

Candidate Marks Report

Series : 6 2018

This candidate's script has been assessed using On-Screen Marking. The marks are therefore not shown on the script itself, but are summarised in the table below.

Centre No :	Assessment Code :	H573
Candidate No :	Component Code :	05
Candidate Name :		

Total Marks :

In the table below 'Total Mark' records the mark scored by this candidate.
'Max Mark' records the Maximum Mark available for the question.

Question Part

1	<p>Brit Ahuvim is the Modernized version of a traditional Jewish Marriage. This was created by Rachel Adler; a Jewish feminist. The traditional Jewish marriage had several problems regarding the rights of women, thus marriages were never completely equal. A traditional Jewish marriage involves the groom signing a contract stating that he will provide food, money, clothes, etc for his wife, and leave things for which she can sustain herself if she he were to die. There is also the giving of the ring from the groom to the bride, as the groom states that his wife is now his "by the laws of Moses" This is where the main problem lies. This turns the traditional Jewish marriage into an ownership of property (man over woman), rather than the marriage being a joint partnership.</p> <p>The purpose of the Brit Ahuvim is to create the law of partnership, so that it replaces this law of property the. Therefore, a union done in this way promotes equal rights. Brit Ahuvim revolves much more around the idea of exclusivity and monogamy, regardless of anything else. This is simply an an equal promise made to each other, similar to that of an equal covenant, also stating that everything will be made a joint decision within the marriage.</p> <p>Dissolving the Brit Ahuvim is approached</p>
---	--



~~heterosexual~~
~~women = divorce rights~~
~~to get~~

Question Part ~~equality, but it's not the same as equality~~

In a similar way. It is no longer a private act, but that done in front of learned Jews. As the marriage involves the community, the divorce should too, and it is sometimes even mourned.

~~But~~ Bat Ahuvim can be viewed as a necessity for an inclusive Judaism for several reasons. Firstly, the Bat Ahuvim ~~also~~ focuses on mainly exclusivity between the couple. This means that within this form of marriage, a more modernised marriage, everyone including homosexuals and transgenders will have equal opportunity to take part. In traditional Orthodox Jewish marriage, marriage between two gay people is strictly prohibited, as they cannot "be fruitful and multiply", but in Adler's version, as long as the two ~~are~~ people are committed and monogamous, their love is considered worthy and marriage is permissible. Thus, by the needs for gay equal rights, Bat Ahuvim is not just a desire, but a necessity.

Furthermore, ~~within Bat Ahuvim, there~~ as Bat Ahuvim is not a traditional Jewish marriage, it is not required to issue a 'get', ~~but~~ on bill of divorce. This promotes equality and inclusivity within the marriage (and thus within Judaism) because a get can only ~~be~~ actually be carried out by the



Question Part

male of the couple. Within Bat Ahuvim, either the male or the female can issue a divorce. This can be seen as a good thing from a feminist perspective as they could deem it as unacceptable, particularly in the modern era, to not be allowed to divorce your own husband if you wanted to. Again, this centres ~~on~~ on the fact that Bat Ahuvim is an completely equal partnership, thus being a necessity for an inclusive Judaism.

In addition, most people would agree that in the 21st century, a woman being a man's 'property' is incomprehensible. It can be argued that this is not even a marriage, but more of a transaction. In Orthodox tradition it is classified as the groom taking the wife away from her father for himself. There is a great emphasis on "taking" here, as it implies how unfair this marriage contract truly is.

☞ Marriage is supposed to be a social and financial 'safe haven' for Jewish females, however they will not necessarily feel this way knowing that they have no say over whether or not the marriage ends, if things did not go as planned. Thus Bat Ahuvim is ~~the~~ necessary for inclusive Judaism as without it, marriage could not be a complete safe haven for



Question Part

Women

On the other hand, it can be argued that the ~~desire~~ Brit Ahuvim is just a desire and is too idealistic. The traditional Jewish marriage has supposedly been around for centuries, thus causing no obvious problems. Therefore, we should not change it now just because it is argued by some to be unfair. Lots of Jewish women could describe their marriages as extremely happy, so it could be argued: why do we need to change the traditional way if it is not causing any issues to those within the marriages? In addition, ~~the~~ Orthodox Jews would find Brit Ahuvim unacceptable, as it is not written about anywhere in the scriptures. Thus, it can't even be said to classify as a real marriage from their standpoint. The Jews are called upon by God to obey his laws, and they have no right to change ~~it~~ ~~ever~~ ~~the~~ tradition in this way, especially without substantial reasoning.

Moreover, the Brit Ahuvim is not a necessity, as it is not the only way to establish endogamy. Judith Plaskow states that what we really need to do is get to the root of the problem by reevaluating the bible stories, all the way back to the revelation on Mount Sinai. She argues that



Question Part

at present, cover have no place in ~~the~~ scripture, which is where the inequality stems from. Thus, to make Judaism inclusive, we do not need to change what we do, but the way we think, particularly about Jewish history.

In conclusion, I believe that Brit Ahumim is a necessity because it is the only practical way in the modern era to establish equality and an inclusive Judaism. Plaskow's ideas may take years to fully develop or emerge, and many would agree that it is better to deal with the problem at hand in the quickest manner, to help those that are in distress sooner.

2

A covenant is an agreement between two or more parties. These can be either conditional, where both parties have to give something to the other, or unconditional, where one party does not have to do anything. The covenant made between God and Abraham initially was that Abraham and his descendants could receive the promised land. This was unconditional at first. Later on, this changed to being conditional. In return for the promised land, the land of Canaan, Abraham had to promise to circumcise all



Question Part

of his descendants (Brit Milah). Abraham agreed to this. ~~A~~ Additionally, the covenant between ~~Abraham~~ Moses and God was also conditional. God revealed the Torah to Moses on Mount Sinai through a direct divine revelation. Moses had to promise that he, and the rest of the Jewish people, would keep these laws for God. In exchange, they would receive the land of "milk and honey". The land here is a representation of a return to Eden, although later ideas changed and Jews were thought they were to be visited by the Messiah instead. The Nechmide Covenant ~~in history, it can be argued that~~ further states a promise between God and his people, although this was made with all of mankind, telling them not to sin in various ways.

Suzerainty treaties are like covenants, where there is a suzerain and a vassal. The suzerain in this case is the one with the power, telling the vassal what to do, and the vassal is submissively passive and agrees. There is emphasis here on the benevolence of the suzerain, so it is not an attempt to feel powerful. A parity treaty is that of which both sides are of equal status and have both promised something to each other.

It can be argued that covenants are just ~~so~~ promises on the part of God and



Question Part

Not two-way agreements because God is omnipotent. It states in the Bible that "the Lord gives and the Lord takes away". ~~That~~ God can give and take away the land as he pleases, but his omnibenevolent nature would always ~~allow~~ ^{permit} him to give the most loving outcome. If Jews were to sin by not keeping up their side of the covenant, the pattern of sin, exile and return would occur. There will always be a return. God created humans as imperfect creatures, thus, he knows what they can be capable of. Covenants are promises on the part of God because he will always keep up his side, and perhaps it is on Muslim to make Jews think they have to hold up their side, to improve their morale.

Covenants are not two-way agreements because essentially, Jews are God's "chosen people". Thus, if he has chosen them, the choice is no longer theirs. God has elected them to make a promise to, and he will do this regardless of what they say in return. This can be seen through sins committed by Jews having no repercussions. For example, the Zionist movement could be classified as racism or against God's will, but it could be argued that

~~Example~~
~~of racism~~



Question Part

The Jews have not been punished for this because it is still occurring today, where there is the Jewish refusal of Arabs into Palestine. And yet, God does nothing but lets them keep the geographical state of Israel, even though surely they are breaking the laws of the 613 Mitzvot by attacking the innocent who enter their land?

Thus, it can be seen that covenants are promises on the part of God, not two-way agreements.

~~Moreover,~~ On the other hand, some events would lead one to think that covenants are two-way agreements. Firstly, the Jews ~~have~~ have received many punishments in the past for the breaking of the covenant.

~~The~~ For example, the destruction of the first temple, the second temple and the tragic genocide that is the Holocaust. It can be argued that events like these inspired Jewish people to keep up their end of the bargain, thus making the covenant a two-way agreement.

Moreover, the idea of divine reward and retribution, as stated in Maimonides' thirteen principles of faith, states that the good ~~will~~ will be rewarded and the bad will be punished on day of judgement. The reward is said to be the land that the



Question Part

		<p>Jews have been promised for so long; the paradisaical promised land. If this is truly the case, it establishes that covenants are in fact two way agreements, as ultimately character does determine whether the God's side is upheld; he is the final judge.</p> <p>Thus, if one lives their life abiding by the 613 mitzvot, they will receive reward in the afterlife, but if not, they will not.</p> <p>In conclusion, I believe that covenants are promises on the part of God because ultimately, he does not want his creation to suffer. He has chosen his elect people, to give to them the law and the land. However, Trepp states that being God's chosen people is a "call to responsibility rather than a privilege", indicating that actually, it is a two way agreement, and they Jews must work hard to fulfill their side of it.</p>
3		<p>The process of conversion to Judaism is written down in the Shulchan Aruch. It states that there are several stages to becoming a Jew. Firstly, the proselyte is questioned. They are asked why they want to convert, knowing all the suffering and oppression that Jews face. If the proselyte answers that they are aware of this and</p>



Question Part

Still do not believe that they are worthy of conversion, they are immediately accepted into the conversion process. This is to test that their intentions are pure; that they are converting for the right reasons. Next, they are taught the principles of faith, the serious mitzvot, the lighter mitzvot, the punishments and the rewards for obeying the mitzvot. They must then appear in front of a Bet Din to ensure they have all the knowledge they need to become Jewish. Then, if they are a ~~male~~ ^{male}, they will be circumcised. If they are already circumcised, they will draw blood for themselves as a sign of the covenant. After this, they will go through immersion in the Mikveh, and this will occur in front of a Bet Din. ~~They~~ ~~stand~~ stand aside if the proselyte is female. Here they are offered the opportunity again to withdraw. ~~After this~~ Finally, the proselyte is a convert and it is said, "behold! He is an Israelite!"

It can be argued that the conversion process is too complex to Judaism because there are too many unnecessary steps. For example, in Orthodoxy, the study and knowledge required e.g. learning Hebrew, is unnecessary to be a part of the faith. Once one is converted, all that matters is that they are dwelling



Question Part

with God. These unnecessary steps distract from what is going to be the most important factor post-conversion.

On the other hand, these steps are necessary to become truly Jewish. These are what traditionally makes a Jew Jewish. Immersion, circumcision and study are not outdated acts, but instead they are timeless ones. This has always been the traditional conversion process, thus it will remain. It can be added that although they do seem complex, living life as a Jew will ^{SURPASS} ~~surpass~~ that complexity. If one cannot handle the complexity of conversion, perhaps they are not fit to be Jewish.

The process of conversion can appear ~~to~~ too complex for those with the weaker intentions. For example, if a woman wants to convert to marry her Jewish husband to have Jewish children together (as it is the line of matrilineal descent that Judaism is passed on), then they are not fully considering the act of being a Jew, just the title of being Jewish. People like this may not even see the point in going through the whole conversion process as it is so complex, but instead perhaps prefer to live as a "righteous gentile". This way, they will at least still be accepted in reform



2796206475

Unit code	H	5	7	3	/	0	5
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Write here how many booklets you have used in total	2
---	---

4 PAGE CONTINUATION BOOKLET

Write the information required clearly in the boxes above using capital letters.

Question Part

3		<p>Synagogues.</p> <p>Leading on from this, the process can definitely be seen as far too complex, considering it will not give you full access everywhere under your new Jewish title. For example, Reform conversions performed by Reform rabbis will not be accepted under the roof of an orthodox synagogue. This is due to the fact that orthodox are less accepting of converts, and their conversion process is even more difficult. For example, despite the lack of lessons they will give you, the knowledge required in regards to Jewish Study will be much more advanced. Thus, the complexity of conversion to Reform is not worth the outcome, but</p>
---	--	---

This document consists of 4 pages

OCR4



Question Part

The added complexity of the orthodox conversion process is not worth the outcome, as technically if you were initially converting to reform, the orthodox lifestyle is not what you want.

However, some processes of the conversion can be seen as completely necessary. For example, the circumcision symbolises the everlasting covenant that God made with Abraham, which is obviously vital to be a part of if you are joining the Jewish community. To receive a circumcision is to become a part of God's elect people, to become one of Abraham's descendants, and to be truly part of the covenant. By doing this, the male will receive their part in the promised land and be able to live peacefully in eternity with God. Therefore it can be argued that the conversion process is not too complex, as in fact it is the bare minimum that one needs to do to be a part of the Jewish community as a whole (and the covenant).

In conclusion, I believe that the conversion process to Judaism is too complex as the main purpose for wanting to convert is to become a member of the Jewish community and obey the laws of God. Thus, it should not be for a rabbi



Question Part

to instruct and determine such a strict and time-consuming process as to whether or not this person is allowed to dwell in God. The process should be much less complex, and the point at which the complexities arise should be between God and the convert during the convert's actual time examining Judaism; not ~~the~~ the process to get there.



