

*Kedushah = creativity – reintro into history creates rather than diminishing kedushah,
Kavod = dignity = autonomy*

The Rav Speaks, “The Joy of Being Creative – Greetings from the Rav to the 1966 Mizrahi Conference”, p. 203 – 209

The Hebrew words for “to be faint/ףי” and “to be weary/עג” are synonymous, but there is a fundamental difference between them. *Ayef* always relates to faintness that results from failure . . . *Yegiah* is the result of work, of activity in which one sees blessing and enjoys its fruits . . . He knows that he has brought about something new, that he has created something, that there exists a goal in his life and that his existence has value, that he is fruitful and creative . . . The mixed multitude was faint . . . On the other hand . . . the Children of Israel who had sung Az Yashir . . .

Our movement . . . is entitled to be weary . . . but the constructive, creative weariness, the profound inner joy, the satisfaction from the work of our hands must not intoxicate us, and must not prevent the continuation of our work . . .

We are also entitled to be faint . . . First, we have not succeeded in nourishing a feeling of respect towards Jewry in the heart of the secularists in Eretz Yisroel . . . second, within the religious camp, there too they preach something akin to hatred for the Mizrahi.

וקווי ה' יחליפו כח

1956 Kol Dodi Dofek = Fate and Destiny,

Iyov

Six knocks = UN Vote, War of independence, Christian unsecessionism, youth religious revival, Jewish blood is not hefker, open gates for aliyah

Covenants of Fate and Destiny = Egypt and Sinai

<https://traditiononline.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Blau.pdf> by Rabbi Yosef Blau

. . . We were aware of the destruction of European Jewry by the Nazis but had no real sense of the enormity of the Holocaust. The survivors, including some of our teachers in Yeshiva, did not talk about what had occurred. However, the theological questions relating to that destruction and the conflicting uses of Zionism as either cause or solution were in the air. The talk of the Rav zt”l on Yom ha-Atzmaut in 1956 dealt authoritatively with all three issues. His approach to suffering and to the dual covenant between Hashem and the Jewish people was as important as his description of a non-messianic religious-Zionism. It changed the entire nature of the discussion and, for me, became the intellectual framework for my outlook . . .

The Rav foresaw that the birth of the State of Israel would not eliminate anti-Semitism. It did, however, create opportunities and demands upon us. The powerful image—taken from Shir ha-Shirim—of the beloved knocking on the door was applied to the changed reality.

The six knocks on the door reflected the multifaceted nature of Jews having our own state. In mixing the theological and the political, the impact on the Jewish psyche as well as the practical existence of a place of refuge, the Rav showed how an important event had occurred without claiming that it had messianic implications . . .

As in Shir ha-Shirim, the original source of the imagery, with the passing of a half-century the knocks reflect a sense of missed opportunities. Is anything left from the Rav’s article that can help us to redefine religious-Zionism in the present climate? Minimally, the notion that one can find religious significance in a Jewish state without seeing it in messianic terms is a start. A closer examination reveals that a number of the “knocks” are still relevant and that other opportunities and challenges have emerged . . .

Facing the issues of today requires new approaches. Trying to speculate what the Rav would have said is not productive. However, those of us who have been exposed to his thinking should have absorbed his way of viewing issues. The ongoing influence of Kol Dodi Dofek is in its perspectives, which have created a framework for confronting the developing reality.

The Rav Speaks p. 32

. . . The Torah is no longer in Heaven!

G-d handed over technical legal matters to the authority of the Sages, to rule on what is clean and what is unclean, to decide between obligation and exemption, forbidden and permitted. But in historical questions, not those related to the legal status of ovens, food, or determination of fixed monetary obligations, but those relating to the destiny of the Eternal People, G-d himself decides as to whose interpretation shall become the "law" (the historical development). Nor can anyone dispute the ruling of G-d in this domain. In the controversy between Joseph of yore and his brothers thousands of years ago, G-d decided in accord with Joseph's interpretation of the historical process. In our days, the Creator of the universe similarly decided that the (historical) law will be as the Joseph of 5662 (Religious Zionists) predicted – in accord with the view of him who had little faith in the future of Eastern European Jewry and who dreamed of another land and of other conditions . . .

If I now identify with the Mizrachi, against my family tradition, it is only because, as previously clarified, I feel that Divine Providence ruled like "Joseph" and against his brothers; that He employs secular Jews as instruments to bring to fruition His great plans regarding the land of Israel. I also believe that there would be no place for Torah in Israel today if it were not for the Mizrachi. I built an altar upon which I sacrificed many sleepless nights, doubts, and reservations . . .

p. 49

We are in the midst of a struggle; we are a living movement, and as such it is impossible that we should not err at times. I once said that there exist problems for which one cannot find a clear-cut decision in the Shulchan Arukh; one has to decide intuitively. Sometimes one cannot even know whether a decision was correct. It is easy for zealots and negativists to solve all problems – they see the entire world colored black and white. For us, however, many cases are difficult to decide – whether we have reached the boundary point and we should part from the "two lads" and tell them "wait here with the donkey and I and the lad will go there and worship."

מבקשי פניך, p. 187

"קול דודי דופק" זו יצירה שזכתה להצלחה כבירה, אבל היא משקפת הלך רוח מסוים, דברים שנאמרו ביום העצמאות, בתקופה שהמדינה אמנם התחילה להשתרש, אבל עדיין לא פרצה לחלוטין. בשעה כזאת הרב ז"ל אמר את מה שהוא אמר.

לא צדקו אלה שטענו שהוא התנגד למדיניות הציונית או ליזמה הציונית. עם כל זה הוא הזדהה. אבל

נכונים דברי אלה שטענו שהצד התיאולוגי לא היה דומיננטי אצלו.

דווקא אצלי, מאז שעלינו ארצה, יש מאותה נימה יותר מאשר הייתה אצל הרב ז"ל, אבל שאבוא ואדבר

בתפים ובמחולות על מעין דפיקה היסטורית, עד כדי כך איני חושב שאני מגיע.

p. 228

נכון, יום אחד, בפני ועידה של מזרחי, במגרש הביתי שלהם, הוא אמר מה שאמר. זה לא שיקף את עמדתו הבסיסית, לא רוחו לגבי אהבת ישראל וכו' וכו'. אבל די היה שפעם אחת הוא אמר את זה, כדי שמי שירצה לתפוס אותו, יכול היה לתפוס.

<https://www.firstthings.com/article/2018/05/soloveitchik-the-zionist> by Rav Shalom Carmy

In 1982, Lebanese Christian militia allied to Israel perpetrated massacres at the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps. This time the Rav demanded that Prime Minister Menachem Begin appoint a commission of inquiry to investigate Israel's failure to prevent the massacres. Carnage and suffering make a claim upon a Torah-informed conscience.

Do such interventions make him a liberal, as some would say? This distorts more than it clarifies. It would be more accurate to think of R. Soloveitchik's political declarations as profoundly conservative. In the course of his life he moved from the anti-Zionist to the Zionist camp. But then, from within religious Zionism, so to speak, he criticized the transformation of politics into the anticipation of a messianic future.