



## Daniel Jeremy Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4850: Daniel Jeremy Silver Papers, 1972-1993.**

Series III: The Temple Tifereth-Israel, 1946-1993, undated.

Sub-series B: Sermons, 1950-1989, undated.

---

Reel  
45

Box  
14

Folder  
723

Until Death Do Us Part - Until Life Do Us Part, 1960.



UNTIL DEATH DO US PART -- UNTIL LIFE DO US PART

Marriage Today and Yesterday -- A Comparison

THE TEMPLE  
February 21, 1960

Rabbi Daniel Jeremy Silver

We live in an era which likes to make its education dramatic, so it is perhaps fitting that this morning, when our lecture is concerned with the family, that we received a dramatic lesson in what makes family living such a delight. The father or mother announce a decision, and the family blithely carries on in its own path as if the decision was never announced.

America has been inventoried. We are entering a new decade, and we want to know where we stand. Many important and learned articles have been written on the state of our foreign policy, of our science and of our technology, our standard of living and our rate of production, our civil liberties and our freedoms. But strangely, there has been almost nothing written - silence - concerning that aspect of daily life which affects each and every one of us the most intimately, the question as to the vitality and the stability of our families. Perhaps it is so because all is well with our families. Family life is strong and healthy and no one need address his mind and his talents to a discussion of the American family. But when Dr. Joseph Read, the Head of the Child Welfare League of America, asked himself recently in a rhetorical vein the very simple question, "Is all well with the American family?", his answer was equally simple and direct and monosyllabic, "No."

*The answer can be*  
*What his concern is over the*  
 What was his concern for the American family? Basically this: that the American family has lost the dimension of permanence, that the broken home has become as much a part of the American landscape as the split level house, that



the American family fairy tale no longer ends "and they lived happily ever after". It ends rather "and they lived happily for a short time thereafter". Last year alone in the United States three hundred and eighty thousand couples were divorced. Last year alone in these United States twenty two thousand marriages were annulled. Last year alone in these United States two hundred and ten thousand desertions were reported to the authorities. Last year alone in our own country three million, one hundred thousand men and women were living separate from, apart from their husbands or their wives. The American family has lost its stability. This is our concern.

The American seems to have transposed the marriage vow, "Do you promise to love, honor and cherish until death do you part?", so that it reads, "to love, honor and to cherish until life do you part." And there is cause for this concern, because the broken home, the disintegrating, dismembered family affects the welfare and wellbeing of all of us and not simply the happiness and the welfare of those most intimately involved. <sup>Touched</sup>

It was Dr. Carl Zimmerman of the Department of Social Relations of Harvard University who coined the very happy phrase that "the family is the moving <sup>Never</sup> figure of history". His allusion is, of course, to Daniel in <sup>our</sup> Bible, who saw written on the wall of the king's palace through the agency of a moving finger <sup>the</sup> the augury, ~~the prophecy~~ of the future. The family makes the future. A strong family contributes to a stable society. A weak, disintegrating family saps the vigor of ~~the~~ <sup>that</sup> society. <sup>The</sup> A strong family teaches by example citizenship and character, and it breeds confidence. <sup>The</sup> A broken home produces the rootless, lonely, unhappy human being, the human being who will never find fulfillment for his talents, will never be able to live up to his promise of ~~creativity~~, who in his aloneness, in his frustration, in his guilt is ready grist for the demagogue's mill. The dismemberment of our homes, the quicksand upon which the



foundations of so many of our homes seem to be <sup>cast</sup> built augurs poorly for our future because it poisons the wells of spiritual vigor from which a country and a nation draws ultimately its strength. And what is more, it scars - scars the lives of hundreds upon thousands of innocent young people. A child thrives in love. A child withers, draws in upon himself, his personality becomes distorted when that love is withdrawn from him when he feels insecure and unwanted.

In the last years, fourteen million American children have suffered the trauma of a broken home. They will bear the scars of this trauma throughout their lifetime. Some of the scars showed immediately in learning problems, in problems of adjustment and antisocial behavior. Some will show only later, when they are unwilling to accept, unable to accept adult love because unconsciously they fear that ultimately in time that love will be withdrawn from them. Some of them will live bitter, vindictive lives, punishing all about them for their childhood hurt. Some will draw in upon themselves, shelter themselves under a shell, be unable to relate to their society. In some way most of these young people will bear throughout their lives the agony of their childhood hurt. They will suffer and we will suffer, because, in the long run, their anger, their frustration will spill out, involve, poison, the lives of those about them.

Have we Jews as a religious community reason to be concerned with the disintegration of the American home, or is it completely a non-Jewish problem? The Jewish home has in history had a legendarily high rate of stability and health. Perhaps we have avoided in America any semblance of joining in the rush to the divorce court. Unfortunately, there is no mystique of faith which permits us to assume that the Jewish family, too, will not suffer the disintegration which is so widespread on the American scene. Indeed, year by year, perceptibly, the rate of divorce in the Jewish community is rising higher and higher and approximating closer and closer to the rate of divorce in the community about us. Statistics are hard to come by, but broadly the picture is this; one marriage in three, nationally, ends in divorce. One marriage in five, within our



religious community, is today ending in divorce. Many of these involve inter-marriages, but when all is said and done, for better and for worse the Jewish community is accepting the manners and the morals of the community about us. And there is a tragedy in this -- a tragedy that as a religious community we have not been able to accept the blessings and hold ourselves aloof from the failings of the American community. How much better would it have been if our spiritual walls had been high, if we had been able to maintain the higher levels of family stability, the higher and nobler concepts of family living which come from our tradition, hoping in time that these would ~~transpose themselves~~, transfer themselves by example to the community about us.

But apparently this is not to be the case. Apparently, in our patterns and habits of life we, as Jews, are going to approximate, are determined to approximate the manners and morals and mores of those with whom we live.

The disintegrating American home is, then, a cause of concern to all of us. Why has the home, so traditionally, so historically the bulwark of any society, begun in modern American life to disintegrate and be dismembered? In part, in largest part the answer lies in the sweeping economical and political and technological revolution, the ~~industrial revolution~~ which has swept over the world in the last century and a half or two centuries. The factory has replaced the farm as the basic unit of production. The city has replaced the hamlet as the basic ~~element~~ or unit of domicile. The home is no longer the center of production, of education, of recreation, of identity, for these functions have been taken over by organizations outside of the home, and the home is today a motel, a hamburger haven, and a darkened T.V. theater.

Writing of the changes which have overtaken the American home, Dr. Reed has this to say:

There are forty-three million American families, and they vary with all the richness that human differences and opportunities in a democracy permit. But all have been and still are subject in some measure to the radical changes that have taken place in all aspects of American life in the past one hundred years. Some families have



had three, four, or five generations to assimilate and adjust to that change. Others, like the Puerto Ricans, have felt its full force in the few hours it takes to fly from San Juan to New York, or, like the Southern Negroes, in the time it takes a bus to travel from the Mississippi Delta to Chicago.

Today's family is a very different family. The couple married out of romantic love. Their marriage was not arranged, as it once would have been, by their parents. This couple see their own parents perhaps once a year, and the rest of the relatives, for the most part, exist only as an annual Christmas card list. They expect to move at least two or three times while their children are growing up, not infrequently to other states or even across the country. Our cultural pattern is such that it is almost taken for granted that the family will move if a better opportunity is found elsewhere -- a job with increased status, a better climate, or better educational opportunities for the children. Family friends must be newly made, perhaps every two or three years.

The family today must establish its own status. Few know, and fewer care, what the grandfather had achieved or who the great-grandfather had been. No generation-established reputation follows the family. Its status is almost wholly determined by the husband's achievement in his occupation. He cannot gain status simply by being a good provider of the necessities of life. He is expected to advance, to "be somebody", and to provide the necessary symbols of success -- a car, a color TV set, a better neighborhood for his family to live in. What he does during most of his waking hours is almost unknown to his family, for in addition to working long hours to get ahead, he must often spend a good part of his day commuting. The more ambitiously he responds to the goals of his culture, the more apt he is to become detached from his family responsibilities. Even if the status of women had not changed, the husband could not realistically be, in the old sense, the head of his household.

Recreation and education (including religious education) are provided by someone else. The children of the family are no longer an economic asset. The traditional roles of husband and wife are no longer distinct, and each family must find its own balance. The wife no longer has a clear-cut role. The demand for industrial workers has taken millions of mothers into industry. At the same time her role as mother and housewife has been devalued -- it is of low status. Often from her employment she may earn as much or more than her husband. The mores of the community, its patterns of sexual conduct, its standards and values are not so clear or so socially enforced as they once were. In essence, the family is alone, isolated, separated from relatives or those to whom it would be natural to turn for counsel. It must in large part make its own choices, vote its own decisions, establish its own values.

9 In short, the industrial revolution in America, the industrial revolution throughout the world brought with it a family familial dissolution and dismemberment. Fifty years ago one family in three in America lived in a rural or farming



community. These families involved in the same house three or four generations. The home was the center of activity, the matrix around whom all the educational and recreational and social and religious activities of these individuals revolved. Today less than one family in ten lives in such a community. The others have had to congregate, to congest themselves into center cities, to live largely anonymous lives, to live largely outside of their homes. Their jobs now take them outside of their homes. Their production takes them outside of their homes, their religion takes them outside of their homes, their education takes them outside of their homes, their recreation takes them outside of their homes, ~~and~~ the homes have been left an empty shell. The web of family relationship has, in short, been drawn taut and thin, and lacking richness and lacking depth, these webs have often under stress and strain broken and been ~~torn and~~ ruptured and torn asunder.

Now, some have tried to solve this problem of the modern American home by in its essence turning back the clock of history. They have said -- and this is the reason for our suburbias and our exurbias -- they have said in short that the modern society requires that we congregate for our businesses, that we work in a central factory <sup>or</sup> ~~and~~ a central office building, but the industrial society does not require that we live near where we work. It is still possible to have our homes in the countryside, surrounded by trees, away from the congestion of the city streets and the cacaphony of city noises. And some families have been able to find in suburban living a slower, less hectic pace of life, a greater degree of identity, rootedness, values which lend support and strength to the family. But the rate of divorce, my friends, in our suburbs is as high as it is in our cities. Of themselves, the suburbs have not staunched the flood of divorce. Why is this so? It is so in part because the husband in the suburb~~s~~ is away from his family even more than he would be in the city itself. For he must add to his time at work commuting time, and this is often great. Often all that a husband during the work week sees of his family is a hasty evening snack, a shave as the family



prepares to go out for some social occasion, and then a look into his children's bedrooms as he tiptoes and puts them to bed. The husband is less and less with the family. The wife is less and less with the family, for in the suburbs she not only assumes the responsibilities of her home, but she assumes the responsibilities of the community. It is she who makes the suburban community work, its organizations interrelate. ~~She is, as we would say in our tradition, the suburban "macher". So she spends less and less time in the home.~~ And the child spends less and less time in the home. It takes him a while to get to school, ~~no longer around the corner.~~ When his recreation is to take place it must be planned. Transportation is involved. It is centered in some activity or some institution. So in and of itself, the suburb has not solved the problem of the attenuated family living of modern society. Indeed, many who sought to find the bucolic atmosphere of suburban living have seen it only through the alcoholic haze which surrounds it, and in that haze many have forgotten themselves, forgotten their vows, and forgotten their children.

Others have tried to solve the status of the modern family by making available to the family information, clinics, family service associations, agencies where they could go to seek help. Many fine schools have adopted family life courses where high school age youngsters are made aware of some of the necessary information for any householder, for any partner in a marriage, where they are taught something of personality adjustment and where basic information is made available to them. All around our big cities marriages clinics have developed. Indeed, America has pioneered in the professional development of the marriage counsellor. But unfortunately, less than twenty percent of all the students in American schools today receive any family life training. Less than one tenth of one percent of all those marriages which are tottering ~~and teetering~~ ever seek the professional help available to them, and were all such marriages to seek that help we would not begin to have the professionals to provide it. Less than one percent



of all adult Americans in their whole lifetimes, ~~my friends~~, ever attend a single course, not to speak of a single lecture, on marriage and its responsibilities. You can provide help, but you cannot force people to ~~abide~~ and to accept it. And until there is a desire, a widespread desire on the part of the millions of Americans who make up our married couples to ~~take advantage of these resources~~, to shore up the shaky foundations of their homes a few marriages will be saved, but the larger problem will remain unsolved.

Others have sought to meet the problem of the ~~American home~~ through legal remedy. Efforts have been made in our several states to equalize the rules and regulations surrounding divorce. Attempts have been made to close the notorious divorce mills where, for a few dollars and a few moments, a whole family can be immediately disintegrated. The legal profession has taken upon itself the responsibility and has largely discharged the responsibility to see to it that when couple comes to them seeking help in a divorce proceeding the first piece of business is not the filing of affidavit, but an attempt at reconciliation and at ~~the rehabilitation of the home~~. And in our courts, domestic relations courts and other reconciliation activities have been established in many communities, which have made the courts an agency aimed at the rebuilding of the home rather than the sheer processing of a legal formula. But this, too, has not stanchd the flood of divorce. This, too, has not prevented, year in and year out, the number of American families which are being disoriented and dismembered from growing tragically. ~~For~~ some have said that since America has the highest rate of divorce of any nation of our world, and since divorce is easiest to come by in America ~~than~~ of any major nation in our world, the problem and its solution lies in the divorce proceeding itself. "Let us make divorce so difficult," they say, "that it is well nigh impossible to come by. Let us limit the causes, the grounds for divorce to infidelity and nothing more." They argue that this was the intention of Jesus when he said, "Whom God has joined let no man sunder." They argue that we ought to



return to older, more moral, stabler, more religious ways, medieval days in which divorce was within the Catholic world well nigh an impossibility. But, unfortunately, we remember Prohibition, and we know that you cannot force millions of people to live as they will not live, that were we to close the doors to divorce, all we would succeed in doing would be to force a notorious flaunting of the marriage vows, and at least, today marriage, if it is not permanent, at least retains some of its sanctity.

Divorce is a symptom. It is the product of a broken family. It does not create the broken family. The ease with which divorce is gained has nothing to do with the rate of divorce, and would you see proof of that you have only to turn to <sup>The</sup> ~~our~~ Jewish tradition, for, strangely, within ~~our~~ Jewish faith divorce was easier to come by than it is even in America today. No one had to prove to a court that there were substantial grounds for divorce. It was sufficient that a young couple would come and say: "We can no longer live together. We have no longer anything in common. We find that our destinies are separate. We desire to be separated.", and the divorce was granted, for Israel knew that it is poetically a beautiful image to say that all marriages are made in heaven, but that realistically, in olden days, parents often badly mismatched their children and in modern times love is often blind, and that it is far better for a young couple who are impossibly bound together to separate than it is to chain them to a life of anguish and unhappiness and agony. And what is to be gained by forcing such a young couple to burlesque infidelity, as they must in some American states, that is simply a debasing and a degrading procedure. Jewish divorce is easy to come by, but it was rarely attempted, rarely desired. Why so? Why was the Jewish home so stable? The answer, I think, is a simple one. The answer lies in the cultural milieu in which the home was built. In matters of love and marriage, the Jewish world was an adult world, a world which knew full well that you cannot separate romantic love and the responsibilities of marriage, that these are not disparate entities but



the obverse and the reverse of a single coin. We in America, my friends, live in, ~~I am afraid, as it faces love we live in~~ an adolescent world. Our world glorifies passion. The Jewish world knew passion, but it knew also patience, and it knew that these must be wedded together, passion and patience. In our modern world marriage is the climax of desire. In the Jewish world marriage was the commencement of devotion. We in America say, "I will betroth thee." The Jew said, "I will ~~betroth~~ thee forever." He took the long view, not the short view. He spoke of not only romance but responsibility, and it is understandable, perhaps, that we have emphasized romance, we have revolted against medieval ways in which marriages were planned for the young people. But is it not equally important to tell our young people that beyond falling in love they must rise in love, they must build a family, and they must plan for the future. And this we have <sup>as a culture</sup> ~~culturally~~ neglected to do. But you say, "I told this to my son; I told that to my daughter. And you, yourself, Rabbi, when you married them told them that their love must not only be surging and compelling, but a love which knows how to share, a love which knows how to sustain, a love which knows how to sacrifice." And we did, you and I. And fortunately many of our young people listened.

But what of those whose parents were not so wise? What of those who were married, not before a religious leader, but before some back-country justice of the peace? What did their culture say to them? What did their literature say to them? That it is lust, not love, which is essential. That love is erotic. Live for the moment. The bliss of the hour is the essential things, not the blessing of a lifetime of companionship and happy love. What does their entertainment tell our young people -- our entertainment? It pictures to them the "tender trap" of love. It pictures for them all the enticements of romance. But does it ever picture for them the routine daily loving living ~~together~~ of husband and wife ~~together~~ through the years, through the anniversaries? No, it does not. A love goddess and her suitor clasped together in a lingering embrace, and that is the end of our enter-



tainment.

But life begins where entertainment ends, and this our younger generation does not always recognize or know. And what of our humor? With what voices does it speak to this generation. Our humor about our intimacies, <sup>the</sup> intimate moments of our lives is coarse, is it not? It is coarse, it is sexual, and it is public. And yet these intimacies, these intimate moments are the foundation, the bedrock of any happy marriage, and ought they not to be sensitive moments, delicate moments, and private, intensely private moments.

All in our society, my friends, speaks to our young people and to us of pleasure for pleasure's sake. It fails to remind us that beyond pleasure there is responsibility, beyond the sensual there is the sacrificial. You can see it in the terms which we use for marriage. The marriage itself comes from the Latin, from the word "maritare", which <sup>means</sup> simply to be together, to live together. The Hebrew word for marriage is "kiddushim". It comes from the root "kodosh", to be holy. It says that beyond the sensual there must be the sacred, that beyond physical attraction there must be spiritual attraction, that beyond mating there must be union. In our tradition marriage is a covenant, a holy contract entered into for a lifetime. It is a pledge of shared destiny, not the permission for an hour of ecstasy. I think it was Heine who once jestingly toasted, "Here is to matrimony, the high seas for which no one has ever invented a compass."

Now, the problems of married life are many, and they are varied, and they shade and are <sup>as</sup> variegated according to the number of couples as exist. No one can give you a sure answer to all of your problems. Patience, will, resolution, understanding, wisdom, love, devotion -- these are the answers. But I firmly believe this, and I put it to you this morning: that if we can raise our children in a more adult culture, if we can accept this adult culture for ourselves, if we can accept marriage as a responsibility beyond romance, if we can strip lust from love, desire from devotion, and put them back into a better balance, we will have gone a long way, you and I, towards establishing more stable families for our



selves and for our children and for our children's children. This, then, is the obligation which I would place before you ~~this morning~~. To be adult in your expectations of marriage. It begins with love -- in that our generation is entirely correct. But it must be a mature love, a sacrificing, not a devouring love, an enduring love, not a love simply for the immediate physical pleasure. A kiddushim, ~~a sanctification~~, not merely a marriage.

## Kaddish

Friday FEB 19

Sunday " 21

### Those who passed away this week

REBECCA FREEDMAN  
SADIE RIGELHAUPT  
FANNIE A. STONE

MARTIN B. WEISS

## Vahrzeits

GABRIEL SCHAFFNER  
JANE ELLEN UDELF  
EARLE M. LIEBERMAN  
DR. MORTON MORGENSTERN  
SIDNEY S. WOLFE  
SANFORD LIPHABER  
HELEN SAVLAN ROSE  
ROSE ROSENTHAL SCHOENBERGER

I bind myself for life -- from now on, my life is yours  
and to accept for service which will please me, but to please you  
I am sure

Contract  
Signed - j. 1919



~~And what of today's family?~~ Of course, no more than there was a hundred years ago, there is no single description that is comprehensive. There are 43 million American families, and they vary with all the richness that human differences and opportunities in a democracy permit. But all have been and still are subject in some measure to the radical changes that have taken place in all aspects of American life in the past <sup>one</sup> hundred years. Some families have had three, four, or five generations to assimilate and adjust to that change. Others, like the Puerto Ricans, have felt its full force in the few hours it takes to fly from San Juan to New York or, like the Southern Negroes, in the time it takes a bus to travel from the Mississippi Delta to Chicago.

Today's family is a very different family. The couple married out of romantic love. Their marriage was not arranged, as it once would have been, by their parents. This couple see their own parents perhaps once a year, and the rest of the relatives, for the most part, exist only as an annual Christmas card. <sup>list</sup> They expect to move at least two or three times while their children are growing up, not infrequently to other states or even across the country. Our cultural pattern is such that it is almost taken for granted that the family will move if a better opportunity is found elsewhere -- a job with increased status, a better climate, or better educational opportunities for <sup>the</sup> children. Family friends must be newly made, perhaps every two or three years.

The family <sup>today</sup> must establish its own status. Few know, and fewer care, what the grandfather had achieved or who the great-grandfather had been. No generation-established reputation follows the family. Its status is almost wholly determined by the husband's achievement in his occupation. He cannot gain status simply by being a good provider of the necessities of life. He is expected to advance, to "be somebody", and to provide the necessary symbols of success -- a car, a color TV set, a better neighborhood for his family to live in. What he does during



most of his waking hours is almost unknown to his family, for in addition to working long hours to get ahead, he must often spend a good part of his day commuting. The more ambitiously he responds to the goals of his culture, the more apt he is to become detached from his family responsibilities. Even if the status of women had not changed, the husband could not realistically be <sup>in the old sense,</sup> the head of his household.

Recreation and education (including religious education) are provided by someone else. The children of the family are no longer an economic asset. The traditional roles of husband and wife are no longer distinct, and each family must find its own balance. The wife no longer has a clear-cut role. The demand for industrial workers has taken millions of mothers into industry. At the same time her role as mother and housewife has been devalued -- it is of low status. Often from her employment she may earn as much or more than her husband. The mores of the community, its patterns of sexual conduct, its standards and values are not so clear or so socially enforced as they once were. In essence, the family is alone, isolated, separated from relatives or those to whom it would be natural to turn for counsel. It must in large part make its own choices, vote its own decisions, establish its own values.



business have been trading other. We are entering a new era. We  
 have do we stand? Critics have investigated our technology, our science,  
 our defense, our medicine, our foreign policy, our economic progress,  
 our standard of living, our freedom - well - everything - and have  
 concluded on each one as a whole of each living under what we must doing -  
 the critical and stabilizing for mankind.

Forburn took pleasure in having a very satisfactory. All in all with  
the American family - as well <sup>with</sup> it. Forburn so. Just when Dr.  
General ~~Scott~~ Reid, Forburn of the Good will was the subject of interest  
addressed himself to the study of the families - his answer to all  
these was the American home - even a simple, direct, and unconfused  
No.

[illegible]

Bank you about 380,000	divided between you and
Bank you about 22,000	incurred was covered
Bank you about 210,000	divided was reported
Bank you about 3,100,000	between you and
	reported from each other.

Or Paul can even go down to the market in London and dominate  
it totally. American has to respond that meaning "to love, have  
 & share with others to an extent" to mean "to love, marry &  
 share till life is over"; "the American youth feels no longer need  
 of any social happiness over others" but "to love, marry, procreate  
 & have"

As the translation of some 1/2 million hours each year is matter of  
concern to all of us on only to those whose happiness is immediately  
involved? It is a matter of national concern. A command to you the  
happy persons of Prof. Charles Zimmerman of the Dept. of Soc. Sci. & Human  
Resources "The Journal is the measure of his life" - ~~of David~~  
~~to our people~~ ~~and the people~~ This statement is to David as an



Better ends than a money finger with <sup>a</sup> ~~invaluable~~ property of <sup>the future</sup> ~~infidelity~~ or  
the result of the very future. The family makes <sup>the future</sup> ~~itself~~ - a sound family  
land changed to a society. Better houses & up societies more. A  
sound family <sup>by itself</sup> ~~character~~ & ~~integrity~~, it needs ~~confidence~~.  
Better have on the other hand make home, unpleasant, it  
disenchanted people, a society of strong healthy homes can lead  
confidently to the future. A society of disorganized homes faces a  
difficult road.

Family including parents, the mother, spiritual mother, from which even  
to notice some true things, loneliness, isolation, unhappiness, self  
preoccupied people filled with frustration & guilt not only fail to find  
fulfillment  
peace for themselves - but fail to make a contribution equal to the capital  
and in this absence and neglect are marginalized and must  
be the homogeneous rule.

Worse yet is the emotional damage suffered by children. A child needs security. He can not leave on gradual nor abrupt shifts to new relationships. Children learn on <sup>love</sup> ~~love~~, They thrive under security. There is a paralyzing loss of morale - often nervous anxiety & adjustment problems - sometimes a lifelong incapacity to accept love freely, self-consciously and the love too much be with drawn. Others become bitter & need punishment themselves & subordinates for the children's hurt. Still others may get out with & under ~~under~~ passionate zeal flung out in uncontrolled jealousy and anger.

There are 14 million children in America who have suffered as victims  
of a broken home. These emotional scars run deep, & each child in some  
way carries the burden of emotional distress also - and all of us must  
~~be concerned about~~ ~~the~~ ~~well-being~~ ~~of~~ ~~these~~ ~~children~~ ~~and~~ ~~their~~ ~~families~~  
until we can bring them a deep peace for their hearts.

Then can we just assume ourselves that family disintegration is  
a rising disease rate - is not our problem, we are right when we say  
that historically Jewish family structure is changing. We are misjudging  
if we assume that some negative of faith will keep matters  
even so.







An interesting study of the English Renaissance has been Conrad  
Disquisition : Fifth 1000 '90 11 and 13 of which have been in a small case  
on a form : These generally have generally named 4 questions. The  
home was a study of education, music, literature. To 12 and 13  
found a 10 then at our command. The home generally named 2 questions  
parents : Education - Education in music, education <sup>about the kitchen</sup> and education  
The Disquisition - must be in, all possible, most education (the place  
should be in. Found up has been attended - demands of many  
all within - after down this - and the question of young all you in  
which we can do to small a study of the new family for when  
starting as have to 1/2.

[illegible]

For many such reflections during his late accepted visitation, "There is more peace, a greater identity - a greater peace between us. But we will of course it not necessarily mean an indifference to ourselves - to the answer we get to the world's past that we are living and not of itself being a part of the world. Indeed committing to the future and of the home more than ever in our a reflection home education remains the promise of the world, we have reproduced the reality of family living & a kind of home & home, a kind of just peace in the midst of a husband's expectations will be home. The supreme beauty of all is that for more the children themselves as well as their own individual and in our an atmosphere may have forgotten ourselves, forgotten the world & forgotten the children."

My husband is always leaving me and the kids - all in there - ~~about~~ I would  
 still be <sup>depend</sup> on him and on the kids but now you know &  
 will let your parents in at last



Andersen being his usual attendant on board & likewise his representative!

Now have the very first meeting of Friends for Commerce & Industry  
and have the committee to be held in London - subject to be decided by the  
committee & send a letter to the committee & the committee.

The program was immediate; the material to be taught was  
as far as needed, has been 2070 of course. U.S. 5th grade needs to  
know a French pop. has been 1/10 of 1% of all American men added to  
the data made from a census of marriage & was 1 month. Has this 30%  
all been used then used in marriage counseling: but if the country  
includes a variety men & women must come to a new up down 0.9%

[illegible][illegible]

The blame is run & down the road of the past,  
a return to older, older, & more religious days when great  
teaching was proclaimed world - we have abandoned it to be "us human  
was not run down the road of the past."



Temple in the suggestion is it is no solution. Most any business  
be reminded of prohibition. You can not compel millions to live as  
any will not live. What is to be said by doing the same with the  
at <sup>least</sup> produce of a certain quantity of money - at least  
to be money is to improve but it retards the process

The idea of a not a result of desire, desire is a result of  
the human family. What do you gain in treating a disease - if all you  
succeed in doing is making the symptoms? A new sound with such  
treatment <sup>leading</sup> to the same illness - also the only effect is to make the symptoms

A lesson can be drawn here from our Jewish tradition, just as in the  
of anything less more demand a permission as matter of desire  
than even current American practice. In Jewish law the couple  
need not abstain from sexual intercourse - they <sup>are</sup> permitted to engage -  
but despite this permission the Jewish family has been a stable  
and healthy unit.

How so?

First of all Judaism is enough to recognize that <sup>the</sup> father  
image of the perfect man <sup>is not</sup> as human has not  
fully correspond to reality. Home is often void. An older drug parent  
often live separately from their children - for better and for worse  
generally a void void he reminded that it reminds of  
void into a lifeless void. Hence the permission of desire.

Judaism was also in recognizing that personal differences  
can be real & bad. In tradition was providing not to allow  
mis-matched young people to suffer the added misery of polygamy  
or multiple infidelity.

What made the Jewish home stable?

~~Businesses are not the same as the business life is the system of Jewish life is more~~  
~~to the Jew was not the desire of desire but the commandment~~  
~~of desire was not the desire of desire but the commandment~~  
~~was not the desire of desire but the commandment~~  
~~was not the desire of desire but the commandment~~



The simple fact that the Jewish home was based on a collective common sense culture - a culture in which the nominal of home and the responsibility of members were regarded not as disparate entities but as the direct means of the same end.

Conscious glorification of passion

Products from faraway must be added to palatable

Our culture needs desires

Our full physical sanctification

Our young say "I will be married soon"

Our ancients said "I will be married soon again"

The ancient culture is a function of the concept of love - as expressed in culture. At least on that stage - when the long has been made, man is made to see the sanctification of love as the source of sanctification of love.

We work - perhaps useful - with the European pattern of marriage by arranged marriage partners. Our young fall in love. We forget to see them and they must also build a home.

Oh, young say; but until then. An ancient idea before marriage - you yourself which is the marriage since and then but that must be a love which is not only sentiment & compelling but one which knows how to sustain, & live, & sacrifice.

And, of course, you are right. We do. And perhaps very soon. But what I would suggest to you and marriage is that an ancient idea which is the marriage since and then but that must be a love which is not only sentiment & compelling but one which knows how to sustain, & live, & sacrifice.

What does an ancient idea mean? - Our ancient idea is the marriage since and then but that must be a love which is not only sentiment & compelling but one which knows how to sustain, & live, & sacrifice.

What does an ancient idea mean? - Our ancient idea is the marriage since and then but that must be a love which is not only sentiment & compelling but one which knows how to sustain, & live, & sacrifice.



What does our humor say? That aspect grows & looms - not that it  
is the sensitive delicate period basis of money.

<sup>English</sup>  
Our word  
The ~~translation~~ meaning comes from the Latin root manus & means  
simply "to bind together" then just word for money is "1818"  
at various "to manually definitely definitely" Here also the fundamental  
definition "1818" implies something shared - under the shared. is  
partnership <sup>in life</sup> beyond physical <sup>shared</sup> togetherness - beyond man's attention

learned there on a shared meaning "to share manually". The best sense  
for which no comparison can be made. The problem of money  
is many & complex. Some meanings must always fail - but if  
beliefs of us can be more adult with children & with our  
children, help them to see money as the shared definitely  
compensability it can be - shared the shared manually  
possible - we could have come a long way toward stability  
the American home & building the American future.

