

BRITISH RABBINICAL UNION

Principal Rabbinic Authority for DEFENDING TRADITIONAL EDUCATION

Advancing the right to authentic Torah education for over 10,000 children
85c Cazenove Road, London, N16 6BB ■ Tel: 020 4610 0939 ■ Email: info@britishrabbinicalunion.org

5 February 2025

Stephen Morgan MP

Minister for Early Education
Department for Education
Sanctuary Buildings
20 Great Smith Street
London SW1P 3BT

CHIEF RABBI

Rabbi David Weis

Judge and Prominent Authority on Jewish Law
Head: Beis Din Le'inyonei Mumones (Bournemouth)

PRESIDENT

Rabbi Asher Gratt

Lifelong Advocate for Religious and Educational Causes
Former Principal of UK's Largest Haredi School

RABBINICAL COUNCIL

Rabbi Yehuda Osher Steiner

Senior Dayan: Manchester Beis Din
Rav: Kehal Chanichei Hayeshivos

Rabbi Moshe Uri Schlesinger

Rosh Hakollel: Yetev Lev D'Satmar

Rabbi Pinkas Englander

Dayan: Union of Orthodox Hebrew Cong.
Beth Medrash Ohel Yakov Pshevorsk

Subject: Request for Clarification Regarding Nahamu Policy Position and its Inclusion in Government Documentation

Dear Minister Morgan,

I write in my capacity as President of the British Rabbinical Union to formally seek clarification regarding an apparent contradiction in government documentation relating to the Schools Bill and its associated policies.

In your attached letter to me, dated 22 November 2024 (Ref: 2024-0036220), you unequivocally state that Nahamu's *Education Policy Position Paper* is *not* government policy. You further affirm that while the government considers a range of external reports, such reports do not constitute government policy.

However, upon reviewing the attached DfE-CWSB-RP-06 - Strengthening Regulation of Independent Education Institutions - Impact Assessment, it has come to my attention that Nahamu is explicitly referenced in footnote 12 of the document. The inclusion of Nahamu in an official government impact assessment related to the Schools Bill raises significant concerns regarding the integrity and consistency of governmental statements on this matter.

Furthermore, my attached letter addressed to Ms. Catherine McKinnell MP, dated 5 November 2024, sets out in detail the factual inaccuracies, prejudices, and discriminatory aspects of Nahamu's paper. Despite these concerns being formally raised, they appear to have been ignored by the government. This failure to address fundamental misrepresentations and the subsequent reliance on Nahamu's paper in policy documentation create a serious issue of transparency and accountability.

Given this apparent contradiction, I request the following clarifications:

1. On what basis was Nahamu included in the DfE impact assessment (DfE-CWSB-RP-06)? If Nahamu is not part of government policy, why was it deemed appropriate for official citation in a document outlining regulatory measures?
2. Does the citation of Nahamu in the impact assessment imply that its perspectives have informed the government's policy considerations? If so, to what extent has Nahamu's position paper influenced the proposed regulatory framework?
3. Can the government categorically confirm that Nahamu's stance has not, directly or indirectly, influenced the policy formation of the Schools Bill? If so, why was it referenced in an official document intended to shape legislative and regulatory outcomes?
4. Why has the government not responded to the substantive concerns raised in my letter of 5 November 2024? If Nahamu's report has been debunked as containing inaccuracies, why does it still feature in government materials?
5. Will the government take steps to rectify this inconsistency? If Nahamu's policy paper is not considered part of government policy, will there be an amendment or clarification issued in relation to its inclusion in the impact assessment?

This matter is of utmost significance, as the inclusion of an external advocacy group's position within an official government document risks legitimising its recommendations and giving the misleading impression that they have been adopted or endorsed as part of government policy. It is crucial that governmental processes remain transparent, legally consistent, and free from any ambiguity that may undermine public trust.

I would appreciate a substantive and legally precise response to these concerns at your earliest convenience. Given the significance of this issue, I kindly request that your reply explicitly addresses each of the five points outlined above.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your prompt and comprehensive response.

Yours sincerely,



Rabbi Asher Gratt
President
British Rabbinical Union