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Objectivity requires an honest examination of the criticisms of חסידות which have emerged since the time of Rav Hirsch. Some of these criticisms are based on the changing times, and some have simply taken time to emerge and to be formulated. Now in Torah circles such as ours a lecture is called a שיעור, I propose to begin with a number of שיעורים, that is to say, criticisms, which I have read and heard, and to conclude with a תרומה, a solution, which will solve the various difficulties raised by the critics.

Let us begin the list of שיעורים with the criticisms contained in an article written in 1957 by Rabbi Elie Munk of France, himself a product of חסידות experience. He mentions three criticisms, which I may summarize and paraphrase as follows:

1) The attractive culture of Rav Hirsch's time, which was congenial to Torah values, has degenerated into today's culture, which is hardly congenial to Torah values, but rather destructive of them;

2) With a few notable exceptions, the hybrid approach of חסידות did not produce great תלמידי חכמים, when compared with those produced by the Yeshiva world;

3) The Torah, תורה, should not need to be supplemented by the external cultures of the עולם. The demand for such supplementation
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would seem to be an insult to the perfect of G-d.

These are strong, serious criticisms. There are more.

Jacob Rosenheim, in his small book published in 1951, entitled "Samson Raphael Hirsch's Cultural Ideal and Our Times," mentions the problems of contained in many secular subjects. He also mentions the and the problem of caused by a deep involvement in general studies. Of course, even without Rosenheim we are all aware of these problems, which become criticisms of the approach.

"Secular learning has become today so highly specialized that it requires a major effort to master even a small segment of it . . . This problem escalates in the same measure that science marches forward. Where would the required time be forthcoming which is needed for profound learning and research in the vast field of T'nach, Shass and Poskim? With meager and superficial Torah-learning we have not done our Divinely ordained task. What about the command 'to meditate therein day and night' (הזההכו ימיليم לילדה (ת"וח"כ) until one is able to know all laws and 'answer without hesitation' (решא טצאל אוט דער שלא תמצט תמצט לה מיז) (Sefer Yetzirah).

In case these words sound familiar, do not accuse me of plagiarism. I freely admit that they are quoted from the of our own Rav Schwab שליטא, who puts these words in the mouths of the critics of . When an audience does not realize that words are being quoted, they are more likely to listen more attentively. That's why I waited until the end before disclosing that it is a quote. Let's call it method, rather than plagiarism.

Let's add one more, one more criticism, to the list before we begin our answer. What is the source for ? The usual sources that are given are doubtful, and certainly debatable. refers primarily to the ways of earning a living, not to an educational approach. Rav Hirsch himself was, of course, fully aware of this. Thus in a letter to his great opponent, the Wuerzburger Rav, Rav Seligmann Baer Bamberger, Rav Hirsch himself wrote that the concept as "a principle of education" ("Bildungsprinzip") was open to question and even dispute. Obviously, if one is convinced of the as principle, then one sees the means of earning a living as simply one aspect of among many, as Rav Hirsch does in his commentary to on this. But it seems fair
to say that the different uses of the term ר"ץ found in לֹא יָזַר are not really the initial source of Rav Hirsch's ר"ץ conception. They are explained and expanded by him to coincide with his ר"ץ principle only because he recognizes that principle in the first place. But if so, we still have not discovered the real source of the ר"ץ principle.

So we have quite a list of complaints and criticisms—six ו"עפ to be exact.

Before launching into our answer, our ו"עפ, let us first zero in on the first word of the title of tonight's lecture. The title of tonight's lecture opens with the word "Hirsch"—"Hirsch: The Relevance of ר"ץ in Our Time." In order to give a basic definition of ר"ץ, we must begin with the word "Hirsch"; we must realize who Rav Hirsch was. This is a preface to and a part of the answer.

Rav Hirsch was a Gaon in Talmud and in מַכָּר. That was the title of the first lecture, given by Rav Perlow ר"ץ. Rav Hirsch was a warrior. That was the title and the content of the second lecture, given by our Rav ש"לַש. But there is still another aspect of Rav Hirsch which is essential to an understanding of what he really meant by ר"ץ. In addition to being a מַעַר, in addition to being a fighter, he was clearly a דּוּר, a man on fire, on fire with the flame of Hashem's Torah. Now this is meant to be a lecture, not a sermon with oratorical flourishes. So I shall make an objective statement, befitting a lecture. To understand the ר"ץ principle of Rav Hirsch we must realize that he was clearly a דּוּר, a man on fire with the flame of Hashem's Torah. And do you know what the ר"ץ of Hashem's Torah is meant to accomplish, in the view of ה"ז, in the view of ה"ז? Only one thing: the nearness of the שֵׁנֶה, an awareness that we are always in the Presence of G-d, even in the world of business, not only in the world of business, but from there the awareness overflows into the world of business, into the world of the professions, into the street, into the dining-room, into the bedroom, into the places of work and into the places of relaxation—into all aspects of normal living! In all the vicissitudes of life, in sorrow and in joy—always in our Father's house, always in His Presence, always aware of His nearness! This is the goal of Hashem's Torah! This is the goal of ר"ץ! This is what ר"ץ meant to Rav Hirsch!

What was all this on the part of Rav Hirsch? Artistic license? Literary style? High-sounding, pious platitudes, meant to "kosher" the inherent
compromise of a הערתא. Perhaps some of the distorters of השולחןϊוوحוזירא take it as literary style, but by Heaven, רכבההערתא meant it!! Literally, in every fiber of his being! If it is true, as Dayan Grunfeld wrote, that "the certainty and absoluteness of (Rav Hirsch's) religious convictions are awe-inspiring," then especially awe-inspiring is his sense of holiness, his awareness of שיכנת-nearness, which is a constantly recurrent theme throughout his writings. No man was ever so consistent in everything he wrote. No one who has read all this will believe it to be a הוראה שמה of compromise for certain conditions. It is the sincere understanding of a נץ and a warrior and a קצין of the true, undistorted meaning of the Torah in its original, pristine glory, as he saw it. In a letter addressed to Rabbi Lowenstein of Mosbach, dated January 1, 1839, Rav Hirsch wrote: "I have not set out to create a new Judaism; instead I want to grasp and describe—as far as is possible—the ideas of Judaism as it is."

Let me document what I have said about the recurrent theme of שיכנת-nearness in Hirsch's writings. In a חל, on the words לירושם, Rav Hirsch comments:

"On this verse our Sages remark: עליך שיכנת בכוחו שלעם, that originally and essentially the principal nearness of G-d was to rest down here on earth. . . . To open the gates of Paradise once again, . . . and to bring (the שיכנות), the Glory of G-d back to earth—that is what is proclaimed on every page of the Word of G-d as the result and aim of the Torah."

In an חל, on the words וירושם באהולך, Rav Hirsch, commenting on the word שיכנות, שיכנות, from which root we get שיכן and שיכן, writes:

"The Divine is the קין of Man, and Man of the Divine, but neither becomes completely absorbed by the other. . . . While Judaism does teach the most intimate nearness of G-d to Man, it wants to keep us to the clearest, most comprehensible, we would say sober, way of contemplating it. Not by a fanatic gushing over into the Divine, not by a so-called absorption into G-d . . . do we become servants of G-d." And now the words are italicized: "Only in using the mind and the freedom of will which G-d had given us in the earthly sphere to which He has appointed us, in the most complete faithfulness to G-d, with deliberation and the clearest human insight, do we ourselves attain the height of human perfection, and our earthly management of life gains the holiness that makes it worthy of the nearness of G-d."

In a "פי היראא:

"קריב נלמי" seek to get nearer to G-d on account of feeling complete-
ly satisfied with life, feeling that there is nothing lacking in one’s circum-
stances, the only thing that is still necessary is the crowning feeling that one is near to G-d. . . . is the very summit of the Jewish ‘lebensanschauung’. Not trouble, joy is to be the eternal bridge up to G-d, and to enjoy this life on earth in the Presence of G-d is the highest service of G-d.”

In קדושת
“Realizing (the significance of the שומע ציון), we pay attention to all our feelings, think all our thoughts, speak all our words, do all our actions before Him, conscious of His Presence . . . which is to render our whole existence becoming a holy one.”

In אמרו
“For קדושה אלוקים, bringing the nearness of G-d into earthly material life and existence is the purpose which is aimed at with all קדושה, all והיות, all the מawaiter ימיו.”

In נشاء
“expresses the highest final result of blessing. . . . It is the most intimate, personal nearness to G-d. It is attained when all the material and spiritual possessions and gifts . . . are used . . . entirely for the realization of the godly purposes revealed by G-d. The nearness of G-d is not to be desired for receiving in it and through it material and intellectual blessings. But all material and spiritual blessing is only desirable for using it in the ways indicated by G-d to become worthy of the nearness of G-d. קדושה אלוקים, nearness of G-d is, in itself, is the absolute good (Psalms 73,28).”

In אמרתם
“Love is the most intimate bond between two beings. . . . Accordingly, אמרתם שאם הדלי אלוקים בכל לביך ובכל נשך בכל מא髌ך, means: ‘Seek to get near to G-d by devoting . . . the whole of your heart, the whole of your soul and the whole of your fortune. Everything that you think and feel, everything that you strive for and desire, and everything that you possess, shall be unto you only the means, only have value to you, for getting near to G-d, for bringing G-d near to you. But not the other way around. Do not seek G-d to obtain and keep what you think of, wish for, and have, or would like to have. The nearness to G-d is to be for you the greatest ‘good in itself.’ As David expresses the Love of G-d (in Psalms 73): עמי כי קדושה אלהים לי טוב, ‘But for me the nearness of G-d is what is good, כי דת קדושה אלהים לי טוב. ‘Whom shall I have in heaven one day, and besides Thee I have no other desire on earth’.”
I could go on and on. Because of the limitation of time, I have eliminated many quotations from the הומימ-commentary. And, of course, especially in the commentary to the Psalms do we find the same recurrent theme of the love of G-d and the constant awareness of His nearness, of His Presence, in all our earthly endeavors as the only source of true happiness.

And so, as we begin to answer the six תור despreach, the six criticisms, that have been levelled against Rav Hirsch’s מקרות, we must bear in mind that we are defending, not a pragmatic principle of compromise, not some kind of רוחני, but an exalted G-d-conscious, religious principle of a great G-d-conscious פל, a spiritual giant, a religious genius.

Bearing this in mind, let us begin our answer, our דון, with the last criticism, the sixth מקרות. What is really the מקרות, the source for מקרות, and why have only some flimsy, questionable and debatable sources been offered? Let me give a simple, “לומדיש” 바גי. You may say that is oxymoronic. If it is simple, it is not “לומדיש” and if it is “לומדיש,” it is not simple. But an astute colleague of mine once said, “את מי למדת את זה?” Real לומד is putting your finger on the תורא, on the simple explanation, which often eludes us.

So, to the point. What is the מקרות, the source, for מקרות? Our simple, “לומדיש” 바גי is: There is no such source! And do you know why? Because the basis of מקרות is האונומ, self-evident, and therefore no source is necessary! The first, the most primary fact of our existence is not that we are Jews, who have been given the Torah. The first, the most primary fact of our existence is that we have been given life, and have been placed in this world, in this century, in this living generation of fellow human beings who comprise the society, culture and civilization of our allotted time on earth. This is fact number one, chronologically and logically. Fact number two is that gave us the Torah to teach us how to live in this world, in this century, in this living generation of fellow human beings to comprise the society, culture and civilization of our allotted time on earth. These are the do’s and don’ts of the Torah, the תורות and the התושבות (the outlooks), which guide us in the use of the physical, social and cultural raw material which comprises the world in which we live. First there is life—הLifecycle—the physical, social and cultural raw material—that is the great given!—And then there is the Torah—זוית תור—heh—which shapes this given life, this physical, social and cultural raw material, and tells us what to use of it and how, and what to reject. In the process, the raw material of life becomes
“Toraized” (to coin a word)—it becomes Torah. But there must be a raw material for the Torah to work on. The Torah is not the raw material. The raw material is supplied by the life around us, into which we were born.

No man understood Rav Hirsch better than Weinberg, the Lithuanian and academic scholar, the author of the Hebrew anthology, Let me quote from an article he wrote in the Hebrew anthology.

The Torah, then, is according to Rav Hirsch, the force that gives form; and form, in the Aristotelian sense, means: the essential nature of a thing (as distinguished from the matter in which it is embodied). The Torah is simply the matter on which the Torah works.

You realize, of course, that in the process of answering the sixth קש (“What is really the מָדָר, the source for א"תדЎ?”) we have automatically answered also the third קש, which was that וָתִית היא המימה should not need to be supplemented by some external culture. There is no supplementation! There is only raw material, which the Torah does not supply, but which it molds and transforms into Torah. Not supplementation, but “Toraization”—of the given raw material!

If we still insist on some קש, the closest would be the מָדָר: מָדָר היי רד"ך א"תדЎ precedes the Torah, chronologically and logically. It is the given raw material which the Torah must shape, mold, “Toraize”—transform into Torah into nearness.

So is א"תדЎ still relevant today? It’s a silly question! Once we understand the basic source and the basic definition of א"תדЎ it becomes clear that as long as there is a world, a generation of men, a civilization—and as long as there is a Torah, there is א"תדЎ. א"תדЎ is as relevant today as it always has been and always will be—Because it is the plan of the Creator of the world, Who is the מָדָר.

And what is the basic definition of א"תדЎ in the light of all this? Does it mean going to college? Does it mean becoming a professional? Does it mean becoming an artist, a novelist, a journalist, a musician, a physician, a scientist, a T.V. actor, etc.? Not so fast! Maybe yes and maybe no! The irreducible definition of א"תדЎ is Torah in relation to, in the contrast of, the world, the civilization, the raw material as it exists in time, in our
time, in this time. Not as it existed in the sixteen hundreds, or the seventeen hundreds, or even the eighteen hundreds or Rav Hirsch’s day in Germany, or in Poland, or in Lithuania. *But in relation to the raw material as it exists today.* What that relation should be, however, what form it should take, what must be rejected and what may be accepted, must be decided, as any other question, according to the halachic factors and the values of the Torah.

What are these halachic factors and values? Obviously, this is not the place for involved halachic analysis, nor do we have enough time left for it, nor am I the authority to “pasken” for you. However, we must make some allusions to such analysis, if we are to answer the remaining, particularly those that deal with *אָסִפּוֹרָתָה* and the "אָמַר מִנָּהוּ".

Nowhere in Rav Hirsch’s writings do we find harsher and angrier expression than when he castigates *מִינָהוּ* and *אָסִפּוֹרָתָה*. “Fools,” he calls them, though it be “argumentum ad hominem,” and in various places in his writings we notice an angrier, less calm approach when he confronts the enemies of Hashem’s Torah—both Jewish and non-Jewish. *רְבָּנוּ הַמְּבִיא* was not easy-going about *מִינָהוּ* and *אָסִפּוֹרָתָה*.

Now the dangers inherent in many college courses should not, and cannot be minimized, especially when an isolated young student is enveloped in a classroom climate of *אָסִפּוֹרָתָה* propagated by a professor who is a priest of secularism and *כּפְרָה*.

Varied have been the attitudes of different *יְהוּדִים* even towards *יְהוּדִית* in general, throughout the generations, down to our time. As the *אֲבָהָה יֵשָׁבֵב* writes in answer to the Maharsh’s criticism: “אֲבָהָה יֵשָׁבֵב חַד רִבָּא מָנוּ בִּנְיָמִין, יִשָּׁה יִשָּׁבֵב בִּנְיָמִין. בִּנְיָמִין בִּנְיָמִין בִּנְיָמִין בִּנְיָמִין.” In our time every Yeshiva man is familiar with the *יִשָּׁה יֵשָׁבֵב* and of *יִשָּׁה יֵשָׁבֵב* which were given in response to a *שָׁלָשׁ אֲשֶׁר* asked by our Rav *שָׁלָשׁ אֲשֶׁר* when he was a young man. Less known is the *שָׁלָשׁ אֲשֶׁר* sent by the Telzer Rosh Yeshiva, *רְבּוֹנַךְ זַכַּֽךְ* בְּלוֹךְ. In it the Telzer Rosh Yeshiva writes that it is very difficult in such matters to give a clear answer, because these matters are very much dependent on outlooks and opinions ("*הַשָּׁפֵכָה עָשֶׂה*" which are more the province of *זָמַח* than *הַלָּ镯ָה*). A consequence of this is that one cannot render a decision which applies to everyone equally. Much depends on the student’s temperament, his uniqueness, as well as on conditions of time, place, situation and surroundings ("*זָמַח* תִּלְמַיֶּשׁ הַנָּמֶס הַמְּפַקֵּד הַמַּכּוּב הַמַּכּוּב*). He goes on to enumerate certain guidelines, but even with
regard to these he writes: “But still there is an area which must be judged and decided according to each person and his situation (דוקא דידי דמאא דמיהא) [and so forth].”

Among the factors of the hirhur mentioned by the Telzer Rosh Yeshiva even with regard to subjects that incline towards לאל חסרה לפשתא אוף אוחנה לאל חסרה לפשתא, which is the hidur of הידור of the hidur ofהל Greenville תור and also the hidur of hidur שלחנונא שתחשבי לאיפאוף. This applies even to subjects which are in the main outright לאל חסרה. But with regard to truly scientific subjects (I am quoting now), which have some elements of לאל חסרה intermingled in them, like the natural sciences and medicine, there is no לאל חסרה. Not only can they assist Torah study, but they contain elements which can lead to the strengthening of לאל חסרה as mentioned in the לאל חסרה of the לאל חסרה of the לאל חסרה. Elements of לאל חסרה have become intermingled with the objective scientific facts through irreligious persons who propound theories that do not lend themselves to experimental demonstration. One should discard these, and concentrate only on the truly objective facts. Indeed, there is a great need to have scientific texts written by לאמור החור. He goes on to give certain guidelines, among which is that לאמור החור should remain ליאכד.

Now my point is not that this or that ליאכד is invested with canonical authority, but that there is a variety of views and factors which must be taken into consideration, and that the entire question is not given to precise halachic decision.

Personally, I removed my own children from the biology class in our Mesivta when the theory of evolution was being taught by a non-religious teacher, and I taught it to them myself, pointing out to them the serious weaknesses and defects of this unproven and unprovable theory. אברא! I convinced them of its falseness. They made out well on the Regent’s Examinations. We need Torah-true teachers who will do this in the classroom.

When some of my children went to college mainly to study computer science, I told them, “Take courses, not apikorsus.” My wife, who worked in college, used her influence when this was necessary.

Before leaving this subject, I should like to point out another source, which has been overlooked. פרק י-פרק האנזימות תקווה, in his ספר ט-ספר האנדוספירה. נאץ. He states that his philosophical discussions, which include the opinions of the opponents of the Torah, do not lead to התשערב and nor do they violate the המ לאומד, המ העריהם, nor do they violate the of speculating about.
mentioned in the halacha, the 'What is prohibited (says ה' בר השעיה交谈) was to put aside the סופר הנבאים and accept any personal view that might occur to an individual about the beginning of space מוקפת המסות ובציוב כל הזמנים заказ ו.setHorizontalAlignment. Whoever speculates in this way may either arrive at the truth or may err. But even if he arrives at the trueאמונה, there is no guarantee that it will not be uprooted from him because of some subsequent error that might arise in his mind, which might corrupt his views. . . . But we . . . do not engage in research and speculation in this way." He goes on to say that our speculation is to confirm logically what we know from the Torah and the אסרו, and, secondly, to refute anyone who argues against us in matters of our האמת.

In other words, if we base ourselves at all times on the התה האהבה下载 of Hashem’s Torah, and measure all opinions against this standard of truth, then there is no lugar in reading and discussing the views of those who oppose the Torah. The אסרו is only to start from zero and attempt to arrive at our conclusions through independent speculation, independent of the Torah.

In the light of these words of רבי we can answer a seemingly perplexing contradiction in the writings of the Rambam.

In his הלכה י''ע הב''ג the Rambam "pasks" at great length and in no uncertain terms that we are prohibited from reading books about מוח and to dwell on such thoughts of צל. Moreover, it is prohibited to dwell on any thoughts that might undermine any fundamental of the Torah. Reading such books and dwelling on such thoughts is a transgression of the ביד את התורה אוחזר ללהבך: לא מינתה עליה תודיו on which comment: ז. מייתו.

And yet, on the other hand, in which the Rambam’s אביו reads: הוה הלכה ע''ב—Be diligent to study what to answer the מימה לולא המ醫生 השכיב את ספרותך, שך לולא המ醫生 השכיב את ספרותך, and know before Whom you are toiling, and Who is your Employer, the Rambam comments: Study subjects through which you will be able to answer the non-Jewish כופים should they question you about Torah הומת ות своб המפרדים מהימת ות своб המפרדים אתמה:" But, though you study their views in order to know how to refute them, take care that none of these views enter your heart立ת סאה ות своб המפרדים ות своб המפרדים אתמה המפרדים אתמה והומת ות своб המפרדים או ות своб המפרדים: ות своб המפרדים. And realize that the One Whom you are serving knows your secret thoughts (ודא כיוושאת התומש ידוע ונ dataIndexי).
In light of the overlooked words of ד"ת, the solution is simple. The Rambam’s פסיקת הלכות פסוק in פֵּסֵק, and the independent pursuit of doubts and thoughts of מְנֵיתוֹ, and the independent study of הָלְכָּתוֹ, and of putting aside the Torah and the נְבוּיִים, and saying: “Well, let us see which is right.” But in the מְנֵיתוֹ, the Rambam refers to the study of הָלְכָּתוֹ in order to refute the פֵּסֵק. Such study obviously does not put the Torah aside even for a moment. On the contrary, the Torah is the starting point and the standard by which one judges the words of the פֵּסֵק.

The point is not that הָלְכָּתוֹ overrides, is ilm, the פֵּסֵק. The point is that any reading of מְנֵיתוֹ which does not put aside the Torah and the נְבוּיִים for even a moment, but which measures everything being real by the truth of the Torah, any reading which is not undertaken for the purpose of independent speculation and the dwelling on doubts for their own sake and on their own terms—any such reading is not אָסָר in the first place. To realize how blind are the gropings of men in relation to the enlightening truth of G-d’s Torah is not an אָסָר. But even then, the person, and the circumstances, must be such that there is no danger of the פֵּסֵק gaining a foothold in the heart. In most cases my advice remains: “Courses, not apikorsus!”

So the charge of מְנֵיתוֹ, הָלְכָּתוֹ is an oversimplification. There are many factors to be considered, and they must be considered in relation to each individual and his specific situation.

Let us go on to the next פֵּסֵק, the next criticism, to the פֵּסֵק and the הבשלה וידינו מְנֵיתוֹ. Notice how I worded it: “The פֵּסֵק and the הבשלה וידינו מְנֵיתוֹ. There is a difference between the הבשלה וידינו מְנֵיתוֹ, the matter of הבשלה וידינו מְנֵיתוֹ although many of us have been indoctrinated, in accordance with a minority view, to think they are the same.

There is little room for הבשלה וידינו מְנֵיתוֹ in a comprehensive sense, if every minute not spent in eating, sleeping and working must be spent in “learning” Torah, and if to do otherwise constitutes an אָסָר of הבשלה וידינו מְנֵיתוֹ. But this is not the view of the majority of מְנֵיתוֹ and מְנֵיתוֹ.

Thus, the well-known פֵּסֵק enumerates that have no fixed limit: אֶלָּכָל עָבִּיר קָטָן יִלָּאַשְׁפָּר הָלְכָּתוֹ וְשַׁעֲרֵי הָלְכָּתוֹ וְהָרֹאִים וְמַרְבֻּעֵי הָלְכָּתוֹ וְהָרֹאִים וְהָרֹאִים. The comments: הבשלה וידינו מְנֵיתוֹ is limited to שַׁעֲרֵי הָלְכָּתוֹ and מַרְבֻּעֵי הָלְכָּתוֹ. This would seem to mean that הבשלה וידינו מְנֵיתוֹ is a limitless obligation, day and night. However, the מְנֵיתוֹ objects that this would not parallel מְנֵיתוֹ and
The view concerning which maximization is possible, but purely voluntary, the maximization of doing purely voluntary.

Therefore, the Rambam explains that maximization of the obligation of learning cannot be fixed during the day and some time during the night, and this is the view of the Poskim. Similarly, the Poskim explains that maximization in relation to learning to mean that there is no minimal time since, as the Gemara states in Menahot, one may be commanded to learn, and this statement is also referred to by the Rambam in Menahot, where it is stated that although a maximization cannot be fixed on something which we have already commanded at Sinai to do, nevertheless if one swears to learn a given matter or a given subject the maximization of the Sinaic obligation of learning may be fulfilled minimally with some time during the day and some time during the night for learning.

Since this is the view of the Gemara of the Talmud, according to it, as noted by the Rambam.

The Rambam objects that one is obligated to know the Torah so thoroughly that one can answer any question without hesitation and to accomplish this one must learn constantly day and night, as much as possible. However, the Rambam points out in his Talmud, who said in Menahot who said in Menahot, that the maximization of learning is voluntary, a maximization of learning in Menahot, who said is referring to the obligation of learning which can be fulfilled minimally with some time during the day and some time during the night.
the voluntary maximization of \( n'\) as a means of \( l'\) (Shemot: 13, 1). The study of Torah gives a similar answer.
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calm are to be preserved for the cultivation of the Torah's wisdom (which is to say, for \( \text{Torah} \)). Yes! But we should seek to increase our study of Torah, and to decrease, or as Rav Hirsch puts it, to "moderate" our \( \text{Torah} \) for the sake of \( \text{Torah} \). "If one is to attain the prize of [Torah] knowledge, then he must restrict his business activities also to a minimum." That was written by Rav Hirsch.

And so the Rambam first rules, in \( \text{Torah} \) of \( \text{Torah} \) that the halachic obligation is to have fixed times for Torah study during the day and during the night. Beyond this halachic minimum, however, the Rambam speaks in \( \text{Torah} \) of voluntary maximization in terms of one whose heart prompts him to carry out the \( \text{Torah} \) fittingly, and wishes to be crowned with the crown of Torah. (Mishneh Torah)

And so, in choosing a profession and a life-style in accordance with \( \text{Torah} \) all these halachic factors and Torah outlooks must be weighed and considered in relation to each individual's personality and situation. In choosing a vocation and a life-style let's not forget the warning of an earlier Torah who wrote: "Today's dangers threaten not from sword and arson, but from the allurement of enjoyment, the enticements of profits, the attraction of world cultures... 'Pious' fathers and mothers entrust their sons to 'vocations,' occupations, in which the Torah of G-d counts for nothing. [As for the daughters], domesticity bores them. Their minds, longing for 'higher' purposes, are no longer satisfied and fulfilled by the duties of... a wife, a mother. And so they grow up, the future wives and mothers of our generation." The earlier Torah who wrote these words was Rav Samson Raphael Hirsch.

In choosing a profession and a life-style according to \( \text{Torah} \) let's not forget that the goal of \( \text{Torah} \) is \( \text{Torah} \)-nearness in every area of life. (You begin to see, I am sure, how inappropriate, how contradictory to the spirit of \( \text{Torah} \) is the establishment of Samson Raphael Hirsch chairs in academic institutions here and in Israel, which strive for academic achievement, not \( \text{Torah} \)-nearness. As a matter of fact \( \text{Torah} \) was not happy even with the academic approach to Torah of the Berlin Seminary. You can make your own "Kal vachomers.")

Time is running out. So let us address ourselves briefly to the criticism, that the attractive culture of Rav Hirsch's time was congenial to Torah values, but today's culture is destructive of them. In the first place,
the culture of Rav Hirsch’s time was by no means congenial to Torah values, as is evident from the quotation you just heard. There are other passages from Rav Hirsch’s essays, too numerous to quote, that warn against the atheistic science of his time, the immorality of his time and the gross materialism of his time. Rav Hirsch rejected all aspects of his society that were inimical to Torah and accepted as raw material only what could be “Toraized.” We can do the same.

Of course, in our society agnosticism, immorality and gross materialism are far more pervasive, more accepted as the norm, than in earlier times. The הָלָא הַמַּאֲרֵי וּמְאָרָה describes our society literally, without exaggeration. The growing university population, in contrast to earlier times, has an increasingly secularizing influence on our culture. To this anti-Torah philosophy we must apply the teaching of הָלוֹא הַמַּאֲרֵי וּמְאָרָה. Certainly, there is more scientific knowledge, הָלוֹא הַמַּאֲרֵי וּמְאָרָה in today’s society than ever before. Moreover, the מסָרָה is not only its science, but also its artistic and literary productions ... the sum total of human thought and accomplishment throughout the ages down to our time. While a great deal of this, perhaps even most of it, must be rejected, especially the more recent literary productions, yet there are some gems here and there that lend themselves to “Toraization.” But these gems are really few and far between.

On the other hand, personally, it seems to me that it is almost impossible to “Toraize” TV-viewing, and even listening to the radio requires careful selectivity. “Careful selectivity”—those are the key words. We must reject much, even most, of today’s values and productions. But we can select the best of the human spirit, the best of civilization’s legacy, and “Toraize” it. This is the approach of “Mensch-Yisroel,” as Rav Hirsch termed it. We can in this way remain the surviving representatives of the best of the human spirit. We go even further. We “Toraize” it. We transform the raw material into Torah and מְאָרָה. We certainly cannot and do not accept the life-style of the general society. We Toraize the best of the human heritage and make it part of our Torah life-style.
In conclusion, what about the one remaining criticism, that with a few notable exceptions, the approach did not produce great when compared with those produced by the Yeshiva world? This is true. But it is not a function of the approach, but rather a result of historical conditions.

The production of great requires an ongoing tradition of intensive Torah “learning,” carried on by a large pool of scholars. This situation existed in Eastern Europe, but had been interrupted in the West. It was Rav Hirsch who complained of this historical condition, when he wrote:

“We have lost our seminaries for youths and men, our Yeshivas and schools for children and adolescents. The study of, that central luminary of Jewish life, that Divine fire of the Jewish people, has been allowed to go out. Why, then, should we be surprised that spirits have become bleak and hearts cold, and that there is no zeal left for Judaism? Why should we be surprised that winter has come to Judaism? ... Harbingers of a Jewish springtime must come to us not from the outside, but from within Judaism itself. ... The yearning for Torah has been reawakened in many. They labor to reintroduce the knowledge of ... These impulses and endeavors have already generated action.”

(If there is any element of in it is not in its ideal conception, but in the way it had to be carried out because of historical circumstances.)

But it takes time. It has taken a century to reintroduce the United States to the point of producing outstanding scholars.

We spoke earlier of a spectrum ranging from those who make to those who are with the halachic minimum, with the majority in between, who strive, or should strive, to maximize their. A healthy Torah community has always been based on many varied occupations and professions. But those among us who choose to make should be considered the most valued resource of the community, members of the highest of all professions. We Hirschians must and can produce our own in our own Yeshiva, if necessary, to whom is relevant, who even as recognized Torah authorities will still maintain an interest in general thought and affairs, and relate to them, despite severe limitations of time.

In writing of , the Rambam speaks of the who is perceived by his community as always as generating a. But
he adds the significant phrase: the must not go to extreme and must not become a recluse. Indeed, too many budding slowly abandon effective ways of speaking, abandon dignified manners and behavior patterns and dress, abandon conversance in general affairs, as though the of a recluse were a Torah virtue,!

We should go our own way, convinced of the correctness and relevance of as the ideal Torah system, as the . We should promote it as such vigorously, no less aggressively than the non-Hirschian Yeshiva world and Chassidic groups, who see themselves as and others as . We may respectfully grant the usefulness, and indeed, the hidden blessing of the non-Hirschian approach as a .

Perhaps, too, as communal ties are loosened, we should think of less in terms of community, and more in terms of a movement in Torah Judaism, to be promoted and fostered wherever possible.

In the of and through our own sincere efforts, both spiritual and material, may we succeed to bring the nearness of in all areas of living to more and more of our brethren, and may we restore Torah life to its original glory—. It is a challenge worthy of a mature approach.