is, you search the Jewish and modern secular sources, particularly in ritual matters and make an individual choice using ‘discretion and common sense’, to use a phrase of J. Romain in his Faith and Practice, RSGB, 1991, p.11. This procedure is in practice rarely undertaken by the rank and file but it supports the individualism even self-centredness of which Melanie Phillips is suspicious and neglects the community dimension of Judaism. And if you can make your own choice in ritual matters, why not extend it to moral choices? Furthermore, this freedom of choice is itself heavily influenced by the general secular cultural mores, the realities of contemporary British culture, which themselves are becoming more relative, a danger perceived even by politicians.

I and I feel a majority of Jews, join Melanie Phillips in a commitment to the traditional concept of family, about which she writes, based on a married mother and father responsible in love to each other and for the upbringing and support of their children. The goal of Jewish endeavour must be, through education and example, to reinforce this pattern, where possible, rather than ‘redefining’ the family and looking for so-called alternative patterns. So much is slipping for the worse in our society. All hands are needed to preserve what someone called the Jewish secret weapon, the family.

Rabbi Michael Leigh,
Minister Emeritus
Edgware and District Reform Synagogue
THREE OF MADELEINE Albright's grandparents vanished from her teenage world. Unlike her father and mother, they were not able to make it to Hampstead before the Second World War made them immobile in Prague. When the family got back there late in 1945, they were gone—forced into the gas chambers of Auschwitz.

Yet we are asked to believe that the new American Secretary of State, a Catholic by upbringing and an Episcopalian—the American equivalent of Anglican—by conversion, did not know that she was Jewish by birth and ancestry. A newspaper reporter helpfully printed the evidence for her and for us this winter.

By clinging so tenaciously to her gentle illusions, Mrs Albright certainly displayed a genius for turning blind eyes and deaf ears to plain but possibly inconvenient facts. Did this tough and otherwise fearless woman never ask, never probe and never, however gingerly, take a step towards the obvious conclusion?

And which other inescapable facts will she blithely wave aside in her new and awesome role as the most powerful woman in the world?

I AM WRITING THIS WHILE briefly ministering to two congregations of Ukrainian Jews. They have, within the last four years, settled in north-east Germany.

My question to them: Why are you here? They were goaded into leaving by unabated antisemitism. They decided their children could have a better future only elsewhere. They did not try to go to the USA because that country has a quota of 40,000 Jews a year from that huge landmass which we used to call simply Russia. They did not want to go to Israel because they feared hassles from the Orthodox rabbinate and because the process of settlement and absorption can be slow and painful.

Then came their question to me: "What have English rabbis done to press the British government to allow Jews from the former Soviet Union to settle in your country?"

For a moment I thought I would talk about the long campaign against the strict new asylum seekers' laws, and then swiftly gave them the honest answer: "We have done nothing."

With it I could offer neither excuse nor explanation.

HUGE SMILE WAS BEAMED on me one moonlit night by fate, or as I would say, God. I was allowed to chair a meeting for Shmuley Boteach, the Oxford student chaplain with a genius for grabbing media time.

His arms and his words hit the air with speed and passion. He veered from ultra-Orthodox dogma to 1997 Jewish realities. Through the rhetoric there broke through a man of generous instinct and liberal insight, and the courage to follow both. That is why the Lubavitch Movement could no longer stomach him. And that is why he is now seeking to strike new roots and build a new role.

So what chance has this American comet of turning himself into an Anglo-Jewish star?

He is a learner. That gives hope that he will one day resolve the three-way tug between his dogma, his instincts and outside reality.

The next lesson he must learn is that bridges between institutional Orthodoxy and Progressives cannot be built on dreams. His current dream is that we might give up our ultimate autonomy over conversion.

He has yet to learn that our approach to conversion is one of the most valuable contributions we currently make to Anglo-Jewry. For most of us, that is not negotiable.

I GIVE UNRESERVED RECOGNITION to one major feature which the United Synagogue shares with the Reform and Liberal Movements.

It is beyond belief. But all are looking to fill some of their major current pulpit vacancies with candidates from the USA. A sufficient number of the right calibre simply cannot be found on these shores.

What does this tell us about the way we spot, train and nurture our native talent?

ABORTING-AND-BURYING a rabbi's life is full of evidence that one doctrine of Judaism is proof against all secular onslaughts. That is the belief that the life of the individual soul goes on indefinitely after the body's death.

I had a sharp reminder of it on the day I took the funeral of a namesake who had once been a popular religion school teacher. Even at 92 she was still able to command a reasonable congregation for her farewell.

The third old lady with whom I shook hands after the service was in aggressive mood. "Who wrote that?" she demanded peremptorily about the eulogy I had just delivered. "Well, er," I mumbled, "I did."

"Can't have done," she snapped.

"Didn't know her."

Five hands later another old lady asked the same question far more gently. My reply was more assertive. "I did," I said firmly.

"Ah", she smiled, and pointed to heaven. "But you had help."

How could I argue?

NEVER MIND THE POLLS AND the prayers of John Humphrys, the Today team, the bulk of the Catholic and Anglican clergy and most of the Progressive rabbinate.

With the Sun shining upon him and the religious leader of part of Anglo-Jewish Orthodoxy blessing him—though insisting that he is above politics—how can Tony Blair fail to be installed at 10 Downing Street before Shabbat comes in at 8.10pm on Friday, May 2?

RABBI WILLIAM WOLFF is minister of the Brighton and Hove Progressive Synagogue. He has previously served in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Milton Keynes, Reading, and as an assistant to Rabbi Hugo Gryn at the West London Synagogue. He was trained at Leo Baeck College.
THE MANOR HOUSE SOCIETY

THE MANOR HOUSE SOCIETY is the cultural arm of the Sternberg Centre for Judaism, the largest Jewish centre in Europe. The Manor House Society brings a wide range of Jewish cultural and intellectual events within easy reach of a large audience. Regular activities include concerts, debates, exhibitions, drama, seminars and lectures.

Membership of the Sternberg Centre includes the Manor House Society and gives easy access to the Centre's many amenities. These facilities include a bookshop, library, cafeteria, extensive grounds and tennis courts.

Membership brings advance information about events, priority booking and ticket discounts and automatic subscription to MANNA at the reduced rate of £8.50, as well as the bi-monthly Sternberg Centre Diary.

Membership can be on either an individual or family basis. Subscriptions are modest.

The rates for 1997 are:

- Individual membership £15.00 (with MANNA: £23.50)
- Household £20.00 (with MANNA: £28.50)
- Individual concession £10.00 (with MANNA: £18.50)
- Household concession £15.00 (with MANNA: £23.50)

Details and application forms from Pam Lewis at the Sternberg Centre.

FORTHCOMING EVENTS

1st May – 27 June
The Book of Ruth – an Exhibition of Woodcuts by Maty Grünberg
(Closed: 5th and 26th May, 11th June)

Sunday 18th May 8.00pm
Dr Bernard Wasserstein, President of the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies will talk about his controversial book

Wednesday 21st May 1997
"Ruth, the last Patriarch?" – A talk by Rabbi Sybil Sheridan to accompany the art exhibition

Sunday 25th May 1997
Annual Awayday together with the North Western Reform Synagogue to the Jewish East End and the Jewish Museum in Camden Town

Thursday 29th May 8.00pm
The Manor House Society together with the Leo Baeck College will launch "The Subversive Bible", Rabbi Professor Jonathan Magonet's new book, with a reception and interfaith panel discussion

Sunday 1st June, 3-5pm
Demonstration of Wood Cutting Techniques by artist Maty Grünberg

Sunday 15th June 1997, 8.00pm
"The Three Sopranos" – Vivienne Belios, Noa Lachmann and Alexandra Valavelsky will follow the tradition of The Three Tenors with a programme of great soprano arias, duets and trios by Mozart, Puccini, Delibes and Bernstein together with their own blend of Hebrew and Yiddish Songs

LUNCHEON RECITALS
Thursdays, 1.15pm
Summer 1997 Series: 1st, 15th and 29th May, 12th and 19th June

ART COURSE
Ten week daytime courses from 29th April – 2nd July. Tuesdays 10.00am-12.30pm and 1.30pm-4.00pm

JUDAIC EMBROIDERY COURSE
Ten-week embroidery course with Lana Young from 30th April – 9th July. Wednesdays 10.00am-12 noon

WATERCOLOUR CLASS
New nine-week course with Jackie King-Cline on Wednesday evenings from 30th April – 2nd July. 7.30pm-10.00pm

S.T.A.R.S
Manor House Society Drama Centre
Ongoing programme of play production, play readings, workshops, play writing and theatre outings