
TITLE "Pacifism as a Jewish Identity"

Master's [] Prize Essay []

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. yes no

Bruce Cohen
Signature of Author

Microfilmed _____
Date _____

Signature of Library Staff Member

PACIFISM AS A JEWISH IDENTITY

Bruce Mark Cohen

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters
and Ordination.

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion

1973

Referee, Professor Ellis Rivkin

DIGEST

Birrur, meaning separation, is the Jewish term for a non-violent resistance which speaks with compassion for the oppressor's divine spark. Possessing Birrur one states to the oppressor:

What you are doing is wrong. I submit not to you and will not be coerced by you. My responsibility is to God and I am responsible not only for myself but also for your spark.

This above definition of Birrur or Jewish Pacifism has been stated by Rabbi Zalman Schachter. However, the embryonic origins or roots of pacifism as a, specifically, Jewish identity may be evidenced amidst those wandering bands of Habiru in the Second Millenium before the Common Era. After establishing a definite link between the Habiru, Hebrews, Judeans, and Jews, this thesis shows that "alienation" or "strangeness" became the common denominator. As strangers themselves, all of these cultures implicitly recognized not only the divine spark in themselves but in all humanity. Indeed the Hebrew prophets exemplified this discernment of the One Man by their messianic hopes for a global society. Hence, the very first formulation of a world-wide brotherhood and sisterhood united by its acknowledgement of One God, as Creator of all, may be attributed to Judaism.

Since identity connotes the resiliency of maintaining essential patterns in the processes of change, the Jewish-Judean-Habiru value of de-emphasizing blood and soil not only aided in the perception of the One Man but also enhanced the

Jewish people's ability to positively identify as exiles from their territorial homeland. The Jews, prepared by a collective historical retention of their Habiru ancestry, were adept at accepting their diaspora role as an interstitial people. However, as a people between the parts of a society, the Jews, like the Habiru, have often been entrapped between those parts. Ultimately, the only salvation for the Jews remains their acceptance of a prophetic interstitial role, which actively strives for universal peace. In fact, the future existence of not only our people but of our planet necessitates that Jewish Pacifism become recognized as the only viable identity for Jews. With pacifism as our Jewish identity, it remains our task to re-examine our religious tradition without the bias of a cynical relativism, which negates the essential essence of our Torah as a "Tree of Life."

PREFACE

In writing a thesis, one immediately recognizes the influence of home upon one's intellectual endeavors. Indeed, a sense of justice and a love of Jewish history was instilled in me by my father, Emil Cohen. Balancing this element of justice, was the compassionate concern for the less fortunate that Bernice Cohen and Constance Wagner, my mother and mother-in-law, act upon in their daily lives. While the "agnostic" (for was not Maimonides an agnostic) inclination of Oscar Wagner, my father-in-law, motivated my concern for illustrating the relevant dynamics of our Jewish history. Finally, the active search of my sisters, Susan Lubick and Nancy Nowak, to find a meaningful Jewish existence for their families may be reflected in my suggestions for religious education.

In addition, three other teachers deserve special mention. The concept of the Habiru as an interstitial paradigm was first introduced to me by Dr. David Weisberg. Indeed, most of my initial studies of the Habiru arose from writing a paper for Dr. Weisberg's course in Ancient Near Eastern History. The general historical approach taken by this thesis was suggested by Dr. Ellis Rivkin. Although I am not a total disciple of Dr. Rivkin's futuristic global capitalistic utopia, I shall always remain in awe of Dr. Rivkin's creative dialectic--the unity concept--and his analytic insights. Furthermore, in an institution which often bears resemblance to a twentieth century

"heder," I am indebted to a "mench" who has consistently shown respect towards his students and who perpetually reaffirms their inherent ability to become "intellectual giants." My third teacher has influenced me in an inverse ratio to her academic credentials. Although my wife, Lynda, is just achieving her Bachelor of Arts Degree, her inquisitive scholarship permeates this thesis. My guide to Erich Fromm, Erik Erikson, and Sartre was Lynda. Furthermore, any psychological or anthropological insights expressed in this thesis were catalyzed as a result of our intellectual interaction. However, all inadequacies of perspective or approach remain my own and in no way reflect any limitations of the above teachers.

This thesis has been written in memory of Ethel Greenglass Rosenberg. On March 29, 1951, Ethel Rosenberg, Julius Rosenberg and Morton Sobell were found guilty of espionage. On April 5, 1951, Judge Kaufman, a Jew, sentenced Julius and Ethel Rosenberg to death.

Some opposed the death penalty for the Rosenbergs because they saw the Rosenbergs as innocent. Others opposed the death penalty from a sheer anti-capital punishment stance. Still others, like Professor Rivkin, saw the Rosenbergs accused of a crime--aiding the development of Russia's A-bomb, which never occurred. [See Schneir, Walter and Miriam. Invitation to an Inquest. Doubleday and Company, Inc. Garden City, New York, 1965.] Yet, it is not within the scope of this thesis to examine whether a great injustice was perpetrated against the Rosenbergs.

The only thing that can be said is that Robby and Michael lost parental love and care due to the forces of history. The Rosenbergs were sentenced to death by an hysterical American public which had become unable to rationally evaluate "cold war" events. Whether there was an internal communist menace or not, the supposed Soviet spy ring included not only Julius and Ethel Rosenberg but David Greenglass (Ethel's brother), Harry Gold, Martin Sobell, Abraham Brothman, and Miriam Moskowitz. All of them were Jews. Furthermore, the defense and prosecuting attorneys were Jewish as well as the presiding judge. Hence, the Atomic Spy Ring Case illustrates what Robert J. Marx calls "the institutional process which sees the Jewish community as the soft under belly into which social conflict is to be focused." Like the Habiru, who were also charged with being fifth columnists, Ethel and Julius Rosenberg's excessive punishment of death ominously warns us of our possible future entrapment between the parts.

Yet, as an entrapped scapegoat (for even if she was guilty, her death could never atone for the accused damage), Ethel Rosenberg exemplified the highest ideals of Birrur--Jewish non-violent resistance. Maintaining her innocence to the end and thereby refusing to admit any guilt which would have commuted her sentence, Ethel Rosenberg confronted the matron who led her to the gas chamber and performed a most simple and yet meaningful act which clearly stated to America:

What you are doing is wrong. I submit not to
you and I will not be coerced by you to lie. My

responsibility is to God and I am responsible not only for myself but also for your spark.

As she was about to enter the gas chamber, Ethel Rosenberg turned toward the matron, who led her toward her own execution, and lightly kissed her on the cheek. At 8:16 p.m. on June 19, 1953, fifteen minutes before the Sabbath Queen of peace and tranquillity commenced her weekly sojourn, Ethel Rosenberg became the only American woman to ever be executed during peace time for atomic espionage. Although June 19, 1953 will always be marked as a "black Sabbath," the memory of Ethel Greenglass Rosenberg shall always reflect the righteous blessing of the divine spark which resides in all of us.

I am dedicating this thesis to my nieces and nephew. But in order for them to understand the significance of this act, I must first relate a story which has been adapted from the Writings of Flavius Josephus and from James Michener's The Source.

About 2,000 years ago, the Jews lived in ancient Palestine which had been conquered by the armies of Rome. As farmers, the Jews grew food for the great armies of Rome. Although the Romans imposed great taxes upon these Jewish farmers, the Jews were content for they were still able to worship God.

However, there arose a new emperor of Rome who loved himself greatly. He worshipped himself instead of the Source of all life. This emperor, called Caligula, ordered his statue to be placed in every temple throughout the Roman Empire. Caligula ordered General Petronius to take a vast army to Palestine in order to force the erection of his statue in the Jews' sacred Temple of Jerusalem.

Hearing Caligula's edict, the Jews of Northern Palestine gathered to discuss what they would do once General Petronius and his army got off the ships

at what is now called the Port of Haifa. All of the Jews agreed that they were powerless to defeat the Romans as Judah Maccabee had overthrown Antiochus Epiphanes. Furthermore, many families remembered the bloody civil war where the Maccabees killed those Jews who had accepted Greek thought. Still others recalled that the worst rulers that ever ruled Palestine were the descendants of Judah Maccabee. No they did not want another Maccabean Revolt.

After much debate, a young olive grove worker named Yigal began to speak; "We are not without strength," said this average man of average height, "we still have faith in the Lord and does it not say in the Torah, Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." Tonight I, my wife, Beruriah, and my daughter, Shulameet, will walk to Haifa and confront General Petronius. We will bare our throats to prove to the Romans that they may not do this wrong thing unless they kill every Jew in this land."

Some older men protested that the planting season was approaching and that everyone was needed in the fields. To this Beruriah, Yigal's wife replied, "Those fields can be our major weapon. If we refuse to plant, the Romans will be forced to listen, for the armies of Rome depend upon our harvest."

Unarmed, except with their belief that right conquers might, thousands of Jews joined Yigal, Beruriah and little Shulameet. When General Petronius saw the men, women, and children lying in the road to prevent Caligula's statue to pass, he was shocked. "Why make such a big deal out of a piece of stone?" he asked. Yigal answered, "A false god must not make a mockery of our sanctuary." "Are you challenging the power of Rome?" demanded General Petronius. "Our quarrel is not with Rome," replied Beruriah, "but we cannot permit our religion to be destroyed and we cannot permit you to do this wrong."

At first, Petronius ordered his men to charge the Jews but when he saw the Jews did not resist, countermanded his order. Then Petronius threw a cordon about the Jews allowing none to leave the plain. After eight days without food, Petronius spoke to the Jews, "I appeal to your good sense" But before he could continue, little Shulameet said, "O mighty warrior, we appeal to your good inclination

so that you will see that Caligula's order is evil and that you must not follow it." Shulameet's statement made General Petronius think. He was a warrior, yes, but he did not picture himself as a killer of unarmed men, women and children.

The awakened conscience of General Petronius encouraged him to end the cordon and give the Jews food. Then Petronius wrote Emperor Caligula this letter:

In order to place your statue in the Jerusalem sanctuary, I would have to kill every Jew in Northern Palestine. For generations your granary would lie barren.

The name of Rome would be cursed forever. Unless you wish to kill on a scale not yet seen in our empire, I must beg you to withdraw your instructions to me. You must allow the Jews to worship as they have in the past.

Upon reading Petronius' letter, Caligula ordered Petronius' death. But, the citizens in Rome recognized that Caligula was not a good emperor so they elected a new leader. However, the ship with the orders to have Petronius killed for disobeying Caligula had already been sent. The new Emperor knew that Petronius was a good man so he sent another ship with the message of Caligula's defeat and that his order to kill Petronius should not be obeyed.

One ship bore the news of a death sentence while the other spoke of a reprieve and life for General Petronius. Unexpected storms caught the ship of death and held it prisoner for six months, while the ship of life sailed calmly to port, informing General Petronius of Caligula's election defeat and his own salvation.

Thus, on the Feast of Lights, we, like Yigal, Beruriah and Shulameet, rededicate ourselves to the ideals of our religion. As a sign of the great and noble acts that even the most average perform, we eat olives on Chanukah to remind us of the brave but humble olive press worker, Yigal. We light eight candles on Chanukah to remind us of those brave but non-violent Jews who defeated the Roman armies by showing the true strength of their convictions--they ate no food for eight days.

Our story does not end here. Years later, Shulameet married and had a daughter who she called Beruriah

after her mother. Like Judge Deborah, Beruriah became one of the wisest Jews. Soon Beruriah, the grand-daughter of Yigal and Beruriah, developed legal arguments which helped found what is called Rabbinic Judaism. Rabbinic Judaism's main goal is to bring all men and women into a harmonious and peaceful society. Hopefully, you, Jonathan, Caroline and Lisa Lubick, and Karen and Julie Nowak will dedicate yourselves to strengthening this dream of Rabbinic Judaism. If you do accept this great mission of our people, may you be encouraged by the story of Yigal, Beruriah and Shulameet, who met force with faith and ignited the divine spark or inner goodness of General Petronius.

HAPPY CHANUKAH!

To Jonathan Lubick, Caroline Lubick and
Lisa Lubick and to Karen Nowak and Julie Nowak.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Preface	ii
Dedication	ix
Chapter	
I. An Historical Beginning	1
II. Between the Boundaries	43
III. Beyond the Boundaries	69
Bibliography	94

I. AN HISTORICAL BEGINNING

In reconstructing the history of the Jews, the Bible as a historical document must be utilized. However, many may question the historicity of the Bible, specifically the so-called myths or tales of Genesis. Ironically, according to E. A. Speiser, "few portions of the Bible, if any, have received as much support and illumination from archeological discoveries as the patriarchal narratives in Genesis. . . . It is sufficient to emphasize that the results so far have borne out the essential reliability of the background that the Bible has sketched. Hence there are good reasons for assuming that many of the remaining obscurities will be cleared up in time."¹

One of those unanswered obscurities appears for the first time in Genesis 14:13:

And someone who had escaped came and informed Abram, the Hebrew, who had settled down beside the terebinths of Mamre, the Amorite, a kinsman of Eshkal and Amer who were allied with Abram.

The identification of Abraham as a Hebrew introduces the possible relationship of the Hebrews with the Habiru. Indeed, in Ancient Israel, Harry Orlinsky states:

The fragmentary data available seems to suggest that various nomadic groups, both Semitic and non-Semitic, but generally known as Habiru began to appear about 2,000 B.C. They wandered from one area to another, sometimes with their own flocks or as skilled craftsmen, smiths, musicians and the like. At other times they hired themselves out for specific functions and periods of time There appears to be good reason for associating the Biblical Hebrews with these far-flung Habiru.²

Although Moshe Greenberg recognizes the likeness of sound between Habiru and Hebrew and the concurrence in time, place, and activity between the Habiru and the Hebrew invaders of Palestine,³ he cautions against an "outright combination" of these two groups. Greenberg writes, "Beyond the fact that the Habiru and the Israelites were both militant, the two differ in every way."⁴ The differences, according to Greenberg, were that the Habiru, unlike the Hebrews, were neither ethnically homogeneous, tribally structured nor possessors of a unifying purpose. Furthermore, the Habiru were better warriors in that they were adept in chariot warfare and, thereby, were not restricted, like the Hebrews, to occupying only the Palestinian highlands.

Objections to Moshe Greenberg's perception of the Hebrews during the pre-monarchial period must be raised. First, contemporary scholars "possess no means of testing the veracity of the Joshua narrative in detail" even though there is abundant archaeological evidence that a major onslaught upon the land did take place in the thirteenth century B.C.⁵ In speaking of the school of A. Alt and M. Noth, Bright states:

Many think that the picture of a unified invasion of Palestine is the author's (of the Book of Joshua) idealization. They regard the narratives as a row of separate traditions, chiefly of an etiological character (i.e. developed to explain the origin of some custom or landmark) and minimal historical value, originally unconnected with one another or, for the most part, with Joshua--who was an Ephraimite tribal hero who was secondarily made into the leader of a united Israel. They hold that there was no concerted invasion at all, but that the Israelite

tribes occupied Palestine by a gradual, and for the most part peaceful, process of infiltration. The picture presented in Joshua, chapters 1-12, is therefore regarded without real historical value.⁶

Although the possibility of a pacifistic assimilatory Hebrew integration into Canaanite culture remains our concern, our present concern must focus upon the relationship between Hebrew and Habiru.

While most scholars would concur with Greenberg concerning the militancy of the Hebrews during the pre-monarchial period, these same scholars would strongly dissent from Greenberg's portrayal of the Hebrews as an ethnically homogeneous during this transitional period. For example, Orlinsky notes that:

Chapters 15-19 in Joshua and chapter 1 in Judges give a different picture both of the conquest and the role of Joshua therein. This version describes the conquest as a slow piecemeal affair, accomplished largely after Joshua and his generation were gone, by individual tribes and clans seldom acting even in partial unison. More specifically, Theophile Meek states 'these early invaders of Palestine were not an ethnic unit, but a composite group.'⁷

To those like M. Greenberg, who perceive a unified ethnic group roaming through Genesis, Meek presents a possible reason for such a conclusion in the following hypothesis:

As the various tribes and groups of tribes became consolidated into a national unit, as they did by the time of David, the traditions of each became the common possession of the whole, and as the tribes and their traditions fused into one, the various episodes naturally became the experience of the nation as a whole; the experience of each became the experience of all.⁸

If we accept the Hebrews as a "mixed multitude" (Numbers 11:4), then we are forced to recognize great parallels between

the Hebrews and Habiru. For example, in her paper Habiru-Hebrew Problem, Mary Gray states:

In their historical context, the Habiru, as well as the Hebrews, are to be understood as groups or as individuals present or emerging throughout the Near East during the second millenium B.C.E., persons of various nationalities whose common feature was that "they had crossed a boundary," had left their homeland, and who therefore had to accept employment in whatever occupation they could find.⁹

From an examination of Near Eastern records recently discovered, Gray was able to reconstruct the following composite picture of the Habiru:

The Habiru possessed fixed places of abode. They were neither bedouins nor nomads. The term Habiru specified a foreigner rather than an ethnic group.

The Habiru were known to have been employed in many ways. Quite frequently, they were soldiers or robbers, but they were also engaged as messengers, scribes, unskilled labor in the stone quarries and building projects of the Pharaohs, vineyard workers and as general servants. The Habiru could thus be found in almost any economic status, although the average person of this group might well fit into a societal position below the free citizens and above the slaves.

In spite of the fact that the Habiru was on occasion able to achieve much, a certain stigma was attached to his name throughout the centuries.¹⁰

Besides the appearance of this stigmatized term, Hebrew in Genesis 14:13, occurrences of Hebrew within the Bible cluster in two situations:

1. The Israelite-Egyptian episodes in the Pentateuch (the Joseph story (Genesis 39:14; 43:32) and the Exodus story (Exodus 1:15-9:1).
2. The Israelite-Philistine episodes in I Samuel.

An examination of the Biblical utilization of the term Hebrew is presented in Julius Lewy's article, Origin and Signification of the Biblical Term Hebrew.¹¹ Lewy elucidates Exodus 2:11-14, "where the narrative distinguishes between Hebrews whom it describes as brothers of Moses thus characterizing them as Israelites, and Hebrews hostile to him who seem to make common cause with the Egyptians."¹² Likewise "chapter 13 of I Samuel has King Saul draw a distinction between his Israelite followers and the Hebrews, whom he expects to join him in his rebellion against the oppressive Philistine overlords."¹³ Certainly, the above image of the Hebrews as mercenaries who ally themselves with the native Israelites remains consistent with our previous portrayal of the Habiru. Furthermore, Lewy's examination of Exodus 21 and Deuteronomy 15 also emphasizes the aforementioned alien or foreign aspect of Hebrew/Habiru. Both these laws

. . . deal with the acquisition by an Israelite of a so-called ebed ivri, that is, a Hebrew servant, and prescribes that, after six years of service, such a servant shall decide whether he wishes to discontinue his service and leave as a free man or whether he prefers to stay and to become a 'ebed olam'--a 'slave forever'. To assume that this law concerns Israelites in the service of other Israelites proves impossible because this assumption would be contrary to the gist of those Biblical laws which prevent an Israelite from selling himself into slavery and provide for capital punishment for an Israelite who steals another Israelite and sells him.¹⁴

To Lewy, "it was Israel and not the Hebrews for whose release Moses and Aaron pleaded with the king."¹⁵ The question to

Lewy is not whether the Habiru are Hebrews but whether the Hebrews are Israelites. In essence, Lewy's opinion is that Hebrew merely denotes "alien" with all of its pejorative connotations. Concerning our obscure verse in Genesis 14:13, Lewy writes:

For since the Book of Genesis states in detail that Abram's original home had been far away from Palestine, and since we have already demonstrated that in the Biblical narratives and in the Biblical legislation 'Hebrew' signifies 'alien' and especially 'resident alien,' it is not surprising that our verse appends the expression Habiru as an apposition to the name of the patriarch. But, it is important to note that this apposition occurs here as an epithet of the patriarch whom the Israelites glorified as their ancestor and in a tale which, as I have stated upon another occasion explains how and why this patriarch obtained for himself and especially, for his descendants the right to settle permanently in Palestine.

Hence Julius Lewy concludes that the Hebrews were not necessarily Israelites. "Later generations, who had no clear idea of the original signification of the archaic term Hebrew, probably reasoned that they too were entitled to call themselves Hebrews." Thereby, Lewy explains "the emergence in the inter-testamentary period of the term Hebrew as a designation of the Israelites and Judeans and their ancestors, as well as their language."

Several objections may be raised to Lewy's hypothesis. First, the image of an awl being bored through a man's ear who refuses freedom, appears as a punitive form of negative reinforcement for those of Israel who did not "hear" the word of the Lord and willingly submitted to life-long servitude.

Indeed, Rabbi Yohanan ben Zakkai (Tosefta Baba Kama 7.5) and Rashi on Exodus 21:6 state: "The ear had heard on Mt. Sinai 'for unto me the children of Israel are servants' and yet this man went and acquired another master, therefore let his ear be bored through because he observed not that which his ear had heard." Hence, rather than condoning the enslavement of oneself to one's Hebrew Israelite brethren, those passages from Exodus 21 and Deuteronomy 15 attempt to implicitly condemn such action.

The second problem of Lewy's hypothesis arises from Exodus 5 where Yahweh is referred to as both "the God of Israel" and the "God of the Hebrews," and the narrative of Exodus 1 which refers to the two Hebrew midwives and Moses as one of the infants of the Hebrews. Indeed, Lewy states, "a glance at the first chapters of the Book of Exodus seems, indeed, to indicate that the terms Hebrews and Israelites could be used indiscriminately."¹⁶ Furthermore, Gray points out that the term Hebrew is employed by foreigners in referring to the Israelites. Hence, Gray states concerning Exodus 5:

When Moses uses the term "God of Israel," the Pharaoh replies that he does not know this deity but the implication of the narrative is that the Egyptian ruler would recognize the rights and commands of the "God of the Hebrews."¹⁷

Thus, we come to the verity of Jean Paul Sartre who said "the Jew is one whom other men consider a Jew."¹⁸ Likewise, the "Hebrew is one whom other men consider a Hebrew." Indeed, the Israelites speak of themselves as Hebrews when addressing

foreigners. Besides the two midwives (Exodus 1:15) and Moses' sister (Exodus 2:7), Joseph also refers to himself as coming from the "land of Hebrews" (Genesis 40:15) when he speaks to his fellow inmates in Pharaoh's prison. The fact that others view the Israelites as Hebrews and the fact that the Israelites refer to themselves as Hebrews when speaking to foreigners clearly indicates a conscious retention of this stigmatizing label both by the Israelites and their enemies.

A third objection to Lewy's hypothesis is that Hebrew does not have to denote all Israelites in order for one to maintain that the Israelites came from that heterogeneous and widespread social class of the second millenium known as the Habiru or Hebrews. In other words, the relevant point in Exodus 2:11-14 is that at least one Hebrew was considered as Moses' kinsman. Lewy's interpretation of hostility emanating from the two fighting Hebrews who resented Moses' interference and thereby told Pharaoh about Moses' murder of the Egyptian, does not negate an equation that the Israelites are Hebrews. "To make common cause with the Egyptians," as Lewy refers to it may merely indicate the narrator's attempt to portray the divisiveness of slavery. Not being a homogeneous group, the two fighting Hebrews would naturally seek to achieve favor with the ruling class at the expense of a member of their own class. Indeed, one of the purposes for wandering in the desert for forty years must have been the formation of group solidarity. In fact, the traditional argument that men born

into slavery cannot inherit the land of milk and honey also applies in this case. By Biblical definition, self-servitude arises from the selling of one's brother for self-aggrandizement. This principle is exemplified not only by these two Hebrew slaves but also by Joseph's brothers who sold him into bondage and thereby initiated the Hebrews' Egyptian experience which resulted in slavery (Genesis 3:7). Another possibility is that this episode is related in order to reveal the Hebrews' reticence to recognize Moses as a fellow kinsman. After all, Moses was raised as an Egyptian prince. Hence, the fact that the Biblical use of the term Hebrew is only applied to Israelites when they are "away from their land and serving the masters of the foreign land"¹⁹ does not negate the probability that the Israelites, the dominant social group in Canaan, were descendants of Habiru/Hebrew groupings.

As indicated in our second objection to Lewy, the Israelites retained an understanding of their ancestry. Indeed, from I Samuel 14:21, it appears that those Hebrews who are alien-servants of the Philistines also feel this historical tie to the Israelites. In other words, why did "the Hebrews, who up to now had been under the Philistines and had been with them in camp, changed sides and joined the Israelites under Saul and Jonathan" (I Samuel 14:21). Gray sees a parallel with this event and the fact that "the native population of Palestine joined with the Habiru in the 14th century to get rid of their masters"--the Egyptians. But, Gray also states

that "the Hebrews seem actually to have turned the tide of battle, since prior to their defection the battle was greatly confused, and immediately afterward, we are told that the Philistines had fled."²¹ If we say the Hebrews defected at a point in the battle when the outcome was uncertain and an unsuccessful rebellion on their part would have been met with harsher servitude or death at the hands of the Philistines, we must ask why the Hebrews were willing to take such chances to be able to join the Israelites. In other words, how did the Hebrews know that the Israelites would not also enslave them? Eventually, as Gray, herself, hypothesizes, these rebellious Hebrews were assimilated into the Israelite nation.²³ Greenberg's statement that "hospitality to fugitives on the part of the Habiru suggests that they were composed, at least in part, of similar elements"²⁴ seems equally applicable to the Israelites. The Hebrews, who "fought either with the native population or with the Egyptians in the 14th century"²⁵ chose in I Samuel to risk possible death in order to side with the Israelites for they knew the Israelites, conscious of their own historical past, would hospitably accept them.

Furthermore, it must even be questioned if whether during this early monarchical period, the Israelites had really lost the characteristics of being Hebrews. In the words of Lewy, these Israelites "did not enjoy the same civil rights and political status as the ruling population" (the Philistines).²⁶ In the early monarchical period, therefore, the Israelites

were still the non-dominant and thereby alien minority in the land of Canaan. Moreover, David must be labeled as an Israelite or Judean. Yet, David's pre-monarchial existence parallels that of a Habiru/Hebrew chieftain. Just as the Habiru/Hebrew groups "welcomed fugitive and renegade elements"²⁷ David, a fugitive himself from Saul, "gathered men in any kind of distress or in debt or with a grievance around him" (I Samuel 22:2). Indeed, David, in typical Habiru/Hebrew fashion, became a mercenary to a king of the Philistines and was assigned cantonment in the Philistine town of Ziklag (I Samuel 27). David never raided Israelite-Judean towns. To the contrary, David annihilates tribes or towns which are under the protection of his Philistine overlord. Meanwhile, David falsely relates his exploits against Saul's kingdom to his overlord. Yet, not even the antimonarchial narrator, who finds no limitation in his chastisement of David's errors, exploits this period of David's life as a sign of his ignoble nature. David is neither portrayed as a traitorous or dishonest person. Instead, the narrator seems to comprehend, accept and condone David's duplicity as the oftentimes necessary behavior for a Hebrew or alien. The fact that the Judeans and Israelites perpetuated this tale of their beloved King David indicates a continuous understanding for their Hebrew identity.

It is relevant to note in reviewing the history of the Davidic monarchy that a distinction must be drawn between

those Israelites from the North and those from the South. After Saul's death, "the war between the Houses of Saul and David was long drawn out" (II Samuel 3:1). Only after seven and a half years, do the Southern and Northern Israelites accept David's rule (II Samuel 5:5). After David defeated the Philistines, Absalom, David's firstborn son, revolted against his father's rule by nurturing the historic distrust the Northerners had for David, a Southern Judean (II Samuel 15:3-6). Even after Absalom's death and unsuccessful revolt, unity is difficult to maintain. In II Samuel 20:1-2, we are told:

There happened to be a man there, a scoundrel named Sheba, son of Bichri, a man of Benjamin. He blew the trumpet and cried out: "What share have we in David? We have no lot in the son of Jesse. Away to your homes, O Israel." The men of Israel all left David, to follow Sheba, son of Bichri, but the men of Judah stood by their king and followed him from Jordan to Jerusalem.

Although Bichri is defeated, Solomon, David's successor also confronts rebellion at the hand of Jereboam, his servant. Encouraged by the Prophet Adonijah, Jereboam sought to secede the ten Northern tribes from Southern rule (I King 11:26-40). Forced into exile in Egypt by Solomon, Jereboam returns upon Solomon's death and leads the successful Northern break-away from David's descendant, Rehoboam (I Kings 12:1-17). "So Israel went to their homes, and Rehoboam ruled over those Israelites who lived in the cities of Judah." This time the region of Palestine remains divided between the Northern and Southern Israelites. It is noteworthy that Jereboam's rise to

power through exile parallels David's ascension to the throne.

These historical events, related in the Books of Samuel and Kings, seem to undermine Greenberg's assertion that the Israelite-Judean Hebrews, in contradistinction to the Habiru, were ethnically homogeneous or possessors of a unifying purpose. Like the Habiru, the Israelites and Judeans only unifying purpose existed when an outside force, the Philistines, necessitated such action. Once the Philistines were subdued and the threat of foreign interference abetted, regional rivalry prevailed among the Israelites. Certainly, ethnic homogeneity between the North and South seems circumspect in light of a recurrent Biblical statement expressed by the Northern Israelites:

What share have we in David? We have
no lot in the son of Jesse. (II Samuel
20:1-2 and I Kings 12:6).

We come then to two essential limitations in reformulating Jewish history from the Bible. These two limitations are:

1. Not all Habiru/Hebrews became Israelites.
2. Not all Israelites possessed similar ethnic backgrounds. However, both the Northern and Southern Israelites possessed the common historical antecedent of being elements of that widespread group known as the Hebrews.

Accepting the above limitations, let us commence with our goal of depicting the embryonic growth of the Jewish people.

During the second millenium, the Hebrews, a mixed multitude of aliens and outcasts, dwelled throughout the Fertile Crescent or Near East. Naturally, some of these Hebrews settled in

Canaan. As indigent migrants, many accepted a client status to the more numerous and dominant Canaanites. In the second millenium, the Egyptian provinces of Syria and Palestine were wracked with disturbances. In the ensuing anarchy, the Hebrews were available to all as mercenary troops.²⁸ Indeed, chapter 14 of Genesis, which according to Speiser, "has all the ingredients of historicity,"²⁹ records that Abraham, our Patriarch, joined the Canaanite rulers in subduing such a rebellion not for reward but to rescue his nephew, Lot.

As individuals and families, the Patriarchs were among this class known as Hebrews. Uprooted from their native place, migrant, having the status of protected clients (*ger-u-toskav*) in the land of their sojourn, they bear the earmarks of the class. A reminiscence of their Hebrew status is to be seen in the peculiar restriction of Hebrew to the migrant Patriarchs--for example, so as to apply to Abraham, but not to his settled kinsman, Lot.³⁰

Besides, the Patriarchs and their clans, clans of kindred origin--many of them later to contribute to the bloodstream of Israel--were migrating into Palestine in large numbers during the early second millenium, there to mingle and proliferate as time passed. With the formation of the Israelite confederation under a faith tracing its ultimate origins to Abraham, the traditions of these disparate Hebrew claims were subsumed within the context of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and his twelve sons.³¹

Sometime after the beginning of the second millenium, a small group of Hebrews from the Southern region of Palestine settled in the cantonment of Goshen, Egypt due to a famine in Southern Palestine. Certainly, the number of Hebrews was not great since Genesis 46:27 states that only seventy Hebrew men entered Egypt. These Hebrews eventually achieved freedom from their Egyptian servitude and left with kindred tribes of alien or migrant status, thereby forming a "mixed multitude." In the meantime, the majority of Hebrews who remained in Palestine, especially in Northern Palestine, had lost their minority immigrant status and had become a people. The name change of Jacob to Israel symbolizes this development in the North.³²

With the Hebrews becoming the dominant social group in Northern Palestine, God's covenantal promise to Abraham of "I will give to you and your seed after you, the land where you are a resident alien," (Genesis 17:8), was coming to fruition. The Southern Hebrews, possessing the historical experience of Egyptian servitude, liberation, and instruction in Mosaic monotheism, rejoined their Northern kinsmen in attempting to wrest the Southern portion of Palestine from the native populations. Rather than Hebrews, the Southerners, as they became more settled and dominant and thereby less alien and beholden to the native Canaanites, became Judeans just as the Northerners had become Israelites.

As centuries passed, the process of incorporating the Southern Hebrews' Egyptian experience into the national

ethos was attempted. Since the Bible was written by Judean hands, we cannot assume that the religion of Moses was as well imbued up North. Indeed, the fact that the Levites, who definitely were in Egypt due to their Egyptianized names, predominantly remained in the South, indicates that the tradition of Moses' monotheism was more alive there than in the cities and agricultural regions of the North.³³

Since the Hebrew or alien experience of Egypt was possessed by a larger percentage of Southern rather than Northern Hebrews, the Judeans retained a definite consciousness of their Hebrew heritage. The folk-myths surrounding the Judean folk-hero, David, are filled with Hebrew motifs of the outcast who must become a mercenary for survival. Furthermore, the Hebrew characteristic of giving refuge to the alien and fugitive remained a cultural norm among these new land holders. Indeed, such compassion became incorporated into the monotheistic law; "And a stranger you shall not oppress, for you know the heart of a stranger, seeing you were strangers in the land of Egypt." (Exodus 23:9) Egypt became the code word for all lands throughout the Near East where these former aliens suffered under harsh overlordship. In the collective experience of all Hebrews--whether North or South--Egypt also symbolized Hurrian, Hittite, and Philistine oppression. Indeed, even the Far Northern tribes of Asher, Dan, Naphtali, Issachar, and Zebulun, "all of whom," according to Meek, "were more native than Hebrew and became Hebrew only as they were drawn into the

Hebrew confederacy by a common peril,"³⁴ could identify with Egyptian liberation when they witnessed the defeat of the Sisera menace under the spiritual leadership of Deborah (Judges 4).

The possession of this common and widespread collective experience of oppression, however, did not prove to be a sufficient unifying factor. Evidently, the settlement of the North and South at different periods and under different leaders led to the development of different cultural and religious attainments.³⁵ As recorded earlier, the two regions divided into two kingdoms.

Although Lewy demarcates the intertestamentary period as the time for the reappearance of the term Hebrew for the language and people of Judea, we have already seen that the folk tales of the beloved David indicate a clear awareness of the term Hebrew. If we accept the dates of 850 for the divided kingdom, 722 for the Israelite exile, and 586 for the Judean exile; then David's rule ended in about 810 (Solomon ruled forty years--I Kings 11:42) or 234 years before the Babylonian exile of the Judeans. To claim that the Judeans, witnesses of the Assyrian conquest of their Northern Israelite brethren, maintained a collective consciousness of their Hebrew past during those 234 years, seems most plausible. Four and one-half generations after David, the humble Hebrew king, the upper and middle classes of Judean society found themselves in their previous Hebrew/Habiru existence along the banks of Babylon.

Interestingly, when the elders of the Judean community in exile approached the Prophet Ezekiel and suggested "the erection of a Temple on Babylonian soil, he vigorously and relentlessly set himself against such a plan. Against their own will, if it must come to that, the dispersed were to be gathered back; they must pass again, as in the time of Moses through the wilderness. . . ." ³⁶ In Ezekiel 20:36, the reference to "the wilderness of Egypt" indicates the relevancy the Exodus experience still had for the Judean people after almost 1000 years. A prophet speaks in metaphors, parables, and parallels not only to be dramatic but, to be understood. Ezekiel's analogy between the ancestral Egyptian experience and the Judeans being scattered "into the wilderness of the peoples" possibly plays upon the theme of the Judeans as Hebrews or aliens.

The fact that the term Hebrew, originally denoting alien, foreign, or stranger, reappeared in the intertestamentary period is most significant to our thesis of a Judean historical collective retention of the Habiru/Hebrew second millenium experience. Rather than being "inexplicable or surprising" as Lewy perceives it, ³⁷ the Judeans and Israelites accurately refracted their real-politic situation in utilizing the term Hebrew as a designation for themselves and their language. As Samuel Sandmel points out:

. . . the misconception exists that the Dispersion awaited the events of 70 (C.E.), and was a consequence of the crushing rebellion against Rome.

Actually, however, the Dispersion in the west, that is, in Grecian lands, began no later than the time of Alexander the Great, who died in 323 B.C.(E).³⁸

Not only had the Judeans voluntarily accepted the status of alien or Hebrew in the western Greek world but those of the Babylonian exile in 586 B.C.E. remained in the majority, along the banks of the Babylon. According to Zeitlen "Although the prophets proclaimed the action of Cyrus as inspired by Yahweh and urged the people to return to Judea, only a minority (about 40,000) heeded their words."³⁹ Those Judeans, who had once wept when they remembered Jerusalem (Psalm 137), had become integrated with the Babylonian population, were well off socially and economically, and yet retained their alien or Hebrew status by remaining in Babylon. Even as early as Solomon's time, many Judeans settled in Egypt. Indeed, Jeremiah found Judean communities both in Upper and Lower Egypt.⁴⁰ Hence, the reappearance of the term Hebrew as the designation of the Judeans and Israelites and their language merely reflects the sizeable proportion of Judeans and Israelites living outside of Judea during the intertestamentary period. This re-identification with the term Hebrew/alien on the part of the Judeans and Israelites only becomes explicable if we accept our thesis of conscious Judean retention for the symbolic historical significance of the term Hebrew as connoting alien. Drawing upon their past recorded history in the Bible, those living outside of Judea once again began to speak of themselves

as Hebrews/aliens with all of the pejorative (outcasts), honorific (we are like Abraham, Joseph, and Moses), and covenantal, through us "All the nations of the world will be blessed" (Genesis 22:18), connotations.

This conscious Judean retention of their historical antecedents as Hebrews/Habiru explicates several other phenomena. Besides the policy of Assyrian dispersement of conquered peoples versus the Babylonian removal of whole classes of conquered nations to one area of the empire; most scholars also attribute the prophetic consciousness-raising of Yahweh in the intervening century as crucial for maintaining Judean identity in exile. For example, Marx and Margolies state:

What differentiated these new-comers from the Israelites whom the Assyrians had deported more than a century before was just the circumstance that this very respite had intervened. The Israelitish brethren probably were absorbed by the foreign environment--we speak of the "lost ten tribes"--though some residue must have maintained its identity in the Median highlands and beyond, to be merged later with the Jewish people. The Jews (Judeans), on the other hand, on the transplantation to Babylonia, had become conscious of the religious uniqueness which set them apart from all other nations. They had witnessed the rehabilitation of the Mosaic Torah; the Sabbath and other rites were the 'signs' by which they knew each other and held together; they had been chastened by the stern rebukes of great prophets, whose lessons they now, as never before, took to heart.⁴¹

Certainly, this classical explanation seems most plausible. Yet, it does not explain why the Judeans in Upper and Lower Egypt, who dated back to Solomon, were found, according to the prophet Jeremiah, clinging to their nationality and practicing the religion they had known in the rural districts of Judea

from which they came.⁴²

Historically, there never was a period in time when some economic class or political faction in Judea ceased to retain the Habiru/Hebrew characteristics of being strangers in a strange land. A continuous line of "Hebrewness" was maintained from Abraham, to Joseph, to Moses, to David, to the Egyptian Jews of Solomon's reign up to the Babylonian exile. Many Judeans, unlike the Northerners, participated in the Egyptian experience of Moses' time and, thus, found their Babylonian captivity as another chapter in their history as Hebrews. Indeed, the "Israelitish residue" which maintained its identity was most likely composed of those Northerners who had not lost their historical Hebrew consciousness by uniting with the native Canaanite tribes of Asher, Dan, Naphtali, Issachar, and Zebulon. Hence, uprootedness was not foreign to most Judeans and some Israelites.

The Judeans and some Israelites possessed a historical blueprint on how to survive as a people without residing in a national homeland. Indeed, it is the prophet Jeremiah, after visiting the self-exiled Judean communities in Egypt, who wrote the following letter to the Babylonian communities: "The captivity is long; build yourself houses, and dwell in them; and plant gardens; and eat the fruit of them." (Jeremiah 29:28) Thus, a group of Hebrews, experiencing Egyptian liberation, created a nation-state in the hills of Judea but always retained a historical consciousness of their past as aliens so

that the ability to maintain a peoplehood away from the land always remained a viable option. Certainly, the prophetic voice was most instrumental. But the prophets, as we have seen, were aided by drawing upon the precarious but fortuitous Hebrew experience of the past to fortify the Judean faith in the future as the exiles wept on the banks of the Babylon.

If the Judean retention of "Hebrewness" was actually cultivated before the Babylonian exile then we should not expect, as Marx and Margolies claim, an awakened Judean consciousness of their religious uniqueness. In other words, possessing a trans-national history as Hebrews, the Judeans should have already perceived the distinction of their religion before their Babylonian captivity. Furthermore, the geopolitical location of Judea prevented a parochial world view. In describing trade routes, Samuel Sandmel states:

The major trade routes between Egypt to the West and Assyria, Babylon and Persia to the East traversed Palestine. So too, did major routes between Egypt and Asia Minor. Because major routes passed through, Palestinian trade cities were often cosmopolitan. The Hebrew religion was thus confronted by alien practices and ideas.⁴³

This confrontation with non-monotheistic religions, did not merely induce a movement to retain the Judean principle of a universal omnipotent deity but it encouraged the desire for all men to recognize Yahweh as God. The Second Isaiah (chapters 40-55) relates Judea's role in the attainment of this goal.

You, Israel, My servant,
 Jacob whom I chose,
 Seed of Abraham, My friend,
 You whom I took from the ends of the earth,
 Summoned from its distant parts
 Saying to you: "You are My servant,"
 I have chosen you and not rejected you.
 (Isaiah 41:8-9)

According to Second Isaiah, the role of the servant Israel is to become a nation of prophets who attempt to save mankind from ruin.⁴⁴ When Isaiah states that God, "took (Israel) from the ends of the earth" and "summoned (them) from its distant parts," the Prophet alludes to the pre-Judean experience of being dispersed throughout the Fertile Crescent as well as a possible future ingathering of the exiles. Similarly, Isaiah informs Judea of a renewed Hebrew/Habiru role which is divinely inspired.

Indeed, God states; "It is too light a thing that you should be My servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the offspring of Israel; so I make you a light to the nations, that My salvation may reach to the ends of the earth.

God is merely sending Judea into its traditional role as exiles or aliens in a strange land. However, this time Judea has a mission besides survival and identity retention. Judea must be a "light unto the nations." National restoration is only part of God's salvation, as revealed through his prophet, the Second Isaiah. As Professor Sheldon Blank states:

It is the goal God has set for mankind, the realization of the divine purpose in human society. Out of chaos God created the world. Creation is purposive, and it is not to be

reversed--creation should not revert to the tohu bohu which it was before God spoke. 'Not to be an empty waste did He create it [the prophet said]; to be inhabited He formed it.

(Isaiah 45:18)

Once because of human depravity He had been constrained to destroy with a cosmic flood all flesh and start anew with the family of Noah. Again for men's arrogance, He had found it necessary to divide mankind into a Babel of unrecognizable tongues and scatter them over the earth. But both events were a slipping back, and what ground was lost was yet to be regained. Mankind divided into warring tribes, hopelessly unable to reach an understanding because their words have lost all meaning and so communication is cut off--such a society was not the goal of God's desire for humanity. Eventually the family of man must again be united. Their reunion is the goal; a reconciled humanity, this is salvation.⁴⁵

The ultimate development of a reconciled humanity as salvation was enunciated several hundred years after both the First Isaiah and Micah in the following passage that became attributed to both prophets (Micah adds the last line):

At the end of days the mountain of the Lord's house will be established as the highest mountain and be lifted above the hills. Then nations will flow to it, many peoples will go and say: "Let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, that He may reveal His ways to us and that we may follow in His paths." For revelation will come from Zion, the Lord's word from Jerusalem. And He will arbitrate among great peoples, set aright distant populous nations. Then they will beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. And people will not raise sword against people and will learn war no more. They will sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, with none to make them afraid--
For the Lord of Hosts has spoken.

(Micah 4:1-4)

Since most scholars, like Blank, believe the above passage in Micah and a similar one (with the last line missing) in the First Isaiah were written several hundred years after these two prophets,⁴⁶ we may assume that the above passage began its formulation during the period of the Second Isaiah, two and one half centuries after the First Isaiah. During the period of the Second Isaiah, the concept of universal peace as a result of the universal acceptance of Yahweh as God, was formulated. It was not merely belief in or acceptance of Yahweh which would end human contention and strife. Rather, the prophetic voice spoke in terms of man developing his God-given potentiality "to do justice, to love righteousness, to walk humbly before your God." (Micah 6:8) In essence, it was ethics or conduct along with monotheism, a belief system, which distinguished the Judeans from their neighbors. As Samuel Sandmel states: "What made the Hebrew religion different from kindred Semitic religions was its fusion of religion and ethics."⁴⁷ Hence, through their prophets, the Judeans learned of their distinctive role as a nation of prophets who would bring Yahweh and His ethical laws to mankind. In contrast to Marx and Margolies, we see that the prophets already awakened the Judeans' awareness of their unique religious heritage.

In fact, the prophets attempted to show a continuous link with the Judeans' Hebrew/Habiru past. We have already noted Isaiah 41:8 with its reference to Abraham, who was "summoned

from the ends of the earth." In chapter 20, verse 7 of Genesis, God informs King Abimelech that Abraham is a prophet--"he is a prophet and he will intercede on your behalf." This notion of Abraham as a prophet is expanded upon by the Psalmist when he refers to the above scene in the following manner:

A small company it was; few in number,
strangers in that land, roaming from nation
to nation, from one kingdom to another; but
He let no one ill-treat them, for their sake
He admonished kings--'touch not My anointed
servants, do My prophets no harm."

(Psalm 105:12-15)

Psalm 105 is a most poetic portrayal of Hebrew transience. Importantly, it is not just their patriarchal leader but the entire small band of Hebrews "roaming from nation to nation" who God calls "My prophets." The Second Isaiah's concept of Judea as a nation of prophets has been interwoven into Genesis' one-time portrayal of Abraham as a prophet. If the Judeans will become strangers in a strange land again, they, like the prophetic portrayal of their Hebrew patriarchs, will be Yahweh's prophets and "a light to the nations."

The importance of this prophetic attempt to link the mission of Judea as a nation of prophets amidst foreign cultures with the Habiru/Hebrew past of the Judeans cannot be overestimated. At this moment, it matters little to prove the Habiru/Hebrew culture as possessing a missionary zeal to bring others into their ethical monotheistic religion. The important point remains the prophetic genius for understanding

the nature of human identity. By establishing a chain of authenticity from the Hebrews to the Judeans, the prophets not only brought the authority of the past to their call for a missionary religion. But, they ensured the continuity of ethical monotheism by giving the Judeans a well-established identity which could effectively confront calamitous Babylonian exile. In other words, it is the ability to maintain sameness and continuity in the face of change rather than the perception of uniqueness which sustains identity. To quote Erik M. Erikson:

The key problem of identity, then, is (as the term connotes) the capacity of the ego to sustain sameness and continuity in the face of changing fate. But fate always combines changes in inner conditions, which are the result of ongoing life stages, and changes in the milieu, the historical situation. Identity connotes the resiliency of maintaining essential patterns in the processes of change. Thus, strange as it may seem, it takes a well established identity to tolerate radical change, for the well established identity has arranged itself around basic values which cultures have in common. . . . We may think here of the 'primitive' and isolated Yeminites' adherence to The Book as a link over the centuries with the modern world of literacy.⁴⁸

And we may think here of those Judean exiles' belief in the prophetic assertion that their Hebrew ancestry overcame similar obstacles which allowed them to transfer similar determination to their present plight. In essence, the Babylonian Jew stated, "I can identify and maintain my religion as a Judean in Babylonia just as Abraham was an alien in Haran, as Moses was a stranger in Egypt and as those clans from the

Judean hill country have maintained their religion in Egypt since Solomon's time. Being a stranger in a strange land is common to my experience as a Judean. Like my ancestors, I will perpetuate my religion and culture as I roam from kingdom to kingdom."

Of course, the prophetic notion of the Judeans as the bearers of ethical monotheism bolstered many Judeans in realizing the need to retain their identity. But, identity cannot merely be based on distinctiveness or purposefulness. Identity requires some link to the past. It was a brilliant stroke of genius when the prophets linked the prophetic mission of the Judeans to the Hebrew/Habiru past.

We seem to be reiterating our former thesis of Judean survival and Israelite disappearance based upon the Hebrew experience of the former and the lack of one for the latter. We have returned to this former theme due to the novelty of our explanation for Judea's survival. Other scholars, like Marx and Margolies, speak of the rehabilitation of the Mosaic Torah; the Sabbath and other rites were the "signs" by which they knew each other. Still others, like Blank, Sandmel and Bright emphasize the prophetic hope of ultimate triumph of Yahweh's future redemption of Judea.⁴⁹ Yet, scholars like Bright admit that "When one considers the magnitude of the calamity that overtook her, one marvels that Israel was not sucked down into the vortex of history along with the other little nations of western Asia, to lose forever her identity as a people."⁵⁰ Bright also states, "A new community did,

in fact, begin to emerge though the details are wholly obscure." Besides being in an informational vacuum, these scholars do not bring any sociological understanding to the problem of identity. Thus, our thesis of a collective Judean retention of their Hebrew/Habiru experience cannot be overestimated in explaining the Judeans' maintenance of their identity during Babylonian captivity.

We are now ready to examine the only appearance of the term Hebrew in the prophetic books--Jonah 1:9. When the frightened sailors ask Jonah, "Where do you come from, and what is your country, and of what people are you?"; Jonah responds, "I am a Hebrew." As indicated previously, scholars, like Gray and Lewy maintain that the Septuagint rather than the Masoretic text provides Jonah's original answer of "I am a servant of the Lord."

According to this interpretation, "eved yod-heh-vov-heh" became abbreviated to "eved yod" which had the misreading of the "daled" to a "rash" thereby rendering "ivri." This is most plausible. But why is it necessary to accept the Septuagint over the Masoretic text? Is the term "ivri" inapplicable to Jonah? Even if the term "ivri" resulted from a misreading and miscopying, is it not still significant that "ivri" only appears in the prophetic book of Jonah.

In Understanding the Prophets, Sheldon Blank states:

The Book of Jonah is a metaphor, a comparison, and Jonah is, like the suffering servant, a kind of personification. He is Israel through the eyes of the author of the book of Jonah.

And the author of the Book of Jonah saw his people in that light because he was a spiritual descendant of the Second Isaiah and he was not pleased with his people's apparent failure to carry through its destined task. He invented the character of Jonah to serve as a characterization, or perhaps as a caricature of Israel, a prophet people assigned a prophetic role and loafing on the job. (page 134)

Hence, it is most appropriate and significant that Jonah, the missionary wandering prophet, is called a Hebrew. Rather than read out the phrase "I am a Hebrew," we should understand the subtle implications.

As previously indicated, the sociological genius of the prophets to link an ethical missionary monotheism to the Hebrews gave the sameness and continuity necessary for a well-established Judean identity to confront the great upheaval of national destruction and exile. Yet, as scholars, we should be wary of attributing genius to the prophets. Indeed, Freud, questioning the origin of monotheism states:

The question of the origin of monotheism among the Jews would thus remain unanswered or else one would have to be content with the current answer that it was the expression of their particular religious genius. We know that genius is incomprehensible and unaccountable and it should therefore not be called upon as an explanation until every other solution has failed.⁵¹

Hence, let us search for other solutions than the genius of the prophets as the primary cause for their association of an ethical missionary monotheism with the Hebrews. Perhaps, the Hebrews actually precipitated ethical monotheism.

The great enigma enveloping the origin of the religion of Israel and its ethical monotheism has never been answered by

scholars. If we accept the Hebrews as coming from the Habiru, we can perceive the embryonic development of the Judean prophetic voice, which summoned men to acknowledge Yahweh as the universal deity who demands men to be just in their relationships with their fellowmen.

In studying ancient Near East texts, we learn that the Habiru invoked their own gods in treaties with the dominant culture.⁵² For example, the gods of the Habiru were invoked for over a century and a half.⁵³ Hence, the Habiru maintained their own gods rather than adopting the gods of their host country.

Although the Habiru possessed fixed places of abode and were not nomads, they were a mobile group throughout the Near East. As the Habiru were mobile, so were their gods. From gods that are portable, it is merely another step to the idea that these gods are universal. If the gods control one's fate in Haran, Goshen, and Syria, they cannot be perceived as local deities with limited terrestrial powers.

Actually, our references to "the gods of the Habiru" come from non-Habiru texts. All of the host cultures to the Habiru believed in polytheism. When the Habiru or non-Habiru scribe wrote up the terms of the treaty, it was only natural for this scribe to write according to the polytheistic thought patterns of the dominant or host culture. Since the term "gods of the Habiru" emanates from a writer who is writing for an audience with a polytheistic mind set, we may only deduce

the dominant culture's perception of the Habiru religion. Ultimately then, we lack any explicit data which reveals the Habiru perception of their own religion.

However, implicitly within our texts we can perceive the organizational structure of the Habiru. The Semitic scholar, Thorkild Jacobsen, has clearly shown a direct relationship between the structure of a society and its god concept. "In blunt fact" says Jacobsen, "the gods came to be part of society."⁵⁴ In ancient Mesopotamia, according to Jacobsen, the differentiated, stratified, and complex society was refracted in a pantheon resembling the ruling caste of the landed aristocracy. An examination of the Habiru society would indicate what human authority modeled itself for the familiar image of the Habiru numinous or "Wholly Other."

Although our texts only have one reference to the "chief of the Habiru,"⁵⁵ we must assume that these diverse ethnic groups, which possessed a common sense of alienation to the greater society, evolved an internal organization. On the other hand, one could argue that "anti-Habiruness" created group solidarity. The stigma of murderers and invaders was attached to the term Habiru.⁵⁶ Indeed, in at least three texts, the Habiru are charged with rebelliousness and disloyalty.⁵⁷ Another text compares the Habiru to a dog. A continuous theme in all Near Eastern texts is that the Habiru were a group to be feared. Survival, in the midst of this hostility from the dominant culture necessitated, according to this argument,

a natural group solidarity without any need for a well-defined internal organization.

Yet, one reason that the Habiru were objects of fear and danger was their power and ability to welcome political refugees.⁵⁸ In one case, Inri-mi, a usurper of the Alalah throne in Canaan, remains a political refuge of the Habiru for a seven-year period before he gains possession of his father's kingdom.⁵⁹ In another text, a Hittite king's emphatic articulation of his intention to extradite any refugees who sought assylum among the Habiru who lived within his realm indicates this fear of the Habiru as a source of refuge for the discontented elements within a monarch's realm.

The fact that Idri-mi used Habiru warriors in his rebellion reveals Habiru military support for those who took refuge with them. Furthermore, since the Hittite king refrained from forbidding the Habiru to grant political assylum, we must assume that the Habiru were too strong to be controlled by such a dictum. Indeed, the very definition of Habiru was a group of political, economic or territorial aliens who banded together to share a common destiny. To forbid the Habiru to welcome and accept refugees would be tantamount to outlawing the condition of Habiruness or Alieness within one's sovereignty. Why did the kings not forbid these feared Habiru to dwell in their realms must be asked. Although the Habiru possessed potential danger to one's throne in that they might side with an internal or external enemy, the kings ironically retained the Habiru

for economic stability. In other words, the Habiru fulfilled a necessary role in the extremely stratified societies within the fertile crescent. The Habiru filled the vacuum between the free citizens and the slaves as indentured servants, shepherds, scribes, messengers, soldiers, vineyard or quarry workers and in general whatever occupations the native population either lacked the skill or the adaptability thereof.

The question also must be asked, why the kings were not able to bribe the Habiru to turn over those political refugees which the kings feared as pretenders to the throne? The Habiru were noted for fluctuating their support between powers. Sometimes they would support the dominant culture and other times, they would fight with the internal or external enemy. Being totally unpredictable, they cannot simply be equated with the enemy.⁶⁰ Yet, not one text from the Near East records the attempt or event of a king ransoming his political adversary from the Habiru camp. We have texts referring to rich Habiru ransoming themselves from imprisonment by the opposing army.⁶¹ But, no text reveals that the "notoriously unstable allegiance of the Habiru" ever swerved away from those who came to them as refugees from the dominant culture. Evidently, the Habiru possessed a code of honor similar to Leviticus 19:34:

The stranger that dwells with you shall be considered by you as a native in your midst and you shall love him as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt. I am the Lord.

If the established power structure could not bribe all the Habiru to turn over the fugitive, why were they also

unsuccessful with individual Habiru? After all, a great proportion of Habiru sold themselves into indentureship and even slavery in order to survive.⁶² Some Habiru individuals must have reasoned that it was better to sell a refugee rather than oneself into slavery. Yet, the passage in Leviticus 25:48 commanding the redemption of one's brethren in slavery indicates the opposite emphasis. Not only can I not enslave my brethren, but I must attempt to redeem him from his foreign masters. Such group loyalty demands an absolute authority who will punish those deviants that otherwise in a period of anarchy would gravitate toward selling their brethren and fellow fugitives into slavery as occurred in the anarchic or acephalous periods in Joseph's and Moses' adolescent experience among their fellow Hebrews.

Our only reference to any Habiru authority remains "the chief of the Habiru." Yet, emphasis must be placed on the absence of a referent to the elders or leaders of the Habiru as the authority figures. A singular and absolute authority figure is most consonant with the non-stratified social structure that the Habiru, a basically one-class society, possessed. A few Habiru rose to positions of prominence within the dominant culture but the majority remained in an intermediate economic level. It is most likely that the Habiru were led by a chief vested with absolute authority for only such power could maintain group loyalty within a heterogeneous ethnic group amidst a hostile environment. Just as the chief was singularly absolute

in his earthly power over the group, so too was the deity of the Habiru a portable (or even universal) absolute deity who demanded justice and righteousness between the Habiru, a people united by a shared destiny and a need for respect and cooperation rather than an ethnic, cultural, or national identity. Since we have established the Hebrews as elements coming from the Habiru, Abraham, as a chief of his Habiru group, becomes a possible paradigm for the Habiru in general. In this context, Ellis Rivkin, who inherently accepts Jacobsen's principle that the cultural environment is refracted in that society's god concept, creates the following analogy of Abraham:

Abraham is portrayed as a patriarch exercising absolute authority and demanding undeviating loyalty from his followers. This patriarchal structure underwrote the power of a single, absolute, patriarchal God.⁶³

The phenomenon is not that the Habiru possessed an embryonic belief in one absolute deity but that the Hebrews, Israelites and then Judeans, were able to extend this concept of one deity in order to be relevant to their more complex society and experience. Rivkin's perceptiveness in formulating his unity theory of the belief in "one and omnipotent God, which changed as changing historical circumstances confronted the Jews with new problems,"⁶⁴ indicates a total awareness of this dichotomy. Whereas a complex society led to a pantheon in Mesopotamia, the same economic environment in Israel and Judea became subsumed under the organizer, systematizer, and processor of diversity--the belief in one, omnipotent God. The resiliency

of Rivkin's unity concept to incorporate radical change remains the true area of human study rather than the origins of the belief in one, omnipotent God.

It is important to note that the prophets always intone against the syncretistic (combining of religions) tendencies of the Israelites and Judeans. As Solomon builds a vast and complex empire, he attempts, much to the consternation of the Yahwehists, to compliment his diversified economy with a polytheistic Jerusalem. (1 Kings 11:4-12) Interestingly, the literary prophets speak for a universal monotheism during the era of the rise of empire hegemony over the civilized world. Just as one empire, either Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, or Roman, attained hegemony over the civilized world, so too does God, a singular absolute power, have control over that historical event. With such an approach to the numinous or Wholly Other, the prophets sought confirmation in their belief from the historical precedent of the recorded Hebrew experience. Like Abraham, they worshipped one absolute deity. Like Abraham, who redeemed Lot from captivity, the prophets intoned their people to do justice to their brethren. The Hebrew tradition of accepting one's neighbor and even stranger became a proof-text for acts of righteousness and mercy. Just as the Habiru were united by a code of honor between themselves, so too did the prophets emphasize one's obligation to one's fellow man rather than any ritualistic ceremony dedicated to Yahweh. Just as the Hebrews encourage

the stranger to accept their code of honor, so must the Judeans teach all men to walk in God's paths of righteousness. Just as God redeemed the Habiru and Hebrews from their oppressors, so would God redeem the Judeans in their Babylonian captivity. Most definitely, the prophets refined and expanded upon the Hebrew/Habiru monotheistic religion. They purified and developed the monotheistic, ethical, and universal elements which were inherent within the Hebrew/Habiru religion. Yet, the basic or embryonic essentials of an ethical monotheism were present to some degree not only within the Hebrew but even within the Habiru tradition.

In all sincerity, the prophets could portray themselves as the perpetuators of the Hebrews' wilderness tradition. Finally, and most importantly, the prophets spoke of the old but simple monotheism of the wilderness for they knew that their audience, the Judeans, possessed a collective historical retention of their Hebrew past. The prophets perceived and solved the problems of identity retention during a period of forced uprootedness by creating a well-established link between the besieged Judeans about to enter exile and their Habiru/Hebrew ancestors who consistently maintained a belief in their numinous even though they were strangers in a strange land.

Perhaps, we seem to have gone on a tangent for the title of this thesis remains, "Pacifism as a Jewish Identity." Yet, we are talking of pacifism as an identity for Jews. In this context, we must ask "What is Jewish identity?" Or to put it

differently, "When, how, or why did Jews emerge as a distinct group?" As we have just shown, the embryonic identity formation of the Jews occurred during the Habiru/Hebrew wanderings of the Second millenium before the common era. In essence, then, the Habiru/Hebrews were the precursors of the Jews.

If the thesis were entitled "Pacifist Elements Within Judaism," we could merely quote sources from the Bible, Talmud and contemporary Jewish sources. But, in order to affirm a pacifist Jewish identity as being resilient enough to undergo radical change, we must demonstrate well-established patterns of thought and action which tend toward pacificism among Jews. Like the prophets of ethical monotheism, who also dreamed of a world at peace or completeness, I also will link myself to the Habiru/Hebrews as the harbingers of a pacifist Jewish identity.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. E.A. Speiser, "The Patriarchs and Their Social Backgrounds," from The World History of the Jewish People, Volume II, editor Mazar, p. 160.
2. Orlinsky, Harry, Ancient Israel, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1960, pp. 14-15.
3. Greenberg, Moshe, Hab/piru and Hebrews, from the World History of the Jewish People, op. cit., p. 188.
4. Ibid., p. 199.
5. Bright, John, A History of Israel, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1958, p. 118.
6. Ibid., p. 118.
7. Meek, Theophile, Hebrew Origins, Harper and Row, 1936, p. 25.
8. Ibid., p. 33.
9. Gray, Mary, The Habiru-Hebrew Problem, Hebrew Union College Annual, Cincinnati, 1958, p. 194.
10. A synthesis of Gray's excellent study, op.cit.
11. Lewy, Julius, Origin and Signification of Biblical Term Hebrew, Hebrew Union College Annual, Cincinnati, 1957, pp. 1-15.
12. Ibid., p. 2.
13. Ibid., p. 3.
14. Ibid., p. 4.
15. Ibid., p. 3.
16. Ibid., p. 2.
17. Gray, 178
18. Sartre, Jean Paul, Anti-Semite and Jew, Schocken Books, New York, 1965, p. 69.
19. Gray, op.cit., p. 187.
20. Ibid., p. 187.

21. Ibid., p. 181.
- 22.
23. Ibid., p. 188.
24. Greenberg, op.cit., p. 190.
25. Ibid., p. 192.
26. Lewy, p. 6.
27. Greenberg, op.cit., p. 193.
28. Ibid., p. 191.
29. Speiser, E.A., Genesis - The Anchor Bible, Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York, 1964, p. 109.
30. Greenberg, op.cit., p. 200.
31. Bright, op.cit., p. 69.
32. Meek, op.cit., pp. 29-31.
33. Kittel, Rudolf, Great Men and Movements in Israel, (New York, 1929) p. 170.
34. Meek, op.cit., pp. 42-43.
35. Ibid., p. 47.
36. Marx and Margolies, A History of the Jewish People, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1927, p. 116.
37. Lewy, op.cit., p. 2.
38. Sandmel, Samuel, The Genius of Paul, Schocken, New York, 1958, p. xiii.
39. Zeitlin, Solomon, Rise and Fall of the Judean State, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1968, p. 4.
40. Marx and Margolies, op.cit., p. 113.
41. Ibid., p. 114-115.
42. Ibid., p. 113.
43. Sandmel, Samuel, The Hebrew Scriptures, Knopf, New York, 1963, p. 82.

44. Blank, Sheldon, Understanding the Prophets, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York, 1969, p. 127.
45. Ibid., p. 120-121.
46. Ibid., p. 109.
47. Sandmel, Hebrew Scriptures, op.cit., p. 62.
48. Erikson, Erik, "Insight and Responsibility," from Identity and Uprootedness in Our Time, editor - W.W. Norton, New York, 1964, p. 95-96.
49. Bright, op.cit., p. 329.
50. Ibid., p. 328.
51. Freud, Sigmund, Moses and Monotheism, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1939, p. 101.
52. Gray, op.cit., p. 153.
53. Ibid., p. 153.
54. Jacobsen, Thorkild, Toward the Image of Tammuz, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts, 1970, p. 10.
55. Gray, p. 168.
56. Ibid., p. 168.
57. Ibid., p. 156.
58. Ibid., p. 168.
59. Ibid., p. 146-147.
60. Ibid., p. 157.
61. Ibid., p. 144.
62. Ibid., p. 151-152.
63. Rivkin, Ellis, The Shaping of Jewish History, Scribner, New York, 1971, p. 3.
64. Ibid., p. xviii.

II. BETWEEN THE BOUNDARIES

In Chapter I we introduced Erik Erikson's concept of identity as connoting the resiliency to maintain essential patterns in the process of change. With this in mind, a comparison of the Habiru with the Jews should reveal similar essential patterns if these two groups share the same identity.

First, the initial reappearance of the Judean self-portrayal as a Hebrew or alien and the embryonic development of Judaism commenced during the same epoch--from the pre-exilic to the post-exilic period. In Chapter I we established that the concept of "Hebrewness" or alieness re-emerged just prior to the Babylonian exile. During this same period, prophets, like Jeremiah who lived to witness the fulfillment of his prophecy of national destruction, initiated major changes in the Judean religion so that it became Judaism.

In commenting on Jeremiah, Professor Samuel Sandmel states that, "When men could worship Yahve outside of Palestine . . . we can see a transition from the old Hebrew religion to Judaism."¹ "Jeremiah," continues Sandmel, "insisted both that Yahve could be worshipped in Babylonia and that the Judeans would be restored to Palestine. Although the primacy of the land was shattered, the affection for it remained."² By anticipating and preparing his people for their loss of political sovereignty, Jeremiah created the spiritual environment for a truly religious response to this national calamity.

Yet, the religion of Israel was transformed into Judaism by the boiling cauldron of the historical imperative. As Bamberger states:

The power that brought Judaism to full maturity--the fire that fused its component materials into a unified whole--was national destruction and exile. It was in the ashes of the Jewish state that the Jewish religion ripened.³

Hence, Judaism truly developed only after the umbilical cord of the nation-state was severed from the Judeans. Jeremiah, like Isaiah II and Ezekiel, influenced the new directions of the Judean religion called Judaism. But, he needed the destruction and exile to have legitimacy for his innovations.

Preceding, during, and after the Babylonian exile, these prophets, who laid the cornerstones of Judaism, emphasized ethical and spiritual development rather than military prowess as the path towards national salvation. For example, Jeremiah perceived that the high officials, who were ready to plunge Judea into war, were more motivated by their desire to increase their own power than by their love for their countrymen.⁴

These are the words of the Lord: Let not the wise man boast of his wisdom nor the valiant of his valor; . . . but if any man would boast, let him boast of this, that he understands and knows Me.

(Jeremiah 9:23-24)

Jeremiah's disdain for man's false pride is reflected and refined in the following post-exilic prophecy of Zechariah:

Not by might nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.

(Zechariah 4:6)

Erich Fromm has summarized this development in the following manner:

While one cannot speak of a straight line in the evolution of prophetic thought from the earliest to the later prophets, it is nevertheless possible to say that from the first Isaiah onward, the basic vision of the messianic time is more clearly and fully expressed than before. Perhaps its most important aspect is peace. When man has overcome the split that separates him from his fellow man and from nature--then he will indeed be at peace with those from whom he was separated. . . . Peace is more than not-war; it is harmony and union between men . . . and between man and nature . . . it is the overcoming of separateness and alienation. . . . The Hebrew word for peace, shalom, which could best be translated as "completeness" points in the same direction. 5

According to Fromm, one must recognize one's alienation or separateness in order to become fully human or complete. However, one consciously experiences alienation and separateness only after one breaks the incestuous or primary ties "that bind man to his land, to his kindred, and to his father and mother. Freedom is based on the achievement of liberating oneself from the primary ties that give security, yet cripple man."⁶ Incestuous fixation does not refer to the natural and desirous love that a person feels towards family, kindred, and group. Rather "incestuous fixation is by its very nature a bond with the past and a hindrance to full development."⁷ In other words, only by breaking with the comfortable past will one feel the isolation of the present and of the unknown future. Furthermore, this alienation is a prerequisite for man's awakening consciousness to his true condition in society

and nature. Such an honest appraisal of one's separateness is necessary if a harmonious union between men and between man and nature is to occur. Thus, at-onement, completeness or shalom can only be achieved by severing the ties of blood and soil.

By sheer force of the real-politic, the Babylonian exile necessitated that the Judeans break some of their affective ties to blood and soil. One could state that Judaism developed in response to the alienation and separateness felt by both the Judeans who were exiled and those who were not. Both the Judeans in Palestine and in Babylonia lacked territorial sovereignty and an ethnically homogeneous environment. Unfriendly neighbors, like the Edomites, moved into Judean territory vacated by the repeated deportations to Babylonia. Lacking fewer incestuous ties to blood and soil than before the exile, the Judeans strove to find completeness and at-onement through their developing religion--Judaism. Hence, the underlying motivating impetus for both the development of the Habiru and Jewish religions was an attempt to overcome the acute awareness of isolation and separateness which naturally arises when one is a stranger in a strange land. The radical transformation of Judea after its destruction made its once familiar landscape "strange" or "alien" even to those Judeans who were not taken into captivity.

We have spoken of Jeremiah as an initiator of Judaism. We have also stated that Judaism's distinguishing characteristics

evolved from a lessening of the incestuous ties that drew Judah to its blood and soil. The synthesis of these concepts is presented in the following eloquent statement by

Dr. Bamberger:

The roots of all religion are in the experience of a social group-clan, tribe, nation. In Jeremiah we see for the first time its loveliest flower--the discovery of God within the soul of the individual.⁹

Hence, Judaism conceived of at-onement, or completeness not only in terms of the nation, tribe or clan but also in terms of the individual. With a de-emphasis of blood and soil, Judaism freed the individual from incestuous ties which, thereby, improved the chances for effectuating the full humanity of the individual. As Erich Fromm has stated in Beyond the Chains of Illusion:

When I experience myself fully, then I recognize that I am the same as any other human being, that I am the child, the sinner, the saint, the one who hopes and the one who despairs, the one who can feel joy and the one who can feel sadness. . . . I discover that I am everybody, and that I discover myself in discovering my fellow man, and vice versa. In this experience I discover what humanity is, I discover the One Man.¹⁰

The Hebrew prophets' messianic hopes, which were quoted in Chapter I, reflect a universalism which was predicated upon a prophetic vision of man as being one. Actually, one may argue that the prophets saw man as both being one and becoming one. Man as becoming one is perhaps expressed by Zechariah's prophecy that:

In those days, when ten men from nations of every language pluck up courage, they shall pluck the robe of a Jew and say, "We will go with you because we have heard that God is with you."

(Zechariah 8:23)

In Micah and Isaiah the idea of all men coming to learn the ways of God's righteousness also indicates a universal religion. This prophetic essence is reflected in Reform Judaism's Concluding Service for Yom Kippur--"the Shabat of Shabats" or the ultimate day of peace. At the hour when all Jews are feverishly attempting to achieve at-onement or completeness with God, Reform Jews speak of the time:

When joy will thrill all hearts, and from one end of the earth to the other will echo the gladsome cry: Hear, O Israel, hear all mankind: the Lord our God, the Lord is One! Then thy house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples, and all nations shall flow unto it. And in triumphant joy shall they cry out: Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, that the King of glory may come in. Who is the King of glory? The Lord of hosts, He is the King of glory.
(Union Prayer, Book II,
p. 345-346)

Although the acknowledgement of Israel's God as the One God may appear to lead towards one religion; thought concepts, customs and traditions among peoples may still differ within prophetic universalism. Rather than saying all humanity must become identical, the prophets say that all humanity already bears the likeness of One God. Indeed, to the prophets, all humanity, even within its ethnic tribalistic diversity, already appears as One. As Amos puts it:

Are you not like the Ethiopians to me, O people of Israel, says the Lord. Did I not bring up Israel from the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir?

(Amos 9:7)

The prophets are not saying that the nations must cease. Rather, they speak of an end to the illusory distinctions that one nation constructs against its neighboring states. In the following passage, Isaiah clearly states that God is not on one specific nation's side but equally loves all nations.

In that day there will be a highway from Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian will come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria, and the Egyptian will worship with the Assyrians. In that day Israel will be the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, whom the Lord of hosts has blessed, saying, 'Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my heritage.'

(Isaiah 19:23-25)

The phrase, "the Egyptian will worship with the Assyrians" again seems to connote one world religion. I believe, however, that it refers to the world-wide acknowledgement, through worship or reverence, of One God. As the Reform Prayer Book states:

. . . the truth of Israel's message: One humanity on earth even as there is but one God in heaven.
(U.P.B. II, p. 345)

In other words, by recognizing God as one and omnipotent, we recognize the similar divinity in our fellow human beings even amidst our differing thought patterns, customs, and physical differences. When all men come to worship and learn the ways of God, they are affirming that holiness in man transcends

creed, race, or even religion. We are all holy for we are all creations of the one, omnipotent, and holy God. We all may be different but we all have the divine spark. To the prophets, the universal age of peace and brotherhood will arise when all men perceptively acknowledge the unifying factor of our diversity--God. Ironically, only by accepting God's unity will one be able to perceive diversity among men as non-divisive and thereby non-challenging to one's own ego.

By discovering God in the soul of the individual, the prophets, like Jeremiah, linked the concept of a universal God with the concept of the universal potential for man's goodness. It was not enough to maintain God's omnipresence. The prophets also had to recognize mankind's innate divinity in order to discern the historical possibility of world-wide brotherhood and peace. The prophets actualized their humanity so that they transcended the illusory differences among individuals. The prophets discovered the One Man.

Judea's ability to discover the One Man may be clearly attributed to the breaking of the incestuous ties to blood and soil which forcibly occurred after the Babylonian exile. Yet many universalist prophets already prophesied before the exile. There is no doubt that Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, and Jeremiah were extremely sensitive men who were able to project and identify with those of differing social class and nationality. However, as we indicated in Chapter I, these prophets also possessed a well-established pattern of perceiving the One Man.

In the second millenium, the Habiru had already demonstrated their understanding of the One Man.

Although the Habiru religion probably did not visualize God within the soul of the individual, the Habiru culture already demonstrated its capacity for human unity amidst ethnic, racial, and cultural diversity. The only factor unifying the heterogeneous Habiru was the lack or absence of blood and soil. All Habiru were united in their necessity to sever affective ties with blood and soil. The Habiru became strangers in strange lands due to economic necessity. They resided in places which offered them greater economic security than their ancestral homes. Without a city-state or homeland, the Habiru were strangers. In essence, all those peoples of the second millinium, who were uprooted due to the increasing scarcity of land in the more settled areas, became Habiru. Being trans-national, and strangers in strange lands, the Habiru had overcome their fear of other strangers. Indeed, as already emphasized, the fundamental ethical principle of the Habiru was their receptiveness towards the stranger.

A reflection of this Habiru ethic is the Leviticus commandment that "the stranger that dwells with you shall be unto you as the native unto you and you shall love him as yourself. (Leviticus 19:34)" To love the stranger as oneself is the elemental but primary step towards discovering the One Man. In discussing why most individuals cannot experience themselves fully and thereby discover the One Man, Erich Fromm suggests

the following stumbling block:

Man's life begins in the womb. Even after birth he is still part of mother, just as primitive man was part of nature. He becomes increasingly aware of himself as separate from others, yet he is deeply drawn to the security and safety of his past. He is afraid of emerging fully as an individual. Mother, the tribe, the family--they are all "familiar." The stranger, the one who is not familiar through the bonds of blood, customs, food, language, is suspected as being dangerous.

This attitude toward the "stranger" is inseparable from the attitude toward oneself. As long as any fellow being is experienced as fundamentally different from myself, as long as he remains a stranger, I remain a stranger to myself.¹¹

Hence, as a stranger to oneself, the individual is unable to discover the full self and thereby recognize the sameness of humanity. As strangers in strange lands, the Habiru completely recognized as individuals their own alienness or separateness in society. Recognizing their own "strangeness," the ethnically heterogeneous Habiru could unite for they saw beyond bonds of blood, customs, food, and language. It was not that bonds of blood, custom, food, and language were not important to the Habiru. Rather, the Habiru never viewed the differences in these outward manifestations of ethnic expression as "dangerous." The stranger always found refuge in the Habiru camp. Thus, the Habiru possessed an embryonic understanding of the One Man. Prophetic universalism of the first millenium may and most likely should be viewed as a logical extension of Judah's collective historical retention of a Habiru ancestry

who loved the strangers as themselves. Indeed, only a Habiru outlook could have evolved Micah's concept of a messianic time when "all the peoples walk each in the name of its god. (Micah 4:5)" Since the Habiru culture clearly demonstrated an ability to perceive unity in diversity, the name of God or a theological framework did not have to be viewed as stumbling blocks to the prophet Micah's vision of a single universal God who was perceived in varying ways by different cultures.

For one and a half chapters, I have attempted to establish a link between the highest ethical and moral ideals of Judaism-- pacifism and the collective Judean retention of a Habiru ancestry. Yet, we as Jews who live in the Diaspora, may identify with the Habiru not only for the possibly hypothetical similarities of our belief systems but more importantly, we and the Habiru have and will share similar cultural roles as strangers in strange lands. In order to compare the societal role of the Habiru and the Jew, let us first examine the Jewish societal position since Chapter I already provides an almost complete composite of the Habiru role. My source for the Jewish position in society is based upon an address presented by Rabbi Robert J. Marx in the chapel of Hebrew Union College on November 2, 1969. Since Rabbi Marx's thesis is not in print, I will quote extensively from it for I truly believe his far-reaching message should be heard by as many as possible. Here then is Rabbi Marx's message:

The Jewish Community must turn aside and understand the role, the particular function that it

is playing in our society. By constructing that role in terms of scapegoatism and anti-Semitism, the Jewish Community has missed some of the major facets of the role that has been thrust upon it. The Jewish community, in my estimation, plays an interstitial role, a role between the parts.

To be between the parts may be negative but it also may be positive. It may be destructive but it may be creative. The Jewish community is often entrapped between the parts. But at moments it soars from its entrapment and becomes free and prophetic.

The paradigm for our model is the Jewish community in Poland during the eighteenth century. Here, as Simon Dubnow has so beautifully described, the Jewish community was neither part of the masses nor of the power structure. It was caught between pan and peasant, between Greek Orthodox, Russian Orthodox, and between wealthy and poor.

The Jewish community was prohibited from participating in many of the normal functions of Polish society in the eighteenth century. . . . They were excluded from key areas of Polish economic and social life. And excluded from occupations of the peasants. Instead opportunities were opened to the Jewish citizens of eighteenth and nineteenth century Poland to practice two professions: 1) collecting of taxes; 2) selling of liquor.

These positions Jews were encouraged to occupy by the Polish landlords and counts. Thus, when the Polish peasantry in its anger and frustration seeks to turn against their Polish masters. . . . They do not turn against the Power Structure of eighteenth century Poland. Rather, they turn against the very visible minority--the Jewish community. And the pogroms of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century were the consequences of this pattern of social identification.

I am not for a moment suggesting that all or even a sizeable number of Jews sold liquor or collected taxes. What I am suggesting is that there was a visible enough minority placed in key positions so that when problems in Russian and Polish society became insoluble, that society, as a very useful mechanism, was able to use the Jewish middleman as a way out of the frustrating dilemma in which

it was trapped--in which it was doomed. Nor am I suggesting that this pattern was done without the conscious participation of the Jewish community. Here was a case as we shall see in Jewish life in United States in what sociologist York Zimmel has called "territus gaudums"--the third party rejoiced. The middle man was making money. He was profiting from the process. So devastating can this process be that we shudder when we recall that during the Chmielnicki massacres in 1648, Jews willingly entered Chmielnicki's service in order to act as his tax collectors and accountants at the very time Chmielnicki was massacring their Jewish brothers up and down the Russian countryside. Is this pattern--is this paradigm unique to Russian and Polish life?

I suggest that it is present in the United States as well as it is present in ways that are shocking and terrifying . . . and am suggesting it is present in the United States in ways in which up till now we have closed our eyes.

The Jewish community of United States is not part of the Power Structure of the United States. Nor part of the masses. Jews are neither farmers nor factory workers on one hand nor certainly are they holders of great power. We are wealthy as a community and wealth is not to be confused with power. The Jewish community occupies a position of wealth and social status to a certain extent in the United States but its exclusion from the centers of power is significant and must be fully documented.

[N.B. Marx fully documents the fact that Jews are virtually absent from all key leadership, decision-making roles within all major banking, financial, industrial and utility corporations in the United States. Hence, Jews are never placed in those positions which make all the key decisions that affect our cities or nation as a whole and our national policy.]

Where Jews are present is in the rapid growth industry. Jews found in industries which are expanding rapidly. And very often the Jewish role is to lead those industries into meteoric success and then to sell out their position for membership on the Board of Trustees. A membership which may last a decade or less and certainly disappears when the

man who sits on the board dies. It is not passed on to his children or other members of his family.

Jews are absent from power structure in United States. And yet they are placed in key and sensitive roles while they are seen as the middle people vitally affecting the social and dynamic processes that occur in our country.

There is an institutional process in the United States which sees the Jewish community as the soft under belly into which social conflict is to be focused. And that's the meaning of the Time magazine cover last spring where the conflict in New York City was that of the school teachers. And Time magazine at that time had a board of Wasp trustees. It pictured the confrontation in New York as not between black and white but between black and Jewish. There were Jewish faces seated at one side of the table and they looked black and there were black faces on the other side of the table and they looked Jewish. And they were yelling at one another. And the only thing that the all Wasp board of Time magazine did not show were the puppet strings leading up to that board of trustees picturing the confrontation of our times as a Jewish-Black confrontation rather than as a confrontation related to the larger issues of our society.

And what is the Jewish role in all this? Territius Gaudus--"the third party often rejoices". . . . The Jewish community of the United States has been invited into the same type of positions that characterized a small but visible minority in Russia and Poland. And thus we have the exploitive contract sales problem. . . . A small group of Jewish businessmen, taking advantage of a very poor dastardly social condition in which banks were unwilling to lend money to black people moving into a previously white neighborhood, were able to exploit at least \$75 million from one small section of a major city. And thus when urban renewal takes homes and decides that they are more valuable for businesses and commercial enterprises of the large power structures; black people were moved in on the Jewish community. Thus, leaving a small number of unscrupulous businessmen who took advantage of the social injustices and made themselves large sums of money.

Why so important? What happens is that whether it is the teachers of New York City or the contract

sellers of Chicago or the used car salesman of another city; if you are able to conceptualize in the public mind the role of the Jews in these exploitative capacities then the Jewish community suffers and will suffer. This was exactly what Hitler was able to do.

The response of Jews is to say "Well, why aren't Jews allowed to have their own criminals too?" That is true and carries good logic. But, the truth of the matter is that the interstitial role is uniquely characteristic of the Jewish community and not of any other community. And that is why Hitler was successful.

What I am saying is that Jews have to be concerned with exploitation in their own midst and look deeply at the processes which are at work to protect this process and that are rejoicing. And at the same time attacking the larger power structures from which the Jewish community is excluded.

There is a unique function and role for the Jewish community which has been fashioned for us, imposed upon us and used by us. . . .

Our country needs an interstitial people not to be caught unknowingly between the parts but to be actively between the parts:

- To question the role of large corporations as they pollute our atmosphere.
- To deal with power.
- To raise the moral questions.
- To question government and business.

These are the tasks of an interstitial people. These are the prophetic tasks of a Jewish community that can and will be done.

[Marx describes statue commemorating holocaust in Italy. The statue is of an old grandfather, father and son. They are grouped together as they face the firing squad of the mass executioners. The father has his hands on his young son's eyes so he won't see what is about to happen to him.]

I say it is about time we took away the hands on our children's eyes so that they can see the tasks that lie before them. So that they can see the light of hope, the light of faith, and the light of peace. Or, and this is a terrible afterthought, will what they see be the guns that are about to shoot them dead.¹²

By re-examining the societal position of the Habiru, we can see that well-established paradigm for the interstitial role of the Jew existed as early as the second millenium. The Habiru were neither nobles or slaves. They generally constituted that middle group between the free and non-free citizen. As indicated in Chapter I, the Habiru most often found employment as indentured servants. However, frequently they were caught between the parts as mercenaries. The natural enmity against the Habiru as mercenaries was expressed by the local populace. Just as the cossack hung a Jew and a dog together with the epitaph, "Yid and hound--all to the same faith bound," in the Chmielnicki massacre of 1768;¹³ so also the dominant populations of Mesopotamia compared the Habiru to a dog in the second millenium.

Occasionally, a few Habiru would rise to crucial or key positions as scribes or administrators where they were seen as the middle people vitally affecting the social and dynamic processes that occurred in those societies. Gray, Lewy, Greenberg or any other Habiru scholar has uncovered any evidence whether the Habiru suffered at the hands of the populace for the actions of their brethren who served the local power

structure. Although contemporary scholars provide no insight on the fate of these precursors of the Polish-Jewish tax collector, our Torah provides an ancient paradigm in the narrative of the Hebrew Joseph.

After correctly interpreting Pharaoh's dream, Pharaoh made Joseph ruler over all Egypt and said to him, "I am the Pharaoh. Without your consent no man shall lift hand or foot throughout Egypt." (Genesis 41:42-43) During the seven years of plenty, there was so much grain that Joseph stopped measuring the grain collected for "it was beyond measure." (Genesis 41:49) "When the famine spread through all Egypt, the people appealed to Pharaoh for bread, and he ordered them to go to Joseph and do as he told them." (Genesis 41:56) After the third year of the seven year famine, the people had exchanged all their silver and herds for the bread in Pharaoh's granaries. As a result, the Egyptian masses only possessed their parched lands and emaciated bodies as they confronted the fourth year of the famine. "So Joseph bought all the land in Egypt for Pharaoh, because the Egyptians sold all their fields, so severe was the famine; the land became Pharaoh's. As for the people, Pharaoh set them to work as slaves from one end of the territory of Egypt to the other." (Genesis 47:20-21) As for Joseph and his brethren, the third party rejoices, for: "Pharaoh said to Joseph, 'So your father and your brothers have come to you. The land of Egypt is yours; settle them in the best part of it. Let them live in Goshen, and if you know of any capable men among

them, make them chief herdsmen over my cattle.' " (Genesis 47:5-6)

So Joseph and his brethren prospered in an exploitative system which increased the power of Pharaoh and the Priesthood. The Hebrews were wealthy in Goshen. But the real power structure of Egypt consisted of the Pharaoh and Priesthood.

So "when there arose a new Pharaoh over Egypt who knew not Joseph" (Exodus 1:8), Joseph's membership on the "Egyptian Board of Directors" was not passed on to his family. As Robert Marx has pointed out for the United States of the twentieth century, the meteoric success of a Hebrew in Egypt over four thousand years ago was also only rewarded in his lifetime. Hence, Joseph's death signaled the demise of preferred status for his Hebrew brethren in Goshen. Soon the Hebrews were portrayed in the public's mind as fifth columnists who, like all Hebrew mercenaries would join the enemy and, thus, the Hebrews became enslaved to Pharaoh. Perhaps, the new Pharaoh, like the Polish princes, discovered the expediency of utilizing these Hebrews, who had helped increase his power, as a diversion for the masses' pent-up frustrations arising from their own overly oppressed conditions. Although Joseph had saved the masses from starvation, they only remembered the Pharaoh of Genesis who had sent them to Joseph for grain with the order of: "do as he tells you." And Joseph had sold the people into bondage. Like those who read Time magazine, the Egyptian masses were unable to perceive the puppet strings that led from Joseph

up to the Pharaoh and Priesthood.

The Hebrews were not part of the Egyptian power structure. Yet, they were placed in key and sensitive roles where they were seen as the middle people vitally affecting the social and dynamic processes that occurred in Egypt. The institutional process in Egypt saw the Hebrew community as the soft under belly into which social conflict was to be focused. This analytic paragraph was duplicated word for word from Robert Marx's address with Egypt and Hebrew substituted for the United States and Jew. Sadly, we must recognize that the paradigm for the interstitial Jew caught between the parts goes further back than Poland of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The interstitial role dates at least to Joseph in Egypt--a third party who rejoiced.

To those who may argue that we have cleverly manipulated the words of the Torah or to those who may argue that Robert Marx's analysis is totally dependent on only two Jewish epochs, let us cite a different chapter in our people's history with other historians' evaluation. In the fourteenth century, the Black Death, a terrible epidemic, killed over one-third of Europe's population. It was charged that the Jews poisoned Christian wells. The Jews who, because of their abstemious habits of life and their natural segregation, suffered less from the plague. However, the historians, Marx and Margolies, do not view these rumors of Jews poisoning wells as the central cause of the mass murder of Jews. It is true that these rumors

aroused the hatred of the commoners. However, the commoners would not have slaughtered the Jews without the tacit agreement of the ruling classes, for Pope Clement VI sternly spoke out against this libel against the Jews. As Marx and Margolies put it:

What took place was in truth a social revolution. The Jews, by their loans to the lower nobility, enabled these to resist successfully the efforts of the cities to gain supremacy. In the cities proper, the Jews sided with the patrician class in its struggle against the guilds. Thus, the guilds became the bitter enemies of the Jews and, where they succeeded in getting control of the government as in Strassburg, they destroyed the Jewish community. Yet, the result was not quite as desired, since nobility and patricians, once rid of their debts, became only the stronger. This much was accomplished, that every one enriched himself at the expense of the hapless victims.¹⁴

Too many times, the Jew has been entrapped between the parts. But at moments, it, as Robert Marx phrases it, soars from its entrapment and becomes free and prophetic. Indeed, the first major prophet, Amos, censured the merchants for profiteering in words which seem not only applicable to the businessmen of Israel but, also the great grain seller--Joseph:

Hear this, O you that would swallow the needy,
And destroy the poor of the land,
Saying: "When will the new moon be gone,
that we may sell grain?
And the Sabbath, that we may set forth corn?
Making the ephah small and the shekel great,
And falsifying the balances of deceit;
That we may buy the poor for silver,
And the needy for a pair of shoes,
And sell the refuse of the corn.
The Lord hath sworn by your pride Jacob:
Surely I will never forget any of their works.
(Amos 8:4-7)

Amos, like all the prophets, viewed unfair business practices as a major stumbling block towards the attainment of his conceptualization of the Messianic era of peace. In other words, peace to the prophets did not merely mean the situation of no-war. Peace, to the prophets, connoted man's harmonious relationships to his fellowman which necessitated a termination of all exploitative situations. The basis of this messianic view is summarized in the following statements by Erich Fromm:

It must be added that God acts in history and reveals himself in history. This idea has two consequences: one, that belief in God implies a concern with history and, using the word in its widest sense, a political concern. . . . It means, furthermore, that the criteria for judging historical events are spiritual-religious ones: justice and love. According to these criteria nations are judged, as are individuals, by their actions. . . .¹⁵ Because God is revealed in history, the prophet cannot help being a political leader; as long as man takes the wrong way in his political action, the prophet cannot help being a dissenter and a revolutionary. . . .¹⁶ To put it differently: history has its own laws, and God does not interfere with them. They are at the same time God's laws. Man, in understanding the laws of history, understands God. Political action is religious action. The spiritual leader is a political leader. . . .¹⁷ The orphan, the widow, the poor, and the stranger are those members of society who have no power. The prophetic demand for justice is in their behalf, and the prophetic protest is directed against the rich and powerful--both kings and priests.¹⁸

The prophets soared above Judah's entrapment between Assyria and Egypt and between wealth and power. Their message has not been followed due to an inability either to comprehend or to hear. It is time that we comprehend and hear the simple but true message of the prophets. God or the forces of history

demand an ethical sense of justice. A group or nation that lacks compassion for the poor and oppressed will suffer at the hands of the historical force operating in our universe.

Too often, we Jews have aided the powerful and rich in their avaricious quest for more power and wealth. When these self-seeking idolators (for they worship their own power) saw the oppressed beginning to crumble, they immediately sacrificed the Jews on the alter of expediency. It is time to remember Perke Avot which states: "Crave not after the table of kings."

We must remember that we are an interstitial people. As an interstice we are but a small or narrow space between the larger components of our society. We stand between the oppressors and oppressed. We can use our wealth, creativity and dynamism to further entrench the rulers' oppressive hold upon the masses. Ultimately, such a course of action, which has been our cyclical pattern up till now, will lead to destruction.

Or we can discern the wisdom of our prophetic heritage and do justice, love righteousness, and walk humbly before our God (Micah 6:8). Joseph's only viable alternative in Egypt was to utilize his God-given wisdom and intelligence to correct an unjust system which imprisoned and killed his cellmate, the baker, who lived by bread alone. We, also, only have one viable alternative and that is to accept the admonition of the Psalmist and our Rabbis.

In Psalm 34:15, it states, "Seek peace and pursue it." Our Rabbis commented on Psalm 34 in the following manner:

It is written, "Seek peace and pursue it."
 (Psalm 34:15) The law does not command you
 to run after or pursue other commandments, but
 only to fulfill them upon the appropriate
 occasion. But peace you must seek in your own
 place and pursue it even to another place as
 well.

(Numbers Rabbah, Hukkat 19;27)

It is not enough for us to be peaceable and non-violent human beings. We must devote our energies towards the uplifting of all our fellow human beings so that they too can afford the middle class luxury of pacifism. As our Rabbis said, "When the barley is gone from the pitcher, strife comes knocking at the door." (Baba Metzia 59a) When men watch their children going to bed hungry, we cannot urge restraint on their part as their children die and the United States pays farmers not to grow food. Our pursuit of peace must involve our efforts to end human deprivation and degradation. To those who speak of balances in trade or the value of the dollar, we must speak of the illegitimacy of a system which possesses the wealth, technology and manpower to provide world-wide abundance now but refuses to alter the status quo.

To those who urge revolution, we must speak to them of the lessons of our Torah, the historic collective experience of our people. In speaking of force as reflected in the Torah, Erich Fromm makes the following astute observations:

Force never convinced Pharaoh, and it never convinced the Hebrews, who regress to fear of freedom and to idol worship whenever they encounter difficulties or when the charismatic figure of the leader is not present. . . .¹⁹ History vindicated those who spoke the truth, not those who held power.²⁰

All the force and power utilized by various individuals and groups in the Torah, never brought liberation, continuous prosperity, or peace. Just as Solomon's power was broken, so too did the mighty armies of Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, and Rome disintegrate to mere memories before the invincible reality of a historical imperative which demands justice and compassion.

Ironically, as a small interstice, we Jews have often been trapped between the parts and suffered greatly. Yet, our relative powerlessness also has aided our survival as a people. Michael Selzer explains this paradox in the following manner:

States are composed of power. They are material--and matter is destructible. In particular, power, by being the dynamic force which it is, cannot remain stable. It must either expand or contract. While circumstance imposes certain limits on its ability to expand (which is to say that no one has, as yet, achieved the mad dream of world domination), there is no limit on its ability to contract. Even the most powerful of states have contracted absolutely--they have disappeared, dragging into oblivion everything associated with them. . . . It was precisely because Jewish existence was not predicated on, and dependent on, any particular institution or power system that it proved so indestructible. States can be destroyed. The communal organizations of minority peoples can be destroyed. But the determination of a people to continue to exist is, in the last resort, an idea. It is not material. It cannot be attacked. Like quicksilver, it cannot be pinned down. No sooner does the enemy assault it in one area when it re-emerges in another. It is too elusive to be destroyed. Therefore, it survives.²¹

As Jews, it should not be our goal to seek physical power. Nor should our pursuit of peace necessitate the utilization of physical force for that would negate any possibility of bringing

to fruition an age of peace. Instead, we should soar above our entrapment and become free and prophetic. With unreserved restraint, we must become "the nation of prophets" that Isaiah II told us we must become. If our suffering through the lessons of history's imperative has any meaning or value, we must accept our prophetic role. In the name of the countless millions of Jewish and Habiru martyrs, we are compelled to scream against the incestuous ties which make individuals strangers from each other and from themselves. Only by discovering the One Man will men in the power structure, like David Rockefeller, be able to recognize the dying Indian girl as his own daughter NOW and not in his futuristic global society. Our message is not of revolution, power, or force but of justice, righteousness and compassion. Just as Jeremiah was imprisoned and almost lost his life for his unrelenting utterances of truth, our prophetic role possesses uncertainty and danger. But, to continue our part as the reluctant prophet, will only lead to further entrapment and collective doom.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Sandmel, Samuel, The Hebrew Scriptures, op.cit., p. 147.
2. Ibid , p. 146.
3. Bamberger, Bernard, The Story of Judaism, Schocken Books, New York, 1964, p. 32-33.
4. Ausubel, Nathan, Pictorial History of the Jewish People, Crown Publishers, New York, 1956, p. 65.
5. Fromm, Erich, You Shall Be As Gods, Faucetl Publications, Greenwich, Connecticut, 1966, p. 99-100.
6. Ibid., p. 72.
7. Ibid., p. 52.
8. Marx and Margolies, History of the Jewish People, op.cit., p. 114.
9. Bamberger, op.cit., p. 23.
10. Fromm, Erich, Beyond the Chains of Illusion, Pocket Books, Inc., New York, 1966, p. 187.
11. Ibid., p. 185-186.
12. Marx, Robert J., Address at HUC-JIR, Cincinnati, Ohio, Nov. 21, 1969, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio Tape No. 710.
13. Selzer, Michael, The Wineskin and the Wizard, Macmillan Company, London, 1970, p. 85.
14. Marx and Margolies, History of the Jewish People, op.cit. p. 405.
15. Fromm, Erich, You Shall Be As Gods, op.cit. 43-44.
16. Ibid., p. 94.
17. Ibid., p. 96.
18. Ibid., p. 102.
19. Ibid , p. 79.
20. Ibid., p. 91.
21. Selzer, Michael, The Wineskin and the Wizard, op.cit. p. 62-64.

III. BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES

Up till now, we have established pacifism as a Jewish identity by providing a link between us and

- 1) Our Habiru forebearers, who in their status as aliens severed the ties of blood and soil and thereby initiated the possibility for the individual to perceive the One Man.
- 2) Our Hebrew prophets, who perceptively recognized their affinity to the Habiru when they enunciated for the first time in man's history, not only the dream of a universal age of peace but the correct paths that man must pursue in order to achieve peace.
- 3) Our Habiru, Hebrew, Judean, and Jewish ancestors who refused to accept their role as a prophetic people and thereby became an entrapped interstice in the surrounding societies which doomed them to suffering at convenience of the power structure.

In essence then, we have presented two different bases for Jewish pacifism. The first is that we Jews possess a four-thousand year old heritage which from its inception pioneered the development and evolution of pacifistic thought. Certainly, as the descendants of the originators of pacifism in the Western world, we possess, in Erik Erikson's terms, a well-established

link to the past for the continuity and growth of pacifism as a Jewish identity. The second, which is predicated on the first, is that of enlightened self-interest. Only by accepting the word of Isaiah II and becoming a nation of prophets who pursue peace will we truly prosper and be at peace. History empirically demonstrates that when strife and turmoil increase, the Jew not only suffers first but suffers the most.

There remains a third basis for pacifism as a Jewish identity. I am speaking here of a polarity of Jewish identity; specifically, those Jews who gravitate around the principle of creative adaptability. Erik Erickson explicates this polarity or duality in the following interpretation:

The universal conflict of defensive rigidity and of adaptive flexibility, of conservatism and progressivism, in the Jews of the Diaspora, expresses itself in the apposition of two trends: dogmatic orthodoxy, and opportunistic adaptability. These trends, of course, were favored by centuries of dispersion. We may think here of types, such as the religiously dogmatic, culturally reactionary Jew, to whom change and time mean absolutely nothing: the Letter is his reality. And we may think of his opposite, the Jew to whom geographic dispersion and cultural multiplicity have become "second nature"--relativity becomes for him the absolute, exchange value his tool. . . . The psychoanalyst knows that this same set of opposites, this conflict between the adherence to the Letter, and the surrender to the changing price of things, pervades the unconscious conflicts of men and women of Jewish extraction who do not consider themselves, nor are considered by others, as "Jewish" in a denominational or racial sense. Here the Letter may have become a political or scientific dogma quite removed from the dogma of the Talmud, but treated not unlike the way quotations from the Talmud were treated by their ancestors; and exchange value may have become obsessive preoccupation with the comparative value--of values. Economically and professionally, later stages of history have exploited what earlier history

initiated: the Jews were confined to what they did best, while they, of course, learned to perfect what they had permitted to do. Thus, they have become not only traditional traders of goods, but also the mediators in culture change, the interpreters in the arts and sciences, the healers of inner conflict. Their strength, in these fields, lies in a responsible sense of relativity.

This defines Jewish weakness as well: for where the sense of relativity loses its responsibility it can become cynical relativism. Jewish genius, in turn, quietly possessed of the courage of the ages, lifts the matter of relative values to a plane on which known reality becomes relative to more inclusive orders.¹

Erikson's psychoanalytic appraisal of one major Jewish identity as being opportunistic adaptability has been substantiated by the heresian historian Ellis Rivkin, who also perceives the Jewish "quality of creative adaption."² Although Rivkin posits a unity concept of a single and omnipotent God, this concept of God changed, according to Rivkin, as historical circumstances confronted Jews with new problems.³ Rivkin's ultimate heresy from traditional Jewish historians is his statement that "Jewish history gives evidence, not to the triumph of a single form belief, or set of practices [the accepted view. B.C.] but of the proliferation of many forms, ideas, beliefs, and practices--as many as survival necessitated."⁴ Like the prophet Micah, who saw the acceptance of One God in terms of all peoples walking each in the name of its god, Rivkin also recognizes that unity generates diversity. In a sense, Rivkin's approach may be labeled responsible relativism in that it examines Judaism in relation to the dominant cultures around it.

Yet, relativism, as Erikson indicates, can become cynical and irresponsible. In other words, many Jews may possess an obsessive preoccupation with relativity. Due to its survival value, many Jews have come to worship relativity. For these Jews, everything is relative and there are no absolutes. Hence, since Judaism has proliferated many forms, ideas, beliefs and practices, Judaism cannot absolutely stand for something. Even the dogmatic Orthodox, who Erikson labels as possessing defensive rigidity, developed a relativistic approach to the Letter. Although the Orthodox are dogmatic in following the Letter, they, then, argued for two thousand years over which interpretation of the Letter was correct. While the idolater of relativity rejects pacifism as a Jewish identity on the basis that Judaism has no absolutes, the idolater of the Letter rejects pacifism as a Jewish identity on the basis that Berakot 58a states, "If a man comes to kill you, rise early and kill him first."

A third type of relativistic idolatry is the belief that Judaism is relative to the Jewish experience. The underpinning for Jewish history as the ultimate reflection of Jewish ethics is the fact that Judaism is a way of life. Hence, the way the Jews live life becomes the true reflection of Judaism. In the nineteenth century, men of the Jewish enlightenment supported their revisionism of Judaism by stating, "Anything a Jew does is Jewish."

An acceptance of this "Jews are inherently Jewish" idolatry [I call it idolatry for it places a sanctity on blood lines.] may be witnessed in the following passages of an essay that a most progressive and social-action oriented Jew, Albert Vorspan, wrote on pacifism.

Judaism is not a religion of absolute pacifism. The history of the Jewish people is full of instances in which the Jews had to fight to survive.⁵

Here, Vorspan seems to be saying that the Jewish religion may be deciphered from Jewish history. Interestingly, Vorspan seems to have a dualistic connotation for the terms, Jewish history and Jewish people. If we examine the following quotes, we will see that the term, Rabbinic or religion, are really what Vorspan means by history and people.

Yet despite this history, Jewish tradition has not glorified war or extolled the warmaker.

In Jewish history [here Vorspan means Rabbinic tradition or religion when he says history], the heroes are sages and saints, not warriors.⁶

With the destruction of the Jewish state in 70 C.E., the prophetic vision of peace became the dream of the Jewish people. Jews were almost completely non-violent from the end of the Bar Kochba revolt in 135 C.E. to the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising of 1943. The ideal of universal peace had become the mission of the people Israel.⁷

What Vorspan denies is that Jewish Rabbinic tradition became almost completely non-violent after 135 C.E. As Abraham Cronbach has documented, post-Biblical literature divested the Biblical war heroes of their bellicose character.⁸ Yet, Vorspan refuses to state that the Jewish religion speaks for absolute pacifism.

Like the Orthodox dogmatist, who holds up one little Letter of the Law which contradicts pacifism, Vorspan holds up the rare exceptions in a two-thousand year heritage of non-violence.

In answer to these relativists, I will quote from one of the greatest geniuses produced by Jewish creative adaptability-- Albert Einstein. In an essay for Forum Magazine entitled "What I Believe," Albert Einstein, the Father of the Theory of Relativity wrote:

Violence inevitably attracts moral inferiors. . . . War is low and despicable, and I had rather be smitten to shreds than participate in such doings.⁹

Einstein then goes on to state that human nature possesses enough common sense to have wiped out war long ago. However, humanity has been corrupted through the "school and press for business and political reasons."¹⁰

If one of the great relativist thinkers of our era commits himself to an absolute pacifism, we must ask these other Jewish relativists why they resist accepting the Rabbinic position that killing even in self-defense must be called murder. (Torah Shelemah, Genesis 32, No. 94.) As Reuven Kimmelman's scholarship has shown, "the real issue," to the Rabbis, "was how to act to insure that nobody was killed."¹¹ Indeed, those who worship the Letter of the Law have also lost sight of the entire scope of the Law. As Steven Schwarzchild has stated, "one is overwhelmed by the majesty of the evidence that Jewish law (halachah) has effectively reduced the legitimacy of war to the zero-point and that Jewish doctrine (aggadah) is an uniquely powerful

system of ethical peacefulness."¹² If the traditionalists lack an understanding of "gestalt" Judaism, we should expect the disciples of cause and effect, the historians, to be aware of the fact that Jewish violence in the past has inevitably wrought abysmal consequences upon the Jewish people. For example, the Maccabee military victories weakened the Jewish State for they brought people into power whose influence hastened the final downfall.¹³

We are forced to ask, "Why this great resistance on the part of Jewish common sense to recognize the need to wipe out war altogether?" The answer was indicated by Einstein in that our Jewish education and press, like the secular education and press, have been corrupted for political reasons. The creation of the State of Israel has radically altered many Jews' perceptions of their Rabbinic tradition. In a sense, this transformation of Jewish values has occurred due to an inability by most Jews, like Vorspan, to confront the fact that political Zionism is antithetical to traditional Rabbinic Judaism. As Rivkin has pointed out, "the modernizing Jewish intellectuals of Eastern Europe, like their non-Jewish counterparts, viewed religion as basically outmoded, to be tolerated only in the interests of national unity."¹⁴ Political Zionism was not only a refraction of the dominant nationalist movements of nineteenth century Eastern Europe but it was also an acceptance of the anti-Semitic charges that the Jew was a parasite for he lacked a homeland.¹⁵ In its desire to become "like all the nations," Political

Zionism spurned any prophetic Jewish mission by its re-emphasis of blood and soil. Indeed, the poet Shaul Tschernikhovsky, the founder of the Canaanite Movement, pays homage to a Hebrew rather than Jewish conception of God in his poem entitled, "Before a Statue of Apollo."

The mighty God, Who took Canaan by storm
Before they bound Him up with Phylacteries.¹⁶

By giving allegiance to blood and soil, the political Zionists lost all ability to comprehend the One Man. As their goal was political power, the Zionists threw off the constraints of an ethically humanistic Judaism. The political Zionists attempted to utilize English imperial interests in the Middle East by seeking the Balfour Declaration. Yet, "who," asks Uri Avneri, "gave England the legitimacy to control the Middle East?"¹⁷ Neither the Zionists nor England ever recognized that only those who dwell on the land have the inherent right to determine its future. As Avneri points out, the first Zionist Congress in the 1890's remained oblivious to the question of what effect large scale Jewish immigration would have upon the indigenous population of Palestine? Indeed, few Zionists even knew that Arabs dwelled in the Hebrews' old territorial homeland.¹⁸ Today, we witness Arab and Jew committing acts of barbarity against each other on a daily basis. Truly, the Political Zionists have achieved their goal of becoming like all the other nations.

I do not argue that Israel has no right to exist. Rather, I argue that Israel's actions do not necessarily exemplify the ideals of our Jewish religious heritage. For those of us who are committed to an activist pacifism, we must support Israel by furthering the political program of Uri Avneri to create a transnational state.¹⁹ As Vivian Gornick has stated:

So long as each Jew and each Arab refuses to see his own irreducible self in the other, so long as each cannot look into the other's face or hear his voice or imagine his pain, there will be no peace in the Middle East.²⁰

The goal of Jewish pacifists must be to help the Israelis perceive the One Man. Our allegiance cannot be with El Fatah or with the Greater Israel Movement. Our emphasis should not be on the past "crimes" of the Israel government or the Zionist movement since all organizations and governments that seek power are inherently evil. Some of our brethren have become like all the other nations and we must draw them back to the mission of Israel. At the same time, we must avoid the attempt to portray political Zionism as normative Judaism. Political Zionism is diametrically opposed to the ethical religious ideals of the Jewish religion.

Indeed, just as the political Zionists have been unable to identify with the Arabs, so have they been unable to identify with those Jews they left behind in the Shtetl. In the 1937 fall issue of New Judea, the following report was written:

Dr. Chaim Weizmann declared today while on a visit to Poland that Palestine was no solution

for the Jewish problem of Europe. "Palestine cannot absorb the Jews of Europe," said Dr. Weizmann. "We want only the best of Jewish youth to come to us. . . . The other Jews will have to stay where they are and face whatever fate awaits them. These millions of Jews are dust on the wheels of history and may have to be blown away. We don't want them pouring into Palestine. We don't want our Tel Aviv to become another low grade ghetto."²¹

Dr. Chaim Weizmann's statement lends moral and social support to the following actions of Dr. Rudolf Kastner. During the Nazi deportations of Hungarian Jews, Dr. Kastner negotiated with Adolph Eichmann for the "illegal" departure of a few thousand prominent Jews and members of the Zionist youth organizations, who in Eichmann's words were "the best biological material."²² In exchange for what Weizmann called "the best of Jewish youth," Dr. Kastner, vice-president of the Zionist Organization in Budapest, promised "quiet and order" in the camps from which 476,000 were shipped to Auschwitz.²³ In saving exactly 1,684 of Hungarian Jewry's best youth, Rudolph Kastner must have seen himself, as Hannah Arendt has put it, "as a captain, whose ship was about to sink and who succeeded in bringing them safe to port by casting overboard a great part of the precious cargo."²⁴ After the holocaust, Dr. Kastner was brought to trial in Israel and in 1957, a few months after the Israeli Supreme Court had quashed the sensational judgment handed down by Judge Benjamin Halevi in the Jerusalem District Court, that Kastner, accused of collaboration with the Nazis in Hungary, "had sold his soul to the Devil, was killed by

two survivors of the Hungarian catastrophe.²⁵ Perhaps, the Israeli Supreme Court quashed Judge Halevi's judgment because Kastner, as an official of the Zionist movement, only followed the Letter of Weizmann's 1937 statement. Indeed, Hannah Arendt points out that Eichmann, another man who found security in following orders, respected and believed in the Zionists and their movement because "they were 'idealists' who lived for their idea and who were prepared to sacrifice for their idea everything and, especially, everybody."²⁶ Political Zionism then, like all nationalist movements, sacrifices the innocent along with the guilty in its quest for power. Indeed, an honest and critical historical appraisal of any government from progressive Sweden to repressive Haiti would indicate similar anit-humanist tendencies in similar circumstances since all nation-states are based upon the narcissistic tie to blood and soil.

Ironically, the Zionists' ideological goal of normalcy for the Jewish people has never been achieved. Rather than "becoming like the other nations," Israel plays a role which has been fashioned for it, imposed upon it, and used by it. As a Jewish State, Israel, like Judea of the Hebrews, is a small interstice among the international powers. Israel is the interstitial nation entrapped between Russia and the United States; between the oil-rich feudal Arab leaders and the impoverished Arab peasants; between the American oil companies and the Arab nationalist movements; between a United States

confronting a future energy crisis and corrupt Arab leaders who lack the determination to lead their people towards modernization. Israel is not like the other nations. There is an international process at work which sees the Jewish state as the soft under belly into which social conflict is to be focused-- and the third party often rejoices.

I have focused upon Israel for two reasons. First, Israel, like the Diaspora, must stop its rejoicing and be liberated by Jewish pacifism so that it may soar from its entrapment and become prophetic. Second, the contemporary cynical relativism expressed towards absolute pacifism as a Jewish identity by many of our most prestigious Rabbis, erudite scholars, and influential leaders may be a reflection of their reticence to confront the fact that many of Israel's actions cannot be reconciled with the precepts of Judaism. Israel's right to exist is in no way being challenged! We, Jewish pacifists, on the other hand, must be motivated by an awareness that any continuation of approaching Judaism's ethical tenets as "ambivalent" not only corrodes our religious moral fiber but, ultimately, hinders Israel as well. All nation-states need the moderating influence of some ethical system in their quest for power. The good and nobly based intentions of Diaspora Judaism to present Israel with a carte blanche for all her actions only weakens Israel's ethical consciousness and, thereby, lessens her chances for survival.

The holocaust remains another source of cynical relativism towards pacifism as a Jewish identity. As reflected in the

writings of Albert Vorspan, Diaspora and Israeli Jews take a great deal of pride in the fact that some Jews fought back against the Nazis. Many Jews love to recount the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising and similar acts of resistance due to a desire, as Ben Hecht calls it, "to visualize Jews as heroes--not only as victims."²⁷ In Identity, Anxiety, and the Jew, Aaron Antonovsky demonstrates that the modern Diaspora Jew possesses no acceptable identity since the non-emancipated ghetto Jew remains unacceptable to him.²⁸ Contemporary Jews anxiously ask, "Why didn't more Jews resist?" "The usual answer," as Oscar Handlin suggests, "to these questions was that the Jews of Europe had been so conditioned by centuries of accommodation to the persecutor that they had lost the ability and will to defend themselves against attack."²⁹ As Arthur Morse has phrased it, "Recently, the historical focus has shifted to the response or, as some believe, the non-response of the Jews to their oppressors."³⁰ Ultimately, "neither fighting nor praying," as Handlin maintains, "could avail to save the individuals the Nazis captured and murdered."³¹ The direct cause for six million murdered was the Nazis. But, the indirect cause for this slaughter was that the victims--European Jewry--basically had no place to escape from the Nazi dragnet. Europe had become an island in which it only became a matter of time before the Nazis had captured all the Jews. The real question is not "Why did the Jews not fight the strongest army on the European continent?" The real question might be phrased, "Why were the Jews trapped within Europe?"

In While Six Million Died, Arthur Morse documents how the callous unconcern of the American government allowed the condemned to perish although millions could have very easily been saved. As early as September, 1933, a confidential Nazi memorandum fell into American diplomatic hands which spoke of the final solution in terms of extermination. The Nazis referred to themselves in this role of Jewish exterminator as "Ahasuerus."³² Yet, by President Roosevelt's prerogative as executor of national laws, "the United States not only insisted upon its immigration law throughout the Nazi era, but administered it with severity and callousness."³³ From 1933 to 1944, the Roosevelt administration never even presented an official condemnation and warning of retribution for the Nazi barbarity. Only in January 1944, when Roosevelt was shown a secret memorandum entitled, "Acquiescence of this Government in the Murder of the Jews," did he begin to take the first steps to rescue the Jews.³⁴

There is definitely then a great deal of material for developing a most viable thesis that the Jews of Europe could have been saved not by a war--which witnessed six million of them killed--but by a non-violent yet concerted effort on the part of the United States, Britain, and other non-European nations to not only condemn the Nazi program in 1933 but offer the European Jews assylum. Perhaps, the reason for the nascent scholarship in this area is due to the fact that it is too anxiety-producing for American Jews to confront the indifference of our own government, of our fellow citizens and even a sizeable

proportion of our fellow Jews during the holocaust era.

Yet, we should also examine the response of European Jewry for it provides several insights. In Forged in Fury, Michael Elkins, who advocates Jewish vengeance against the Nazis, states:

Although the Jewish ethic as generally interpreted does not teach non-violence, there were about three hundred thousand adult Jews in eastern Europe whose failure to resist was, as they saw it, the very essence of religious duty.³⁵

The paradox of Elkins' statement, that the general interpretation of the Jewish ethic is not pacifism but the Hasidim, those who diligently study the Torah, sought a non-violent response to aggression, indicates the problems of the historical relativists. Since 300,000 adults (who stringently obeyed "Be fruitful and multiply" (Genesis 1:28) and, thus, the Hasidic children brought the number closer to a million) practiced non-violence in Jewish history, Elkins cannot negate pacifism as part of Judaism but neither can he accept it. Hence, committed to an agenda of vengeance, Elkins loses his relative ambivalency towards Judaism and states the ethic of non-violence is not accepted. Perhaps, it is not accepted "generally" but Rabbinic Judaism does preach non-violence in these following passages:

A man should always strive to be rather of the persecuted than the persecutors. (Baba Kama 93a)

He who is a warrior is not a scholar; and if he is a scholar, he is not a warrior.
(Avodah Zarah 17b)

However, it should be emphasized that a distinction between passivism and pacifism can and should be made. Some Jewish

scholars, like Michael Selzer in The Wineskin and Wizard, almost idealize the submission of the Jew to aggression. Yet, one can confront aggression in a non-submissive, non-passive but non-violent manner. In an essay entitled Patterns of Good and Evil, Rabbi Zalman M. Schacter believes that the way to deal with a nature not yet committed to evil in its essence is by the process of Birrur or clarification. Rabbi Schacter suggests this principle of Birrur or clarification should have been utilized by the death camp inmates in the following manner:

The death camp inmate had a responsibility toward his executioners. Seldom did he discharge it. He escaped into terror rather than facing the oppressor and saying to him, "What you are doing is wrong. I submit not to you and will not be coerced by you. My responsibility is to God and I am responsible not only for myself but also for your spark." He would have been put to death just the same or, what is worse, been made to suffer for speaking in this way. Passive non-resistance is escape and not Birrur. Violent resistance seldom is good Birrur. Non-violent resistance which speaks with compassion for the oppressor's spark, with concern for that one's soul: this is Birrur. Birrur would have said to the oppressor, "I cannot cooperate with you; neither can I resist you, for I have not the means of resisting you, nor do I consider it my task to resist you with violence; Birrur is not only my task but yours." We have no way of estimating the spiritual salvage that could have been accomplished through such words.³⁶

Although Rabbi Schacter states, "the Jew would have been put to death anyway," we should note that he only applied his system of Birrur to the concentration camp victim. What effect, we may ask, would Jewish non-violent resistance have had on the Nazis if Jewish non-cooperation had commenced from the beginning of the Nazi era? Hannah Arendt, who bases a great deal of her

thought on Raul Hilberg's The Destruction of the European Jews, argues that "if the Jews had been unorganized and leaderless, there would have been chaos and plenty of misery but the total number of victims would hardly have been between four and a half and six million people."³⁷ Non-violent resistance would not only have meant the disbanding of the Jewish councils and the burning of all Jewish records which related who was a Jew but it would have meant the simple refusal to even walk to the valley of Babi Yar, or to walk to the transport train. Hannah Arendt documents that in Denmark and Bulgaria, where the Nazis met local resistance to the "Final Solution," the local German officials became unsure of themselves and were no longer reliable."³⁸ In order to fully document and examine the potentialities of Jewish non-violent resistance in thwarting the Final Solution, a thesis on that specific topic would have to be written.

However, we do possess the historical documentation from Josephus of an incident in Palestine where tens of thousands of Jews in concerted action successfully prevented the erection of the Roman emperor's statue in Jerusalem by means of non-violent resistance.³⁹ At the dawn of the common era, Jews had already demonstrated Birrur or how to confront the divine spark in a potential adversary when they said to Petronius, "We will not by any means make war with Caesar, but still we will die before we see our laws transgressed."⁴⁰ Whether Josephus is factual or not remains irrelevant when one remembers that the Purim story "should not be regarded as accurate history"⁴¹ and yet it

has been placed in the Bible. The story of the Roman General, Petronius, and the Jews has been beautifully retold by James A. Michener in The Source.⁴² Michener expands on Josephus' story by citing an olive-grove worker, Yigal, as the man who devised the tactic of non-violent resistance. It is a poetic and vibrant story which bears retelling on our pulpits and in our religious schools.

To those who would say that the story of Yigal and Petronius is polemical, we may ask, "What about Masada, Bar Kochba, and Judah Maccabee who are taught in our religious schools? Is this not primarily due to the influence of our contemporary Jewish anxiety which desires to visualize Jews as heroes and not only victims? Yet, one cannot say that Judah Maccabee is part of our Rabbinic tradition.

Our Talmud in all of its 2947 pages does not once mention Judah Maccabee.⁴³ Indeed, the Haftorah portion for the week of Hanukuh includes the non-violent words of Zechariah: "Not by might, nor by power but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." Certainly, the historical story, of Jews stretching forth their necks for slaughter and threatening to let their land lie fallow, who thereby convince the mighty armies of Rome to yield in their unjust demands, seems to be the very fulfillment of Zechariah's prophecy. In the story of General Petronius and the Jews, we can visualize Jews as heroes, who neither are killed or kill, but who by non-violent resistance (Birrur) awaken the divine spark in their potential oppressor's soul.

Another lesson that should be taught in religious school is that the holocaust was not only as Ellis Rivkin calls it, "the final solution for an entrapped nation-state, reeling from economic breakdown and seeking to delay its own plunge to oblivion."⁴⁴ The holocaust was also a brutal lesson of what happens when men cease to see others as themselves. Men become strangers to themselves and see others as "aliens" who reflect their innermost fears and self-doubts. During the holocaust, the majority of mankind lost sight of the One Man and God truly died. It won't happen again if Jewish pacifists begin to lead others towards the discovery of the One Man.

But, we can only begin this movement if we honestly approach our Judaism without a cynical relativism or any hidden agendas to justify Israel or the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. As Rabbi Steven Schwarzchild has stated, "It is true that the vast classical sources of Judaism, extending over 4,000 years and the whole world, can be cited to any and all effects. The chief problem, therefore, is that of a criterion of selection and interpretation. That criterion will have to turn out to be a Messianic fulfillment, as in any rational system the end determines the means. The Messianic fulfillment, now, is, as all are bound to agree, the state of peace, justice, and truth. . . . It can, I think, unambiguously be shown that the ethos, the letter and the spirit, of Judaism de facto rule out all war and killing."⁴⁵

The de facto ruling out of all war and killing within Rabbinic Judaism has only been cited in this thesis. The reason for its non-development is that the ultimate basis for pacifism as a Jewish identity remains our Habiru-Hebrew-Judean-Prophetic and Rabbinic heritage. As an interstitial people since the second millenium B.C.E., we have been, as Erik Erickson calls it, "the mediators in cultural change." Indeed, our very identity or identities have refracted the differing cultural, ideational, and economic forms to which we have been exposed. The Shaping of Jewish History by Ellis Rivkin underscores this primary concept of responsible relativism as our absolute--exchange value, our tool. To quote Rivkin, "Jewish survival is proof that Jews have, thus far, been able to preserve their identity by periodically reshaping it."⁴⁶

Within this thesis, we have seen how the Prophets drew upon the embryonic insights of the Habiru to crystallize Judaism--a reshaping of "Habiruness." The prophets were motivated by an awareness of a global society as Assyria and Babylonia attempted to incorporate into their hegemony the interstice between East and West-Judea.

We dwell once again at the crossroads of man. Yet, like the Habiru, our dwelling place is not territorial for we are transnational. Even our Jewish State, Israel, is but a mere interstice between the greater powers. Today, we dwell between the crossroads where humanity will either gain or lose hegemony over its future as a race on planet Earth. To quote Ben Hecht:

Chief among the reasons for the holocaust was the indifference to death which an era of wars had bred into the world. The American of yesterday watched American soldiers suffer and die in Korea [we could add Vietnam B.C.] with the same lack of emotional response he had for the massacre of Jews a decade ago. Individual life is not sacred, death is not important. The modern soul thus conditions itself for the great battles to come, the battles of H. Bombs, which Professor Einstein prophesies will number their dead in the hundreds of millions; a war which William Laurence, science reporter for the New York Times, prophesies will count as a casualty not nations but a planet.⁴⁷

Or as Erich Fromm stated so simply:

Until now the One Man may have been a luxury, since the One World had not yet emerged. Now the One Man must emerge if the One World is to live.⁴⁸

At the moment then, it is not merely Jewish but world survival which is at stake. It has become mandatory for us to reshape our identity. But, this will not be a dramatic transformation. Like our Habiru ancestors who broke with blood and soil, we can lead our fellowmen in their discovery of the One Man. Like our prophets, we can initiate the emergence of a worldwide fellowship where the One God is recognized as the source and ground of all being. Like the Jews against General Petronius, we can learn the methods of Birrur and ignite the divine spark in our potential adversaries. Unlike our Habiru and European forebearers, we must break the cycle of being entrapped between the parts so that we may soar into the prophetic people our history destines us to become.

Indeed, the historical imperative of God operating through history necessitates that we will reshape our Jewish identity into one of absolute pacifism. The transformation transpires at this very moment for "we must," as Rabbi Gendler states, "expect and insist that our unprecedented situation today be recognized and responded to in unprecedented and daring ways."⁴⁹ And thus, Mishnah Sanhedrin IV 5 states:

One man alone was brought forth at the time of creation, in order to teach us that he who destroys one human soul is regarded as though he had destroyed a whole world, while he who preserves one soul within humanity is regarded as though he had preserved a whole world.

While Mishnah Shalom of the American Talmud adds:

And he who does not actively endeavor to reconcile humanity is regarded as if his soul had been blinded to Scriptures which state, ". . . I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."
(Deuteronomy 30:19)

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Erikson, Erik, Childhood and Society, Norton Company, New York, 1950, pp. 312-313.
2. Rivkin, Ellis, Shaping of Jewish History, op.cit., p. xvii.
3. Ibid., p. xviii.
4. Ibid., p. xx.
5. Vorspan, Albert, Jewish Values and Social Crises, UAHC, New York, 1968, p. 6.
6. Ibid., p. 6.
7. Ibid., p. 7.
8. Cronbach, Abraham, The Jewish Peace, UAHC, Cincinnati, 1932, p. 94.
9. Einstein, Albert, "What I Believe," Forum Magazine, October, 1930, vol. LXXXIV, No. 4, p. 194.
10. Ibid., p. 194.
11. Kimmelman, Reuven, Nonviolence in the Talmud, from Roots of Jewish Nonviolence, Jewish Peace Fellowship, Nyack, New York, 1970, p. 34.
12. Ibid., p. 5.
13. Cronbach, Abraham, The Jewish Peace Book, op.cit., p. 30.
14. Rivkin, op.cit. p. 193.
15. Selzer, Wizard and Wineskin, op.cit., p. 144.
16. Ibid., p. 147.
17. Avneri, Uri, Israel Without Zionism, Collier Books, New York, 1971, p. 67.
18. Ibid., p. 50
19. Ibid., p. 238. See Chapter 13.
20. Gornick, Vivian, Who Exactly are the Arabs? The Village Voice, April 5, 1973, p. 27.

21. Hecht, Ben, A Child of the Century, New American Library, New York, 1952, p. 498.
22. Arendt, Hannah, Eichmann in Jerusalem, Viking Press, New York, 1963, p. 38.
23. Ibid., p. 105.
24. Ibid., p. 104.
25. Ibid., p. 127.
26. Ibid., p. 38.
27. Hecht, Ben, A Child of the Century, op.cit., p. 505.
28. Antonovsky, Aaron, "Identity, Anxiety, and the Jew," (Identity and Anxiety) editor Stein et. al., Free Press, New York, 1960, p. 428.
29. Handlin, Oscar, "Jewish Resistance to the Nazis" (A Commentary Report) New York, 1962, p. 11.
30. Morse, Arthur, While Six Million Died, Ace Book, New York, 1967, p. 7.
31. Handlin, Oscar, op.cit., p. 18.
32. Morse, Arthur, While Six Million Died, op.cit., p. 129.
33. Ibid., p. 124.
34. Ibid., p. 205.
35. Elkins, Michael, Forged in Fury, Ballantine Books, New York, 1971, p. 29.
36. Schacter, Zalman, Patterns of Good and Evil, (Rediscovering Judaism) Editor Arnold Jacob Wolf, Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1965, p. 205.
37. Arendt, Hannah, op.cit., 111
38. Ibid., p. 169.
39. Josephus, Flavius, The Life and Work of Flavius Josephus, translated by William Whiston, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, pp. 549-553.
40. Ibid., p. 55.
41. Sandmel, Samuel, The Hebrew Scriptures, op.cit., p. 502.

42. Michener, James, The Source, Faucett Press, Greenwich, Connecticut, 1967, pp. 457-469.
43. Cronbach, Abraham, Jewish Peace Book, op.cit., p. 29.
44. Rivkin, Ellis, op.cit., 216.
45. Schwarzchild, Steven, "Introduction," to Roots of Jewish Nonviolence - Jewish Peace Fellowship, Nyack, New York, p. 5.
46. Rivkin, Ellis, op.cit., p. 247.
47. Hecht, Ben, op.cit., p. 486.
48. Fromm, Erich, Beyond the Chains of Illusion, op.cit., p. 186.
49. Gendler, Everett, "Therefore Choose Life," Roots of Jewish Nonviolence, op.cit., p. 15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Antonovsky, Anton. "Identity, Anxiety, and the Jew" (Identity and Anxiety, edited by Maurice Stein). Free Press, New York, 1960.
- Arendt, Hannah. Eichmann in Jerusalem. Viking Press, New York, 1963.
- Ausubel, Nathan. A Pictorial History of the Jewish People. Crown Publishers, New York, 1956.
- Avneri, Uri. Israel Without Zionism. Collier Book, New York, 1971.
- Bamberger, Bernard. The Story of Judaism. Schocken Books, New York, 1957.
- Blank, Sheldon. Understanding the Prophets. Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York, 1969.
- Bright, John. A History of Israel. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1959.
- Einstein, Albert. "What I Believe" (Forum). New York, October, 1930.
- Elkins, Michael. Forged in Fury. Ballantine Books, New York, 1971.
- Erikson, Erik. Childhood and Society. W.W. Norton and Company, New York, 1950.
- Erikson, Erik. "Insight and Responsibility" from Identity and Uprootedness in our Time. W.W. Norton and Company, New York, 1950.
- Freud, Sigmund. Moses and Monotheism. Alfred Knopf, New York, 1939.
- Fromm, Erich. Beyond the Chains of Illusion. Pocket Books, Inc., New York, 1963.
- Fromm, Erich. You Shall Be As Gods. Fawcett Publications, Greenwich, Connecticut, 1966.
- Grendler, Kimmelman, Schwarzshild. Roots of Jewish Nonviolence. Jewish Peace Fellowship, Nyack, New York, 1970.

- Gilbert, Martin. Jewish History Atlas. Macmillan Company, London, 1969.
- Gornick, Vivian. "Who, Exactly, are the Arabs?" (The Village Voice) New York. April 5, 1973.
- Gray, Mary. "The Habiru-Hebrew Problem in the Light of the Source Material Available at Present" (Hebrew Union College Annual XXIX). Cincinnati, 1958.
- Greenberg, Moshe. "Hab/piru and the Hebrews" (The Patriarchs, edited by Benjamin Mazer) Rutgers University Press, New Jersey, 1970.
- Handlin, Oscar. "Jewish Resistance to the Nazis" (A Commentary Report). New York, 1963.
- Hecht, Ben. A Child of the Century. Signet Book, New York, 1954.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. Toward the Image of Tammuz. Harvard University Press, Massachusetts, 1970.
- Josephus, Flavius. The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus. Translated by William Whiston. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Kittel, Rudolf. Great Men and Movements in Our Time. Alfred Knopf, New York, 1929.
- Lewy, Julius. "Habiru and Hebrews" (Hebrew Union College Annual XIV). Cincinnati, 1939.
- Lewy, Julius. "New Parallels Between Habiru and Hebrew" (Hebrew Union College Annual XV). Cincinnati, 1940.
- Lewy, Julius. "Origin and Signification of the Biblical Term 'Hebrew'" (Hebrew Union College Annual XXVIII). Cincinnati, 1957.
- Margolis, Max, and Marx, Alexander. A History of the Jewish People. Meridian Books, New York, 1958.
- Marx, Robert. "Sermon at HUC-JIR" (American Jewish Archives Tape No. 710). Cincinnati, 11/21/69.
- Meek, Theophile. Hebrew Origins. Harper and Row, New York, 1936.
- Michener, James. The Source. Faucett Publications, Inc., Greenwich, Connecticut, 1965.

- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era (Volumes I and II). Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1962.
- Morse, Arthur. While Six Million Died. Ace Publishing Co., New York, 1967.
- Noth, Martin. The History of Israel. Harper and Row, New York, 1958.
- Orlinsky, Harry. Ancient Israel. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1965.
- Podhoretz, Norman. "Hannah Arendt on Eichmann" (A Commentary Report). New York, 1963.
- Rivkin, Ellis. The Shaping of Jewish History. Scribner's and Sons, New York, 1971.
- Rubenstein, Richard. After Auschwitz. Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis, 1966.
- Sandmel, Samuel. The Hebrew Scriptures. Alfred Knopf, New York, 1963.
- Sandmel, Samuel. The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity. Oxford University Press, New York, 1969.
- Sandmel, Samuel. The Genius of Paul. Schocken Books, New York, 1970.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. Anti-Semite and Jew. Schocken Books, New York, 1965.
- Schacter, Zalman. "Patterns of Good and Evil" (Rediscovering Judaism, A.J. Wolf, editor). 1967.
- Schneir, Walter and Miriam. Invitation to an Inquest. Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1965.
- Seltzer, Robert. "A Connected and Developing Human Past" (Dimension Number 1) Fall, 1966.
- Selzer, Michael. The Wineskin and the Wizard. MacMillan Co., London, 1970.
- Selzer, Michael (editor). Zionism Reconsidered. MacMillan Co., London, 1970.
- Speiser, E.A. "The Patriarchs and Their Social Background" History of the Jewish People, Vol. II - The Patriarchs. editor Mazer, Rutgers University Press, New Jersey, 1970.

Stamp, Kenneth. The Peculiar Institution. Vintage Books, New York, 1956.

Union Prayerbook II. Central Conference of American Rabbis, New York, 1958.

Vorspan, Albert. Jewish Values and Social Crisis. Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York, 1968.

Wellhausen, Julius. Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel. Meridian Books, New York, 1957.

Zeitlin, Solomon. The Rise and Fall of the Judean State, Volumes I and II. The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1967.