In media res: faith, reason, education

As we recently celebrated the tenth anniversary of our work against the backdrop of the 800th anniversary of the University of Cambridge, the theme of this issue arose in discussion about the place of faith and reason in education. It is part of the quest to respond effectively to the needs of interfaith relations in a wider, often secular society.

The search for mutual understanding and recognition is among the key objectives of interfaith dialogue. Meanwhile, the interaction between the religious and secular spheres tends to move in the opposite direction. The divide leads to religious and secular exclusivism and to the ghettoisation of the religious and secular communities. They tend to develop their own structures and operations, often with no mutual interaction. This applies to such areas as social care, trade, even culture and, crucially, education. Despite some efforts among scholars and educators to change the curricula, both faith and secular schools often refuse to address interfaith and religio-secular interaction, or to explore the synergy between particularism and universalism, between an individual and a community in this context. Thus the current educational sector is not where the divide ends, but where the foundations of future ghettos may lie.

We have seen the tragic effect of religio-secular ghettoisation in the 20th and already in the 21st centuries, from the two World Wars, the Holocaust and other crimes against humanity, to recent genocides and the resurgence of ethnic and religious terrorism. 9/11 and its aftermath brought the dawn of “an era beyond tolerance” that challenges both interfaith and religio-secular relations. It is yet unclear whether this era will regress into intolerance or move to a higher stage of tolerance sustained by the constructive coexistence of diverse identities. The success of the latter largely depends on socially responsible individuals empowered by faith and reason or, in terms of learning, by wisdom embedded through critical reflection and faith examined by knowledge. This is one of our major challenges as we enter a new decade.

Lucia Faltin, Editor
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From the director

Welcome to the new look Perspectives!

As you can see, this issue is far more substantial than any previous edition. This leap symbolises the progress the Institute has made in recent years.

Having celebrated our 10th anniversary last year, we now look ahead to the new decade with confidence. The teaching, research and public education programmes in 2009–2010 would astound the handful of students who arrived in September 1998 to begin the Anglia Polytechnic MA in Jewish-Christian Relations.

Today we teach a Cambridge University Master of Studies in the Study of Jewish-Christian Relations, and offer various programmes on Muslim-Jewish relations. A new course will start in October examining Jewish-Christian-Muslim relations in Europe. It is an exciting time for the teaching programme. As for research, the aspirations of 1998 are being fulfilled by the scholars of 2009–2010. Academic works are being published this academic year under the auspices of the Woolf Institute, including *The Exegetical Encounter between Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity* (Brill, 2 vols) and *An Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations* (Cambridge University Press). Proceedings from last year’s conference, Jews of Arab Lands: 1938–2009, are being prepared for publication and excerpts from the lectures are on our website. We also look forward to welcoming new Visiting Fellows.

Perhaps the biggest development in the last few years has been the significant growth in the number of requests we have received to deliver further educational programmes which explore faith and interfaith issues in communities and the workplace. The Institute’s Public Education Programmes are responding to this increasing demand by providing an accessible learning environment in which the wider public can benefit from the Institute’s experience in research and teaching. This includes face-to-face teaching and e-learning, which enables us to deliver more courses around the UK, tailored for those unable to pursue university studies at the time. We aim to deliver education that changes the way attitudes towards Jews, Christians and Muslims are communicated in congregations, communities and in the workplace.

I invite you to visit our website for more information about our teaching, research and public education programmes. You may also enjoy visiting the electronic version of Perspectives which offers additional resources.

Thank you, as ever, for your encouragement and support.

Edward Kessler, Director
DIARY

Recent developments at the Woolf Institute

Courses

Master’s programmes

As the MA draws to its end with seven remaining students writing their dissertations, the third cohort of MSt students is working on its dissertations and the fourth is busy studying its taught modules. The MSt in The Study of Jewish-Christian Relations is now so well established that it seems far more mature than its four years. At the same time, the change of Course Director at the beginning of this academic year demonstrates that consolidation does not turn into complacency. We are currently investing a lot of effort into improving yet further our online provision (both for residential and e-learning students) and establishing greater coherence between the four taught modules in the first year.

We put in place a number of Erasmus academic exchange agreements with Central and East European universities last year and hope to forge similar links with German universities in the near future. These agreements give both students and academics opportunities for exchange that enrich the MSt and establish it as one of the pioneering programmes offered by the University of Cambridge.

Finally, we are currently updating the relevant section of our website to make it more informative for applicants. That said, there will inevitably be questions that it does not answer and we are always pleased to respond to queries from potential applicants, ideally by email in the first instance.

Applications for September 2010 are accepted now.

Further information: www.woolf.cam.ac.uk/cjcr
Contact Lars Fischer: lars.fischer@woolf.cam.ac.uk

Learning about the history of Jewish-Christian relations in Cambridge: MSt students with Margie Tolstoy in front of Isaac Newton’s windows, Trinity College.

Introduction to the Study of Jews, Christians and Muslims in Contemporary Europe

The Woolf Institute has developed a new course. Starting in October 2010, it will provide a multidisciplinary learning framework to explore the subject through a study of history, culture and citizenship. The course will combine face-to-face tuition with e-learning over two terms and will conclude with a week-long residential period. It is delivered at a level equivalent to the last year of undergraduate, and adds to the synergy of the Institute’s courses. The new programme will be of particular interest to past students of our public education and certificate programmes.

The course may also serve as evidence of relevant recent study and a useful introduction for those wishing to apply for the University of Cambridge Advanced Diploma in the Study of Religion in order to pursue research on a topic relevant to the study of relations between Jews, Christians and/or Muslims. The Advanced Diploma in the Study of Religion is a new qualification offered by the University of Cambridge’s Institute for Continuing Education that is currently in the process of being approved. At the discretion of the Faculty of Divinity, the successful completion of both courses may strengthen the profile of potential applicants for the University of Cambridge MSt (Master of Studies) in The Study of Jewish-Christian Relations.

Applications for October 2010 are accepted now.

Further information: www.woolf.cam.ac.uk/courses
Contact Lucia Faltin: lucia.faltin@woolf.cam.ac.uk
CMJR

Studying Muslim-Jewish Relations

This year the Woolf Institute is promoting two certificate level courses in the study of Muslim-Jewish relations. The first is the certificate programme of the Institute of Continuing Education entitled Studies in Islam, Judaism and Muslim-Jewish Relations which is delivered through seminars held at the Woolf Institute and field trips.

The second is the CMJR’s own Certificate in Islam, Judaism and Muslim-Jewish Relations, delivered via the internet and certified by the Woolf Institute.

These courses provide a unique insight into this subject and have proved popular with a wide range of students from all faith backgrounds and professions including doctors, teachers, businessmen and women, as well as rabbis and imams. The e-learning programme attracts students from diverse international settings including Europe, Pakistan, Israel and the wider Middle East.

Further details: www.woolf.cam.ac.uk/cmjr

Seminars

Who speaks for Women?
A Gendered Understanding of Religious Law in Modern Judaism and Islam

In February, CMJR hosted Ziba Mir-Hosseini (SOAS, University of London) and Miri Freud-Kandel (University of Oxford) to discuss gender issues in Jewish and Islamic law, halakhah and shariah. An audience of over 70 people listened to their reflections on the historical and contemporary treatment of women in relation to religious legal traditions. The seminar offered a comparative approach to gender issues, identifying certain similarities between the two traditions, Judaism and Islam are traditionally represented by men who speak in the name of each religion. Women have often been portrayed as the bearers of cultural and religious authenticity, which has had major implications on their role and determined their status and limitations, illustrated by post-colonial Muslim societies.

However, the two scholars stressed that both Jewish and Islamic sources contain references that open up the possibility for gender egalitarianism as well as those that sustain the opposite. The search for gender equality became more noticeable during the 20th century when women started to engage in the process of textual interpretation and legal exegesis in the case of Jewish women from the 1970s and Muslim women from the 1990s.

Mir-Hosseini and Freud-Kandel also identified latent differences. The incorporation of feminist thought into Modern Judaism seems more established than Islam (though not without argument) whereas it is a much more recent and still much disputed issue within Modern Islam.

They agreed that women and the various roles attributed to them have been conceptualised by the more Orthodox, less progressive schools of thought which allowed a common portrait of Judaism and Islam as bodies of thought unaffected by historical and cultural change. In response, the two scholars analysed the relationship between religious behaviour and law affected by the interaction of text and context, and male and female interpreters.

History through images

CJCR runs all its MSt seminars online to enable access and participation by students and speakers across the world. The extensive programme includes plenaries, research seminars led by academics, and graduate seminars that bring together our Master’s students who are working on their dissertations. The last series presented a number of guest speakers including Michael Berkowitz, Professor of Modern Jewish History in the Department of Hebrew and Jewish Studies at University College London. His seminar Jews and Photography drew on his current research focusing on Jews but as practitioners rather than objects of photography. See also his article on the theme on p. 17. Ludmilla Jordanova, Professor of Modern History at King’s College London, presented her recent findings for a book entitled The Look of the Past, investigating the role of visual and material culture in historical practice.
Exhibition

LAST FOLIO: BEAUTY OF DECAY AND PRESERVATION

Shown for the first time in Britain, Last Folio was an exhibition based on a recent discovery of a Jewish school in Slovakia that stood intact since the deportation of its pupils in 1943. The images of books found at the school were taken by Slovak-Canadian photographer Yuri Dojc (whose photograph is also on the Perspectives front cover).

The exhibition was held in the Lower Library of Gonville and Caius College. “It is a place that symbolises layers of memory and the resilience of life. As such it resonates with what we feel about books as ambassadors of ideas and transmitters of knowledge,” said film-maker Katya Krausova. She worked with Dojc on a documentary film made in Slovakia, which, together with the exhibition, makes up their project Hanishar (Hebrew for ‘what remains’). The documentary follows Dojc’s journey through Slovakia and aims to preserve Holocaust memory through filmed survivor testimonies and photographic documentation of places and fragments, including the school books.

Judaism teaches respect to sacred books, which thus cannot be burnt, thrown away or otherwise destroyed, but may be ritually buried. The portrayed books may seem to be waiting for a burial. Yet their destiny has turned out to be different. Whilst no longer in a state to be physically preserved, they have been preserved as images leaving a permanent imprint in our memory. Instead of letting them turn to dust, Dojc has turned the books into a Tree of Life. With their commitment to the preservation of cultural memory, Dojc and Krausova are providing the water for the tree. It is through such a sense of responsibility that these books now join the magnum opus of universal Wisdom.

Supported by the Woolf Institute and the Cambridge Jewish Residents Association, the exhibition was sponsored by the Rothschild Foundation Europe, the Lowy Mitchell Foundation, the Slovak Ministry of Culture and Epson Canada. Plans are under way for further exhibitions in New York, Moscow and Sydney in 2010.

Public Education Programmes

The Woolf Institute is committed to developing public outreach programmes, applying its academic research to civic communities and the workplace. Over the last year we have developed a number of educational programmes which are flexible in delivery. We offer one-day or more educational programmes specially tailored for faith communities, public-sector bodies and wider community-based groups. They are taught through seminars, workshops and plenary sessions, and via e-learning.

These programmes are developed in consultation with individual groups. Amongst those we have worked with are the Metropolitan Police Service, the Diocese of Salford and Cambridge City Council, offering the following courses:

- Islam, misconceptions and realities
- Faith literacy and the interfaith encounter
- An introduction to Jewish-Christian-Muslim relations

The Woolf Institute encourages progressive learning. Those who complete these courses and are interested in continuing their studies, can choose from a range of further programmes.

Further information:
Trisha Kessler: trisha.kessler@woolf.cam.ac.uk
Andrew Brown: andrew.brown@woolf.cam.ac.uk
Tel: (01223) 478 175

Installation of Last Folio in the Lower Library of Gonville and Caius College, which “resonates with what we feel about books as ambassadors of ideas and transmitters of knowledge”, Katya Krausova.
Public talks

Visiting Auschwitz with the BBC
Following a trip to the Auschwitz-Birkenau Museum, Ed Kessler participated in a special Radio 4 programme on 31 January. He now reflects on the trip for Perspectives:

In early January 2010 Kevin Franz, a Quaker, and I made our first visit to Auschwitz with BBC Radio 4 for a programme to be broadcast for Holocaust Memorial Day. During our 3-day stay, we discussed whether it was possible to discern in the Holocaust God’s relationship to humanity, and humanity’s response. How are we to understand God in the context of such a catastrophe? The results of such inquiry can only be tentative. As Emil Fackenheim has stated, there can be no understanding of the Holocaust theologically: “One does not practise Holocaust theology for there cannot be such a discipline. There is only a theology that is threatened by the Holocaust and saves its integrity by self-exposure to it.”

Fr Manfred Deselaers, director of the Centre for Dialogue and Prayer in Auschwitz, helped. He told me not to begin with prayer or dialogue but with silence and listening. When you stand in Auschwitz, however different you may be as individuals and as nations, or in our case as a Christian and a Jew, you cannot escape the longing to recognise each other as brothers and that while the words of our prayers are different, our tears and our silence are the same.

For many theologians, myself included, the Holocaust raises questions about God’s presence or absence, God’s power and freedom. As Hugo Gryn, put it: “I believe that God was there Himself, violated and blasphemed.” He tells how on the Day of Atonement, he fasted and hid among the stacks of insulation boards. He tried to remember the prayers that he had learned as a child at synagogue and asked God for forgiveness. Eventually, he says, “I dissolved in crying, I must have sobbed for hours. Then, I seemed to be granted a curious inner peace. I believe God was also crying, I found God.” But it was not the God of his childhood, the God who he had expected miraculously to rescue the Jewish People. Hugo Gryn found God in the camps, but God was crying, I think God was silent as well. As a result of my visit, I listened carefully to God’s silence on Holocaust Memorial Day.

Murdered for saving lives
As part of the Holocaust Memorial Day commemorative event, organised by the Woolf Institute and the Cambridge Theological Federation, Ladislaus Löb gave a lecture based on his book Murdered for saving lives: Rezső Kasztner’s tragic rescue of Hungarian Jews (Pimlico, 2009).

Emeritus Professor of German at the University of Sussex, Löb was eleven when he was rescued along with his father from Bergen Belsen by Rezső Kasztner. Kasztner saved nearly 1,700 fellow Hungarian Jews. After the war, he covered the Nuremberg trials as a journalist before moving to Israel, where he became involved in politics. He was later tried and convicted of collaboration with Eichmann. The verdict was eventually reversed, but, by that time, Kasztner had been murdered by an extremist Jewish group in Israel.

In his discussion about this still controversial figure, Löb touched upon a number of profound moral questions which, he admits, no one can answer: “I have been told that I have no right to speak, because I am alive and 400,000 others were killed. I don’t think that there is a causal connection, but there is a very difficult moral problem. I think it’s pure chance that I am here and others are not.” Based on his own experience and documentary research, Löb denies accusations that Kasztner selected only VIPs and his own relatives and asks: “If one has a choice between saving some people and being unable to save others, is it better to let everybody perish or is it better to do what you can?”

Listen to the recording of the lecture at Perspectives online: www.woolf.cam.ac.uk/perspectives

A new logo for the Woolf Institute
The Woolf Institute is pleased to announce the launch of its new logo, which incorporates the image of an open book whose pages are in motion. This logo captures several facets of the Institute’s core mandate. First, the book acknowledges the textual foundations that underlie each of the three faith traditions with which the Institute is currently engaged. Second, the open book, with pages turning, expresses the interactive dynamism of the Institute’s scholarship, which has the power to transform the understanding of interfaith relations as well as the capacity to redefine ourselves as individuals and citizens. Finally, the book’s arched form symbolises the Institute’s aim to bridge, but not efface, the differences that exist between Jews, Christians and Muslims. We are confident that this logo will establish itself as a strong mark of academic discovery, personal development and social engagement.
Celebrating 10 years of the Woolf Institute

The work of the Woolf Institute is a particularly important example of the sort of co-operation urgently needed for the sake of understanding and reconciliation in our world, and its innovative and courageous initiatives deserve the widest support.

Rowan Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury

The values of shared citizenship, tolerance and respect between those of all faiths are a long way from being met in our society. The urgency of our work increases. But in figures like the Archbishop, we have hope.

Edward Kessler, Director, Woolf Institute

Along with the 2010 Woolf Institute Building Bridges Award, the Archbishop of Canterbury received a painting by Bill Papas, entitled Peace. Papas, who died in 2000, was an artistic recorder of people, places and events. He painted Peace, which depicts a Jew, Christian and Muslim together, during a visit to Jerusalem. The picture was generously donated by Bill’s widow, Tessa, who told Ed Kessler that Bill would have supported the Woolf Institute and that the image epitomises what the Institute and the Archbishop stand for.

The work of the Woolf Institute is a particularly important example of the sort of co-operation urgently needed for the sake of understanding and reconciliation in our world, and its innovative and courageous initiatives deserve the widest support.

Rowan Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury

The values of shared citizenship, tolerance and respect between those of all faiths are a long way from being met in our society. The urgency of our work increases. But in figures like the Archbishop, we have hope.

Edward Kessler, Director, Woolf Institute

Archbishop Rowan Williams arriving at Middle Temple and in conversation with Clemens Nathan, former Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Woolf Institute. The dinner brought together over 170 guests from a range of professional, academic and faith backgrounds.
The Woolf Institute team (from left): Dawud Bone, Dan Avasilichoae, Esther Haworth, Andrew Brown, Trisha Kessler, Michael Mumisa, Marta Dominguez Diaz, Jasmine Hou, Tina Steiner, Lars Fischer, Lucia Faltin, Ed Kessler
My research interests centre on issues of faith in contemporary society including education, community cohesion and family law. As part of my doctoral research I made a detailed study of the religious and social backgrounds of South-Asian Muslims and the effect this has had on moulding attitudes and religious legal opinions within their communities in the UK.

In my inaugural lecture, I examined the social dimensions of religious laws in plural societies. The position of Muslim Shariah courts and Jewish Beth-Din courts in the UK has become the focus for a considerable amount of discussion in the media with some commentators fearful of the erosion of the principle of ‘one law for everyone’. Until now most discussions have centred on their legal status in British Law and their position within the legal discourse of the faith communities they serve. However, this overlooks the ‘reality’ of life within Britain’s faith communities. I am especially interested in attitudes and customs as they exist in our society and what steps could be taken to promote the ideals of equality and justice.

Another research interest is the comparatively new field of Muslim Chaplaincy. I was the University of Warwick’s first Muslim chaplain and have taught on the Diploma in Muslim Chaplaincy at Markfield Institute of Higher Education. As a part of my duties at the Woolf Institute I am teaching a course on Islam in Britain at the new Cambridge Muslim College which educates graduates of traditional Muslim seminaries.

The Woolf Institute is engaged in crucial research in the area of inter-religious relations. So much is talked about the need for greater community cohesion yet without improving the understanding each religious group has of its neighbours it is hard to see how genuine progress can be made. The research carried out at the Centre for the Study of Muslim-Jewish Relations goes well beyond the usual superficial exploration of commonalities and exposes important areas of difference and diversity from which all can learn. Through its research and the subsequent dissemination of that research through academic publications and public education programmes, I am convinced we can have a major role to play in community building and strategic planning for a more just pluralist society.

On a more personal note I am married to Amra, a PhD student at Birmingham University and a member of Birmingham Central Mosque’s Shariah Council. Amra sits on a number of advisory committees to the British Government and we have four children aged 9 to 18.

People at Woolf

Dawud Bone

Having joined the Institute in April 2009 as Stone Ashdown Director at CMJR, Dawud succeeded Aminieh Hoti, who, having had a baby recently, remains connected with us as an Affiliated Lecturer.

I joined the Woolf Institute in April 2009 having completed my doctorate in Education at the University of Warwick. This incorporated specialist studies in Religious Education and pastoral care and my thesis was a study of UK Muslim Seminaries and their attitudes towards the study of other faiths. This qualitative study focused on attitudes rather than curricula.

Whilst writing up my PhD thesis I also worked as the first Muslim employee of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. There I was employed on the Shared Futures school linking project which strived to bring together children attending Muslim and Jewish faith-based schools to challenge their prejudices and improve community cohesion.

In addition to my research and professional experience in faith issues and inter-faith relations I have brought to the Institute an expertise in IT developed through my research into knowledge management at the Universities of Reading and Coventry and through my private consulting work with Universities and engineering companies.

Andrew Brown

CJCR alumnus (holding an MA in Jewish-Christian Relations) and a Woolf Institute tutor for many years, Andrew was appointed Interfaith Project Manager in January 2010. He is also chaplain to Cambridge University, Anglia Ruskin University and Cambridgeshire Constabulary. He runs a blog: http://andrewjbrown.blogspot.com

On leaving school after my A-levels in 1984 I went straight into the music profession working as a jazz and rock bass player until I went up to Oxford to train for the Unitarian and Free Christian ministry in 2000. During that time I had the opportunity to play with many musicians from America (including the guitarist Tal Farlow and the drummer Peter Erskine) and the UK (including Benny Green, Pete King, Eddie Prevost, Alan Skidmore et al.). I even had a spell in Steve Harley’s band ‘Cockney
Rebel’ recording one album with them in 1996. The band I spent the most time with was the Flanagan Ingham Quartet and, from time to time that band still does the odd gig but the major project I am working with at the moment is Riprap – a quartet that is collaborating with a number of poets including the American Beat poet Gary Snyder and the British poet Ruth Padel.

I had always been interested in philosophy and theology and the hours spent in vans, tour buses, hotels, B&Bs and planes (and the many months when, like all musicians, I wasn’t working and was flat broke!) provided me with ample time to read and think. Eventually this study, and my continu- ing involvement with Christian communities (Anglican and then Unitarian and Free Christian), persuaded me to begin training for the ministry at Oxford and to study theology at the University.

On graduation I took up my current post as the minister to the Memorial (Unitarian) Church in Cambridge in 2000 and, in 2002, enrolled on the MA course at CJCR. There were a number of reasons for choosing to do this but chief amongst them was the fact that my parents had some very close Jewish friends and so, as a child, I was keenly aware that our family’s Christian faith wasn’t the only one on the block.

The chance to study at CJCR was a great opportunity to see how my positive personal experience fitted into the wider, and often not at all positive, context of the two millennia old relationship between Judaism and Christianity. The real joy was to be able to do this under the guidance of staff who were always concerned to promote excellent historically based scholarship which was concerned to uncover as dispassionately as possible the historical realities of this often fraught and misunderstood encounter.

Since obtaining my MA from CJCR my personal involvement with the Institute has continued to deepen and I am delighted that it has culminated in being offered a position as one of the Educational Programmes Managers alongside Trisha Kessler, fellow CJCR Alumna, who has already done so much to develop the Institute’s public education programmes.

My hope is that I can contribute to the work of the Woolf Institute by finding additional appropriate ways to take the fruits of its excellent scholarship out into the wider civic space so that the many debates on the role religion plays (or might play) in civic life can be better informed and more fruitful for all concerned.

Marta Dominguez Diaz
A Junior Research Fellow, Marta joined CMJR in September 2009. She is carrying out a two-year research project examining how the experience of death and grief is religiously framed and expressed by Muslims and Jews in the UK today.

After finishing my undergraduate programme in History at the University of Barcelona, I moved to London, where I undertook an MA in Islamic Societies and Cultures and then a PhD in the Study of Religions at the School of Oriental and African Studies. Following my interest in the Abrahamic faiths as living traditions, and in understanding how they are manifested by individuals and communities, I investigate bodily manifestations of religion by Jews and Muslims. My PhD dealt with female religiosities in a Sufi Order in Western Europe and Morocco. I am currently working on a study of religious variations in attitudes towards dying, death, and grief, with a comparative perspective of Judaism and Islam in the UK. My work explores the ways in which individuals and communities respond to death in these two different traditions and it investigates similarities and differences in the ways of conceptualising death and grieving, not only between Judaism and Islam but also within these two traditions.

Judaism and Islam provide grounds for qualitative, comparative research since they are similar in the relevant role they give to religious practice. My research analyses the enactment of religious meanings on death, dying and bereavement within a variety of Jewish and Muslim communities. In particular, it will look at how religious communities cope with loss, by seeking to understand the role of religious leaders, and hospital chaplains in assistance and solace. It will also consider religious organisations that deal with issues related to death and dying, such as bereavement-support groups, help-lines and counselling services for bereaved Jews and Muslims. Dying and the sense of grief which loss provokes are chapters of human experience in which nature and nurture overlap with force. It has often been argued that religious life offers protection, ‘a refuge of meaning’ against the non-sense that we as humans often perceive in the forces of nature; hence, exploring approaches to death and bereavement offers an opportunity to reflect on the core and inner logic of these two religions, as experienced by their followers.

The Woolf Institute is a motivating place, for it brings academics the unique opportunity to witness the richness of interfaith encounters, as well as Judaism, Islam and Christianity as living realities. Within the Institute, the Centre for the Study of Muslim-Jewish Relations fosters stimulating discussion about the many issues facing Judaism and Islam in a pluralist society like ours. As a young scholar who studies Islam and Judaism in its current expressions, working in the Centre is an enriching experience; it stimulates a more nuanced understanding of the issues concerning inter-religious relations, the encounter
of Jews and Muslims with their ‘religious others’ and with society at large. Further, the Centre brings together people from a diversity of backgrounds and interests. This diversity constitutes a source of reciprocal enrichment, making our teaching, research and dialogue activities a gratifying platform for academic excellence and interfaith understanding.

Lars Fischer
In September 2009, Lars became the third Academic Director at CJCR since its inception in 1998, following in the footsteps of Melanie Wright, now Lecturer at the Open University and James Aitken who took up a Lectureship at the University of Cambridge.

I finished school in 1984 and moved to Berlin where I had a stab at Theatre Studies (or Theatre Sciences, as the Germans would have it), Politics and, for most of the time, Protestant Theology before eventually dropping out in 1989. Returning to higher education in 1997, I graduated with a BA in Modern History from Queen Mary and Westfield College (University of London) in 2000 and was fortunate enough to receive a Major Graduate School Research Scholarship at UCL where I completed my PhD in the Hebrew and Jewish Studies Department in 2003. I owe an enormous debt of gratitude to the department at UCL and am extremely proud to hold an honorary appointment there alongside my main appointment at the CJCR. A revised version of my thesis has since been published by Cambridge University Press as The Socialist Response to Antisemitism in Imperial Germany and a paperback edition is due out later this year.

Before coming to the CJCR I held temporary lectureships in modern European history at King’s College London (2004–2007) and German history at UCL (2007–2009). One of the most fascinating aspects of my career before coming to Cambridge were the repeated role reversals it entailed. I started out doing my level best as a Graduate Teaching Assistant in the Hebrew and Jewish Studies Department at UCL to persuade our students of Jewish history that their field requires a solid general framework if they are to avoid the futile exercise of treating Jewish history as though it transpired in a vacuum. I then found myself working equally hard to persuade students of ‘mainstream’ European history at King’s – and the same then applied to a considerable degree and from yet another distinct vantage point to my students in the Department of German at UCL – that the Jewish experience with modernity is far from marginal to the encounter with modernity more generally and that perceptions of Jewry and Judaism have had an integral formative influence on the process of Western identity formation. In short, the study of Jewish/non-Jewish relations is anything but a highly specialised preoccupation – yet that is exactly how it is generally perceived and as the pressures on university funding grow more and more catastrophic, it is increasingly being squeezed out of the curriculum. Consequently, I am extremely pleased to find myself in a position where not only do I not need to justify my interest in Jewish/non-Jewish relations but would be sacked if I failed to focus on exactly this field of study!

As a modern historian I view Jewish-Christian relations as one dimension of Jewish/non-Jewish relations more generally. As an intellectual historian with no personal stake in either of the three traditions on which the Woolf Institute focuses, I approach theological issues and religious thought as I would any other school of thought and/or ideology, with a keen interest both in their systematic substance and the various ways in which they reflect and shape political, social, and cultural practices.

The red thread that tends to run through all my research springs from the assumption that fully-fledged ideological antisemitism would stand no chance of exerting any sort of influence beyond the lunatic fringe if it depended merely on the ingenuity and stamina of the self-avowed antisemites or those whose attitudes towards Jews are self-evidently pathological. I am therefore primarily interested in its ability to draw, to varying degrees, on a prevalence of rather more low-key susceptibilities to anti-Jewish stereotyping among those who mean well and whose stance vis-à-vis social conventions and prejudices is generally critical. In short: I focus predominantly on the (problematic) attitudes towards Jews held not by ‘nasty’ but by ‘nice’ people.

I also edit the review section of East European Jewish Affairs and recently took over from Daniel Langton as Secretary of the British Association for Jewish Studies (BAJS).

Congratulations to:
Hannah Holtschneider and George Wilkes on their baby daughter Noa Bendita who was born in January;
Tilde Rosmer and Sherif on their baby daughter, Noura, born in Ramallah last summer;
Amineh Hoti and Arsallah on the birth of their daughter Anah.
Visiting Fellows

The Institute’s Visiting Fellows come from a wide range of academic and geographic backgrounds. Their expertise provides an invaluable resource for the research and teaching at the Institute. Recent appointments assure both continuity and further expansion of the scheme for the coming years. CJCR has appointed three Fellows for different periods between September 2009 and 2010, and an additional two for 2011. CMJR joins the programme with their first Visiting Fellow in April 2010 and the second in 2010–2011.

Navras Jaat Aafreedi will come to CMJR from Northern India in late Spring 2010 to carry out a research project on Muslim-Jewish Relations in South Asia.

Navras Aafreedi earned his PhD from the Department of Medieval and Modern Indian History, University of Lucknow in 2005 and was then engaged in post-doctoral research by the Graduate School of Historical Studies, Tel Aviv University. He is the author of the e-book (CD-Rom) The Indian Jewry and the Self-Professed 'Lost Tribes of Israel' in India, which embodies his doctoral thesis. He is also a Member of the Advisory Team of The Ten Lost Tribes Challenge: Expeditions of Discovery; a series of research expeditions to various groups around the world, who consider themselves - either by their own traditions and beliefs or according to historical and ethnographic research - to be descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel.

Navras has lived all his life in his home town Lucknow. This is a well-known centre for Muslim scholarship (for example, Sayyid Abdul Hassan Ali Nadwi, the former head of Darul Ulum Nadwa in Lucknow was the Founding Chairman of the Trustees of the Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies). However, the city does not have a Jewish community and, as a place of active Muslim politics, Lucknow has often hosted anti-Israel demonstrations. The ignorance of the local community has fed a number of antisemitic attitudes such as Holocaust denial and global Jewish conspiracies. In contrast, Aafreedi’s research has revealed that in the few cities which do possess a Jewish community (Bombay, Calcutta and Ahmedabad) relations between Jews and Muslims are excellent.

Through his Visiting Fellowship, Navras will continue his exploration of Muslim-Jewish relations in South Asia and how these can affect Muslim-Jewish relations across the world. He will reflect on the factors that shape Muslim perceptions of Jews, considering the fact that most Muslims in South Asia have no direct contact with Jews because of their small numbers. The migration of South-Asian Muslims to all corners of the globe means that attitudes in their communities can be highly influential in the wider diaspora Muslim communities and indeed beyond. Aafreedi’s research has tremendous potential to influence attitudes and combat antisemitism.

Navras has emerged as the first person to make a substantial contribution to Jewish Studies in Urdu, which is spoken by almost all South Asian Muslims. Through his research he will be able to extend his influence to the South-Asian diaspora community and beyond, combating ignorance and promoting constructive engagement in the future.

Paul Kerry will take up in June the second part of a three-stage Visiting Fellowship that commenced in 2009.

Paul Kerry is an Associate Professor in the Department of History and member of the European Studies faculty at Brigham Young University. His research and teaching in intellectual history focus on European and transatlantic thought in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, including Jewish-Christian relations during this period. His most recent articles appear in The Cambridge Companion to Benjamin Franklin (2009), Thomas Carlyle Resartus (2010), and The Ring and the Cross (2010). In 2006 he participated in the Silberman seminar at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the following year was a visiting fellow at Princeton University. He is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society.

Marcel Stoetzler is CJCR’s current Visiting Fellow (September 2009 – September 2010).

Educated at the universities of Hamburg, Greenwich and Middlesx, Marcel Stoetzler has held postdoctoral fellowships at Goldsmiths College (University of London) and the University of Manchester. He works on modern social and political thought, usually in an historical perspective (‘social history of ideas’), and is currently concentrating on various aspects of modern antisemitism, especially its interconnections with liberalism and nationalism and the emergence of the discipline of Sociology. He is also interested in, and has previously published on, problems of feminism, critical theory (‘Frankfurt School’), Hannah Arendt, and Marx. His first book, The State, the Nation and the Jews. The Antisemitism Dispute in Bismarck’s Germany was published in 2008 by the University of Nebraska Press. He serves on the editorial board of Patterns of Prejudice.

Eva Maria Ziege joins CJCR as Visiting Fellow for three months in April 2010.

A sociologist by training, Eva Maria Ziege was educated at the universities of Bonn and Potsdam. Her post-doctoral thesis (Habilitationsschrift) on the Frankfurt School’s grappling with antisemitism while in exile was published by Suhrkamp in 2009. She has held positions at the Humboldt Universität in Berlin and, most recently, as a DAAD Associate Professor at the University of Washington in Seattle.
**Daniel Cowdin**

will be Visiting Fellow at CJCR from September–December 2010.

Daniel Cowdin is Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Religious and Theological Studies at Salve Regina University (Rhode Island). He was educated at Yale, Colorado State University, and Stanford. His research interests include environmental ethics, bioethics, Catholic social thought, and religious liberty. During his stay at the CJCR he will focus on the role of the Talmud in Christian ethics and explore the implications of a non-supersessionist theological approach for Christian spiritual life.

**Amy-Jill Levine**

will arrive at CJCR as Visiting Fellow in 2011.

Amy-Jill Levine is E. Rhodes and Leona B. Carpenter Professor of New Testament Studies at Vanderbilt Divinity School, the Graduate Department of Religion, and the Program in Jewish Studies. She was educated at Smith College and Duke University, holds honorary doctorates from the University of Richmond, the Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, and the University of South Carolina-Upstate, and has been the recipient of numerous prestigious grants. Her recent books include The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus (HarperOne, 2006), the co-edited collection, The Historical Jesus in Context (Princeton) as well as the 14-volume series, Feminist Companions to the New Testament and Early Christian Writings (Continuum). She combines historical-critical rigor, literary-critical sensitivity, and a frequent dash of humour with a commitment to eliminating anti-Jewish, sexist, and homophobic theologies.

**Jay Geller**

is the second CJCR Visiting Fellow to arrive in 2011.

Jay Geller is Associate Professor of Modern Jewish Culture at Vanderbilt Divinity School and the Vanderbilt University Program in Jewish Studies. He has also taught at the University of Vienna, Bryn Mawr College, Princeton University, Rutgers University, Swarthmore College, and Wesleyan University. He has published numerous articles on the role of Freud’s Jewish identification in his construction of psychoanalysis, in particular, and on the relationship between the (especially antisemitic) ascription of Jewish identity and Jewish identity formation in modern Europe, in general. More recently, his work has also focused on the Shoah and film. His On Freud’s Jewish Body: Mitigating Circumcisions came out in 2007 with Fordham University Press. He recently completed the companion volume, The Other Jewish Question. Modernity and the Body of Jewish Identification, for Fordham University Press. It includes (inter alia) chapters on Levin Varnhagen, Heine, Marx, Nordau, Schreber, and Kafka.

During his stay in Cambridge Geller’s focus will be on ‘(Un)natural Histories of the Jews’ – forms of animal representation that promoted or subverted (indeed often both promoted and subverted) the bestialisation of the Jew in the Central European cultural imaginary.

**Camilla Adang**

has been appointed CMJR Visiting Fellow in 2010–2011.

Dutch scholar, Camilla Adang received her PhD from Radboud University, Nijmegen and is presently Senior Lecturer in Arabic and Islamic Studies at Tel Aviv University. She wrote an important work, entitled, ‘Muslim Writers on Judaism and the Hebrew Bible. From Ibn Rabban to Ibn Hazm (Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science)’ (Brill, 1996) and is seeking to research in medieval legal writings in the Iberian peninsula, especially the Zahir school of Islamic law and its foremost representative, Ibn Hazm of Cordoba (d. 1064).

**FORMER FELLOWS: UPDATE**

Even after their tenure, Fellows help the Woolf Institute to develop its international academic network. Given the recent 20th anniversary of the fall of communism we focus on some of our former Fellows from Central and Eastern Europe. Balancing faith and reason is their daily bread.

**The Czech Republic**

Our working relationship with Tomáš Halík (CJCR Visiting Fellow, 2003) began with summer school in Prague in 2003. A professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Religious Studies at the Charles University, Halík is one of the key public intellectuals involved in interreligious and intercultural dialogue. He is also the Chaplain at the University Church, the first holder of this post that was established after the fall of Communism. In the twenty years of his chaplaincy which has been recently celebrated, the University Church of St. Salvator has become the meeting place of international religious leaders, including rabbis and imams. Halík’s Patience With God: The Story of Zacchaeus Continuing in Us is now available in English (Doubleday, London, 2009). His most recent book Hope for a Tree. Crisis as a Chance addresses the current economic crisis by rethinking it as a source for ethical advancement. Pilsen’s West Bohemian University has a group of academics within the Centre for Near Eastern Studies who forged a formal working relationship with CJCR. This helped launch an Erasmus agreement between the WBU and the University of Cambridge for the MSt in The Study of Jewish-Christian Relations. Adding to the range of Fellows at CJCR, WBU academics Alena Hanzová and Karel Hanza spent their research leave at CJCR as Erasmus scholars and their student Helena Burgrová joined the MSt during Michaelmas Term (2009). She became the first Masters-level Erasmus student in the history of Cambridge University.
The demise of Communism did not end antisemitism. On the contrary, it is on the increase. In November, the Czech police arrested a group of Neo-Nazis in Pilsen on anti-terrorist grounds: they were training and preparing for attacks on prominent Jewish leaders.

Russia
Further east, Irina Levinskaya (CJCR Visiting Fellow, 2000) has been serving as an expert witness in a series of trials against nationalist and antisemitic groups and Neo-Nazi gangs in St Petersburg. The proceedings even dealt with the blood libel defamation. The severity of the risks attached to her work, which she carries out in addition to her commitments as lecturer at the Academy of Science, is illustrated by the fact that her predecessor in the court was assassinated as a result of his work.

Poland
The work of our Polish colleagues has helped Poland emerge as one of the pioneers in fostering better understanding of Jewish-Christian relations. Among them, Stanisław Krajewski (CJCR Visiting Fellow, 2004) has been one of the leading figures in Jewish-Christian dialogue in Poland. Originally a logician and mathematician at the Warsaw University, Krajewski moved to lecture in the philosophy of religion at the Department of Philosophy. His recent publication *Abraham Joshua Heschel: Philosophy, Theology and Interreligious Dialogue* has been recently published (by Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, co-edited with Adam Lipszyc). The book comes out of an international conference on Heschel held in Poland last year, on the 100th anniversary of his birth. It received contributions from a number of other scholars whom we count as colleagues, including Anna Wojnarska (CJCR Alumna and Sternberg Visiting Fellow, 2006). An Assistant Professor at the Cardinal Wyszynski University in Warsaw, Wojnarska facilitated an Erasmus exchange agreement between her University and Cambridge through the MSt. In addition to raising her young family, Anna recently published her second monograph *To Forgive God. A figure of Job in the literature related to WWII*. She convened an international conference on cultural interpretations of the biblical Job, which was held in Warsaw last Autumn. It was also an opportunity for us to further our relationship with her University, as James Aitken and Lucia Faltin attended to give papers.

Reader interaction

**Woolf Institute courses**
We would be grateful for your help in promoting our courses. If you have an opportunity to do so, kindly pass on or display the enclosed course adverts.

**Perspectives online**
Do visit our new and interactive online version of Perspectives to explore additional sources and listen to recordings.

**Submissions**
We welcome submissions from readers. Details are inside the front cover.

Our cooperation with Central European partners helps dozens of students from the region to pursue Masters studies in Cambridge. In 2009–2010 we have three Czech and one Slovak MSt students, including (from left) Pavol Bargár, Zuzana Baňáková and Martin Borysek.
Beaumont Newhall & Helmut Gernsheim: Collaboration, Friendship, and Tension amidst the ‘Jewishness’ of Photography

Michael Berkowitz

The Yankee yet cosmopolitan Beaumont Newhall (1908–1993) and the Munich-born Englishman Helmut Gernsheim (1913–1995), descendant of a venerable Jewish family from medieval Worms, are among the most important historians of photography of the twentieth century. Both produced classics entitled The History of Photography: Newhall in 1937 (with several later editions) and Gernsheim in 1955 (abridged version 1965, revised and enlarged edition 1969). Their work remains seminal to the field. Newhall and Gernsheim knew each other well and collaborated in a number of ways. Having started as a librarian at New York’s Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), Newhall established the museum’s department of photography, the first of its kind. In 1948 he was appointed founding curator of the Museum of Photography at the George Eastman House in Rochester, New York, an institution which swiftly gained recognition as the world-leader.

In addition to the lasting significance of his scholarship, Helmut Gernsheim is regarded as a savvy and prolific collector of photography, whose treasures now largely reside in the Ransom Center of the University of Texas. Gernsheim’s relationship with Beaumont Newhall was central to this endeavour: In the midst of the Second World War and its immediate aftermath, Newhall encouraged Gernsheim to scour second-hand shops and estate sales in London and the provinces in order to preserve and further investigate the heritage of photography, something that...
few considered worthwhile at the time. The assumption was that this effort at private acquisition would assist Gernsheim in his research, because he was not connected to a library, archive, or museum, as was Newhall. In retrospect, although Gernsheim himself was already an expert, the suggestions and information offered by Newhall would prove to be, in every sense of the word, of immense value.

In the course of ongoing research for a book on the engagement of Jews with photography, I have read batches of Gernsheim’s correspondence from three substantial archival collections. Two are at the Getty Research Institute in Los Angeles: dynamic – although neither talked about this openly. In 1979, Gernsheim sent Newhall the off-print of a short history of his family that he wrote for the Year Book of the Leo Baeck Institute – to assure its place in the pantheon of eminent German Jewish clans. This appears to be the only instance in which he affirmed, in any way, a tie to Judaism. (Biographical entries refer to him as ‘half’ or ‘partly’ Jewish.) In any case allusions to religion were always subtle – as both men (and their spouses) were highly secular. Neither in their extensive correspondence nor in Newhall’s memoirs does religious observance, no matter the guise, feature with any frequency. But the fact that Gernsheim was a refugee from Nazi Germany, an internee aboard the infamous ship, Dunera, which was diverted from Canada to Australia, imprisoned among German and Austrian Jews, and unmistakably of Jewish origin, figured into the equation. I believe that part of Newhall’s generosity toward Gernsheim was due to the fact that Newhall was, without any awareness of it, a philosemitic. It seems he was always willing to give Jews the benefit of the doubt. Newhall certainly was aware of the fact that among many of his colleagues in the world of photography Gernsheim had a reputation as a difficult character – but he never let that hinder his support and constant advice to Gernsheim. Gernsheim himself, though, was so uneasy with his vague Jewishness that he had often excruciating encounters with those whose Jewish identity was (more or less) general knowledge, even if that identity was entirely secular – such as the director of the Warburg Institute, Fritz Saxl, and Peter Pollack, with whom he became involved when Pollack sought to use Gernsheim’s photographs for a new edition of his Picture History of Photography in the late 1960s. Not only did Saxl throw Gernsheim out of the Warburg Institute. Saxl’s partner and collaborator Gertrud Bing would not even mention his name in accounts of the Institute’s work, even though she was effusive about Gernsheim’s photographic achievements for the Warburg Institute during the Second World War.

Although this line of argument is necessarily speculative, I believe that part of Newhall’s fascination with photography derived from its ‘Jewish’ associations. Photography, as a spectacle in its own right and an emergent fine art, was part and parcel of a cultural constellation emanating from New York City with Alfred Stieglitz at its centre. Stieglitz, in his time, was something of an emblematic Jew of New York, much in the same way that Woody Allen came to be seen as the (albeit a-religious) archetypal Jew of New York in the 1970s. The Jewishness of Stieglitz is affirmed by his adherents and detractors alike. As a graduate student at Harvard, Newhall was deeply grateful for the advice and guidance he received, over a number of years, from his teacher Paul Sachs (1878–1965) who had retired early from his family’s business, the banking house Goldman Sachs. It was Sachs, the first teacher of what came to be called museum or curatorial studies, who provided Newhall with an entrée to Stieglitz and the names and addresses of other Jewish collectors at a time when photography was still regarded as marginal or lacking in respectability. Thus far the story may seem unremarkable, given that Stieglitz was famed for welcoming and enjoining all of the visitors to his cutting edge galleries, ‘291’ and ‘An American Place’. Yet Stieglitz not only welcomed Newhall into his gallery and home – he also took him into his darkroom. Newhall would never forget the experience that was to, him, almost akin to the initiation into a religious rite by a founder of the faith.

In the papers of Beaumont and Nancy Newhall, and the Nachlass of Peter Pollack (1909–1978), who was himself a notable curator; historian and commentator on photography; Pollack, incidentally, was the sub-editor in charge of the ‘Jews and Photography’ section of the monumental Encyclopaedia Judaica of the early 1970s. From the Beaumont and Nancy Newhall collection of the Getty I perused their correspondence with scores of other scholars and photographers, including the towering figure in photography and American modernism, Alfred Stieglitz (1864–1946), and one of his illustrious followers, Paul Strand (1890–1976). I have also used the archives of the Warburg Institute in London, which holds letters concerning Gernsheim’s work under the auspices of the Warburg Institute for the National Buildings Record in 1941–42, and listened to several hours of interviews with Helmut Gernsheim in the Oral History archive of the British Library.

Along with their shared passion for photography, it seems that the relationship between Newhall and Gernsheim was shaped by a particular Jewish/non-Jewish

Newhall would never forget the experience that was, to him, almost akin to the initiation into a religious rite by a founder of the faith.
Weegee) whose work he regarded as worthy of consideration as art.

Newhall encouraged Gernsheim to appreciate the ‘pressmen’ such as Weegee but this aspect of photography was not to Gernsheim’s taste. In what might be seen as an eruption of Jewish self-hatred, Gernsheim denigrated photojournalists, agents and editors – a realm largely populated by Jews – as vile creatures beneath contempt. Newhall, on the other hand, found them enchanting and occasionally credited them with the elevation of press photography to a genre in its own right.

Their common interest in photography apart, it would seem that Gernsheim was drawn to Newhall because he represented an ideal-type: a real American blue-blood, a dyed-in-the-wool member of America’s upper crust for whom an elite boarding school and Harvard were rites of passage. Both were, sincerely, good and helpful to each other. But I would argue that Newhall was exposed to the better side of Gernsheim’s complex and volatile personality because Gernsheim was trying very assiduously to nurture his relationship with Newhall.

At the end of December 1941, attempting to gain employment as a photographer with London’s Warburg Institute, Gernsheim summed up his career to date as follows:

I studied photography at the Staatslehranstalt fuer Lichtbildwesen in Munich for two years and took a final degree there with first class honours in all subjects, theoretical and practical. My main interest was always in architectural photography and art reproduction. Before I came to England in July 1937 I took a number of photographs, for the National Museum in Munich; for Dr. Schlegel, formerly of the Marburg Institute of Art, I did a complete series of the Romanesque church of Altenstadt in Bavaria, a rather important work as it was brought before the highest authorities and gave occasion for renovation works which were carried out later on. I also collaborated with Dr. Walter Hege on his book ‘Bavarian Baroque and Rococo Churches’ for which I prepared the Uvachrome Colour plates.

In this country I did all the photographic work for the Sabin Gallery, for Mrs. Mendelsohn-Bartholdy, Mr. Helmut Ruhemann, for the sculptor Georg Ehrlich and Ewein [Ervin] Bossanyi, occasional work for the Studio etc. I also have taken a number of photographs of St. George’s Chapel in Windsor which I should like to show you.

When war broke out I offered my services to His Majesty’s Government and was duly enrolled in the Central Register of the Ministry for Labour and National Service.

In August of last year I received an appointment as professor for photography at the Laboratory For Anthropology at Santa Fe, New Mexico, U.S.A., but alas I had been interned in the general invasion fever in July and was on my way to Australia.

Four weeks ago I returned to this country from Australia having been released from internment by the Home Secretary for my special qualifications.

May I add in conclusion I am brother of Dr. Walter Gernsheim, formerly of 5, Stratford Place, W. 1. I should welcome the pleasure of making personal contact with you and I am looking forward to the favour of your kind reply.

(Warburg Institute Archive, General Correspondence, H. Gernsheim to F. Saxl, 30 December 1941.)

Gernsheim appealed to the director of the Warburg Institute, Fritz Saxl, on the basis of his professional qualifications, but also from his status as a stateless refugee with no
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place to return to in the foreseeable future. Most of his relevant work consisted of the photographing of churches, but Gernsheim was also counting on his connections to the orbit of German Jewish émigrés to help secure a position. Gernsheim was indeed hired by the Warburg Institute and commenced to do extremely important work for the National Buildings Record, notably his photo surveys of St. Paul’s Cathedral and Westminster Abbey. But he was forced to resign under a cloud, and the reasons for his departure have some bearing on the questions at hand: the relationship between Jews and photography, and the issue of Gernsheim’s tortured attitude towards his own Jewish origins.

The friendship between Gernsheim and Newhall was prompted by Newhall’s favourable review of Gernsheim’s pithy book of 1942, New Photo Vision. Gernsheim then wrote to Newhall, pleased that his review received such a positive response. Seizing the opportunity to make use of Newhall’s knowledge and judgment, Gernsheim began asking him for advice about his fledgling photographic collection. Crucially, Newhall expressed his confidence that interest in photography in general, and early photography in particular, would evolve over the years.

On the surface, and as revealed in their extensive correspondence, it is apparent that their main bond was their dedication to the promotion of a better understanding of, and appreciation for, photography as a legitimate form of fine art. Although both men had a scholarly disposition and were painstakingly precise in all of their endeavours, they were not scholars in a conventional sense; neither held a regular university-level appointment. Around the time of the death of Gernsheim’s first wife, Alison (née Eames, c.1911–1969), Newhall speculated that one of the grounds for his requited attraction to Gernsheim lay in the fact that they both worked as part of a husband-and-wife team. Rather than being relegated to secretarial or support roles, as was often the case with the wives of their peers, their respective spouses were as much primary investigators and analysts as they themselves. In one of his most personal asides, Newhall speculated that their connection might also have derived from the fact that both couples remained childless. Their work, as opposed to children, consumed their energy and provided the predominant focus of their lives.

Clearly, then, each of them cared about the background of the other; even if the words ‘Jew’ and ‘Christian’ may never have fallen between them. Fortunately for Gernsheim, Newhall was untroubled by his friend’s tempestuousness and self-centredness, which was legendary. In fact, Gernsheim’s arrogant behaviour led to his rejection from the Warburg and has almost banished him from its very memory. While there are positive references to his work for the National Buildings Record in the historiography of the Warburg Institute, his name does not feature. His mastery of his craft notwithstanding – as a photographer with a background in art history – the...
quasi-German-Jewish Warburg Institute, which was at one point his salvation, rejected him as unworthy of their community. Problems began when he publicly ridiculed a member of the Institute, one of the few non-Jews who had joined the predominantly Jewish group in migrating from Hamburg to London. The members of the Warburg, who prided themselves on their affability and status as a remarkably humane scholarly cohort, were horrified at the way in which Gernsheim lambasted a beloved member of their Institute as an ‘idiot’. Two subsequent debacles finally led to Gernsheim’s termination. He protested that he was not given credit for his contribution to the Institute’s work, as his name was not attached to the photographs he had taken. Gernsheim’s demands caused particular unease because it was not common practice to name the individual photographers responsible for images of art and architecture. The question of their attribution then became one of control over his photographs when Gernsheim sold some of them to the press. Sixty years later, lawyers are still embroiled in this controversy.

There is a great irony in this turn of events, and in the fact that Gernsheim has little place in the history of the very institution that re-launched his career in Britain after his secondary exile in Australia. It seems that he turned to photography (as opposed to academic art history) upon the suggestion of his brother, Walter, resident in England, because this seemed to be a field open to Jews. Perhaps inspired in part by scholarship pioneered by the Warburg, in which great use was made of photography in books and articles about classical to Renaissance civilisation, Walter saw the need, in England, for photographers specialising in capturing fine art and architecture. Furthermore, Helmut’s older brother may have more closely identified with things Jewish, because he married a Jewish woman. Interestingly, Walter Gernsheim is himself one of the most significant interlocutors between photography and art, having begun a vast project to photograph mainly tenth and eleventh-century manuscripts and prints, and later, fifteenth to early twentieth-century drawings, which is now known as the Gernsheim Photographic Corpus of Drawings. The Warburg Institute also played a role in the British government allowing Walter Gernsheim to resume his career in 1944. Yet Helmut Gernsheim, after thinking that he had found a home at the Warburg, was apparently ill at ease with the Jewishness, however a-religious, of the milieu.

Likewise in his relations with Peter Pollack, Gernsheim exhibited no trace of the chivalry he bestowed on Newhall. In the end, Pollack came to loathe Gernsheim, as his name would come up whenever unpleasant issues regarding rights and charges for photographic reproductions arose. The cold and bitter feeling between Pollack and Gernsheim can be starkly contrasted to the warm, fraternal bonds that Pollack often shared with Jewish photographers, agents, and curators for whom their Jewish identity was less problematic than that of the tortured Gernsheim — such as Philippe Halsmann, Arnold Newman, and Sanford Roth. Neither Pollack nor Gernsheim have so far been recognised for their roles in the inception of what might be termed an ‘art market’ for photography.

Needless to say, Gernsheim’s own disdain for the Jewishness of his professional environment did not protect him against being derided himself for embodying characteristics frequently ascribed to Jews. Nor does it diminish his remarkable contribution to the advancement and understanding of photography. What his biography, and his association with Newhall, clearly help illustrate, though, is the extent to which Jewishness, and Jewish/non-Jewish relations, were a part of the story, a fact that has featured all too rarely in scholarly discussions of the history of photography.

Michael Berkowitz is Professor of Modern Jewish History in the Department of Hebrew and Jewish Studies at University College London and regularly cooperates with CJCR (see also page 6).

Further reading

Across the river...

teaching ancient Judaism in a modern University

James K. Aitken

Moving from the Woolf Institute to the Faculty of Divinity is a short geographical step, from one side of the river in the ancient city to the modern buildings of the Sidgwick site. As an intellectual step it is also short, continuing a tradition within Cambridge of teaching Jewish studies while maintaining an awareness of relations between Jews and Christians. The task in the modern University is to maintain a strong tradition of teaching about the faiths, long established in Universities, while bringing in contemporary approaches to history and society. For me, moving from a context of teaching inter-faith relations to one focusing on one particular tradition within a Degree covering a number of religions, brings its own challenges.

It is perhaps appropriate that the Woolf Institute resides in the older quarter of the city, amidst the ancient University buildings reflecting the 800-year history of that Institution. At the time of the foundation of the University in 1209 Cambridge was a bustling market town in which Jews played an active part, with a synagogue off the market place and a living quarter not far from there. The river Cam, being navigable up to this point, had brought many traders to Cambridge since Roman times. Jewish scholars too were no doubt engaged in teaching in those early days of Cambridge, although we have little knowledge of any such individuals. By the 1280s all this was to change, however, with the expulsion of Jews from Cambridge, and subsequently from England in 1290.
Since the expulsion, the University remained a place of Christian education, although the revival of Hebrew study, the learning of Semitic languages and the reading of Jewish sources were revived in the sixteenth century when the Regius Chair of Hebrew was established. Christian Hebraism, the study of Jewish tradition by those of Christian profession, grew throughout Europe at this time as people had greater access to Jewish informants. Such learning can sometimes be dismissed as supersessionist in intention. From the modern perspective the study of Judaism for the purpose of understanding the Old Testament and the background to the New, or for the purpose of disputation with Jews, can be viewed as problematic. However, the depth into which Christian scholars entered into the sources undoubtedly led to deep appreciation of them from many. Notable among early Cambridge figures was John Lightfoot (1602–1675), Master of St Catharine’s College, whose works on both Old Testament books (Genesis and Exodus) and on the New Testament (notably a detailed commentary on Acts) display a wealth of learning in Hebrew and Jewish sources. His most famous work, the *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, provided parallels from Rabbinic literature to various New Testament books.

Without such interest and teaching of Hebrew over the centuries, it is unlikely that genuine appreciation of Judaism and critical engagement with the languages and literature of Jewish antiquity would have been felt so strongly in the nineteenth century. It was at this time that we see increasing appreciation of Judaism expressed by many scholars, long before the twentieth-century recognition of antisemitism. A European-wide development in Jewish studies saw the establishment in 1866 of a University position in Talmudic and Rabbinic Literature. It may be viewed as appropriate or ironic that at about the same time (in 1879) in the former medieval Jewish quarter the Divinity school was rehoused in a new building (the Selwyn Divinity School on St John’s Street). The first holder of the new post, Solomon Schiller-Szinessy, was one of the first Jewish lecturers in Europe, along with one at University College London. His successors have ranged from Solomon Schechter to Nicholas de Lange, the current holder of the post, and have taught and promoted the study of Judaism within the University. It is not by chance that one of the early meetings in Britain between Jews and Christians in 1924 (some years before the formation of a British Council of Christians and Jews) was held in Cambridge, involving the Jewish scholars Dr Israel Abrahams and Dr Herbert Loewe.

It is important to emphasise this long history of non-Jewish enquirers into the Jewish tradition, and the relatively early acceptance of Jewish learning in the University. We can easily be misled to think that Christian appreciation of Judaism has only begun since the Holocaust. However, the tradition of Christian Hebraism has had its positive influences, even though some of its motives can be questioned, and the teaching of Jewish studies in Britain, combined with a long interest in Semitic languages, have ensured a lasting engagement with the topic. A number of British writers in particular contributed to studies of Judaism, both biblical and rabbinic, and edited some of the major texts.

R. Travers Herford, a Unitarian minister, promoted a sympathetic understanding of the Pharisees and the Rabbis. In a number of articles and in his book *Pharisaisms: Its Aim and its Method* (1912) he presented a sympathetic portrait of the Pharisees and of their relationships with Jesus and Paul. In particular his representation of the Law (Torah) was sensitive to a Jewish understanding of the concept. This in part arose from his careful study of rabbinic writings, first by gathering Rabbinic discussions of Christianity into one volume with commentary in *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (1903). His knowledge of the sources he put to use in his edition and commentary of *Pirke Aboth: The Ethics of the Talmud: Sayings of the Fathers* (1925) from the Mishnah. His praise of Pharisaic theology and criticism of Christian repudiation in that work anticipates much later twentieth-century rehabilitation of the Pharisees, associated in particular with the work of E.P. Sanders. Meanwhile, in Oxford Herbert Danby translated and annotated the Mishnah (*Oxford University Press, 1933*). At the same time A. Lukyn Williams undertook a study of Christian anti-Jewish teaching and debate in *Adversus Iudaos: A Bird’s-eye View of Christian Apologetics until the Renaissance* (1935). The most influential figure, however, has been the Revd Dr James Parkes (1896–1981), whose parish was in Barley, a village outside Cambridge. In the 1920s he witnessed

In teaching people to appreciate this era of Jewish history (approximately from the third century BCE to the second century CE) I hope to confront them with the dissimilarity from our own times.

The increase in nationalism in Europe, and became committed to examining the roots of antisemitism. He undertook doctoral work in Oxford in the late 1920s, and his thesis was eventually published as *The Conflict of the Church and Synagogue: a Study in the Origins of Anti-Semitism* (1934). This remains one of the best books on the subject, providing a sensitive understanding of the issues and a balanced judgement. It is, nonetheless, significant in the prominence it gives to Christianity as a source of antisemitism and presupposed much of the current debate today.

These examples are important models of appreciation of one faith by members of another, an appreciation that does not require recognition of twentieth-century extremes. There is a rational appreciation of one religion by another that can spring from a faith commitment. It is true today that teaching is aimed at people of any or no faith, but this presents its own challenges. How will I approach the teaching of ancient Judaism in a modern University?
It is important to note that for everyone the study of ancient Judaism, encompassing Jewish life and thought in the Graeco-Roman world, is in some ways strange. For Christians, ancient Judaism is a new area, although some aspects of it are manifested in the New Testament. My predecessor, William Horbury, has indeed drawn attention to how much of a debt Christianity has owed to its Jewish roots in this period. For Jews we see an expression of Judaism in Greek dress, so different from the biblical or rabbinic presentations, that it can be comparably strange. In that sense there is an ecumenical study of the ancient tradition, since it is not an area championed by either religion.

In teaching people to appreciate this era of Jewish history (approximately from the third century BCE to the second century CE) I hope to confront them with this dissimilarity from our own times. There is a tendency to apply (subconsciously) our own presuppositions to the period, not least through a modern lense of seeing Jews as in some way defensive or ill at ease in the Graeco-Roman world. The term applied to Jewish literature in Greek, for example, is often ‘apologetic’, referring to its perceived intention either to persuade Greeks of the superiority of Judaism or young Jews, attracted by Greek literature, of the value of the Jewish way of life. The term, however, can often raise as many questions as it seeks to answer; since the defensive Judaism of antiquity is perhaps not as real as it might seem. Writing in Greek or expressing Jewish ideas in Greek philosophical terms need not have an apologetic intention; it might be little more than a sign of deep cultural affinity and engagement. Erich Gruen has argued that much of the literature shows great confidence on the part of the Jewish authors, even if his emphasis on the comic nature of the writings has not won many supporters.

What is most striking about Judaism at this time is its absolute normality. It was probably closer to Greek or Roman religion of the time than it is to contemporary manifestations of Judaism or Christianity. The dissonance of ancient Judaism is not so much with the Graeco-Roman world, but with our own understandings of the monotheistic religions. We should not be surprised at Jews using Greek philosophy, writing in forms comparable to Greek literature (including a Jewish Greek tragedy), expressing themselves in terms more appropriate to Roman religion, or following depictions of Roman art and building their houses, tombs and synagogues following Roman architectural styles. It is this conventionalism that is most puzzling to modern eyes and yet does not fully explain the social position of Jews in the Roman empire (as Seth Schwartz has sought to explore). Rather than looking for the clash between civilizations of antiquity, in the future we need to account for the normality of much of the practice of the time. And then subsequently what developments led to separation.

It seems, then that the task for teaching in the future is to encourage students to set aside their faith presuppositions in a different way from the past. Previously, we had to encourage students to learn how to appreciate another religion and thereby remove their prejudices. Now the task is to encourage them to build new prejudices, namely to see Judaism (and indeed Christianity) in antiquity as different and abnormally normal because it is so much like other ancient religions. Students’ faith perspectives can lead them to appreciate ancient religion as too much like their own. They need to learn to see again. And through that we will begin to ask new questions about the history of Judaism, and the subsequent relations. In asking these questions we will be building on the history of the study of religion in Cambridge, although this is now an international enterprise, and we shall hopefully examine the evidence afresh by bringing reason to bear in new ways.

James Aitken is Lecturer in Hebrew, Old Testament and Second Temple Studies at the Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge and former CJCR Academic Director.
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W. Horbury, Christianity in Ancient Jewish Tradition (Cambridge University Press, 1999).
J.C. Vanderkam, An Introduction to Early Judaism (Eerdmans, 2000).
It is somewhat disconcerting just how frequently our students still arrive firmly convinced that from the late eighteenth century onwards European Jewry signed an ‘emancipation contract’, readily committing itself to fulfilling the non-Jews’ fantasy of a world in which all Jews would assimilate to the point of being former Jews, and that it would indeed have done so if Jewish nationalism had not entered the stage at the last minute and convinced at least some Jews of the error of their ways. If our students now leave knowing that the situation was altogether more complicated and that in all sorts of ways, far from cheerfully agreeing to sell out, Jews carved out new composite identities for themselves combining what they considered the best elements that their own traditions and the culture of the majority societies in whose midst they lived had to offer, then few scholars can take as much credit for setting the agenda that has led to this new orthodoxy than David Sorkin.

The volume under review presents the fruits of another major conceptual challenge Sorkin has been formulating for a number of years. He wants to ‘reorient the compass of Enlightenment studies’ to gain general acceptance for the insight that ‘the Enlightenment could be reverent as well as irreverent, and that such reverence was at its very core’ (xiv). The Enlightenment, he insists, ‘was not only compatible with religious belief but conducive to it’ (3). If the moderate mainstream Enlightenment was, on Jonathan Israel’s account, ‘flanked on one side … by a “radical” enlightenment,’ Sorkin would have it flanked by, and indeed ‘significantly overlapping with’, a distinct religious Enlightenment ‘on the other side’ (19–20).

For Sorkin, this religious Enlightenment was ushered in by the Glorious Revolution and ushered out by the French Revolution and Napoleon, and characterised by four main features. Firstly, religious enlighteners ‘sought the middle way of reasonable belief grounded in the idea of “natural religion” and the exegetical principle of accommodation’; secondly, they ‘embraced toleration based on the idea of natural law’ (although, as he readily concedes, the forms of toleration they propagated were ‘decidedly selective’); thirdly, they played a crucial role in shaping the public sphere of the late eighteenth century (this obviously runs counter to Habermas’s assumptions about its decisive role in a scenario that saw the Enlightenment as leading inexorably to secularisation); and finally, the religious Enlightenment gained the sponsorship of states and, using natural law theory, advocated a state church’ (11, 15). In this respect, its Jewish variant, the Haskalah, was to some extent the odd one out, of course, insofar as it ‘depended on the sponsorship of state surrogates, namely, the mercantile elite and court Jews, who had fewer resources than a state and dispensed them capriciously’ (170).

Sorkin seeks to establish the validity of this overall characterisation by presenting and comparing the projects of six religious enlighteners from different denominational/religious and geographical backgrounds in order thus to establish ‘intellectual similarities while recognising national differences’ (11). He discusses a leading Anglican proponent of ‘heroic’ or ‘militant’ moderation, William Warburton (1698–1779, bishop of Gloucester from 1760 onwards), a man whose ‘moderate ideas were immoderately held and expressed’ (63–64). He played a crucial role in shaping the form of moderation that held sway in the Church of England for much of his career and that ‘had a tremendous impact on all subsequent versions of religious Enlightenment’ (65); the ‘middle way’ of Jacob Vernet (1698–1789), ‘Geneva’s dominant theologian and the guardian of
The portraits Sorkin offers of his six religious enlighteners, and their respective contexts, are doubtless intriguing and thought-provoking and go a long way towards substantiating his case. And yet, in the end many questions remain and it seems to me that Sorkin himself may not as yet be entirely sure what exactly he assumes the implications of his research to be. Take, for instance, another concept that Sorkin is clearly intent on introducing as a similar mantra-like theme uniting his religious enlighteners, namely, their emphasis on a specific form of ‘vital’ knowledge that bridges the potential gap between reason and faith and creates a degree of certitude that knowledge generated by reason alone lacks. Sorkin may be on to something here but as it stands it is hard to tell either way. Presumably Sorkin’s decision to use the term ‘vital’ where ‘lively’ or ‘vivid’ would be a rather more obvious translation is down to his determination to emphasise the specificity of the concept in question. Reading just the chapter on Baumgarten one would assume this to be a concept of Baumgarten’s invention. Only in the subsequent chapter on Mendelssohn does it become clear that both Baumgarten and Mendelssohn (and presumably not just they) took this idea from Wolffian philosophy. Where Mendelssohn refers to God’s ‘most vivid’ knowledge, this too is translated as ‘vital’ (174, n19); conversely, what Sorkin insists throughout the main text, and indeed in the chapter heading, on calling Mendelssohn’s ‘vital script’ is referred to in one of the footnotes not as ‘vital’ but as ‘living’ (204, n115). Moreover, the ‘proof text’ Sorkin cites to demonstrate Baumgarten’s reliance on ‘vital knowledge’ is a highly intriguing one that does as much to complicate our understanding of Baumgarten’s position as it does to establish it. The passages in question are in large part devoted to a refutation of prevalent misunderstandings about ‘vital knowledge’; Baumgarten then concludes this discussion with a footnote in which he clarifies that everything he has said was not meant to deny that there is also a valid form of ‘vital knowledge’, namely, the one that serves to bridge the gap between reason and faith. My point here is not that Sorkin has misrepresented Baumgarten’s argument but that at junctures like this his account is simply not thick enough to allow us to judge his conclusions. In this sense, the book is simultaneously both too ambitious and not ambitious enough and the fact that it has no bibliography and the footnotes have not been proofread as carefully as they should, makes any attempt to follow Sorkin’s tracks unnecessarily torturous.

On a similar note, Sorkin tells us that Lamourette ‘devised a theology that combined reasonable religion and Rousseauist sentimentalism on the basis of a moderate fideist skepticism’ (266). Sorkin demonstrates this by citing Lamourette’s own interpretation and appropriation of Rousseau’s sentimentalism, yet without as much as alluding to the fact that to this day scholars cannot agree as to what exactly Rousseau’s sentimentalism actually was and how its various aspects fit together. This may be fine if all we want to know is what went on in Lamourette’s head, yet when it comes to making claims about the extent to which the thought of religious enlighteners flanked, overlapped with, or was at the core of the mainstream Enlightenment, and this is, after all, what Sorkin sets out to do, we would surely need to know to what extent Lamourette’s understanding of Rousseau’s sentimentalism overlapped with that of Rousseau and/or other contemporaries.

The way in which Sorkin discusses the attitudes of his five non-Jewish religious enlighteners is likely to be of particular interest to our readers, and here too, to my mind, Sorkin’s account is potentially self-contradictory and fails to clarify the criteria by which to judge his assessment.
subsequently told that Vernet contrasted Christianity to atheism and Judaism because the latter ‘were neither enlightened nor reasonable’ (79) and that his exegetical approach to the Tanakh was designed ‘to explain Judaism’s particularity and inferiority’ (83). There may well be ways of explaining how all this adds up to a ‘positive view of Judaism’ but explain it Sorkin would surely need to do.

All in all, Sorkin’s claims are in fact not quite as original as he suggests. This is really an observation rather than a criticism because it is in part due to the success of the very agenda he himself has helped shape. His opening contention that ‘in the academic as well as the popular imagination, the Enlightenment figures as a quintessentially secular phenomenon — indeed, as the very source of modern secular culture,’ (1) is largely accurate as far the ‘popular imagination’ is concerned but hardly rings true for serious scholarship any more. Indeed, Sorkin himself goes on to point out that ‘in the last three decades, historians have begun to question the image of a unitary secular Enlightenment project, asserting that it was neither unambiguously secular nor religion’s polar adversary’ (3). This is not the only point at which his conclusions seem somewhat self-contradictory. Setting out his agenda he explains that once we pay due attention to the religious Enlightenment it becomes clear that ‘if we trace modern culture to the Enlightenment, its foundations were decidedly religious’ (3). Yet subsequently he clarifies that ‘the Enlightenment origins of modern culture were neither secular nor religious but a complex amalgam’ (21). Similarly, as we saw earlier, Sorkin wants us to think of the religious Enlightenment both as having flanked the mainstream Enlightenment and as having been at its core; then again, we are to think of ‘the entire spectrum’, i.e. the mainstream and both its radical and religious flanks, as constituting ‘the Enlightenment’ (20). Perhaps Sorkin just likes to mix his metaphors but more likely, having successfully established that his religious enlighteners deserve more systematic attention than they have received to date, he is still grappling with the question of what exactly the implications of his research for the bigger picture really are.

This is underscored by Sorkin’s emphasis on the fact that his religious enlighteners, ‘thinking themselves engaged in a common enterprise with all but the most radical enlighteners … enlisted some of the seventeenth century’s most audacious, heterodox ideas for the mainstream of eighteenth-century orthodox belief’ (6). I myself only caught on the second time I read this formulation. Surely, to place the religious enlighteners at the core of the Enlightenment we would need them to have appropriated the ‘most audacious, heterodox ideas’ not of the previous but of their own century. Indeed, Sorkin himself describes this process of appropriation as one that was ‘making a radical idea of the seventeenth century entirely conventional in the eighteenth’ (13).

What seems to make Sorkin’s religious Enlightenment so very attractive is his contention that it ‘represented the last attempt by European states to use reasonable religion — as opposed to romantic, mystical, or nationalistic interpretations — as the cement of society’ (21). Yet any suggestion that a rejection of, or immunity towards, ‘romantic, mystical or nationalistic interpretations’ is therefore inherent in the legacy of the religious Enlightenment seems highly arguable. Sorkin’s religious enlighteners, as he himself points out (313–314), were the precursors of liberal theology and on the issue of whether, on balance, liberal theology has done any better than mainstream orthodoxy in enabling believers to do the right thing when confronted with the various political, social, and ideological challenges that have arisen in the two centuries since the demise of the era of religious Enlightenment, the jury is still well and truly out.


Further reading
Conversations

The Unbroken Bridge

Myra Cohen Klenicki, her late husband Rabbi Leon Klenicki and Dr. Izzeldin Abuelaish have been friends for years. She recounts for Perspectives a recent conversation with Abuelaish, a 2010 Nobel Peace Prize nominee, about his work as a physician and peace activist.

When it is your children who have become “collateral damage” in a seemingly endless conflict, when you have seen their bodies torn apart, their young lives obliterated, how do you not hate? How do you not rage?

“Religion and deep faith,” is Dr. Izzeldin Abuelaish’s answer. On January 16, 2009, Dr. Abuelaish, a well-known Palestinian peace activist and physician, lost three daughters and a niece when an Israeli tank shell mistakenly shelled his home in Gaza.

Israel’s army took a military action in Gaza in 2008 against militants who had been firing thousands of rockets into Israel.

Richard Kemp, an expert on warfare and former commander of British forces in Afghanistan, was quoted in the New York Times as saying that the Israeli army in Gaza “did more to safeguard the rights of civilians in a combat zone than any other army in the history of warfare.” Even so, a large number of civilians were killed and wounded and many homes destroyed.

The Israeli army has been unable or unwilling to offer an explanation as to why Dr. Abuelaish’s home was shelled. He and his house were well known and neither he nor his many Israeli friends can understand how or why this happened. Nevertheless, Dr. Abuelaish has been able to forgive and continue to work for peace and coexistence between Israelis and Palestinians.

In addition to his faith in Islam, his profession has also helped Dr. Abuelaish forgive. “Being a physician also has a role,” he says. “It is to work for humanity the same way a doctor relieves the suffering of patients.”

He calls hatred a disease. “It is something bad for your body to carry,” he says. “I don’t want to be poisoned. If I want to move forward, I must be healthy and to be healthy, you must get rid of this disease. And this is the right way as a human being.”

My late husband, Rabbi Leon Klenicki, and I have known Izzeldin for many years. He has been a friend and an inspiration. He is an extraordinary man who has experienced tragedy of Job-like proportions, yet he remains grounded in his faith in God and his belief in the humanity of all people. “We are similar; we are equal,” he says, “and the beauty in life is to help others.

I met Izzeldin in 1997. As soon as I heard about him, I knew I had struck PR pay dirt: a Palestinian doctor, no less, who was a resident at the teaching hospital of Ben-Gurion University of the Negev (BGU), the Israeli university for whose American fundraising organization I was the director of public relations.

Many BGU donors embraced the university’s philosophy that helping Israel’s neighbors and fostering understanding between Arabs and Jews could help bring about peace. For years, BGU had engaged in joint research with its neighbors, including the West Bank and Gaza, and its student body included Israeli Bedouins and Druze. Now the staff of its teaching hospital, Soroka Medical Center, included a Palestinian from Gaza. And he was coming to the United States.

Izzeldin was to attend seminar at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Maryland. I arranged to have him come to New York City after the seminar for meetings with donors in New York and New Jersey. Unfortunately, he would be arriving in New York on the Saturday of a long holiday weekend. Our office would be closed until Tuesday, and many of our donors would be out of the city. He would be stuck in a hotel room in a strange city, and I concluded that I would have to “baby sit” the good doctor.
I booked him into a hotel a block from our apartment and informed my husband that we would be entertaining a Palestinian doctor over the weekend.

"A Palestinian?" Leon gasped, raising his eyebrows almost to his yarmulke. "I feel very uneasy about this." To be honest, so did I.

Leon and I were both ardent supporters of Israel. As Director of Interfaith Relations for the Anti-Defamation League and its representative to the Vatican, Leon’s work included battling anti-Israel sentiments. He, like Pope John Paul II, believed that anti-Zionism was often a façade to disguise anti-Semitism.

Before working for AABGU, I had spent 16 years at the Consulate General of Israel in New York as director of the Israel Broadcasting Service in America. My job was to write and produce radio programs and videos to promote Israel’s image in the US. To Leon and me, Palestinians were epitomized by the leering face of Yassir Arafat holding a gun as he addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations or gloating over the deaths of Israeli kindergarten children massacred in a terrorist attack.

Izzeldin was a revelation. He was forceful in expressing his conviction that the Palestinians had a right to a homeland. But, he said, it was a homeland he believed must co-exist with Israel rather than replace it.

"Palestinians and Israelis should cope with each other to find the solution," he told us. "And there is no solution other than peace for the benefit of our children and the peaceful future of our two peoples."

Growing up in a Gaza occupied by Israel had not been easy. Born in the Jabalya refugee camp, Izzeldin was the oldest son in a family of six boys and three girls. He told us that when he was 14, his family’s home was one of more than 1000 others bulldozed by order of Ariel Sharon, Israel’s commander in the region at that time. To help his family earn money to buy a new house, Izzeldin got a job in Israel.

He worked for a family in a moshav, an agricultural village. From six in the morning until eight at night, he cleaned chicken coops and labored at various farming chores. The Israeli family he worked for was kind to him and he says, "I discovered we are all human."

In forty days, he was able to earn enough to make a substantial contribution toward the new house for his family. He returned to Gaza but has stayed in touch with the Israeli family to this day.

Izzeldin studied medicine at Cairo University in Egypt and specialized in Obstetrics and Gynecology in Saudi Arabia in collaboration with the Institute of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of London. While doing his residency in Israel, he received a postgraduate diploma in fetal medicine from King’s College Hospital in London in 2000.

He received a Masters in Public Health Policy and Management from Harvard University in 2004, and in 2006, became a PhD candidate at the Centre for Health Planning and Management at Keele University in England.

His ability to continue to work in Israel was curtailed when in response to suicide bombings and missile attacks, Israel closed the border with Gaza. He has been working with various governmental and world health organizations to improve medical care to people in Yemen and Afghanistan as well as in Gaza.

During these years, Leon and I met with Izzeldin for dinners, lunches and coffees either in Israel or in New York. The last time I saw Izzeldin in Israel was in 2000. I was there to shoot a video on water research and management, and Izzeldin asked me to visit his home and meet his family. On my day off, I took a taxi from Beer-Sheva to the border checkpoint. Once I told the polite but puzzled Israeli soldiers why I wanted to enter Gaza, they let me through. Izzeldin was waiting for me on the other side to take me to his home.

I met his mother, his wife, his eight children, and a large number of his brothers and sisters and their children who also lived in his house. Izzeldin’s children spoke Arabic and Hebrew. I, like a typical American, spoke only English. Nevertheless, we managed to understand each other and to laugh together as I struggled to eat the endless, heaping portions of delicious food his wife and mother kept loading onto my plate.

Izzeldin was waiting for me on the other side to take me to his home.

That evening, as we dined with Izzeldin in our apartment, Leon was also utterly disarmed by his sweetness, his kindness, his charm and his all-encompassing love for humanity. He told us that he had accepted a residency at an Israeli hospital to be “a bridge for peace and mutual cooperation between the Israelis and the Palestinians.” He had accepted a residency at an Israeli hospital to be “a bridge for peace and mutual cooperation between the Israelis and the Palestinians.”
I particularly remember Izzeldin’s oldest daughter, Bessan. She was curious to see the United States, and I teased her, threatening to put her in my suitcase and take her back with me. Years later, she did visit the United States when she attended the Creativity for Peace camp in New Mexico. The camp brings together Israeli and Palestinian teenagers and young women to promote understanding and build leadership skills. Jews and Arabs both have a saying that states that when you educate a woman, you educate a family, and the camp’s goal is to train the next generation of female leaders and peacemakers. Bessan would have been a superb and dedicated leader for peace, but she was one of Izzeldin’s three daughters who were killed when Israeli shells slammed into their home.

Creativity for Peace executive director in America, Dottie Indyke relates that after reading the diary of a young Jewish girl who was killed in the Israeli-Palestine conflict, Bessan told a friend that should she ever suffer such a fate, she wanted to be remembered for her efforts to achieve peace. Her father has established a foundation to ensure that she will be.

Izzeldin is establishing The Abuelaish Foundation, Daughters for Life, in memory of his daughters – Bessan, Mayar, and Aya – who perished on that tragic day in January. Its international mandate is to provide education and health access to women and girls in the Gaza Strip and the Middle East to prepare them to assume leadership roles.

Izzeldin says, “No country will develop if women’s status is not there. We need women to be enlightened. I want other girls and women to achieve what my daughters did, to develop the skills to be leaders.”

Over coffee in New York in October, Izzeldin told me that he believes that women can play a vital role in bringing peace to the Middle East. “Quick,” he asked me, “can you name five women in the history of the world who started wars?”

I knew there were some, but the names didn’t pop into my mind.

“It’s not easy,” he smiled. “But you can name 100 men who started wars, can’t you?”

I could have, and easily.

“We don’t want to replace men,” Izzeldin said, “but we want to help women take the lead and take their part in negotiations.”

The parliament of Belgium has nominated Izzeldin for the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize. If he wins it, he will use the money to help finance the foundation.

Izzeldin now lives in Toronto, Canada, with his five surviving children. He is associate professor at the Dalai Lama School of Public Health at the University of Toronto and is also running research projects between Israeli and Palestinian institutions.

Through his work and through his very being, Izzeldin continues to foster peace and understanding. He says, “What I have lost, it will never come back. I lost the three, but I have other children who need me as well as my people and people in the world for whom I can make a positive difference.”

I asked him if he believed we would see peace in the Middle East in our lifetime.

“Nothing is impossible in life with good will,” he replied. “But God will never change the situation unless we change what is inside our souls and our hearts. We must fill our hearts with love, with respect, and to want for others what each of us wants for himself. There must be respect and an understanding that the dignity of Palestinians equals the dignity of Israelis. Then we can live in partnership and collaboration and share the Holy Land.”

Myra Cohen Klenicki is a freelance writer and producer in the United States. She spent three months in Cambridge with her late husband Rabbi Leon Klenicki, who was Hugo Gryn Fellow at CJCR, in 2001. Myra has stayed in touch with CJCR since then, visiting on an occasional basis.
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Portraits in mirrors

Lucia Faltin interviews Sandra Smith, award-winning translator of Irène Némirovsky’s novels

Sandra Smith: That is the goal. It must sound as if it’s written in the target language. A reviewer once said that the books I worked on sound translated. She meant that they transported you to another culture, world and civilisation, allowing you to experience their flavour which would not have otherwise been possible. She felt as if she’d been in a French countryside. A good translation should take you into that time and place.

Faltin: You move between different cultural worlds. How does it affect your understanding of Némirovsky?

Smith: One of the reasons I feel I had so much empathy with her was because our family backgrounds are very similar, mine fortunately without her tragic ending. My maternal grandfather was Austrian and grandmother Russian. They emigrated to the United States before WWI. My grandfather spoke six languages, so I was brought up surrounded by Yiddish, German, Russian and French. On my father’s side the family came from Latvia, then the Pale of Settlement. They emigrated to London and then to New York, where my parents met. When I was studying foreign languages I had the opportunity to live in France for a year.

Faltin: Coming to Europe must have been like going to a new world for you. What was it like?

Smith: It was the first time I had ever been out of the States. It was frightening and liberating in a way. I fell in love with France. My mother was anxious about me going there because the war was only thirty years before, which for her was still in living memory. I was of the generation that could not identify with her fear. When people are in a university, they distance themselves from a lot of family values, including religion. It is natural and you come back to all of it later.

Faltin: So did your time there prove free of the past shadows?

Smith: I always lived in an area with a large population of Jews. To be the only Jew in a group, not to know or meet any Jewish people in France – not that I was actively looking for them – and to be a part of a minority rather than a majority was an unusual situation. When I went to Berlin, the Wall was still up and we were only allowed to go to East Berlin with an East German guide who told us in English, so that there was to be no misunderstanding: “You are not allowed to take photographs on the Eastern side. If you do, we will shoot you and take the camera away.” That terrified everybody. A lot of what I was brought up with – what I would call prejudice, politically about communism, Russia and the East – was starting to be confirmed. I found that very uncomfortable, because I wanted it to be prejudice and not to be real. Finding it to be real was quite upsetting.

Faltin: Was the prejudice-cum-reality ever challenged?

Smith: My first encounter with someone who experienced the war was an elderly woman who sat next to me in a park.
Smith: In *The Dogs and the Wolves*, she chastised the wealthy Jews for looking down at or using the poor Jews. The idea of noblesse oblige. The poor Jews were a constant reminder to the wealthy Jews of what they used to be and what they might be again. The rich Jews were a reminder to the poor ones: on the positive side, it was possible to get out of the misery, but there was also envy involved: Why them, and not me? We have the same name, we look alike, so why? A part of Némirovsky’s gift as a writer was an ability to show it from different perspectives, to feel sympathy in a way and also criticise the various attitudes towards foreigners and Jews. She was often criticised for propagating these attitudes, but she was just reflecting the stereotypes that were common in her time.

Faltin: Yet her panoramic portraits aren’t limited to Jewish strata.

Smith: No. She also looks at the way the French upper class Catholics viewed both the upper class and the lower class Jews. They did not have much of an opinion of or contact with the lower class Jews. To be Jewish and foreign was a deadly combination to the French in 1930s. She often asks whether full assimilation is ever really possible. I think that, had she lived, she would have come to a conclusion that it wasn’t.

Faltin: Despite her realism, one senses an underlying fatalism in Némirovsky’s works. Do you think it reflects her personal turmoil?

Smith: Némirovsky was brought up as a secular Jew and in France everyone is secular. She was writing *The Dogs and the Wolves* while she was considering converting to Catholicism. Her French biographers Olivier Philipponnat and Patrick Lienhardt suggest that she might have been looking for some sort of faith that hadn’t been provided by her secular Judaism, and that the conversion wasn’t simply a matter of wanting to assimilate and to be more accepted.

A lot of her characters try to deny their roots and are often very unhappy. She did hesitate and didn’t convert until September 1939 when war was declared. Her daughter, Denise Epstein, said that it was the only reason, that they were never really practicing Catholics or Jews.

Faltin: How does Denise take her mother’s comeback?

Smith: The publication of *Suite française* brought a major revival and recognition of Némirovsky’s talent. In the 1930s she was extremely prolific and popular; and then completely lost. After 1940, as a Jew she could not be published. *All Our Worldly Goods* was published posthumously in 1947. It was not very well received because no one was interested in WWI after WW2. Plus there was a movement towards modernism. The revival of interest in her was very rewarding and satisfying for Denise. She once told me that now, that her mother is being ‘reborn’, she could begin to accept that she had died.

Faltin: Némirovsky is a mirror that reflects characters in full complexity intensified by their social setting. You have become Némirovsky’s full-size mirror.

Smith: To be able to translate Némirovsky is a great responsibility. When the author is no longer there to defend herself, I often find myself in a position of having to speak for her. There have been hundreds of reviews of her books, most of them very favourable. But a few have accused her of antisemitism. The new biography [translated by Euan Cameron and Smith] might dispel the few people who consider her a self-hating Jew or antisemitic. Angela Kershaw suggests that we read Némirovsky with a post-Holocaust perspective, whilst we should be looking at it through a pre-Holocaust perspective, which is quite difficult to do.

Explore further …


A radio play of an adaptation of Némirovsky’s *David Golder* begins on Woman’s Hour on 29 March. Sandra Smith’s translation of *Jezebel* will be published in July.
The Book Shelf

In each edition a guest of Perspectives will share their favourite and most formative books. The aim is to inspire us all to widen our reading, thinking and knowledge. Do send us your thoughts on his selection and your tips for books: trisha.kessler@woolf.cam.ac.uk

Our first contributor is the Archbishop of Westminster, The Most Rev Vincent Nichols, who is the most recent Patron of the Woolf Institute and represents the Roman Catholic voice in the interfaith encounter. At a recent meeting with Ed Kessler he expressed his support for the work of the Institute and his commitment to fostering ecumenical and interfaith conversation. He agreed to launch this cultural section of Perspectives, by sharing with us four of his favourite books.

Archbishop Nichols was ordained in 1969, after studying at the English College in Rome, Manchester University and Loyola University, Chicago. In 1992, he became the youngest bishop in Britain, when he joined the Westminster archdiocese as auxiliary bishop, with special pastoral responsibility for north London before becoming Archbishop of Birmingham in 2000. In 2009 he succeeded Cardinal Cormac Murphy O’Connor as head of the Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales.

1. _Jonah, The Reluctant Missionary_
   Peter Burrows (Gracewing)

   This is an insightful commentary on the Book of Jonah setting it in its Jewish liturgical context and relating that context directly to the liturgy of the Catholic Church. Father Peter Burrows brings a remarkable range of abilities and insights to this study.

2. _The Way of Paradox_
   Cyprian Smith (Darton Longman and Todd)

   This book, published some time ago now, is an excellent exposition of the spiritual life as taught by Meister Eckhart. Cyprian Smith, a monk of Ampleforth, helps us to enter deeply into the contemplative tradition of this medieval mystic and theologian with a freshness that makes it extremely relevant to our daily struggles in contemporary Britain.

3. _Upon This Mountain_
   Mary McCormack OCD (Teresian Press)

   This short book is an excellent introduction to prayer in the Carmelite tradition. It not only explains this tradition of prayer but also gives us a step by step understanding and guide to prayer in our daily life. Again here is a book that, in a succinct and masterly way, opens up a rich resource, drawing on great figures such as Teresa of Avila and John of the cross.

4. _Mr Golightly’s Holiday_
   Sally Vickers (Harper Collins)

   This novel is gracious and gripping. Its descriptions of Dartmoor through its different seasons are beautifully composed. But so is the storyline which eventually poses us many challenging questions about our understanding of life and faith.
On Set with Israelis and Palestinians

Alex Bodin Saphir

In the winter of 2007 seventeen Jews and Palestinians from Israel, Palestinians from the Occupied Territories and myself, a Danish/British Jew, converged on the Negev desert to shoot a short film Winds of Sand. The fictional film, starring Shmil Ben Ari (Life According to Agfa & Go, See and Become) and Kais Nashif (Paradise Now & Body of Lies) follows the tempestuous journey of two enemy combatants. After surviving an ambush gone wrong they inevitably become locked in a downward spiral of violence, hatred and regret as they try to outwit each other in the desert wasteland.

The film purposefully does not mention names, places, dates or events that might contextualise the narrative or lead it to be pigeonholed as an exclusively ‘Israeli-Palestinian’ film. Abstracting the nature of the conflict makes it possible to engage with the characters without the burden of seven decades of real-world baggage.

To this end the script took great pains to show that both characters were equally to blame for their predicament. Interestingly this even-handed representation of a fictionalised conflict caused no end of controversy as one Palestinian crew member commented that it was “pro-Israeli because it was so balanced”, that “the Israelis have visited much worse atrocities on the Palestinians than the Palestinians have on the Israelis” and to present them as equally to blame was “unfair”. Then, as if on cue, another crewmember (an Israeli Jew) noted that he felt that the film was “pro-Palestinian” for exactly the same reasons.

In many ways the production of the film became a microcosm of the intractable conflict in the Middle East. One crew member, for example, gained an exemption from his commanding officer while serving his annual military service in the Israeli Defense Forces and flew down to the Negev especially to be part of the production. The day before he was leading a mission in the Occupied Territories and the next day he was working on a film set, designed to bring Israelis and Palestinians together in mutual respect.

At the best of times filmmaking is a stressful enterprise, with little sleep and limited daylight to shoot. But in this case, searing desert temperatures (35°C/95°F) coupled with the added strain of ostensibly collaborating with the enemy meant that on an almost daily basis the unspoken tensions would spill over into the workplace. But these outbursts were short lived and on the whole quickly resolved, mainly because filmmaking is a brief and intense endeavour in which one only has a short window of opportunity to complete the shoot. Hence problems that may escalate in a long-term ‘shared-living’ environment can be solved on set relatively easily because of the temporary, artificial nature of the situation.

After a week’s shoot in the Negev and two months post production at Nordisk Film A/S the film was completed and premiered at the Shanghai International Film Festival. It went on to feature at a number of film festivals around the world including the Human Rights Film Awards in Australia, the Karachi International Film Festival in Pakistan and was runner up for A Film for Peace Awards. Fittingly, the European Arab Film Festival initially accepted the film, but pulled it before screening amid concerns that it presented the conflict in “too” balanced a manner!

A. Bodin Saphir is a writer/director currently seeking financing for a feature film based on the same concept as Winds of Sand. He is also an alumnus of CMJR.

Lars Fischer

Spicer’s account focuses on a number of particularly prominent ‘brown priests’. These include Alban Schachleiter (1861–1937) who considered himself ‘a kind of neo-John the Baptist’ (37) to Hitler; and Josef Roth (1897–1941), who became the director of the Catholic Department in the Reich Ministry of Church Affairs in 1937. Spicer also examines the careers of Philipp Haueuser (1876–1960), ‘next to Schachleiter … arguably the best known brown priest’ (101), Anton Heuberger (1890–1967), Christian Josef Huber (1888–1958), and Lorenz Pieper (1875–1951). Spicer has done an absolutely extraordinary job trawling the archives for all the material synthesized in this study and although the book gets off to a slightly plodding start, the reader’s endurance is well rewarded. The discussion becomes increasingly intriguing and Spicer serves up the best at the end in his truly heart-stopping chapter on Kleine. His account of Kleine’s various initiatives, exploits, and entanglements is as engrossing as it is repellent and depressing, and it is a breath-taking piece of scholarship.

In at least one respect, Kleine was something of an exception; he focused predominantly on ‘behind-the-scenes action that would promote change within the church’ (175). The full extent of his activities has therefore only now become known. While this doubtless helped him ‘to escape relatively unsathed in postwar Germany’, it has to be said that ‘the majority of the brown priests who were still living after the war remained in the Catholic priesthood and maintained some form of ministry’. Attempts at denazification, such as they were, ultimately ‘affected only a limited few’ (202) even of those whose support for the Nazis had transpired anywhere but ‘behind the scenes’. The Catholic priest Richard Kleine (1891–1974) took up his position as a secondary-school teacher of religion in Duderstadt in 1919 and continued to teach there until well beyond his official retirement in 1957. He was known affectionately as ‘Papa Kleine’ by the thousands of students whom he taught over the years. Following his death the local newspaper referred to him as ‘a good and well-respected human being and priest’ who had withstood ‘the growing terror of anti-Christian and anti-Church forces in the National Socialist regime’ that had supposedly wanted to remove him from his teaching position. Yet in actual fact, as Kevin Spicer reveals in the volume under review, Kleine was ‘a zealous adherent of National Socialism’ (155). He played a key role in a number of initiatives designed to align Catholicism with National Socialism that were ultimately abortive but drew surprisingly prominent support. He was also an avid collaborator of the Eisenach-based Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on German Church Life and ‘at times… even pushed’ its director, Walter Grundmann, ‘to be more aggressive… with regard to Jews’ (192). Spicer’s focus in this book is on what he calls ‘brown priests’. By this he means priests who actively and quite intentionally supported the Nazis. In some ways this may seem a rather odd topic to study. There can be no doubt that only a small minority of priests were ‘brown priests’ and identifying them is not without its problems. Spicer cites the example of the archdiocese of Freiburg. A Nazi party report classified eight per cent of its priests as ‘politically reliable and sympathetic to the aims of the state and party’ (23–24). Ironically, of these priests, twelve subsequently got into trouble with the Gestapo for one reason or another (though not, it is worth adding, for politically motivated direct opposition to the regime). Yet of these priests whom the regime itself considered reliable, only five in fact ‘left behind any evidence that would reveal sympathy for National Socialism’ (25).

More importantly, though, one might well ask why we should care. After all, as Spicer himself points out, ‘some priests flirted with National Socialism without embracing it fully’ (23) and ‘many priests, along with much of the German population, supported Hitler anyway’ (155). One might well ask, then, whether the various forms of complicity and acquiescence, of tacit or partial support that the overwhelming majority of German Catholics, including their clergy, displayed towards the regime is not an altogether more important issue than the exploits of a couple of dozen ‘brown priests’. Yet the story of the ‘brown priests’ is also the story of the church’s response to their activities and it is here that Spicer’s account gains its wider significance. For ‘most bishops tolerated extensive disobedience from their brown priests’ (233). To be sure, the church’s relations with the regime were for the most part tense. Yet ‘its leaders focused solely on the survival of the institution and its sacramental mission’ (231) and the study of ‘brown priests’ reveals how all levels of oversight and leadership in the Catholic Church failed to oppose the persecution of Jews and National Socialism’s social and territorial goals. It thus raises the issue of complicity not only among the clergy of the highest levels of Church leadership, but also among the diocesan and religious-order priests of parochial rank and station (9).
Alumni

Change and growth
Relations and relationships remain at the heart of our mission and purpose and it is with this in mind that we are widening and formalising our alumni programme. We would like to ensure that once students have completed their studies with us, we provide them with an opportunity to remain in touch with each other and with the Institute in a social and professional capacity. The forthcoming Alumni Weekend will be a chance to put all this into motion.

Since their time with us, our graduates have undoubtedly changed, as have we. The diversity of our students has been vital to the Institute and its mission. Over 2000 people have passed through our programmes over the past decade. This includes 200 graduates who gained postgraduate awards, 100 achieving Masters degrees at CJCR, and numerous students who have completed courses at CMJR or as part of the Public Education Programmes. A number of you have remained in active contact with us, either through further studies at the Institute, or by joining our team as tutors or collaborative partners at conferences and academic exchanges.

We continue to provide bursaries to support a significant number of people in their academic pursuit. We also support guest researchers, particularly young scholars who use the Institute as a complementary base to work in Cambridge research libraries.

All this creates a vibrant global alumni community. The first Institute-wide alumni reunion will help our alumni form an effective social, cultural and intellectual network dedicated to the advancement of constructive relations between Jews, Christians and Muslims.

Stay in touch
Do send us your up-to-date biography and a photo and we will include you on the new alumni page of our website.

If you did not receive our alumni email in November but would like to receive future mailings, please let us know.

Contact: Esther Haworth: esther.haworth@woolf.cam.ac.uk

Alumni Weekend: Marginalised Minorities
On Friday 25 – Sunday 27 June the Woolf Institute will host its second alumni weekend. Following the success of the CJCR reunion in 2008, the coming event will, for the first time, bring together graduates from all programmes across the Institute, thus widening the opportunity for the vast variety of graduates to meet, reunite and become further acquainted with each other. It is also an opportunity to come together to discuss diverse and mentally reinvigorating subjects with each other, the Institute’s staff and other professionals who work in the field.

The theme of the Alumni Weekend will be Marginalised Minorities. We will explore the external and internal factors that affect minority formation and dynamics. We will discuss those factors which constitute a minority and question the role of policies and international upheavals in their formation. We will ask questions such as: How do groups preserve their authenticity and heritage? What isolates minorities? What leads them to self-isolation? What happens when a minority becomes a majority? This approach should also help us not to limit the debate to an exclusively negative consideration of the concept of minority which emphasises blame and focuses on victimhood.

One of the highlights will be a panel on The Jews of India, a topic that has not yet been covered in any of the curricular of the Institute’s programmes. We have drawn together a panel of people with a wealth of experience on India:

Julius Lipner (www.divinity.cam.ac.uk/faculty/lipner.shtml) is Professor of Hinduism and the Comparative Study of Religion at the University of Cambridge. He is also a Trustee of the Woolf Institute. Of part-Indian extraction, Julius Lipner was born in Patna and brought up in Benga. He travels to India every year for research, which gives him both an academic and also intimate personal knowledge of the Indian scene.

Naomi Gryn (www.naomigryn.com) is a writer and documentary filmmaker who recently went to India, where her father Hugo Gryn, was a rabbi in the 1950s. She explored the change in the lives of Jews since his times spent there for a radio documentary for BBC World Service.

Navras Jaat Aafreedi will join CMJR as Visiting Fellow later this Spring and is the author of the e-book (CD-Rom) The Indian Jewry and the Self-Professed ‘Lost Tribes of Israel’ in India.

Trisha Kessler (www.woolf.cam.ac.uk/staff) has collated oral histories of Baghdadi Jewish women born in India and living in London. Her interest lies in the transition these women made from
a vibrant Sephardi Jewish Community in Calcutta to life in London living as a minority. In her research she has also written on the role of the Sassoon family in India with specific reference to Flora Sassoon.

The alumni experience will be enhanced by an international colloquium on The Frankfurt School and Antisemitism Revisited on 24–25 June. Alumni are welcome to register to attend the colloquium. For details, see www.woolf.cam.ac.uk/cjcr.

In addition to the structured talks, this weekend will provide ample opportunities to enjoy the social and cultural side of a Cambridge summer weekend. As Alumni, you will also be able to share experiences. You are involved in some of the most important work in our societies; you include barristers, police officers, social and health care professionals. Some of you are teachers, academics, rabbis, imams and ministers. You have taken your knowledge and understanding to start social justice teams, interfaith magazines, cross community arts and sports projects. We understand that many of you live, work and study across the globe but we invite you to return to Cambridge in June to refresh yourself on the subject of the interfaith encounter.

Alumni Weekend  Marginalised Minorities

Friday 25 – Sunday 27 June  | Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge

**PROGRAMME**

**Friday 25 June**
19:30: Dinner at Efes Restaurant, 78–80 King Street, Cambridge CB1 1LN. All guests are kindly requested to cover the cost of their own meal.

**Saturday 26 June**
Morning: Breakfast at Lucy Cavendish
10:00: Life at the Woolf Institute as seen by its staff
12:30: Lunch at Lucy Cavendish
14:30: Marginalised Minorities: The Jews of India Panel with Naomi Gryn, Julius Lipner, Navras Jaat Aafreedi and Trisha Kessler
16:30: Afternoon tea
17:00–19:00: Film
19:30: Dinner at Lucy Cavendish

**Sunday 27 June**
Morning: Breakfast at Lucy Cavendish
Free morning
13:00–15:00: Lunch aboard the Georgina riverboat; cruising the river Cam
Afternoon: Free time and departures

**Price**

- **£95 non-residential** includes: meals excluding breakfast and Friday night meal, all event sessions, riverboat cruise
- **£185 residential** includes: accommodation Friday and Saturday night at Lucy Cavendish College (bathroom shared between 2 rooms or £15 supplement for en-suite), all meals excluding Friday night meal, all event sessions, riverboat cruise.

**Registration | Deadline: 1 June 2010**

Registration form: www.woolf.cam.ac.uk/news-and-events/alumni.php

Whilst we do not intend to alter the programme significantly, we reserve the right to make amendments.

25% of our alumni proceed to PhD. Mila Ginsbursky was the first to gain her doctorate at the University of Cambridge.
RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Exegetical Encounter between Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity
Emmanouela Grypeou and Helen Spurling (eds), (Leiden: Brill; Jewish and Christian Perspectives 18; 2009).
This book arose from a CJCR conference and is edited by two CJCR Research Fellows. It is a collection of essays examining the relationship between Jewish and Christian biblical commentators with a focus on interpretations of the book of Genesis, a text which has considerable importance in both Christian and Jewish tradition. This book is significant in the light it sheds on the history of relations between Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity.

Contributors: Philip Alexander, Dmitrij F. Bumazhnov, Burton L. Visotzky, Hanneke Reuling, Sebastian P. Luttikhuizen, Michael E. Stone, Robert Hayward, Gerard P. Luttikhuizen, Günter Stemberger, Judith Frishman, Emmanouela Grypeou and Helen Spurling, Alison Salvesen, Stefan C. Reif and Marc Hirshman

An Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations
Edward Kessler (Cambridge University Press, 2010)
This new publication examines the encounter between Jews and Christians, exploring key writings and themes in Jewish-Christian history, from the Jewish context of the New Testament to major events of modern times, including the rise of ecumenism, the horrors of the Holocaust, and the creation of the state of Israel. It also touches on numerous related areas such as Jewish and interfaith studies, philosophy, sociology, cultural studies, international relations and the political sciences. The Introduction is the first single-authored work which traces the Jewish-Christian encounter from the first to the twenty-first century in an accessible and authoritative way.

Religious Roots of Contemporary European Identity
Lucia Faltin and Melanie J. Wright (eds), (London: Continuum, 2007, paperback edition published in 2010.)
This work, edited by Lucia Faltin and Melanie Wright, at the time Academic Director of CJCR, brings together contributions of a number of the Centre’s colleagues in the UK and overseas. It provides a coherent critical examination of current issues related to the religious roots of post-1990 European identity.

The publication provides a multi and interdisciplinary approach to the theme, bringing together scholars in history, religious studies, sociology, cultural studies, European studies, and international relations. The authors build upon their expertise in different fields of arts and humanities to identify some of the key elements of European religious heritage and its manifestation in Europe’s identity, be it secular or otherwise perceived. This text aims to help readers to view their own identity in a wider context of shared values, reaching beyond a particular faith or non-religious framework.

The Socialist Response to Antisemitism in Imperial Germany
Lars Fischer (Cambridge University Press, 2010)
2010 sees the publication of the first paperback edition of Lars Fischer’s work on antisemitism and anti-antisemitism in Imperial Germany. In it he focuses on a broad set of perceptions accepted by both antisemites and anti-antisemites and draws a variety of new sources into the debate. He shows amongst other things how Socialists’ arguments generally did more to consolidate than subvert generally accepted notions regarding ‘the Jews’. This study offers a reinterpretation of seemingly well-rehearsed issues, including the influence of Karl Marx’s Zur Judenfrage, and the positions of various leading Social Democrats (Franz Mehring, Eduard Bernstein, August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Karl Kautsky, Rosa Luxemburg) and their peers.
Virtual reality as daily reality

In addition to the new online version of Perspectives which is more interactive and provides extra resources, this academic year saw major developments in the use of online tools across the Woolf Institute. This makes our courses more accessible and effective for our own students. The Institute continues to support the expansion of e-learning across the Cambridge Theological Federation. We are now exploring digitisation of our Master’s theses in order to make them easily accessible outside Cambridge. This pilot project within the Federation’s Library is part of the University of Cambridge library network.

Masters dissertations submitted at CJCR in 2009

The following Masters dissertations can be found in the Cambridge Theological Federation Library Catalogue: http://affint-newton.lib.cam.ac.uk. Most of these are based on original research and are thus a valuable reference for further study.

Religion As a Cultural System: Consequences of the ‘War on Terror’ for Jewish-Christian Relations.

The Christian Claim of Responsibility to Believe and Jewish-Christian Relations.

“A Common Declaration on the Family”: The Basis and Implementation.


Benedict’s Mustard Seed Church and its Potential Implications for Jewish-Christian Relations.

The soul’s longing for God: Allegorical and symbolic readings of the Song of Songs in 12th and 13th century western Europe and the relationship between evolving forms of Christian and Jewish mystical piety.

Subservient citizens or embattled aliens? A sociolinguistic analysis of Jewish identity as represented in The Times, 1939–47.


Exploring Jewish-Christian Relations through the lens of Integrative Complexity.

Leadership, Messianism and the Question of Christianity in a Post-Schneerson Habad.


The Christian Hebraism of John Lightfoot.

Jewish Identity and Jewish-Christian Relations in the United States of America.

The Post-Liber Theology of George Lindbeck as a tool for addressing Christian supersessionism.

The challenges posed by a Palestinian Theology of Liberation on Jewish-Christian relations.

Jewish and Christian Communities at Dura-Europos in Roman Antiquity: A Comparison of the Synagogue and Church.

Saul of Tarsus: Recent Jewish perspectives.

When We Remembered Zion. Dislocation in Jewish-Christian relations brought about by the revision of the Psalms for ‘A New Zealand Prayer Book/ He Karakia Mihinare o Aotearoa’.
Highlights

Life and death in Judaism and Islam
This interdisciplinary conference seeks to understand how Judaism and Islam have transformed death’s stark end into a cycle of life and how ideas attached to death generate meanings for the living. Topics include: Jewish and Muslim approaches to brain death criteria, euthanasia, autopsy and cremation; ritual practices related to death, burial, funerary rituals and annual rites for commemorating the dead.

26 May, 10.00-16.00, St Edmunds College, Cambridge

International Colloquium: The Frankfurt School and Antisemitism Revisited
Jack Jacobs, Thomas Wheatland, and Eva-Maria Ziege will speak about their work on the Frankfurt School and its attempts to grapple with antisemitism, followed by responses from Christine Achinger, Marcel Stoetzler and Lars Fischer, and general discussion.

24-25 June 2010, Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge.

Women and Work
CJCR research seminar with Susanne Kord (UCL)
3 May, 16.00, Dining Hall, Wesley House, 30 Jesus Lane, Cambridge

Interfaith reflection
Woolf Institute with Cambridge Theological Federation
4 May, 18.00, Wesley House, Cambridge

Life and death in Judaism and Islam
CMJR conference
26 May, 10.00-16.00, St Edmund’s College, Cambridge

Mattathias and Judah: in defence of the ancestors’ religion
Erasmus Lecture by Edward Dabrowa (Department of Jewish Studies, Jagiellonian University)
9 June, 17.00, Faculty of Divinity, Cambridge

Calendar

WOOLF INSTITUTE EVENTS

Women and Work
MSt Research Seminar with Susanne Kord (UCL)
3 May, 16.00, Dining Hall, Wesley House, 30 Jesus Lane, Cambridge

Interfaith reflection
Woolf Institute with Cambridge Theological Federation
4 May, 18.00, Wesley House, Cambridge

Life and death in Judaism and Islam
CMJR conference
26 May, 10.00-16.00, St Edmund’s College, Cambridge

Mattathias and Judah: in defence of the ancestors’ religion
Erasmus Lecture by Edward Dabrowa (Department of Jewish Studies, Jagiellonian University)
9 June, 17.00, Faculty of Divinity, Cambridge

The Frankfurt School and Antisemitism Revisited
CJCR International Colloquium
24-25 June, Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge

Book launch
Michael Mack (Durham) presents his new book Spinoza and the Specters of Modernity. The Hidden Enlightenment of Diversity from Spinoza to Freud
24 June, 18.30, Heffers, Trinity Street, Cambridge

Alumni Weekend
25-27 June, Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge

As events are constantly being added, see:

www.woolf.cam.ac.uk