THE USE OF HOLOCAUST TESTIMONY BY JEWS FOR JESUS: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY

Elliot Cohen*

The primary concern of this paper is a video entitled ‘Survivor Stories: Hope from an Unlikely Source’, published by the controversial organisation Jews for Jesus (JFJ) in 2001, which consists of several historical and evangelical testimonies from Holocaust survivors who are now Messianic Jewish believers and spokespeople for the JFJ movement. In analysing the presentation and language used and its relations to questions of identity, we will adopt a discursive approach that is transdisciplinary, extending beyond social psychology into literary theory and theological reflection, which is designed to avoid the reductionist tendencies that are found in many standard anti-missionary tracts and materials concerning the JFJ and other Messianic Jewish movements. We will inevitably touch upon issues relating to Jewish identity more generally in our attempt to locate the use of the Holocaust testimony of members of the JFJ within wider Jewish and academic discourse concerning the Holocaust. The primary focus will be the utilisation of such material for evangelical or missionary purposes.

The purpose of this paper will be to perform a narrative inquiry into the use of Holocaust testimony by Jews for Jesus (JFJ). When referring to ‘narrative’ throughout this paper I shall be conveying two meanings. The first meaning concerns narrative as the literal form of storytelling, specifically as a Jewish folk art. In this way we might observe a particular style of narrative that possesses certain features that may be recognised as a ‘Jewish story.’¹ The second meaning concerns narrative as understood within the discipline of what has come to be known as Narrative Psychology. This particular approach, or analytical method, focuses on the various ways that one’s
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identity and social reality is formed, performed, negotiated and re-formed through the telling, retelling and hearing of stories.\textsuperscript{2} This inevitably initiates discourses relating to the expression and performance of Jewish identity within the JFJ’s testimonies. We will observe how some of the perceived paradoxes and problems associated with being a ‘Jew for Jesus’ are smoothed over in a ‘narrative of the self’,\textsuperscript{3} whereby disparate and contradictory parts of one’s identity are seemingly resolved and unified within the sequential telling of one’s tale (within the logic of the narrative). For the purposes of avoiding any grand epistemological claims, whilst also recognising the importance of reflexivity, the author declares himself to be from an Orthodox Jewish background, and currently self-defines as a post-denominational Jew.

The JFJ is an organisation devoted to evangelical outreach, primarily amongst Jewish people; or to quote directly the Jews for Jesus mission statement: ‘We exist to make the Messiahship of Jesus an unavoidable issue to our Jewish people world-wide.’\textsuperscript{4} There is a certain ambiguity in the ‘our’ of this statement, as it may be construed as indicating either a claim to belong (that is, to be part of the Jewish people) or even an affirmation of ownership as the authentic claimants to the title of the Jewish people. It is partly due to ambiguities of this nature that particular controversies arise. To illustrate further, one may consider the use of the words ‘testimony’ and ‘witness’. One may rarely encounter these terms in daily usage outside legal discourse, yet within a specifically Evangelical Christian context their meaning and purpose is quite specific. In Evangelical Christian discourse to ‘give testimony’ or to be a ‘witness’ implies that one has undergone a transformative experience that has led to one’s acceptance of Jesus Christ as one’s personal lord and saviour and is testifying in the hope that others will be brought to the faith.\textsuperscript{5} What I will be addressing throughout this paper is primarily a war of words or, more precisely, the way certain words or phrases are being used, who is using them and for what purpose (or imagined purpose). As Judaism is not (currently) an evangelical faith and does not actively seek

\textsuperscript{4} Jews for Jesus Mission Statement \url{http://www.jewsforjesus.org/about Accessed 03/10/08}.
converts, one of the few places one encounters individual Jewish testimonies is in relation to the Holocaust. These testimonies served firstly to record, in the form of witness accounts, the atrocities that occurred, but over time they have borrowed from established literary genres, in particular the Chasidic tale or travel story. The JFJ’s use of Holocaust testimony to serve as a contemporary evangelical resource could, arguably, be likened to one of the functions of ancient and medieval Jewish martyrological traditions, but has nevertheless proven offensive to many within the Jewish community.

It may be noted throughout this paper that the controversies arise not simply over what is being said, but who is speaking. The JFJ will address Jewish people as fellow Jews (speaking as if they were insiders, providing an emic perspective), and indeed this is one of the features that distinguishes their evangelical appeals. Outside Orthodox Jewish circles (in contrast to inside, where one’s Jewish identity is determined purely by matrilineal descent, that is, whether one’s mother was Jewish) there is much debate over the question ‘who is a Jew?’ Which in turn raises the question ‘who has the power to define, to recognise and refute Jewish identities?’

What is perhaps significant is that the ‘Jewish’ status of the JFJ has been denied by almost every mainstream denomination of Judaism (such as the Orthodox, the Conservatives, the Reformers, the Reconstructionists, and the Liberals). However, one result of the emergent complexity of modern (or post-modern) definitions of Judaism (ranging from religious, cultural, ethnic to political) has been that groups seeking to enter the Jewish world and identify themselves ‘Jewish’ now have seemingly more entry points than ever before.
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Despite believing and propagating a theological system that is very similar to mainstream Evangelical Christian Theology, the JFJ movement still maintains that it is both a Jewish and a Christian movement. Terms such as ‘Jewish-Christian’ have been abandoned in preference of the term ‘Messianic Jew’, or ‘completed Jew’. Consequently in the testimonies of JFJ one will often find that immediately following the acceptance of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah and the Son of God there is an explicit affiliating (or re-affiliating) with the Jewish people. An example of this can be seen in the JFJ testimony of Richard Harvey. The title of his book *But I’m Jewish!* (1996) is a clear and bold affirmation, which when read as a testimony may appear either ambiguous or confrontational. To a Jewish reader the statement may appear to challenge any who would seek to deny Harvey his Jewish status on account of his acceptance of the New Testament, and specifically the recognition and assertion of Jesus of Nazareth as both Messiah and Divine. To Christian believers/readers the statement may appear somewhat more complex, but is primarily intended to demonstrate that the acceptance of the New Testament does not lead to the loss, or devaluation, of one’s Jewish heritage and identity. Likewise on the JFJ founder’s (Moishe Rosen) homepage there is a section titled ‘Don’t call me a converted Jew!’ which begins:

> Please don’t call me a converted Jew! I was born a Jew and I’ll die a Jew. Even if I wanted to be anything else, I couldn’t because Jewish is what I am and will be irregardless of how I or anyone else feels about it. As it is, I’m pleased to be a Jew and part of a noble people who have brought so much to the rest of the world.
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It concludes ‘So don’t call me a converted Jew. I’m a converted sinner and a completed Jew.’\textsuperscript{12} Other testimonies follow suit\textsuperscript{13} and insist upon retaining their Jewish identity not simply in spite of their acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah, but because of it. The acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah is consistently presented as being the missing piece to a complete Jewish identity and faith, thus Jews who do not believe in Jesus are consequently perceived and related to as being incomplete Jews.

Counter-missionary organisations such as Operation Judaism in Birmingham (UK), Jews for Judaism (US) and Outreach Judaism (US) consistently argue that the ‘Jewishness’ of the JFJ serves only as a veneer, or subterfuge, with which to lure in unsuspecting members of Jewish communities into accepting Jesus.\textsuperscript{14} Whether one believes that deception is indeed taking place is dependent on one’s ideological position. One example may be seen in the JFJ’s avoidance of using the name and title ‘Jesus Christ’ and preference for the Hebrew name and title Y’shua Ha Moshiach (Jesus the Messiah). This intentional Hebraising may be viewed as either camouflaging the overt non-Jewish perception of Jesus (the greatest barrier to a Jew’s acceptance) or may be a sincere expression of one’s belief in restoring Jesus back to his Jewish roots, and revealing the Jewish origins of the Christian faith.\textsuperscript{15} One may also observe the JFJ’s conscious sharing (or occupation) of Jewish time and space in their marking the Jewish festivals and their use of Jewish cultural resources (speech and symbols), which all raise complex and problematic questions pertaining to cultural ownership.

It is perhaps in keeping with this theme of sharing Jewish time and space that the JFJ looked to the Holocaust as an event that, to a large extent, has shaped and defined the modern Jewish experience.\textsuperscript{16} But the JFJ’s use of the Holocaust to create a platform for evangelising to the Jewish people has been a highly controversial decision. The

\textsuperscript{12} Moishe Rosen’s homepage http://members.aol.com/mitymo/convert.html Accessed 12/12/06.
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\textsuperscript{16} J. Sacks, Crisis and Covenant: Jewish Thought After the Holocaust (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 25-51.
question that naturally arises is: who owns the Holocaust?\textsuperscript{17} This draws one’s attention to the various ways the Holocaust may be used by different groups for very different ends:

Holocaust survivors and children of survivors give their amazing true-life accounts, telling how they clung to life amidst unimaginable horrors and loss. Most amazing of all, these ‘survivors’ did more than survive. Despite the darkness they endured, they found light and hope – from a most unlikely source.\textsuperscript{18}

The respect afforded to Holocaust survivors by the Jewish community is something that appears to have been keenly appreciated and consequently used by the JFJ in their evangelism; there is understood to be something different, special, about these testimonies as opposed to other standard JFJ testimonies: ‘Before you dismiss my belief, you should know that in addition to being Jewish, I’m also a Holocaust survivor.’\textsuperscript{19} The JFJ Holocaust survivors have been allocated their own JFJ web space and literature. It is this fact that the teller is a Holocaust survivor that suggests you ought to listen, even if (especially if) you don’t think you’ll agree, out of a certain reverence and respect.

The Jewish community is accustomed to listening very carefully to its Holocaust survivors. There has been an established tendency turn to them into the living symbols of Jewish continuity and their experiences have been painstakingly documented and recorded for posterity, with the emphasis that this ‘never happens again’. In Oren Baruch Stier’s thesis four main methods of memorialising are considered.\textsuperscript{20} The first is iconic and would include symbols and images that are collectively recognised by Jewish people as specifically pertaining to the Holocaust. One example of this may be the rail tracks that led to the Auschwitz concentration camp; this can be seen in the JFJ’s choice of barbed wire as the iconic imagery for their online collection of

\textsuperscript{18} From the video sleeve of \textit{Survivor Stories: Hope From an Unlikely Source} (San Francisco: Purple Pomegranate Productions, 2001).
\textsuperscript{19} Jews for Jesus, Australia \url{http://www.jewsforjesus.org.au/survivor-stories.html} Accessed 03/10/08.
Holocaust testimonies available in several pages designated ‘Survivor Stories’. Other examples may include the pictorial use of a yellow star or the train tracks that led to, or the sign that hung at the entrance of, Auschwitz. Museological remembrance would include memorials such as Yad Vashem in Israel and numerous Holocaust education centres, and their respective Internet sites all ensure that people ‘never forget’ what happened. Ritual-ceremonial remembrance includes the Jewish annual festival of Yom Hashoah (day of calamity) and the recently created United Kingdom Holocaust Memorial Day (27th January). But of all these forms of memorial it is the actual survivors and their personal stories that consistently can be seen to have the most profound and lasting effect.

In stark contrast to the Evangelical Christian’s emphasis on their personal relationship with God, the voice of the individual speaking apart from his/her community may sound out of place in a Jewish context, at worst it may sound divisive and perhaps even destructive. The ‘Jewish people’ may be understood as being exactly that: a people. And it is within this collective identity that narratives have been formed, re-formed and continue to be performed. Of course this idea is to be found within early Rabbinic commentaries: ‘And you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation (Exodus 19:6) - this teaches that they are like a single body, a single soul.’

Further demonstrations of this collectivity may be seen in the way that Jewish people perform prayer. Ideally Jewish people will pray, not as individuals, but as a community, a kehilla. Jewish law Halacha explicitly states that at least ten men must be present (a minyan) before a daily service can begin. Jewish prayers themselves speak both of and as the people of Israel, and do not generally take the form of individual petitions. The following examples are taken from the Amidah prayer:

Blessed are You, Hashem, our God and the God of our forefathers, God of Abraham, God of Issac and God of Jacob.

Be favourable Hashem, our God, toward your people Israel and their prayer and restore the service to the Holy of Holies of Your Temple.
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The place of the individual is seemingly always to be understood within the context of the whole. As such the actions of an individual Jew are often seen and depicted as affecting the entire Jewish people. In an illustrative parable told by Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai:

It is to be compared to people who were in a boat, and one of them took a drill and began to drill a hole beneath himself. His companions said to him: Why are you doing this? He replied: What concern is it of yours? Am I not drilling under myself? They replied: But you will flood the boat for us all.25

As for the one who denies this collective identity and positions him/herself in opposition to it, the consequences can be quite severe. If we consider the liturgy of the Passover festival, the Haggadah, we encounter an ancient and unfavourable image of the Jew who rejects this communality in the form of ‘the wicked son.’ An important ritual of the Passover seder requires reciting the questions of ‘the four sons’. Each son and each question represent an approach or attitude towards not only the Passover service (seder), but towards the Jewish law and the Jewish people. In this ritual performance there is the wise son, the wicked son, the simple son, and the son who does not know how to ask. It reads,

What does the wise son say? ‘What are the testimonies, statutes and laws that Hashem our God has commanded you?’ You then instruct him in the laws of Pesach, that one may not eat anything after eating the Pesach sacrifice.26

Through the framing of his question it can be seen that the wise son includes himself as being both within and a part of the Jewish community, by virtue of his referring to the laws that Hashem ‘our God’ commanded. One may further reflect on the JFJ’s reference to ‘our’ Jewish people, perhaps initially seeking to share in this communal

24 Ibid., 111.
identity. The wicked son is deemed wicked, seemingly, solely on account of his denial of this communality. Thus,

The wicked son, what does he say? ‘What does this service mean to you?’ ‘To you’ (he says) but not to him! Therefore, because he has excluded himself from the community, he has denied the foundation of our faith; consequently you must blunt his teeth and reply to him: ‘It is because of this that Hashem did for me when I went out of Egypt’; ‘for me’ (you say), not for him – had he been there, he would not have been redeemed.27

The distancing from the community expressed in the question of the wicked son and his consequent designation as ‘wicked’ may serve as a useful additional perspective relating to discussions regarding Judaism’s struggle with modernity, a struggle which itself placed such an emphasis on individualism above and beyond any communal identity. Further examples of Judaism’s traditional aversion to overt individualism in general, and individualistic narratives in particular, can be seen in Rabbinic discourse, as Green has argued:

Rabbinic literature is largely indifferent to the presentation of distinctive individuality. No document pays homage to a particular rabbi; none celebrates one man’s virtue, reflects his thoughts, recounts his deeds… In all of the literature no rabbi emerges as central, dominant, or determinative; none appears to symbolize, guide, or shape rabbinic destiny… the virtual anonymity of person in rabbinic literature reveals a powerful cultural disinclination, perhaps incapacity, to construe rabbinic culture and religion as the work of powerful individuals.28

In effect the voice of the individual may appear not only to threaten communal cohesiveness, but also the divinely decreed spiritual communality of the Jewish people.

27 Ibid., 73.
However, the individual voices of the Holocaust survivors are not to be heard or understood in the same manner as other individual (or individualistic) voices. These individuals did not choose to separate themselves, but were forcefully separated from their communities and their families. Communities were shattered, fragmented and destroyed, and it is from these shattered fragments that the Holocaust testimonies, the voices of individual survivors speak. It is only after the Holocaust that we encounter this Jewish form of individual Testimony. But in contrast to the JFJ Holocaust testimony its purpose is not salvational. As previously discussed the very term ‘testimony’ conveys very different meanings when used in either a Jewish or Christian framework. Whereas Christian testimony appears to have its roots in some of the earliest forms of Christian narrative (the Gospels being the personal recollections of Mathew, Mark, Luke and John), it took the Holocaust to produce this particular form of Jewish testimony. In a Christian or Messianic framework ‘to give testimony’ is to give witness of one’s personal experience of salvation. In a post-Holocaust framework Jewish testimony is instead bearing witness to the atrocities one experienced. From a mainstream Jewish perspective, when the JFJ transform Holocaust testimony into a form of salvational testimony, this appears as a spiritually subversive act, altering the very meaning of the Holocaust. And this, of course, raises the vexed question as to whether the Holocaust contained any meaning or message in the first place.

Perhaps the question concerning the Holocaust has less to do with ownership and more to do with the attribution of meaning. This would change the question to ‘who has the right to explain or interpret the Holocaust?’ Within the domain of Holocaust theology one rarely encounters any certainty as to why or how six million Jews were murdered. In the shadow of Auschwitz any and all explanations appear at best inadequate and at worst dangerously close to justifications; for example, divine retribution for straying from the commandments and traditional observance. Whilst all frameworks appear to break apart the temptation to contain the events and interpret
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them seems to persist. This is exemplified in the work of Melissa Raphael\textsuperscript{30} who collected the Holocaust testimonies of female survivors and then, writing from within a feminist theoretical framework, manages to extract fully formed critiques on traditional Jewish patriarchy and the ‘masculinization of theology’\textsuperscript{31}. This raises important questions in relation to theoretical frameworks and reflexivity: to what extent does a particular framework or paradigm actually seek to provide an authentic account of what was said and experienced and to what extent does it simply reproduce the underlying theoretical assumptions of the researcher? There is, however, less issue with methodology concerning the JFJ’s use of Holocaust Testimony. For while the survivors are also reserved in their judgments on the meaning of the Holocaust, the salvational messages and interpretations, which are an inevitable consequence of their context as evangelical appeals, are clearly articulated by the survivors themselves and are not interpreted by a third party.

While by no means monolithic, JFJ holocaust testimonies do tend to conclude with a common, clear articulation of a formerly illusive hope, meaning and purpose above and beyond the Holocaust via the message of the New Testament. This particular perspective appears especially striking when considered in relation to the wider academic discourse of Holocaust Studies, in which the Holocaust is most commonly related to as a singular event that appears to defy reason and resist meaning.\textsuperscript{32} Lawrence Langer reflects:

> The raw material of oral Holocaust narratives, in the content and manner of the presentation, resists the organising impulse of moral theory and art. Does this keep these narratives closer to their source in the pain of persecution? A kind of un-shielded truth emerges from them, through which we salvage an anatomy of melancholy for the modern spirit – part of our anguish and our fate. For the former victims, the Holocaust is a communal wound that cannot heal. This is the ailing subtext of their testimonies, wailing beneath the convalescent murmurs of their surface lives. We have little trouble listening to that surface murmur. When the subtext of their


story echoes for us too as a communal wound, then we will have begun to hear their legacy of unheroic memory and grasp the meaning for our time of a diminished self.33

It is possible that the mainstream Jewish objections towards JFJ holocaust testimonies stem not only from the unlikely (unacceptable) source of the healing, but also from the salvational nature of that healing which would appear to move the JFJ survivors beyond Langer’s ‘communal wound’ and therefore arguably beyond, or away from, their fellow Jewish survivors.

It may be fair to say that both forms of testimony are essentially trying to communicate lived experience. One may also observe that the story requires one to share the experience, a call requiring a response; but whereas in the mainstream Holocaust testimony one may be seen as displaying and sharing a deep, communal wound, in the Christian and Messianic testimony one is in addition undoubtedly sharing one’s faith, and emphasising hope and healing.

Holocaust testimony is often understood and related to through the psychological label of trauma. Before the stories are told, or are encouraged to be told,34 there is often simply silence:

Judaism has its silences, Elie Wiesel once said, but we don’t talk about them. After the Holocaust, the shoah, there was one of the greatest silences of Jewish history.35

This silence is understood to reflect the incomprehensible magnitude of the traumatic experience that transcends any sense of reality or meaning. The Hebrew word for the Holocaust is Shoah, which literally translates as ‘catastrophe’ or ‘utter destruction’. It
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cannot be spoken about as it is experienced as being beyond the reaches of articulation let alone comprehension.\textsuperscript{36}

There is silence precisely because what occurred resists meaning or containment, be it in the form of a memorial or a spoken testimony. To speak of the events may be seen as trying to share something that cannot (or perhaps should not for sake of the burden) be shared, and to memorialise may consign the event to history, a black and white past of ‘yesterday’. Yet the trauma operates very much in the present for the survivor and the sanitised tidiness of the memorial monuments often seems totally at odds with the chaotic nightmarish visions they cannot communicate.\textsuperscript{37} This is illustrated in the Holocaust testimony of Gena Turgel where she reflects on her return to the former site of the Belsen concentration camp with her husband, Norman:

\begin{quote}
Norman, too, saw only the original picture of the Belsen camp, a wasteland without trees, flowers or grass. He still saw the walking skeletons, still felt the air of death about the place. Like his fellow soldiers that came to liberate us, he always has that picture of a living hell in front of him, and not the neat-looking memorial park of today.\textsuperscript{38}
\end{quote}

Aside from simply serving as historical documents, a collection of witness statements to the Nazi atrocities, the testimonies are also understood as assuming an important therapeutic role for the survivor. To render the inarticulate as articulate may be to render the incomprehensible, partially comprehensible, perhaps more containable and thus hopefully make the trauma more manageable. In this way the Holocaust testimonies may be understood as constituting a form of narrative therapy.\textsuperscript{39} Yet as a therapeutic tool, narrative therapy may still not (should not attempt to) artificially imbue the Holocaust with meaning, redemptive or otherwise, or even to attempt to render the atrocities comprehensible. As Bolkosky\textsuperscript{40} maintains, the Holocaust resists

\begin{footnotes}
\item[37] This is a recurrent theme in, for example, O. Stier, \textit{Committed to Memory: Cultural Mediations of the Holocaust} (Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003).
\item[38] G. Turgel, \textit{I Light A Candle} (London: Valentine Mitchell, 1995), 155.
\end{footnotes}
(and must resist) any and all attempts at reductionism; one might then ask does this entail the denial of any possibility of genuine closure for the survivor?

Following the Holocaust many religious groups believed (and continue to believe) that evangelising the Jewish people is itself a morally questionable activity. This is not only a Jewish sentiment but is also echoed by many Christian groups, including the Christian scholars and clerics within the International Council for Christian and Jews and organisations such as the World Council of Churches, who include within their ‘ecumenical considerations’ (1979), the proposal that any true ‘dialogue’ must not contain any proselytising undertones.

JFJ member Richard Harvey’s testimony contains a partial transcript from a BBC Radio Four debate with the Bishop of Oxford, Richard Harries, who expressed this widely shared Christian attitude, that the Holocaust should necessarily exclude Jews from having to undergo evangelising:

Well, first of all I would want to emphasise that people of a Jewish background who have become Christians are most warmly welcome and are fully member of the Christian church. But I object to Jews for Jesus targeting Jewish people for conversion, because I think that at this stage of the twentieth century, after the Holocaust, we ought to be having a very different set of priorities as Christians. We are all aware now of the tragic history—a tragic history which has been caused by the teaching of contempt by Christians about Judaism—a long history of harassment, persecution and so on. And the overriding priority for the Christian church is to establish a new relationship with Judaism.

Similarly one could witness the Holocaust being ‘used’ by Rabbis Marvin Hier and Rabbi Shmuley Boteach frequently and consistently during the ‘Larry King Live’
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41 For a brief attempt to outline the issue according to several messianic perspectives, see R. Harvey, *Mapping Messianic Jewish Theology* (Milton Keynes: Authentic Media, 2009), 91-3.
44 Dean and Founder of the Simon Wiesenthal Holocaust Memorial Centre.
television debate to silence and shame their evangelical opposition. In one example Rabbi Hier speaks in response to the proposition that evangelism emerges out of ‘Christian’ love for the Jews, and not hatred or persecution.

During the Holocaust we didn’t hear those words of love, it’s kind of hypocritical now when Jews have just come out of the holocaust, when there are thirteen and a half million Jews in the world, there are five billion people on this planet that there is nobody else to convert but thirteen and a half million people who’ve just lost one third of the Jewish people in the Holocaust.

Rabbi Boteach also makes explicit the link between evangelism and intolerance in the context of the Holocaust:

Religion has caused so much aggravation, so much suffering. This isn’t just an intelligent debate on TV, this is a subject which has led to my people being turned into lampshades, you know?

Seemingly exacerbated by the consistency and frequency of evangelistic activity being linked to the Holocaust, by both Rabbis, following Rabbi Boteach’s appeal Larry King responds with a raised voice:

Rabbi, that’s an emotional appeal and well done, however, if someone has a sincere belief that Christ is the answer and wants to share that with you, why are you hanging the Holocaust around his neck? He wants to share a belief with you.

---

45 Former Director of the Oxford L’Chaim society.
46 CNN Larry King Live broadcast on 01/12/00.
47 David Brickner, Executive Director of the JFJ and Reverend Albert Mohler, a Southern Baptist minister.
48 Rabbi Marvin Hier speaking on CNN Larry King Live broadcast on 01/12/00 (Researcher’s personal transcription).
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid.
The very mention of the Holocaust seems designed to end the evangelical appeal, and in its place initiate a respectful silence. The missionaries’ silence would, ideally (from the perspective of the Rabbis), be one of both shame and remembrance. This appeal works due to the recognition that historically Christianity has been responsible for much of the Jewish people’s suffering and that the Holocaust arose against the backdrop of Christian anti-Semitism. What infuriates mainstream Jewish commentators is that Christian anti-Semitism is usually understood as persecution or evangelism by ‘outsiders’, whereas when the JFJ evangelise ‘their Jewish people’ they do so as if they were on the inside.

Perceiving and presenting themselves as ‘Jewish insiders’, the JFJ may (and do) claim the Holocaust as being part of their collective history and identity. As such, whereas a non-Jewish group would almost certainly never dare to use the Holocaust as an evangelical tool, the JFJ have certainly done so. Reporting on an anti-missionary campaign, the Anglo-Jewish newspaper *The Forward* said:

> In a dramatic tactical shift, the Christian missionary group Jews for Jesus has masked its proselytising efforts behind the one event considered out-of-bounds by even the most aggressive of evangelists: the Holocaust.\(^{51}\)

In giving Holocaust testimony the JFJ appear to blur the formerly clear boundaries between Jewish holocaust testimony of remembrance and Christian testimony of salvation.

The *Survivor Stories* video uses all the aforementioned forms of memorialising.\(^{52}\) There are frequent ‘yellow star’ and ‘barbed wire’ motifs, black and white footage of Jews in the camps, there is slow mournful music, Holocaust poetry and testimonials. The footage and format appears no different from other documentaries about the Holocaust such as Claude Lanzmann’s *Shoah* (1985), or video testimony as might be

\(^{51}\) Anti-Defamation League Website http://www.adl.org/special_reports/jews4jesus/jews4jesus.asp Accessed 02/12/03.

seen in any Holocaust museum collection.\textsuperscript{53} The JFJ Holocaust testimony begins not simply with the recounting of the events leading up to the Holocaust but rather recollections of their Jewish upbringing. This is perhaps significant by virtue of its inclusion, as in many Jewish Holocaust Testimonies the overt declaration of one’s Jewish identity and heritage is not deemed necessary; the consequences of that identity are made evident in the testimony. The vivid portrayals and recollections of Jewish daily life in pre-war Germany and Eastern Europe may be instantly familiar to a Jewish audience member, and imbues the speaker with an almost grandparental voice, as their age clearly places them within this particular generation. The JFJ survivors regularly recollect their level of observance or involvement in their synagogue. They speak of the persecution and the camps. They recall the suffering and humiliations that they endured. But gradually the testimony metamorphoses into that of a ‘Messianic testimony’, as they each, in turn, tell in turn how they found Jesus and were saved. Like the other JFJ testimonies they also emphasise their continued Jewishness.\textsuperscript{54} Once again this is an emphasis on restoration or identity continuation, as opposed to conversion:

I didn’t convert, I’m Jewish you see? I found the God of Israel.\textsuperscript{55}

I am not losing being a Jew, I’m just adding Jesus as my saviour. I’m still a Jew inside. I always will be.\textsuperscript{56}

The video material is accompanied by additional resources on the JFJ website\textsuperscript{57} which contains web space for additional Holocaust testimonies of survivors, their children, and a link to a page commemorating \textit{Yom HaShoah} (Holocaust memorial day).\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{53} For examples the reader might visit the following two websites: Washington Holocaust Memorial Museum Website \url{http://www.ushmm.org/} Accessed 07/10/08, and Yad Vashem Holocaust Memorial Museum \url{http://www.yadvashem.org/} Accessed 07/10/08.


\textsuperscript{55} Rose Price (Holocaust Survivor) speaking in \textit{Survivor Stories: Hope From an Unlikely Source} (San Francisco: Purple Pomegranate Productions, 2001).

\textsuperscript{56} Bob Kertesz (Holocaust Survivor) speaking in \textit{Survivor Stories: Hope From an Unlikely Source} (San Francisco: Purple Pomegranate Productions, 2001).

\textsuperscript{57} Jews for Jesus: Survivor Stories \url{http://www.jewsforjesus.org/answers/survivorstories} Accessed 29/10/08.

\textsuperscript{58} Jews for Jesus: \textit{Yom HaShoah} \url{http://jewsforjesus.org/judaica/yomhashoah} Accessed 29/10/08.
The familiar question of losing one’s Jewish identity through accepting Jesus as the Messiah (and more problematically as God incarnate) is typically negotiated through the JFJ’s redefining of what it means to be Jewish. In this manner the moment that most Jewish authorities would recognise and classify as ‘conversion’ and ‘apostasy’ is expressed as a renewal and recovery of one’s Jewish identity (a ‘homecoming’) in the JFJ Testimonies and literature. The JFJ Holocaust testimony of Hans Bernd, entitled ‘The Journey’, exemplifies this perspective:

My journey from Koblenz to England to faith in the Jewish Messiah brought me home. It was with much joy that I was able to finally resolve a hidden conflict of identity, for I discovered once and for all how Jewish it is to believe in Jesus the Jewish Messiah.\(^{59}\)

The concluding message in *Survivor Stories* reiterates the central message of the JFJ that one doesn’t simply remain a Jew after accepting Jesus, but that one actually becomes more Jewish. The chosen form of this reiteration is a concluding prayer:

> God of Abraham, I know that I have sinned against you and I want to turn from my sins. I believe that you provided Y’shua as a once and for all atonement for me. With this prayer, I place my trust in Y’shua as my saviour and my Lord. I thank you for cleansing me of sin, for giving me Your peace and for eternal life. Please help me be faithful in learning to trust and love you more each day.\(^{60}\)

The explicit appeal to the Jewish lineage can be identified in the naming of God as the ‘God of Abraham’, the first of the Jewish patriarchs. Likewise the name of Jesus is rendered (restored) in the Hebrew ‘Y’shua’. These two features contrast with the otherwise general Christian, individualistic nature of the prayer and the recognition and acceptance of Y’shua’s status as ‘saviour’ and ‘Lord’. The prayer is followed by a brief moment of silence and the narrator then announces: ‘If you just prayed this prayer *Mazel Tov.*’ The expression ‘Mazel Tov’ is most typically heard within the

\(^{59}\) Jews for Jesus: ‘The Journey’ Holocaust Testimony of Hans Bernd

\(^{60}\)*Survivor Stories: Hope From an Unlikely Source* (San Francisco: Purple Pomegranate Productions, 2001).
synagogue and reserved for moments of great celebration. A Simcha, or time of joyous celebration, and achievement, may include the conclusion of a Bar Mitzvah or a wedding ceremony, both prime examples of Jewish continuity, and the fulfilment of the Jewish commandments. As the word ‘Mazel Tov’ appears in the centre of the screen it is surrounded by numerous Jewish symbols and accompanied with traditional Israeli folk music. ‘Mazel Tov’ implies that in accepting Y’shua one is fulfilling a Halakhic obligation and is contributing the continuing legacy of the Jewish people.

Not only does the video attribute the Holocaust with a salvational meaning, but this meaning is perceived by the majority of Jewish people to be an ‘insiders’ attempt to further harm the Jewish cause (to deplete their numbers through conversion to Christianity). As a Jew, however, one may feel prevented from, or hesitant in, criticising a survivor of the Holocaust. They are seemingly above reproach, and it seems likely that the JFJ are well aware of this. The JFJ have taken a testimony of memory and transformed it (by means of a messianic supplement) into a testimony of faith in Y’shua. Through the salvational form of the messianic Holocaust testimony the Holocaust is implicitly (in some cases explicitly) imbued with a salvational meaning. Several of the JFJ Holocaust testimonies in Survivor Stories even speak of ‘forgiveness’ of the Nazis through the grace and power of Jesus, thus including traditional Christian discourses within their testimonies. The reaction to the publication of the video testimony on the part of the international Jewish communities (as expressed through the Anti Defamation League) was one of collective outrage and condemnation:

‘Once again, Jews for Jesus is trying to distort Jewish identity as part of their deceptive and offensive campaign to impose Christian beliefs on Jews’ said Abraham H. Foxman, ADL National Director and a Holocaust survivor. ‘By emphasizing the Holocaust, Jews for Jesus is using the darkest chapter in the history of Judaism - the persecution and annihilation of European Jews - to attempt to mislead survivors and their children about their history and faith. It is impossible for a person who is Jewish to worship Jesus
Christ. That is the fundamental distinction that sets these faith systems apart.\textsuperscript{61}

The individuals providing the JFJ Holocaust testimonies are thus not directly blamed but are positioned as ‘survivors’ who have been misled. Not only have they been the victims of the Nazis but they have also been the victims of the JFJ’s evangelism and have become unwitting agents in the continued destruction of the Jewish people.

The concluding motifs of a newfound peace and meaning in the person of Jesus Christ, in the JFJ testimonies discussed, may not be seeking to account for, or seek meaning in, the Holocaust. They do, however, appear to be offering a controversial and theologically complex form of closure. The relatively newly emergent field of Holocaust Theology is typified by difficult questions and, most commonly, hesitant, partial answers. Hope and meaning are rare commodities seldom encountered within the various theological reflections and theodical justifications. When that hope is being offered from a movement whose Jewish status is most commonly and adamantly denied, and whose evangelical agenda is so transparent, the resulting outrage and controversy is hardly surprising. The JFJ themselves appear to adopt, momentarily, a more recognisably mainstream Jewish standpoint when they recognise that their particular offering of hope is from an ‘unlikely source.’
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