

"All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by YMG - 28 Jul 2011 17:12

Philosopher: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Philosopher: "... and since kids are ticklish, kids like black jelly beans".

Philosopher: "You're a kid. You must like black jelly beans too!"

Child: (puzzled) But I don't like black jelly beans.

Philosopher: Could it be that *maybe* you're not a kid?

Child: (holding up 5 fingers) - "I'm this much!"

Philosopher: Then *maybe* it's because you're not ticklish?

Child: (poking at his ribs) But I am ticklish.

Philosopher: Then maybe you're not *that* ticklish. Not all kids are *that* ticklish!

Child: Um... I dun know.

Philosopher: (frustrated and upset) Why don't you listen to me when I tell you "how" kids are and "why" they are!

Philosopher: Look "Kid" – you've only been a kid for 5 years, and you don't know so much about being a kid. Me on the other hand, I've been around much longer than you and my child years span greater than your whole life!

Philosopher: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans...!"

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by YMG - 04 Aug 2011 07:24

More thoughts I'd like to share, and another thing that bothered me about that write-up.

Here's something quoted from the handbook article:

"There's a well known adage that if Hashem gave us a test, we must have the ability to overcome it as well. R' Tzadok HaKoehn says though, (in Tzidkas Hatzadik) that this is not as simple as it sounds. It is true that we all have free choice to do what Hashem expects of us in this world, over the course of our lifetimes. However, in the process of our journey, there are many times when a person is considered an onus."

In *Tzidkas Hatzadik* this can be found in *siman mem gimmel*.

There also - if anyone actually pulls out the *sefer* and looks this up, they'll find that R' Tzadok HaKohen concludes his thought saying, **"But the person himself cannot testify on himself concerning this, because perhaps he still had the power to overcome the yetzer."**

And in the text that's: "??? ????? ????? ??? ????? ?????? ?? ????? ???, ?? ????? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ????? ?????".

That would be another important point to note for the handbook.
"... this is not as simple as it sounds".

=====

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"
Posted by trying123 - 04 Aug 2011 07:42

P.s. Check this out:

??? ????? ?????? ??? ?"?????? ??????" (???? ??"?, ??? ????? ???????, ??' ??): ?????? ????? ??
????????? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????? ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ?????? ?? ????????
????????? ??? ?????? ??????? ??????? ?? ?? ?????? ??????. ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ??? ??? ??????
????????? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????????? ??????, ?? ?????? ??????... ?????? ?????????? ??? ??? ?????? ???????,
????????? ??????? ?? ?????? ?????????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?? ?? : ?????? ??? ?????? ?????????????? ??????? ??????
????? ??????? ?????? ??????????... [?]????? ???, ?????? ?????? ??????? ??????. ?????? ?????? ??????? ??????
?? ??? – ?????? ??????? ?????? ??????, ?????? ??? ??????? ??????????. ??? ??? ??? ??????? ???????
????? ??????.

- from Teshuva B'zmaneinu by Dr. Sorotzkin

=====

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"
Posted by YMG - 04 Aug 2011 08:20

Then there's this:

"We must also realize that we didn't always have free will in the past. This is clear from various
Sefarim and in various places in Chazal. To quote one of the foremost baalei mussar of our
times, Rav Shlomo Wolbe, [zt"l]"

Firstly - It's not clear *where* you're quoting from because there's no reference cited.

And because you go on to say something else, it's also not clear *what* you're quoting.

But assuming that you're addressing the quote that Tried-123 brings in last post, here I'm attaching an image so we can have the *sefer* right here in front of us.

His wording "and they can't overcome this in any way" *can only* be understood to mean that "they are literally powerless!" if it's read on it's own - as if disjointed from the rest of the paragraph.

Combined with the rest of what he's saying though; he's addressing the *mechanchim*, and telling them that we have to find a better approach in dealing with youth who are caught up in masturbation. The core issue he's dealing with here is guilt. He addresses the fact that they're burdened with guilt and if we can somehow help them relax about this issue, and help focus their energy in Torah, their masturbation issue will be "forgotten".

I happen to agree with that statement *very* strongly!

But I don't hear *any* talk about powerlessness and lack of free-will...

In this context, where he gives advice on how to deal with the issue till it's is "simply forgotten" - his statement, "and they can't overcome this in any way" can't *in any way* be seen as literal.

Here's another thing that needs to be seen in the *sefer* itself.

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by the.guard - 04 Aug 2011 10:48

[YMG wrote on 04 Aug 2011 04:00:](#)

And with that definition, at *what point* does a he say that he's failed at his attempt?

When is it determined that he can't?

Good question.

The point and intensity of his decision that

(a) he **must** stop

as well as

(b) the realization that he **can't**

are both things that are "d'varim hamesurim la'lev".

That is why this defination of "addiction" and "powerlessness" can't be argued. As Dov always says, it will not help at all for me to tell you that you are an addict. It is only the person *himself* who can decide (a) how desperate he is to stop and (b) by studying his track record honestly, coming to the conclusion that he **can't**. No other person can tell him these things.

Only at the point that it truly hits his heart can he be considered an addict and powerless, as per the AA definition. It can't be measured or tested in any way, and it may be different for each person.

=====
=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by the.guard - 04 Aug 2011 10:54

1. If you check out this page: www.mechon-mamre.org/i/5101.htm you'll see that it seems there is confusion about whether it is 1:8 or 1:9.

2. The point the handbook is trying to make is only that there are cases when a sin, even one we enjoy, can be an oness.

[YMG wrote on 04 Aug 2011 05:32:](#)

In the Rambam's *Issurei Biyah*, check your source. The *halacha* where the Rambam writes "for the Yetzer and human nature forced her to want," is actually 1:9, not 1:8. It's also taken way out of context - to the degree that the point you're trying to make is actually *the opposite* of the Rambam's general perspective on free-will at the time of sin. That's apparent to anyone who'll look things up in their source.

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by the.guard - 04 Aug 2011 10:58

[YMG wrote on 04 Aug 2011 07:24:](#)

There also - if anyone actually pulls out the *sefer* and looks this up, they'll find that R' Tzadok HaKohen concludes his thought saying, "***But the person himself cannot testify on himself concerning this, because perhaps he still had the power to overcome the yetzer.***"

And in the text that's: "??? ????? ????? ??? ????? ?????? ?? ????? ???, ?? ????? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ?????"

????".

Very true. But so what? The handbook is not saying **you** can decide that you were an oness on your own, the handbook is just saying that there are times when **Hashem** decides you were an oness.

The handbook is just trying to help people get past guilt so they can move on. If Rav Tzadok says that it "could be" we were an oness, it helps us move past the guilt. Because we can't start teshuvah if we are stuck in the mud. The guilt keeps us in the mud. So if we let go of the guilt and succeed in stopping, only later can we start talking about teshuvah for the past...

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"
Posted by Eye.nonymous - 04 Aug 2011 13:35

This conversation is getting quite lomdishe; perhaps it should be moved into the beis medrish section.

Besides that...

[YMG wrote on 04 Aug 2011 05:32:](#)

Since the Rambam has been the general flow of this conversation, let's begin with that:

I would like to make another point here, to REALLY keep this thread on-track.

The main point, at the beginning, if you remember, was jellybeans.

So, I set forth a motion to get back to that.

We will now clarify if the Rambam, indeed, liked black jellybeans.

Please quote only sources from the Rambam, and don't confuse the issue by quoting pesukim, gemaras, midrash, other rishonim, and certainly not contemporary mussar or (especially) chassidic writings (no offense).

The point, to be clear, is to determine if the Rambam liked black jellybeans. Please do not diverge from this main topic and assert your own opinions as to whether YOU like black jellybeans, or whether people in general ought to like black jellybeans, or even to discuss whether black jellybeans are intrinsically likeable, or not.

As important as all these questions may be, and as well-taken as such points may be taken, they would comprise a horrible tangent, and are not the point of discussion at this point in time. It would only serve to confuse matters, although such issues may be taken up at a later date or via PM.

Once again, as we are trying to determine whether or not the Rambam, indeed, liked black jellybeans, please support your viewpoint purely with quotes directly from the Rambam.

A final rule, however, is to bring only the quotes that support YOUR opinion. If, by chance, you should encounter any quotes to the contrary (whether in the course of your own research, or whether as expressed by another party in this discussion), they must be disregarded immediately. (For the time being, we are suspending the general rule (#13) by which the Torah is interpreted, that you often find 2 contradictory sources and then must resolve the apparent contradiction, somehow accepting both original statements in some way.)

I trust the bright Talmidei Chachamim of GYE should be able to keep up a heated debate on this matter (though heated jellybeans are overall less desireable under most circumstances, but I digress, as that is my own assertion).

Let the games begin (keep it clean)...

--Elyah

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by YMG - 04 Aug 2011 13:49

Wow! That's *really* a great idea!

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by Yosef Hatzadik - 04 Aug 2011 18:04

R` Elyah,

YMG started this thread. He used a metaphor to bring his point across. You are free to mark it read if you don't want to see it, but it seems to be one of the few threads that ARE staying on topic!!!!

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by ZemirosShabbos - 04 Aug 2011 18:15

i think i found a good proof

a question is asked, how do we know that Moshe Rabeinu wore a shtreimel? (works just as well for a frock btw)

the answer is simple, it says ????? ???, do you really think he would walk without his shtreimel?

so by extension, the Rambam, we can assume, ate a few meals a day, and being a doctor would be conscious of health concerns, so if he ate a snack in between meals, do you think he would eat black jellybeans?

i rest my case

=====

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by YMG - 04 Aug 2011 18:16

Love it! ;D

=====

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by YMG - 04 Aug 2011 18:32

Despite the misuse of the sources I've seen presented here (at least the ones I've checked up thus far), there are, in fact, *very valid Torah sources* that assert the fact that *there are indeed times* when a person can be "forced" to sin (so to speak). These are some things *I have seen* even throughout *my own* learning.

At first glance – in reconciliation of the apparent contradictions between these two approaches

on the “powerless theory” though - one might propose the following approach; being which; there be no need to deal with contradictions in something that relates to action. That means to say, that - be it philosophical or not - a *Yid* is to view matters that *relate to halacha*, only in the most *practical, halachic* sense. That’s *despite* the fact that there are other – Torah - views out there!

In demonstrating this fact, an example for this would be the many disputes between *Beis Shamai and Beis Hillel*. Both opinions are Torah *mamash*! Both are “*Divrey Elokim Chaim*”! Although that is true, only one of them is *halacha*! While Torah speaks of two different ways to light one’s *menorah* on Chanukah, practically speaking, there’s really only one right way to **do** it! If a person lights his *menorah* differently then what the *halacha* prescribes, *he’s actually doing it wrong*!

In addition to the above, we also know that once something’s been stated *halacha*, *everything changes* – even the very *reality*! The reality actually *is* or *becomes* what the *halacha* determines!

This concept can be seen in many places, including: *Talmud Yerushalmi* (*Ksubos* 1:2 and *Nedarim* 6:8), the *Shach* in *Yoreh Deah* (189:13 and 23), and the *Shulchan Aruch HaRav* (189:23). There are also many examples for this, for instance – like a story of the *Arizal*’s psak and a story of the *Rogochover Gaon*’s psak – stories written in *seforim* – how *they actually had an impact on the actual way of things*!

I’d also suggest a look at *Rashi* in *Shoftim* 17:11, and in the beginning of the Rambam’s *Hilchois Mamrim*.

Anyway, that’s one approach...

=====
=====

Re: “All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!”

Posted by Yosef Hatzadik - 04 Aug 2011 18:35

[YMG wrote on 04 Aug 2011 18:16:](#)

Love it! ;D

[Eye.nonymous wrote on 04 Aug 2011 13:35:](#)

Please do not diverge from this main topic and assert your own opinions as to whether YOU like black jellybeans

Who cares what YOU love? >

Oh!

You mean that you love **ZemirosShaboss**'s post?

We **all** love his posts!!!

=====

Re: "All kids who get ticklish like black jelly beans!"

Posted by YMG - 04 Aug 2011 18:37

And if anyone's interested in another approach to the apparent contradiction through a deeper look into the actual sources where this is discussed, please send me a private message, and I'll

And another thing...

I encourage everyone reading this thread to get into the habit of looking up sources.
try to continue posting on this topic - be"H.

And while I'm on that note:

Guard, did you mean to quote "Aleí Asoir"? That's the only musar sefer that I know of that bears a title even slightly resembling the one you mention. I double checked that in a seforim database just to make sure I'm not missing anything here, and I found nothing. There are 2 different prints bearing the "Aleí Asoir" title, but neither of them go up to page 156. Would you please verify/clarify your "Aleí Schur" reference for accuracy's sake?

And from the Steipler, where?

=====
=====