

9, West Heath Road London NW3 7UX
Tel 071-433 3434 Fax 071-433 3934

Mr. A Frei
18 Oakfields Rd
London NW11 0HY

12.1

17th January 1994

Dear Arie Lind,

Sorry that it has taken me a while to get back to you about your letter to Rabbi Roberts.

I think the issues that he can be called to relate to are:

How can the notion of an eruv in NW London be rejected out of hand - ie without him studying the detail and rejecting it on specific halachic points - when Reb Elchonon Halpern proposed the idea in principle many years ago, citing the Chasam Sofer, and Reb Shimon Eider approved the detail on his feasibility study visit here.

Regarding his letter to the Inquiry

Having told me on the phone that he would not, as a matter of principle, write to the Inspector, how does he explain doing so which is a matter of 'Ercaot'.

Why in the letter does he knowingly **contradict the evidence of the present and emeritus Chief Rabbis** in stating that there is such a thing as a dispensation when they were at pains to explain that Jewish Law does not have such a device. They explained that in the case of medical emergency etc the law itself provides a remedy and that Rabbis do not have the power to suspend or alter the law. If he did not know then why did he not trouble to find out before writing unless his purpose was clearly mischievous and intended to interfere with the United Synagogue case.

Why does he knowingly contradict his own shul member and **purger her evidence in a non-Jewish court** environment held in the eyes of the press?

If it is true that he could have granted a dispensation because of her severe condition then **why must he wait until he is asked?** Is he not aware of the fact that she and Alan are members and that she would have wanted to attend shul for her own son's aufruf? Does he not have an halachic obligation to her to make her life as easy as possible and if there was any such *heter* should he not have made her aware of it years ago?

In writing this letter, Rabbi Roberts was knowingly helping an alliance of self-hating Jews and antisemites to oppose an eruv in a non-Jewish Government Inquiry. The extent of the *chillul Hashem* cannot be measured.

Is Rabbi Roberts saying that the eruv is against the halacha - if so he is making a very clear statement about Dayan Ehrentreu's competence as well as that of the Chief Rabbi and Lord Jakobovits, Rabbi Eider and others. This would need to be substantiated and not just by a copy of Rabbi Halpern's letter which is vague in the extreme.

One suspects that Rabbi Roberts is unhappy about the fact that the Dayan and particularly Rabbi Kimche took this initiative and because for many years he has rejected the idea of an eruv as being impractical, he now cannot face the fact that it *can* be done and he has no answer to the implied criticism that if it is possible - how come he did not back it years ago? He seems therefore to need to oppose it and destroy it.

If he holds certain *chumras* that have not been incorporated, one would have hoped that he would adopt the position, as they do with Beth Din meat, which has never been condemned as *treife* but which certain people choose not to eat - good luck to them! Similarly in B'nei B'rak or Jerusalem there are individuals who choose not to use the eruv but none have ever condemned it in this way.

I do hope that the community will resolve these issues in a peaceful and positive way!

Best Wishes,

