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Elite are always more interesting. Influential is a different story. Anti-elitest may have more influence. Sometimes the best thinkers arent best represented.

A popular distinction in 19th century- Tsaraat hayehudim and tzaraat hayahadut. Eastern European.

Tzarat hayehudim mean the Jews are a problem

Tzarat hayahadut means that Jewish culture or judaism has a problem.

1880- many people think the situation isnt so bad. In Western europe, Jews had legal equality, Jews in germany doing well. The attitude was that things were getting better. In eastern europe, (John Lock- in the beginning the whole world was america, ie, there was free land) everything would be like France and england. Ok, not russia, but otherwise, things looked good. In Austria Hungary which was like Western europe, things were on its way up.

1881- first progroms in Eastern Europe. Literature calls it “asufot banegev” from yeshaya 21. Storms in the south- in southern russia. Optimistic jews had doubts now. Western Europe was still ok. People wanted to move to America. Israeli historians downplay the focus of immigration of Jews to America. One consequence was a greater influence of going to Palestine. But going to london or America was much larger. On a more theoretical level, this led some people to believe that Jewish subserviance was a bad idea. Maybe jews shouldn’t be part of the rest of society. (Dr. Pitsker wrote- Autoimancipation- a book about how we have to create our own nationalism. 1878.) (Mordechai Emanuel Noah- was a Jew involved in Jaaksonian politics who wanted to set up a Jewish colony. A hero in R Carmy’s youth)(in England- Benjamin Israeli- a jewish chevenist, but wasn’t really jewish.)(george elliot- novelist intilectual- Daniel Daronda- novel about protozionism- person who discovers he’s Jewish and wants to make a Jewish state.)

The other side of this is Tzarat hayahadut- the concern of the maskilim, who some of which did mitzvos, general education and modernization, these people believed- even b4 progroms- that there's something wrong with Jewish culture, society. Their agenda was compatible with Jews having jobs in russia as it becomes more livable, freedom from religion, etc. Some were highly anti-religios, but some would get involved in big arguments about kitniot. In Eastern europe, ppl werent setting up reform temples. Those who knew how to learn were trying to get rid of kitniot- not protozionists.

For example- Yehuda Leib Gordon- YaLaG- anti-religious. Was painfully aware that Hewbrew poetry wouldn’t make it big in his period. Yalag met R Shlomoh Rappaport, and Yalag said he’s a poet. “what century did u live in?” Yalag wrote a poem called “lmi ani amel” “for whom do I toil” wrote several anti-religious poems. “kotzo shel yud” where there's an aguna who finally sends a get, and the rav examines it and there's a problem because the name is spelled wrong and condems the women to igun. Closer to political realm, gordon wrote “tsidkiyahu bveit hapekudot” Tsidkiyahu in prison- in which the king is soliloquizing- and everything bad is because of Yirmiyahu. Tzidkiyahu wanted to fight and have self respect, and yirmiyahu is telling everybody to give in. in the 1880s, when people were worried about the Jews, not just Jewish culture, so Gordon had a poltiical solution- go to America. Why no Palestine? Well, there it’ll be worse, there's frum people with frum halachos of EY. Go to America- there we can break away from religion, then we can talk about going to Israel. Even in his concern about the political issue, his priority is to break away from religion.

Moshe Leib Liliumbloom- MaLa”L- grew up learning, forcibly married young, started reading secular literature, and rebelled. This is a classic pattern. (Allan mintz- paper idea- banished from his father;s table- a book about this thing that happened a lot) so Malal broke from wife’s fam, was atutor and a poet. Autobiograpohy- chatat niurim. The sins of my youth. Hashchatas zera- implies that his cultural actions in his youth were lowly. Wasted time. Wtvr. He complains abuot himself, written after 1881- I broke away from the Beis Midrash, doesn’t mean that I found anything better. The position he’d taking is that he exchanged religion for being a Hebrew poet, which is just as much a waste of time as reading tosfos. Writing poetry for a language with no real readership. We have real problems here, our culture, our people, and I’m an intillectual, editing magazines. Tutoring some rich guy’s kids who want to learn math. This is post-pogrom mentality. Liliumbloom became a zionist in the end. The change of the external situation was necessary. As a zionist he was sorry that he provoked the orthodox, cause he burnt his bridges. Had a bad rep. if he had to do it again, he probably wouldnta complained about kitniot.

Some people can take positions in tzarat hayehudim- political concerns, but no agenda about religios issues. Hertzle.

We spent time in Eastern Europe- worrying about Jewish culture. Herzle really grew up outside of J culture. Budhapest- central europe. Assimilated. Worked in vienna. No Jewish ID, children not circumsized, but had fantacies of being the leader of the Jewish people. He had a dream of solving the Jewish problem by arranging all the Jews to convert, march to rome to the pope. Eastern Euroopeans wwoouldnt have identified with this. Pride was important to Hertzle. Dualing was important. In central europe and germany, respected people arranged duals. If u don’t respect someone, u don’t dual with him. Duals are between nobility. Many Jews were officers and a gentile would insult them, and the Jew would demand a dual, and the guy would say “I don’t have duals with Jews.” The pple wanted to be treated with respect.

Read Hertzle, nordau
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1840s Hayeshuv hayashan- raised funds from eastern europe to live in Jerusalem or Tsfat. Wealthy people went to die, poor people find it easier to shnor there then in Europe. RC’s being cynical but that’s one way to look at it.

Sfardim- ppl had been there for generations. What do u do with these people? Well the yishuv hayashan werent zionists. And sfardim werent rejecting zionism, they werent living off charity/ chaluka. But not part of the zionist establishment. So israeli historiography ignored non-zionists till 1970s. As these people became noticable, they started saying, “hey, we were here before u were here”. So they were all equally poineers. Weakening of earlier zionist ideology. And some political changes in Israel.

In 1870s and 80s, we have more typical zionists- they are giong to Israel to build the land economically. The first aliya- (1907 is 2nd, and the 3rd is after WWI). Biluv “bet yaakov lechu venelcha” and the antizionissts (bshem R Chaim) they didn’t finish the passuk “beor Hashem”. These people werent anti-religious, they were balebatim. In Jerusalem they built outside the words. Meah shearim was also. This isnt due to Hertzel.

Ok, Hertzel general attitude was indifferent to practicing Judaism. He was a journalist for press owned by jews, wrote op eds, “feuilletons” in french? Hebrew?. leaflets- panflets. Hertzle was radicalized by Dryphus. French lost in 1870s against Germans and were obsessed with Germany. In mid 1890s- a cleaning woman in Paris worked for German embassy, cleaned trash- she was a spy- and found fresh sketches of military instilations. How did the Germans have that? The handwriting resembled that of Alfred Dryphus. Ya, it does look like me, but I didn’t write it. he didn’t really have the ability to have that kind of access. So they investigated. Dryphus had no reason to spy against France. The investigation began innoccently. However, there was someone else’s handwriting who looked like it too. And for him it wasn’t such a surprise. Colnol Esterhazy. A nobleman, originally hungarian. Had a lot of gambling debts. Anyways, he figured he’s a dead man. But that’s not what happened. Esterhazy had friends and Dryphus was convicted and the army didn’t want to admit it made a mistake. Similar case in Israel where a druze officer was accused of spying, but then evidence pointed to his innocence. And Israelis let the guy go. But the French didn’t. Dryphus was convicted, and in a ceremony, they broke his sword, ripped his uniform. Sent him to devil’s island. Hot in day, cold at night. This became the major issue in French politics for several years. In order to maintain his guilt, the army had to forge documents. French minister of defence was caught and commited suicide. It became an issue between chilonim and dattim. The frum catholics sided with the army and the secularists took dryphus (with significant exceptions). Governments fell over this. Shaar maurras- an aetheist catholic held that if not for christianity, the jewish impact on europe would have been \_\_\_\_\_\_. Pope pious 11 put him in cherem. Issur to read his newspaper. “accent Francais”. instead of doing teshuva, he didn’t do communion, certain people- I forget who R Carmy said.

Maurras was convicted after WWII, and on his way to prison- this is dryphus’s revenge. There was a retrial, military court reconvicted dryphus and government fell, and they pardonned him. He left the army because they wouldn’t give him back pay, but in WWI he became a general again.

Hertzel was in paris and when he heard the yelling death to dryphus and the Jews, then if this is happening in france, then we have to get organized. Good story. Who knows.

Hertzel set up a zionist 1897- commerce in basil zwitzerland. How many ppl u think would show up- well, not that many. Hundreds of deligates showed up. Western european jews.

Max Nordau from Sudfeld. (south field became Nordic hero)known as having written degeration- about ratial hygene. Purity of race. Nordea also had issues of racial pride etc.

There were a few hundred from eastern europe- from russia! Czarist govt wanted to know y ur going. And if vaguley political they were suspicious. Robbonim went. Maskilim came. Amazing.

Yeshaya Leibowitz- nechama’s brother. He taught experimental physc and biochem. JPh, and others. Strong critic of established zionism. 2 people got what they got based on their beard. Mark \_\_\_\_ and Hertzel. He looked like an assyrian monarc. For many eastern europeans, the fact that he wasn’t over their world, he looked very attractive. Also Moshe. He, this guy who could be a famous journalist, he was caring for the flock. That was the easy part. The difficult part was what to do with them when he got them together. This tells a little of HErtzel- solution of tzarat hayehudim- so make a state to escape to. Death of a hired man.

Among those who werent zionists this idea also existed. Territorialism- that the Jews should have an autonomous state in europe. The soviet union made a place to be an autonomous jewish area. One of the 16 official languages was yiddish. 15000 jews went there. When Menachem began was arrested by KGB was that he’s a zionist but they don’t need it cause they have autonomy. Some Jews wanted to immigrate to South America. Hertzel wanted a state and mistama it should be in Palestine. Practically there were sentimental connections. An ideologist name Nathan Bernbaum- invented zionism before Hertzel. (later he became aguda) he argued ratially to go to Israel. That’s our climate. Cyprus, or syria- anywhere else close enough in climate.

How do u get a state? Well, automan empire (the sick man of europe) owns it, so they have to give us land. How? Money. Why not. Hertzel spent a lot of time travelling around convincing diplomats to sell Israel. So a couple of million may help. Frustrating- went to Istanbul- u go to a low level official- he welcomes u open arms, gives u sweet coffee. U give him a bribe and he’ll arrange u to meet someone higher up. Run around in Germany who have alliances with Turks, maybe get a meeting with caisor. Go to St Petersburg, Russia where they hate the Jews, so high up officials said that 1/3 would convert, 1/3 immigrate and 1/3 die. “we’ll give u some money, we’ll get rid of ur Jews”.

To sell this idea, he needs money but he really needs the goyim to think that he represents the Jews. That he can get the rothchilds to put up a million or 2. Meanwhile, in order to present urself as king of the jews, u need subjects and u need to convsince them that ur being successful. This is a treamendous congane – ur convincing the goyim ur in charge and the Jews that u have a foot in. its amazing what he pulled off. Year after year congress after congress he gave reports. Ideologically, this was consequence of building zionism on politics. Political zionism. Based on the notion of jewish poliical entity achieved thru negotiation.

The other option was to settle the land without politics. That wasn’t HErtzel. That was the miluim. Build here and there. But the yishuv EY zionists were unable to do what HErtzel wanted- but if u just expand neighborhoods and plant a vinyard, ur still a minority under turkish rule. Ur not solving the problem that Hertzel wanted to solve.

However, the political approach is up in the air- ur waiting for a masterstroke- its like breaking a lock by smashing down the door, or by fiddling with it til u pick it. picking is cleaner, but it doesn’t work always. Close doesn’t help u. Hertzel wasn’t interested in gradualism. Others couldn’t wait for Hertzel’s miracle. So cultural zionists thought it shuld be gradual and it’ll happen. But how will it solve the problem of antisemitism.

Asher Ginzberg- Achad Haam was the most influential cultureal zionist- Eastern European. Chassidish married young and went off. He grew away from yiddishkeit without crisis. Cooperative shver. Had a job working for wistozky tea. Lived in odessa. Cosmopolitan city. Economics changed and he went to london where he worked for tea company and lived in tel aviv in the 20s. he had a great sense and attraction to second rate ideas in europe. Became an important baal hashkafa for maskilim like him. Editor of hashiloach, published literature. Tzarat hayahadut. Cultural zionism. Ideology of jewish culture requires continuity. A certain darwinism influenced him. Herbert spencer was the influence. One of achad haams’s hashkafas was that Change occurs and is important but its slow. Darwin couldn’t explain why change is slow until genetics.( Is it even true- some hold of punctuated evolution- its sharp and it works so it stays. ) also, biology is based on survival. The will to survive. We might explain with genetics. But in 100 years ago, dogs survive because they are able to adapt to this world. They want to survive. So if its hungry, it forages. All animals want to be alive and make little animals too. So why cant we? If animal is well suited to circumstance, so it has to adapt a little when things change.

Wolves one day are being killed by humans. If ur a smart wolf- “hmm, we should develop characteristics to be more like dogs and then they wouldn’t kill us. Well, wolves cant become dogs with comittees. Rather, the wolves that adapt to be able to co-exist will have advantage. Humans wont kill em and even breed them.

Well, likewise, achad haam- 1. A nation persisits because it wants to persisit. Its not a Q about y I should want to remain a jew. Dogs don’t ask that Q. likewise, we that’s not a fair Q. a healthy nation doesn’t ask that. Forget about why u justify being jewish. In western europe ppl didn’t know why they’d stay jewish. Hertzel thought- ya, if we can stop antisemitism, so lets stop being jewish. Achad haam- huh? Don’t commit suicide for no good reason. 2. Change is important, but it occurs gradually and virtually unconsiously. Achad haam is Eastern. A western Jew would say- being jewish and non-jewish isnt intillecutal. Also, reform jews take the torah and cut out things- what is that? U cant do that. U accept what u got and gradually u evolve. Changes occur uncosiously. U don’t go and say the halacha sais don’t break shabbos and I say ya. Instead u say nice things abuot shabbos and it’ll take a form that’ll serve ur needs for now. U wanna smoke Friday night, ok, no harm done. But don’t make a big deal about it. vehemently rejected reform judaism.

Achad haam thought that his position would appeal to orthodox and was dissappointed when he said stuff like Halacha is not from G-d. his orthodox colleagues rejected him.
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So Herztel didn’t care about Jewish culture. Achad Haam only cared about culture- jewish peoplehood- a people not open to question- Frenchman don’t go around asking if they should be a frenchman. A frenchman could go on his own and opt out, but not as a society. (pirates and Pensance- an opera ode to the englishman at the end. So an eglishman has a hava amina to change his nationhood. But englishmen don’t think about such things. It’s a comic though. But by jews u could really have that- the Jew could have been a prussian-) But Achad Haam never has such a shaaloh- that’s something unhealthy biologically. Also emphasizes evolutionary idea- culture should change gradually and unconsiously. Achad Haam writes against Reform (who believe in changing religion) example- look at ayin tachat ayin- maskilish idea- torah sais ATA. Reform Rabbi would say that “we don’t agree with ATA” we have a higher morality. The rabbis decided it meant money- with a higher morality than G. they changed halcha with nobody noticing. Today, laws against homo and abortion are against our morality, but authentic judaism would manage to shuffle the cards and come out with the opposite. That’s how evolution works. But Achad Haam’s orthodox collegues didn’t conform. Orthodox- no, that’s really the mesorah.

19th cent Reform Rabbi- Moses was right in his time and I am write in my time.

Achad Haam- traditional approach is healthier human beings. Mashal to Baseball- lower the mound, designater hitters- don’t want the pitcher to get hurt. Don’t change the game drastically, but this encourages higher scoring.

“The invention of tradition” a book- we have this notion that part of being English is a reverence for monarchy. 200 years ago, there wasn’t reverence. If u asked someone in 1819, the monarchy was fragile- scandals etc. victoria’s reign brought the pedistal, and ppl got used to it, it creates unity in England. The war was over- sees the ppl are celebrating and the king and queen with elizabeth- and ppl cheer- it sounds like a tradition. Our christmans- 200 yrs ago, ppl didn’t make a big deal- Kirkegaurd didn’t have a big christmas and somehow ppl think it’s the same as it was thousands of years ago. If ur good at doing it, so u can pull it off. Yaakov Avinu wore a shtreimel.

Reform approach- either chazal were idiots that they made such changes- or they were conmen. In certain conservative circles, achad haam- and in even some modern orthodox cirlces. Achad Haam wanted to create a common culture and make bridges. The important things like pplehood, and willingness to behave traditionally. He told his orthodox friends- look,ur really like me.

(Mordechai Kaplan arranged a bat mitzvah. Orthodox rabbis were upset. Kaplan read achad haam. So nobody thinks that there were bas mitzvas hundreds of years ago, but in chareidi world, theyre gonna think that serach bas asher had a bad mitzvah.)

So achad haam and Mainstream conservative had this outlook- reject Torah misinai. U shmooze with a guy, and u don’t think to ask what he believes, but then u think u may believe what he believes. Achad Haam thinks that ayin tachat ayin is a higher moral level. Is that even so pashut? Once upon atime, one guy poked out his friends eye, and other guy wanted revenge. So I tell him, “I’ll pay you” “pay me? I don’t want ur money! I want satisfaction!” (challenges to a dual) justice! And then for Achad Haam- they reached a higher moral level- look chap, if u poke his eye, u wont get ur eye back. “ur right, grunt” so why don’t u pay him compensation for it. so the two cavemen say “that’s right” and then chazal come and change the halacha. Logically I could say the opposite- the primative person doesn’t want revenge, he just wants compensation. And the higher moral level guy sais, “I don’t want money. Justice is more than money. I want something more tangible than money” (or less tanigble) that’s why in european culture u didn’t fight a dual with ur inferior. Inferior vulgar ppl who just want to get by are happy to get money- nobility. Satisfaction. The dual is fought among social superiors. Go back to biblical period- everyone knows hamorabi’s code has ayin tachas ayin- but its not to deal with disputes among ppl, its between the upper classes. Because in that framework, there's no ayin tachas ayin for peasants. Achad Haam’s anthopolgy is influenced by his idea of middle class late 19th century morality. Achad haam is utilitarian- like Nietche. (btw, acahd haam attacks hertzel for wanting to dual- so Achad Haam had limited perspective on his approach for ayin tachas ayin).

For Achad Haam, G-d isnt in the equasion. Talking about G-d didn’t bother him because its part of our culture. He has a famous Essay called Moshe- I don’t care whether or not he existed. Doesn’t matter- all that matters is that for Jewish Culture is that the personality existed… an orthodox perons couldn’t accept that, but for AH, he thought he was solving problems. It doesn’t matter if the tradions about the queen are recent or not. Also in his essay about Moshe- AH took the view that Jewish morality is a higher form of morality. Ethnic pride. Its important for AH to justify who he is. If u hold ur a Kantian, or autilitarian, and ifu cant show ur morality is better, then u should change. That’s why a lot of Jews think their choice needs justification. Someone not insecure in that way, just say I love this identity, that’s who I am, that’s how I grew up. The need to show ideological superiority if ur insecure, that’s why America is so full of democracy- because theyre all immegrants. France would not have an unfrench activities committee. In America if flies. So if u have a higher morality, u don’t have to id french. The other way is the “I’m a dog, I’m french, its biological” but AH for some reason he needs this argument of moral superiority. So what is it in Jewish morality that is superior? A: the connection to justice. That’s Moshe- what made him Moshe? He coulda been an Egyptian and he goes out to his bros and sees injustice, mitzri makeh ivri. Goes after him. Next day, a jew vs jew. He runs away a refugee and should keep a low profile. No, shephards misstreating yisro’s daughters, and he gets involved. Whether he existed or not, that’s justice. Christianity believes in love, though. Not justice. AH sais that it’s a nice idea but doesn’t translate. If u believe in justice and halacha (not what we think is halacha) then its concrete. Practicle. These ideas are found in R Kook, the Rav, and German and Reform Rabbis. Leo Baeck 1930s imprissoned by germnas. Harnack wrote a book “the Essence of Christianities” or what is christianity. Where the contrast was pointed out- has to point out contrast. Especially if ur just a liberal christian. Liberal christians are much more anti-israel by and large. Lord Jacobovitz used to say that the C’s talk aobut love and did whatever they did, we didn’t but practiced it. (it may be overkill ideologically, because he aready holds biologically u shouldn’t deviate)

In Achad Haam, Wait, if its all about justice, its kinda self-centered morality. Bava Metzia- two ppl walking in a desert and only water for one. RA said ur water, u drink it. Ben ptura says they should both drink, we’ll share and both die. Rather than have the owner take precidence. That’s a morality of self-sacrifice. Achad Haam- this is where Judaism is different. RA- its urs. Look out for #1. Ben petura is christian morality. Not mentioned anywhere else. Probably a christian. Sounds like a christian. Give up ur life for ur fellow- is there no greater love. That’s high feluten christian thought, while Judaism says no- the biological morlaity comes first. RCarmy- note, we’re rejecting heroic altruistic behavior. First of all, not clear if we pasken RA clearly. There's a 7 volume book by Dov Halberthal- kedushas hachaym beyahadus.

Rav Kook- knew AH. Had a lengthy correspondance with Rav Yechiel Peynus. They were discussing self-saccrifice. I don’t know if the guy with the water has to drink it. maybe the principle was that both shouldn’t die, but that if he wants to give it away, maybe RA has no objections. I’m not paskening halacha- emphassizing in part as a response to Achad Haam. There's a memorial volume for young with an article by David Shatz.

What kind of religion do u get if u eliminate self-sacrifice. For AH, secular hashkafa- look out for #1. Is religion really about that? Calculated selfishness? Ur a nationalist so ur concerned abouthte comm. In Christianity- they love dying as martyrs. AH liked judaism, didn’t believe in G-d, but selfsacrificed for the good of the nation. No passion for G-d. a religeous practice isnt the passion that real religion is gonna have, so R Kook emphasized self-sacrifice to response to AH.

Achad Haam wrote about shabbos- more than the Jews guarded shabbos, shabbos guarded Israel. Making shabbos a cultural thing. It may be good for ur blood pressure. That’s a very practicle message.

Many years ago, an ad in Torah journals about Jews carrying money on shabbos, so that if got robbed, u could give it to the robber. And every few years a jew would be mugged and the discussion would come up. An ad taken under the signature of GRMF, which said we shouldn’t do this- don’t sacrifice shabbos just in case a mugger will be satisfied with ur $5 and not get beaten up. Why should u sacrifice shabbos for this. Yoser miyisrael shamru es hashabos, hashabbos shamru es yisreal. RHS- I think it’s a maskil. But the fact that u can get away with it, it means that the idea is practicle. It captures a lot. U can very easily say that we cultural jews have so much in common. Why must we insist on supernatural judaism? Its an issue still alive today.

Ok, but what does this have to do with political zionism or ideas. Achad Haam rejected political zionism- because he thought he had an alternitive. He also rejected on other grounds- we’ll see on Monday.
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Role of EY for echad haam- to make merkaz ruchanit- a cultural center, value, authority. To drift healthiliy we need EY, because people care about it.

Discussion of Traditions of Yom Haatzmaut- if u formulate it right, ppl might think that it was always there, How do you greet s/o on YH? Am yisrael Chai! A: Am Y Ch Vekayam

Bialeck looked up to EY. He wrote an article Halacha Vagada- critizsizing how modern Jewish culture is based on hagada and not enough on halacha, meaning that there's cultural poetry but not policy and how people should behave.

R Kook- no Geirus in Chutz laaretz. EY should be the center of psak.

Echad Haam- the Jews don’t have 2 go to EY, we just need a cultural center there of intilelectual elitists

Interested in cultural, but not in politics – didn’t think it was even possible 2 get political Isreal. Gentiles wont cooperate and ppl and land without ppl, Achad Haam- there are Arabs there.

Jabotinsky- it’ll ne hard to win the arabs over, we gotta show military. Echad Haam was upset by the notion. Achad Haam – and if u do, political zionism, they’ll prevent my plan too.

What about constructive zionism? AH wasn’t into it. in the 1890s he visited EY and said that the people living there think they’re being economic, productive, but they arent. They think theyre better than the chaluka (tdsedaka) people, but the vineyard

(Didn’t finish transcribing from written notes)
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William Olsler- Canadian Doctors travelled to Europe and saw antisemitism in 1884 and was not an antisemite. Wrote for Canadian med journal- ppl are saying they shouldn’t be allowed to advance and there's too many of them. “should another moses arrise and preach a semetic exodus from germany, they would leave the land impoveresh far more than when the Jews left Egypt and left the land spoiled. To say nothing of the material wealth, enough to buy palestine enough over and over from the turk. And they are all over the job market, in non- more over than our own.” Tie pin with a latch key is the symbol of William Olsler club- students had a key to his house to read from his library.

In theory, if the Jews left- they have enough money to buy palestine several times over- nothin to do with zionism, just an anglican Dr visiting germany.

Olsler once wrote “its astonishing how ppl can practise medicine with so little general reading and education. Its not astonising how poorly they do it.”

Back to Uganda and Cultural Dispute. Hertzel with Mizrachi support- to 1) be with hertzle, and 2) to make it clear that they were focused on political problem of saving lives, and not that theywere working with kofrim in terms of Jewish culture. 3)others at the time made a big deal about not being able to cope with mitzvos EY, but no one mentioned that at the time. These ppl wrote a lot and never said it.

Culture- zionists did adopt culture as part of the movement, but should be interpretted by individual clubs. We should also be aware, that zionist organization did more than listen to Hertzle speak once a year. So people had to have thjings to do.

In russia, ppl werent active in self defense. Ppl could be a zionist and in polish parlement and not planning on leaving. Obviously, there was phenominon of ideological zionists and had no intent of going to EY- they wouldn’t fit in anyways. Being a zionist is a way of being an eastern euroean Jew, or an American Jew, not connected to what ur planning on doing with ur life.

1904- Herzel died in his early 40s. u would tihnk that with someone with his charisma, that the organization would fall- and it did shrink. During WWI, the zionists had a lever and supported Germany because of Russia, which was antisemetic. Stam a Jew was pro Germany. Herman Cohen- German Philosofer was arguing because of Russians, he was arguing that Germany is Kant and Schiller, and the philosofy and neviim allign, a nation of culture. Sounds strange in the aftermath. The Irish were also proGerman because they were against the England. American Irish hatred of England contributed- like Joseph Kennedy- American Ambassador to England in 1930s, and Roosevelt wanted him out of the US so not to be a threat. Once the war began, and he was progerman, it was an embarassment.

Anyways, we had WWI and Jews played – what will u do if we win? Chaim Weitzman was in England, and an anglican, and Achad HAam was also. He was also involved in discovering how to make synthetic rubber, was well connected. So what Hertzle was struggling with, fell into their hands- the brittish kicked turks outa palestine and were willing to announce a national home for the Jews. Ted Kennedy was by mother- reminded sons that Balfur declaration only gave them a home, not a state. Btw, the Arabs were also promised about land.

David Frunkin- the peace to end all peace. 1991- during first gulf war.

So after WWI, the political zionists had won something. So there were 3 ideologies- there was political zionists, there were cultural zionists, and there were practicle zionists- dunam po dunam sham. And there was overlap between the parties.

Things fell into Chaim Weitzman ‘s hands that Achad haama could never dream of- the turks wont let. Fixed. Weitzman wasn’t gung ho on political zionism.

1924, Jabotinsky who is political and demands a state, and knocks himself out of the zysborg organization(huh?) in 1943 when mainstream organization (ben gurion) demands a state, in middle of holocause, Weitzman is against. And Ben gurion is running the show. Weitzman is weaker and indicisive. Ben Gurion is like Jabotinsky, but didn’t go public til later.

Micha Birdichevski and Yosef Chaim Brenir- wrote fiction and prose. Both of them were cultural zionists but different than AH. AH had a faith in gradualism, that u build a secular Jewish culture continuuous with Jewish Culture. Brenner and Bridichevski didn’t subscribe to that. Brenner- an animal evolves without feeling a commitment to what it was before. If we have a Jewish culture, why should that culture be based on some model of what J-culture was in the past? It’s a secular culture. Who dictates where its supposed to go? In western culture, ppl disagree very strongly- TS Elliot in 20th century. His idea- there's a canon of western literature, and u as an individual are taking ur place in the canon, if ur super creative, u could help recreate, but the canon is there. U cant start from scratch, that’s kfira. Its not accidental, that within 7 years of writing that essay, Elliot converted to christianity. After he became religious he was much less of an antisemite. Wrote to Groucho marx about how much he admires Israel.

So Brenner and Birdichevski were exposed to Nietzie. A vibrant Jewish culture does whatever it does. If it’s a radical departure from traditional Jewish views, so be it. An article by brenner in 1908 which brought forth meora brenner- the brenner affair. He wrote that he didn’t chup why a person cant be a jew and also be a christian. Be an englishman an anglican, a roman catholic, even a jew. French, and Jewish. If Judaism is really a nationality, so why should a particular religious belief be tied to that nationality. There are countries where there is religion- like Irish constitution states that holy catholic church has special place in the irish consititution. Part of that drafting was done by R Herzog. But in europe in general, why cant u be Jewish culture and christian. He wasn’t really thinking about it that people would subscribe to the doctorin, but to be defined as a christian- like Tolstor- a kofer-parts of the New testiment that he liked.

Achad Haam – in his desert two people- was responding to montifyuoree- who was writing in a pro-chrisitan flavor. So AH said that our morality has nothing in common with Christ.

Brenner was a the pious fool I russian orthodoxy- like in dostevski’s idiot. So AH was livid, who was raising money for this magazine about that article. Brenner took cultural zionism to the extreme and AH didn’t approve.

So Achad Haam who already was bent against christianity because Jews are into justice and not the love thing, but to adore Jesus- culturally was abhorent to AH.

Brenner- whats the betrayel? Why should adoring Jesus, or kirkegaurd and \_\_\_\_- I can imagine that AH would be scandalized by R Carmy.

AH’s daughter married a non-Jew. His orthodox friend suggested that he would talk to the man and convert him. AH- a few drops of blood and dunking him wont make him Jewish for me.

Brenner- just like in America, whatver the ppl do the ppl do, and not that u have to do x and y. but does this work? Think about european immigration- muslims in France- no burkas in public- to prevent a fighting back. If america was in danger- like, making laws of business only in English- like they don’t care here. In Ireland where irish land died out against despite vigourous govt antagonism. Geilick as a national language Ireland died out. If u really reject religion u reject it. AH didn’t cchup this- and wanted Jewish symbols to remain, but brenner udnerstood that if u reject it, it’s a radical break. U cant reject religion and say it’s the same thing.

Birdichevki was a theorist, did folklore in Germany. Brenner went to Israel in 1907-1908. R Kook was fasinated by Brenner. Several times they were seen in the street together. Agnon tells the story that they were walkingin Yafo, and Agnon said “ R kook is going to mincha, lets go and daven. Brenner said no.” intresting relationshpi. R chaim Beer- Gam ahavatam gam sinatam. Bialick, agnon, and brenner. Bialik didn’t like brenner, but was also a cultural zionist. Brenner was murdered young- living in yafo in an arab neighbourhood and murdered in first Arab riots.

Amos Oz wrote a term paper about agnon- so he went to visit him. Agnon-u know something, Brenner and I were in love with the same person- Oz’s eyes get big- who? A: we were both infatuated by shmuel yosef agnon. (himself).

After Brenner died, a baal teshuva guy named zeitlin- gave R Kook musar for associating with secular zionists. “but u were fascinated with Brenner” “oh, he had a spiritual spark” “maybe I could see the spark” if he had been religious, he woulda really been religious.

There was a Hebrew literary critic names Baruch Kurtzwhile. Grew up as a hershman. Had smicha. Interests in real literature. Politics were what they were and ended up in Palestine and wasn’t a zionist. Got a job teaching literature in chaifa. Eventuall, bar ilan opened and became head of hebrew and comparitive literature. Powerful. Religious, not a zionist, and center of gravity was european literature, not zionist literature. So he wasn’t looking for what kind of literture promotees zionism, but rather lishma.

For him it was a tragedy that bialiek wrote important poetry about his personal life, but ended up being paralyzed, as he was forced to serve the national cause. Achad Haam ruined Bialek, according to Kurtzehile. He coulda written about personal crisis.

Ex: bialiek- the masmid- this guy sitting night after night in a yeshiva (volosin) and sitting and trying to conquoer shass and dreams of greatness, and the RY, (netziv) comes out at 2am, and its about a world that bialek thought was dying out. U read the poem and realize it didn’t die out.
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Early in Israel history, everytihng was looked at as “is this good for the Country”. A friend of r Carmy’s was in Kerem Byavneh, asked to leave, because he wasn’t fitting in. everything was focused on the klal. Amitai Etzioni “rubber bulllets” where u cant kill arabs, so these things don’t stop the arabs, but the ppl o the world arent on ur side. Ettzion’s father- started to speak hebrew as a child, his father would take down everything he said- so in other societies it was a mark of how much they were valued in society. So they wanted to hear him speak before the language evolved. Before tanach. Lab work. Instead of enjoying his son, he was doing lab work- a certain coldness of that level. The history- in 1940s, there as a group of hebrew writers- small group, called knaanim. Their view of rennessant culture in Israel had nothing to do with yahadut. These ppl thought like brenner, birdichevski. But these ppl wanted to start anew, the lest they had to do, the better.

In 1950s, there was a political party- merchav hasheni- wanted to conquor the surrounding lands and assimilate into Arab worlds. Military expressive but anti-Jewish. Today we look at more mainstread writers and see if they had any element of knaanim in it. knaanim – we read and ask if there's any Judaism in it.

Chaim hazaz- Jewish novleist- typical zionist. Wrote “hadrasha” there's a point where it discusses jewish culture and someone sais “I sone historia yehudis” how? “everything about it, we’re starting afresh” that’s knaanin,

Alpaim- high class intelleectual magazine. Shapiro- a historian wrote about reception history of that story. We read it today to get flavor of the zionist rebellion against jewish culture. Stop pretending achad haam stuff. But the author wasn’t like that consistently. How did ppl respond in the 40s.

Shaul Chenekovsky- the number 2 of Hebrew literature. Bialick was #1. Its anti-Jewish. Poem “nochach pesach apolo- before the statue of apolo- he stands b4 the statue- I’m here, I am the son of the G-d who conquored kanaan in a storm- bisaarah, vayaasruhu the tragedy the hebrew religion is that it had tefilin- they tied up the G-d with tefilin. All tangled up in black. (song by bob dillan)

Whats noticable is that these people were politically very right wing. Today, ppl think that left wing is anti religios, and right wing is alligned with religion, but that’s not how it was way back. The kanaanim were right wing politically. Within 10 or 20 years of the state, they ended up on the left, because once u have a state and if ur anti judaism, - well, if u were a mideastern power and u assymilate, ok, but if u don’t, then there's nothing left to pull u to the right.

See the hunter gatherers, where person gets into a feminist who is into witchcraft- the idea of rejecting traditional religion and romanticize pagain religion. That’s all part of that phenominon.

Davka the bulk of the political zionists were politically left. Mizrachi 2 seats. Poel mizrachi got 8 seats. Mildly socialist. Kibutz hadati was social.

Balfur was given- now there's official Jewish presense in palestine. 1919 to 1948 wher brit in charge and jews have national home, and we’re gonna get along together, but it became clear that there was gonna be conflict. We’re gonna discuss a lot how the zionists tried solving the problems.

Recall the political ppl- HErtzel- to aquire a state in EY. If not, then somethine like a state- a noational home. Progress is in terms of political events.

Cultureal – creating a new jewish culture

Tzionit maasi- practicle zionism. Dunam po vdunam sham. Build another facorty, buy more land, another vineyard- with or without a state. That was the most important one to move towards the state. Political moves are up in the air and invlove peieces of paper. A settlement is a settlement. Martin Buber- a left wing zionist- in 1922 said we have to have settlements on the east bank of the jordan. The original mandate included the west bank too. In 1922 they divided it. churchill- prozionist- split transjordan. East to Jews and west for ppl to whom the brits promised stuff. But buber was officially a cultural zionist like achad haam. Ben gurion, a practicle zionist, was famous for having said “lo chashuv mah sheyomru hagoyim, chashuv ma she’osim hayehudim- he was speaking about mililraty issues, but it’s the same for this matter.

Jewish settlement explanded. Population expanded. But it got problematic, the arabs protested. Skipping ahead in 1939- it limited Jewish Immigration- to appease the arabs. Davka in the itme of the holocaust. 1919 40 000-50 000. 1948 had 600 000. Area and infrustrcuture were developing.

The histatrud- the labor union- was central. It ran the governemtn in the 60s- almost like soviet russia. But in the 20s- how u create a nation- a labor union means- its not a matter of wages, it means u have a center where things have idnetified, and ppl learn how to run a country. How to get tihngs done, and keep things stable. It eventually became a monster and all powerfull. So ur doing things that a govt does, ut it can become corrupt. Poel mizrachi joined histradut under threats of political zionism. Non-socialist zionists suffered- they were lepers.

Here in the US, if u like socialized medicine, ur a left winger. Right wingers wanna privitize. In Israel, the right wing wanted national health insurance- nationalism. Left wing- histatrud- at kupat cholim- not a member- ur left out. There was once a virus in KBY, R Carmy and R Stav was sick. The Stavs got a private Dr, and Mosh had to wait a few days for histatrut to get around to u. in terms- there was an advanatge to no histatrut.

Encyclopedia haivrit- writin by axon- a right wing law professor. Wrote the article on EY. Right wing professors had trouble getting jobs under a one party govt. couldn’t get jobs in academai, too right. And not in politics, because ben gurion didn’t like him. Yeshaya Leibowitz running it- hired ppl who otherwise would not have had jobs. Axon wrote that Israeli political parties have power normally not found in democratic parties, equivalent to large corporations in the US. R Carmy- how was allowed to be published? A: Axon isnt like that. Israeli’s believed that the US was entirely contollled by corps. Wilson was asked aobut GM conflict of interest “whats good for GM is good for America.”

So histadrut was a state within a state. They became politically powerful- in zionist congress, etc. the first secretary general was be ngurion- but there was a committee of 3 and he dominated. From there, he built his position as the most powerful in zionist congress.

From those on the left, it betrayed them. Ben Gurion saw himself as a national figure, no longer a socialist group s- socializm had to change too.

Meged Polalei eretz yisrael- MAPAI- from 1935 they controlled zionist congress. From 1948-1977 they dominated every govt. never with a majority- except once- when they united left wing parties. MAPAI became maarach then labor. When golda meir was in labor party. Even when Gurion was at his height- he could form coalitions- MAPAI had 47 seats. MaPAM 19- also socialist- coulda had 66 seats. But until today, they believe in stabbing eachother in the back. MAPAM was Rejected because foreign policy was pro soviet. Marxist.

So Ben gurion took in religious parties with 16 seats, that’s 63 already. Then the arab parties with MAPAI, 4 seats. Then the progressive 4 or 5 seats. And a small sfardi party. 70 seats.

In the 50s, ben gurion realized u need the religious in there. U may expect them to disappear. U cant ignore them, though. In prestate- this is a big issue- u cant exclude part of the population and pretend to represent them. U can exclude the non-religious right wing. Within mapai, Golda Meir was anti religios. Grid didn’t meet with her. Real socialist. Then some MAPAI ppl were traditional. They fit in for other reasons- u can be frum and democratic. But then there were ppl in the middle- guts were antireligious-= like ben gurion- but was a politician.

MAPAI 1930s- precurser- and there's a book about it- mimaamad lerov- from class to majority. Started being a socialist party pritecting econoimc class, t obecomeing the majority.

So this was an important development in zionist society. Can u imageine living somehwere in NY that belongs to the democratic party? Its bad enough that the university exists where conservatives are isolated. Democrat elected mayor, so ur garbage is removed less frequently, and jobs are on the stake. Not just the post office in america. But most jobs- ur a building contractor. A sick person- what helth insurance.

The Arab issue- miliraty issue. Within socialist majority, there r many approaches. Socialists were universalitsts. Socialists couldn’t day arabs don’t count. Intillectually, it was tough justifying any difference between Jew and Arab. U need a certain amount of intillectual domain to explain how we should have separate laws in terms of employment. Actually, if ur socialist, and ur membershipto working class is all important, so whyd u leave russia, if that’s all that’s important.

So socialists would have liked to live with the Arabs. How did they square hiring Jews policies, ok, they said things. Barbarchuv- marxists- after antismeitisms- affirmitive action. Teirutzim.

But there are military issues as well, it become evident that- initially ppl said that the arabs arent against us, the big shots were. But Jobatinsky was a bit of a knaanni- very assimilated background. Mastered many languages, orator. Had he remained in russia, he might have become a famous russian writer. Begin rewrote the relationship between him and jobatinsky. Had no use for Judaism. Political zionist. The politics were imporant. He was involved in Jewish self deffence. During WWI, tried organizing Jewish Bregade- if the british win, and we look organized, that’ll look good. Strongly involved in jewish self denfense. Got kicked out of palestine. Lived in Paris and NY, and died in NY. Political in its purist form. Translated into militant zionism. Mainstream had hagana. Jabotinsky- from the start- held we needed an army- not just negotiating, it means defending. 1924- the iron wall- kir barzel. U wanna live well and peacefully, we need to show them we can defend ourselves. Temporarily an iron wall until they understand that we can stand up for ourselves. In Europe, Jabotinsky, he organized a similar kind of zionist structure. By 1924, he a revisionist zionist. A return to what he felt Hertzel was all about. Revisionist zionism was strong in poland- generational issues. Beitar- the youth movement in poland- brit tumpeldor- a russian Jewish officer who got high in russian army who was in EY during early arab riots in the north, in Tel Chai. Arabs attacked, and jabotinsky advocated leaving. Tumpeldore was killed. Tov Lamut be’ad artezeinu. But his hebrew wasn’t really that good. In russian it sounds like a curse. So for “beitar” the military adornments and display was important. When polish dictator died, so beitar ppl were proud when they wre praised for how well they marched. Fascistic flavor. Ok, that was part of the military elemtn of political zionism. Jabotinsky called it Hadar. Dignity. Very much like what HErzel meant by dualing. Not the old bent over Jew, ur militant.

By the middle 1930s, revisionsists and socialists relationshjip was bad. And also jabotinksy was antisocialist writings- as the split develops- Jabotinsky becomes more critical of socialisms economic way of life- collectionism. Anti histadrut. From an economic point of view- jews who owned orchards- socialists- only hire jews. That’s what zinisms about. But employers want cheep labor and arabs were better farmers. So there was violence when Jewish employers hired arabs, and histadrut wanted u to hire their ppl. So owners werent socialist. (Shapiro- this was a political battle, because when the economy was good, everyone had jobs)

The
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Jabotinsky was iron wall and not a kehanist. A 19th century liberal. So if u wanna be a state, u gotta maintain that kind of miliary self respect. Anti-socialist element became more pronounced. If the arabs don’t cooperate. For other zionist it wasn’t as simple.Eventually, Jabotinsky arrived at free enterprise, with coorporists. Popular in early 20th century. Associated with fasicm. Working class cant be separate from other classes. So the state itself should arbetrate amongst the classes.

In 1933, there was a change in the govt of germany. And the new german govt was anti-Jewish. Foreign minister of the yeshuva was a moderate Arlosirov- who went to germany to try to arrange a way of getting jews out and talking about what to do about his money. Ppl criticized him in the revisiionist newpapers in EY. He returned in mid-June. June 16th a Friday- were supposed to have dinner at his mothers home, but Mrs. Elazar asked to be alone, so they stayed home, and ppl kept talking to him, so they went to the restaurant and found no privacy, so they walked on the beach and two ppl were following them- and Elazar turned around and said he didn’t like them following him, so one of the me made a gesture and the other one shot him. He died. Jewish police and british went on manhunt for invisionsist. The other two were accused, names Avraham Stavski and Rosenberger. Stavsky was convicted even though he didn’t fit the description she originially gave the police. And the minute the verdict was handed down, R Kook went on a campaign claiming Jews could not have done it. the conviction was vacated on a technicality, because u need 2 eye witnesses for a crime. So they disallowed the testimony on eid echad. So stovski got off. R Kook was villified in labor zionist press as the rabbi of the murderers.

Stavsky had an aliby- because nobody knew elazar would be on that beach except Mrs. Elazaroff. Stavky was in Yerushalim. Ppl saw him there. He would have had to go to Tel Aviv, at a time when there werent so many cars around, found out where he was, kill, get back to Yerushalaim, climb into his hotel room window in time for them to see him in bed at 7am, and for at least one of them to comment that his socks smell awful.

The revisionsists thought he was apeasing hitler, negotiating with the enemy. Begin was pro-religios. Didn’t give antireligious ppl positions in his party. Jabotinsky died and began took over. Traditional revisionism was marginalized. Begin was super military.

In 1952, the Israeli govt came to an agreement to accept reperations for property from Western Germany. Semi-retired Began hadnt been to kneset for 8 months, but showed up and spoke b4 kneset- when the altanelo was sunk I said no violence, hayom- the nations have gone to the barricades- a threat of violence. Then they went into the kneset. Ppl were throwing rocks, tear gas was there. Strange experience. They suspended him from kneset for a period of time for making those remarks.

Anyways, Elozerov was a frame up, so when Began came to power, he made an investigation committee who concludd vistovsky was innocent, but the false evidence was sinserely presented, meaning that the fabricaters believed he was guilty. By the time Began straigtened out the record, some of the convicters were his supporters. Some socialists supported Began at that point.

The Altalena (Began’s group was the irgun, the new militant revisionists) had a boat with a huge amount of ammunitiion. They were smuggling it during a ceasefire- Began said he woulda handed most of it to Israeli army and would researve some of it for irgun ppl in jerusalem. Ben Gurion said we have on army, NO. Irgun will just use the ammo to destroy the Govt by force. Ultimately, within this missunderstanding, the irgun was directed to unload at a socialist settlement. But they’ll kill u, ben gurion, so it moved to tel aviv. So they were going to unload on the same stretch of beachfront on the same beach where elazar and his wife walked 16 years before. And the army open fired. Yitzchak Rabin is the one who fired. In Rabin’s autobiography, (pinkas Sheirut) he skips that incident in 1948, bu in 1977, he goes back and tells the story, that … and at that time I sincerely believed he was planning a military coup, but 30 years later I realized I was wrong. He came to power democratically. Stavsky was killed on the Altolena. 37.5 years later, Rabin was murdered not far from there.

That murder helped labor zionists consolidate their home on zionist movement. Jabotinsky and ben gurion met in Parsi talking about revisiotist getting back together, but ben gurion’s men were against it.

Labor zionis, Jabotinksy (revisiionsit or milirlatry), socialist- some in labor- some non-marxists, some were shomeret tsair. Some further to left. Mapai was ben gurion. There were left marxists, and some more pro arab, and some were more militant. Within socialist zionsts there was a large group of opitnios= left of mapai, were less militant- just build upthe yishuv. Pro arab humanistic. (shomeret Tsair) but then there were marxists who were more militant.

Begin- american position- the law is soveregin. Ben Gurion rejected that. This is a state of chok, not of mishpat, not of Halacha (religion). For example- Memshal Zevai- in heavily Arab areas, Arabs didn’t have civil rights- because it’s a military area, so Govt has to be there. Every once in a while there would be close votes over that- freedom of conscience. Mapai was ben gurions. Religious parties in colaiition with mapai too. Begin’s party- Begin campained in arab villages to get rid of memsheles tsvi. Ok, maybe it was self-interest on begin’s side. But it was always close votes. The left wing part of coalition needed freedom of conscience, and small arab parties suporting mapai didn’t vote mapai on those things. One time, Aguda was not in Govt, and ben gurion wanted their vote so gave them a lot for it. Ben Gurion was called a bbulhsovick, as he used a strong arm some times.

Ppl use the word MamLachtitut- statism- the notion that state soveringty. Like the french etatism. Not party soveignty, but that the state is above everything. Lo chashuv what the goyim will say, rather what we will do. Under begin- not important what the goyim will do, rather what the Jews will say.

MOrdechai Kaplan- born in Russia, educated in USA. Went to high school on lower east side. Once, someone decided YU should honor the oldest living alumnus and found out it was him so they didn’t. ended up at JTS which was somewhat orthodox at the time. Became a rabbi at the Jewish Center. By mid1920s, it was evident that his beliefs didn’t belong in Orthodox conservative framework, remained on board of JTS but founded his own branch of judaism- deconstructionism.

Conservative on paper believe in ikarei emuna, but interpret litberally especiaily in nature of Torah Shebaal Peh. If its assur, in theory they would not do it. to permit something, a committee gets to gether to discuss the halacha. Ethical Monotheism. Liberally interpret halacha. Also take Jewish Peoplehood seriously. Solomon Schacter (founder of JTS) had a term “catholic Israel” meaning all inclusive Israel. The Roman Catholic church was centered in rome but universal. So it means “kneses Yisrael”. In that sense, both reform and orthodoxy agree that there are higher things that what ppl want. But conservatives in the middle. Saul Liberman didn’t think of himself as conservative.

Reform- halcha has no role. Even right wing reform, “halacha has a vote, but not a veto”. Talks with respect about sources, but has a voice, at most. No authority. Authority comes form huministic voices that we have. They still identified Jewish.

Whats monotheism? Humanitareism is a half-way between christianity and aetheism. It’s a religion that believes in no more than one G-d.

Kaplan didn’t believe in what others in JTS held. He taught philosofy and homiletics- which the JTSers didn’t care about anyways.

Heshcel was treated well in JTS, he had a personality, but look, the people who ran it- Lieberman, JTS, thought of it as a yeshiva, more academic than our way- so Heschel wasn’t talmud, so who cares. So reconstructionism emerged from JTS, not from reform, because Kaplan is preaching a much greater degree of Jewish practice than the average reform rabbi, but there's a total rejection of traditional doctorine.

Reconstrucionists are aethiests, but its really a heresy within conservative, and not left wing reform.
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The average reconstructionist Jews can drift into a conservative temple- may be more shomer mitzvos than the average reform person and conservative person- so practice is greater than ud expect.

Kaplan produced a sidur without belief in mashiach, so agudata rabbanim put him in cherem. (the old european rabbanim) they burnt the siddur. Ok. After that time, Prof Leiberman made a point of not sitting in Kaplan’s 4 amos. If he’s in cherem, so u cant. Is this literally true? Unclear. From Lieberman’s point of view, it was an aetheist teaching socialogy in YC. He’s a shegetz, what does it have to do with me. But remained at JTS. The sharp devide between JTS and orthodox symbolized what was wrong with the institution. The division in the 40s of standards of learning was not such a big thing, but driving in the 50s was a divider, but made by the movement, not by the roshei yeshiva. The raabinical assembly decided that. United synagogue. (mechitzas were important for splitting congregations too. But recall, orthodox jews drove to shul too at the time. What went on in the shul played a large role.) btw, the heter was to drive to shul, not to drive to play golf. The mechitza becomes important because it happened in shul. Orthodox rabbi in non-mechitza shul, so they had to report it to the RCA.

Analogy- there was a psak from JTS cancelling the 9 days. So u’ll ask- does that mean conservative jews keep halacha, that ppl are strafing at it, so they needed a kula, that in our day and age, mourning isnt psycological issue… um, wait, the majororty of conservative balebatim don’t eat kosher. Problem: there are summer camps, so they have a problem, and needed a way out. That’s why women ordination became such a big issue, and ppl left because of it. Prof Halivni- whatever they do in the synagogue, they do in the synagogue. But here, they were asking us, JTS, to do something against our conscience. So u can have prof homiletics, apikores, wtvr, but when he put out a sidur- that was news.

Rabbi Herzog was invited to JTS and he woulda maybe gone if they fired kaplan. So from the 30s on, he’s teaching at JTS and founding reconstructionists- a small small movement.

What did Kaplan stand for intilectually: general phylosofical position: secularist. Doesn’t believe in hashgacha, nor in bechiras yisrael. (he read John dewey)(kaplan read Herman cohen). Read achad haam. No personal god, but an idea of personal pplhood. Reject the doctorines, retain peoplehood, but what kind of peoplehood. This is where kaplan differed from achad haam. Both prozionist. Achad haam believed in the end, jews were separate from goyim, but kaplan didn’t hold that as much. But there was still enough anti-semitism to prevent intermarriage.

Kaplan, whethr lechatchila or bedieved, believed in jewish id, and continuity. Their shuls were called Jewish centers. The Jewish center could have become a place like that. Gemara megila call beis kneses not beis haam. But he held the shul was a cultural center, not a place of worship. There's a shul there, a pool, a gym, bingo hall (to raise money). So kaplan had more jewish id, so the more jewish things u do, the better. In terms of halacha, but also in terms of living jewishly- like tennis when u play with other jews. Mixed swimming so u’ll marry jewish. But don’t forget, Orthodox shuls had that too, they’d have breakfast with a ball player.

Reform jew who votes democratic and goes to shul 3 times a year and denies christianity. The reform rabbi wants them to do more, but sosiologically, kaplan was for. Reform jews wouldn’t keep kosher- maybe once in a while to remember ur jewish. But in reconstructionists- that’s a very good thing. That’s the Jewish way of life. Kaplan wore tefilin every day, but didn’t daven, he’d read something for a few days. In Kaplan, u can redefine G-d, and call it nature. 1960s there was a hit song called dominique sung by a nun who dropped out later- a singing nun. It was number one and no other hit songs. The song was about st tomas climas, referring to vanquihing of heretics in debate and at the state. Ppl didn’t know that that’s what the song was about. So ppl go to shul because its part of the culture.

Jewish centers may have predated kaplan, but theyre in line with him. Now, the people we described had not emunot vdeot. Kaplan had serious emunot vdeot, but the were kefira. no god, no transecndant god, why? Scientists say so. A savage in South America taka believe that babaloo could give em small pox, but we don’t believe that. Rashi believed that u commit certain sins and G-d will punish u, but today we don’t believe that. (he read sosiology and used it to replace religion, read american philosophy).

R Aaron Lichtenstein in Merkaz harav (he said mosad harav) The idea that g-d is subservient to the interests of the culture of the people is Avoda Zara- that YU personality was seeing how far he could go and see the reaction.

Kaplan: Why should we assimilate? Nothing to be ashamed of. We believed in G-d, but the goyim also did. Shulwise- my goldfish and the Jewish Problem- when he was a child, he owned a goldfish. Did s/t wrong and it didn’t look good. Wrong food, too much, didn’t clean takn, wtvr. He was in despare, and turned to his uncle who took a pinch of salt and put it in the tank and the fish perked up and was back to normal. Half an hour later the fish was dead. Salt was a very temporary remody and didn’t really work. The nimshal is antisemitism. Antisemitsm is the salt of the rabbionate. We have nothing to offer, and we look at the fish tank, and the fish isnt doing well, in our desperation, we throw antisemitism and the fish perks up, but ½ hour later, its dead. When antisemitism goes away, the frum have that prob as well. We want jews to do teshuva and read ramban on chumash, but we have to give them zionist trash and socials and talke about antisemitism to get ppl to shul. If u don’t believe in yahadus, then u have bigger problems, unless u enjoy Jewish literature and food and are proud of ppl, but to sell it to people… very few of these people admit that theyre selling antisemitism, no more than the owner of the parrot shop admits the parot is dead (monty python) but the most intillectual serious thinkers try not to be that cheap. (sartoron french jewish philosofor - the gaze of the others keeps us jewish).

For kaplan, if there's less antisemitism, so there’ll be more intermarriage- look if its more common, so we’ll have to make judaism more palatable for intermarried couples. He articulated what other people are actually doing. In the language of meir kahane- you think is what I say. Jews arent asher bachar banu mikol am, because it doesn’t suit the higher morality of … so we want an idea of god, so it’ll be an ideal that ppl talk about. We can talk aobut messianic age, in terms of faith in progress. We can talk about the jewish ppl, but not say asher bachar banu, cause we have to be honest .

Achad haam was trying to be subtle, but kaplan was saying- there's a gulf between me and what was before, and we have to choose, andu’ve already chosen. Kaplan wasn’t an intillectual peace maker, and he didn’t sugar coat the message.

One argument against Kaplan- “we modern people don’t believe in G-d and so one” and we could say “excuse me, with all do respect, I’ve read as much philosophy than u have, my scientific training is up to date, and Ii’ve read novels and I have incites into ppl, and I was in the Rav’s shiur, and I hold what I hold. And take R Carmy out of the equasion. Peter Eniguagine published why philosofers get involved with theology, because thelogians are too stupid to get invovled with theology properly. Meaning, Boltman famously said that no person who uses a radio could possibly believe the ressurection of the dead (and rejected jesus) huh? But ppl use it and hold of ressurection! Well, they don’t understand what its about. So Peter knows many scientists who believe in resurection and many who are aetheists. Actually, I don’t know any liberal christian scientist. Ppl in serious academic fields, most are aetheists, but the ones who practice don’t have this nonsense that radios disprove resurection. And ask Prof Boltman- u use a radio, do u understand it? how much physics did u take? How much logic did u take? Liberal theologians who say thinkgs like “we today know so much science…” ya, ok, but ur not fooling anyone.

So Kaplan has an answer- judaism is a culture and a civilazation- there are, even in our day and age- ppl for whom the traditional experience of G-d is real. Its not that theyre fooling themselves, its just that we’re talking about culture- not individuals. For individuals, u can have real traditional life- u might admire those individuals or deplore them. Ppl arent really living by those measurements. Sociologically. Intillectually, I believe what I believe, and maybe u could argue for G-d’s existance better than me. But I kaplan and talking sociology- we’re talking about the religion. Not elite intillectual experiential world. So the orthodox who have vivid real G-d wont stop davening even if they know medical science.

Achad haam might have said we have common culture and lets leave asside other issues. But kaplan sharpens the point- if ur honest, u cant blur the differences, lets lead ahead.

If Kaplan was such an accurate sociologist, why is it that reconstrucionism is such a small group and even amongst reconstrucionists ppl turn to mystisicim. Which is far from what Kaplan believes in. Kaplan wanted to talk about G-d wihtou that emotional side, and his writing forced him to make hard choices. We cant sing that piut anymore, its not true, its not honest. Even if u like the toon. Stop singing babaloo if u don’t think it causes smallpox.

A: R Carmy- precisely because kaplan was right that American Jews see judaims as a culture. Jews don’t give a hoot about intillectual honesty and the result is that if u tell them to turn jewish culture into ideology- they want to go to the pool at shul, tney want lux, and don’t care about G-d, but don’t want to make speaches about that and change the siddur. It’s a failed movement as prove that his sociology was correct, and fairly accuarte in certain respects. There's a kind of hidden influence of reconstructionism that strikes a mood that’s very much there, because that’s where american and even israeli judaism is. Even though few people actually subsrcibe to it. so maybe reconstrucionissts will rejoin- mordechai was first to bas mitzvah his daughter.

Even in the chareidi world- do u really believe- ppl like the life style, or because of cultural lifestyles. R Carmy discussed this last week with grandson of reconstructionist- by chassidim its true but by others- if ur chassidic and subscribe to lakewood. As mechanchim if u really knew what was going on. Culture of confomity. In the right wing world- the threat to yirat shomoyim is more from conformity, less from science.

Story from R Shteinzaltz- writing about tefila. The kotzker rebbe talking about yehuda and tamar- its so important to have a friend sho is so close, u can tell em u made an embarrassing choice I went to a prostitute and she’s walking aroudn with my stuffl. U need a friedn like that, but nowadays everyone talks about that. But u need a close friend to tell ur orthodox, and a member of a shul, and still I beilieve in G-d, that requires enourmous confidence

(I missed the last conversation abuot chareidim.)
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Buber- dies in 1965. Grandfather was Solomon Bauber. When Buber was 3, his mother disappeared and Buber ended up growing up on his zadie’s farm. He ran into mom 30 years later. In his teens, he was shomer mitzvot. Afterwards, he wasn’t. it can be odd, that someone who wrote so much about his life, never commented on that. Some ppl arent particularly introspective in this regard. Precautcious. active political speaker in college. Zionist from day one. Cultural zionist. In universtiy, he didn’t do much jewish stuff. Was interested in mysticism and wrote a thesisi n medieval christian mysticism. Published chassidesh stories. There's a tension between scholars interested in Torah and kaballa, like Gershom scholem- chassidut is about kaballa. Focussed on the sefarim- pop kabala. The alternative is to focus on chassidish stories. There were books out. Buber was successfully writing in German. By the late 190\_’s he’s doing well. (Mendes Flohr wrote about this period and about Buber and the receptive history). Struck it rich, because there was interest in mysticism. Ppl like it, especially central european ppl. Its exotic. s/t u have englishmen enfatuated with muslim world. And some jews too! Ppl of the east r more authentic, and easterners are more authentic, real ppl, and the religion has something authentic. It doesn’t lead to belief in doctorine, its just an idea that east is closer to the ground.

In the 19th century, some jews are attracted to chassidut. They’ll be more interested in stories than how a malach learned pshat in parshas veyechi. In terms of the ideas themselves, Buber created a chassidut that had little emphasis on shmirat hamitzvos. (u wouldn’t know, for example, that chassidishe rebbes were big into dikduk in halacha). Buber doesn’t tell u where he got his stories from- no footnotes. Scholem disregarded buber for that. Also, its just stories.

Scholem- the messianic idea and other essays- wrote an article on Buber, also Rivka Shatz (Ufenheimer). She did a hatchet job on Buber too.

K, so shmirat hamitzvot is gone, hard core kabala is gone. Doctorines end up being Bubarian. The notion of devekut. For Devekut in chassidut-see “reader in chassidism” written with R Lamm & Carmy. Buber makes it sound like living with G-d is a worldy social kind of think with human encounters. Serving G-d thru gashmiut. In Scholem, chassidut is ascetic. The baal shem tov taught that u serve G-d when thinking about the beautiy of the women and u realize that some day, she’ll be dead, and worms will craw in and out. That’s avodas Hashem. An otherworldly perspective. Worldliness is taken to get beyond. In buber is jollier and more worldly. Uses stories to illustrate his outlook on life. Not an accurate 18th century history.

Buber made it clear that socially oriented living is ideal, but christian mystics had a concept of thinking of G-d on a mountain. This was a turn from the old philosofy that he worked on in university. 1908, 1912.

In the early 1910s, buber was sitting at home and had an experience- an uplift. On cloud 9. Then there was a knock on the door, someone wanted to see him and talk about an important subject. After the conversation, it turns out, it was a matter of life and death. I treated this as an intillectual conversation, and I was so full of spirit, and the person was making a demand on me and I didn’t really respond. The impression is that it happened early in 1910s, and the guy committed suicide. But it was really about a soldier- should he expose himself to more difficult positions in battle, and in fact he was killed. Why did Buber say it like this? He may have wanted it to sound more dramatic, or maybe he didn’t want ppl to realize that he was pro-war. Everybody we now was pro war. Except a socialist leader of france, who was assicinated. Freud was into it. the only person who was anti war was Isaac Brueur. They underestimated how long it would take. They felt a war every few years build characters. Herbert Cohen wrote an open letter to Jews in America how they should support Germany as it’s a nation of Kant and that’s a Jewish philosify. Cark Bart was anti war. The De’es atten- the dark day, when 90 theologens published a pro-war manifesto. At that moment I understood that 19th century liberalizm has no future with me, and I can no longer understand the bbible, G-d, Jesus the way they did. That’s where, in 1922, Bart is overturning 19th century prodestant theology. By 1916, buber is anti-war. Cohen died during the war. Buber in 1916 responds to Cohen and is anti-war. We’re jewish, why would be going to war. (Scholem was a kid at the time, but was also anti war). So maybe buber wanted to shroud his original ideas of pro-war. (Shcolem was antizionist)

Buber was into mysitcal experience, but that incident initiated a process where he rejected mysticism in favor of something more “ethical”.

This is background of “I and Thou” (book by buber? In reading?)

In 1920’s, teaches in Frankfurt, popular lecturer in general taught in Frankfurt Lau House, a project of Franz Rosensweig. In 20s also translated bible to German with Rosensweig. Translation is interesting. Bubers writing’s on Tanach, the Rav quoted those writings in private. Never quotes buber as a philosofer. Necham Leibowitz quotes buber. Beino Jacob (Reform Rabbi) Nechama also quoted him. So ppl thought he wasn’t a bad reform Rabbi. He was anti biblical chritism. Nechama- no, he was one of the worst reform rabbis, but I quote buber too, there are certain keilim that he adds, so too Jacob. No hechsher.

In the 30s, hitler comes to power, buber remains in Germany. Somebody had to be there for the German Jews, and the cultural acitivites between 33 and 1938, many jews became cloer to yidishkeit. WWI brought german orthodox jews in contact with “authentic” orthodox jews from the east. RShRH planned a yeshiva in Frankfurt and it never opened, but in the 20s, it opened. After Hitler, it became exentuated, because ppl had to deal with it. buber was part of the intillectual activity at the time.

Anecdote- someone at Berlin doing doctorate, had chassidish background. (Heschel)Heschel had a problem in Berlin. In german university, u had to publish ur thesis. Heschel wrote an early version on the prophets. Needed a publisher, but Hitler was in power. Shoken sent to Buber, and he didn’t like it. Dean of U of B was referred to as Dean Fourfoot (Feerfus) his academic qualifications, he was a veterenarian. The idea that the dean should be a vet, ok, he was a good Nazi. He writes to HEschel- Dear Mr Heschel, we sympathize with ur situation, that u cant find a publisher. So I’m giving u a 6 month extention. Hail Hitler…. 6 months later, we’re giving u a nother 6 months. HH…. 6 months later: Dear Mr Heschel, we cannot keep giving u extensions forever, but I think we’ve got a solution, the rules are that u have to publish with a German publisher, we’ll make an exception, if u find a decent academic publisher out side of Germany, we’ll move ahead. Buber held up Heschel’s career that way. The two worked together until 1938, until it was impossible,, Buber went on Aliya and wanted to teach at Hebrew U- where? Bible? He’s an apikores. Hebrew U’s agreement with R Kook was no bible dept. R Dovid Zvi Hoffman wasn’t in Israel- why cant they have two depts? Catholic dept and prodestant? Or a frum and not-frum. Ay, isnt there a tradition when R Kook wept when he disscovered they were teaching bibcliacl criticim at Hebwr U, then R Carmy reached the conclusion that its true- in 1990, in the mid republic library- a yidish newspaper. The newspaper was open to a remebrance to R Hutner’s 10th yarzeheit. So R Carmy wanted to read it. in a certain way, the Chaim Berlin myth of R Kook was that R Kook had no sense of reality, and that’s how he was kasher enough that R Hutner learned by him, but they don’t have to be goress him. R Hutner was in R Kook’s home when r Kook discovered Prof Terhchinor was teaching biblical criticms, and r Kook wept, as they had lied to him. R Carmy- Torchyner? There was no bible before 1941, and they only had ancient near east and parshanut. So when R Kook was alive, no bible. Torchyner wasn’t in the bible dept, he taugh Hebrwe language. He was a bible critic. Heres the kicker, there's no way that the talmid from Chaim Berlin would know this. R Hhutner would know who torchyner was, not the writer in yidish. Doubt it. using torchyner by name is proof.

Buber- couldn’t be put in bible, and would be passul anyways. Phylosofy? Hebrew U was small- and lots of high qualified people were teaching high school. He wasn’t a serious phylosofer. He ended up in sociology. To his credit, what he did was impressive. He was 60 and had a rep, and told to teach a field that wasn’t really his field. He actually did it. it was philosofical soc. Not imperial, ok. Social philosofy, but it impresses R Carmy that even when R Carmy was younger- someone who’s written and published a lot and told to teach new courses that he didn’t teach before, that’s impressive. Did a decent job.

Buber was dubbish- he insisted that zionist congress has to settle the east side of the jordan. Sounds militant. But in relation with arabs, he was vary dubbish. Brit shalom included the president- magnus- german jews in hebrew u. buber was opposed to Jewish state. In late 40s argued that there shuld be binational state.

It’s a confession of weakness to say we cant live with the arabs, but also \_\_\_\_\_\_

Mahatma gandi- against partition of india. Hindus and muslim shouls live together. In 1930s, Gandhi- Jews shouldn’t resists Hitler, be passive. The problem with mice is that they fight the cat. If the mice just stood there and said u do whatever u please, we’re resisting passive,the cats would lose interest. I think this requires a bilogy course. Buber disagreed with that. Gandhi also held Jews had no budiness demanding Israel. Remain in Germany. The british in indiea are like english in india. Gandhi- and if u get killed, ur religious, the olam haba is better anyways. Buber wrote to Gandhi about what Israel means for Jews. 15 years later, when Gahndi was gonna die, Buber writes we should have a commonwealth. Switzerland, ugoslavia. Lebanon. See how it works out there. In the 50s, Buber was a guru for left wing zionists. The peace movement. A person became obsessed it yaruk chazon. He is a baal teshuva runs the sheleim center. An important right wing think tank. Journal called Azhur.

Buber dies. We’ll get to more biography stuff when we discuss I and though.

26/10/11

Missed 5 mintues

Sholem- kicked out of father’s house (why?\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_)

Nothing Jewish is alien to me. Meaning including a lot of things that ppl had rejected, most importnatnly kabalala. 19th century Jewish scholars were embarassed by kabalal. Supersticius., irrational. Sholem thought there was conspiratcy at work trying to hide kabala. Hashkafically, he had a desire to say I’m including all Jewish culture, and I’m not selecting what part looks good for the Jews and whats bad. He was also attracted to Shabtai Zvi who scandalized Jewish thought.

Sholem was at Hebrew U, became chair of JPh of kabala and was a sort of dictator there. Very powerful personality. Had a great deal of impact on the non-Jewish world too. Influenced ppl important in German culture.

There's a turning point in Buber’s thinking- traces dramatically to experience. Whatever it was “I and Thou” in the opening gambit, Buber denies the existance of the eye in the abstract. The eye always exists in relationship. Mennice Flohr claims Buber is driven by classical metaphysical problemss- how do u know anyone else exists. So he’s still bothered by such isssues. Whether or not that’s true, he’s certainly addressing certain social philosofical problems. There's a lot of ppl in the street who think “I’m here, and then the Q is what relationship is there btwn me and anything else. There's a gap between me and u and there's some kind of vector to connect the two of us. This may bother ppl in percieving external objects. Or specifically, perceieving ppl. The relationship is prior to the self. There is never an “I” just sitting there. There are two kinds of relationship. I it and I thou. Most relationships are I-it. as far as I’m concerened, the table is there to serve certain purposes. There are no personal relationships with the table. Its useful, made of metal. Most of the time, ppl are the same. But there can be an I-thou relationship. Relate to the other as a person. He knows this as certain philosofers arent good thinkers, but good at describing things. What defines the I-Thou, is that a thou makes demands of you. I ask myself what should I do for you. The table doesn’t want anything from me. That claim, that the other makes upon me is what invokes the I-thou. This is very different from \_\_\_\_. Theyre both experiences that ppl consider important. Maslow spoke of peak experiences. Uplifting experience. Ppl think it gives meaning to ur life. So mysticim is the same sort of thing. A vision of angels dancing around me. U might consider that to be what life is all about. That’s not an I-Thou relationship, because mysitcal contemplation doesn’t make any demands on you. I thou is less vulnerable to fantacy. Involves real encounters. Mysiticism might make u feel good but its not I-thou relationships.

Buber is making a value judgement. recall the man who came to speak to buber who Buber wasn’t really there for him. That’s a move from mysicism to an ethical approach. You can use the word “love” too for this kind of relationship. Buber points out that hatred may have just as strong an I-thou relationship. Its easy to confuse buber with Kant.

Kant has the notion that one must (this is his fundamental ethical principle) always treat other rational beings as ends in themselves, never merely as means. Merely implies that still, Kant is realistic that ppl help us get ahead.

Buber is talking about a personal relationship. Its not about me and rational beings, its about me and you. Its an experience. For Kant, its an inference. Kant claims that there are certain duties that we owe other humans, and ur a human, therefore u come under that principle. that’s different than saying that I have experience with u and therefore act in a certain way. Kant is building a system of ethics. Appealing to my intillectual judgement. For buber, we start with an experience, which involves with starting with a … buber is describing a relationship. It doesn’t impose a duty on you. He’s saying that there can be situations when there are i-thou. He must hold that I-thou is good.

Buber, biographically, is starting with mysticism and then shifts to ethics- this makes u a better person in terms of social relationships. Ur a Dr and walk down the street and come across someone in epileptic shock, or cholera, hay fever, and you feel that the sick person is reaching out to you. If ur not a Dr, u might feel it as well. U feel the demand. Does that mean u have any friendship with that person? Absolutely not. U may spend 2 hours helping him, and 5 hours later u wouldn’t recognize the person.

Maybe Buber’s dichotomy is overly sharp and unrealistic. For Buber, its not a relationship that ppl can will into existence. Most people don’t have it. its not like u can decide. In Kant, it’s a duty. I promise to treat u in a certain way. That’s a demand I make on myself. In buber, there's spontenuity. Its like the holiwood conception of love. Ppl are bashert. Ur ina crowded room and suddenly, u see the enchanted stranger.

For buber, there has to be reciprocity, mutuality. There's good reason for saying it: if a relationship is from top to bottom, its not eye to eye, its paternalistic. I am powerful and you’re not. There can be relationships where ppl engage on those relationships. So Buber addresses parent-child: vary often there is mutuality, because the parents get as much out of it as the kids do. It really does even out.

Can you really say that the relationship is equal on both sides at any given moment? There's a romantic illusion that it is, but if it isnt, (buber doesn’t want one sided reltaionshjip, Hagels master slave relationship) so Buber leaves problems open. So relationship has to be spontaneous, mutual. That means that the relationship is fragile.

In autobiographical passages in readings, Buber tells that he grew up on a farm, and on that farm he had a horse. Buber had a relationship with the horse. He stroked, and groomed the horse. It was I –thou. Spontaneous. They both got a great deal out of it. one day he started thinking about it- its no longer spontaneous. Kirkegard did this in his novel repetition. A Danish man visited Berlin and wanted to have the same experience the second time. And its not the same the second time. Constancies Constancious sais he wanted repitition and instead got recollection. U get this in comidies where in I Love Lucy, there's a typo in the marriage certificate and Lucy isnt really married to Ricky, and Ricky checks it out with Lawyers and its nothing, but Lucy wants to get married aggain- dress the same way and repeat the same thing. For entertainment value, in real life, there can be charm in it, but ur deluding urself if u think that that’s deep.

So the magic was lost. U cant build ethichs from these experiences. There are billions of ppl with whom I don’t have this relationshjip. What can I do abuot it? In yahadut, even emotions can be obligatory. I’m supposed to feel commitment to this person, and I know at a certain level its artificial. Even the deepest relationships, even themost abiding, unfragile, are very deep. There is something interesting abuot the human condition. Buber- u can marry a person, ur feelings change, doesn’t mean u stop changing the way u act. I thou is a rare state of mind.

RCarmy- how do u build an ethic out of this. Bechol zot, how do u live? R Carmy tried to avoid it and made it a description. There's an analogy between I thou and another important spiritual phenominon familiar to christians and prodestants- salvation thru devine providence. U do mitzvos and u think ur accomplishing? Nah, I can only achieve thru divine grace, open myself to it, and be able to achieve.

Buber- Zionism- there is I thou btnw Jewish ppl and EY, but he doesn’t really describe that in his books. We can sometimes not imply relationship- we’re arriving on the train in 10 minutes. or We can mean collective identity.

Viewing the I thou relationship- Kant- u can will the relationship. Morality is about making moral judgements adherent. Ask a litvuck- I thou- learn torah, lishma, don’t bother me with this german stuff. But if u do care about that- then its this prodestand theology. The other tzas hashaveh is that neither is halacha friendly.

Prussion theologian- Rinol Neiber. As a prodesdant, grace wasn’t the issue, but it troubled him that his type of prodestnantism didn’t deal well with down to earth ethical matters. Its much better at making ppl tzadikim than making ppl behave nicely. If u study catholic or Jewish writing, it might improve the quality of prodestant mentality. But Buber was running to those elemtnes that were running to the overly extreme elemetns of prodestant.

I thou is for beyond animals, and for plants. Wheres the mutuality in a plant? Ok, a little weird. WH Auden, a friend of Neiber, wrote a short poem “Martin Buber never said thou to a tuber despite his creed, he never felt the need.” Its funny, because anything in the non-animal world, houseplants is one tihng, but relationship with a potatoe is. “neither did the tuber say thou to buber, whatever its creed, raises for the need. Normally, Ithou is the best. Wrt animals, who do we leave out. Inanimate objects are left out, but so is G-d. that will prepare us to relate this to Yahadus, and what kind of ethic can be derived from all of this.

31/10/11

Sacrifice for people doesn’t necessarily mean ur relating to the person. Some like being preoccupied with their own self sacrifice. We should be aware of that. That’s Buber’s reciprocity. If I love someone it doesn’t have to be reciprical. Even if it balances out over 50 years, it can be in theory one sided at any one time, and its stilled a love. (if I love u, what business is it of yours). If ur life focuses on non-human relationships, then the chances of deception can be extremely great.

The woman who gave the chimp wine to drink, 200 lbs monkey ripped a woman’s face off. There a danger when u start thinking of animals in those terms.

What about G-d- lichora, the same danger should apply. I’m not living a self-centered life. I have no use for u, but I’m close to G-d. in real life, forget about buber, we think in those terms. I’m full on love. Only to G-d.

On the other hand. G-d is very important. What we mean by G-d is another story. Buber was concerned that G is an abstraction, and is difficult to use G in its tradiional sense. Not important for us now. Buber solves this by speaking of G as an internal center. The image would be- take a cirlce, and there are points on the circumfrance. The points are attached to eachother and are involved with the cirlce. U might have a relationship with the points, and also with the center. That kesher isnt exclusive.

Meshech chochma in emor- moadot. Unity of klal yisrael not dimished in any way. Everyone revolving around center and connected to the middle. Existentially, religious peoplpe don’t feel ben adam lachaveros competes with ben adam lamamkom. (also end of Taanis) With humans, there's competition between ppl. AA is having spiritual time with H, and 3 ppl show up so he tells H to wait. Sounds disrespectful. But the idea is that its not really snubbing G-d.

But heres 2 arguments against that: the first one has nothing to do with buber, the second one brings us back to buber.

1. There is a tention – and when I’m doing chesed, I’m not commited to the other, ‘I’m just obeying G-d. when I help an old lady across the street its just a mitzvah. I have no more an eye to eye relationship with a human being, than I do with a lulav. Some religious ppl think like this.
   1. Rashba- no bracha on adam lachavero- cause it would mafkia the human element. Its not only just cause H commanded, rather becase there is also value in dealing with the other peole
   2. Note also, Yechiel Wienberg- late 19th cent. Died 1960s. Sridei Esh. Studied in slabodka. Later went to germany. Headed hildesheim yeshiva. Beit midrash/orthodox rabbinical seminary. Required to have a university degree. They were taught scholarship in the seminary. Mark Shapiro couldn’t find R Yehiel’s doctorate, but it was on targumim. Important figure in terms of Rosh Yeshiva and strong background in academia. When the seminary closed, he was arrested and taken to a pleasant concentration camp, survived. “Are there other Jews around?” he was broken and lived lasat 20 years in switzerland. Teshuvot sridei esh- things that survived the fire. Includes some of his academic writing. Anyways- is there a bracha on mishloach manot- tarti desasri- ur doing out of friendship and would undermine the mitzvah. So its clear that there no perception of contradiction. A bracha would mean that u don’t care about the person.
      1. Avel cant give gifts. To be yotzi mishloach manos, give a gift to one person. No more than one. So ur really doing it as an obligation. But in real life, it’s a human relationship.
2. Back to Buber- within yahadut, there are situations wher obligation to G-d conflict. Off hand, if everything is personal relationship, so if abstract morality, then u can work out a system, where if u ought to do x, then even if it’ll make someone unhappy, u have no commitment to that person. If my obligation is to spend time w u, I don’t have to spend time with him. R Carmy holds that u can have ehtical comflicts. But Buber sais everything grows from personal relationships, there can be conflicts. In yahadut, there's possibiliy of such conflicts. Walking down the street on shabbos and non-jews playing ball and u throw it back or stop it and let them get it themselves. Or something as complicated as the akeida. Buber avoids this. Buber can agree that ppl’s relationships are functions of relationship to G. But he doesnt tihnk it makes sense that hard and fast rules can be applied to relationships.
3. Kant would say “morality is agaisnt this. I don’t care if ur G-d or a devil” Kantian has faith in reason. Buber- “I don’t care, its wrong.” He’s just a liberal. Halacha can contradict human values and at the same time be legally binding. If someone told me to kill my son as a religious act, so lets see if that person is a navi. In jewish framework, in prinicple, H makes demands, but it has to be mediated thru legal framework. Or u could have someone who could say that if H makes demands, u lsiten to G. Haberwas: who am I to stop u from killing for G-d. Halacha- even if G-d speaks to u, mehecha teisi ur right. Its shocking so think twice before u do it. there's two vectors involved- divine ocmmand vs other ethics. And then how do u do morral reasoning, is it a framework or spontaneity. Buber on 10 commandments- not absolute duty, Buber would say that the authors of the Torah heard G-d and the 10C are their interpretations. Approx obligation. How does Buber produce an ethic? Out of experience we distill some kind of daily rules to live by. I don’t kill u because of the eye to eye relationship, and I don’t kill someone from there, because I can extrapolate to a general rule and it wont be absolute.
   1. Herman Cohen’s unorthodox approach- a Kantian- revelation is identical with reason. G revealing the 10 Cs, its means humans discovered what is rational. Bubuer sitn commited to rationaluty so he goes back to experience. Cohen has reason and traditional religion, “the religion of reason from the sources of judaism”. For Cohen, lo tirtzach is absolute, not because G said it, but its ethical. Buber would extrapolate it. in terms of astehtic judgement, I have some ideas- looking at a nude painting. If I’m coming “horny” then I’m not really looking at it the right way. If I have a headache also. Or if I’m thinking about my relationship with the painter. A critic, most of the time theyre not in astetic mode, they just have a certain idea, and can figure out the quality even not in the mood, so I don’t murder even when I’m not in the mood, and I can build a foundation of ethic from that. (buber). But when there's conflicts, like mechiyas amalelk or confrontations shmuel and shaul, Buber sais that shmuel must have missunderstood G. Kant would respond to a voice in ur head to kill “I don’t know who u are. I know what ethics is, and this voice is telling me to kill, but I dunno” 19th century work revolving around akeida- “Fear and Trembling” Kierkegard. Took it very seriously. “teleological suspension of the ethical.” Teleological – for a purpose. Suspension isnt abrogation. Ethics are still applicable. Yitzchak is still a person. He’s not wood. So Avraham was right, and Kirkegard even satirizses the more conventional approeach. “either AA did the right thing, or he was psychopath. U cant reject what he did and take him still as a model.” Clearly, akeda isnt a normal daily thing according to kierkegard. Btw, Kierkegard got engaged and then broke it. u could say it was ethical, doing her a favor. For kierkegard, being ehtihcal was connected to leading a conventional social life. Marriage and regular employment are normal. (“Either Or” V. II) after the broken engagement, before she married her original boyfriend. During Buber’s time, there was preoccupation with kierkegard’s biographical life- kierkegard had his own akeida. In her 80s, that lady gave interviews and sais that kierkagard devoted self to religious writing, and when kierkegard died, he left his stuff to her.
      1. In his diary, he wrote “if I had believed /trusted G, I woulda stayed with her. In buber, that means that conflict between ethical and religious is wrong. What K really meant, it woulda meant he gave up his son and woulda gotten him back. Buber “the Q of the single one/exception”. (a halachist woulda asked who paskened) Buber thinks k is wrong cause there's a dicotomy and that could never happen. But come on, it can happen. U can have a cohen who falls in love with gioret, she makes him frum, and they’re about to get married. But a halacha is a halacha. This is where Buber and halacha go in different directions. Buber had no use of halacha whatsoever.
      2. 3 stories: 1) buber didn’t take YK seriously. 2) buber had a frum friend (agnon) who dragged him to shul on RH. 3) buber also raised his grandchildren. When they were young, he made kiddush every Friday night. Held seder, and left out shfoch chamascha. Then he stopped. Why is this interesting? Cause ud think that even if ur not frum, it would become part of u, but once they grew up, it didn’t mean anything to him. Sais something abuot his view of halacha.
      3. So what did he hold of human relationships? He assumes deep relationships are fragile and momentary. Seems to be no middle ground. Walter Kaufman translated Nietchze and Hagel. Was shomer mitzvot in his 1930s. at princeton. Not a good analytic philosofer. He translated I and thou. (I and you) he sais that buber never had an eye and thou relationship. Its too airy fairy and they talked to buber and they agreed.
         1. Philosofically interesting story- buber in US lectured at Penn, Malcom Diamond (scholar of religion at princton) asked Buber a Q after the lecture. Buber said, that was a serious Q, I wanna make sure I’m really listening, so he left the podium and sat next to him in the crowd. So that’s terrifying. If the Rav had said that, he woulda done that if the Q was stupid. Either buber didn’t know what he was doing or he was putting on a show. So Buber seems to have something not eye to eye.
         2. Another maaseh- Chaim Cohen, a chassid of Buber- wrote about a female student in 1940s. she was in hagana. Once she had to meet Buber in morning and came from guard duty. Hadnt eaten nor slept. 10am. Buber’s wife came out with coffee and cake for him. And she felt resentful. Subsequently, at snack time, Buber understood that there was something wrong, so he arranged that his wife call him into kitchen so he could eat there. Girl said Buber was talking to her and mentioned that he was wealthy in germany, and now he lives barely off his salary. Someone active in skokie, an old man- in the 1930s, he was in NY sent by skokie to transmit something and ask s/t from RMHS. No matter what he sais don’t eat or drink, because anything he offers u is out of the mouths of his family. (feel free to go into RC’s fridge)
         3. Upbeat story about buber told by an orthodox person. Michael wishered- Friday night dinner at JTS, and some others too. Buber was staying at 59th, JTS is 120’s. near columbia. How will Buber get back to the hotel. Non of the JTSers were ready to admit that they were carrying money. So there was a standoff. Buber is standing there, and was sure that one of the JTSers woulda given him taxi money. Buber broke the standoff- “its shabbos- u wouldn’t have money on shabbos. So he starts walking and the 30 start walking with him. It started raining. And they all walked down 60 blocks.
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Rosenzweig- born Dec 25 1886. Born 2 a very assimilated family, but he had some Jewish education, if u see his letters at 5 years old. Unlce that kept kosher. Certainly didn’t go to shul often. Cassel in Germany. Started as premed, switched to philosophy.

At 20 years old, pre war, 20th century, several members of his fam converted to Christianity. There is a lengthy letters between him and his cousin Eugine Rosentook-Hensy- Judaism Despite Christianity. So there was an intillectual pressure of him to convert. Its not easy for us to figure out that, so this might be slightly speculative. Judaism didn’t speak to Rosensweig’s modern world, but Chrisitainity did.

Hegel, German philosofer 1770-1839. Had a philosofy of history. Philosofy is inherantly historical. The history of philosofy is a history about arguments. No more relvant to him than history of other things to other fields. Many analytic philosofers think that way. Continental philosoefers are much more focused on how it unfolded. For Hegel, philosofy is the history of philosofy. Astetics the history of thinking about are. Dialectic- terms in argument change their meaning during the argument.

The process of discussing changes the philosfy. Each position forces u to reevaluate the question and build one on the other. U have to understand that progress. That’s hegel. Dialectics and hietory is important. If u ask Hegel what he thinks about judaism, he’ll tell u that it belongs 2000 years ago. Focuses on moral concepts of duty and its been superceded.

A non-Jew’s thinking of Judaism- did he think about the Jews in his own time or only about those 200 years before? Hegel had Jewish friends and students but it might not effect his philosofy. Hegel thought of Judaism as something that happened 2000 years ago. Nietchze thought about tanacha and about how it fit into this world. AND What about Rabbinic Judaism? Historical judaism still ended after Jesus showed up, so these philosofers may have been unaware of what elese was going on. For example, If u meet a zooloo chieften today, so either he’s a decendant and a vestage of another world, or he went to oxford and he’s one of us. Hegel was involved in the dialetic so he saw it as evolving. A second ansewr why christianity is more modern- it relates to eh political world, so its important in that sense- how the world unfolds. History of the world- Hegel started in China, but stopped 2000 yrs ago, greek, Jewish, mai dehava hava. So where is the real world? The West, and cultural is moving there. We’re not talking abuot a side tributary. That’s another strike against judasim. Its gone for 2000 years, and even if its not gone, its in galut.

A german profesor wasn’t a melamed, he was an officer of the state and it was about his relationship to the state and the universtity. There was catholic and protedstant theology departments. The kesher betwn Dpts of philosfy and history, a german prof of history is a servant to the state, which serves to grandise of culture of state. A gemara rebbi in highschool has to represent the school otherwise u don’t hire him. Herman Cohen was the first unbaptized jew to teach philosfy at a german universtiy. Academic freedom in america is was a big chidush.

**So from Hegels perspective, Judaism is irrevelant. Rosenzweig is interested in religion and his fam too, and the one to be is christianity. 1912- Rosenzweig was ready to convert. Then he learnt a strange pshat in NT, where St Paul said “In christ, there is neither Jew nor Gentile” and R understood there are two paths to christianity. There's the one who comes from paganism, and the one that converts from Judaism. And the pagans don’t have to become Jews first. R understood that it meant that if ur a Jew, u have to cmoe to Christ as a Jew, and since he hadnt been involved in Judasim until then, so he decided he had to leap into christianity with Judaism. So decided to go to shul at the liberal temple. Mom said no, everyone knows ur converting. So he went off to berlin, and accordning to legend, he went to a shtebel there- really he went to a Modern Orthodox shul. Somehoe after YK, something had happened, he writes a letter to cousin, I have discovered that it is possible to remain Jewish, and if its possible, it is necessary.**  “Judaism Depsite Christianity”

Why would it suddenly become relevant? Is it that he’s trying to overcome Hegel and say that there's life in the old bones? Did he reject Hegels way of tihnking completely.

Btw, there's one more point about Hegel- before he became Hegel, he wrote 4 essays as “early theological writings on religious issues” we’ll get back to that maybe. Hegel blossomed when he was 35. Became prof at 45. Early 30s wrote some essays. R read those essays 100 years after they were discovered. Ok, so he’s 26 working on his doctoriate and on Hegel and Shell. Then comes a war (WWI) and he served as a medical orderly on the eastern front. Ugoslavia to poland. Many jews encoutered authentic jews in the course of the war. Isaac breuer rubbed elbows with polish jews and that was part of the experience for R.

Also, he wrote the star redemption during the war. His major work. After war, came back. Minake katobin- ur doctorate is so good, u could get a job as prof philosofy in German U. No. I wanna do something Jewish. Minika wrote to someone and said R is depressed because Germany lost the war. R did 2 things of Jewish nature. He married Jewish. (but had a relationship with a non-Jewish woman too). He founded the Frankfurt Lehrhous- lecture house. A Lehrhous is supposed to recreate authentic Jewish study. We need less lectures and more dialogue in beis midrash. Not talking about judaism but doing Judaism.

Buber taught there, R taught there. Nechemya Nobel (orthodox) taught there. In lincoln square, their adult education was named after it.

In early 1920s, something happened that altered his tragectory- lu gherigs disease. Initially it progressed rapidly and then slowed down. When it slowed down, he had 5 or 6 years left, during which he was paralyzed, unable to speak. He had a special cage to keep his head up. Had a pipe in his mouth to drain saliva. Unable to write. Communicated by using his hand. Then blinking.

Worked on bible translation during that time with Buber. He wrote some essays. Letters. He told jokes.

Chana Rabina- founder of Tel aviv theoater company. Visited R and talked about Zionism. He was trying his best, but one letter at a time, u cant. It limits u.

Rivka Horowitz once spoke about R and then Yeshaya Leibowitz got up and mentioned how difficult that had to be and then that his philosophy was garbage.

Died at 43 in 1929. Learned Gm at night. Why? Simple. When u learn gm u don’t have to turn the pages that often, so the person who turns pages can go to sleep between turns. He woulda wanted to write a work later in life which incoporated things he know understood. He wasn’t orthodox, had a particular view of halacha. At the end of his life, there werent too many averos he could do.

Ok, lets talk about his book the Star of Redemption. He wrote a book to make it help ppl understand his first book. The book was published in English in late 1950s “understanding the sick and healthy” but its really called “the sick and [the] healthy understanding”

Mashal- Lets say u have a paralyzed person taken to mountains to be cured. TB was the common one. TB was called Jewish Asthma. The magic mountain- famous novel from 1922 about this idea. There are 3 mountains. U go up one mountain. On top u can see all three mountains. What happens on the way up? U got around and around. Then u see #2, then #3, and at the top u can see all three at the same time.

Nimshal- there are 3 elements (building blocks) of the world. Man, G-d, and world. How do u get those three? Look at the world and ull see it. bad philosofy would focus on one and reduce it to that one. A better philosofy would compare the relationship of man and G, mand and World, etc. The best philosofy would be at the top of the mountain when u compare all three toeghetr. Empiricism- metaphysical puricism. Don’t reduce to smaller things. Not a reductionist.

The opening of the book states that all philosofy is an attmept to escape from death. Philosofers have tried to escape death by finding an element beyond perishable. Like, u can escape death by studying math. Its not true. (Kierkegard was translated and became popular in germany in early 20th century and became popular.) heidiger knew little abuot rosenzweig.

Chompenheimer (what is the value of the world for me), neitzeh, kierkegard. These are importnant for R. ok, if a philosofy is good, it has to have all 3 pillars.

Part I of the book- theme: ways of thinking that take one element as ultimate. Pantheistic- reduce the world to G-d. Materialistic rules of world. Subjective rules that are human. R develops a grammer of each type of isolated philosfy, dicusses literature and ecxamples.

Part II- brings each building block in contact with eachother. H’s relationship to world- “creation”. H’s kesher to man- “revelation”. Man kesher to world – “redemption. Makes a triangle. Gets to a discussion of shir hashirim. Discussin Jewish tihngs. It makes a magen david. And that may be why its called star of remeption.

Part III is on the mountaintop and ur able to inegrate all 3 elemtns at once. There are two different modes of intergrating all three elemtns. 1) star of judaism… but 2) also christianity deals with it. C is given a privilaged position. Recall where we stand in terms of R and Hegel and J and C. so he remains a Hegelian, (Kierkegard woulda thrown Hegel out the window and say only the individual matters) R cares about historical issues.

The book is very complex and got it from Hagel. Not empiracle.

Eisen ( a fellow) wrote a book relating R to astestics and how he can be viewed as part of artisitc revolution of 20th cent.

Read Glazer Anthology. Selections from part III of star of redemption. Letters and documents.
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Missed 30 minutes

Rosensweig and symbolizm of star of David- stabile Cross is moving. Captures insites in a complex way. Two equal religions with one being more equal than the other. (Islam is a religion of divine power of G-d with no room for man) Judaism and Christianity have Torashpbpe and ksav. And christianity had old and new testament. Islam has only one law. When u mention rosensweig in the street, ppl think he was good for J & C dialogue, too bad he was close minded about Islam. But rosensweig had different opinion of Islam bedavka.

Peter Gorder wrote a book comparing Heidiger and Rosensweig. Hegel’s early theological writings is anti chrisitian, and one of his complaints about the C is that Jesus is unhistorical. This was picked up by Nazi ideologists. They gave the picture that Germany is not Christian. Christianity is a cosmopolitan disembodied teaching. The Christians managed too put a thin venere over the good old pagan christians, but it doesn fit. A german christian is like a dog wearing a rain coat. You can do it, but that’s not a real dog. Other dogs know it. those poodles would be somewhat ashamed of themselves. That’s what christianity did to europe. “fortunate to the catholic church, cause otherwise Judaism woulda taken over europe even worse.”

So if we examine Judaism to christianity, to Hegel, its like Christianity to the world. The Jews are a Jesus figure. The Jesus is at the center of history, Europe is not. The Jews are the the center of history, Christinanity is no. This may be how Rosensweig came to his conclusions.

Notice the calandar- both have a shabbos (Sunday) and both have 3 regalim. Pesach Shvuos, succos,.Christmas, easter, pentacost (50 days after easter) when the holy spirit decended upon the ppl of the church and they were inspired to speak in tongues. Our 3 regalim (creating, revalation, )Pesach is creation- am zu yatzarti. Shavuos is revelation, succot the ultimate redemption. (see the haftaros of succot). Another triad- davening on shabbos- vayechulu- creation. Shacharis is revalation- luchot avanim horid beyado. Mincha –redemption- ata echad. Rosensweig sais it but the Tur said it before him. For Christians- Christmas – Jesus is born. Easter is redemption, and pentacost is the revalation to the people. There's this isomorphism between J and C. what didn’t we talk about? RH and YK. There's no YK corresponding date (according to Rosensweig). Hey, recall Rosensweig was inspired by YK, but he didn’t write about it. So that may be key to Rosensweig. YK has no connection to history- we’re outside of history. We don’t involve ourselves in anything relating to this world. The kotzker – who needs to eat.

YK is significant- all philosofy is to escape from death- right? And YK is about not being part of this world. We bow down on YK.

Q: in the real world, you don’t have religions, u have people. So on YK, we’re malachim. The rest of the time, it sounds rediculous. Ur not part of the world? We’re perfect? We all know we struggle the same as anyone else. So there r two dinim. Human being- Jew is different than everyone else. Then if u ask what it means to live as a Jew, ur living a double life- as a human, ur like everyone else, but in this religious space, u divest urself of humanity. That’s a difficult position to take. Then we can take it a step further- Yahadut has a religion that has a land that nobody lives in. Galut situation is a norm. Rosensweig thinks that Galut is the real Jewish Experience. (opposite of Hegel who thought Judaism ended when that period left)

Biblical judaism is one thing- when C divides off, there's a new din in Judaism, and C occupies part of that space. But Rosensweig didn’t use that kind of language, as it overstates the gap between yahadut and biblical judaism. It would make C very central, as it reshuffles the deck.

Rosensweig isnt a zionist. He’s not an antizionist. A funny position. Recall the woman from habima- she came to argue with Rosensweig about that issue. On the other hand there's a letter in the readings where he writes that u have to hand it to Tel Aviv, that the shutters go down and shabbos starts- and nothings going on. With all the orthodoxy in frankfurt, we don’t have that. This is different than Herman Cohen who thinks Zionism is selfishness- “Those bumbs want to be happy. What does religion have to do with happiness.” Cohen was a kantian- being ethical etc will do it for you.

This positon of history – Lev Bronstein (Leo Tratsy) Lenon’s first governemtn- someone once said to him he’s not interested in marxist dialected. Trotsky told him “ u may not be interested in the dialectic, but the dialectic is interested in you” and a zionist could say to rosensweig- u may not be interested in history, but history may be interested in you. Emel Fakenheim said this- he was a reform Rabbi. Ended up in Toronto.

Interesting historain filosofy focused on hegel but had Jewish ideas. Fakenheim was a zionist. Wrote an essay about roesnweig. “the Jewish return into history” u know, J was outside of hisotry for 2000 yrs, but then the holocoast and state of Israel changed that. What happened in the holocaust was that rosensweig was refuted imperically. The notion that history would come and go and we wouldn’t take center stage, its not true- history was interested in us. In the big Q- hegel was right and Rosensweig was wrong.

When the Rav met Began, so he asked a shaaloh- about commemorating the holocaust- so we’re in agreement that it shold be integrated into 9 of Av. From Fakenheims point of view, Hegel was wrong about optimism, a summary- the religios dimension of hegel’s philosofy- the opening few pages he writes that Hegel was wrong about optimism, but wrt the machlokes with Rosensweig- there's no such thing about being outside of history, and jiudaism is \_\_\_\_

The YK issue captures the hashkafa- recall- philosofy is to escape death, and YK refutes death by setting up eternity. We saw how C out of the way and Jis the goal. And we want to know how that effects the way Jews live. That raises some complications.

In his 3rd part, there are some other interesting pieces of drush- the christion is always young, the Jew is always old. (One side of the coin is old and one is old- it’s a gemara) ppl think of Jews as old and christians as the young athelete- Ein hachi nami. But ppl in America don’t think this anymore. But maybe 50 years ago. Werent there old christians back then? Well, did u see them on telivision. Christians on TV had no grandparents.

Do you think Abe Simpson is prodestant like Revrerend Lovejoy? You think Jews are young nowadays and goyim are old- go to predestant church and u see old ppl walking out.

Shul Vs Church- in church, (prodestnat) minister stands in front, and the community is down there and he lectures to them the word of G. By Jews, the bima is in the center, and who reads the Torah? Every person goes up and has an aliya. In church the minister speaks and the community keeps quiet. In shul, ppl have constant converstaions during davening. There's an interesting sociology in this.

Btw, we can also say that Rosensweig is bad for dialogue (Leora Batninsky) because Judaism has nothing to learn from Christianity, so Rosensweig is similar to GridHLS. Postions are incommensurable. There's no standard to compare them. C is not true as J is true. The star redemption is kind of even handed. He’s vague and writes like a german philosofer.

We still have to question halacha in rosensweig.
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Where does Rosensweig fall on Halacha? On one level he’s not far from Buber- psuedo quasi existentialist notion that u have a relationship to G-d and get a stage of life based on that encounter. For Rosensweig is a more national encouter. But at the same time, whenever he reads dayenu, he thinks of Buber. Buber would say “dayenu- what do we want halacha for” so Rosensweig wants halacha, but maybe not want it to be obligatory. In star of redemption R distinguishes btwn ways of approaching halacha- gezeezt (something u put to people, or “law” and gebot is less like a command and more like an invitation or to “bid”. In German, they use d’s instead of t’s sometimes. Like “open the window” vs “would you want to open the window”. So laws of Torah are diff than political and secular law. Laws are laws, but laws of torah flows out of th erelationshiop- like Buber- gebod. Buber, however, wasn’t interesetd in keeping halacha. Rosensweig IDed much more with traditional Jewish practice, he believed that communities means something. More in favor of shmiras hamitzvos and indescrimanately so. Meaning that- if u examine the theoretical reform approach- we have our ethic and take halacha if it doesn’t step on our terms. Consrvative- historical judaism- observe what klal Yisrarel observes. We don’t reject any part of halacha a priori. Its not that I have abstract judgements beforehand. so R is like Conservative. So many conservative thinkers thought that u accept everything in halacha even if u don’t do everything in halacha. For example, the state of Jewish belief- in 1968- commentary magazine had a piece- the state of Jewish belief. 38 participants- every possible view that R Lichtenstein considered kfira is listed in his article. So the average reform respondant would appeal to Buber, and the average Conservative respondant would appeal to Rosensweig.

So does R accept everyhintg? Cause u don’t pick and choose. Once u have revelation- a Buber like experience, and halcha being a human response to revelation. But why doesn’t he do everything? It doesn’t speak to him. One way of looking at that is biographical. In the end R was a baal teshuva. On a practicle level, baale teshuva work that way- u start somewhere. “I now wear tefilin, what do I do next?” so there's a concept of doing things gradually. How do u deal with a baal teshuva? If u tell em to do the things they want to be mekayem, so that’s what they already do. If u give em what they cant handle, so it wont work. A: go back to Mara- shabbos, dinim, and para aduma. So make steps towards shabbos, ethics and para means that from the start u have to give em chukim that are hard to accept. So this explains R- a baal teshuva, so start slowly.

s/o asked R if he puts on tefilin every day. “not yet”. Seems that the ideal is to do all mitzvos. Another story- once sitting with a Rothschild on shabbos, and talking about cheshbonos shel mitzvah. Then rothschild asked R, we’ve gotten to some important ideas here. Lets write it down. R: its shabbos! Rothschild- but I know u write tihngs on shabbos. R: ur right, its time for me to stop completely. It doesn’t make sense for me to keep doing this. Remember, onc paralyzed he was much closer to full observance.

What about maamad har sinai- R, in some of his letters, in terms of Biblical criticm, he holds that H revealed himself, but secular academic world, several authors, and the concept of that- so how does he deal with that- if ur frum, u look at it one way. If ur not orthodox, then why wouldu take it seriously. R was a good reader of Tanach- recall he colarborated on a translation. They assumed u cant really read tanach in translation, and we try to keep all nuances in original, so if there's a pun in the hebrew, so the pun must be retained in translation. Or if the Torah uses a particual word, so the translation has to be consistant- use the same word for that translation to get close as possible to the original flavor. This played a roll in litereary roll in tanach. This was influential.

Anyways, R is negative about biblical criticism as cynical as R Carmy is about these things. But at the same time, he was unwilling to reject the whole shita. Why? For the same reason that R Carmy wouldn’t reject science. Many frummies like to reject science if it doesn’t agree with ur particular idea of what the Torah sais. But R Carmy, and ppl like him, say look, let the scientists do science, and there's no mitzvah to create machlokesim, and there's no reason why every highschool rebbi is an authority to tell biology teachers whats true and not in biology. R: look, if this is what the scholars say, then who am I to reject it completely. So even if he is cynical, he isnt interested in being a kofer in scholarship. Similar approach in our age: Robert Alter. Literature guy. Has sense of Tanacha in the sense of literature. He’s working on translations influenced by R/Buber model. In terms of criticm, he puboished enough and scholars took him seriously in Journal of studies of Old T. asked him how he ignores Criticm. This isnt ur field, bud. “assured results of scholarship” is a term only used in biblical criticism. Alter: chas vshalom. I don’t hold T misinai. I believe beemuna shlaima that it was put together by ppl, just that working in Eng Lit, and Qs come up about authorship- I have real evidence.. like Mark Twain- we have evidence, he started writing huckelberry finn and came back 12 years later, and contradictions because he forgot what he wrote, so its not 2 authors, but it really is. in tanach, we don’t have that. I’d rather explain the text we do have than to fantacize about the text we don’t have. Secular position, but has enough litereary sense to not be too impressed by the theories out there. R has that sense too.

I may reject many opinions in medicine, but I wont set up an alternative medical school to challenge those things.

What position is he taking? He once wrote to Isaac Breuer “the diff btwn me and the bib critics in philosofy, is that they believe that u have all these diff sourse and then u have an editor, R for redaktor. For me, R stands for Rabbeinu.” In Isaac Breuer, the R becomes Ribono Shel Olam. Insights are good, but we have a unified tradition. Rabbeinu is the authority of our tradition.

When we think about the authority of Torah, we don’t usually calculate is this doraysa or derabanan. Sometimes teenagers think that way. “I keep only mitzvos d’oraysa” and unpleasantly surprised that the first part of krias shma is d’oraysa. Non of us thinks in those terms though. No on wrote Shagis Aryeh asking which parts are d’oraysa and derabanan, so he wrote a shtikle. In that sense, we talk about the authority of halacha, power of chazal, but ppl don’t think about comlicated machinary on a day to day basis. R: its not my responsibiltiy to work out all these things- we just do what Jewish tradition is about.

Taken one step further, d’oraysa is same as minhag, its all on the same level. There's an exchange of letters between buber and R published under the title “the builders” vchol bonoych limudie H al tikrei ba ele bonoyich, Buber is saying antihalachik- spontaneity. And R looks frum here in these texts, “no, yahadus it about building halacha.” R: gefilta fish is as serious as any other halacha.

R is most similar to charedi ideologies. (Kaplan is pro zionist. R is more other worldly. Very diff. the maxim of the more jewish things u do the better they share) think about a nation with a land that u don’t live in. a law that is beyond secular application. A language that u don’t speak. Every minhag Yisrael din hoo. It sounds like a satmar chassid. The Rov insisted from the start that a child going to Maimonidides should know diff between chiuv shofar and the structure of musaf on RH, vs eating apple with honey. U have to know that distinction from the start. R would be frumer than the rov.

Again, for buber, if its not spontaneous, its not effective. R- community is effective, and repetitiveness isnt meaningless. If u take spiritual dicipline seriously, it doesn’t change, there's stability. R is much closer to an orthodox way of life.

R probably knew the idea of minhag yisrael din hoo.

Chazon ish dies 1953 at 75, so he’s born 1878. A Litvuck. Avraham Yeshaya Karelitz

Biographically, he didn’t serve rabanus or any public position till his 50s. he was a private person for 50+ years. Presented himself as not being a big ilui. But from early teens he had good work ethic. Wrote books. Called it Chazon Ish. Intially, it was 18 small producitons, now 6 fat volumes. First Orach chaim, then kept working. Published anonymously. The name Chazon Ish was- somebody’s chazon. Derasha- the approach to Torah may be a certain kind of impersonal approach- in contrast to the most influential book of lomdus at the time was Chidushei Rabbeinu Chaim Halevi. Cute story: a chassid of chazon ish said “u say Rabbeinu” as if a rishon, so responded- Chazon as if he’s a navi. In Reb Chaim, they set him up as a rishon. Radiates charisma in all directions, while the other side was chazon ish, impersonal, no personality standing behind torah. Its only a joke, but captures a difference of style. Look, Reb Chaim was charismatic. In volosin, on netziv days, they closed their gemaras when he started shiur. On Reb Chaim days, when he walked down the street, everyone was excited. Chazon Ish never gave shiur.

When he reached EY, settled in bnei brak- not a center of Torah. Jerusalem, or maybe tsfat. Bnei brak was a concervative town of shomrei mitzvot. If u think abuot creativity and what the yeshiva system does to creativity and consider what happens when ppl grow up with one on one framework.

Chazon Ish moves to BB and he lichora looked at BB and saw a place that could become BB. He wanted to shape a culture. R Chaim Ozer, the chief Rabbi of Eastern Lita europe. R Chaim Ozer told ppl Chazon Ish will be gadol, and came out of shadows. So small enough to shape, and there wont be fights with chilonim and socialists. He was there YT, and asked him to please speak. He got up and read braitah in avot that le’olam u should be in a makom Torah. And sat down. They asked him to please say more. He reread the mishnah. He wasn’t a person to speak and have thousands spellbound. Ppl didn’t hold their breath when he walked down the street spellboiund.

The Rav and R Aharon had similar education. A lot less threataning to sit in R Aharons shiur. It’s a personal style that reflects what he’s doing. Even if the roots of his hanahagos are in some personal psycology, but how it expresses itself is important that we can learn from.
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What is brisker lomdus really about? Brisk isnt so much about interpretting the text as explaining the halacha. In science, we have a phenominon and we look for a principle that underlies a lot of things. Everything falls into place. So brisk could be “principles that underly the phenomimnon.” But that’s not the same thing as explaining the texts. R Carmy was in R Aharon Lichtenstein’s shiur. RA asked RC: What does Tos say? A: there's a prob with Rashi and if u interpret diff u don’t have that problem. But what does Tos say? Eventually RC figured out what RL meant. Principles that explain Tos. There are a certain number of terms- cheftza gavra mafkia, and these terms explain these underlying explanations, so these explanations may not sound like the texts being explained. Like in physics, there's a point when the moon disappears and ur left with an object with a certain mass, and the center of the mass is at a certain place. So if ur not from Brisk, ppl think ur not answering problems, ur just redescribing it in slightly different language and accomplishing nothing. Replacing text with a set of distractions.

Btw, if ur careful, R Chaim uses terminology from the texts and from chazal. Telz uses mideveal philosofical terminology. They arent ashamed to talk like Aristotle. R Chaim was very frum in that respect, so at least one branch of the solovetching fam was more right wing than telzers. But he uses the lashonos more liberally than whats found in the gemara. Cheftza gavra is a sugya in nedarim, and he uses it as a key to open all the sugyos.

R Shimon Shkop could say ‘the secular world has a good svara so I think u could say this’ but R Chaim would never write it.

So these are the differecnes in the lithuanian schools of Brisk and Tells. But the focus isnt how u learn pshat in Gemara and Rishonim, but rather what are the underlying principles that u glean from Rishonim. So if u don’t know how to read the underlying principles, then u get frustrated with the style.

The approach isnt psak oriented. Ur trying to explain the rishonim and there's no issur anymore of whos right and whos wrong. In the Rav’s major lomdus works he doesn’t write anybodys wrong, except for a single chayeh adam once. But saying that the Rambam is right and Ramban is wrong.

Btw, R Moshe didn’t fit that style. He sais a good svara and then spends a lot of time, that if the gemara meant what the rambam sais, so whyd it say it like this and not like that. In brisker framework, that idea is skipped a little. (once u create a svara, the text is no longer the same text. Within a brisker world, the rav understood that- see the halachik mind where he would draw conclusions. Ish hahalacha says openly that R Chaim wasn’t interested in psak. And psak would be marginalized.

Dr Gra”ch has said (in the context of legal pluralism) that he doesn’t like the charachterization of brisk as being anti-psak. They were really thinking about psak. The radical natur of brisk wasn’t the theoretical nature of it, rather it was the small library of brisk, that a large part of halachik literature disappears from the library.

The Rav states in ish hahalacha that R Chaim wasn’t into halacha. Told dayan to do what he wants to do just not to talk to R Chaim about the nature of rational, because in Rational he could paralyze the dayan.

Thirdly- how concerened are u with the shakle vetarya. Dr. Grach- Brisk isnt against the shakle vetarya. Theyre just as painstaking as everyone else would be. Ppl think unlike that, because of R Chaim’s writing style. (Dr. Grach said that if u take R Chaim’s shiurim where we have a version on Rambam and from notes, and clearly in the shiur there were textual issues that he discusses. But the fact is that R Chaim’s contribution when he published- he wasn’t interested in the step by step.) the process of writing may create (Orthodox forum on lomdus and in tradition- polythonic diversity (lomdus) and military music (psak) where R Isser Zalman melzter writes that when u write it comes out differently than when ur giving a shiur.

One last comment on sliding through the sugya- there's more than one letter on chazon ish- u know where everything deteriorated from? When it all started going sour? When they stopped learning Maharsha. Think about how many ppl learn with maharsha nowadays. Shas with Rif was a new thing. The Shas that R Carmy was born in didn’t have Rif in it. when he was 11, his dad got a shas.

Yaakov Elemen once asked a kasha on this letter from Chazon Ish- I don’t think he was on the level here because how often does he really discuss maharsha. So he was just giving mussar to the yeshivish velt. RCarmy: Chazon ish doesn’t say ppl should write about it, but that u should learn it. From Maharsha u learn that every hava amina in Tos gets attention. Go through step by step. Weather or not u quote is different.

Story: Chazon Ish didn’t have children, he would adopt teenagers, guys who would visit etc and they were bnei bayit. The most famous was R Chaim Grada- yidish novelist. Turned against religion, but didn’t turn againt chazon ish. Tsemach atlas-and milchemes hayetzer- translated “the yeshiva”. Tzvi Yehuda- lived in Cleaveland, learned as a teenager by chason ish- start with mishna. Read first line and make sure u understand it. etc. read gemara. What was the answer. Now go back through the mishna and look at the Q and A. and then the gemara asks another Q. look at it. go back to the mishna and start again. Get the teirutz to Q2, then go back to the beginning. If u wanna understand, u have to hold the entire train of reasoning in ur mind. If u don’t do it, occasionally ur sorry. U find urself down the page, lost the thread, twisting pshat to make it fit. Then u do Rashi and go back to beginning and work it all out. Then Tos has a Q, and what is Tos saying? The answer is: the Mishna sais this, the gemara said that, then Rashi sais this and Tos asked that. Then u arrive at RAE. Tzvi Yehuda tells Chazon Ish what he heard pshat in yeshiva on RAE, and Chazon Ish learned differently.

1. What about brisk nowadays where they still give shiur and its
2. What about brisker chumras. Did they come out of this or did they perhaps cause this. A: The youngest person to write in Tradition was Dov Fermer, and then Dovid Horowitz wrote an analytic review of moadim uzmanim- classification of chumras there. Benny Brow- wrote 800 page biography of Chazon Ish- has an article on different styles of charedi chumras.

R Moshe is interested in responsibilty and sais look, the ball is hit to me and I have to field it, so sometimes u have to disagree with Rishonim very strongly. Ramban and baal hamaor, or baal hamaor and raavad. U wont find they say “look, we’re cholek and if u ask me, I’d pasken…” no, they said “I think ur wrong on textual grounds, or factual grounds”. There r 2 coherent approaches, so how do u prefer one over the other. That’s a difficult question. There's someone who says something important about this: read Chaim Soloveitchiks book on yayin nesech. The fat book. U have to be in the sugyas to understand. U can date the diff statements of RT. RT- how do we square the kulot with our gemara. Comes up with an anwer. 10 years later, he comes back and says, I can do better. And then a 3rd time, he sais he can do even better. So u have to date the versions of Tos. If u can do that, u can bring RT into the room and u can see him. He basically patterns it after how his father relearned sugyas. And we’re not talking about correcting a word that u didn’t understand, its about ur own mind and rereading anyways.

The famous Reb Chaim about tefila- in perek 5- u need kavana in tefila and if don’t, u cant pray. Its me’akev. The gemara sais in avos that kavana covers the rest of tefila, and in perek 10, he quotes that. There's really 2 dinim in kavana- there's kavana of tefila which means if ur praying u have to know that ur standing in front of Hashem. If I read shmona esrei in a class on chazanut, ur not yotzi. If u don’t have the awareness, ur not praying. But kavana for the words, that we can compramize on. If I’m reading a letter I wrote, I may not pay attention, but I’m communicating. This is a very interesting analysis of tefila. Chazon Ish- pshat in Rambam is that in perek 5 he is introducing the idea of kavana. 5 praking later, in the details he tells u the details. Rambam in Moreh Nevuchim writes that ppl write books like that. Awkens raiser- u should not multiply uneccassaritly. Walli’s razor. Beaver’s older brother entering teens. One day, theyre alone, and Walli decides that he’s grown a beard and has to shave, takes his dad’s shaver, shaves shows his brother how smooth it is, and beaver notices that there's no blade in the razor. They conclude that if the shave was outstanding without a razor, imagine how great a shaver this is. RC’s conclusion- if there's no problem, then any teirutz will solve it. so according to chazon ish, u don’t need a solution. Chazon Ish also argued anthropological- how can u distinguish between the shmona esrei. If ur ina classroom lecturing on tefila, lecturing chazanut so that’s not tefila. But if ur davening there, then if u ask if u have kavana – who needs complicated lomdus- he’s davening so presumably has kavana for tefila. R Carmy claims that even if the klal uprat argument isnt good, R Chaim’s explanation fixes Rambam’s psukim, even if the argument isnt good. The svara – distinugsuishing levels of kavana, even though the particular explanation is not so good. (I don’t chup whats wrong with the R Chaim’s thing)

Krumbine- R Chaim may have been a brisker- concerning himself with concepts and not kashos and teirutzim, but the sefer procedes with kashos and teirutzim, because externally, it look slike any other book, but really he’s making a revolution. If RC is right in his argument, then RChaim may have even preffered a weak kasha to set up a svara, as oposed to giving solid evidence. (missed the point)

Whos more acceptable among academic Jewish styles- depends who the person is. a real academic jewish scholar- interested in text. Chazon ish. But a philosofer scholar may be interested in the svara behind the issues. Mashal- in philosofy, u have an historian vs a philosofy studying the philosofy- is this argument usable for me.
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RC thinks it depends on which kind on conception we’re interested in. if your talking about real academic scholars, so chazon ish is more classic. He’s all about pshat in what the Gemara really means, and Reb Chaim is concerened with theoretical conception. In Rambam scholarship, ppl might disagree with R Chaims approach. The academics might not care about psak, but chazon ish lists all the NM in the halacha at the end of some of his pieces.

Story: Yaakov Zussman Talmud scholar- not frum- once spoke at YU about zraim- about an important archeological discovery- old synagogue helped him learn pshat in a sugya in Yerushalmi. Geography doesn’t go with svara. Either u know or u don’t. so it really opens things up. He lectured on this. At the end of the lecture and then said one more comment, took out the Chazon Ish and he had the exact same pshat. So Chazon Ish was capable of accomplishing some type of academic scholarship. Lieberman could also quote chazon ish, but unlikely to quote Reb Chaim, because he learns differently. Certainly Chazon Ish was unsympathetic to that kind of scholarship.

Benedict- Harambam lo mistiya min hatalmud- what happened when Rambam contradicts the gemara- so he showed that Rambam never deviated from gemara- either gemara unlcear, so followed yershalmi, or read gemara differently in shkale vetarya. Every once and a while he’d quote chazon ish. (Benedict was frum, but he was establishing that point in Rambam) but brisk, he’s make critical comments on every once in a while.

Chazon Ish was against newly found Rishonim. Maybe in hashkafa- he was conservative. Stareodecisis- u don’t overturn precidents. Every time when ppl are interrogated in supreme court, the judge thinks on his own and notices how badly a case was decided. Brejinen doctorine- whatever is communitst stays communist forever, if not, then we can talk about it. whatever is left we can argue about it. conservatives cant be changed. There's a tendancy that once something is decided it isnt turned over. We arent discussing why it makes sense in a secular court, but in the religious system we understand that G-d wanted us to have it. Gra never relies on his hagaos for proofs in shulchan aruch. So maybe its svaras.

Grid- we know the Rashba was the gadol hador, because ppl kept thousands of teshuvos to make tshuvas Harashba. But wheres teshuvas hameiri?

R Aharon paskened meiri.

The rav once went over nida 2 years later all over again. R Ahararon was a more omnivorous reader. More interested in bekius than the rav.

Yechiel Weinberg- what we’re doing here is two things- we’re doing academic work- we’re reading old texts, doing the best philology we can. But we also do pilpul (meaning lomdus) because ppl make fun of it as not being acadmic for them, but serious goyishe philosofers do it too. The best law profs do this. I have no apologies for the yeshivish velt, nor the academic velt in our discussions.

The rav held that R Chaim was greater than Gra because he had svaras.

Chazon Ish in mussar world- mussar is founded in R Yisrael Salanter. For us 1) where does mussar fit in a talmudic curriculum. In 19th century, the baale musar tried getting it into yeshivas. R Yitzchak blazuer tried convincing volosin to study mussar. R Chaim was the vibrant Rosh Yeshiva. RYB: leolam u have to fight the yetzer. He stands firm. Yaasok batorah,. If it works, read shma, if it doesn’t work, contemplate death. We see from here that the greatest power against yetzer is thoughts of death. This is more powerful. R Chaim- “if u want to have a regular bowel movement, whats going to do the trick better? A shot of castor oil or a normal diet? Castor oil. So le’olam a person should be physically healthy, but since ur threatened by constapation, so u prune juice, and if it doesn’t work, so castor oil. So shouldn’t we focus on oat meal and veggis? Why not go straight to castor oil. The answer is that if ur sick, u may need it, but if ur healthy, we’re not constapated.” Reb Yechiel Weinreg, a product of slabodka yeshiva, a mussar yeshiva, he wrote a long article in 4th volume sridei esh- he writes that he woulda told Reb Chaim “don’t be so sure that everyone in ur yeshiva is healthy.”

In later generations, there were diffs btwn yeshivas. Slobodka vs nevardick. Slobodka- Rav in Ish Hahalacha tells a story about how maybe reb Chaim may have not been as opposed to slobodka. Slobodka mussar emphasized the greatness of man, so ur not talking about death. For example, the or hatzafun- from R Nosson finkel the alter mislobodka- one after the other- the midrash sais that yaakov was punished when dina was raped because when yaakov confronted esav, he hid dina, lest esav sees her and want to marry her. The alter asks- but Yaakov was right! Who wants their daughter to marry esav? A: when yaakov hid her, his motive was good, but at a certain level, there was a mischivious pleasure getting back at esav. And for that, that wrong motivation, he was held responsible. we see that a human being is so elevated, but the smallest thing that u do has reprocussions.

Nevordick plays the opposite roll. The slobodka younger man dressed well. R Hutner dressed like a european. Clean shaven, jacket. The nevordik person dressed in rags, might actually walk into a hardware store and ask for some butter, or go to an egg store and ask for a hammer, the point of it was that, since ur a human, u have to work hard to tame the yetzer hara, so u act in such a way in which ur calous to what ppl think of u, so that when ur tested, u will stand up to the test. Yozel Horowitz was the founder. He died taking care of influenza epedemic in 1917. He wasn’t scared of taking care of ppl with an infectios disease. In the 20s, bnei tora trapped in communism, the nevardik ppl stood up strongly against persecution. If ur willing to act in a away ppl think its nutty, and u stand up for whats right, so it stands strongly against communism.

Slobodka holds u want ppl to respect u. at the end of R Hutnars life he dressed very informally.

If musar is important, hwo does that impinge of learning torah. The more mussar becomes a dynamic part of yeshiva. In nevardik u have more than that.

Before we get to real chazon ish, we have the fictional chazon ish. Chaim Brada grew up in home of chazon ish- left yidishkeit and became a yiddish writer. Also left his entire family in the holocaust. Wrote “Tzemach Atlas” abuot a nevordiker. Atlas is greek mythology of someone who carries the weight of the world on his shoulders. The image of a mussarnick. This kid named chaim in mussar yeshiva. Rescued and deprogrammed by the machazeh avrohom. (clearly the chazon ish) ppl in chazon ish’s circle, said that it’s a good portrait. R Lichtenstein who didn’t know chazon ish said that he wouldn’t give it any more creadence thatn Chaim Potock on the Rav. So this gives insites into tensions btwn chazon ish and navardik mussar. So in one of the scenes, Chazon ish calls tzemach atlas an apikorus. “Me? I’m super frum.” “if u were really a maamin, u would be satisfied that following halacha is sufficient to make u a righteous person. If u need tricks and therapies, it means u really don’t trust in halacha. Ur frummer than yahadut. In ur heart” the amazing thing is that u would think that chazon ish read the first few hundred pages of the novel, where there's 100 or 200 pages when tsemach married a more liberal woman and was almost swepped away, but then became more intense in mussarkeit because he was so close to falling. so the argument is that ppl who sign on to more than simple yidishkeit are in to something more problematic. Hashkafically, some ppl in this room would say that reading literature and lib arts gives u insights and self understanding. So u could use the same asnwers against R Carmy. But there are answers. Halacha is for everyone, but individuals can do what they need as individuals.

Emuna Ubitachon- u have this litvishe phenominon where they hold halacha is enough and u shouldn’t need hashkafa, but sometimes ppl are wrong, so u created a halachik framework to answer them. Like nefesh hachaim was a litvish response to chassidus. So chazon ish is a response to mussar. If u ask what about agadeta, he sais that if u learn gemara don’t skip it. there's no specific depth that u have to arrive at. But the editors of gemara knew what they were doing. So study it like u do other things. When he polemisizes against secular studies- if u read Rashi in chumash, u get more out of it than psycologists. R Carmy once had a discussion with a litvishe Rosh Yeshiva and thought it was unfortunate that its more likely that ppl would study moreh nevuchim than agadeta, so RC quoted the letter in chazon ish. “no, its just not part of our world”

Chaye adam comments on phillosfy that all that had been accomplished til kant was wrong. Chaye adam liked kant. Chazon ish wrote “v’ad bichlal”. Either he didn’t like philosofy, or he read enough philosofy to write that. There was a nevardick yeshiva in bnei brak, and he allowed it. all the evidence was that he encouraged them to open. He coulda driven em out. He had a position about whats correct and whats incorrect. He doesn’t persecute yiddin for having a different understanding of halacha. Probably true of other gedolim as well. Think about how much the rav raised funds for lakewood, but chazon ish would never support nevardick. But chazon ish didn’t take ppl to the stake for it. there are universities where there are the concept that the closer u are to someone, the more u hate them- cause u have to show that ur different. In gedolei yisreal, at least by chazon ish, there's a certain intillectual and spiritual equilibrium, so he respected that to an extent. He held mussar leads u away from emes, but how do I do these tihngs if not through mussar. If not for the challage of musar he may have never written emuna ubitachon.
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Emunah Ubitachon- inside frum discussion- not directed to the larger world. Starts talking about emuna and bitachon. The thrust of the argument, is that theyre the same thing. Ppl assume that they arent the same, that emuna is belief in divine sovereignty, and bitachon is belief that things are going to work out. That’s 2 different beliefs. In zionist language, bitachon= yihyeh tov. Chazon Ish sais no, it’s the same, emunah is the detatched point of view, and bitachon is ur own point of view. Meaning, whatever happens is G-d’s will and that there's no indication that His will is suited to what I want. Many are committed to G-d as they expect Him to respond, and Chazon Ish says that it has nothing to do with everything. Emuna is divine control regardless. Austere and non-worldliness. Not like pop-religion. Not al menas lekabel prass. From the view point of modern religious zionist mentality, this would be problematic. (why) But for the average person, its also problematic.

For example, there's a Person who denies hashgacha completely, and has cancer. Boasting about how he is so praisworthy that he never asked G-d “why me” and RC said “huh? U don’t believe in it.” ele, even if u don’t believe in it, u still have kashas. And ppl who do believe certainly hold they have a right to have kashas, and chazon ish is saying no.

On implication of this is that we cant adopt a political policy based on the notion that we know how G-d will pasken. To a very large extent, religious zionists assume that we can act in accordance with out belief and be sure G-d will bale us out based on what G-d has promised us. The average zionist (not that Chazon Ish was referring to them) may say that we refuse to negotiate with x. what about America? G-d will take care of that. Its one thing to argue yehareg v’al yaavor. But to argue that G will take care and that we trust G to do the right thing. So in chazon ish, if its yehareg, u risk everything. Within religious zionism- there's an opinion that there wont be a third churban. Usually, ppl ascribe it to Rav Herzog- the Ashkenazi Rav Rashi from 1930- late 1950s (succeeded rav Kook). U must also know that he’s a roll model in secular studies, law, scientist, languages. The story is that in WWII, he said that there's a guarantee is that there will be no 3rd churban. RC thinks he R Herzog wouldn’t really put his life on that. He was encouraging the troops as Rommel was marching across Africa towards EY. Would R Herzog pursue a militant foreign policy- I have my doubts. Wrt Israeli politics, he was a very candid. Both kids were shrewd diplomats. Chaim became president, and Yaakov was Israeli embassedor to Canada. Also offered Chief Rabbinate in England. They didn’t decide to rely on Hashem for parnassa, they were both diplomats.

So if modern state of Israel could make bad choices, so that’s a big deal. So in Chazon Ish- we don’t do things based on guarantees in the bank. It’s a matter of temperment- ppl are either skeptics, and don’t buy in, and even if u have his sense of emuna- that its not ur business to calculate, so its ur job to put urself in G-d’s hands.

R Lichtenstein once wrote after Yom Kipur war- about emuna and bitachon and said that we should read the Chazon Ish seriously. Many Rishonim were more optimistic and populous than Chazon Ish. RL ends saying that religious zionists spend too long reading divine comedy and not enough religious tragedy.

Can we apply this to Shmita? Late 19th century- how can we deal with shmita. In europe, poskim debated the issue. R Yitzchak Elchonon- welcomed the heter mechira. Sell the land and u can do certain things and maintain occupancy. Netzi"v refused- perhaps ideologically he would argue, if u go there, y would u evade the mitzvos hateluyot baaretz. When rav kook arrived- shmita was 1910, and as it approached, Rav Kook advocated heter mechira, and was rav of Yafo and the heter was put on the map. Published a book defending the heter. From that point on, it became acceptable.

When Chazon Ish arrived, he didn’t accept it. the first thing Chazon Ish did was ask how to be noheg in pidyon maaser. He treated R K as rav roshi but rejected him in certain places. Chazon ish, because he didn’t hold of heter, he had other kulot in shmita. The kibutzim- chafetz chaim- Kalman Kehana was rav of kibutz chafetz chaim- serious torah scholar. He consulted chazon ish. Hydroponics was big- if u grow cotton in atzis she’eino nakuv its fine. But the kind of cotton was vulnerable to pests, but this kind of thing was big in Chazon Ish followers.

What are the issues in volved? Vetziviti es birchati bayom hashishi. There’ll be enough in 6th to carry through to 8th. R Ovadya was asked and he said shmita nowadays is derabanan. So there's no promise. U need a promise from rabanan, and they didn’t give a promise, they gave heter mechira. If u ask Chazon Ish, whats the diff. u gotta do it. (I think there's an exception)

R Kook- letter 555, (gematria Takana). Between R Kook and Ridvaz- an expert in this area. Ridvaz Was against heter mechira. So there's a long letter where r Kook sais that part of the dispute is ideological, that RK is comitted to revive agriculture and revive frumkite, and Ridvaz is turning ur back on em. Its not a halachik argument, but the hour requires this. R K’s position on murkav esrogim may be similar. (less famous contraversy- hybrid etrogim. NM- etrogim in EY were suspect. Etrogim from quarfu were clean. R Kook defended the Israeli ones and conflict was- well, if u want no chashash, so take quarfu. If u want yishuv EY, so u’ll go with Rav Kook.

Chazon Ish took anti position- R Goren was once in America and went to visit Grid. Grid asked R Goren what he does himself, and he said he himself didn’t use it. typical problem. Religious zionist poskim don’t want to undermine the Israeli economy, but there are genuine problems with the heter, so what can u do? A liberal zionist called It hypocracy and R Lichtenstein didn’t disagree. He took it. he’s not pleased to be that yeshivish.

(Today, there was an attack on Tsohar- a group of rabbanim- moderate merkaz harav ppl. R Dovid Stav is the leader. They’ve been arranging weddings in gush or petach tikva. Ppl don’t like rabbanut because there's too much red tape, so they have more modern, cheaper rabbanim. But in theory, u should get married where u live. Rabanut tried to close em down, and R Stav met with minister of religion and among the things said that was “shakran”. At the end, minister of religion, u can at least shake hands in front of cameras and they got a picture of them hugging. Fellow asked RC and asked if that’s how he was as a child? Ya.)

Be aware that Chazon Ish wasn’t oblivious to political aspects, he helped ppl do things in shmita. The automan war made posession connceted to working land. If u own and didn’t till, there's a danger u could lose it. this is something still true today- automan law still applies. Arab Land lord who left the country in many cases lose their land. There are lots of debates that Israel is stealing land, and its not propaganda- that’s how ownership works. So we were afraid that it would happen to Jews- shmita would come, and there's a danger that u’ll lose the land. So that raised the Q of doing kinds of things to maintain a jewish presense without losing land. so Chazon Ish was careful of this.

1935- Chazon Is arrived in EY. Met RK once. Didn’t go to yerushalayim.

There's a certain tendancy to say we’re not interested in philosofy of history- R Chaim was in warsaw during WWI- the Jew said to RChaim- if only we knew that this was atchala degeula, then we could bare all these things. GRCh- I don’t understand, why is it all ok if Mashiach comes? – this is a little anti-messianic. And R Chaim didn’t write it, nor did Chazon Ish write it. but it is there. That’s the litvishe chareidi mentality. Pikuach nefesh is so important.

RK was unhappy that Mizrachi suported separation of religion and culture. We don’t know if R Kook commented on Mizrachi’s suport of uganda. Partition came up after RK’s death. Peel commission in 1937/38- to partition palestine and the religious zionists were against it.

within religious zionism there was mizrachi and poel mizrachi. In Israel, PM was big. M was bigger in america. Economic difference- mizrachi was a bursua party, and the PM was social. PM was also- more liberal halachikally, and more moderate politically. So Tom Segev’s “1967” does real research, and writes on Israeli history. Has a wonderful eye for a good anecdote to capture the way things are. The most moderate ppl were the religious zionists.

The next piece in emuna ubitachon is a response to mussar- with a dramatic story- there's a contraversy going on- a new teacher comes to town and the old teacher is worried about his livelihood. He’s unhappy, and the second melamed said “lehagdil Torah veyaadir” and each side calls the other side names. How do u decide how to judge the situation. Chazon Ish- there's only one way- halacha/din. If it turns out that the first is right, that territory is protected, then the first one is right, and the second should desist and those supporting his are right, but those supporting the new one are wrong. A mussar-nick might get involved in motives- the second melamed is trying to cut the wings of first, or he really feels a need for more tutalige. So go examine ur motives. Chazon ish sais no. motives are irrevelant. Psychological analysis is irrevelant. The important thing to follow the din, and other factors are irrevelant. We will say that in addition to choshen mishpat, study motives. That’s unecaasary, its missleading in a serious way.

Heres another example- the boss coming to dinner, and everything has to be perfect. Housewife is beside herself to make sure everything is perfect. In Chazon Ish’s senerio, the boss is coming Friday night. So the wife is preparing for the boss, and they notice that the oil is low. (agav, Chazon Ish prohibited electricity on Shabbos. The modern solution is that the electric plants have to be on for hospitals so we benefit as well. Chazon ish compared that to a fire consuming the neighborhood, and looks and sais, if its burning anyways, I can save a match and light my cigarrette here. So there is often no electricity, and the hospitals use private generators). But the boss is coming, so the gas has to be on high. From the viewpoint of mussar, the mussarnick is the one who will close his eyes and turn up the gas on shabbos. So mussar isnt enough to fortefy u against eh yetzer. Mussarnik tells u Torah isnt enough to conquer the yetzer and chazon ish says no: when ur on non-halackik factors, ur more likely to do the wrong things. The only thing to trust is dikduk hadin. this position isnt in absense of mussar ideology, it’s just a narro mussar ideology, based on one consideration- dikduk hadin. (this is similar to Kant’s doing a moral act based on one reason alone) chazon ish isnt saying just to know choshen mishpat, he tells about a motivational factor- the desire to do what is right. He said about himself, what else do I have in my life? I’m physically broken. What other motive is there in my life other than study and to get it right.

Chazon Ish had difficulty with dealing with those who learn gemara all day and arent good ppl. Passuk in chumash sais Veshochad lo tikach- don’t take bribes. Why? He hashochad yeaver ene pikchim. That’s how musarnick talk. The classic mussar word is negia. U have a negia, and interest involved. Torah recognizes ur a talmid chacham, but if u take a bribe, its no good. From a purely halachik point of view, if torah didn’t prohibit it and still be able to pasken. that’s how Chazon Ish would rule. Ohev and soneh cant give eidus. What does Chazon Ish say about that? He argues back that ki hashochad yeaver isnt a statement of human psycology, it’s a gezerat hakatuv- a punishment that if u take bribes, H will effect ur daas Torah. If not for that, it wouldn’t effect u. ohev vesoneh halachkikly means u cant give edus in specific cases- for really close relationships or ppl who u don’t talk to. Just because lots of ppl don’t fit that category, that doesn’t make me passul edus. This is all nothing to do with psycological reality.

Story- about bribes (we’ll get baack to chazon ish next time)- Rashi Chaye Sarah- ulay lo telech ha’isha lalechet acharei. Ulay/elai- eliezer- ely- hoping that the shiduch wont work and then I’ll be the mechutan. So that’s why its written like that to show how his mind was divided. Kotzke Rebbe- its in the beginning of the parsha with a vav. The chasser ulay is later when he repeats the story. So if we’re really medayek, so he wasn’t nogea the first time? The first time, Eliezer had an agency to fulfill- a job, and a religious person, ethical, and loyal. So the nogea fact could not effect him. After he accomplished the mission, and he reflects, then that motive bubbled up- and had a slip of the tongue, and at that point the deep seeded motivation rises. Ppl want to claim kotzker rebbe knew of the uncounsious b4 freud, so this kotzker emphasizes that. When u have a job to do, sometimes u can get over it. in Chazon Ish, that’s the way it always is. after the fact, maybe there's a cheshbon. But if u faces with a kasha and ur driven, and the only motive isnt mentchlikite, but getting it right, so u should be ok.

Missed a class
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Rav Kook- 1865, dies in 1935 at 70. Iluy. Born in latvia. Chazon ish just started workin in early teens, not an ilui. RK spent a year in volosin. Had relationship with netziv. Biographically he was, even at that age, had insight in hashkafa. Which is unusual at that age. Sometime it happens that u have precosious ppl in machshava. Pears look at em as baaley hashkafa. Was offered mashgiach in mir. Chafetz Chaim told him to do into rabanus, in latvia. Publsihed young- and was interested in playing a large roll in hashkafa.

Did the projects start as zionist projects? Its possble now that we have lots of material. When he started out he was worried about klal yisrael, not so much about EY. He wrote hrashot and didn’t publish at the time. Midbar Shur. Shur = look. In yidish –kook. A pun. The manuscript disappeared. His son told him to get it back- he knew who took it. eventually, 50 years after he died, it made its way back and was published. Also wrote on ein yaakov.

1904- first father in law pushed him as Rav of Yaffo. There r 4 major centers. Yerushalyim, Tsfat, Tevarya, Yaffo. Yaffo is most modern. It’s a port. He took it. Yaffo vehamoshavot. The colonies. There are small villages around like Tel Aviv. Cultural settlements. Prominent rabbinical personality in contact with ppl. Aliya hashnia- 1907, brings lots of young ppl who are socialist- significantly aliented from traditional judaism. Intensified certain tendancies. EY became a central pillar. Writes quite a few articles for publication. Unlike drashot and perushim on agada, when he wrote a sort of morah nevuchim, he wrote about problems ppl had with yahadut. Never published because it wasn’t the style. In the 1908-1910 period, he wrote important systematic essays- but he wasn’t a very good systematic writer. Tzvi Yehuda was involved in editing. Even in Halacha, he wasn’t an organized writer. Bialic- R Kook is a better writer than everybody else around but doesn’t have the patience to revise.

Late 19 zeros, got into halachik controversies and confrontnational with old school rabbonim. Famously- shmita. In europe, there was a machlokes. In EY, they were machmir. The rabbanim werent involved in the new yeshuv, so their inclination was to be machmir. The gedolim werent in EY. Chazon Ish wrote about intl date line. Goyishe concept. 2 possibilities. Either China is 6 hors ahead of Jerusalem, or its 18 hours behind. Problem- when we have Jews in the far east. Solution- keep shabbos and Sunday. But what about YK? In the 40s, Yeshiva in shanghai, and Japan, At least china was the same continent. So we have an issue. R Tokachinsky pasked x, Chazon Ish paskened y. what does the teenager of Chazon Ish remember? Not the machlokes. The imprint was the realization that there's no gedolim in europe to deal with this. The ball is being hit to u. r Chaim Ozer- now u got somebody.

R Kook paskened from Yaffo. His position was like RYitzchak Elchonon. And Rabbanei Yerushaim disagreed. Ridvaz in Tsfat disagreed. Halachikly on shmita, and ideologically, igeret 555 he writes that he wants the settlement to do well.

Shabat haaretz was written in the wake of that contraversy. Shemen shumshimin. Sesamie oil manufacturer- does the gezera of kitniot apply to sesamie byproducts? He gave the hechsher and it caused a ruccus. Brought into conflict. Netanyahu’s brother in law wrote a doctorate on RK being a posek, the good RK was meikil, and later in life became more of a machmir. (u could just say that the shaalos were different).

RK never became an official zionist. Separating culture from Judaism. The whole point of zionism was to create a new J culture, and he fought for it to be religious. Aguda founded in 1912, and it wasn’t clear that it was antizionst, just religious. So RK was interested. He travelled to the aguda conference in 1914. While he was out of country, the war broke out and he was russian. So that was good to be a foreginer. It was easier to an ashkenazi russian than be subject to automans. Turks came in, and the russians were in a difficult situation. Many left. Ben gurion was in US during WWI. RK was out to begin with. Spent part of war in berlin. Switzerland. Ended up in a shul in London, on condition that he’d go back when the war ended. Did one important intervention- RK didn’t want the yeshiva to be drafted. Probably gave a lot of ppl smicha to keep em out. Also wrote a letter to chief rabi to make it clear to king that according to sota, that the reason that asa suffered form gout was because he drated beni yeshiva.

After the war, the zionists had won and one of the issues was jewish self government- so decided to have ashkenazi chief rabbi. Before that there was only a rishon letzion- sfardi. Chacham bashi in persian. RK was the clear choice for the ashkenazim. There was some ppl asking him to stay in yaffo, but it was clear he was going to Yerushalim, and it was clear the rav of Yerushalim is also the rav Roshi. Just like the byshop of rome is the pope. On his way, he was met by some rabbanim, and confronted regarding the cherem on secular studies. RK was upset that bochurim came to Yaffo to study and were studying secular stuff. So he forced them to stop. So he got to yerushalim- and he had to make it clear that he wasn’t gonna sign that cherem. In the frum world, there was no secular studies til the early 1930s. Mizrachi was teaching stuff. Secualr schools existed. But the first aguda school was chorev, founded by Yekkes.

In early 20s, there were confrontations wrt zionism and secular teachings in schools. When orot was published, someone tried buying all copies and disposig of it alll. Prasing chilonim. Passages about value of phys ed, prasing chilonim. RK’s daughter was killed in a car accident and some chareidim celebrated.

1924- RK was raising money for yeshivos, and many of the yeshivas he was raising money for were mevazeh him. Major rabinical figures were nicer. In 1913, masa harabnim- the journey of rabbanim- RK and R Zonenfeld (head of antizionists) travelled through galil to fortefy trumot umasrot, and a way to get to know him. There's a story recorded in the biographies- RK ran into RZ erev Pesach. RZ: I wish u that next year at this time u shuld be swimming in a sea of blood. RK was a cohen, so the mikdash would be rebuilt. When u tell the story like there's a certain edge of hostility to the story.

Monty pithon- prince of whales, shaw, whistler, and s/o. W: ur heiness reminds me of a stream of bat urine. Huh? I was repeating one of whiles. Huh? “what I meant was that the prince shines like a shaft of gold even when everything around is dark.” Unclear if RZ said it, probbly someone with an edge just made it up.

RK had to deal with J communities, British communities. Modernize the rabbinate. And walk a fine line btwn rav of chareidim and everybody else. It actually worked somehow despite how everybody treated him. There ended up 3 groups. Some rejected the rabbanut. Anti. Then there were religious zionists and RK represented em. Then a group in the mid, the RK was rav of yerushalaim, but didn’t recogznize it as a position of authority. And the election was irrevelant. In terms of shochtim showing the knife. So many shochtim would reject zionism, but go to RK with the knives erev YT. After RK died, Grim Charlop, yerushalmi bred and born. Became diciple of RK in Yaffo. Was RY of merkaz harav. Mystical zionism rav. Came close to winning. R Herzog won who was rav in Ireland. With very broad secular education, card carrying zionist. R Tukachinsky- maybe if u renounce ur doctorates- R herzog- huh? How do u renounce ur doctorates? He was the rav Roshi, but not of Yerushalmi. So R Zvi Pesach Frank became rav of Yerushalmi. Nobody could sit in both chairs anymore after RK died.

In terms of hashkafa- RK was pro zionist. Wanted soverginty in EY. RK’s attitude was that G will take care of it. ppl asked him- hwat about nations of the world that don’t recognize nationhood, etc. RK: let me ask u s/t. did anybody think tha league of nations would make the state? Herzle had this idea and it was an issue of pressing the write buttons. “luck is the residue of design”. U have know way of knowing which effort will open the doors for it. RK- who would imagine belfer declaration. So the time will come. Yeruhslaim, kosel. Ok, very idealistic. Or realistic. “ein hachi nami- we cant force G’s pen.” If u wait, opportunities come up… sometimes.

View of arabs- humane. wrt halacha- as a shabbos goy, in terms of milking on shabbos- Chazon ish and RK agreed to have shabbos goy milking. Militant zionists were against. RK- its racsist to be anti shabbos goy. Don’t be so excited that they arent as refined as us.

RK was agrieved by the developments of 1929. 3 volumes of letters up to 1919. But he was so busy, so we wonder how things changed at that point. He was disappointed with the riots, very strong remarks against the mufti whoe encouraged the riots. Certainly effected him. Did he change his politics. How did he react to rise of Hitler.

Speaking of hitler, recall Elazaroff was murdered, the revisionists were arrested. Stavsky was convicted, and the evidence was flimsy. The moment the verdict was pronounced, RK went to action claiming that a Jew could not have done this.

Yaakov Dehan- a strange bird- dutch Jew, communist. Married a shiktza many years older who financed law school. Divorced. Kicked out of communist party for homosexuality, came to palestine and wanted to be a leadership figure in mizrachi and they didn’t need him. At a coctail party, goes up to an Arab “u know I like Arabs very much, just that its too bad that sometimes u guys get out”. English person- “is he one of urs?” no no, ended up workind journalist, taught law s/w which would be take over of Hebrew U and became foregn minister of eida hachareidt. Knew all em languages. Wrote for all the newspapers. Murdered outside of old shaarei tzedek. Eida charedit said the zionists did it. Ziniost- perhaps it was the older brother of an arab did it. eida charedit were afraid his wife would demand buryin in goyish cemetary. A few yrs later a novel was written about him “the friend comes him” implying hagana killed him. 60 yrs later, the assasins came forward, the hagana did it. Aguda wanted to name a branch after him, and Isaac breuer said no. wrote dutch poetry- very scanty. Strange guy. Lived dangerously. RK didn’t take to that style of kicking arabs out of the way.

“its more reasonable to blame murder of rabin on the rav than \_\_\_, because RK’s attitude was the G would take care of it. but if u hold like the Rav, that there's much more individual responsibity, so G points at u and u habve to take responisbtly, so then to bring mashiach u may have to kill rabim.

RK’s writings- Orot Hakodesh. Difficult writer and its important to get over the fear of RK. 25 years ago, at 50th yartzheit, benny alon and RC appeared together and he kept saying- its important to stop looking at his picture on the wall and start reading. It was written in the 1910s, 8 notebooks “shmona kfatzim” mostly written in london. Not organized at all. RK had R Dovid Kohen edited (the Nazir) had academic training in philosofy. The Nazir edited orot hakodesh. Do these texts really connect? Is it RDK or is it RK? Rearrange, and put headers, so u created a system of philosofy which may be the nazir’s and not RK’s.
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Recall, we were talking about the 8 kuntrusim that R dovid Cohen edited. There were sensorship issues in everything that RKook wrote. And the vast majority of the stuff published, if u compare, the vast bulk is not sensorship. Its editing and clarifying and word order. But RK wouldn’t have intervened so much anyways.

Btw, when uv edited large amounts of 20th century big philosofer, u realize that u don’t publish word for word and u have to do some reorganizations. But ya, it leaves open the interpretation of what the Rav meant.

Orot hakodesh- 3 volumes. 1) how we know what we know. Estimology. 2) metaphysics. What the world is really about. Both are chochmat hakodesh. 3) mussar hakodesh. Ethics. Volume 4 is a continuation of volume 3.

RK write in a very high level of abstraction. So RC read stuff closer to the ground. When he writes on the siddur, on the aggadeta, so u get a good idea to grab hold of. RC read Hakdama to siddur- and showed talmid orot yeria- the first thing that RC read from RK. He read 2 pages a day. If u read it fast, its like davening. On shabbos RC would read all the pages of the week.

1980s, there were several underground groups. Kill arabs, blow up their cars. Mosque of omar. Not in touch with eachother. The govt was tracking them and they were all arrested the same day. Chagai segal wrote a book about it. he mentions that when the Israelis came to arrest him, they told his wife to pack a bag and put in a copy of orot. “what do u know about orot? Ur police” “u arent the first person we’re visiting tonight. Everyone else is packing orot.” But RC didn’t think that made sense because if we were going to jail together, ud want diff books.

Reading: page 14- there are views which by the neceessity of human nature must lead, when they disseminate, they must cause harmful consequnces, even tho they on their own are worthwhile and true. (there are true statements that can be very harmful). Therefore the spirit of man was made to resist them, in order not to be harmed by them.

Btw, Notice any metaphores? Certain metaphores cause ppl to do things (vote for republicans). Words like “up, down, insight”. Battling cancer, wrestleing with conscience. Branches- the tree is a good tree, but the branches just knock u over. The roots grow in a certain direction and tear up a sidewalk.

Cont: it’s a long battle. The person gains a greater power from his spritiutal source and then becomes stronger and feels that his position need no longer fear from those positions from which he fought against.

Ithink an idea is dangerous, I fight against it, and then I realize that I don’t have to fight against it. he realizes that its no longer a threat.

Cont: (so why did I previously resist and now embrace) I have changed.

In life these things happen. It’s a statement about psycology, not logic

Cont- a person whos had that experience will value conflict.

RK doesn’t bring examples. So its abstract, so we try to bring our own examples. Like hes talking about trusting secular zionists. (one of the things wrong with our educational system is that we’re afraid of letting ppl fail. The content of books in grade 1 and 2 was much lower than at home. If kids see words they don’t know they’ll feel traumatized, its not true. That’s the American liberal arts plan. In America, they wanted to teach math phylosofically, learn set theory and figure out arithmatic on their own. That doesn’t work either. U meet a person and don’t get it right away, so u make some assesments and u might have to make reassesments. (Shalom Aleichem: a human being is just like a carpenter. Is born, is liveed, and dies. A human being is the same thing)

Is there value in the ideas of the secular zionists, u may fight it, and then realize that the ideas arent really threataning anymore. He hasn’t stated about the value about the idea, just that struggle is important.

Cont: and he knows how sorry he woulda been had he just accepted them naively, he’d have been in trouble, it woulda harmed him “az” if he accepted them right away. Rather he accepts the ideas when he’s ready for them.

Cont: just as the person has been elevated through the struggle, his concepts have changed as well. It would seem that he rejected these ideas last year because he struggeled with them, but its not true. Externally, the ideas u rejected yesterday are the same as the ideas today, inwardly perceived they’re totally different though.

This is a logical point. When ppl read Hegel, and from analysis viewpoint he says giberish, most analytical philosofers think hegel is nonsense. But there are some ideas there. Hegel is oblivious to fundametnal logical principles, for example, he’s not bothered by the principle of contradiciton. If ur logical, u cant accept s/o contradicting himself. But what happens if the stira isnt a stira, because the terms change meaning. If I say work is moving an object from place to another. But I then say work is prohibited on shabbos. So if work is the same, it’s a contradiction. So “work and work are homynins.” But sometimes u cant distinguish the meaning of words. Like using the word “love”. U cant say it has 4 different meanings. If u just put a label “love 1” and love2- u’ll avoid contradictions, the problem is that the love of a 5 year old and a 55 year old is connected. The experience of life alters the meaning of those concpets. That’s a dialectical conception. A dialectic. The notion that the meaning of concept changes over the course of reading and thinking. So RK is a Hegelian thinker. Ideas change through conflict. True value of an idea becomes clearer in conflict, the idea changes from the experience.

Cont: he is right when he rejected them and he’s right when he accepts them. These are the most important ideas.

From a religious point of view- how can we accept actions coming from a rejection of torah umitzvot. If we emphasize bitachon, so how can we accept validity of actions antihteitcal to bitachon. If there's a conflict btwn bitachon and hishtadlut, and u have to choose, then ur in trouble. And u may say that the modern attitude of relying on yourself is a threath to religion. A more complex way of thinking- Mordechai Kaplan held there's a conflict. If u accept modern science and medicine, so traditional tefila is out the window. So either reject tefila, or modern medicine. U have an outlook where u reject modern medicine and then when u have a deeper understanding, u then go and relook it. u have changed, have become a stronger person intillectually, and ur ideas have changed as well.

Rabbi Shaul Yisraeli- RY in merkaz harav. He wrote “prakim bemachshevet yisrael” popular in the 50s. has passages from nietche. Shows how he’s antihuman. Nietze was more wiling to see ppl die than R Kook. N is not a fan of ppl shooting eachother. But perhaps dying in battle. Lemaaseh, u struggle with things and then afterwards, u can see how they can be integrated into life. If someone gets sometihng without a struggle, its suspicious. One minute in the beis and then he’s in an academic confernce and in each place u just conform.

In terms of biblical criticims, rather than just reject it, we should first understand it, and build a palace above the conflict and use it to develop ur own derech. Charedimwould say RK was too unique, but the masses cant do that. Or that he didn’t synthesize properly.

Cont: next section:the emptiness and humility between circles, when looking from one cirtl to the other. the more important the ideas are,the bigger the conflict will be. From the inner point of view, they should be local differences of plants that are distant from eachother so that each can develop properly. The character of each one of these ideas should be fully developed. If grown together, the distinctivness woulda been loss.

Consider intillectual differences. Think about a unified world view compared to a dicotomist world view. So we want unification. Nathan rotenstreich – in 50’s to 70’s in HebrewWhen RK writes, he gives u unitiy. The idea that ultimately everything is unified. So offhand, ud think he’s the last person to praise distinction and separation.

Most baalei hashkafa start out with an early vision and then medayek in it the rrest of ur life. So there will beunity in that philosofer. Even if u chnagne ur mind about particular issues, the method used is the same method. U have to deal with this thinker by thinker. RK lichora sat down after turning over the struggle.

In this struggle- is it a struggle how to formulate? Is it u think one thing in the morning and one in the evening. So lichora when ur ready to write, u can write.

Cont: the realization is that when ur ready to develop- there's a unified way of thinking and a dissunified way. When ur studying psych- so if u keep asking whats daas Torah about this- u might be preventing the scientific perspective from developing in stead of developing a sythesis. u should led the secular perspective to develop in its perfect form before integrating it into ur Torah life.
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If u want unifying ideas in science, then there has to be a gleishshlartzin- the yasher kav- align it with eachother. Everyone has to get into line. When there's a machlokes physics and chem, get into line. Ex: age of world- evidence from physics sais one thing and chem sais something else. If u wanna be honest, let each develop on its own and at some point pull it together. Free will and determinism. Its obviously desirebale if we could agree, but it may be more honest to let diff approaches, and if science may move in one direction and theology goes somewhere else, and we don’t have to be so anxious to knock em together.

U could have the same argument at the social level, that truth is served when we’re pushed to work out contradictory opinions. When u allocate money for research, u may want to develop programs not worth very much, so that advocates of that position should work out their position well. RK on Biological evolution- famous letter- Moshe Zaygel asked him about it and got 3 answers.

1) there are sources in yahadut that support this- that He created worlds and destroyed them. Early 19th century tiferes yisreal- R Yisrael Lifshitz from Gedantz. Appendix to Sanhedrin not in all editions.

2)we don’t understand the first few prakim anyways, so whatever the Torah is talking about is more mysterious than what the scientists are talking about. So torah has its agenda and scientists have their.

3) and afterall, who knows if its here to stay. The Torah doesn’t change.

That’s sorta whats more abstract here- either identity- that theyre both the same, or there's outright contradiction, or that each has its own sphere and its not important to sit down right now and solve this. In V2 or Orot Hakodesh that he has sympathy for evolution.

The concept that things change and that its essential, that’s something RK has written to. Evolution didn’t scare RK.

Other passage from V1- page 16- Etzem Machshavot HaShonot- different opinios don’t necessarily contradict one antoher totlally. There's a unified revalation that manafests itself in different sparks. There are valid ideas and ideas that cast shadows that interfere with sight. Shadows are either mutations of human imagination or emotion where there's a new idea- a response to something. (then he takes a passuk from Yirmiyahu- dnot worry about astronomical phenomimon, the goym are afraid of it. Chazal- it efffects goyim and not us cause H watches over us. RK takes the image and applies it to us- ) For Goyim to be afraid of new ideas is understandable, but we have a genuine unity that is beyond unity (kabalistic language) and we have nothing to worry about. Shadows fdont let u see clearly, so ideas cast shadddowws and its hard to see clearly, which leads him to his next statement, that these shadows are the limits of imagination of emotional factors.

RC can imagine someone else saying the exact opposite- if ur cristian, new ideas come and go and just as C replaced J, so something else can replace C. there are serious christians ready to face a post christian era. RC’s friends hold the future of Christianity is in Africa (I think he said that) (in S America its left wing and anti semetic) (future of religion in Souther hemisphere- Joey bottom, editor of first things- u see the antisemitism there and that’s a codeword for antiamericanism and leftism. So maybe we shouldn’t be so optomistic about building church down there. Maybe just as well that we don’t get a pope from them for a while) so liberal Cs can handle a post C era. For us, we cant say that we’ll keep certain elemtns of the J message and throw out others.

This may be false optimism- in RK’s time, it was the church who messed up between religion and modernity. Catholic church messed up in middle ages. So we will do a better job. So last time we assumed his strategies would work. But are ppl inmerkaz harav really calm about challenges?

Think again about evolution- one prob is pshuto shel mikra in breishit. Others say “my grandfather was a monkey?” u understand that its not a rational argument. If it turns out that I’m composed of Hydrogen and Carbon, does that mean that I’m nothing but a few dollars worth of chemicals? Nobody sais “my grandfather was a piece of clay? He was shmutz?” so logically the continuity of me with a monkey and carbon, is a Question, but emotionally it has an effect. But if I have something in common with a monkey, does that mean that there should be no diff socially between us and monkeys. Emotional and imaginary factors are at play that can fight.

Many years ago there was a baboon heart transplanted into a girl.

In any case, the Jew is closer to the all encompassnig perspective. If u have the notion that all nations are limited because each nation has one idea to contribute, but that our message contains all the truth, then by definition, its all encompassing, but then u have the leap of applying it to how to handle problems of science and religion. And then from that perspective, there's no reason to assume that we’re more sophisticated.

Back to text page 17”yesod kol hamachshavot” there's a certain value in positions. (RK found value in Jewish secularislms, in the value of work that theyre doing, in the critique the secularlists of galut. Ppl rebelling on judaism are rebelling on galut, and theyre right, our life in galut isnt healthy.) Nothing is wasted. (strong sense in unity and divine providence- everything has a contribution) we’re all from the same mekor chochma. Things that appear empty arent really. All ideas will be redeemed in the end. The greater u are, the more ur able to learn from everything- u can even learn from yourself. U can even learn from others, which is a bigger chidush for some ppl. Ezehu chacham halomed mikol adam.

Plu tark- best known for his biographies of parrallel lives. President Truman- if I knew tanach and plu tark, I would know all there is to know in politics. He asks in one of his works about aetheism vs crude ideas of G-d. would I prefer someone say that plu tark didn’t exist or that he was a murder and rapist? Whats better? And that – is it better to believe in G-d and think he’s a NAZI or that He doesn’t exist.

R Lichtenstein – chassidish rebbi on a cart, and the dirver was an aethist so he got off. He would go with a christian. Whats the cash value.

So lets go to RK’s discussion on hishtadlus- frum ppl tihnk u don’t have to lift a finger. Secularlists hold u roll up ur sleeves. And we do the middle ground. But ppl get emotionalyl involved and if its one or the other, then the person in thename of materializm, he may be onto something that the religious perosn should be listening to. Ideas opporate within human lives, so a true idea wont be truly executed, so u may have lots to gain from listening.

There's an issue with prodestant theology. 1939 at a seminary and was told to stay in America and wen back to Germany and arrested after a certain plot and execuded right before end of war. Last words “well, this is the end of one part and the beginning of something else.” Or exocutionar- “well, this is the end” “no, this is the beginning” so he’s seen as saintly, but some saw as contravercial. Did some writings from prison. What it woulda looked like had he not been in prison. Developed a theology that securalists like- to act as if there were no G-d. so ppl think he’s really one of them. He’s struggling with some of these issues.

What would RK say about dialogue? RC thinks its sheker vechazav and Grid held like that too. In terms of discussion, RK was certainly willin to talk to secularlists. He didn’t activiely debate religion, which isnt a smart way to work. And if u don’t believe in that kind of argument, than u wont engage in that ikind of argument. This dialectical approach of RK is that ppl develop truth as they experience certain arguments. It’s a matter of experience, not logic. The ideas are different than what u started out with. Us ee things differently. How do u do it? Cardinal Rinsay on dialogue distinguishes between prostelitizing, scholarship, dialogue- all different things. Dialogue isnt about converting the other person. Each activity is separate. It may not be that simple to make those divisions, but there certainly is a difference. RC claims he does dicussion, but then there's conversion, dialogue, scholarship.

In RK, thereis a right way, but ppl are limited. So there's always something to learn, to grow in dimentions. U can have a yareh veshalem. When ur contradicting doctorinees, so its tough to say this, but if its theories about how to live ur life, then there's room.

(note, a group of catholic priests change times of conferences to accommodate Rabbis)

RK, educationally is unrealistic. When he described the ideal yeshiva, the plan was that ppl don’t sleep or there's more than 24 hours a day. So if u infer to what he mighta written about in this idea- he’s not safe to appoint to design a real curriculum. RK- u learn gemara 16 hours a day and u can do moreh nevushim in another hour.

Dr Revels’ plan was that by graduation, a student woulda read a pleforation of 1 credit courses convering lots and lots of material. There's a story in the Nazir’s diary- RK gave shiur in yerushalmi, meaning he had sfarim in his house, and ppl sat there. Once a day he would show up and read a text yersushalmi. Once a guy asked him a Q and he said “there r three ways u can explain this” and then kept reading. Nazir was supposed to chazer Tur even hae’zer. Started 6pm talking about spinoza. Spoke about spinoza til hanetz. RK held u have to know everything, and chazzer things and write about thiings all over the place.

Its not a big chidush that J and C that go off the derech have a lot in common, but that a member of the RCA (RC) and Cardinaal avery dullus- who really believes that catholisim is true, so he’s no better than the Rav who held u can learn from christians but that yahadus is true. This person is advocating that we should drop our emes thing. What would happen if secularlists disappeared tomorrow- Wishelbroad- the church wont change back. But after holocost gen passes maybe antisemitism will come back.

(Paeg 26) Perek 9- deficiency of yirei shomoyim is that they arent rooted enough in intilecutal Torah and end up with fear of thinking instead of fear of sin. Ppl think its yiras shomoyim and really its just ignorance. 10- yirat shomoyim must be purified from contaminants. Whether ethicla or intillectual. Humans . when u see everything is clear, then u have to figure out how to weigh diff factors. Yiras shomoim is a practical matter. Intilectually uhace t have insight to create that balance. 11- its important to adopt simple natural morality- the way ppl think about morality. And then yirat Hashem, which is separate, so that there's an elemtn of emuna pshuta, u build a grand framework of personality. Yirat shomoyim shouldn’t surpress natural morality. U wanna see if ur making progress- don’t check strange chumras, rather chech ur ethical straight behavious. If u look at ur self, and ask that would u be a better human being, and being a yira shomoyim…. If more yirat shomoyim makes u do less for those around u, then there's something really wrong with ur yiras shomoim. R Metal liked this passage in R Kook. He spoke about it a lot.

Ppl that make fun of sheltered existance, its because u don’t understand it. he’s a pluralist, understanding diff ppl in diff ways.

(u can ask yourself- what would I be without yiras shomoyim. U can also ask what do I gain from having YSh. If, because ur frum, so u grumble at others when they say hi, so that’s a problem.)

R Yaakov lived near a nunery in Monsey and a nun once asked who is that great man? He’s a big rabbi. What’d u notice about him? Well, he’s the only one who greets u nicely, he radiates. He’s something special. In terms of halacha lemaseh, if u find ways of being abnoxious, (well, they would claim theyre doing it bedavka) so there's ppl who radiate something diff.
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Orot Hakodesh page 28 Rosh Davar- 12- Bitchilata – the beginning of yirat H is batlanut. Being yirei Elokim, u lose ur will and selfhood, and only the external aspects of yirah (the hat, shuckling and trepadation) RC once met a guy who was seriously concerned that because he doesn’t have a netilas yadaim next to his bed that he may go to bed. He knows that its kabalistic but someone made him think he may go to hell if he doesn’t do it, and he was nervous about it.

Yirat Elokim doesn’t turn wisdom in him, he remains materialistic, his yetzer is what it was before, the tuma in the lees of life are still there, and as he becomes aware of the Divine, it simply cancels himself out. His life becomes weak and pale. The community becomes pale. There's no courage, there's no determiniation to improve their life, their social life.

There has to be dialectilca improvement

Aval Ruach Adam- no matter how much he suffers physically, or spiritualy, he wont abandon it. he rejects all the values of culture, vibrancy of life, and even clash between common/natural morality and Yirat Elokim as he understands it now.

Despite the fact that it conflicts with freedom and beuti and even ethic, he’ll continue to struggle.

But eventually there’ll be an integration of Yirat Elokim and the very element that he suffered from will become essential for the future development.

Techuna- the first exposure weakens a person which gives u greater power later on. That greater spritual courage compensates for whatever harm Yiras Shomoyim does to u. the lonliness that comes about because of Yirat Shomoyim gives u greatness of \_\_\_\_, and lack of Yira defaces spritited man.

In terms of ethics, we RK’s elements working out here as well. U find a kernel in one page all over his various pages.

A man once told RC that he was married to a lesbian, and werent religious. They went to a lecture of the Rav and she asked the rav that if a person has no religious side at all what do u say and he said that he didn’t have anything to say. Many of these scholars lived their whole lives as religious. So RK isnt starting from scratch.

RC wrote a booklet “forgive me father-in-law”. Outwardly there was a religuos guy but inside not. RC sais that Orot is rather autobiographical to RK.

Cardinal Newman describes how ppl become very excited about religion then decide they don’t have the same fervour and that it musta been a passing phase. Newman argues that that’s not the case. Ppl take lack of fervour to indicate lack of convition and lack of faith and lack of truth, but that’s not the case. The Rav would argue that its not a chisaron to write from this perspective because its important to tell ppl abuot what it was like to be Jewish.

RK speaks of emuna and bitachon, being active and passive. Religious ppl might think they cant be dynamic, or else I’d better rebel because its not healthy, and in this world I have to stand on my own two feet and get do soemthing empowering, achieve… RK would see a struggle btwn two valid orientations. Today he might have different examples- back in the day, religious ppl had a stronger sense of guilt, but today, RC doesn’t think it exists as much. There's other kinds of conflict. The danger today that ppl with shallow religion are more likely to be selfsentered than guilt ridden.

\_

From RK article called Maamare Hayira. Not officially from his writings that he published. 1913-

Background- the Shomrim- ppl that stood guard. Back in the day, ud have to hire an Arab guard. Security is partly security and partly blackmail such that if u paid them enough, they wouldn’t rob from u. If Maphia comes to u and tells u hire them, so if u don’t u’ll be in trouble. RC thinks that the maphia sells chritsmas decorations to get money in a polite well.

So if u didn’t take the Jewish shomrim, u got vandalism as a lesson not to hire Arabs. These ppl had ideals, and held that they could play hardball. So if ur playing that game, there's gonna be violence. There was an ambush and some Jews were killed. Today, ppl come out for memorial siren. This was the first time that it happened. A Z Rabbinowitz was close to RK and was an editor and approached RK, so RK wrote:

She’ela ketana shaalta mimenni- ud think that a guy like me is an easy marker, and that one more intilleectual tear in a flask of tears. But these ppl came to Israel differently. These werent ppl who wanted to leave Russia and some ended up in EY and some other places. But these kids came to EY davka for a harder life. They came to build us. But I cant write an article about these poor souls who were killed. (skip to page 90) Kshemitgaleh- am Yisrael has a way of thinking (skip to lo Nizdamen) I never met these ppl, I was dayan for one guy’s will and I see he was a ben Torah, a bal kishron, pure soul, and after being shot, while he was alive and he realized he was dying and that it happened for EY, so he was at peace with himself. He saw all glories of life before him, and it was snatched away. The Heavens and Earth say this person was Kadosh and lichora the other ones were similar.

Don’t be oversentimental.

Aval dom kol kore me’acharai- but there's a voice shutting me up. U have no right- u don’t know the story. U know the group where their coming from. U know their attitude towards religion and values, and may mean violence. Perhaps they never learned “kol poresh min hatzibur, we don’t deal with them, the relatives should dress festively, that Hashem’s enemies were killed. See the Rambam – if ur poresh min hatzibur, and ur porek ol, theyre arent part of klal yisreal, theyre bnei chorin. We don’t misabel over them.

And maybe u’ll quote Achad Haam that it doesn’t matter what the books say, because we evolve and change, and that in the end the book will be fanageled… Please, (when he wants to sound frum, he uses aramaic, and when he wanted to sound european, he used “sentementalit”) the book is the expression. The lev of the uma, this is the heart of … (notice he’s not saying “if there's a conflict between G-d and Achad haahm, we go with G, because he’s arguing instead that religion is what the nation is all about, because he also holds G and Israel are one, that what H demands is what klal yisrael demand. And his audience …) this is a love hate relationship. Oy meh haya lanu

This is a zealous and vengful nation, and we don’t deal nicely with betrayers, levvim killed relatives for the purpose of H. Even an animal knows its self-interest. Jews without religion are Jews without Judaism. So how do we deal with this paradox.

So how do we deal with this? We hold that ovdei AZ in our times are simply following maaseh avotehem. So we can say the same thing nowadays- the porshei tzibur bizman hazeh are diff. ppl 500 years ago separted from klal yisrael. They wouldn’t sacrifice themselves for the nation. But nowadays, ppl can reject klal yisrael and not reject Jduaism, they martyr for the kalal. The weakness of religion in Western culutre and the impovershment of galut lead this ppl to look with hatred at traditinoal religion. They think that for the good of klal yisrael they must turn against religion. They wanted to weaken klal yisrael. Rambam- a person might be frum frum frum, but if he doesn’t join the klal, so u have to know…

Rabinowitz sees the letter and didn’t publish it in the volume of his editing. So this document says a lot about RK’s approach to ahavas Yisrael.

Another piece by A Z Rabbinowtiz. Starts with a letter signed by “baal habait” (AZR)- about how his dad was a Torah personality and didn’t need more than that, but this “baal habait” needed more stimulation. Just like my dad never go tired of his body, he never got tired of his learning. (point is, when u are yourself, u take everything ur there for. U sit through intro to bible 75 times) But I’m interested in the world. And despite this, I’m a pashuta yid in Judaism. I may not be as smart as the greatest scientists, but they don’t understand Judaism. But I want more sophisticated Hebrew literature. I want to deal with eternitiy and substance.

But when I open Hebrew literature, there's struggles about poverty buying oinion and potatoes. Criticim of Jewish society. When ppl translate things to HEwbrew, by the time its published, itw out of style. And when ppl publish and thank them and buy it,

So RK anwers also anonymously- u went too far. Hebrew lit isnt only about eternal values. Attitudes that have nothing to do with life, I cant imagine why ur so unrealistic- must be u still hjabve a spriti of galut in u. greatest curse of galut is fear. (recall he’s cautios of the wrong kind of fear in orot hakodesh above) (btw, in R Lichtenstein’s talking a lot about orthodox being afraid of thinking and self criticizm). Unhealthy fear in spiritual life and physical life. We have broken souls. Even given the opportunities

When we dealt with the Nochri, every policeman made us tremble. What could we do. That kind of

Hebrew literature can have maaseh breishis, halacha, agada, and u think that other think that we cant have other thinggs. That’s galus thought. What u think are apssing questions … a living nation takes everything from world culture and digest it yourself. Passing concerns are not as important as eternal concerns. In galut we had triage, so we walled off secular culture, but the time as come to expand we can no longer be the way we were in galut. We needed goyish police, so we need science.

RK does agree with him on pornography that indeed

These 2 documents show how RK opporated with the chalanges of his time.

RK spoke at opening of Hebrew U- turns out they didn’t want him to say what he said. He was asked to say something rabbinical like say hamotzi. So he gave a real speech. And he made it clear that what he does is more imporatnt than what the University does. He makes a distinction btwn export and inport. If u ask most, they thnk export isnt problematic. We go and tell em what its about and they’ll listen. But import- that we should read and take in, we cant do. RK held the oppositve- import isnt a problem if I’m yere shomoyim, I sit here I read books and u do it. If u know who u are, u take and read and incoroporate. The other side is more dangerous. The export- when u try to explain yourself to them, there's a much greater danger that u’ll distort yahadut to make it appealing that’s why there's anxiety to translate Torah into Greek.
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The Rav- 1903. In 1983, they wanted to make a party for the Rav, so he decided he was 79, but it was probably just a stunt. His grandfather was GraCh, and the method of learning is very relavent here. To what extent its different- see Dr. Krunbein, a classmate of RC. Orthodox Forum, Avi Walfish who also a close friend of RC in college. As opposed to chazon ish, scholarship, and traditional learning which is focussed on psak. Brisker lomdus isnt bottom line oriented and whatever Grach was doing, so Grid was very aware. R Moshe was his dad. His mom was Pesha Feinstein. She was very well read. R Lichtenstien commented that she knew Shakespear and Isptein by heart. One would imagine that it was something known, that as anti secular studies RChaim was- that he preferred to close yeshiva than to allow govt to force it into yeshiva- despite that R Aharon Soloveitchik had evidence how Grach did tolerate ppl to get general education, but overall Grach wasn’t pro secular education. But his son married someone who was clearly more open that way. R Moshe S. went to live with wife’s family, which was not typical, so RMS was challenged after a while. And there are stories that there were arguments. Grid was oldest son, and sent to Chabad cheder. He was in white russia. Had lubuv melamed. RChaim held they were good for yiras shomoyim. The melamed didn’t do what he was supposed to do- gemara- but instead he taught em tanya. The rav’s mom heard and was sent to learn chavrusa with his father. 14 years. According to R Aharon, it was the greatest father son relationship in the history in lomdus with the possible exception of RAE and R Shlomoleh Eger. When he was 18, he was the talk of all Europe. His secular education, he had private tutors, read on his own. His mom was primary influence on these early stages. Studied at U of Warsaw polisci and economics. Transferred to U of Berlin. Urban Legend that he went to U because he had to leave poland because of the army, so while he was in Berlin already he figured he’d get a PhD, because if its not worth it, so being in berlin isnt a good reason just like u don’t just pick up a bottle of scotch in the airport. Btw, in terms of the solovethcik financial terms, it didn’t make sense to go to U for no reason. And his brother was in chemistry in brussles. But now we know he was in U in warsaw too. Was in berlin for 6 years. Studied philosofy, philosyf of science, and in later years mentioned that he doesn’t know why ppl expect him to know anything about philosfy of religion. Wrote discertation on herman cohen- the first Jew who was prof of J Ph without converting to christianity. The dicertation had nothing to do with Cohen’s Jewish writings, (although he took cohen seriously on MOreh nevuchim) and the rav’s understanding on teshuva, the Rav was influenced by cohen. (he was relevant to the rav).

Philosofy of science is important to the Rav’s view on Halacha. By the time he finished in Berlin, he has a girl friend, and he was more in Vilna, because the rebbetzin was from Vilna, and he spent time with R Chaim Ozer, and had involvment there. When he went to Berlin, it was a shok to the frum community, an enourmous sense of betrayel. Shulvas- prof JH in chicago, was in berlin in the 30s, and asked him why was it such a shok- there were other TChamim. A: u have no idea what reputation he had. Grandson of GRCh. Enouromous hype about him. R Yechiel Wienberg was in U from Slobodka, and mashgiach wasn’t happy about it. Lubuvitcher rebbe, R Chaim Heller, apparently the Rav had more hype and great hope.

By the time he’s married, hes back in berlin with wife, and ends up going to the US. He was considering skokie much earlier, but father had mixed feelings, and comgin to YU father was against, because he would be given highschool kids. And the rav wouldn’t have had the patience for it. by RC;s time, he was mellow and ppl were scared anyways. R Lichtenstein- u have no idea what it was like 20 years ago. Second objection- if he came to YU, itd interefere with cpmopleteing his secular studies. Its in writing, k?

He delayed coming to America, because rebbetzin was pregnant and he didn’t want to travel. Living in Berlin waiting to leave was probably not nice, as the politics were a little volatile- 1932- but in terms of his married life, this is important for mussar.

They come to boston, he was the rav of chevras shas of boston, and was seen as chief rav of boston. Most ppl were very supportive of him. There was great hope he’d become a leader. Quickly became vice presidnet of agudas yisrael. rLeizier zileber- the equivalent of R Chaim Ozer in America, was very supportive. He got into trouble by trying to improve quality of kashrus. U realize that if u have any business that involves transportation and items that are perishable, who is going to be interested? The maphia. Because u can distrupt it very easily. It just takes a few flat tires. So kosher meat business was infested and corrupt. A fairly reliable shochet came to US in the 20s, discovered how corrupt it was and told ppl at an agudas rabbanim meeting and was told to shut up. It was RC’s grandfather. The rav tried dong something in boston and “they” cooked his goose. They implied he was taking bribes from shochtim and ppl gave him charitable contributions with a check made out to him and pointed to out to IRS as hiding income. Some rabbaonim felt he was overshaddowing him. If u read hapardes a Torah journal with Torah news, “meeting of shochtim which gave vote of thanks to Grid” “police report states that investigation shows that he was framed” late 30s, early 40s.

his father died, agudat rabannim told YU to hire the rav as his replacement. Dr Revel had died. 1941. So there was board running YU and thanked agudat rabbanim for the telegram. “thanks for the recomnodendation” “um, we didn’t recommend. We told u what to do” commentator was against because it was bending to right wing. And others were against having a RY with U training because he wouldn’t stay cooped up in the corner like a good YU rosh yeshiva.

A leader of mizrachi wrote letter to R Herzog- as u know I was agaisnt ur eleciton to begin with, because I wanted a rav to pasken for me, not someone who would teach me to speak english- so there was a feeling that he had too much charisma. In the end the did hire him. The major problem thought he was too on the right.

Rebbetzin’s first thought when moving to America- how could she help her husband if she had no English.

Starting teaching at YU, and at some point drifted out of Aguda- as the idea of secular studies, and at a certain point deicded zionists were more right. RChaim started aguda but broke away. RMS was very anti aguda. Because they didn’t have proper kavod Hatorah. And my dad figured it out. RMS taught in a zionist instituition- it may have been just amatter of having a job. Made conflict wrt smicha standards and wrt some of the teachers here. And the Rav may have percieved that some of those ppl shouldn’t be teaching here. RMS came in 1926.

RMS was willing to teach in a mizrachi institution. Why he was prt of aguda- I dontknow. Aharon Rakefet has said that the rav came to germany and saw the aguda and saw that they were as frum as a summmers day long, had secular education and gravitated to them, desptie his critizims of yekeshe metnality. However that might be, but he claimed his family was antizionsit- the holocaust decided that the zionists were going in the right way. Becomes the rpesident of mizrachi in a couple of years, becomes halachick authority of RCA. Becomes rabbincal leader of MO. 1950s.

1959- diagnosed with cancer. As the 5 year period approached- if 5 years passed, u could kiss it goodbye. His wife got cancer, and her death was a great blow to him. He taught for another 18 years, RC was in shiur in 70s, and 76 had access to the 76-85 was close to the rav. RC wrote- whatever a personal reltioanship means, RC had insights that others didn’t have. But it was 8 years in a very long life- and even those were very limited, comepared to R Wortzberger from 1940 and on- engaged as pulpit and intilectual, and its ulikely that RC knows anything really important that nobody else knows. The lesson to be learned from here – look at the written record and if it varies with the written record, then u don’t trust em even when it doesn challenge the written record.

Even when talking about the family members, the attempt to create mythology- if someone knows something that others don’t, take it with a grain of salt. He held his better talmidim were in 60s and 70s than in 50s. in terms of number of top students. In a famous article he writes that he was successful gm rebbe, but failed in hashkafa- there are those who know how to learn but are hashkafically shallow- machmir on crazy things and meikil on important things. 3 things- problems with MO- lack of inwardness, serinormalization of religion, and utilitarianism of religion. There was a yidish article where he give diff meanings of serinomliazations.

By the early 1980s, he was physically fragile, and productivity time went down. His mind remained, but the consentration wasn’t there. U have to be able to work for hours. The RCA wanted him to write a teshuva on something in the 1980s and he couldn’t stopped. Giving shiur.

Reputation was that he was stingy wrt publication. Briskers were always not publishing. Perhaps s.t 2 do with perfectionism. Also something about oral instead of written. Which becomes fixed and stagnant. Hashkafa should be alive, and halacha, there's a sense that ur encoutering rishonim anew every day- not wanting to repeat. This contradicts the scientific model- because no one says to start physics anew every day, and in Ish halacha the rav models learning after physics.

On first yerztheit- RHS, RReichman, RC talked about the stira, and someone told him he really expliained it. there's a sense that ur experience of Torah changes from day to day. Ppl repeated what he said before and he wasn’t interested.

Early- there a lot in letters- and those were important records of some of his tihnkging when he was younger. Many written up by his father, which says something about how commited RMS was to his son’s fame and success. It has something to do with plagarism issues. The rav was campagining for ciheff rabinate and gave some shiurimg and things were appearing in other ppls names. So RMS published to head of plagarism stuff. Grid said shiruimg zecher avi mori. Either his own writing, notes of various quality.

In terms of machshava- besides the doctorate- ish hahalacha- a work that he was known by for many years. Shortly after, he wrote two others- the halachik mind- “is the phiosofy of halacha possible” it went unpublished. “ish haelokim” published as “ubikeshtem misham” according to R Lamm. According to R Lichtenstein- evertying that the rav wnted to preserve from ish haelokim found its way into ubikashtem.

R Meir Lichtenstine once found Ish Haelokim in a closet in boston- reported some of the differences.

Ubikashtem was published either. If uv seen the movie- the rav said a few times that ish hahalacha had no real audience. He planned on writing a lot more, but found it a waste of time so lost interest. Juda Dark, rabbi in oakland- that was one of the saddest things he ever heard. When he fist read the halachik mind in type script, and RC had it late one time, and he read it all night, and said “it reminded me of a holywood directors who said “I want u to film the sunrise over the ocean and they told him that u cant do it cause ur from california. So u can only get a sunset. To the producer sais then film a sunset and run it in reverse. That was RC’s reaction- it’s a proclamation of not integrading halacha and machshava, being writen at sunrise in the 1940s, and read at sunset. The rav had done some things to fulfil that vision. Those works werent published except for ish hahalacha.

Kol dodi dofek was published in 50s, because there was a zionistic need. In 1964, article that the rav wrote called confrontation, written under occasional pressure- vatican II opened Jewish Catholic dialogue. The rav came to a restrictive position. There are areas where we can work, but not with theological dialogue. He publishe it cause it was a burning issue.

1965 published loneli man of faith- dedicated to his wife who was deathly ill. Maybe he published because of family element. Ish hahalacha might have been a monument to his father, and LMoF might have been to honor his wife.

By min 70s, ppl convince him to publish more. Late 70s publishes yartzheit shiurim. R Twerski ZL was involved. R Lichtenstein was involved. R Menachem Genack was involved. RC was involved, R Wortzborg. Ubikashtem eventualyl comes out. Halachik mind is allowed out. all kinds of other things less major get into print without adequate review by the rav. And whatever comes out posthuomously comes out. book of family. Worhisp of the heart. Articles here and there. Unoffical stuff too.

Ok, substance- Ish Hahalacha- there are a few fundamentals- the intillectual resourse- 1) brisker lomdus. Recall, when the rav talks about halacha, he means brisk. That means that psak is ignored. And he’s open about it. Ish hahalach isnt interested in psak. Obviously the Rambam was interested in psak. The rav focuses on theoretical aspect. For the rav, halacha is science, not technology. Physics is quantum mechanics, not car mechanics. It’s a good description of what goes on in a litvish yeshiva. If u were learning YD, u were a bit of a traitor, who was preparing to defect to the real world of rababnus, and not lishma.

There's a certain approach to philosofy of science. The science in ish hahalacha is herman cohen, even though in his doctoroate, there are things wehre he disagrees with cohen. Ppl will tell u Grid changed his mind on things. Lonliamn fo faith- if u look at doctorate, ull see he didn’t change his mind. The things that he held cohen were lacking were published in ish hahalacha. In the frame work of ish hahalacha- cohens views are central.

3)typology or idea types- type means imprint- a story in old testimant that forshadows Jesus is typology. U can speak with typology as any system where u take a particular model and the exmaple becmoes a model for the rest. So an ideal type in the rav is taking a certain description and making it into an abstraction. There r writers who do this- kierkegard. Early 20th cent sociologists do this. Max vager, Edward Shpringer- the rav does quote him- “forms of life”the idea of an ideal type- when u talk about a scientist, ur not doing a sociological study of them- how many chew gum. Ur interested in conceptually what it means to be a scientists. Ur conclusions are logical, not statistical. What does it mean to look at the world as a chemist, physisist. What ur getting at isnt imperical sociology. It has logical consistancy, how a scientist thinks about space and tie is phylosofically important. And ur aware that there are diff types, and the diff types percieve in different ways. The ideal types don’t describe any individual- in real life there no such thing as a real scientist. From philosfical, it maybe useful to take scientist and look at him in the abstract. Ideal types is fundamental to Rav’s writings. Majestic man, man of faith. In ish hahalacha there is scientific man or cognitive man. (herman cohen scientist). Then there's religious man. (ish hadaat and ish hadat). Homoreligiousis- a religious personality- not a person who believes in G-d, (sometimes that what it means, but here it means) a person who is yearning beyond this world. And then there's ish hahalacha- the rav’s claim in the first page, is that ish hahalcha has features of both cog and relig, but isnt the same as either. Therefore if u want to have serious philosofy of religion, if u don’t know about ish hahaclah, ull be missing somehting. Ull look at phenominon in religious life and u wont get it.

Tzvi Krovolitz- wrote a book about the rav. Had haskama from R Lamm, and a christain theolgiian- Harvey cox- this is a valubale book, because reading it he began to understand prof Twersky who previously seemed to strange to me. For a christian, RT is much more a litvuck than a Nochri. This idea of centrality of halacha and how it interacts with Jewish life. There's something missing that ifu read ish hahalacha, u might understand it better.

It deaserve its own presentation.

14/12/11

Recall we discussed things that Grid utilized Lomdus, and Philosofy of science, and idea types. This is a conceptual way of thinking. Sociologist, philososphy.

For example, the rav talks about cognitive man- who isnt a realy person. Its used in what is required to do science. CM looks at the world of science. Kantian, Cohen. It ends up being invariably modern physics.

Homoreligiousis is primarily about what religion is about- meaning a yearning for something beyond this world. Schleiermacher was a reliogious thinker in early 19th century Germany. Older than Hegel. Defined religion as a feeling of absolute dependance. A sense of something beyond this world. Hegel didn’t like Sh, because then if religion is about dependence, then the ideal chrisitain would be a dog. Someone living post-kantian. After kant the proofs of existance of G-d, and getting to G-d through scinec, so to get to G-d, he used emotional states. A certain philosofy connected to religion. Something in world beyond world.

Ish Hahalacha is a little like both of them but unique (both of who?) famous footnote 4- ppl tend to think of religon as s/t that makes life sweeter and more tolerable. Certainly in America at the time Grid was writing. That its down to earth and practicle. U turn on a radio, and listen to a sermon, its either a promise of heaven, or a threat of hell. Its about making ur life better, attaining peace and prosperity. Grid- that’s not what religion is about. If religion is yearning for something beyond the world, then this world cant make u happy. HR will be a conflicted personality. Then he gives a catalogue of great thinkers who emphasized conflict. Mentions Hegel and Kierkegaurd. Bart, Otto (even though bart wasn’t mekabel Otto in many respects). Forces that pull us in different directions that cant be reconsiled. Moreoever, Ish Hahalacha is even more conflicted than HR, because he’s also a HR. so in addition to all the HR conflicts, IHH is even more conflicted, or pluralistic because he’s got that extra think. (this might contradict IHH in other places in chibur)

A lot of IHH describes IHH as a relatively peacefull personality. If u read lonli man of faith, then footnote 4 seems to fit. But IHH isi relatively unconflicted. RC thinks u can metaretz.

The Rav’s interest in early parts of IHH is to work out the differences between the diff types.

1. Cog Man is interested knowing contraversial. Therefore CG is a personality who is victorious personality. He accomplishes things intillectually. He conquers the world. Because of phil. Of science, he conquors in a particluar way of developing concepts.
   1. Certain ppl might think science is about facts. Some kind of Junior High School science teachers who are really gym teachers, who think of science as accumilating facts. And he piles and piles em up. And finally those facts tell u the truth. This is not really how science works. The Rav’s concpetion is that theory plays an important roll. Developing concepts have to identify to reality. Revolutions arent new data, its new ways of conceptualizing. Data is the NM, but the theory is the study. Science is about producing concepts and theories. Involves the idea of working out concepts, and Grid’s view of halacha is very similar. U start out with certain principles and see how they work themselves out. In a brisker context, principles are svaros.
   2. Scientist aims at generality. The scientist is also focused on quanitity rather than quality. Thikning of newtonian physics, there's no such thing as diff kinds of objeects. There's one set of matter, one set of laws that apply to it. the laws of physics quanitify those. Physical laws have mathematical equasions. Y is a funciton of x, and when x changes, so y changes. F and a. For the Rav, if u ask CM about smells and feelings, he cant talk about it. “to be is to be the value of variable.” (some philosofer) a lot of the world is left out.
   3. Quantity is important. In halacha, the quanitity is important. Shabbos is nice, but why does it have to be connected to ereve shabos. “what do u mean ur not coming Saturday? U can keep shabbos next week” ppl have trouble coming home from work. So the mentality of IHH is similar to that of CM. In terms of leaving out subjective elements, so u have a problem. Halacha isnt subjective in the way that religion is subjective. Mitzvas tzrichos kavana. There's sugyos, Rambam, it’s a machlokes. And the requird kavana is to do a mitzvah. Even if the mitzvah isnt meaningful to u. Halacha is a science in that respect. But there are many mitzvos that have a quantitative aspect- tefila, averot, simchas YT, avelut. Grid did a lot of work on those issues. He made a distinction btwn chiuv and kium. Kium is the action even though the mitzvah itself is much more than the action. Like teshuva in Rambam- vidui or teshuva. Grid- its one mitzvah and the external manifestation is mumbling words. The external can be seen externally, and the internal cant be. Every IHH must be an ish Daat, because he must have that subjective religios dimention. We’re not talking about not doing certain mitzvas mihadrin, meaning ur gonna miss a lot.
   4. CG doesn’t have a sense of mystery. He’s a conquerer. U come with concepts, u apply em to the world and when the world responds to those concepts u celebrate. HR in the contrast, has a sense of mystery, looking beyond the world. Ex- article on cartharsis and in bikashtem- qualitative vs quanititative. When u talk about optics, it’s a mathematical science- angle of insidence, and refractions, trigonometry, tells u how light waves are refracted, propagated. A blind person maay be able to do well and get an A in physics. A blind person doesn’t know what yellow is about. U have to experience it. and until then u don’t know it. for Grid, the ultimate mystery is the qualitative elemtn of experience. If u ask Gird where do u see mysterious in the world? So G-d is One. But u can also recognize qualitative experience is challenging. CG isnt interested. He wants to bring colors under the rule of science. That doesn’t mean that scientists arent religios or don’t need religion or experiences. Its quite possible to have a sense of mystery and at the same time exalt in using the tools and concepts of science to dominate the physical phenominon.
   5. Aderaba- Grid quotes Natrop (important neokantian) that from the view point of a religious personality, the more science u know the greater sense of mystery. Because if u can experience yellow and know the laws of physics, u know have to mysteries, u have qualitative experience, and that ppl are able to know the laws that describe the phenominon. The relation btwn sense of mystery and knowlegde is like the relationship between area of circle and the circumfernece.
   6. Be aware, in the Rav’s doctorate, he sais that Natrop is right against his Rebbi Cohen. Cohen failed to deal with transendance with sense of perception, meaning that actualy qualitative experience we have tansends religious understanding. So he returned to this hashkafa later in life.
2. CM is interested in knowledge, quanititave, and has no place for mystery. HR is opposite of al these things.
3. In terms of ethic: CM- nothing outside the world exists. For Religios man, there's 2 worlds and the really important world is not the one we’re in. IHH holds that CM is focussed on this world. Understanding and acting in it. that means that at a practicle level, the Q comes up how we view death. HR- death is good, it’s a better place. CM- there's only one world. This world is whats really important. This is why halacha has such a negative outlook on dead people- metame. Etc. in brisk, they went to extreme- Grach didn’t visit graveyards. Interesting that after rebbetzin Grid was nifteres, he went to beis hakvaros every week. R Simcha Zelig’s son asked Grid how he goes all the time? A: I cant help it. IHH is against death. Don’t get involved in cemetaries. Develops abstract theory what halacha is about. Which makes concepts intersting. We werent talking about pesach and aveilus. Before we were talking about halacha in general. But this example (Grid- if Christianity was halachik, ud get “what is the minimal height of a christman tree” and what if its higher than 20 amos, what if the berries are yavesh, if its plastic r u yotzi. Can u be yotzi putting it behind glass if the person has hay fever. Whats interesting is that in tumas mes, the theory has an intersting result. This way of thinking should lead to those halachos. The mishna sais yafa shaah achas koras ruach in the next world is comparable to all of this world. And yafa sha’ah achat maasim tovim in this world is greater than anything in the next world. Negative attitude towards death and viewing the dead.
   1. In IHH he talks about chassidus, and refers to baal hatanya as IHH and Ish Hasod. Basic chassidic outlook is not that of IHH. Yahadus as a whole : even a chassidishe person is more like IHH than like a religious personlaity because actions determine hashkafa. Hassidus might be very diff than Grid’s description, but how u act may modify ur theory. The chasside rebbi, regardless of what he prints, if he learns gemara and does mitzvos, it molds him in a certain way and that’s why he’s diff from a christian mystic.
   2. One point that Grid says is that Halacha is democratic. Everyone can participate. For HR, if u arent a religious virtuoso, then ur nowhere. RC can imagine u saying the exact opposite. All u have to do is read Gm and be mechadesh. If ur not halachik, u need mystical raptures. So hard. But today, s/o could argue that gemara is not easy, and being mechadesh is not easy, but spirituality is fuzzy and if it doesn’t help, u can smoke something and drink something.
   3. Grid- the gra and the shoemaker shake the same lulav.
   4. McEar. Imnipotant means to be able to everything that u can do. If doesn’t mean making a stone larger than u can lift. So if a being has the ability to wiggle his ear. He does it at will. So he’s omnipotent. If someone has a very narrow range of mitzvos, a ben noach, ad in hamevaser where lubavs who walk up to goyim. R u a Nochri? Ya. Would u like to come into a truck and obstain from ever min hachai. This is a very narrow way of life. A way of obstention. If u have a framework where if halacha were less all encompassing, the world would be very diff. at what point do u measure s/t as narrow and thick. We intuitiviely understand the diff between Torah and mitzvos that keep u occupied vs limited obligations and then done ur duty.
   5. So this negative attitude towards death- IHH doesn’t want to die. This is part of nature of halacha. Family tradition was why Grid didn’t want to die. There r times when Grid thinks that he cant do YK anymore, so from IHH’s point of view, that’s ok, ur anus. But still he’d rather be dead than come to that point. Remember, IHH isnt all of yidishkeit, its only one way of looking at it (huh?)
   6. IHH values this world, so action is importnatn. HR sees the world to attain somtehitng else. For HR, world can function in 2 ways. 1) asetic- fasting and obstaining. That’s because this world is just a way of getting to the other sied. 2) u can have a personality indulgent in this world whos a HR. An orgiastic person. We get more and more of this, where spiritual life is about overindulgence. John Balougi- an actor and performer. U escape this world through orgi. Drinking the extra shot even when u don’t want to.

19/12/11

We spoke about how man can be other worldly or this worldly0 avoiding death thing.

IHH manifests positive view towards knowledge. GRID writes about a foundtain. Physicist look sat hydrolics, chemist at water, poet at inspiration. IHH looks at the halachik aspects- tahara bezochalin. An early english commentator referred to purification of reptiles “zochalin”.

Kantian- views of science- Junior science teacher who happens to be teaching to fill hours- for that person, science is accumulating evidence. That’s not kantians think of science. Its not how any modern philosofer thinks of science. Grid uses kantian leshaber es ha’ozen- some thought Grid isnt serious about philosofy and is just using it to impress people. Grid really means that u can understand science without being neokantian. He uses neokantian because that’s the way he thought about it. the point is that science is more about theories than about laboratory work.

To put more flesh on this- if u take aristotilian physisist, he holds that things remain stationary unless something moves them. But if I push it, I impart a finite force, and when its spent, it stops. That’s one way of looking at the world. The conception of motion, is that default is 0, and that force imparts a certain amount of motion to an object. But newton’s concept has altered. Default means that the object continues at the same speed as before. Force doesn’t cause motion, it causes acceleration of motion. In RASAG proves G-d’s existance based on Aristotle’s physics. Newton tells us the object stops because of friction. But the theoretical frameworks will be different in each place. A scientist comes to the world the apriora principles, so now we can understand the IHH who also has various principles that he looks at the fountain with.

Herman Cohen’s philosofy of science is about how u develop those concepts. “The Constituition of the world in H Cohens’ philosofy” was Grid’s PhD. Without neokantian, theory precedes observation.

Some make the opposite idea- ah, why cant we make up any halacha that we want to make up? Create halachik categories and results. But those people don’t understand Brisker halacha. Ppl think that Grid’s talks about halacha being man made, thinks he’s talking about maskanos. But he’s talking about forumating. Grid is very clear in IHH that he’s not focused on psak. This is surprising to many- to many poskim. Rambam woulda been surprised too. Grach would be surprised too. Grach wanted the Dayan to handle psak. “u do whatever u want, but don’t give me the reasons, cause if u do, I’ll upshlug em and we’ll be in trouble” Dr Grach agrees that briskers are interesetdin halcha lemaaaseh but have a different way of getting to it.

Lomdus includes kodshim and taharos- brisk didn’t invent that. But they care as much about things that arent halacha lemaaseh as not. Whats the diff between Rambam and maxwell house hagada. (good to the last drop- from President Roosevelt) as a child, he was into asthma. They’d give kids coffee. They figured if u’d smoke strong scigares and threw up, so then it’d clear it up. He only used cigarres under extreme circumstances, lest he got used to it. coffee relaxes mucosal and muscles. For Rambam, he assuems the existence of the beis hamikdash. So we study kodshim and taharos.

The American Baleh bayis- a lomdun isnt a technician, a lomdon is a scientist. An old story – a rav entereed community and saw lights on at 2am. “is everything ok?” “I was studying” so they fired him, obviously he wasn’t very bright cause he has to cram. That’s the point- we don’t look at TT like that. Like science and not like technology. Curious intlectually, not just pragmatically.

IHH wants to bring heaven and bring it back to earth. Its kinda commentary that christian might find disturbing, who may be vaguley distrubed by mysticism. Christiannity background. Attempted to get awwy from that. So serious christand feel it as well. So davka in halacha, in this intilectual and practilca reigment, we have a worldliness, a willingness to deal with world and not escape.

In halacha, there's no ideal of fasting, nor of orgiastic eating. But all in all, if u add up everything in halacha, u get an attitude in eating and drinking- and it’ll offend acetic ppl and orgiastic people. Whatever he ended up talking about, it was about TT. Seder, is the model of proper eating- intgegrate divrei Torah. In terms of that attitude that u bring to the world, IHH “chagigius” which “somenity” picke dup from william james. Solemn really means fernerial. Means usually abad mood. Low spirits. But it had a more festive spin a few years ago. So it’s a solemn joy. A sobre joy. IHH isnt emotianlly easily swayed, doesn’t give into enthusiasm. A quiet cheerful attitude.

Like R Lichtenstein, maybe. Not emotionally excittable, but cheerful simcha, sobring.

Why does he say that? Danger of emotional extremes. Talks about it in IHH. The world is a positive place. Competent when dealing with the world. U have a job to do and have a +ve attitude.

The emotianly attitude comes up in discussion of musar. Mussar refers to more violent forms of musar- extreme like depressive aspects of msuar- that the world is a lonely place, burden of Yetzer hara. Grid tells the story of how Grach rejected musaar in yeshiva about laxitives. Also appears in Yechiel Weinberg’s wriitings. Yazkir yom hamita. Recall, Grid doesn’t like thinking about death.

Homorelgiouses is give to emotioanl highs and lows. There are dejected moments, because ur so small, and then there are moments of great pride and arrogance, when ur high. HR oscilates. IHH isnt that way. He’s not focused on emotianl state, rather on this world. World outside. Intillectual and practicle creativity. If this is what IHH is focused upon, then the move u take to the world is sobre joy. Wont be focussed on emotional extremes.

Many great christain thinkers are very focused on emotional highs and lows. But for the rav, its not about that.

The book IHH assumes that we understand that Halacha tells us that indeed halacha is more important than other sciences. The relatsionhsip to H is more important. HR is obviously thinking abuot G-d a lot (until he’d too invloved in emotions and forgets about Him) but u have to be careful not to end up as an automaton. RC holds ubikashtem is the second half of IHH. There's an aspect of HR in IHH that’s not focused on this essay (except footnote 4). IHH isnt just sitting around creating sihurim. There are end of life mitzvos, there's simcha, (its not as wild as other’s concepts of simcha) btw, use of alcohol on purim was very limited by grid. Dr Grach- I don’t come from a drinking family. A guy in Grid’s shiur was in a plane that was hydjacked and was sent back. R Hutner was there too. In Jordan for a few weeks.

Grid was upset at the guy for another reason, and they made a kidush, and with great reluctance he made a lechaim.

GRMF heard GRACh died in WWI. He didn’t believe it. white russia- when travel was difficult, decided to go to warsaw, and got more evidence and went home.

Story- IHH mentions other stories. R Prusioner- favorit daughter was dying. Dr: she’s going fast. How long? 40 minutes. good, I can be yotzi shacharis with Rashi and RT tefilin today. That’s an extreme example of someone emotioanlly restrained. R WErtsberger- please dnot tell that story again, its shocking. Grach wasn’t like that. The stories in IHH are meant to ilustrate. Grach who played horsy with little children didn’t make it into IHH.

Grid sais elsewhere, that GRACH had trouble with Kriash shma sometimes, Grach had trouble making it. Grid once broke a rib concentrating too hard.

Why are emotions so bad? Alex Student has in tradition- focussin on avelut and manifestations in halacka, but if RC would title “the natur of emotion” but Grid calle dit the nature of a person.

Centrality of halacha means that emotianl ups and downs don’t play as much a role. Also, pracitcle is halaha is important, so kium mitzvos is more important. Other elemets – the rationalist will distrust being overwly swayed by emotion. That’s not IHH, its stam his hashkafa. So value and danger excess of emotion, and calculate whats inhernat in halacha.

Consider a short 2 horu shiva, followed by YT, and u get rid of sad rags and put on ur glad rags. Or if u suddenly find out one of ur loved one’s died, and its YT, so u act as if its YT. That’s not a matter of IHH, that’s just the halacha. Many ppl may have trouble living that way.

One of Grid’s grandchildren that rebbetizin died on Tanis Ester, that pesach, Grid wasn’t easy to be with. Even when asking what ideal would be- IHH is an ideal type of yahadut- not all of what ur supposed to be. A person whos really in tune with halacha will bend in that direction. Whether ppl succeed in that is a different story. #2, is that ifu have a system of law, it wont work out w every individual. Psycologists: we hear shiva is is really healthy? RC- I dunno, both my parents died on Tuesday. Levaya Wednesday, shabos in middle, it woked out, and ppl came to visit. Some ppl come and don’t know how to behave during shiva.

Content of IHH- Purpose in the world. HR looks for a purpose outside the world. IHH doesn’t have that element. It’s a very worldly outlook, like when u study science, u try to understand the world, and u don’t ask why does water boil at 100degrees C. some religesous thinkers ask these questions. Grach visted vilna, and a chabad book in waiting room, the author claimed H created lmaan tuvo and lmaan chasfo. Grach- nah, its because he wanted to. He rejected a very common idea, but he’s coming from Rambam where its very clear that the world wasn’t created for the sake of anything- not man, etc, rather, because H so willed it. “volunteerism”. It goes together with creativity. G-d creates and so do humans. Even for no alterior motive. For this reason, IHH is not in favor of taameh hamitzvos. Elsewhere Grid has problems in Halachik mind- when taamim dnot fit halacha exactly. Halach is not about looking for reasons, its lookinf for structure. Its analysis.

Story- one RH night, chassidim were doing crowning- a chaba ritual where they mekabel ol malchut. Corronation night. GRAM caught Grid saying tehilim with them. “look, if u wanna see what the day is about, come with me and they sat down and learned about tekias shofar.” Grid claimed that the chassidic ritual was invaluable to his concpet of RH. That’s HR, and he got it from chassidim and not from lomdus in tekias shofar.

GRAM had a chabad baal tokea in washington heights, and he cried when he blew. Presumably, because he was thinking about likutei Torah, where it’s a cry across the abys separateing man from G-d, so he wept. father said to him, “cut it out” do u cry when u sit in the succa? When u take lulav? This is the mitzvah and that is it. we mekayme mitzvah with solemn joy and non of this bawling. This is IHH’s attitude on taameh hamitzvos. Look at structure of mitzvos and not emotional ascpect.

Grid- if it happened with me, I wouldntve stopped the baal tokea. R Aharon Soloevetichik claimed that the trei kalei issue was bothering his father.

So the rav didn’t take this possition al the way through. and G-d is volunteeristic. This is what the world is. take into consideration that certain mitzvos are in a aveilut state. U cant learn about avielut and ignore the sad aspect. Reb Moshe once asked when an avel was weeping. Ok, that’d be rediculous. Avelut and teshuva isnt what IHH is focussing on.

Adam I fits CM, but Adam I is about power and achievements. Adam II is HR. IHH is neither here nor there. The reason IHH isnt in LMoF, maybe because LMoF was delivered to non-Jews, and because it was Adam harishon, which may be connected to the audience also. There are other things abuot avos and Moshe one.