

Limmud 2019

**RABBINIC
FREEDOM OF
PULPIT**

Study pack



Student Rabbi Gabriel Kanter-Webber
gabriel@gabrielquotes.org.uk

EARLY EXAMPLES: UNWELCOME PROPHECIES

SPEAKING OUT OF TURN

וַיִּשְׁאָרוּ שְׁנַיִם אֲנָשִׁים בַּמַּחֲנֶה שֵׁם הָאֶחָד אֶלְדָּד וְשֵׁם הַשֵּׁנִי מֵדָד וַתָּנַח עֲלֵהֶם הַרוּחַ, וְהֵמָּה בְּכַתְּבִים, וְלֹא יֵצְאוּ, הָאֵהָלָה; וַיִּתְנַבְּאוּ, בַּמַּחֲנֶה. וַיֵּרַץ הַנָּעַר, וַיֵּגֵד לְמֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר: אֶלְדָּד וּמֵדָד, מִתְנַבְּאִים בַּמַּחֲנֶה. וַיַּעַן יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּרְנוּן, מִשְׁרַת מֹשֶׁה מִבְּחָרָיו, וַיֹּאמֶר: אֲדֹנָי מֹשֶׁה, כָּלָאִם. וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ מֹשֶׁה, הַמִּקְנָא אֶתְּהָ לִּי; וּמִי יִתֵּן כָּל־עַם יְהוָה, נְבִיאִים, כִּי־יִתֵּן יְהוָה אֶת־רוּחוֹ, עֲלֵיהֶם.

Two men remained in the camp. The name of the one was Eldad and the name of the other was Medad. And the spirit rested upon them, and they were among those recorded, but they did not go out from the tent, and they prophesied in the camp. And a lad ran to tell Moses and said, “Eldad and Medad are prophesying in the camp!”

Joshua son of Nun, attendant to Moses, one of his choice men, replied, “My lord Moses, restrain them!” But Moses said to him, “Are you jealous on my part? Would that all the God’s people were prophets, that the Eternal One would place the Divine spirit upon them.”

Numbers 11:26-29

אמר לו רבוני משה כלם מן העולם לבני אדם שבשרוני בשורה רעה זו ד"א אוסרם בזיקים ובקולרות כמה שנאמ' ונתתם אותו אל בית הכלא [ירמיה לז יח].

[Joshua] said to him, “My master Moses, restrain them from the world of human beings, for they reported an evil report.” Or maybe [Joshua said to him], “Lock them up in chains and collars, as it is written in Jeremiah 37:18: ‘Now that you have put me in the prison house...’”

Sifre Numbers, B'ha'alot'cha 96

WHEN PEOPLE DON'T WANT TO HEAR

אָמְרוּ לְרֵאִים, לֹא תִרְאוּ, וְלַחֲזִים, לֹא תִחְזְרוּ־לָנוּ נְכַחֹת; דְּבַר־רִלְנוּ חֲלָקוֹת, חֲזוּ מִהַתְּלוֹת.

[They] said to the seers, “Do not see,” to the prophets, “Do not prophesy truth to us; speak only of smooth things, prophesy delusions.”

Isaiah 30:10

SPEAKING TRUTH TO POWER

וַיְהִי כִּי רָאוּ אֲחָאָב, אֶת־אֵלִיהוּ; וַיֹּאמֶר אֲחָאָב אֵלָיו, הֲאֵתָה זֶה עֹבֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל. וַיֹּאמֶר, לֹא עֹבֵרְתִי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל, כִּי אִם־אַתָּה, וּבֵית אָבִיךָ, בְּעִזְבְּכֶם אֶת־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה, וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו לְנָבִיאֵי הַבַּעַל, בְּחַרוּ לָכֶם הַפֶּר הָאֶחָד וַעֲשׂוּ רֵאשֻׁנָה, כִּי אַתֶּם, הָרַבִּים; וְקִרְאוּ בְשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, וְאֵשׁ לֹא תִשְׂיִמוּ. וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת־הַפֶּר אֲשֶׁר־נָתַן לָהֶם, וַיַּעֲשׂוּ, וַיִּקְרְאוּ בְשֵׁם־הַבַּעַל מִהַבֶּקֶר וְעַד־הַצֹּהָרִים לֵאמֹר הַבַּעַל עֲנֵנוּ, וְאִין קוֹל וְאִין עֲנָה; וַיִּפְסְחוּ, עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה. וַיְהִי בַצֹּהָרִים וַיִּהְיֶה בָהֶם אֵלִיהוּ, וַיֹּאמֶר קִרְאוּ בְּקוֹל־גָּדוֹל כִּי־אֱלֹהִים הוּא, כִּי שִׁיחַ וְכִי־שִׁיג לוֹ, וְכִי־דָרַךְ לוֹ; אוּלַי יֵשֵׁן הוּא, וַיִּקָּץ.

When Ahab caught sight of Elijah, Ahab said to him, “Is that you, you troubler of Israel?”

[Elijah] retorted, “It is not I who have brought trouble on Israel, but you and your father’s House, by forsaking the commandments of the Eternal.”

Elijah said to the prophets of Baal, “Choose one bull and prepare it first, for you are the majority; invoke your god by name, but apply no fire.”

They took the bull that was given them; they prepared it, and invoked Baal by name from morning until noon, shouting, “O Baal, answer us!” But there was no sound, and none who responded; so they performed a hopping dance about the altar that had been set up.

When noon came, Elijah mocked them, saying, “Shout louder! After all, he is a god. But he may be in conversation, he may be detained, or he may be on a journey, or perhaps he is asleep and will wake up.”

1 Kings 18:17-27 (abridged)

THE PROPHETIC CHARACTER

What manner of man is the prophet?

Sensitive to evil: He delivers orations about widows and orphans, about the corruption of judges and affairs of the market place. Instead of showing us a way through the elegant mansions of the mind, the prophets take us to the slums. The world is a proud place, full of beauty, but the prophets are scandalised, and rave as if the whole world were a slum. Their breathless impatience with injustice may strike us as hysteria. We ourselves witness continually acts of injustice, manifestations of hypocrisy, falsehood, outrage, misery, but we rarely grow indignant or overly excited. To the prophets even a minor injustice assumes cosmic proportions.

Luminous and explosive: The prophet's images do not shine: they must burn. The prophet is intent on intensifying responsibility, is impatient of excuse, contemptuous of pretence and self-pity. His words are often slashing, even horrid – designed to shock rather than to edify. Reading the words of the prophets is a strain on the emotions, wrenching one's conscience from the state of suspended animation. The prophet is human, yet he employs notes one octave too high for our ears. He experiences moments that defy our understanding. He is an assaulter of the mind.

Iconoclastic: The prophet is an iconoclast, challenging the apparently holy, revered, and awesome. Beliefs cherished as certainties, institutions endowed with supreme sanctity, he exposes as scandalous pretensions. Their words may sound blasphemous.

Compassionate: The words of the prophet are stern, sour, stinging. But behind his austerity is love and compassion for mankind. Every prediction of disaster is in itself an exhortation to repentance. The prophet is sent not only to upbraid, but also to bring consolation, promise, and the hope of reconciliation along with censure and castigation. He begins with a message of doom; he concludes with a message of hope.

Makers of sweeping allegations: If justice means giving every person what they deserve, the scope and severity of the accusations by the prophets of Israel hardly confirmed that principle. The prophets were unfair to the people of Israel. Their sweeping allegations, overstatements, and generalisations defied standards of accuracy. In terms of statistics the prophets' statements are grossly inaccurate. Yet their concern is not with facts, but with the meaning of facts. Few are guilty, but all are responsible.

Endowed with a blast from Heaven: To a person endowed with prophetic sight, everyone else appears blind; to a person whose ear perceives God's voice, everyone else appears deaf.

Distrusted: The prophet faces a coalition of callousness and established authority, and undertakes to stop a mighty stream with mere words. It is embarrassing to be a prophet. There are so many pretenders. By the standards of ancient religions, the great prophets of the Israelites were rather unimpressive. Evidence such as miracles were not at their disposal.

Lonely and miserable: None of the prophets seems enamoured with being a prophet nor proud of his attainment. To be a prophet is both a distinction and an affliction. The mission he performs is distasteful to him and repugnant to others; no reward is promised him and no reward could temper its bitterness. The prophet's duty is to speak to the people, whether they hear or refuse to hear. Thus the prophet bears scorn and reproach. He is stigmatised as a madman by his contemporaries, and, by some modern scholars, as abnormal.

Abraham J Heschel, 'The Prophets' (New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 1962; repr 2001): extracts from pp 3-21

TRANSITION TO THE RABBINATE

THE NEW PROPHETS

אמר רבי אבדימי דמן חיפה מיום שחרב בית המקדש ניטלה נבואה מן הנביאים וניתנה לחכמים.

Rabbi Avdimi from Haifa says: From the day that the Temple was destroyed prophecy was taken from the prophets and given to the Sages.

bBava Batra 12a

NO WRONG ANSWERS

אמרו רז"ל במסכת עירובין, "תלמיד אחד היה לו לרבי מאיר שהיה מטהר את השרץ במ"ט פנים." כל זה הוא כי בדיבור אשר נאמר עליו בדברים, "קול גדול ולא יסף," היו בו כל הפנים המשתנים והמתהפכים לטמא וטהור לאסור ומותר לפסול וכשר, כי לא יתכן להאמין שהיה הקול ההוא חסר כלום, ולכך בגודל הקול היו הדברים מתהפכין מכל צד זה לעומת זה, וכל אחד ואחד מן החכמים קבל את שלו, כי לא הנביאים בלבד קבלו מהר סיני אלא אף כל החכמים העומדים בכל דור ודור, כי כל אחד קבל את שלו שנאמר בדברים, "את הדברים האלה דבר יי אל כל קהלכם," ועל הענין הזה אמרו במסכת עירובין, "אלו ואלו דברי אלהים חיים הם," כי אם היה אחד מהם טועה בקבלתו לא היה אומר כן.

Our rabbis said in Tractate Eiruvim, "Rabbi Meir had a student who could find 49 ways of declaring a reptile pure."

All this is contained within the Word, as it is written in Deuteronomy, "The Great Voice did not cease," and within it are all these facets that change and contradict each other: pure and impure, forbidden and permitted, unclean and kosher. For it is impossible to believe that the voice omitted anything, and thus the Great Voice contained contradictory faces – one side against the other – and each of the sages received their own understanding of it. And it was not just the prophet who received the Torah on Mount Sinai, but rather all the sages who stand in every generation: each of them received their own understanding, for so it is written, "The Eternal One spoke these words to your entire community." And with regard to this matter, they said in Tractate Eiruvim, "These and these are both the words of the Living God," and if one of the sages had erred in their understanding of the Torah they received, God would not have spoken thusly.

Recanti on Exodus 20:10

THE VALUE OF STUBBORNNESS

עקביא בן מהללאל העיד ארבעה דברים אמרו לו עקביא חזור בך בארבעה דברים שהיית אומר ונעשך אב בית דין לישראל אמר להן מוטב לי להקרא שוטה כל ימי ולא ליעשות שעה אחת רשע לפני המקום שלא יהיו אומרים בשביל שררה חזר בו.

Akavia ben Mahalalel testified concerning four things. They said to him: Akavia, recant these four things which you said, and we will make you Av Beit Din over all Israel. He said to them: "It is better for me to be called an imbecile all my days than that I should become even for one hour a wicked man before God; they will not say of me: 'He recanted [his opinions] for the sake of power.'"

mEduyot 5:6

NO HECKLERS' VETO

אמור את המשפט כאשר הוא, וקולר יהא תלוי בצואר הרבים.

Speak judgment as it is: let an iron collar hang on the necks of the many.

Rashi on Exodus 23:2

CHANGING TIMES AND CHANGING OPINIONS

רבי יהודה אומר לא הוזכרו דברי יחיד בין המרובין אלא שמא תיצרך להן שעה ויסמכו עליהן.

Rabbi Yehudah says, "The words of a minority are recorded alongside the words of the majority because at a future time they may wish to rely upon the [minority argument]."

tEduyot 1:4

למה מזכירין דברי היחיד כלומר שכיון שכל מקום יחיד ורבים הלכה כרבים למה הוזכרו דברי היחידים שאם יראו ב"ד דברי היחיד כגון האמוראים שפסקו הלכות וכשרואים טעם היחיד יכולין לפסוק כמותו שאם נשתקעו דבריו לא היו האמוראים יכולין לחלוק בהדיא עם התנאים שהיו גדולים מהם בחכמה ובמנין, ועל זה יכולין לפסוק כדבריו שכבר אמרה תורה אחרי רבים להטות ואע"ג שלא נתקבל דברי היחיד בזמן הראשון ולא הסכימו רבים עמו כשיבא דור אחר ויסכימו רבים לטעמו יהיו הלכה כמותם שכל התורה נאמרה למשה פנים לטמא ופנים לטהר ואמרו לו עד מתי נעמוד על הברור ואמר להם אחרי רבים להטות מיהו אלו ואלו דברי אלוהים חיים.

Why do we record the words of the minority? That is to say, every source treats [the words of a] single [person] and [the words of the] many equally. Why are the words of the minority recorded? For if a beit din sees the words of the minority, such as the Amoraim who gave legal

rulings, when they see the minority's reasoning, they are able to rule in its favour. Whereas, if [the minority's] words were buried, the Amoraim would not have been able directly to contradict the Tannaim, who surpassed them in wisdom and in number – but because [the minority's position was recorded] they can rule in accordance with their words.

The Torah has already said, "After the majority you shall incline" (Exodus 23:2), and even though the minority's words were not accepted originally, and the majority did not rely on them, when a different generation comes, the majority [may] rely on the [older minority's] reasoning, and the halacha will follow them.

For the whole Torah was told to Moses, including passages of impurity and passages of purity, and [the Israelites] said to him, "How long should we stand here trying to clarify [these laws]?" to which he replied, "You shall follow the one who is in the majority, [but] these and these are [both] the words of the Living God."

Tosafot Shantz on mEduyot 1:5

REGARDLESS OF WHO DISAGREES

רע בעיני על לא כתבת שאלה זו סתם בשם ראובן ושמעון יען נאשתרוק קאף אהובי אבל האמת אהוב יותר.

It is regrettable, in my view, that you did not write this question only in the names of Reuben and Shimon [ie using anonymous placeholders]. I like Ya'an Nastruk Caf – but I like the truth more.

Rivash, no 104

אין האמת נעדרת מפני שלא תקובל ממי שאמרה.

The truth does not go away just because it is not accepted from the one who speaks it.

Rivash, no 309

SILENCE AS COMPLICITY

כל מי שאפשר למחות לאנשי ביתו ולא מיחה נתפס על אנשי ביתו באנשי עירו נתפס על אנשי עירו
בכל העולם כולו נתפס על כל העולם כולו.

Anyone who is able to protest [against the sins of] members of their household and does not protest, they are apprehended for [the sins of] their household. [Likewise for the sins of] the people of their city, they are apprehended for [the sins of] their city. [Similarly, one who is able to protest against the sins of] the entire world [and does not] is apprehended for [the sins of] the entire world.

bShabbat 54b

MODERN APPROACHES

FROM THE COURTROOM TO THE PULPIT

The modern [Methodist] preacher may not think of themselves as addressing a mob. Still, a congregation can be well-dressed, well-fed, well-housed, well-mannered and still be seething with hostility. It takes immense courage these days, for example, for a preacher to look their congregation in the face and declare that racial segregation is a sin. From such pronouncements many congregations are currently recoiling in wrath.

Yet, here and there, there are preachers who refuse to be throttled down to the idling purr of innocuous and insipid sayings in the midst of raging evils. Undoubtedly, preachers of this calibre have read, and taken seriously, the words of God heard by Ezekiel (3:7, 11): “But the house of Israel will not listen to you, for they are not willing to listen to me; because all the house of Israel are of a hard forehead and a stubborn heart [...] So go, get you to the exiles, to your people, and say to them, ‘Thus says the Eternal One’ – whether they hear or refuse to hear.”

Lee C Moorehead. Freedom of the Pulpit (New York: Abingdon Press, 1961): 47.

A HALACHIC RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH?

[The Torah details various restrictions on speech, including perjury, cursing one's parents and taking God's name in vain.] This kind of restriction underlines rather than undermines the freedom of speech; were it not for the generally valid proposition that everybody is at liberty to speak out as he pleases, the exceptions to such a general rule need not have been particularised. That the general rule is nowhere explicitly stated is neither here nor there; [I] have already observed that Jewish law excels in stating duties and prohibitions and only implying rights.

Haim Cohn. 'Human Rights in Jewish Law' (London: Institute of Jewish Affairs, 1984): 109.

A HALACHIC DUTY TO SPEAK FREELY?

We affirm the inherent right of the rabbis of our congregations to express freely their views and their interpretations of Jewish doctrines in the light of contemporary life. We proclaim equally the right of the congregant to dissent from the views articulated from the pulpit.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations (now Union for Reform Judaism), resolution, 1950s

By the demands of prophetic precedent, the rabbi has the right, duty and obligation to express themselves on all matters which they feel involve moral and ethical issues.

[...] The rights of the individual to apply the teachings of their faith to all issues involving moral and ethical implications must be safeguarded [...] This right applies both to the rabbi and to members of the congregation. Wherever possible, a rabbi and congregation should work unitedly in this regard. Where there are differences of opinion on local, political or economic matters between pulpit and pew, the rabbi's right to preach and the layperson's right to dissent must both be preserved.

[...] The rabbi is not necessarily the spokesman of their individual congregation, but is a spokesman for Judaism and its principles. Their expressed opinions are their own, but must reflect the principles enunciated by Judaism.

CCAR Yearbook, volume 63 (1953): 'Report of Commission on Justice and Peace', 131-32.

NO TO PULPIT CENSORSHIP

The chief office of the minister [...] is not to represent the views of the congregation but to proclaim the truth as they see it [...] How can anyone be vital and independent and helpful if they are tethered and muzzled?

[...] A free pulpit will sometimes stumble into error; a pulpit that is not free can never powerfully plead for the truth and righteousness. In pursuit of the duties of their office, the minister may from time to time be under the necessity of giving expression to views at variance with the views of some, or even many, members of the congregation.

Far from such difference proving the pulpit to be in the wrong, it may be and oft-times is found to signify that the pulpit has done its duty in calling evil evil and good good [...] The minister is not to be the spokesperson of the congregation, not to be the message-bearer of the congregation, but the bearer of a message to the congregation.

Stephen Wise. "Rev Dr Wise surprises Emanu-El trustees", New York Times, 7 January 1906: 5.

LEGAL TEXTS

THE PERSON AND THE OFFICE

[There is] difficulty in separating the office-holder from the office. I have no doubt that [what Ken Livingstone] said did bring him into disrepute.* I am less clear that in reality it was right to say that the office of Mayor was brought into disrepute. While the appellant has a high profile as Mayor, I doubt that many people would regard what he did as bringing disrepute on the office rather than on him personally. Misuse of the office can obviously bring disrepute on the office, but personal misconduct will be unlikely to do so. [There is a] real distinction between the man and the office.

High Court: 'Livingstone v Adjudication Panel for England' [2006] EWHC 2533 (Admin), [2006] LGR 799

* Collins J added: "I must make it clear that this decision must not be taken as an indication that the appellant's actions were appropriate. They clearly were not. His initial question – 'Were you a German war criminal?' – was obviously intemperate. However strongly he felt about the impropriety of the journalist's conduct, the remark was unnecessarily offensive [...and going on to compare the journalist to a concentration camp guard] was indefensible. He should have realised it would not only give great offence to him but was likely to be regarded as an entirely inappropriate observation by Jews in general and those who had survived the Holocaust in particular."

THE JUDICIAL OATH

I {name} do swear that I will well and faithfully serve in the office of {role} and that I will do right to all manner of people without fear or favour, affection or ill-will according to the laws and usages of this realm.

Justice (Northern Ireland) Act 2002 s 19

PUTTING UP WITH EACH OTHER

A free society is sparing in imposing limits upon the choices of the individual and acts with patience and tolerance, and tries to understand the other, even when they choose paths that the majority does not deem acceptable or desirable. Tolerance is not a slogan for accumulating rights, but a criterion for granting rights to others.

*Israeli Supreme Court: 'Hoffman v Director of the Western Wall'
HCJ 257/89, 1994*

PUSHING THE ENVELOPE

Free speech includes not only the inoffensive but the irritating, the contentious, the eccentric, the heretical, the unwelcome and the provocative provided it does not tend to provoke violence: freedom only to speak inoffensively is not worth having.

*High Court: 'Redmond-Bate v Director of Public Prosecutions'
[1999] EWHC Admin 733, (1999) 163 JP 789*

States are obliged to put in place an effective system of protection for authors and journalists as part of their broader obligation to create a favourable environment for participation in public debate by everyone and to enable the expression of opinions and ideas without fear, even when they are contrary to those held by the authorities or by a significant section of public opinion and even if they are annoying or shocking for the latter.

*European Court of Human Rights: 'Dink v Turkey' [2010] ECHR
2668/07*

TRUTH WILL OUT

“With intelligence shall man distinguish between the true and the false.”
So wrote Maimonides in his *Guide to the Perplexed*.

An open, democratic society is willing to bear offence. To permit the restriction of false expression would allow the authorities the power to distinguish between the true and the false and the power to substitute its own decisions for the decisions of the free market of ideas. Freedom of expression also includes the freedom to present facts and interpret them, even if many are certain that the presentation is erroneous and the interpretation deceiving.

The false and the fraudulent should be confronted with the good and the true, and it is the latter that will ultimately prevail, taking its place among the rainbow of beliefs, ideals, and faiths of the free world.

Israeli Supreme Court: ‘Bakri v Israel Film Council’ HC 316/03, 2003

A LINE FROM ABRAHAM TO US

Freedom of political expression is protected not only because we are a democratic state, but also because we are a Jewish state. It has been this way from the earliest days of our existence.

We are told that our patriarch Abraham was called “Ivri”, from the same root as ‘Hebrew’, because he maintained his opposition to the idolatrous regime: “The whole world was on one side (‘e-ver’), and he was on the other side (‘e-ver’)”: Genesis Rabbah 48:8. The first holiday of the Jewish nation – in fact, its constitutive holiday – is Passover. It is a holiday that counterposes individual liberty and the slavery regime of the Egyptian Pharaoh.

These points accentuate the centrality of freedom of political speech as integral to freedom of the individual confronted by the existing regime that limits his choice. The issue is not only the ‘marketplace of ideas’, but a person’s right to freedom of expression in opposition to the ruling political regime, and the power of the individual to make their own decisions and express their views without society – even a democratic society – deciding for them in the public’s name.

The harsh result of this law, which makes calls for a boycott of Israel or any part of Israel or the territories an actionable wrong, will be a chilling effect that will influence freedom of expression. The presence of a chilling effect in this case is not at all speculative. The creation of a

chilling effect is the primary means chosen by the legislature for achieving the law's purpose.

Calling for a boycott, at least in some of situations, is a person's basic right of conscience. There are people whose conscience will not permit them to purchase an automobile produced by a certain country. Others are upset by the very thought of patronising certain stores that sell non-kosher products alongside kosher ones. They do not wish to empower those that they perceive as 'offenders'. To each their choices, and to each their conscience. Such choices stand at the core of a person's freedom to realize his values in his lifestyle. At times, a call for a boycott is a call to act in accordance with one's conscience. Conscience may be the compass of freedom of expression, including the freedom of political expression.

Israeli Supreme Court: 'Avneri v Knesset' HCJ 5239/11, 2015

THE PROPHETS IN THE COURTROOM

The prophets of Israel and their prophecies have long served as the paradigm of impassioned and uncompromising rebuke of governmental abuse of might and power, and of a corrupt public or individual. They condemn oppression of the poor and exploitation of the widowed, [...] and deviation from the spirit and substance of the Torah and halacha. The firm stand and struggle of the prophets of Israel, even when they evoke severe and angry reactions, has been an inexhaustible source of inspiration in the struggle for freedom of expression and for contemporary enlightened democratic regimes. This is common knowledge, not in need of proof, and common currency for every student of political and democratic theory.

[...] That is the lesson of leadership and government in the heritage of Israel – tolerance for every individual and every group, according to their opinions and outlooks. And this is the great secret of tolerance and listening to the other, and the great potency of the right of every individual and every group to express their opinions: they are not only essential to an orderly and enlightened regime but also vital to its creative power. For in the real world “two opposing elements converge and fructify; how much more so in the spiritual world” [Rav Kook, haNir, 1909: 47].

Israeli Supreme Court: 'Neiman v Chairman of the Central Elections Committee for the Eleventh Knesset' EA 2/84, 1985