

The following is a lecture delivered in Baltimore, Md. on 1/29/69

"The Role of Orthodox Judaism in the Protest Tradition of America"

This past week, I made a very brief trip (I say brief, so that if <sup>any</sup> ~~some~~ of my baalei batim hear me, they shouldn't think I'm only out-of-town) to the Pacific Northwest and met with two communities, ~~and~~ <sup>also</sup> In the course of lecturing there, I met with college groups in both communities. This was for me the first opportunity to meet, in the flesh, <sup>the</sup> Jewish New Left, West Coast variety. ¶ I didn't find it exhilarating; I was repelled. One of them said: "Do you really think Israel is always right?" No, I don't think Israel is always right; I am a believer in Judaism, and the whole literature of Judaism and the Prophets shows that Israel is not always right. He said to me: "In that case, would you join in publicly condemning Israel for its attitude on Viet Nam?" I found, in general, an attitude of moral disdain for Israel, for Jews, and for Yiddishkeit. ¶ It is not an immoral dissent, ~~but~~ The same moral impulse which brings the members of the New Left to protest the barbarism of the Viet Nam policy of our government (assuming you call them barbarities), which brings them to protest the starvation of Biafrans, or against ~~mistreatment~~ of the various underprivileged classes in different countries around the world, <sup>--</sup> this moral impulse, I felt, despite the ugly way in which it was expressed, fundamentally spoke of something of the Jewish background of these young men and women. ~~Because~~ I find it fascinating that Jews have almost always been in the forefront of radical movements in this country and in Europe. Somehow, despite the fact that they have been cut off from the Jewish tradition, sometimes a

generation, or two or three, <sup>they benefit from the</sup> ~~possess some~~ interest they are still collecting on the old capital. The passion for just causes, even when it is expressed in dangerous fashion, betrays some kind of Jewish element deep down in them.

Since protest is in the air today, since protest really defines the spirit of this country <sup>in</sup> in fact, it may be the element which will tear asunder the whole fabric of America and leave it a completely different kind of country from what it once was <sup>we</sup> we ought to ask ourselves: what does Judaism have to say about the nature of protest, social protest, for just causes? ~~whether it is~~ it is it conceivable that protest really has Jewish roots? My answer is clear: ~~I think~~ it does, I know it does. In fact, I believe that protest is, as it were, a Jewish vocation. <sup>9</sup> It is part of the mission of the Jew in the world to protest. Noah didn't protest and was criticized for it. ~~Because~~ His sole concern was with saving himself and his family. (I am told that Rabbeinu Tam, in his Sefer Hayashar, says that the reason Noah went into the Ark was that the <sup>אֱלֹהִים</sup> said to him: You had the responsibility to involve yourself in the lives of your contemporaries and restore them to their previous faith, to make <sup>person</sup> of them, to remind them of their own moral <sup>gestalt</sup> ~~gesture~~, and you didn't do it. If you couldn't <sup>bother to</sup> save a human being, then stay in the Ark for 40 days and 40 nights with the animals! <sup>Because</sup> he didn't protest, he was committed to the Ark.

Moshe Rabeinu, before he became the <sup>פּוֹלֵגֵם</sup> ~~פּוֹלֵגֵם~~ 113/1



was a protestor. He protested against the <sup>123N</sup> striking the <sup>1278</sup>, and again when he saw injustices being committed against the daughters of Yitro. RaMBaM; This capacity for advocating the part of the underdog is part of the preparation for <sup>7(112)</sup>. This is part of the whole shitah of the RaMBaM on prophecy.

The Maccabbees were people of protest. The Perushim were people who stepped out of society in order to protest it. They believed in separation in order to show their protest against the kind of society in which they lived. And the RaMBaM, in the ~~first~~ <sup>third</sup> part of the Moreh, in commenting on the mitzvot, says that one of the fundamental reasons for a good number of the mitzvot is ~~(that)~~ ~~in order~~ to protest idolatry, polytheism, and the heathen cult. RaMBaM has his own explanation of the Commandments, but the common thread that <sup>runs</sup> ~~ran~~ through the majority of them is that the Torah wants to teach <sup>לעולם</sup> ~~to~~ to protest idolatry and the ritual of the heathen whenever it can. <sup>9</sup> Even non-Jews saw this quality of protest as part of our essential nature. The great economist <sup>Ernest Renan</sup> ~~called us~~, in a veblen complimentary sense, "disturbers of the peace." <sup>9</sup> A saw the Jews as "a living protest against superstition and religious materialism." <sup>9</sup> Of course, with all our penchant for protest, we must agree that it can be overdone. Protest, I submit, is Jewish, but there is an ethic of protest. I must protest against injustice, but within ~~a~~ <sup>S</sup> limit. My protest must be equivalent to the injustice. Once I overdo it, I am in trouble. In the Midrash there is an interesting question concerning Dor Hamabul. We know that the people were

punished because of hamas, gezel; stealing. But there is a very simple, logical question that we ought to ask: assuming that  $\frac{1}{2}$  the people of the generation were ganovim, <sup>and</sup> ~~so~~ they should have been punished. Why were the other  $\frac{1}{2}$  punished, the victims? This is not ~~an~~ "evenhanded" justice. So the Medrash answered:  $\frac{1}{2}$  the generation, the thieves, were guilty of גניבה, while the other  $\frac{1}{2}$ , the victims, were guilty of פיגור דין, violent words. One of the great דברי ימינו, (der Alter, called so even in his youth) <sup>R. Nata Hersk Funkel</sup>, said: the problem of the generation of the flood was that the victims were outraged, i.e., a man stole \$5 from another; so he should have shouted. He did shout -- but he shouted as if they had taken \$5,000 from him. Their protest was overdone and that extra protest of injustice, itself <sup>constitutes</sup> an injustice, <sup>it</sup> is פיגור דין, because that excess <sup>of outrage</sup> brands the criminal a much greater criminal than he really is. It is a moral offense and therefore they too were guilty; the victims of גניבה <sup>were</sup> and the thieves of פיגור דין. They protested too much, they committed an ethical violation. A sensible human being protests, but never more than the injustice deserves. So there is an ethic of protest, I ~~believe~~ and that ethic of protest calls upon us to refrain from over-reacting, from shrill hyperbole and exaggeration, from extremism, the ugly kind ~~of~~ which is now, as I said before, threatening to tear apart ~~our very~~ country. Yet, all this



having been said, the fact remains that protest is a Jewish vocation.

The great <sup>Reszhar Rnr</sup> once said that; <sup>היה זה פסלן שלילי</sup> - the existence, the superiority of man over animal, <sup>פ"ל</sup>, doesn't exist, <sup>it</sup> is naught. This is <sup>wholehearted</sup>

*Kuhelchris*  
A pessimistic way of saying that in many ways man is no more than an animal. But the Reischer Row interprets that just a bit differently: Do you want to know wherein man is superior to animals?

"*file*" - his ability to say "no." An animal always says <sup>"yes,"</sup> is always obedient. *But a Jew*, by virtue of his ability to say "no", the ability to dissent, he is more than an animal. The ability to dissent is a Jewish vocation.

Der Alter Rebbe: אל זינאט באדער בארן און זינאט

Where the word "no" was sown, the ability to protest. "And God knows that there is a need for protest and dissent in the non-Jewish or general world today. We live in an atmosphere where agnosticism is pervasive, ~~where~~ <sup>humanism</sup> humanism has taken hold of most of the civilized world - ~~aetheistic ecumenism~~ - and therefore we have a world which is destructive and capable of the most ~~critical~~ <sup>cynical</sup> kind of action. It is a world of scientism, where science has been elevated from an effective technology and method to a religion in its own right. It is a highly efficient functional neo-pagan society in which we live. And the most dreadful aspect of it, the one that needs the greatest <sup>protest</sup> by Jews, is the fact that this pervasive secularism in our society wears ecclesiastical clothing. It has insinuated itself into all the religious structures of Western society, so that you have the phenomenon ("social Gospel")

ethical,  
which is a very/benevolent kind of movement, but really means the  
relation to God is something totally private; it has no relation  
with public. I prefer to call this movement, which so shocked  
America, the movement which wrote an obituary on <sup>בד"ד</sup>, "atheo-  
logy," because (1) it is against theology and (2) <sup>it is the "theology" of atheism.</sup> ~~it~~ . It shocked  
everybody not so much because it was a blasphemous statement about  
God's not being alive, <sup>but</sup> even more so because it revealed something  
about religion and its establishment. Everything was secular - no  
<sup>mythic</sup>. Speaking in the avant-garde of Christian religious  
circles (and in some Jewish non-religious circles), it means  
"speaking of religion without God." ~~To put it a different way, to~~  
<sup>quote</sup> ~~quote~~ A very perceptive Catholic philosopher, Jacques Maritain,  
said 30 years ago that the Jew had <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ duty towards the world; and  
that is -- "stimulating it, exasperating it, moving it - Israel  
gives the world no peace, it bars slumber, it teaches the world  
to be discontented and restless so long as the world has not God."  
In other words, he sees the Jewish mission as that of gadflies -  
I was almost about to say "God-flies" - that of pricking the conscience  
of the world. Somehow we must have the ability to remind the world  
~~that~~ of God, ~~even if foolishly.~~ <sup>Q</sup> And there is a need for protest  
in the Jewish world in which we live. And here we have a function.  
Obviously, it goes without saying in this kind of audience, that  
one of the things we have to protest is a Jewish community which  
has no Jewish identity; A Jewish community which has disclaimed  
its Jewish tradition and heritage; A Jewish community which



more and more defines itself as Jewish by virtue of the anti-Semitism which fortunately (or unfortunately) pops up here and there to remind us that whether we like it or not we are still *גוי' ממשל' ישר*

7811, and we can not assimilate even if we <sup>should want</sup> ~~care~~ to ~~assimilate~~ too quickly. When I think of the secularism which pervades all of

Christian life, the identical thing is true of our lives. In our religious establishments secularism has also insinuated itself.

WIE ES CHRISTELT SICH  
SO JUDELT SICH

I always feel happier when the Christian goes to church on Sunday rather than going to a ballgame; because the possibility then is that the Jew will want to go to shul on the day before -- or six days later. But we have a problem; ~~our Jewishness has become~~ ~~by and large~~ by and large the American Jew has learned how to

assert his Jewishness in a secularized way; a very nice way, a philanthropic way. And you can't dismiss philanthropy; it's of enormous <sup>importance</sup> proportion. But where it is only philanthropy, it is,

enormous proportion. But where it is only philanthropy, it is,  
as someone said: "They" Alimony Judaism. We suffer in this

country from an <sup>"Edipus"</sup>~~Oedipus~~ complex. The rabbis in smaller communities that are less intensively Jewish know the problem; people contribute to a building campaign for a shul and then don't bother coming.

Somehow we seem to have a "thing" - Jews are doing their "thing"  
of the structure  
when they build and make no use later. They are involved with

communal, temple, activities which don't pertain at all to religion -

But, and it becomes a matter of status seeking. We must protest

this devaluation of the intellect, the de-emphasis of Talmud Torah as a valid activity for adult Jews. We have begun to relegate it to a minor activity; to a children's activity. Responsibility to educate a child is derivative; we must learn too, It is not just a "pediatric Judaism." Not only Rabbis must learn, רב חכם must too learn. It struck me as strange in the Mishnah Berurah: the author ~~when it~~ bewails the fact that רב חכם could only devote 3-4 hours daily to be פוסק in Talmud Torah. בית דין של פוסקים. Something has happened to all of us where the whole principle of Talmud Torah, which is on the very apex of the hierarchy of Jewish values, has atrophied. What protest must Orthodoxy have in a world of this sort?

I am going to give you a biased point of view --

"modern Orthodox" - I don't like either of the terms. Normally, in English, Orthodoxy means narrow-minded, גורם צר-מבט. "Modernism" It is a kind of arrogance, what the same Jacques Maritain has once called "chronolatry" - the worship of the calendar; if I'm up to date, that means I'm really it; I am superior. This kind of modernism, or the worship of being modern is really non-sensical. So I don't like either word. Every time someone says: Don't you identify yourself as more or less a "centrist?", I always remember what the Kotzker Rebbe used to say about middle-of-the-roads. He said, referring to life in the Shtetl, אין אמצע בין גאון וטולדן. I don't like the whole thing; I have to think of a new word. Frankly,



I don't like "moderates" either. A moderate lacks passion, he lacks zeal. To be a moderate you generally have to weigh and balance several alternatives. You have to have the ability to see the competing ideals and you choose a particular course. In the course of weighing and measuring and trying to understand, you lose emotion, you lose passion and zeal. It is wonderful to have extremes, to be on the extreme -- any extreme. You have energy, passion, commitment, zeal, <sup>energy</sup> ~~energy~~, and then you can ~~instruct~~ <sup>express</sup> yourself unencumbered by other ~~hypotheses~~ <sup>hypotheses</sup> and other calculations. So, unfortunately, I am a moderate, and I apologize for it. I think the issues are too big to be left to emotions alone. After you have passed a certain age, ~~you~~ I think that experience and <sup>^</sup> sense <sup>vt</sup> and history call upon <sup>you</sup> ~~us~~ to think - and if we want to come to a non-moderate conclusion, good. But it has to go through the crucible of having been thought through carefully. But this is my position, for better or for worse. ¶ In trying to give it to you, I confess to being guilty of interpretation. I give you my interpretation. I say so without self-certainty, without self-assertiveness. I know that interpretation is always open to question and you may rightly question me. Interpretation always frightens me (Story of two vying Jewish old dailies, "Empress Cina here on maiden voyage.") ¶ So, aware as I am of the dangers and perils of interpretation, nonetheless, I ask you to believe me that I try very hard to keep away from the extremes of this kind of liberality of interpretation. ~~Quite seriously now~~ ¶ Our Orthodox community consists of an almost infinite variety of shapes, in the way we try to formulate

our response to the modern world, or whether we want to respond at all. More or less, I would say, we can be divided into two camps, and we define ourselves in relation to these two poles. I would prefer to call them the "moderate" and the "radical". The radical, in the finest sense of the <sup>term</sup> ~~word~~, is from the word root. They want to go to the root and express it as they see it, as they think it originally is, without embellishment, completely, totally. Radicalism, as usually expressed, is a carry-over from the previous generation, either in Lithuania, Poland, Russia or Frankfurt-am-Main.

¶ The moderates, the radicals, and all the shadings in between -- all of us are together on one basic principle: our unalterable commitment to the supremacy of Halakhah. Not that the Halakhah is the only thing to Yiddishkeit - there is halakhah, agadah, there is hashkafah, kaballah, and hasidut, and there is mussar. But that which defines us - the sine qua non, the irreducible common denominator, is our commitment not to a specific halakhah, but to the whole purpose, the whole body of Halakhah and the fact that it retains its supremacy in Jewish life. <sup>¶</sup> ~~The radicals - and~~ I need not spell out which groups are radicals, because they differ in their intensity between these two poles. We can define one as close to ~~one~~ <sup>one</sup> and one as close to the other. Whether you go to Lubavitch or Telshe or YU or HTC, or to any of the groups -- in some cases one group will be more radical socially and more moderate intellectually. But by and large in describing these patterns, the radicals are separatists.



There is social separatism in different neighborhoods, in different clothing. In the really radical groups there is an attempt to separate oneself from the general and the even rest of the Jewish community by distinctive clothing. There is a communal separatism such as the ongoing, ever-continuing, never-ending discussions and battles about the SCA and the NYBR, with the radicals denouncing any participation in the SCA; constantly, thoroughly, and incessantly. Stephen Wise, the Reform Rabbi, was very hard on corrupt politicians in New York City; he was very brave in denouncing them. He once went to a cocktail party and was introduced to a man, a ganav whom he had frequently berated from the pulpit in the Stephen Wise Free Synagogue. The man says: 'O, Dr. Wise, you have denounced me often enough.' Rabbi Wise looks at him and says: 'Denounced you, yes; often enough, not.' Somehow the radicals in our mahaneh have denounced the ~~rest of the~~ moderates for their association in the SCA and the various boards of rabbis which are mixed - Orthodox, Conservative and Reform. <sup>91</sup> ~~There is a~~ radical group that de-emphasizes the synagogue and its centrality in Jewish life. Instead, a re-emphasis on mitzvot maasiot that they regard as equal and that really are equal or more important than tefilah be-tzibbur; especially in the assertion of the Bet Hamidrash as superior in importance to the synagogue. Roshe Yeshiva, correspondingly, ~~equivalently~~ have gone up in prestige and rabbis have gone down. The synagogue itself has changed in its conception

amongst what I like to call the radical Orthodox. There is a de-emphasis on form, a de-emphasis on esthetics, sometimes almost to the point of a conscious non-esthetic attitude. There is the proliferation of shtiblech at the expense of the more established synagogues, a kind of delight in non-conformity, and <sup>protest against</sup> ~~in~~ the synagogue's bureaucracy. And then, in varying degrees, there is in the radical wing of our mahaneh a position to secular education, which, of course, despite the fact that all radicals are united by their general attitude toward secular education, is the most ambiguous of all their points of view. <sup>91</sup> How about an evaluation of the general radical approach? There are some very positive things and anyone who denies them is, I believe, simply denying what is obvious. The emphasis, the attempt to keep observant Jews in specific neighborhoods, to my mind is a marvelous thing. It has tremendous educational value for children. I would love my children to grow up in this kind of community. It gives Orthodox Jews, <sup>אורח חיים</sup>, the possibility of creating the right kind of environment without distraction that is necessary for their own spiritual progress and that of their families. It gives us the possibility of creating a total community structure that tries to actualize the ideals of Torah in the world, which means, all the communal functions that are necessary for a Torah community, such as yeshivot and hadarim, Kosher establishments, etc. I confess that I am much more favorably disposed to physical ghettos



than I am to intellectual ghettos. There is something very beautiful about it. It is, in the positive sense, a real rejection of the emptiness that has crept into organized Orthodox life, and with this we struggle constantly. <sup>subtle, quiet</sup> Also our/secularization which we in the Orthodox mahaneh and in the general Jewish community suffer from. And the question of bigness and bureaucracy for its own sake. So in addition to the obvious values of intensified

פירוש הלכה, and intensified study of Torah and the elevation of the concept and the practice of Talmud Torah, these are genuine expressions of the whole movement of protest that I think are so necessary in the Jewish community. ¶ But there are negative features too. I say this - and I really shouldn't have to say it - I say it not as an outsider; we are speaking together. What are some of the negative features? I speak here of negative features primarily in the sense that the radical movement, I believe, has not fully fulfilled its function of protest in the proper way and ~~that~~ I am speaking now of the protest function. The major brunt of radicalism in Orthodoxy, Torah Orthodoxy, is that of communal and intellectual segregation, and with it occasionally some of the side phenomena, such as militancy and the escalation of disagreements between it and other <sup>מחנות</sup> <sup>יהודים</sup>.

¶ My own position, let me make it clear, would be this. My boundary is that I accept the social legitimacy of those who identify themselves as religious Jews, but are not within the realm of halakhah. To cut through the circumlocution - Conservative

and Reform. I recognize their social legitimacy which is another way of saying I recognize that they are there. They count for a power in the total community structure. You can wish them away but that won't chase them away. They are part and parcel of the community and they perform certain functions. But I do not, can not, and never shall -- it is impossible for me to conceive of giving them Jewish validity as a religious group. That is to me out of the question. I can't bring myself to talk of three wings of Judaism; a bird that has three wings is  $\text{שלושה כנפים}$ , it isn't kosher. I recognize that there are Conservative and Reform Jews -- I don't quite know what they mean, I don't understand the commitment thoroughly; I am very confused by them. They act, and as such they do ~~things as such~~ some good things, and some bad things. But they are there. And when I deal with the community as a community, I recognize them as such. But halakhically, religiously Jewishly, spiritually, I must deny them validity if I am to be true to my own conviction. That is my left ~~quarter~~ <sup>border</sup> ~~quarter~~ <sup>border</sup> My right ~~quarter~~ <sup>border</sup> is: I will not be a dropout out of the Jewish community. I believe that as a Jew I live in two worlds, and those two worlds sometimes rub each other the wrong way, but they are fundamentally not in ~~combat~~ <sup>conflict</sup> with each other. And I am involved in the larger world not because I have to make a better living, not because of parnasah, not because of vocation -- I am involved in it without apology, without temporizing. I am involved in it because I believe that as a Jew, as a ben Torah and a baal halakhah, I want to be involved.



Without apology. I may be wrong, but I do it right now without excuses. Of course, the moderate point of view is one that attracts ~~empathy~~<sup>enmity</sup> on both sides. Stated positively, it is my conviction, and I think that here I possibly speak for the Torah moderates, that the <sup>Jewish</sup> function of protest <sup>in</sup> to the world ~~which is~~ ~~a Jewish function~~ is served neither by integration completely nor by segregation completely. Similarly, the function of the Orthodox Jew within the Jewish community is served neither by obliterating all differences and recognizing the validity of all the "wings," nor is it served by segregating oneself and ignoring the existence of anyone else save ourselves. To protest effectively <sup>which</sup> is another way of saying "to teach" one cannot be identified with that against which he protests, nor can he be totally insulated from them, <sup>for then his</sup> ~~Because the~~ voice is muted, and he accomplishes absolutely nothing. It is my belief that Am Yisrael was brought into the world and chosen as the Am Ha-nivchar to be both separate and involved at the same time. And if that sounds paradoxical, then it is paradoxical. But we are separate and involved. At Mt. Sinai we were made a people and are a people only because of the Torah. When we were called into being as a people we were told that we have a dual function. To be a <sup>עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל</sup> and a <sup>גוֹשְׁמֵי אֶרֶץ</sup> <sup>קִדְּשָׁה</sup>. Kedusha, kadosh, means separatists, it means turning inwards, trying to develop our own spiritual being and ges<sup>h</sup>talt,

<sup>לְעַצְמָנוּ</sup> means to be for ourselves and by ourselves. Kedusha means perishut; kadoshim ti'yu means perushim ti'yu.

So it is a kind of drawing within. It is a centripetal motion, inward. *ממנה פנינים* would be a kingdom of Kohanim. What

does it mean to be a Kohen? The Prophet Ezekiel tells us that Kehunah means teaching: *אֵלֶּיךָ יָבֹאוּ וְלִמְדָה וְלִפְעֻלָּה וְלִדְבָרֵי חַיִּים*

*וְלִפְעֻלָּה וְלִדְבָרֵי חַיִּים*. As a Kohen you are a teacher, as a teacher you can not teach by keeping quiet. It is not only publish or perish; speak or perish. To be a teacher we must engage a student, you must have a dialogue with him. You must confront him speak with him, engage him. In other words, *ממנה פנינים* means turning outwards, centrifugally. So that we must do two things that are opposed to each other at the same time. Turn inwards and turn outwards. Pull in and push out. And the

*ממנה פנינים* of the Jew is that he has been able to do both at the same time; and <sup>if</sup> he isn't able to do both at the same time, he should.

Look at the tefilah with which we conclude each and every service three times a day, every day of the year - *שְׁמַח וְשִׂמְחָה*. The

first half is a separatist kind of tefilah; we speak of ourselves as being different: *אֵלֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְלֹא אֱלֹהֵי אֲחֵרִים*

*אֵלֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְלֹא אֱלֹהֵי אֲחֵרִים*. We are different. I do say the words of the Sefardim; in this Democratic country I am not afraid of the Christian censor. I say the words: *אֵלֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְלֹא אֱלֹהֵי אֲחֵרִים*

They pray to a god who can not help, even if the name is Yeshu, it is lo yoshia. Va'Anahnu - and we pray and kneel to the melekh

malkhai hamlakhim. It is a very separatist, a *לִפְעֻלָּה וְלִדְבָרֵי חַיִּים* type of feeling.



And then we turn to *אִלּוּ בִּן נְקוּדָה*, and we completely reverse ourselves. We speak of our sympathy for all the world, for they too must come to the *רֵשׁוֹלָה*. We want *בְּכָל צָרָה*, every ~~means~~ *אֲמֵל*, not only of Jews, but of Japanese, Russians, Spaniards -- all colors, all races, all sizes, all shapes. And we finish with the great universal proclamation *וְהָיָה ה' אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵי כָל הָעוֹלָם*

4 Rabbi Yaakov Yechiel Weinberg, *יְצִי*, who passed away 1-2 years ago, one of the greatest poskim of our generation, one of the wisest of all the Rabbonim we have had in many a generation, pointed out that these two functions of Klal Yisrael, the particularistic, the pulling in, and the universalistic, the turning out, were given to us at the same time, even before Matan Torah. What is it that marks the Jews as different?

Brit Milah. Milah is the sign of the Covenant, and the Covenant is that which distinguishes us from all the Umot Ha-Olam. When was the brit given to Abraham? When his name was changed from *אַבְרָם* to *אַבְרָהָם*; because *אֲבִי כָל הָעוֹלָם*. When Avrom's name was changed to Avrohom, it implied that he was going to teach the entire world, *אֲבִי כָל הָעוֹלָם*. In one *פסוק* the *רש"י* says: *וַיִּתְּנֵהוּ בְרִית אֲבִיכָם וְאַתְּ מִתְּנֵהוּ בְרִית אֲבִיכָם* at one and same time a brit to be separate, and *אֲבִי כָל הָעוֹלָם*; go out and teach and speak to all of mankind. And this is what we have to do. It is a very difficult task. You can get dizzy going in and out at the same time. But if it is the Jewish

meshugas, it is the greatest and most sublime meshugas in the whole world. That means, for instance, to bring it down to very <sup>אין די דאזיקע</sup> things, with regard to our attitude to the rest of the world. This means that we should have been in the forefront in the battle for civil rights, and Biafra, and anti-poverty, and every kind of just cause. The problem was that those Jews who did participate as individuals, as secularists, as humanists, didn't have any relation, any <sup>אין די דאזיקע</sup>, to Yiddishkeit. And we who were in the camp of Torah, we sat silently and as usual we allowed them to represent us. I don't care that we have been paid back in a terribly ungrateful way by the Black community. Our involvement on their behalf, if we felt it was a just cause, should have been done without thought of compensation and should still be done. But it should be done not as individual Americans, but as a people of Torah, as a people of mamlekhet kohanim. We must be separate, but not separatists. Or, if you will, separation but not segregation, by which latter term I mean the complete insularity and failure to engage the rest of the world. The same holds true within the Jewish community. We decisively frustrate our duties towards Klal Yisrael when we take a posture of angry and frightened withdrawal into our own camp. We ought to be separate, but not to cut ourselves off from any contact with others. I don't think we have the moral right to abandon the majority of ~~K~~al Yisrael today. We just don't have the right. We don't even have the right to admit to



them that they are פלפול - they are not. To me this is the foundation, the ציו'. The great founder of Galician Hasidut, the Noam Elimelekh, once said about the famous verse in Tehillim:

אל טו וחסד ירדעני כל ימי חיי ושגחי בקרני חן עארק ימי

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I shall dwell in the House of the Lord forever. The Noam Elimelekh asks: Does this mean that David is asking God for a soft life, he wants a Cadillac, a cruise, Medicare payments, etc. --

אל טו וחסד ירדעני כל ימי חיי -- No. What he means is that if you look at a Jew who possesses in him the quality of חסד וטוב;

he is a man of innate goodness, he is willing to risk his life for a just cause, he is willing to give more than any of the world's people for UJA, Bonds, Federation and for shuls -- even if he doesn't go into them -- and the American Jews possess

חסד וטוב in historic proportions, then you must remember that if we חסד וטוב are clever enough, then we will never give up, then we will wait for that Jew, because אל טו וחסד ירדעני, they will pursue him and not let him rest because he has a mekor kedushah, until חסד וטוב ; that חסד וטוב will bring him into the synagogue, if the gates will be held open. And this is where some of those, not all, in the radical camp have, I believe, failed to fulfill the function of creative protest because their posture of withdrawal and fear of the outside world is more reaction than radical protest. Reaction against pressure -- sometimes against cruel pressure, against a sustained pressure and therefore there

is a tendency to pull back. I am not against radicalism, not  
in the least bit. But I don't believe that radicalism in  
the sense of bringing the shewah of expressing the Torah as it  
was meant to be expressed in this world in its finest and purest  
and holiest sense -- I don't believe that it means ~~that~~ with-  
drawal. I think that it calls upon us to do something with the  
world. Not only with ourselves. We do something for ourselves  
when we do something for other Jews and for the rest of mankind.  
I think it means protest. If we see things we don't like, we should  
not keep quiet, but we should protest. And in a manner which  
will be effective. We should engage other Jews, we should confront  
them. תוכחה היא לא תעשה . It is a mitzvah to reproach, to rebuke  
provided you regard the man you are rebuking or the organization or  
the community as חבירו , as your colleague, as your friend.  
When ר' said: תוכחה תעשה אל כל עשרת אלפים , rebuke even  
1000 times -- I think it was the great R. ~~Symon~~ <sup>Russel</sup> who said it  
means one תוכחה , one rebuke, broken up <sup>over</sup> 1000 <sup>years</sup> people. We  
must give it a palatable form. You don't shout at people. Protest  
when it is shrill and when it is couched in insults won't be ac-  
cepted. It can't be accepted. And to keep silent altogether  
means that we have not done what we were supposed to do towards  
the rest of the Jewish community. And we shouldn't abandon them  
or anyone else, neither here nor in א"י. When ר' said: ואלו  
היו שנים רבות, the Torah lies neglected in a corner, this was not  
their prescription of the ideal situation. It was a lament.



They were weeping that Torah lies in a corner. But what we should do is bring it into the center and have others share the centrality of Torah in our life. ¶ Do I mean that in the Torah community there should be what I have called moderates only? No, I don't. I don't think the moderate community has a complete absence of problems. We have problems galore. We haven't solved all of ours, not by any means. If anything, I would subscribe to what might be called for want of a better term, Torah pluralism. ¶ I think the Torah community can afford two approaches and all the varieties in between. I think that we ought to have ~~an~~ in a thoughtful, vibrant, dynamic Jewish community those who take the point of view of "Torah and ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> Derekh Eretz, and those who take the point of view of only Torah. Those who take the point of view of segregation, and those who take the point of view of mingling and getting to engage the rest of the Jewish community and the rest of mankind. I don't believe that we have to have a monolithic community. I believe there is definitely a place for another point of view. I think those who advocate the other point of view might also agree to this pluralistic approach with regard to the composition of the complexion of the Torah community. ¶ I conclude with this -- the point of view I tried to present to you is a difficult one. It is a perilous one, it is a dangerous one. The idea of being separate and yet involved, of striving for kedushah and yet for kehunah, of saying the לִפְנֵי and the בְּפָנֶיךָ, of pulling in and going out at the same time, of traveling on that thin line is a very, very risky

affair. My only source of optimism and courage is that this point of view is undertaken not because we want to compromise with the world. Not at all. It is undertaken not because we find ourselves beset by impossible conditions which are new in the history of mankind. Not at all. It is because of emunah, faith, that every generation has something to accomplish. And our generation is called upon to show the world what it means to live in the tzellem Elokim and to fulfill it. And that we were chosen for this task and as such we have to be a part and have to be within. And that we can do it. ¶ Perhaps the best way of closing is with the words of the late Rav. Kook <sup>ר</sup>35, when he visited New York in the 1930's and he told the story of his youth from the Steppes of White Russia, where the houses were on the hill and the Bet Hamidrash was in the valley, and the weather was very, very cold with heavy snows all winter long. And when the children came to shul he noticed that he came having fallen and stumbled and slipped, and the other children were bruised. The Rebbe came down completely clear, neat as a whistle, unbruised, untattered. He asked the Rebbe: How is it possible, all of us come from the same place, all of us slip and fall and you come down so clean. He said: Mein Kind, notice that on top of the hill there is a stake driven in and there is a rope that leads down. Hold on to that rope and then you will discover that

כל אדם יכול להיחלץ  
בזמן קיצוץ  
השינה

It is possible for a Jew in his mission of protest to the world which



calls for him to be separate from the world and yet engaged with the world, which calls for him to be totally devoted to Torah and yet aware of and involved in other matters outside of our realm; it is possible to slip. But if our kavanah is le-shem Shamayim, if our intention, if our faith derives from לפי ה' ד if our stakes, in other words, are driven in deep and soundly up there, then we shall not stumble downhill.