



taught by Rabbi Jeremy Winaker



Agenda for February 27, 2021

- I. Welcome
- II. Lingering from Last Week?
- III. Definitions for this Week
 - A. Dual Loyalty
 - B. Identity Politics
- IV. Dual Loyalty
 - A. Sources
 - B. Alignment Today
- V. Identity Politics
 - A. Sources
 - B. Alignment Today?
- VI. Between Now and Next Class
 - A. Recommended Materials
 - B. Is America too divided for alignment?

Syllabus

Part I: Stories of Jewish Peoplehood

Unit 1: From No Home to Two Homes

Unit 2: Judaism of Being

Unit 3: Judaism of Becoming

Unit 4: On Universalism and Particularism

Part II: Contemporary Challenges to Jewish Peoplehood

Unit 5: Between Nationalism, Ultra-Nationalism, and Fascism

Unit 6: Moral Implications of Jewish Nationalism

Unit 7: Israel's Nation-State Law: Ramifications for a Jewish and Democratic State

Unit 8: Antisemitism as a Divisive Force

Unit 9: Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism

Unit 10: The Accusation and Dilemma of Dual Loyalties

Unit 11: "What's Good for the Jews?" Identity Politics in North America

Part I: Jewish Peoplehood

January 9: Introduction From No Home to Two Homes

January 16: Judaism as Ethics *and* Beliefs
(Units 2 & 3)

January 23: On Universalism and Particularism

Part II: Challenges to Jewish Peoplehood

February 13: Nationalism
(Units 5, 6, & 7)

February 20: Antisemitism
(Units 8 & 9)

February 27: Dual Loyalties and Identity Politics
(Units 10 & 11)

Syllabus (cont.)

Part III: New Relationship Models for Jewish Peoplehood

Unit 12: From Family to Consumer

Unit 13: Shared Believers, Partners, and Investors

Unit 14: At-Homeness

Part III: New Models of Peoplehood

March 6: Models to Consider
(Units 12 & 13)

March 13: At-Home-ness

Definitions

“Dual Loyalty” is an insidious denial of a human’s multiple loyalties, elevating one aspect of another’s identities into a contradiction to a shared identity. Jeremy Winaker

“Identity Politics” is a group-based political identity most often rooted in one’s racial, ethnic, sexual, religious, cultural or gender identity. It is an unapologetic affirmation of one’s heritage. Mijal Bitton



Sources on “Dual Loyalty”

שמות א': ז'-י"ב

Exodus 1:7-12

(7) But the Israelites were fertile and prolific; they multiplied and increased very greatly, so that the land was filled with them. (8) A new king arose over Egypt who did not know Joseph. (9) And he said to his people, “**Look, the Israelite people are much too numerous for us. (10) Let us deal shrewdly with them, so that they may not increase; otherwise in the event of war they may join our enemies in fighting against us** and rise from the ground.” (11) So they set taskmasters over them to oppress them with forced labor; and they built garrison cities for Pharaoh: Pithom and Raamses. (12) But the more they were oppressed, the more they increased and spread out, so that the [Egyptians] came to dread the Israelites.

(ז) וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל פַּרְוֹן וַיִּשְׁרֹצּוּ וַיִּרְבּוּ וַיַּעֲצְמוּ בָּמָאָד מִאָד
וְתִמְלָא הָאָרֶץ אֲתֶם: (ח) וַיַּקְרִים מֶלֶךְ-חַקְשׁ עַל-מִצְרָיִם
אֲשֶׁר לֹא-יָקַר אֶת-יוֹסֵף: (ט) וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל-עָםוֹ הַגָּה עַם בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל רַב וּעֲצָום מִפְּנֵינוּ: (י) הַבָּה נִתְחַכֵּם הַזֶּה פָּנוּ-יְרֻבָּה
וְהַזֶּה קִידְתְּקָרָאנָה מִלְחָמָה וּנוֹסֵף גַּם-הוּא עַל-שְׁנָאִינוּ
וּנְלַחֵם-בָּנָנוּ וְעַלָּה מִזְהָאָרֶץ: (יא) וַיַּשְׂרִימּוּ עַלְיוֹ שְׁנִי מִפְּנִים
לְמַעַן עַנְתּוּ בְּסֶבֶלְתָּם וַיְבִן עָרֵי מִסְכָּנוֹת לְפִרְעָה אֶת-פְּתָחָם
וְאֶת-רְעַמֵּס: (יב) וְכַאֲשֶׁר יַעֲנוּ אֵתָה כִּי יְרֻבָּה וּכִי יְפַרֵּץ
וַיַּקְרִזּוּ מִפְּנֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

Esther 3:5-9

(5) When Haman saw that Mordecai would not kneel or bow low to him, Haman was filled with rage. (6) But he disdained to lay hands on Mordecai alone; having been told who Mordecai's people were, Haman plotted to do away with all the Jews, Mordecai's people, throughout the kingdom of Ahasuerus. (7) In the first month, that is, the month of Nisan, in the twelfth year of King Ahasuerus, pur—which means “the lot”—was cast before Haman concerning every day and every month, [until it fell on] the twelfth month, that is, the month of Adar. (8) Haman then said to King Ahasuerus, **“There is a certain people, scattered and dispersed among the other peoples in all the provinces of your realm, whose laws are different from those of any other people and who do not obey the king’s laws; and it is not in Your Majesty’s interest to tolerate them. (9) If it please Your Majesty, let an edict be drawn for their destruction, and I will pay ten thousand talents of silver to the stewards for deposit in the royal treasury.”**

(ה) וַיּוֹרֶא הָמָן כִּי־אֵין מְרֻדָּכַי כֶּרֶע וּמִשְׁתְּחִנָּה לוֹ וַיִּמְלֹא הָמָן חִמָּה: (וֹ) וַיַּבְצֵעַ בְּעֵינָיו לְשַׁלֵּחַ יְדֵ בְּמְרֻדָּכַי לְבָדוֹ כִּי־הָגִידוּ לוֹ אֲתִיעַם מְרֻדָּכַי וַיַּבְקַשׁ הָמָן לְהַשְׁמִיד אֶת־כָּל־הַיְהוּדִים אֲשֶׁר בְּכָל־מִלְכּוֹת אֶחָשְׁוֹרֹשׁ עִם מְרֻדָּכַי: (ז) בְּחִדְשׁ הַרְאָשׁוֹן הַוְאִ-חִדְשָׁ נִימְלַחַן בְּשַׁנָּה שְׁתִים עִשְׂרֵה לְאַלְמָן אֶחָשְׁוֹרֹשׁ הַפִּיל פּוֹרָהוֹא הַגּוֹלֵל לְפָנֵי הָמָן מֵיּוֹם וּלְיּוֹם וּמִחְדָּשׁ? לְחִדְשׁ שְׁנִים־עַשֶּׂר הוְאִ-חִדְשׁ אַדָּר: (ט) (ח) וַיֹּאמֶר הָמָן לַמֶּלֶךְ אֶחָשְׁוֹרֹשׁ יִשְׁנוּ עִם־אַחֲד מִפְּזָר וּמִפְּרָד בֵּין הָעָמִים בְּכָל מִדְיָנִות מִלְכּוֹתךְ וְדָתִיךְ שְׁנָוָת מִפְּלָעָם וְאֲתִידָתִי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֵינָם עֲשִׂים וּלְמֶלֶךְ אֵין־שְׁנָה לְהַנִּיחָם: (ט) אִם־עַל־הַמֶּלֶךְ טֹוב יִפְתַּח לְאָדָם וּעֲשָׂרָה אַלְפִים כְּפָרְסָף אַשְׁקוֹל עַל־יְדֵי עֲשֵׂי הַמֶּלֶךְ לְהַבִּיא אֶל־גִּנְגִּין הַמֶּלֶךְ:

Napoleon's Instruction to the Assembly of Jewish Notables (1806), excerpt

From: Paul Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz, eds., *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed., 125–126

His Majesty, the Emperor and King, having named us Commissioners to transact whatever relates to you, has this day sent us to this assembly to acquaint you with his intentions. [. . .]

The wish of His Majesty is, that you should be Frenchmen; it remains with you to accept the proffered title, without forgetting that, to prove unworthy of it, would be renouncing it altogether.

As to us, our most ardent wish is to be able to report to the Emperor, that among individuals of the Jewish persuasion, he can reckon as many faithful subjects, determined to conform in everything to the laws and to the morality, which ought to regulate the conduct of all Frenchmen.

[One of the secretaries (proceeded to read the following) questions proposed to the Assembly of the Jews by the Commissioners named by His Majesty the Emperor and King.]

Is it lawful for Jews to marry more than one wife?

Is divorce allowed by the Jewish religion?

Is divorce valid, when not pronounced by courts of justice, and by virtue of laws in contradiction with the French code?

Can a Jewess marry a Christian, or a Jew a Christian woman?

Or has the law ordered that the Jews should only intermarry among themselves?

In the eyes of the Jews, are Frenchmen considered as brethren or as strangers?

In either case, what conduct does their law prescribe toward Frenchmen not of their religion?

Do the Jews born in France, and treated by the law as French citizens, consider France as their country? Are they bound to defend it? Are they bound to obey the laws, and to follow the directions of the civil code?

What kind of police jurisdiction have the Rabbis among the Jews? What judicial power do they exercise among them?

Are the forms of the elections of the Rabbis and their police jurisdiction regulated by the law, or are they only sanctioned by custom?

Are there professions from which the Jews are excluded by their law?

Does the law forbid the Jews from taking usury from their brethren?

Does it forbid or does it allow usury toward strangers?

Answers to Napoleon: The Assembly of Jewish Notables (1806), excerpt

From: Paul Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz, eds., *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed., 128–130

Resolved, by the French deputies professing the religion of Moses, that the following Declaration shall precede the answers returned to the questions proposed by the Commissioners of His Imperial and Royal Majesty.

The assembly, impressed with a deep sense of gratitude, love, respect, and admiration for the sacred person of His Imperial and Royal Majesty, declares, *in the name of all Frenchmen professing the religion of Moses*, that they are fully determined to prove worthy of the favors His Majesty intends for them, by scrupulously conforming to his paternal relations; that their religion makes it their duty to consider the law of the prince as the supreme law in civil and political matters; that consequently, should their religious code, or its various interpretations, contain civil or political commands, at variance with those of the French code, those commands would, of course, cease to influence and govern them, since they must, above all acknowledge and obey the laws of the prince.

That, in consequence of this principle, the Jews have, at all times, considered it their duty to obey the laws of the State, and that, since the revolution, they, like all Frenchmen, have acknowledged no others. [. . .]

Fourth Question: *In the eyes of Jews, are Frenchmen considered as their brethren? Or are they considered as strangers?*

Answer: *In the eyes of Jews, Frenchmen are their brethren and are not strangers. [. . .]*

A religion whose fundamental maxims are such – *a religion which makes a duty of loving the stranger* – which enforces the practice of social virtues, must surely require that its followers should consider their fellow citizens as brethren.

And how could they consider them otherwise when they inhabit the same land, when they are ruled and protected by the same government, and by the same laws? When they enjoy the same rights, and have the same duties to fulfill? There exists, even between the Jew and Christian, a tie which abundantly compensates for religion – it is the tie of gratitude. This sentiment was at first excited in us by the mere grant of toleration. It has been increased, these eighteen years, by new favors from government, to such a degree of energy, that now our fate is irrevocably linked with the common fate of all Frenchmen. *Yes, France is our country; all Frenchmen are our brethren, and this glorious title, by raising us in our own esteem, becomes a sure pledge that we shall never cease to be worthy of it. [. . .]*

Answers to Napoleon: The Assembly of Jewish Notables (1806), excerpt (cont.)

Sixth Question: *Do Jews born in, and treated by the laws as French citizens, consider France their country? Are they bound to defend it? Are they bound to obey the laws and to conform to the dispositions of the civil code?*

Answer: Men who have adopted a country, who have resided in it these many generations – who, even under the restraint of particular laws which abridged their civil rights, were so attached to it that they preferred being debarred from the advantages common to all other citizens, rather than leave it – cannot but consider themselves Frenchmen in France, and they consider as equally sacred and honourable the bounden duty of defending their country.

Jeremiah (chapter 29) exhorts the Jews to consider Babylon as their country, although they were to remain in it only for seventy years. He exhorts them to till the ground, to build houses, to sow, and to plant. His recommendation was so much attended to, that Ezra (chapter 2) says, that when Cyrus allowed them to return to Jerusalem to rebuild the Temple, 42,360 only, left Babylon; and that this number was mostly composed of the poor people, the wealthy having remained in that city.

The love of the country is in the heart of Jews a sentiment so natural, so powerful, and so consonant to their religious opinions, that a French Jew considers himself in England as among strangers, although he may be among Jews; and the case is the same with English Jews in France.

To such a pitch is this sentiment carried among them, that during the last war, French Jews, have been seen fighting desperately against other Jews, the subjects of countries then at war with France.

Many of them are covered with honourable wounds, and others have obtained, in the field of honour, the noble rewards of bravery.

Louis Brandeis, "The Jewish Problem: How to Solve It," excerpt

From: Paul Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz, eds., *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed., 496

Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with Patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. A man is a better citizen of the United States for being also a loyal citizen of his state, and of his city; for being loyal to his family, and to his profession or trade; for being loyal to his college or his lodge. Every Irish American who contributed towards advancing home rule was a better man and a better American for the sacrifice he made. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so.

...
America's fundamental law seeks to make real the brotherhood of man. That brotherhood became the Jewish fundamental law more than twenty-five hundred years ago. America's insistent demand in the twentieth century is for social justice. That also has been the Jews' striving for ages. Their affliction as well as their religion has prepared the Jews for effective democracy. Persecution broadened their sympathies. It trained them in patient endurance, in self-control, and in sacrifice. It made them think as well as suffer. It deepened the passion for righteousness.

Indeed, loyalty to America demands rather that each American Jew become a Zionist. For only through the ennobling effect of its strivings can we develop the best that is in us and give to this country the full benefit of our great inheritance. The Jewish spirit, so long preserved, the character developed by so many centuries of sacrifice, should be preserved and developed further, so that in America as elsewhere the sons of the race may in future live lives and do deeds worthy of their ancestors.

Aligning Loyalties:

Compatibility of Americanness and Zionism

Does this work today?



מכון
שלום הרטמן
SHALOM HARTMAN
INSTITUTE

Practices of Ethical Communal Discourse



We as Jews should be the last people casting aspersions on one another about the nature of our loyalties.



The better we are at managing this conversation ***internally***, the better equipped we will be to resist the ways that it becomes a means of indictment of the Jewish community ***externally***.

- This is especially critical in a **partisan landscape** when it is clear that other political actors *gain* when they can claim the loyalties of the Jewish community on their side.
- When Jews become complicit with this rhetoric, we undermine our collective capacity to resist these arguments when used *against us*.
- Jews should be especially circumspect about not casting the accusation of dual loyalties to *other* groups as well, especially vulnerable populations.



YEHUDA KURTZER: REDEFINING ZIONISM

We have to find ways to ensure that Zionism does not become a platform for pronouncing loyalty! There are a lot of generative ways for Diaspora Jews to belong to the project of the national homeland of the Jewish people – through spiritual connections, activism, philanthropy, tourism, culture, and religion. Too much of our communal conversation about Israel revolves around implicit and explicit pronouncements of loyalty.

On the reverse side, Diaspora Jewry must acknowledge that sometimes Israel will act in its own state interests, and that sometimes those interests will conflict with the ideological or political interests of world Jewry.



Sources on Jewish identity politics

- Equal Right for All is Good for the Jews
- Identity Politics is Good for the Jews
- What is Good Now?

Emma Lazarus, *The New Colossus*, 1883

...“Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp!” cries she
With silent lips. “Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!”

Rabbi Joachim Prinz, “The Issue is Silence,” selection from a speech delivered at the March on Washington, August 28, 1963

...When I was the rabbi of the Jewish community in Berlin under the Hitler regime, I learned many things. The most important thing that I learned under those circumstances was that bigotry and hatred are not the most urgent problems. The most urgent, the most disgraceful, the most shameful and the most tragic problem is silence.

A great people which had created a great civilization had become a nation of silent onlookers. They remained silent in the face of hate, in the face of brutality and in the face of mass murder.

America must not become a nation of onlookers. America must not remain silent. Not merely black America, but all of America. It must speak up and act, from the President down to the humblest of us, and not for the sake of the negro, not for the sake of the black community but for the sake of the image, the idea and the aspiration of America itself...

**Marc Dollinger, Black Power, Jewish Politics: Reinventing the Alliance in the 1960s (2018),
112**

As Donald Feldstein, an education consultant hired by the National Jewish Welfare Board to study college-age Jews, reported in 1970, “It is no longer embarrassing or ‘out’ to belong to a group on the college campus with the word ‘Jew’ in the title.” He noted “literally scores” of Jewish groups forming on college campuses across the country with “aggressively Jewish” missions that imitated “the spirit, the style, and the tactics of the New Left and black militants.”

Soviet Jewry Rally in San Francisco 1983, Simchat Torah (American Jewish Historical Society)



Ephraim Buchwald, “The Holocaust Is Killing American Jews,” *The Los Angeles Times*, Apr. 28, 1992

There is almost nothing more sacred or more sensitive for Jews living in the generation after the Holocaust, than the memory of the 6 million martyrs of the Nazi genocide. The poignant question “Where was God?,” rather than being a theological provocation, is more likely a reflection of the abiding pain which lingers from the staggering losses. After all, what could possibly be more important than sanctifying the memory of those who died – except insuring a future for those who wish to live as Jews?

There is great justification for the continuing Jewish obsession with the Holocaust. It was numerically the greatest loss of Jews ever in Jewish history, and the wound is still raw. Survivors, who actually witnessed the horrors, can be spoken to personally. And now that “revisionists,” who seek to deny the Holocaust, have become even more brazen, sensitive Jews are reacting with even greater passion.

But obsessing over the Holocaust is exacting a great price. It is killing America’s Jews. ...

If we are to stop the hemorrhaging of Jewish life in America, intensive, positive, joyous Jewish education and experiences must become a priority. But right now what seems to be the priority is building Holocaust memorials. Over half a billion dollars have already been pledged or spent to build 19 Holocaust memorials and 36 research centers or libraries in America. Some cities, like Los Angeles, have 2 or 3 competing Holocaust memorials. The largest and most expensive American Holocaust memorial, the US Holocaust Museum was dedicated on April 22, 1993 in Washington D.C., built at a cost of \$168 million.

More than a quarter of the books published on Jewish themes today concern the Holocaust. Jews who have never opened a Bible, have broad expertise in Holocaust studies. Jews who have never read a single page of Jewish philosophy, are fully conversant with Hitler’s Mein Kampf. Jews who are totally ignorant of the ABC’s of Judaism, have enrolled in intensive courses analyzing the most obscure details of the European Jewish Holocaust. It is quite likely that a young Jew today knows who Hitler and Eichmann were, but has no idea of Rabbi Akiva and Maimonides.

We’ve reached the absurd point where the only feature of Judaism with which our young Jews identify is that of the Jew as victim – murdered, cremated or turned into a lampshade. Is there no joy in Jewish life? Is there no balm in Gilead? No wonder our young Jews are turned off and walking away from their heritage.

James Baldwin, "Negroes Are Anti-Semitic Because They're Anti-White," The New York Times, Apr. 9, 1967, excerpt

... It is galling to be told by a Jew whom you know to be exploiting you that he cannot possibly be doing what you know he is doing because he is a Jew. It is bitter to watch the Jewish storekeeper locking up his store for the night, and going home. Going, with your money in his pocket, to a clean neighborhood, miles from you, which you will not be allowed to enter. Nor can it help the relationship between most Negroes and most Jews when part of this money is donated to civil rights. In the light of what is now known as the white backlash, this money can be looked on as conscience money merely, as money given to keep the Negro happy in his place, and out of white neighborhoods.

One does not wish, in short, to be told by an American Jew that his suffering is as great as the American Negro's suffering. It isn't, and one knows that it isn't from the very tone in which he assures you that it is. ...

The Jew's suffering is recognized as part of the moral history of the world and the Jew is recognized as a contributor so the world's history: this is not true for the blacks. Jewish history, whether or not one can say it is honored, is certainly known: the black history has been blasted, maligned and despised. The Jew is a white man, and when white men rise up against oppression, they are heroes: when black men rise, they have reverted to their native savagery. The uprising in the Warsaw ghetto was not described as a riot, nor were the participants maligned as hoodlums: the boys and girls in Watts and Harlem are thoroughly aware of this, and it certainly contributes to their attitude toward the Jews.

But, of course, my comparison of Watts and Harlem with the Warsaw ghetto will be immediately dismissed as outrageous. There are many reasons for this, and one of them is that while America loves white heroes, armed to the teeth, it cannot abide bad niggers. But the bottom reason is that it contradicts the American dream to suggest that any gratuitous, unregenerate horror can happen here. We make our mistakes, we like to think, but we are getting better all the time. ...

In the American context, the most ironical thing about Negro anti-Semitism is that the Negro is really condemning the Jew for having become an American white man – for having become, in effect, a Christian. The Jew profits from his status in America, and he must expect Negroes to distrust him for it. The Jew does not realize that the credential he offers, the fact that he has been despised and slaughtered, does not increase the Negro's understanding. It increases the Negro's rage. ...

The crisis taking place in the world, and in the minds and hearts of black men everywhere, is not produced by the star of David, but by the old, rugged Roman cross on which Christendom's most celebrated Jew was murdered. And not by Jews.

Aligning Loyalties:

Compatibility of Americanness and Zionism

Does this work today?



מכון
שלום הרטמן
SHALOM HARTMAN
INSTITUTE

Mijal Bitton, “I’m a Sephardic Latina with an Intersectional Identity. That’s Why I Oppose the Women’s March,” *The Forward*, Jan. 15, 2019

This coming Saturday, thousands of women across America will be marching in the 2019 Women’s March. But unlike the first march, many Jewish women have pledged not to attend this year, thanks to the March leaders’ ties to the anti-Semitic head of Nation of Islam, Louis Farrakhan, and other reports of anti-Jewish sentiment.

Still, social media posts have been circulating across Facebook and Twitter with the hashtag #jwocmarching, for Jewish women of color who are marching. The hashtag is part of a recent campaign led by Yavilah McCoy, a Jewish leader and founder of Ayecha who has been recently added to the Women’s March steering committee. McCoy and others have been urging Jewish representation in next week’s march, and specifically highlighting the voices and experiences of Jewish women of color in this contingency. The campaign released a nuanced, thoughtful statement which clearly outlines why many Jewish women of color are committed to the Women’s March as part of an intersectional struggle of solidarity against oppression.

“As Jewish women of color who live at the intersection of racism, sexism and anti-Semitism, and who are committed to standing against white supremacy, patriarchy and religious oppression in all its forms, we will play an integral role in the healing and unification of our communities and in the work of securing greater justice and freedom for us all,” the petition states.

I read this statement with respect for the experiences that lead its authors to write it. And in some ways, you might expect my identity as an intersectional feminist Latina immigrant from Argentina and a Sephardi Jew whose family hails from Arab lands should lead me to participate in the Women’s March, a movement predicated on solidarity for intersectional oppression and vulnerability.

But it is precisely my intersectional identity that leads me to abstain.

My childhood memories were happy, but still to this day carry a distinctly diasporic taste: Argentina never felt like home.

...

Mijal Bitton, “I’m a Sephardic Latina with an Intersectional Identity. That’s Why I Oppose the Women’s March,” *The Forward*, Jan. 15, 2019 (cont.)

I write to help explain why I am not marching, why my identity, which otherwise fits in within the intersectional fight for common liberation and for women’s rights, informs my refusal to participate in a movement led by individuals who have contributed to the normalization of anti-Semitic discourse, and who have yet, despite recent apologies, to regain the trust of many in the Jewish community in this issue, myself included. ...

I write to express that there are feminist Jewish women, Jews of color, Hispanic Jews, Jewish immigrants, Mizrahi Jews, Sephardic Jews, Jews from Arab lands and others Jews with intersectional and marginalized identities who are making a conscientious choice to not join in the Women’s March, a decision partly informed by their own experiences of vulnerability and motivated by a determination to fight oppression through other means.

My commitment to upholding anti-Semitism as a moral red line which determines who I will partner with was not awakened, as it was for some American Jews, by the terrible attack in Pittsburgh. While the shooting at Tree of Life synagogue stands out as the most deadly anti-Semitic attack on American soil, observers attuned to the experiences of other, smaller, Jewish communities around the world know that the post-Holocaust resurgence of anti-Semitism (if it ever went away) has older, more pervasive and more complex global manifestations.

My political understanding of liberatory intersectionality includes not only Americans who suffer gender, racial, economic and other forms of inequalities, but also Jews around the world still facing one of the oldest forms of hatred that human history has witnessed.

I write this, then, to challenge the dichotomy that has already begun to emerge, a dichotomy that posits an “either/or” worldview in which individuals who refuse to march in this particular Women’s Movement are portrayed as not caring for social or racial justice.

I care. It is because I care that I am praying with my feet and marching away from the Women’s March.

Louis Brandeis, "The Jewish Problem: How to Solve It," excerpt

From: Paul Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz, eds., *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed., 496

Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with Patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. A man is a better citizen of the United States for being also a loyal citizen of his state, and of his city; for being loyal to his family, and to his profession or trade; for being loyal to his college or his lodge. Every Irish American who contributed towards advancing home rule was a better man and a better American for the sacrifice he made. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so.

...

America's fundamental law seeks to make real the brotherhood of man. That brotherhood became the Jewish fundamental law more than twenty-five hundred years ago. America's insistent demand in the twentieth century is for social justice. That also has been the Jews' striving for ages. Their affliction as well as their religion has prepared the Jews for effective democracy. Persecution broadened their sympathies. It trained them in patient endurance, in self-control, and in sacrifice. It made them think as well as suffer. It deepened the passion for righteousness.

Indeed, loyalty to America demands rather that each American Jew become a Zionist. For only through the ennobling effect of its strivings can we develop the best that is in us and give to this country the full benefit of our great inheritance. The Jewish spirit, so long preserved, the character developed by so many centuries of sacrifice, should be preserved and developed further, so that in America as elsewhere the sons of the race may in future live lives and do deeds worthy of their ancestors.

Potential Solutions

Brandeis OR

Bitton OR

?

Recommended Materials

- Unit 11 interview 33:50-52:56
- On Michael Che's SNL joke, [podcast](#)