

Sh'ma, celebrating a decade as a journal of Jewish responsibility

10/198, OCTOBER 3, 1980

The holocaust and the duty to forgive

Stanley Hauerwas

(What follows is a substantially abridged version of a sermon I preached at Rockefeller Chapel at the University of Chicago on Holocaust Sunday which also happens to be the Sunday after Easter. Therefore, I at once had to deal with the resurrection and the Holocaust. I have asked that the sermon be published as a sermon in Sh'ma even though I knew some of the concerns in the sermon might be of little interest to Jewish readers. But the conclusion of the sermon—that Jews must forgive Christians for their complicity in the Holocaust—makes sense only in the light of my attempt to interpret the texts I was obligated to preach on that day. (Job 42:1-6, Acts 5: 12a, 17-22, 25-29, John 20: 19-31) For anyone to make such a suggestion may appear nothing short of obscene and therefore I thought it particularly important for me to receive criticism from Jewish readers. I look forward to learning from your response.)

Resurrection as the felt absence of God seems particularly powerful when we must face, as we must this Sunday, the Holocaust. All those who used to celebrate the absence of God as providing the space and arena for human freedom have run aground on this reality. We live in a world where six million Jews and other “non-desirables” were put to death by people not too unlike you and me. How are we to “explain” that one, for like evil itself, every explanation seems to trivialize the reality. Who can blame God for exiting from this kind of world? I do not particularly want to be involved with it either.

But I am involved with it. I am the inheritor of the history and benefits of a civilization that brutally and coldbloodedly put six million people to death for no other reason than that they claimed to be God's chosen

people. And like Job we cry out for an explanation—how and why could this happen to your own and why and how could it be perpetrated in a culture formed by those who claim to worship the same God as the Jews? And like Job all we feel we get back is claimed power and incomprehensibility made all the more unsatisfactory by being packaged in magnificent poetry. Job claims he now despises his doubt because where once he only had heard God now he sees him, but that hardly seems satisfactory. Claims of power hardly seem appropriate for the question raised by the Holocaust.

And that makes us particularly sympathetic with Thomas and his demand to “show me.” Like doubting Thomas (John 21:25), especially after Auschwitz, we want to see some marks that God has not abandoned us in the mess. For Auschwitz seems to be the surest sign we have that is exactly what has happened. Where is God in this— or even more radically if God is in this how can we possibly continue the presumption that he is worthy of worship?

Christian faith demands forgiveness

We think we might be better believers in spite of the commendation for those that believe without having seen, if we could just get some better evidence. We want to know if Jesus really was who he claimed, or if he even claimed to be who we think him to be.

That the issue is not evidence is clear from the incompatibility of the evidence with Thomas' confession. For after Jesus shows him his hands and side, Thomas exclaims, “My Lord and my God!” That is an extraordinary deduction from nail marks. But what Thomas saw in those nail marks was not evidence of resurrection, but that the resurrected Lord is not different from the crucified Messiah. The presence of such a Lord is the presence of the Lord whose exaltation is the cross on which comes our forgiveness. For what does it mean to confess Jesus as Lord other than he has the power to forgive sin even to giving us that power.

That Thomas was able to see that the resurrected Lord is not different from the crucified Messiah came from the fact that he had first learned to follow Jesus as his disciple. And like Thomas, if we are to understand the significance of those holes, we must also learn to be trained to be his disciples. But such training entails that we learn to be in the presence of a Lord whose power is that of forgiveness and thus creates a community of forgiveness. For if we have received the Holy Spirit, his continuing presence, he tells us we have the power to forgive sins. And we have such power because through his cross and resurrection we know we have been forgiven. No small matter to be sure, for it is exactly the

not encourage student interest in Judaism but instead often discourages it by making the Jewish student who is not orthodox regardless of sex, and the student who is female, regardless of devoutness, feel that he or she is not *really* Jewish because he or she is not accepted by a Jewish religious organization as an equal. In some extreme cases, Jewish students feel that rather than be the second class Jew which they are made to feel they are, they would rather be a member of a cult which welcomes them as an ostensibly first class citizen.

Bernard L. Albert
Scarsdale, N.Y.

The myth of the Jewish president

Johathan D. Sarna

In America, even a Jew can be president. That, at least, has been the claim for two long centuries. It hasn't yet happened, nor does anyone look for it to happen in 1980. Still, the myth of the Jewish president remains pervasive. Manhattan Borough President Andrew Stein talks of being the first Jew in the White House. A novel about "President Levine" has sold well. Jews of all kinds continue to hope and pray. "Though he may tarry, still they await him." Jews have an abiding faith sustained by inexhaustible patience. When it comes to waiting, they are truly the world's most practiced people.

The myth of the Jewish president reaches far back in American Jewish history. Always it has existed independently— without any relationship whatsoever to political realities. In 1807, for example, Myer Moses assured an audience at the Charleston Hebrew Orphan Asylum that "any among us may rise to the first offices in our country should we have talents and popularity to lead us to those places of honor and emolument." He even cherished the fond hope that from among the Jewish orphans there might spring a Washington or a Jefferson. His hope, however, was illusory. In fact, American Jews of his day could not boast of so much as a single Jew in high elective office— not even in New York City where Jews formed over two percent of the population.

Today, there are a number of Jews in high elective office. But not a single one is a serious presidential

OUR CHEAP, COLLEGE-STUDENTS' RATE, *only \$2.50 for five months [most of the school year], individually addressed, is again available through institutions taking at least 25 prepaid subscriptions.*

candidate, nor has one ever been. Several display ample qualifications, and not a few are fired with appropriate ambitions. Hints from party regulars, however, usually suffice to puncture presidential dreams before they even begin to inflate. And if they don't work, graphic pieces of hate mail generally do. Still, Jews continue to talk about a Jewish president as if his coming were a foregone conclusion. They do so for a simple reason: to perpetuate a comforting myth.

The Roots of a Dream

The Jewish president symbolizes to American Jews their equality and supposedly unlimited potential.

"America is different" the myth cries out; here Jews can aspire to anything at all. The highest office in the land—the seat of power—is open to them. Their reach is limited only by their grasp.

To Jews, therefore, the myth of the Jewish president is a pledge of allegiance. It is the Jewish equivalent of "liberty and justice for all." To question the myth—even to point out that it represents an ideal rather than a reality—is to court disloyalty and all it portends. So Jews profess their unshakable belief. In the American Jewish creed, the fourteenth article of faith reads: "I believe with perfect faith that in America a Jew can be elected president of the United States."

Many non-Jews share this article of Jewish faith, but, as is so often the case, they disagree over how to interpret it. They see the possibility of there being a Jewish president as an absurd but logical extreme, a necessity born of church-state separation. Liberty of conscience, they say, demands freedom of religion. Freedom of religion can only exist if people of any creed—even Jews, deists and atheists— can be elected president of the United States. The lesson they learn from this is that Christians must be eternally vigilant. Where once the state stood guard against the election of an "unbeliever," now the responsibility lies squarely on the shoulders of individual voters. Without due caution, the unimaginable "even"— the election of a non-Christian president— might actually come to pass.

The Gentile use of the Jewish Hope

Occasionally, liberal Protestants strike up the Jewish president theme in seeming approval: "*In this country...a Jew [can] be the first magistrate, the President of these United States...provided his morality his wisdom, and his active talents pronounced him the best.*"

Examined closely, however, these references usually appear in the context of Jewish rights. If a Jew can be president, the argument proclaims, he surely deserves

equal status at all other levels. How can individuals persecute a people who might produce a future occupant of the White House?

Once full equality is achieved, however, many non-Jews shift responsibility for political achievement to the Jews themselves. They use the myth of the Jewish president to clear their own consciences of any blame for Jews' continuing absence from the list of American chief executives. They proudly point out that any deserving Jew can have his name on the ballot. Then, they say with a shrug, majority rules. With a smug smile of self-satisfaction, people who themselves would never vote for a Jew can thus insist that Jews have an equal shot at the White House. The myth of the Jewish president, by confusing legal equality and social equality, provides the prejudiced with a powerful polemical shield.

Was not the Catholic Barrier Broken?

In recent times, talk of a Jewish president has quickened. "Before this century bows out," Stanley Chyet has written, "American Jewry will produce a President of the United States." Chyet continues: "*He will be nominated by his party almost entirely on the basis of his vote-getting power. Once elected, he will not be likely to take more than a perfunctory interest, if that, in Jewish affairs. Most Jewish voters will, nevertheless, cast their ballots for him—even during his second campaign—since the prestige of having a Jew in the White House will be too compelling to resist.*"

Others lay great stress on the fact that a Catholic served in the White House. If the country could elect a President Kennedy, they exclaim, can the days of a President Cohen be far behind?

In fact, there are great differences between a Catholic

presidential candidate and a Jewish one. In spite of America's deplorable heritage of anti-Catholicism, its Catholic population now boasts of almost fifty million people. The Jewish population, by contrast, numbers less than six million. This difference, translated into votes, is more than sufficient to elect someone president. Furthermore, a Catholic still believes in the divinity of Jesus, even if he disagrees with Protestants about everything else. A Jew can make no such claims. He therefore has a much harder time gathering good Christian votes.

Still, America may, some day, elect a Jewish president. In times of crisis, people who formerly had no chance even of being nominated can sometimes win the presidency hands down. Prophecy is thus too dangerous a game for an historian to play without hedging his bets. Whatever the case regarding elections however, there can be no doubt that the myth of the Jewish president will long endure. It helps Jews and Christians coexist in a nation where, both assume, that anything and everything is possible. It reinforces deeply held beliefs of American exceptionalism. It bridges the gap between Jewish hopes and American realities. It is far too useful a myth to be abandoned.

STANLEY HAUERWAS, a Protestant, teaches *Christian Ethics at the University of Notre Dame.*

ELIEZER BERKOVITS, who has written extensively on *Jewish law and theology in the United States, now resides in Jerusalem.*

JONATHAN D. SARNA teaches *American Jewish history at the Cincinnati campus of HUC-JIR.*