

## How to Fight

Korach 5780

After the incident with Korach, the Pasuk says (יז,ה) ולא יהיה כקרח וכעדתו. There are many commentaries who learn from this Pasuk that there is a prohibition to engage in מחלוקת. How exactly does one define such a prohibition?

The Mishna in Pirkei Avos (5:17) says the following:

כל מחלוקת שהיא לשם שמים סופה להתקיים ושאינה לשם שמים אין סופה להתקיים איזו היא מחלוקת שהיא לשם שמים זו מחלוקת הלל ושמאי ושאינה לשם שמים זו מחלוקת קרח וכל עדתו

The obvious question on the Mishna is the inconsistency. When giving an example of a מחלוקת שהיא לשם שמים, the Mishna says the machlokes of Hillel and Shamai, who are each of the opponents. However, when giving an example about a מחלוקת שאינה לשם שמים, the Mishna says the machlokes of קרח ועדתו, only mentioning one side of the machlokes and not mentioning the opposing side, Moshe Rabbeinu. (See the Malbim for an explanation)

Reb Yerucham Levovitz, in his Sefer Daas Torah, explains based on Rashi quoting Onkeles במחלוקת במחלוקת, וזהו שתרגם אונקלוס ואתפלג נחלק משאר העדה להחזיק במחלוקת, that the issue with Korach was not just the dispute itself but rather the way he conducted himself throughout the Machlokes. Meaning, he didn't respect the opposing side in the dispute and viewed it as if there was no opponent.

It's difficult to say that any Machlokes and dispute is prohibited because people that enter into an agreement of some sort or a marriage are bound to have differences which lead to machlokes. People come from different backgrounds and develop their ideologies and opinions differently than others and therefore machlokes is inevitable and unavoidable. However, if each side in the disagreement has the best interest of the other party and they are trying to reach the best possible solution, then in the end they will come to a solution which pleases both sides. But this can be done only when each side respects the other throughout the disagreement and they can see that there is an opposing side and are willing and interested in hearing what the opponent has to say. When this is achieved, this is no doubt a מחלוקת לשם שמים which is סופה להתקיים.

With this we can answer both questions we began with. The prohibition of engaging in machlokes that commentaries extract from the Pasuk **ולא יהיה כקרח** וכעדתו is not barring all disputes period, rather it's the prohibition of not being **כקרח** who didn't treat the other side of the machlokes with respect and dignity. Rather he was **במחלוקת** and removed himself as if there was no opposing side.

According to this, we can suggest the reason why the example of a machlokes that is **שלא לשם שמים** ועדתו **קרח** and not **קרח ומשה**. The Mishna is expressing the point that a machlokes where one side is not showing the other respect, and is arguing as if there is no opponent, is specifically the type that is **שלא לשם שמים** and **אינה מתקיים** because they really don't have an interest in the truth and therefore they don't respect or bother listening and understanding the other side.

(Adapted from the Malchus Beis Dovid)