

VOLUME 5782 · ISSUE XXIV · PARSHAS VAYIKRA-ZACHOR



WARFAIR: MAY COUNTRIES INVADE THEIR NEIGHBORS?

Adapted from the writings of Dayan Yitzhak Grossman

Russia's invasion of Ukraine has met with nearly universal condemnation; the United Nations General Assembly voted overwhelmingly to reprimand Russia, with only five countries voting against the resolution: Russia itself, its close ally Belarus, and Eritrea, North Korea, and Syria.¹ This condemnation is rooted at least in part in the principle, widely held in the modern era, that war is morally and legally unjustifiable except in selfdefense.² As the United Nations Charter states:

All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.³

The only exception recognized by the Charter is

1 Humeyra Pamuk and Jonathan Landay. U.N. General Assembly in historic vote denounces Russia over Ukraine invasion. https://www. reuters.com/world/un-general-assembly-set-censure-russia-over-ukraineinvasion-2022-03-02/.

2 See, e.g., International law says Putin's war against Ukraine is illegal. Does that matter? The Conversation. https://theconversation.com/ international-law-says-putins-war-against-ukraine-is-illegal-does-thatmatter-177438.

3 Charter of the United Nations, Chapter I Article 2 (3-4).

BAIS HAVAAD HALACHA HOTLINE

1.888.485.VAAD(8223) ask@baishavaad.org self-defense:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective selfdefense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.⁴

In Western "just war theory," for a war to be morally justifiable it must satisfy two sets of criteria: *jus ad bellum* (the laws governing under what circumstances a country may resort to war) and *jus in bello* (the laws governing the conduct of war, under which some activities are forbidden as war crimes).

But while the horrors of war are undeniable, and the famous vision of Yeshayah looks forward to the Messianic era when "no nation will raise a sword against another nation, and they will no longer study warfare,"⁵ our mesorah does not unequivocally condemn even elective war as an absolute moral wrong in all cases. This is obviously a complex topic; in this article, we briefly discuss some important sources on the subject.

(continued on page 2)

4 Ibid. Article 51. 5 Yeshavah 2:4.

Coin of the Realm

Q I plan to be in Eretz Yisrael for Purim while my family remains in America. When fulfilling the minhag of *zeicher lemachatzis* hashekel, I follow the Mishnah Brurah and give on behalf of my children. Which currency should I use for them, the Israeli half-shekel or the US half-dollar?

A The Rama (O.C. 694:1) says to follow the universal minhag of giving tzedakah before Purim to commemorate the *machatzis* hashekel donation in Adar in the time of the *bais hamikdash*. (Many have the custom to give three half-coins, as mentioned by the Rama.) Local currency must be used.

A PUBLICATION OF THE BAIS HAVAAD HALACHA CENTER

105 River Ave. #301, Lakewood NJ 08701 1.888.485.VAAD (8223) www.baishavaad.org info@baishavaad.org

Lakewood • Midwest • Brooklyn • South Florida

לע״נ הרב יוסף ישראל ב״ר משה גרוסמן זצ״ל

Dedicated in loving memory of HaRav Yosef Grossman zt"l



PARSHAS VAYIKRA **BEG, BORROW, OR STEAL**

Excerpted and adapted from a shiur by Dayan Yehoshua Grunwald

A person (adam) from among you who brings from you an offering to Hashem, from an animal, from cattle or sheep, you shall bring your offering.

Vayikra 1:2

Rashi comments that the word "adam" teaches that a *korban* may not be a stolen animal, just like Adam Harishon couldn't possibly bring a stolen *korban* because everything was his. However, it is permitted to borrow without permission for a mitzvah in some cases. The Shulchan Aruch (O.C. 14:4) says that one may borrow a tallis without asking and even recite a *bracha*, provided he folds it afterward. The Rama adds that the same is true of tfillin. The Mishnah Brurah explains that a person generally does not mind someone else using his possessions to perform a mitzvah.

However, there are a number of limitations to this halacha. First, the Mishnah Brurah writes that one may only use the tallis or tfillin on an occasional basis and in the place he found it. Second, he quotes from

(continued on page 2)

JUS AD BELLUM

The Rambam rules:

A king should not wage other wars before a milchemes mitzvah. What is considered a milchemes mitzvah? The war against the seven nations that occupied Eretz Yisrael, the war against Amaleik, and a war fought to help Jews against an enemy that attacks them.

Afterward, he may wage a milchemes hareshus, i.e., a war fought with other nations in order to expand the borders of Eretz Yisrael or magnify its greatness and reputation.6

A possible source for this assumption of the Rambam is the following passage in the Gemara:

The Chachamim said to Dovid Hamelech: Our master the king, your nation requires sustenance. He said to them: Go and make parnasah from one another. They said to him: A handful does not satisfy a lion, and a pit cannot be filled by its dirt. He said to them: Go and take up arms with the troops in battle.7

It is not entirely clear whether the permission to wage war for economic or nationalistic reasons extends to contemporary and to non-Jewish governments, because the Gemara continues as follows:

The Chachamim immediately seek advice from Achisophel, and they consult the Sanhedrin (to receive permission to wage war, per Tosfos HoRosh),⁸ and they ask the Urim Vetumim.

It is unclear, then, whether elective wars are permitted in the absence of the imprimatur of an Achisophel, the Sanhedrin, and the Urim Vetumim.

R' Meir Eisenstadter (the Maharam Ash), however, after citing other precedents for the permissibility of elective war, asserts that the implication is that such wars are permitted even in the absence of the Urim Vetumim (and the context of his discussion is the wars waged by European nations of two centuries ago).9

As we have previously discussed,¹⁰ another precedent sometimes adduced for the legitimacy of elective war is the following striking, albeit somewhat obscure, Gemara:

6 Hilchos Melachim Umilchamoseihem 5:1

7 Brachos 3b.

8 There are other approaches to the requirement to consult the Sanhedrin; see Ramban Devarim 11:24; Amud Hayemini end of *siman* 14 *os* 10; and here.

9 Shu"t Imrei Fish Y.D. siman 52.

10 Living Dangerously: *Pikuach Nefesh* in War. Bais HaVaad Halacha Journal. Sep. 10. 2021.



(continued from page 1) the Pri Megadim that if one is able to verify the

owner's consent, he must do so, because the chazakah may only be relied upon when it isn't possible to verify. Third, the Rama writes that this ruling does not apply



Shmuel says: A monarchy that kills one in six in the world is not punished...11

Tosafos explains this to refer to the waging of elective war,12 and R' Naftali Tzvi Yehudah Berlin (the Netziv)13 and R' Eliezer Yehudah Waldenberg (the Tzitz Eliezer)¹⁴ accordingly adduce this statement of Shmuel in support of the permissibility of waging elective war. The Netziv applies this doctrine to B'nei Noach, and the Tzitz Eliezer extends it to modern governments, both of which are obviously not consulting the Urim Vetumim or the Sanhedrin.

R' Yehoshua Menachem Ehrenberg (the Dvar Yehoshua) also extends the permissibility of elective wars to the context of modern Israel (even insofar as we are contemplating a war which would be considered elective), despite the absence of the Urim Vetumim and Sanhedrin.¹⁵

JUS IN BELLUM

In our mesorah, the classic discussion of jus in bello occurs in the context of Shimon and Levi's attack on Shechem. As we have previously noted,¹⁶ the Maharal justifies their conduct with the doctrine that war between nations has its own rules, different from those that apply to individuals. In war, once an enemy nation has committed an atrocity and initiated hostilities with us, any member of that nation, even if he himself was not involved in the crime and casus belli, may be summarily killed, with no further justification necessary.17

This doctrine is controversial, though, and the fact that virtually all other mefarshim, Rishonim and Acharonim, that discuss the morality of the Shechem incident offer various other justifications of it may imply that they do not accept the Maharal's novel doctrine and do not consider innocent civilians fair game even in the context of war.¹⁸ Further, even the Maharal explicitly limits his doctrine to a war being waged in response to an outrageous provocation, as in

11 Shavuos 35b

13 Ha'amek Davar Bereishis 9:5 (and cf. Harchev Davar there) and Devarim 20:8. Cf. Meromei Sadeh Eruvin 45a to Rashi s.v. Vahalo ba'u. 14 Shu"t Tzitz Eliezer cheilek 12 siman 57 os 2 and cheilek 13 siman 100 os 7, and cf. cheilek 13 siman 21 os 11.

15 Shu"t Dvar Yehoshua cheilek 2 siman 48. I do not currently have access to the work, but I seem to recall that he explicitly rejects the proposition that consultation with the Urim Vetumim and the Sanhedrin is a sine qua non for the permissibility of *milchemes reshus* Cf. Amud Hayemini *siman* 14; Shu"t Tzitz Eliezer *cheilek* 20 *siman* 43 anaf Milchemes Reshus.

16 Marked Men: Are Targeted Killings of Terrorists Justified? Sep. 10,

17 Gur Aryeh Bereishias 34:13.

18 This is not necessarily the case, however, since it is also possible that they do not consider Shimon and Levi to have been operating within the context of a war between nations. See also the following note for another possible interpretation of their view

to borrowing sfarim, because they may tear.

Today, many people are uncomfortable allowing others to borrow their tallis or tfillin, so the Aruch Hashulchan (O.C. 14:11) writes that the dispensation may no longer apply. Conversely, he writes (C.M. 72) that most people no longer mind others using their sfarim without permission, because today sfarim are printed and readily available.

BHHJ SPONSORS Retirement Plan Specialist New York, NY

To become a corporate sponsor of the BHHJ or disseminate in memory/zechus of a loved one, email info@baishavaad.org



ask@baishavaad.org

(continued from page 1)

Yet the Biur Halacha (ibid.) disapproved of using his local half-groschen coin because of its low value; only a coin that is *chashuv* resembles the original silver *machatzis* hashekel. Some *poskim* didn't use the Israeli half-shekel coin for this reason, including



R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach (cited in Halichos Shlomo 18:9) and the Steipler Gaon, both of whom used half-dollar coins. Others maintain that a coin that is not in circulation locally is not considered a coin, so US currency is invalid in Eretz Yisrael, and they do not consider the half-shekel's low value an issue (Derech Emunah Hilchos Ma'aser Sheini 4:14) Some argue that given its universal acceptance, the US dollar is considered currency even abroad. The prevailing custom in Eretz Yisrael seems to accept use of the half-shekel coin.

One who follows the practice to use Israeli currency in Eretz Yisrael, should use it even for his child back home, for two reasons. First (Kaf Hachaim O.C. ibid. note 27), the reason of those early poskim that hold the view that one should give machatzis hashekel for his young child is that the head of a household must ensure that every member of his family receives kaparah, per the pasuk (Shmos 30:15) "lechapeir al nafshoseichem (to atone for your souls)." It stands to reason that the location of the head of household is determinative. Second, the value and qualities of an item are determined based on its location (Arachin 24a). Ma'aser sheini, for example, which can only be redeemed onto currency, may be redeemed with a foreign coin so long as the coin is located in its issuing country, regardless of where the owner and his fruits are (Ra'avad Hilchos Ma'aser Sheini ibid.). In your case, the coin is located in Eretz Yisrael.

the case of Shechem, as opposed to an elective war.19

19 R' Chaim Jachter suggests that this may explain why most commentaries do not justify the attack on Shechem as the Maharal dees: "Even if the various commentators do not share the Maharal's defense of Shimon and Levi, they do not necessarily imply a rejection of his principle. They could simply believe that killing Shechem and Chamor alone would have sufficed to rescue Dinah, and that waging war against the entire town of Shechem was thus unjustified. In other words, the attack against Shechem was uncalled for, but in a justified war, all would agree that one may attack without distinguishing between the innocent and guilty members of a nation if it is impossible to effectively wage war in another manner." The above appears in Part Two of Rav Jachter's article "Halachic Perspectives on Civilian Casualties in Gaza": Parts One and Two include an extensive discussion of the Maharal's doctrine and a survey of attitudes of contemporary rabbinic thought thereto, and cf. Part Three.

Scan here to receive the weekly email version of the Halacha Journal or sign up at www.baishavaad.org/subscribe

Π



¹² Tosafos ibid. s.v. Dekatla.