

The forces agitating for Separation of Religion from State in Israel have found their most vocal and articulate spokesman, surprisingly, in a personally observant Jew, Prof. Yeshayahu Lebowitz, professor of organic chemistry and biochemistry at the Hebrew University. The *enfant terrible* of Orthodox Jewry in Israel, his unconventional views and often sharp and scathing expression of his opinions have made him one of the most controversial figures in the country. Before the recent elections in Israel, Prof. Lebowitz was one of the leaders, together with Eliezer Livneh, of the *ha-Mishtar ha-Chadash* ("New Regime"), a new party critical of the administration and with definite views on the place of Religion in the framework of the State. *It is, of course, understood that neither TRADITION nor the Rabbinical Council of America endorses any of the views set forth in this symposium on the problem of Separation.* We are not responsible for the opinions herein expressed, or for some of the statements of fact which may be open to serious question. We present the various points of view so that our readers may decide the issues for themselves. The present article appeared in the Sept.-Oct. 1959 issue of *Beterem* and was translated by Miss Channah Kleinerman. Following this article is a response to Dr. Lebowitz. Prof. Lebowitz, who is a doctor of medicine as well as a Ph.D. in chemistry, has contributed research papers to a large number of scientific journals, and is co-editor of the *Encyclopedia Ivrit*. He is the author of *Torah U-mitzvot Ba-zeman Ha-zeh*.

IN DEFENSE OF "SEPARATION" IN ISRAEL

"The Separation of Religion and State" is a recurrent slogan in public discussions in Israel, although it is not the active political program of any party or socio-political trend. The slogan is heard in "atheistic" circles as the expression of a theoretical aim or ideo-

logical tendency, but not as a political principle. Even its advocates do not regard it seriously as an actual, political demand to be realized at present. They make no attempt to clarify its meaning or to present a program for its embodiment in law and government. Their efforts on its behalf are limited to sporadic opposition to certain religious or pseudo-religious phenomena in the conduct of the State. Even official Orthodox Jewry (in its spiritual as well as its partisan political manifestations) which opposes the concept of "Separation" and supports the existing relationship between the "state" and "religion," has never clearly presented its arguments and possibly has never clarified them to itself. For actually the religionists and the secularists in Israel have never engaged in a dialogue based on the problem of the relationship between religion and state. Both sides have opportunistically made peace with the existence of *a secular state that is publicly known as religious*.

The platform of the "New Regime" movement contains the principle of the Separation of Religion and State as an immediate political aim, one on which religious and non-religious individuals and groups are united. This fact has occasioned public astonishment and has even met with total non-comprehension. It is difficult for our public to understand the phenomenon of a party platform not bedecked with the plumage of a definitive "ideology," a unified "world outlook," or common "eternal values"; that does not unveil "ultimate aims," "missions," or "visions"; that is, in short, no more than a prosaic formulation of a practical program to be carried out at the present time. For men who disagree with each other in values and beliefs, this demand for Separation of Religion and State in the platform of the "New Regime" movement does not represent a "concession" by one side to the other, or a "compromise" between them, but rather a demand common to all—for which each has reasons of its own. The ideological and socio-political conflict between the camps of the religionists and the secularists in Israel—a fateful conflict for the future of the Jewish people, of Judaism, and of the State—is neither deferred nor blunted by this common demand. On the contrary: the fulfillment of this program is the prerequisite for and the road toward the waging of the struggle.

This demand results from the recognition, on the part of religious Jews, that the status quo is leading to the profanation of the Divine Name, the desecration of Torah, and the destruction of religion; and

In Defense of "Separation" in Israel

from the realization, on the part of the non-religious, that the current situation is proving detrimental to the state. Both sides agree that it contains seeds of falsehood and hypocrisy that may lead to the destruction of the nation.

What is the *religious significance* of the demand for Separation, and what practical results can we expect from its realization? For purposes of clarity we must first postulate two premises: a) the *religion* of which we speak is Traditional Judaism, which is embodied in Torah and *mitzvot* and which demands *sovereignty over the life of the individual and that of the community*—not a religion that is embodied in certain formal rituals grafted onto a secular reality; b) the *state* of which we speak is *this present State of Israel*, a state whose nature has been determined by the manner in which it came into being in 1948 and by its actual existence since then—not a state to be conceived of in terms of prophetic visions. In other words: the question of religion and state is here considered *not* as a problem of faith or of basic concepts regarding what *should be* the relationship between "religion" (in the abstract) and "state" (in the abstract), or in terms of the "sacred" and the "profane," or in terms of the historic or metaphysical essence of the Jewish people as the people of the Torah, and so forth—but rather as a problem of the political-social system, which is the religious concern in the existing situation.

The State of Israel was established in 1948, by the common toil, the common efforts, and the common sacrifices of religious and non-religious Jews acting together, as a state secular in its essence. It has remained essentially secular and will continue to be essentially secular—until a tremendous spiritual and social revolution takes place within its people. Its secularity is not by intent, but in essence: it was not established by the Torah, nor through the impact of the Torah, nor with the guidance of the Torah and its teachings, and it is not being conducted according to the Torah. The doctrine that "the State of Israel is a government of law, not a government of Halakhah" is a principle that is *accepted by all*—including the religious—in relation to the practices, rules, and administration of this state, in which official Orthodoxy has participated from the day it was established. Whether we call ourselves "religious" or "non-religious," the fact remains that all of us together established this state as Jewish patriots, and Jewish patriotism is, like every other

TRADITION: A *Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought*

patriotism, a secular-human characteristic without sacred significance. There is no holiness except in the upholding of Torah and in the observance of its commandments—"and ye shall be holy unto your God." We have no right to ascribe the establishment of the State of Israel to the religious concept of Messianic redemption, which involves the religious regeneration of the world or at least of the people of Israel. We cannot place a halo of sanctity upon this politico-historic event nor regard the very existence of this state as a religious phenomenon.

From the standpoint of religious concepts and beliefs, this state is the State of *Israel* (just as the reigns of Jerobaam, Ahab, Manasseh, and Herod were, in their time, *the Israelite state*); and no Jew—even a religious Jew—has the right to dissociate himself from his obligations to it, even though it is at the present time secularist, i.e., based upon the people's rebellion against the rule of Torah; just as no man can or has the right to dissociate himself from his filial obligations to his parents, even when they are transgressors, or from the status of fatherhood toward a sinful son. But, together with the full recognition of the legitimacy of the state, it is necessary to set up, *in contrast* to its image and character and that of the society organized therein, the image and character of the religious state—that is, one which accepts the supreme authority of the Torah. It is not enough to introduce stealthily, through various administrative devices, certain religious appearances into the secular reality, while accepting the over-all supremacy of the secular authority.

The demand for the separation of religion from the *existing secular state* stems from the vital religious need to prevent turning religion into a tool for satisfying certain social and political needs, into an agency of a secular government, into a function of the bureaucracy and administration of the state which "supports" religion and religious institutions, not for religious reasons, but as a concession to a pressure group for the sake of temporary and fluctuating political interests. *Religion dependent upon an irreligious government* is the very anti-thesis of religion, and destroys all opportunity for religious education and for religious influence upon the community and its way of life. From the point of view of religion there is no greater abomination than an atheistic-clericalistic government. For what have we here?—a state secular in its essence and non-religious in most of its manifestations, but which recognizes religious institutions as official institutions, sup-

In Defense of "Separation" in Israel

ports them with its funds, and forces upon the community not religion but certain religious functions determined by political and inter-party agreements — and all this side by side with non-recognition of the Torah and its commandments (“a government of law, not a government of Halakhah!”); a “dependent rabbinate” which receives its appointments, its authority, and its salaries from a government of the “non-religious,” and therefore confines itself within the limits of the functions that this government assigns to it within the administrative machinery of the state; a religion whose status in the state is equivalent to that of the police, sanitation, vaccinations, the mail, or tax collection. . . . There can be no greater degradation of religion. There is nothing that can do more to sap the potential of religion for influence and persuasion and winning souls than religious institutions maintained by a secular state; than a religious stamp of approval affixed to secular functions; than religious obligations and prohibitions included as incidental by-products in a series of secular laws; than a secular authority that forces certain religious observances upon the community without obligating itself or the community to a recognition of the supremacy of religion itself; than a religion that is dedicated, not to Heaven, but to political convenience.

All this is a falsification of reality, a perversion of social and religious truth, and a source of intellectual and spiritual corruption. The secular state and the secular society must be forced to utter their message without a hypocritical religious mask. Only then will it be clear whether or not they have anything to contribute as a *Jewish* state and as a *Jewish* society. The faith of Israel must be made to speak its message without an administrative disguise. Only then will its true strength be revealed, and only then will it become an educational force and influence.

In religious circles one hears, in opposition to the demand for Separation of Religion and State, the contention that Separation will make the social, and perhaps even the physical, existence of religious Jews within the framework of the secular state and society untenable, and may even become a factor compelling observant Jews to violate their faith. Some of these arguments have their origins of naiveté—in a failure to understand the meaning of Separation and its practice in the daily conduct of government and society. As for the rest, they are nothing but the feigned innocence and

hypocrisy of interested parties. In reality, Separation would not by so much as a hairbreadth impinge upon the opportunity given to devout Jews to live their lives according to their own practices within the state and society. Not only that, but it will actually strengthen religion within the life of the community.

For example:

1. Religious institutions will become the responsibility of the religious community and will carry on their activities according to religious considerations and in consonance with the interests of religion, not in conformity to limitations imposed upon them by a secular authority. Religious functionaries will no longer be appointed by governmental departments that do not consider themselves subject to the rule of Torah. Religious activities and institutions will no longer be conducted by divisions of the government or its various branches. There will arise a rabbinate *for religious Jewry*, not (as once existed in Russia) a "dependent rabbinate" (*rabbanut mi-taam*)—one of the most degrading institutions in the history of the Jewish people. There will arise a rabbinate that will be the representative and leader of the religious community, not a bureaucracy within an actively secular state; a rabbinate that will be free to deliver its message and to make its voice heard on *every* topic and on *every* social issue about which there is anything to be said from the point of view of Torah and Halakhah, and not only on those topics and issues which the secular authority has assigned to it. The voice of Torah and the authoritative judgments of Halakhah will be able to be heard *everywhere* and on *every* subject—regardless of whether the public is prepared to listen or not. And an end will come to that frightful situation under which the rabbinate, as an official governmental institution, is obligated to refrain from expressing an opinion regarding the problem of secular versus religious education—which is *the* central religious problem—and to remain silent concerning instances when Jewish children are caused, by allurements or compulsion, to transgress against their religion. There will no longer be friction and wrangling among the religious functionaries of an atheistic government, between a "Minister of Religions" and a Chief Rabbi," who quarrel with each other not on questions of Torah or halakhic decisions, but about the distribution of the miserable patronage appointments allocated to them by a secular government.

In Defense of "Separation" in Israel

Who will maintain the religious institutions which the religious community requires? The answer is clear: first and foremost, the religious community itself, with its own wealth and resources, as it has done at all times and in all places since organized religious communities first came into being. Obviously this will entail sacrifices, but the religious community has always—and *everywhere*—carried this burden as a matter of course and as something inseparable from its religious existence. Even the poorest community in a forsaken village of Yemen or Morocco or in the caves of Libya supported—by its own means, not with the assistance of the United Jewish Appeal or a subsidy from the Imam or the Sultan—its rabbis, ritual slaughterers, synagogues, cemeteries, etc. and never complained of it. Only in the State of Israel, which has transformed religion into a function of the secular government, has the religious community become spoiled and accustomed itself to receiving funds from a secular authority for the maintenance of religious institutions, thereby making its very existence dependent upon that authority. There can be no doubt that after the short period of confusion that will initially accompany the separation of Religion and State, the "crown of Torah" will be restored to its former eminence. The religious community will once again maintain its institutions as *religious* institutions, whose support will be borne voluntarily by religious individuals. The honor of the Torah and its representatives will once again rise, after having sunk to the lowest depths during the period when they sat as poor relations at the table of the secular state and lived off the crumbs cast to them. In this connection it may not be amiss to cite an example from other nations, e.g. the contempt and disrespect that were the lot of the Catholic Church and clergy in France in the nineteenth century after the Napoleonic Concordat which made them appointees and servants of the state, and their rising honor and influence in the twentieth century after the Separation of Religion and State, when all the institutions of the Church and the entire body of its functionaries were compelled to exist solely by the support and contributions of the faithful.

It is questionable whether Jewish religious institutions in the State of Israel should and, from a religious viewpoint, may receive financial support from the government treasury. The writer of these lines believes that religious Jews are under an obligation, for the

sake of the dignity of the Torah, to refuse such support. If, however, after deliberations, it should be decided otherwise, such support will be given to religious Jewry even after Separation of Religion from State, by virtue of its rights as a community of taxpayers and citizens who share the burden of the state and its services.

2. The governing religious bodies will be chosen by all religious Jews who are interested in them and their activities. They will not be delegates of a "Ministry of Religions" which is itself a secular authority. The abolition of the Ministry of Religions will also free Judaism and religious Jews from the religious nightmare—which official Orthodoxy today passes over in silence—of supporting with Jewish funds the institutions of other religions (among which are some that fall within the definition of idolatry according to the Law). If there is no Ministry of Religions, and Jewish religious institutions are not financed by government funds, then our democratic state will not be obligated to support other religious institutions. The communicants of every religion will support their own institutions.

3. The Sabbath and the State. Under present conditions, when Religion is, so to speak, entwined with the State, the Sabbath is constantly desecrated by the State. The law of the land recognizes the right of every individual to violate the Sabbath publicly, for example, by traveling on the Sabbath. The police and judiciary was frequently brought into action to protect this privilege—even during the time when official Orthodoxy, as represented by all its various shades, participated in the government and shared the responsibility for the actions of the police. The ban upon *public* transportation on the Sabbath, which is enforced in various places by the secular authorities, is no more than a bribe given to Orthodoxy to serve as a blindfold. The hypocrisy of this arrangement, which degrades the dignity of religion and makes its position ridiculous, is revealed most clearly in Haifa where religious Jewry, which is represented in the municipal government, shares the responsibility for running the buses on the Sabbath, in exchange for the dubious benefit of participating in the coalition that governs the municipality, but is prepared to fight against operating the subway on the Sabbath—apparently because it would receive no compensation for this violation of the Sabbath.

The law of the state at present recognizes, not the *sanctity* of

In Defense of "Separation" in Israel

the Sabbath, but the right of every Jew to *rest* on the Sabbath. This is accomplished by abstracting the definition of "rest" from the realm of Halakhah and transferring it to the domain of the secular authority or interparty deals. There is no reason to fear that the State, after its divorce from Religion, will change anything in the existing Sabbath law, which establishes the right of all workers to rest on the Sabbath and requires the closing of stores, workshops, etc., on the Sabbath. To what extent this Sabbath rest will conform in practice to the *religious* requirements of Sabbath rest—this will depend upon the pressure of public opinion and the social influence exerted by religious Jewry. This influence will increase greatly with the separation of Religion from the administration, and the concomitant elevation of the status, the dignity, and the pedagogic power of Religion.

4. Sabbath and Kashruth in the Army. The observance of Sabbath and Kashruth in the armed services is not a result of the formal coupling of Religion with the laws of the State, but rather of the fact that there are many Jews who cannot and will not be able to serve in the Army if they are not assured of Sabbath rest and kosher food. The State will not be able to mobilize the entire Yishuv, for the protection of the country, in a single, unified national army, unless it maintains these arrangements. It cannot maintain a separate "religious army" alongside the regular army, and therefore these arrangements will not change even after Separation. It must be noted that even today the Army does not recognize the religious prohibitions against the desecration of the Sabbath and the eating of non-kosher food, since every soldier is *entitled* to violate the Sabbath at his own discretion, just as he is *entitled* to use one set of dishes for both meat and dairy meals, if he so wishes. The Army only makes it *possible* for every soldier to rest on the Sabbath and to eat kosher food—and this will not change.

5. The Marriage and Divorce Laws. The argument that the recognition of civil marriage *on the part of the State* will eventually divide the Jewish people into two nations that will not be able to intermarry, is founded on falsehood. It is untrue that this recognition will destroy the institution of Jewish marriage (*Kiddushin*). This argument ignores—whether through design or through ignorance—the experience of hundreds of thousands of religious Jews in the Western countries who live their family life in accordance

with the Torah's laws of sanctity and purity, all within the general framework of state laws that recognize civil marriage and divorce (as in England) or even insist upon a civil ceremony (as in Imperial Germany and the Weimar Republic). Torah-observant Jews will continue to wed with *Chupah* and *Kiddushin* and if, God forbid, they decide to divorce, they will do this, too, according to the law of Moses and Israel. Those who reject religion, however, will limit themselves to registering their "marriages" and "divorces" in some governmental bureau in a form to be established by law. The above two terms have been enclosed in quotations marks for, from a religious point of view, there is no actual marriage involved, but only cohabitation with an unmarried woman; hence the question of divorce does not arise. Where there is no sanctification of marriage (*kiddushin*), the laws of *mamzerut* (illegitimacy) do not apply, and a child born out of wedlock is not banned from entering the community. So far the institutions of Torah law have not dealt seriously and directly with the halakhic implications of "civil marriage"—if, indeed, the latter has any halakhic significance. It is difficult to conceive that a woman who lives with a man simply upon the basis of registration in a governmental bureau can be considered married according to religious law, since they have openly demonstrated that they do not desire *kiddushin*, a marriage according to the law of Moses and Israel. This will reduce *mamzerut* to a minimum and will represent an enormous improvement over the existing state of affairs regarding marriage and divorce, which is in effect nothing but a law for the proliferation of *mamzerim* in Israel. For the prohibition against adultery, which applies to certain physiological acts that are the concern of no one but those directly involved, is not based upon general moral or social considerations; it is a grave *religious* prohibition exclusively. That is why in wide-spread circles of the community which reject the binding force of religious law—and this includes many very decent individuals—adultery is not considered reprehensible. Hence, those who force religious marriage rites upon that segment of the community which does not acknowledge their sanctity are gravely violating the injunction "Thou shalt place no stumbling-block before a blind man." By enforcing the prohibition against cohabitation between unmarried partners—the transgression of which does not create *mamzerut*—they are causing the people to violate an injunction punishable by death accord-

In Defense of "Separation" in Israel

ing to the Torah. It is not to be expected, however, that the rabbinical bodies will decide this question objectively, because they are themselves interested parties—just as it is not to be expected that the leaders of the Histadrut and its branches will deal objectively with the issue of taking the health services out of the hands of the Histadrut.

Furthermore, the fear of splitting the nation as a result of the abolition of the marriage and divorce law is ridiculous—and perhaps dishonest—in face of the reality that already exists today. Is it possible for a man and a woman of Israel to enter into a marriage if one of them considers himself subject to the laws of family purity (*taharat ha-mishpachah*), while the other does not acknowledge these laws and is not prepared to accept them? Are not the prohibitions against such a union inestimably more stringent than the prohibitions against cohabitation between unmarried persons, or the far-fetched possibility of *mamzerut*? And one more point. Religious Jewry, more than any other segment of the nation, sees in the State of Israel not a state composed only of the present inhabitants of Israel, but rather the Jewish state, i.e. the state of the Jews, all of whom are its potential citizens. Has religious Jewry, in its concern about family blemishes, on the one hand, and for the unity of the people, on the other, given consideration to the conditions and problems that will arise at the very moment, which may not be far off, of the influx of Jews from the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. to Israel, Jews who for two generations or more have lived within the legal and social framework of their countries, and about whom it will be impossible to know or to establish their family background and the marital status of the parents of whom they were born? Under such circumstances, how do religious Jews propose to maintain the unity of the people, religious and non-religious?

6. Closely related to the preceding is the question of "Who is a Jew?"—a question that could have arisen only as the result of the inclusion of Religion in the realm of a secular State. We have seen how transitory and changing considerations of government and coalition can lead at one time to an attempt to uproot the historic-traditional meaning of the concept of belonging to the Jewish people, and at another time to the revocation of that attempt, i.e. how Religion becomes a card in the game of political interests. Had Religion not been subject to a secular governmental authority, this

problem would never have existed. Were the actual secularity of the State of Israel recognized formally and legally, the question would not have arisen at all, for a secular government does not determine the "Jewishness" or "non-Jewishness" of its subjects; it recognizes only "citizens" and "non-citizens." The concept "Jew" would have retained its historic-traditional meaning. Incidentally, the government's (temporary) retreat on this issue—a retreat which the religious political parties regard as their victory—testifies to the fact that the status of Religion within the State is determined by the consciousness of the community and by the pressure of public opinion at home and abroad far more than by what goes on in the government. Emancipation of Religion from its entanglement with secular-governmental procedures is the most promising road toward the strengthening of religious awareness and influence in the community.

7. Religious Education. There is no *direct connection* between the status and growth of religious education, on the one hand, and the legal status of Religion within the framework of the State on the other. Such a connection exists of necessity only in the framework of a totalitarian regime, but not within the framework of a liberal state in which the social aspects are not identical with official governmental affairs. In progressive and enlightened countries, all of which have established compulsory education for the children of their inhabitants and incorporated it within a legal framework, there exist profound differences from one country to the other as to the uniformity or diversity of education that is provided within the legal framework, as well as to the extent to which government is involved in the determination of pedagogic practices and objectives. As proof one can cite the examples of England, France, Germany (Weimar and Bonn), Holland, and America, in all of which religious education flourishes. Especially in the United States, where the Constitution and decisions of the Supreme Court forbid any kind of religious education on the part of the state, there exists a network of 15,000 Catholic elementary and high schools, with a total of four million students, and all concede that it is not inferior in either its standards or achievements to the network of "public schools"—that is, secular schools maintained by state or municipal authorities. In other countries the objectives of every school are determined by a board of the parents, and the government carries

In Defense of "Separation" in Israel

out the desires of the parents, within the wide framework set up by the education laws. The common factor in all these different methods is that the secular state does not regulate religious education, and religious education is not one of its functions, but is set up and maintained by the religious community that desires it—whether this community is embodied in an an over-all church organization or is represented by the parents of a given school. To what degree the state shares the expenses of these schools of its tax-paying citizens—that is subject to legal determination and depends to a great extent upon the wishes of the religious community and the strength of its religious consciousness.

In all these matters the State of Israel might do well to follow the lead of the most enlightened nations, and from a Jewish religious viewpoint it is eminently desirable that it do so. The fear of educational independence, the apprehension that without official governmental protection religious education will not be able to maintain its position or will be doomed to quantitative losses—these are merely the expressions of the moral weakness of the religious community, a weakness that has developed and spread precisely because of the subjection of Religion to the State, and because of the gradual acceptance of the view of Religion as a function guaranteed by a secular authority. Religious Jews were wont to put massive effort into giving their children an education, and always brought sacrifices for this purpose. Such a renewal of spirit—by religious Jewry's acceptance of responsibility for religious education—is a prerequisite for a religious renaissance, without which there can be no future for religious education in any form.

Removing religious education from the control of the secular state and government, and transferring it into the hands of the religious community—with or without financial support by the government—will not only not weaken it, but will actually open up new horizons for its growth and for winning adherents among the people. The existing law of education, which on the surface seems intended to guarantee the support of a religious education by the government, is actually a legal agreement for the confinement of this education to circumscribed limits—that is to say, within those limits which the secular authority is willing "to put up with" and in those areas which the secular power is "relinquishing" for the benefit of the religious. In turn, religious Jews relinquish the right to wage a

TRADITION: A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought

serious campaign for the broadening of religious education and against the spread of secular education. There have even been instances of specific *numerical* agreements upon the proportionate per capita division of pupils between secular and religious education. Evidently there can be no real competition between two branches of the educational administration of the same government. Only with the existence of independent religious schools will the religion of Israel be able to blossom in *full* vigor, to speak its message and to activate *all* its influence.

With the dissociation of religious education from the secular authority, the opposition that now exists between the "governmental religious" school system (Mizrachi) and the "independent" religious school system (Agudath Israel) will in large measure be lessened. The transfer of authority over religious education into the hands of the community of religious parents, and the orientation of the educational system by that community, will make it possible for the religious schools to accommodate themselves to the spirit and traditions of the different groups and trends within religious Judaism, which will be expressed in parents' committees, so that the direction of each institution will be determined in accordance with the spirit and aims that are dominant among the parents of the specific locality. This, too, will contribute to the strengthening of the vitality and impact of the religious school system. As for the curtailment of the independent religious school system, or its actual suppression by the secular authority—this curtailment, as is well known, has not been avoided even in the existing order. Moreover, within the framework of the present order it is not possible for religious Jewry to wage an energetic battle against such curtailment; indeed, it prefers to avoid this battle wherever possible and accepts many restrictions, so as not to jeopardize the official-legal status of that portion of the educational system which the state has placed under its jurisdiction. The will as well as the moral and social potential of religious Jewry to fight the battle for religious education will *grow* after Separation.

Separation does not mean that Religion is to be pushed aside into a forsaken corner of State and society, nor does it mean that religious Jewry is to be eliminated from the political scene. On the contrary, Separation will mean the beginning of the great confrontation of Judaism and secularism within the Jewish people and

In Defense of "Separation" in Israel

its State, and the beginning of their battle for the soul of the nation. Religion, which today serves as one of the subsidiary functions of the secular State, has no freedom of speech except in those areas of public life in which the secular State has permitted it.

Religion, as an independent institution, will become *the* fundamental opposition to the regime of the secular State—an opposition which will offer clear-cut and specific alternatives on all levels of life within the state and society.