Judaism and Democracy – The Private Domain and Public Responsibility

RACHEL ELIOR

The interplay between Judaism and democracy is one of the most frequently discussed topics on the public agenda in the State of Israel – defined in its Declaration of Independence, and a number of its basic laws, as a Jewish and democratic state. Upon listening to the public debate on this subject, however, there often appears to be a basic ambiguity regarding the essential distinction between these two systems and the ways in which they interact. We often hear conciliatory voices, attempting to present the two systems as being convergent and complementary. Others accentuate the tension in the concept of a “Jewish and democratic state,” by embracing one of its component parts and rejecting the other. I will attempt to clarify some of the fundamental differences between Judaism and democracy, and to examine the different attitudes which result from the distinctions between them.

These two categories, as legal and ideological systems which exist side by side in Israel, and which address issues arising from shared national and civil circumstances, converge and intersect at many points. The difference between them lies primarily in the source of their authority, their applicability, the way in which they interact, and the limits of their
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mutability, or in other words, in the relation between heteronomous and autonomous law.

Judaism, in the minds of its adherents, derives its authority from divine revelation. Divine law, present in its foundation, is thus sacred, eternal and immutable. It is mainly concerned with a Chosen People, Holy Scriptures, a holy community and even a holy land, as well as various concepts pertaining to divine sovereignty and its essential holiness. Divine revelation — perceived to be the absolute and binding truth as expressed in religious law and foundering mythology — is directed primarily toward the establishment of a moral and religious consciousness based upon divine commandment and commitment to the Jewish People and to Judaism. The revelation also sets forth a spiritual and religious destiny, based upon shared memory and shared hopes for a common future. It also presents principles of social justice, as befits a people emerging from slavery and forging a new identity. Judaism is of course not simply an ideology based upon religious revelation and sacred texts, but is rather the aggregate of its changing historical manifestations, as well as the cultural and social processes experienced by the Jewish People.

Until the advent of the modern era, Jewish society was traditional, seeing its existence as being founded upon knowledge and sacred values inherited from the past. Its authority was based upon eternal divine law, and identification with the chain of halakhic and scholarly tradition passed down and interpreted by the Rabbis and Sages. It is in this fashion that the content and meaning of the divine revelation at Mount Sinai was expounded, as well as the attendant matters of faith and lifestyle, past and present. The historical fate of the Jewish People — in exile for nearly 2,000 years — led to the fact that the academic aspect of much of tradition was far greater than the practical, and many of the biblical precepts and guidelines never stood the test of the real world and the vagaries of time. The sacred formula of literal interpretation was discussed, expounded and studied, serving as the basis for a deep and varied corpus of religious literature — created to a large extent beyond time and place. The texts were only wrested from their theoretical status — founded in memory, ritual and study — and forced to stand the test of changing reality — some two thousand years later when the Jewish People, realizing the dream of the Return to Zion, came back from exile and re-entered independent history, within the territorial boundaries of national sovereignty.

The almost mythical Jewish experience — associated with direct revelation, God-given law, and the changing social reality of history and the destiny of a people that "shall dwell alone" — was based upon a heteronomous imperative, or a law deriving from a source beyond Man and not subject to human standards and measures of reasonability and rationality. The vicissitudes of history from time to time brought about creative interaction between the heteronomous imperative and human interpretation of the divine law, revealing new facets. In the mind of the believer, however, religious truths spring from a supreme source of truth, which is not required to answer to rational, critical demands, or to prove itself by standards beyond faith itself.

Religious tradition draws upon eternal divine authority, absolute truth rooted in revelation, and sacred heteronomous law as expressed in the biblical canon and its exegesis. Democracy, which advocates equality between people, is, on the other hand, founded upon the exclusive sovereignty of Man: human decisions, relative truth, doubt and criticism, public consent and autonomous law deriving from a person himself. Democratic legislation incorporated complex socio-political processes in the historical experience of different peoples, striving to ensure that the basic principles of humanism are upheld, preferring them to all other commitments to ethnicity, religion, race, sex or family. These legal decisions and determinations must constantly compete in the free market of ideas, public criticism and relative evaluation, and be subject to majority decision, varying human estimation, judicial criticism and constitutional change. As such, they lack eternal validity and are likely to vary over time. These decisions, on a fundamental level, treat every person as an independent human being without any prior obligation, restriction or prejudice based on ethnicity, religion, race or sex.
In other words, the basic principles of democracy dictate equality, human dignity and liberty, regardless of religious identity or ethnicity, as well as man’s autonomy, independence, the right to critical thought, and the right to doubt all conventions. At the heart of modern secularism lies the fact that it does not rely upon absolute truth, and does not mandate specific content or absolute priorities in matters of the spirit, but is, rather, open to all possibilities of human spirit and creation, while guaranteeing both maximum freedom and maximum access to sources of knowledge and information. The only absolute truth at the basis of democratic thought is that which pertains to the essential equality of all people, their right to liberty, dignity and freedom of expression. This right is not subject to any supreme values or unifying religious truth, but is inherent to the perception of equality as the birthright of all human beings.

The purpose of democratic legislation, beyond ensuring equality, safeguarding individual liberties, and clearly defining what the government may or may not do with regard to its citizens, is to guarantee the existence of a public domain in which different and opposing spiritual, cultural, social and political views can function. It achieves this objective by creating tools with which to regulate public activities and balance the social order, taking into account the various interests that result from changing socio-cultural circumstances. Democratic legislation, by nature, does not strive to realize any lofty spiritual purpose, impart a unifying truth, or promote content intended to shape the soul of the individual. Its goal is to ensure that individuals are provided with the maximum number of tools to achieve their inalienable humanistic rights, and to exercise their freedom to choose from a myriad of cultural, religious and social values, none of which is superior to any other, simply because they are not judged in light of any consistent and solid truth. Open society is based upon the recognition that no individual nor any human organization has a monopoly over truth, and therefore as more opinions and varied beliefs coexist in peace and tolerance, the entire public benefits as a result. Democratic legislation aims to guarantee that all beliefs that do not harm the public have the opportunity to attain fulfillment. Ideally, democratic legislation, when confronting a multi-cultural mosaic, rather than a monolithic culture, recognizes the relativity of the various truths and their relation to the totality of the social experience. Democracy draws upon the prevailing legal tradition and accepted judicial rulings, as well as shifting historical, social and political circumstances, skeptical evaluation and critical judgment that change over time.

Jewish tradition, based on divine revelation, eternal law and a single, supernal truth, is inherently closed to relative criticism, binding rational evaluation, or change, with regard to essential questions. According to this belief, Man is subject to divine sovereignty over everything: law and justice, life and death, past and future. Duties and privileges, preference and discrimination, are linked to covenants and eternal promises between the God of Israel and the People of Israel, as declared in the Holy Scriptures. This is based on an exclusive approach to law and justice which treats one group ("Children of the Covenant") in one way, and other groups ("not of the Covenant") in another. Much of Jewish tradition makes a basic distinction between those who are "of the Covenant" and those who are not, Israel and the Nations, those who are holy and those who are not, Jews and gentiles, those who follow the divine commands and those who deny their validity. This fundamental belief in a "people [that] shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations" (Num. 23:9) intrinsically rejects humanistic, universal and egalitarian concepts of equality between people, since ethnic origin and identity dictate superiority and inferiority, as well as the limits of obligation and privilege, application and exemption.

It is of course easy to find, within the vast and ancient body of Jewish tradition, expressions of humanistic values and moral positions, as well as verses and citations in support of equality and universal social justice. One can also easily find laws within the democratic legal corpus, contrary to the principles of equality before the law, individual autonomy, universal humanism, human dignity and liberty. The proof, however, does not lie in the quoting of random passages, but rather in analyzing the entire configuration, defining not only ideal principles and the
sources of authority, abstract and practical goals, but also the ways in which change was affected and criticism offered, and how the limits of its application were enacted. Religious law — founded upon a single eternal and divine truth, concerning a chosen community of believers, flowing from a divine sovereignty and preserving a tradition rooted in divine commandment and Holy Scripture — strives to mold spiritual identity, emotional status and religious imperative. Democratic legislation, on the other hand, is founded upon mutable and relative human truths, decisions, amendments and mistakes, as well as a system of balances between different interests, reflecting human experience and autonomy. Democracy — not rooted in any transcendental source of validity — in principle treats all people equally, regardless of their religious affiliation. Its legislation does not strive to establish any specific spiritual content or to create a cultural and intellectual agenda, based upon a monopoly over a single heteronomous truth. It is intended, rather, to express a pluralistic view, recognizing many truths, and creating the tools with which to establish a social order, providing equal opportunity and the autonomous freedom to choose between the various spiritual, cultural, political and religious possibilities.

The content of the divine revelation, expressed directly in the Ten Commandments and extensively in the Torah and the Talmud, is unquestionable and irrefutable in the eyes of its adherents. Its precepts, laws and practices are not subject to fundamental change, although they are subject to clarification, debate, elaboration, exegesis and adaptation, based upon human interpretation, for "It is not in heavens." (Deut. 30:12; Bible Metia 59b). However, attributes varying significance to the commandments, both in thought and in deed, which can be negotiated and debated, and can result — for various reasons — in adaptation and compromise. The rich body of Jewish literature in the fields of Halukha and scholarship illustrates the great power that lies within the dialectic unity of the sacred and immutable text on the one hand, and its changing significance on the other, or in other words, the force of human authority to interpret divine law. This neither contravenes the principle of the heteronomous imperative nor exempts it from human critique and fundamental change demanded by changing times and changing views.

Democratic law, on the other hand, is based upon the principles of human autonomy and public agreement in accordance with civil legal tradition, ongoing legislation, basic laws or a constitution, and efforts to strike a balance between different values. It is by nature subject to negotiation, criticism and fundamental change, although this may be limited as a result of various cultural, social, historical, military and political constraints, regarding its applicability to certain population groups, and possibly even reflecting a broad and often intolerable gap between theory and practice. The fundamental uniqueness of the democratic regime lies in the fact that it does not strive for unity and uniformity based upon a single consistent truth, but rather accepts variety and its contradictions as a worthy norm, manifesting the basic values of human dignity and freedom of choice. The democratic system strives to strike a balance between personal and social goals, as well as the spiritual and material needs of individuals and groups. It does so through dominant ideological unity, "religious uniformity or predetermined heteronomous preference," but rather through awareness of the importance of multiplicity and variety, and the contradictions that arise from the absence of a single unifying truth. This balance is based upon an appreciation for a wide variety of points of view, their common and opposing interests, and the dynamic interaction between the various parts of society. Democracy strives to enable the greatest number of views and truths to be expressed, and to regulate the various interests vying in the public arena, without determining their preferable, truthfulness or value, since unity is not measured by the uniformity of the message, but by the ability of the public to bear disparate messages within the framework of common interests and freedom of choice.

These two legal systems derive their authority from entirely different sources, and differ in their history, goals, applicability, and the way in
which they define themselves. There is therefore no point in judging
their respective advantages and disadvantages, or in arbitrarily and
artificially seeking out their similarities. What should, however, be
considered is the way in which they interact, in light of the fundamental
differences between them. Clear distinction should be made between
laws that derive from a divine source and laws made by human voice.
Obligation to the former is based upon faith and tradition, while the
creator, the law and its people are perceived as a single entity ("God, the
Torah and Israel are one") (Zohar III, 71a). Obligation to democratic
law, on the other hand, is based upon the authority of a majority-elected
government, equal application of the law to all citizens, its public
usefulness, and the social order it maintains. Democratic law serves
the common interest and the individual rights of every person. We must
carefully consider which laws we wish to enact, and even impose
forcibly upon the public, and which imperatives and values we wish to
leave up to individual choice, belief and lifestyle.

I believe both systems to be of great importance, for different reasons.
A clear distinction should be made, however, between matters of per-
sonal spiritual and religious freedom (adherence to religious law, tradi-
tion, religious values, or the spiritual and social preferences of a specific
group), and that which can be imposed upon the individual in the name
of social order and the public good, i.e., democratic law, humanistic civil
tradition and democratic values. In my opinion, the former should be left
to the province of individual liberty, freedom of choice, and personal
identity. The latter, however, should be imposed upon society as a
whole, in the name of human dignity, civil liberty and equality before the
law, or in the name of humanistic principles pertaining to the entire
public and to the equal benefit of all its component parts. I make this
distinction according to a universal standard, asking: "Which system
applies to all parts of society, in theory and in practice, guaranteeing the
most rights to the largest number of people, considering their human
dignity, freedom, autonomy and equality, and without discriminating on
the basis of ethnicity, race, religion or gender?"

Religious law draws upon prophetic tradition, extensive moral and
social views, faith and inspiration — some of the noblest expressions of
the human spirit. To a large extent, religious law is concerned with a
historical reality, thousands of years old, much of which no longer exists
and is not relevant to the present time. In this corpus, one can find
humanistic views and striking moral and social insights, as well as many
non-egalitarian commandments, which fail to stand up to the criterion of
present-day rationality, since they do not address issues of an individ-
ual's autonomy, basic rights, equality, freedom and dignity. We need
only mention the many laws which favor or exclude various groups; laws
of slavery, ritual purity, marriage, divorce and widowhood — involving
deserted wives (givoson), coerced levirate marriage (yibum) and release
from a levirate marriage (halitzot); laws governing those who are unfit to
give testimony (the deaf, the insane and minors); excommunication, laws
pertaining to non-Jews, or those that advocate discrimination against
gentiles and the handicapped and dismiss women from public life.

Each historical period appears to possess its own unique concept of
truth, which perfectly explains reality. These concepts differ from one
another, yet all claim to be comprehensive and absolute. Which is the
real truth? The answer is that there is no one truth. Truth is the aggregate
of all concepts of truth, together with the differences between them. This
view is reflected in relativistic pluralism.

Secular democratic law, based on humanistic ideals, human experience
and awareness of human shortcomings, theoretically treats all men
equally. It strives to give expression to values that promote tolerance,
pluralism, democracy, freedom of expression, equal rights, human
dignity, individual autonomy and secure the right to choose and to
criticize, as well as the equal access to the law, social justice, freedom
and peace. A person's identity is not determined by one's religious
affiliation or predilection for some particular divine revelation or an-
other, but simply by virtue of inherent independent humanity, which
therefore grants all of these principles. The attempt to strike a balance
between individual rights and the general good, between universal and
particular values, and between imposed obligations in the name of the
public good and inalienable rights in the name of individual freedom, does not derive from a supernal source. It is the product of human reason alone, which is subject to change, criticism and doubt. History has shown the limits of democratic legislation and its weaknesses, resulting from its dependence upon politics and shifting power bases. It would still appear, however, that the ideas, Weltanschauung, social views and ideals behind this legislation relate to universal humanistic values, and endeavor to achieve the public good.

In light of this analysis, adherence to exclusive religious law—which favors certain groups and excludes others—should be a matter of individual choice and the private domain, while inclusive laws—which claim that all people are entitled to dignity, freedom, justice, equality before the law, civil fraternity and autonomy—should be enforced in the public domain. The former concerns the historical socio-religious identity associated with a specific group, while the latter pertains to everyone, regardless of religious, national, historical and cultural affiliation. A country in which millions of people with different beliefs, religions and lifestyles live, must not enforce religious laws in the public domain. Religious law should apply only to those who freely choose to adhere to it, as an expression of faith, tradition, cultural and historical affiliation, or a desire to disseminate certain values. People should therefore not be forced to adopt behavior associated with a specific group, the values and beliefs of which they do not share. This is in fact the essence of religious coercion: the coerced application of the values, beliefs and mythology of one group, on others who do not share belief in its sanctity, authority or significance. Thus religion becomes a mandatory, meaningless, external system, incapable of serving as a basis for coexistence in a secular, democratic, egalitarian and pluralistic society. It is particularly significant that religious precepts, customs and laws that are not enforced by state law enjoy a great deal of popularity, in theory and in practice, among most of the population. Well-known examples of this are: circumcision, bar mitzvah, mezuza, fasting on Yom
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Kippur, the Passover Seder, Shabbat candles, Holiday celebrations and the customs of mourning.

Relations between religious law—represented by Halakah and the rabbinical courts—and democratic law—represented by the Supreme Court—become particularly strained when the religious imperative clashes with the democratic point of view, or when tradition cannot be reconciled with changing reality. One example of this is the status of women. Women are perceived in many religions as being inherently inferior to men, and thus not entitled to independent status. They are treated as the chattel of their fathers or husbands, and are considered to be particularly prone to sin—thus in need of supervision and "taming." They can be beaten and punished for purposes of education, modesty and correction. In many cases, women are even considered unfit to give testimony or to take on economical and social responsibility. They are often portrayed as being impure, and a threat to public welfare and to family honor—thus unfit to appear in the public domain. Until not long ago, women were in fact barred from the public domain, silenced and not permitted to take part in any affair involving authority, autonomy, knowledge, status and judgment. In other words, they were denied the possibility of taking part in judicial matters, teaching and learning, public responsibility, leadership, etc. To this day, religious law and tradition bar women from serving as rabbis (Orthodox), kaddis or priests, halakhic authorities, Torah scholars, yeshiva deans or rabbinical court judges. Women are not even permitted to lead prayers in the Orthodox synagogue, or to receive honors that require speaking and singing in public, or that pertain to authority and status. These roles and honors are reserved for men only. This absurd situation has had tragic consequences for half of the human race, which has been denied the basic rights of human dignity, freedom of public expression, and equality, as well as the right to study and to participate in public life. This was fostered by the androcentric religious thought of the three monotheistic religions, supported by Holy Scriptures and the institutions of traditional society. These religions fundamentally reject humans' autonomy and equal rights, and are eager to deny the
need to do so by force. The natural vibrancy of the culture plays a decisive role, as evidenced by contemporary Hebrew arts and letters, which draw upon the spirit, imagery, mythology and lyricism reflected in the ancient Hebrew language that pervades every aspect of Jewish life, past and present.

On the other hand, those things that do not enjoy natural, inherent acceptance, and cannot be taken for granted, should be protected. Man is not born democratic, justice-seeking, egalitarian, autonomous, humanistic, sensitive to silenced voices and suffering, compassionate, pluralistic, feminist, respecting all individuals, generous and tolerant. Most people do not think of others in terms of the maxim “Beloved is man, for he was created in the image of God” (Ethics of the Fathers 3:18), nor do they have equal respect for their cultural and religious preferences, spiritual diversity, truths, or their right to espouse them. Tolerant, pluralistic views such as these have no natural language or mythology, and they lack the authority of divine revelation and ancient tradition. They must therefore be taught and defended, protected by legislation and imposed upon everyone. The State of Israel, according to its Declaration of Independence, “will ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants irrespective of religion, race or gender, it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education and culture...and it will be faithful to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.” In reality, there is still a great gap between the commitment and its fulfillment, but once again, it should be remembered that we are not born democratic, tolerant or pluralistic, and we do not speak, from the moment of our birth, the language of justice and equality. There are no inborn cultural reserves, defending these conceptions as part of a distinct cultural, national and religious tradition. Education should therefore teach religious and cultural tolerance, equality, freedom of religion and conscience, recognition of manifold truths and lifestyles, as well as the relative nature of “absolute truth.” One of the most important tasks of education is to point out that no one has a monopoly over truth, or a preeminence of dreams, imagination, memory, sacred belief or myth. No one socio-religious system is the sole arbiter of all meaning, and no single allegiance or commitment is superior to all others. There are, rather, complex interactions between many truths, different loyalties and varied beliefs. The goal of a democratic political system is to maintain an arena of free expression, in which different beliefs and lifestyles can compete in a marketplace of ideas on a basis of freedom of expression and freedom of identification, and freedom of choice without coercion and without predetermined preference.

I don’t believe that culture should be protected by imposed education and legislation. Life itself appears to preserve the common experience by virtue of identification, solidarity, and the decision to live within a specific national reality and cultural borders. This is achieved through the dominance of language, art, poetry, literature, memory and myth, ritual and liturgy in the lives of members of a given people. It is the power of the language of the street, and the diversity of experience constantly renewed through natural cultural growth and creation, which feed on both the past and the present. This growth is inexorably linked to the life cycle of shared association, which goes beyond the limits of time and space, and is deeply rooted in generations of experience. An individual’s identification with a particular collective entity, through language, culture and lifestyle, religious tradition, solidarity, a common past and a common future, is taken for granted, since the individual’s lifestyle, and the meaning and significance in one’s life, is based upon one’s culture. It would stand to reason that anyone born into a certain culture – if granted freedom, equality, dignity, a broad education and access to a wide variety of cultures, as well as a degree of tranquility, financial security and social justice – would naturally identify with some of its components in a fashion suitable to the circumstances of the individual’s life, choosing those things that are close to one’s heart. Judaism, which is thousands of years old, is not merely a religious faith. It is a historical, national and cultural legacy, binding the Jewish People together, not only through belief or Halakah, but by virtue of a national will to exist, a common identity and memory, shared hopes for the future, and a sense of communal caring and solidarity which transcends time and place.
Democracy on the other hand, being much younger, must carve out a new role for itself in the context of a specific cultural and historical legacy. The rise of modern political institutions, their enforcement and the struggle for democracy has been fought in many different settings. The struggle has often been met with resistance from traditional, religious and cultural forces. The experience of the Jewish people, with its long history of oppression and resistance, provides a rich source of insights into the struggle for democracy.

In the context of these two systems, I believe that democracy and Jewish tradition are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, they can be reconciled and even strengthened by each other. Democracy, with its emphasis on freedom and justice, can help to ensure the survival of Jewish culture and the continuation of the Jewish people. At the same time, Jewish tradition can provide a framework for understanding democracy and its values.
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