

THE THREE FUNDAMENTALS OF CONTEMPORARY ORTHODOX JUDAISM

(Introduction to talk to RIETS Yom Iyun on Taharat Ha-Mishpaha)

It is accepted as a given today that the three fundamental institutions of Orthodox Judaism are Shabbat, Kashrut, and Taharat Ha-Mishpaha. These are the three items we generally set before ourselves as our goals in convincing people to return to Judaism, the criteria by which we measure a person's Orthodoxy, and even the three major items to which we introduce potential converts.

What is the source for specifically this collection of three items? The answer is--I do not know. I do not believe there is a text which can support specifically these three as being of over-arching importance. After all, there are a host of mitzvot--from Talmud Torah to Yom Kippur, etc.--which can claim priority. Wherefrom, then, this three-fold emphasis?

I suggest that the source is not a text, but that it corresponds to and is based upon a human-psychological reality.

It is well-known that the three major instinctual drives in man are: sex, food, and power.

Hence, sex is circumscribed and sublimated by Taharat Ha-Mishpaha; food is limited and orientated by Kashrut; and the lust for power is curbed and directed by the laws of Shabbat which force us to relinquish our supremacy and control over mute nature and over our fellow humans (thus, le'maan yanuah avdekha...)

(2)

See your Shyrtalt
= 2032 (2011) & first
p. 77 the introduction

More Ego: secular education (9

Zionism

Emigrate from Europe to USA

West Bank

There are ^{policy positions that are} not divorced from ~~is~~, but
neither are they susceptible to clear ~~is~~.
They are meta-Halakhic: related but not identical

⑤ One such issue important p. 100 today: PLURALISM

⑥ To decide such questions w/o any reference to ~~is~~,
~~is~~ - is subjective, fatuous, not Jewish.
To "look it up" is to misapply Hal.
Rather, to absorb sources, intuit an
approach based on sources but applied to
individual historic situations.

⑧ Several decades ago. Q: Whether belong "mixed orgs"?
Some (11 sub pgs) - NO. 210-11.
Rav - ignore it + join Syn. Council
Rav was criticized: why not (200 that it's ~~is~~)
Ans: Rav understood it's NOT a strictly
Halakhic Q! Hence, ~~is~~, not ~~is~~.
Not relevant to (200 or a non- ~~is~~ 210-11)

(3)

(9) a) So - 2 valid p-r. Each one w. much support.
(when I stood? accepted Rav's p-r / G.A. is -
but problem: what is G.A. / p-r. if: yes on
Syng. Council, no on Bd Rabbis)

b) Clearly, reject extremes:

- exchange p-r/p-rs w. non-Ortho
- ML: young group refuse visit critically
all conserv. Rabbi in hospital

(10)

Situation today is changed:

- a) Ortho much more intense, powerful.
More, & more confident ask: R; better organized...
- b) J. winning as such disintegrating.
- c) WE ARE, despite all, A SMALL MINORITY
- d) Disunity leading to more horrendous consequences:
 1. 21st -- don't know who's Jewish -
(some Reform Temple - majority "2nd"; or 2nd)
 2. 19th -- (g. w. remarriages - 2nd son)
- e) WE STILL HAVE RESP. TO G.O.B.

(11)

Those who argue for total separation are inadvertently
considerate of that resp. to G.O.B.

a) objectively

b) WE can't afford to "quit alone" - neither
politically (ISF/USA) nor economically

(4)

(12) Those on other side who argue to skepticism - are seriously, gravely in error.

(13) Definitional PLM - many equally legitimate "interpretations" of DM

(14) now, many forms PLM:

- a. philosophical
- b. cultural/political ~~(not)~~
- c. halakhic
- d. denominational

(15) P.M. a PLURALIST in first 3 - not 4th:

- a. philos - not necessary now (אין צורך כעת)
- b. cult/polit - vs (vs melting pot) ...
- c. halakhic - אין צורך vs הגדרה (vs definition) (אין צורך בהגדרה)

(16) Denominational. They quote each other's words but not: no ban on intermarriage, etc. is explicit - אין צורך בהגדרה, מילוא (עניין) הוא

(אין צורך בהגדרה) אין צורך בהגדרה כי הנהגה נכונה היא שיהיה
On 2nd - forget Rabbi: אבותינו פסקו את התורה
On 1st - overruled fact WITH IN a community HAL!!

(5)

(17) I: do not know what PLM in denotation means. Is an irrelevancy. Red herring.

(18) PLURALISTS agree: no delegitimation.
Equal legitimacy.

(19) I reply: who agreed to anything we stand for...
no equal legitimacy for left, right, religion, etc...
such "PLM" = relativism - & that UNJUST

(20) yet -- not at all entirely? Refuse "recognition"?
No - "recognition" too is a distraction, slogan...
AND - unity itself is a desideratum -
I resist quite numerous lies on this

(21) I make fully distinction:

FUNCTIONAL VALIDITY - yes, valid when not before I commit
(valid < validity < strong)

LEGITIMACY - NO!

(legitimacy < law = law) = HOL.

different fact (= valid) + quality (= legit)

(22) If want my full position - MOMENT/CLC talk

(23) I know - many p. n's & p. s's will merge w. me;
many will agree; most/all cons/act will agree

(6)

BT I feel I have to let you know
how I feel. And - I haven't begun to
scratch surface of my rationale.

(24) At any rate - this whole discussion is
just an illustration of a highly significant
area of communal life that is neither
purely static + subject to social - nor
purely political + divorced from ethical norms.
Rather -- in gray area, where meta-ethical
principles have to be consulted w. those
objectives always in mind.

a) personal - never really

b) social - + up:

(i) (ii) 23' to 40' 00' 00' - 10' 00' 00' 00'

c) integrity of first 10' + 10' 00'

23' 10' 00' 00'