**Who is Qualified to Determine What is Kosher?**

The historical roots of the *Halachic* phenomenon of certifying food as kosher, are rooted in the rise of industrialization, and its effects on the Jewish communities of the United States in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The production of accessible and cheap processed food steered the consumer towards the purchase of products the kosher (“*kashrut*”) status of which required prior investigation.[[1]](#footnote-1) The Jewish housewife began to turn less and less to the local religious slaughterer with a chicken in her hand, and more and more began frequenting the local butcher shop selling pre-certified kosher meat. Thus, in short, a market for *kashrut* certificates (or the granting of a “*hechsher*” or certification as kosher) was created. Today, the grant of these certificates has become a widespread global market. The regulatory tool of the *kashrut* certificate is intended to express the testimony of a *ne’eman* (trustworthy person) that the laws of *kashrut* and religious slaughter have been observed. In a sense, the certificate is intended to reflect the basic *halachic* (Jewish religious law) rule set by the Babylonian Talmud that *eid echad ne’eman b’isurin* (“one witness is credible in matters of prohibition”).[[2]](#footnote-2) In accordance with the tradition of *Halachic* case law, as long as the prevailing legal requirement for two witnesses is not explicitly stated, a single individual’s testimony is sufficient to prove conduct that may be considered prohibited. Thus, *inter alia*, it is enough for one *ne’eman* – reliable or trustworthy person – to testify to the fact that the food in his possession is kosher.[[3]](#footnote-3) Without being able to apply this basic rule to the laws of *kashrut*, “no person could eats with his fellow, and no person could reply on the members of his household.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

The answer to the question of whether an edible object is indeed kosher does not depend on the ingredients alone, or just how they were treated. It is derived from a normative approach that also involves the characteristics and qualities of the person seeking to ensure that the food is kosher (for example, whether a gentile, a minor, or transgressors of the *halacha* either due to laxity – *a mumar lete’avon –* or ideology, a *mumar lehakh‘is*.[[5]](#footnote-5) The rule of testimony, which is closer by its nature to the rules of *trust*,[[6]](#footnote-6) shows that the determination of food as being kosher is not a priori and ontological (the calf is not kosher in and of itself),[[7]](#footnote-7) but depends on human action (kosher slaughter of the calf) as well as the evidential, epistemological testimony that the product is indeed kosher.[[8]](#footnote-8) Human actions constitute or limit the *kashrut* to such an extent that food transported on the Sabbath, even though its ingredients are kosher in themselves, or kosher wine that is poured by a gentile, lose their *kashrut* label. Food cooked in certain dishes, or by certain people, may also lose its status as being kosher.[[9]](#footnote-9) The decision on the *kashrut* of the food therefore lies in the human actions taken in relation to said food, and in the reliable or trustworthy point of view of the witness testifying to the prohibition. Clear evidence of this is found in the laws that deny the *kashrut* of a product prepared or supervised by a person suspected of transgression.[[10]](#footnote-10) It appears that for this reason, Rashi set the *halachic* precedent, which has served as the basis for extensive *halachic* rulings throughout the generations, that the application of the principle ‘A person remains part of the people of Israel even though he sinned’ [*Yisra‘el, af al pi she’kḥata, Yisra‘el hu*] on a transgressor, means that he remains within the definition of being a member of the Jewish community, but is considered ‘suspect,’ and therefore, “… you should not expel him from the Jewish faith, but he cannot be trusted with prohibitions, since he is suspect with respect to them”.[[11]](#footnote-11) On the other hand, a Jew who is defined as ‘wicked’[[12]](#footnote-12) even though he is disqualified from testifying in court, can, in the opinion of most *Halachic* adjudicators, be considered a trustworthy witness in matters of prohibition,[[13]](#footnote-13) as can a woman despite her disqualification from testimony in court.[[14]](#footnote-14)

The reflection of these laws regarding the transgressor and evildoer on contemporary secular Jews, has generated a plethora of literature and *halachic* controversy.[[15]](#footnote-15) But it seems that opinion is unanimous, and that there is no doubt that the status of the witness (and not the ontological status of the food) is what plays the crucial role in the question of whether or not a product is kosher, since there is no objective test that facilitates a determination of whether a product is kosher, regardless of the person taking part in its production and testifying to its nature. This *halachic* concept can thus be summarized as an epistemological concept at the heart of which stands the reliable witness who provides testimony on the nature of the food. It is mainly in a *Relationship of Trust* between the witness, whose role is to provide evidence, and the person who hears and accepts it. This, in essence, is the religious process through which kosher food has been consumed over the years, and of which the certificate of *kashrut* is a type of modern reflection.

The relationship of trust not only depends on the person, but also on place and custom. Jewish law produced a wide pluralistic range of laws concerning what is and isn’t kosher, stemming from various historical controversies that depended on place or ideology. The Talmud is replete with evidence of various eating habits: Rabbi Bar Bar Hanna of *Eretz Yisrael*, who used to cover his food with ‘permitted milk’ [*Translator’s Note*: Presumed translation – g.m.] arrived in Babylon, where it was forbidden;[[16]](#footnote-16) or of Rabbi Yossi HaGalili’s way of eating chicken in milk, because the chicken’s mother produces no milk;[[17]](#footnote-17) or the people of Babylon who would eat oil made by Gentiles, yet the people of the Land of Israel forbade it.[[18]](#footnote-18) Different *halachic* divisions and customs have been created over the years between the various communities in Spain and Central Europe (*Ashkenaz*),[[19]](#footnote-19) and 16th century Rabbi Moshe Isserle’s (the Rama) reservations about the rules in the *Shulchan Aruch* reflect the differences, as well as the legitimacy of there being differences.[[20]](#footnote-20) Another factor that evidences the widespread *halachic* diversity, is the multiplicity of types of “*Kashrut* Certificates” on the global market. As Rabbi Aharon Lichtenstein points out in an article dealing with the *halachic* status of the Rabbinate of Israel: “On a basic level, the *halacha* is clearly pluralistic. Within certain limits, it not only allows – but encourages – the existence of different and divided opinions, and the world of *halachic* discourse is characterized by the fact that “Both opinions are the word of the living God.”[[21]](#footnote-21)

In the State of Israel, *halachic* pluralism was never explicitly expressed, but the *halachic* principle of the human relationship of trust was reflected in the procedures for the enactment of the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act by the *Knesset* in the 1970s and 1980s. For example, the explanatory remarks to one of the Bills states: “The matter of *kashrut* is different from other properties of products, in that it has no material expression in the essence of the product, and it is difficult to determine the *kashrut* of a product by laboratory testing or a similar process.”[[22]](#footnote-22) When presenting the Bill to the *Knesset* plenum in 1982, the Minister of Religious Affairs at the time noted:[[23]](#footnote-23)

“*There are things that can be tested externally ... but with meat products, you do not know if the meat is from a kosher animal, and you do not know if the slaughter was performed in accordance with kashrut law, or whether the examination of the lungs was as it should be. Therefore, with respect to these products, there can be no external examination, but there should be a significant substantive examination [by a separate human party]*.”

A similar approach has been expressed in the literature. Engelrad writes this: “... the *kashrut* of food is not tested solely by fixed objective conditions. *Kashrut* is a normative religious concept. Therefore, the determination of a religious authority is the crucial factor for a religious person who considers himself subordinate to it.”[[24]](#footnote-24) In this chapter, I would like to focus on four legal cases that reviewed and designed *kashrut* laws in the public sphere in Israel, and the relationship of trust between the witness and target audience. Through legal-*halachic* analysis, I will seek to demonstrate how the Court’s dealing with fundamental questions from the world of *kashrut*, leads to a preference for certain *halacha*s over others, and sometimes even to the formation of new ‘*Erez Yisraeliot*’ [Land of Israel] *halachic* positions, products of the Supreme Court’s sitting as the High Court of Justice.[[25]](#footnote-25)

In order to understand the Court’s role in the phenomenon, we must first address the legislature’s actions. On the face of it, the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act grants exclusive authority to grant *kashrut* certificates to the Chief Rabbinate of Israel, and its extensions.[[26]](#footnote-26) The High Court of Justice is often required to address the issue due to various and diverse disagreements between business owners in need of the Rabbinate’s *kashrut* services, and the Rabbinate’s position.[[27]](#footnote-27) The Rabbinate’s position is not monolithic in this context, and two contradictory trends operate within it concurrently: On the one hand, the decentralised trend of *halachic* diversity and autonomy depending on the place of residence and the approach of the serving local rabbi. This approach is enshrined, in certain respects, in the law itself. Thus, Section 2 of the Act grants *parallel* authority to issue a *kashrut* certificate to both the Chief Rabbinate, and to the rabbis it certified for that purpose, as well as to the rabbis serving the various local authorities.[[28]](#footnote-28) On the other hand, a centralist approach of *halachic* unification, which was also recognized in case law as the central role of the Rabbinate, the entity intended to create uniform nationwide norms in matters of *kashrut*.[[29]](#footnote-29)

Often, the source of a controversy before the Court is the interpretation of Section 11 of the Act, which stipulates: “In issuing a *kashrut* certificate, the rabbi will consider **only the laws of *kashrut***.” Whether be it the *kashrut* laws employed by a local rabbi that contradict the approach of another local rabbi, or the nationwide position of the Chief Rabbinate – rabbinical entities tend to view the expression ‘only the laws of *kashrut*’ in Section 11 a whole world of *halachic* laws, only upon the satisfaction of all will the status ‘Kosher’ be granted to a product or business activity.[[30]](#footnote-30) In contrast to this approach, the Court tended to interpret the expression as limiting the considerations of the entity granting the *kashrut* certificate solely to the *halachic* rules pertaining to the *kashrut* of the food – which has been referred to as the ‘hard core’ of prohibited victuals laws.[[31]](#footnote-31)

The *Kashrut* of a Belly Dancer

The issue of the ‘hard core’ arose in full force in the judgement known as the *Raskin* case. In that case, the Rabbinate refused to grant *kashrut* certificates to places where ‘immodest’ performances (belly dancing in wedding halls) took place, claiming that such a show violates the *kashrut* of the place.[[32]](#footnote-32) A belly dancer named Ilana Raskin filed a petition to the High Court, claiming that following the Rabbinate’s approach, her freedom of occupation had been violated. In its judgement, the Court adopted her position, and rejected the expansive interpretation proffered by the Rabbinate of the expression “the laws of *kashrut* only” appearing in the Act. Thus it was held, that the Rabbinate acted *ultra vires* when reviewing the *kashrut* of conditions that did not relate to the *kashrut* of the food itself (the ‘hard core’), but to secondary aspects that are not at the heart of the authority granted to it by law. The Court therefore rejected the Rabbinate’s position on the basis of an argument from the field of public administrative law – a fundamental principle of administrative law is that a public body is only entrusted with the authorities granted to it expressly by enactment. The flipside of the principle is that anything that is not permitted, is forbidden. Therefore, when the Court held that the Rabbinate acted *ultra vires* in the *Raskin* affair, it in practice determined illegality in accordance with modern administrative law. The Court’s determination was grounded on the definition of the purpose of the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act, as a non-religious law – it was branded (at that stage) as a ‘secular-consumer’ law, designed to protect the consumer (any consumer) from being deceived with respect to the laws of food *kashrut*.[[33]](#footnote-33)

Although many saw the *Raskin* affair as a clash between the values of the religious world of rabbis and the secular-modern values ​​of the judiciary,[[34]](#footnote-34) the argument of this paper is that it should also be seen as a *halachic* ruling in and of itself. After all, at the end of the day, the *halachic* experience of the rabbis who sought to link the existence of belly dancing to the *kashrut* of food was rejected, and the Court’s position is the ‘*Halachic* *Ruling*’ that is currently binding in Israel. Justice Eliezer Rivlin aptly described this conclusion in his remarks in another case:[[35]](#footnote-35)

“*Were it not for the law of the land, every rabbi could, in accordance with his best understanding and conscience, give or refuse to grant kashrut to a food product. [...] Once the separation between religion and law has been broken –* ***the law of the state answers the questions of what a kashrut certificate is****, when it is to be granted, and when refused*.”

In addition to Rivlin’s right and proper remarks, additional evidence can be provided: *First*, on a practical level, there is now a directive from the Chief Rabbinical Council stating that *kashrut* departments at the various local religious councils are not allowed to consider the ‘atmosphere’ of the business, only the *kashrut* of the food itself.[[36]](#footnote-36) *Second*, the existence of a later petition on the same subject that was also filed by Ilana *Raskin,* and that granted her positive remedies, highlighted the prohibition on linking conduct at the business to the *kashrut* of the food.[[37]](#footnote-37) *Third*, and perhaps most importantly, the court in the *Raskin* case also employed *halachic* rhetoric. Thus, Justice Gabriel Bach, on his own initiative, quoted rabbis Moshe Feinstein and Ovadia Yosef in support of the approach that the *kashrut* of the food and the *kashrut* of conduct are not to be linked.[[38]](#footnote-38) Additionally, the *halachic* arguments presented by the Rabbinate were examined in depth, and dismissed. Thus, the *halachic* argument raised by the Rabbinate regarding ‘appearances’ [*Mar’it Ayin*], which is a *halachic* extension intended to prohibit actions which, in themselves, are not prohibited, but could be perceived as prohibited, or create the impression that other actions that are clearly prohibited, are not so, and thus to mislead.[[39]](#footnote-39) According to the Rabbinate (Rabbis Yitzhak Kolitz and Shalom Mashash) in the eyes of the diner “who is served a *glat kosher* meal against the background of a grossly indecent performance... two thoughts may come to his mind ... the first, that there are no prohibitions, and it is permissible to view such a show, as otherwise the rabbis would not grant *kashrut*. The other thought ... it is impossible to trust these rabbis, and their stamp of *kashrut* is meaningless.” According to them, this issue is similar to common examples of ‘appearances’, such as the ban on serving fish blood in a vessel, or almond milk in meat, and can also be evidenced from the general duty ‘and be guiltless before the Lord, and before Israel’.[[40]](#footnote-40) The Court rejected this reasoning on the grounds that it is an argument that “clearly has nothing to do with the *kashrut* of food” since it is based on a *halachic* line of reasoning according to which the *kashrut* certificate is granted for the nature of the business, and according to “acts done at the business over and above the *kashrut* of the food.”[[41]](#footnote-41) The Court presented an alternative *halachic* construction, ruling that the claim of ‘appearances’ of the type submitted by the Rabbinate may be relevant to a business interested in a general *hechsher* for all its activities, but not to the *kashrut* certificate, which only relates to the food served at the business. With respect to another claim submitted by the Rabbinate according to which the owner of such a business cannot be considered a ‘credible witness’ since “... he consents to the display of gross indecency in public in front of a large audience, and is not afraid to cause many people to stumble ... thus surely he acts in the same manner with respect to non kosher meat, and will deceive the supervisor”[[42]](#footnote-42) – the Court ruled that non-observance of other *halachic* laws could not constitute a legitimate *halachic* reason for revoking a *kashrut* certificate, since it was in fact an “indirect way of enforcing the obligation to observe all *halachic* laws.”[[43]](#footnote-43)

But even without the additional language and terminology familiar to us from the field *of halacha*, it seems that the ruling in the *Raskin* case can be classified as one that shaped and changed the religious sphere in Israel in terms of *kashrut*, also (and perhaps mainly), due to the crucial distinction it created between the ‘hard core’ of the heart of *kashrut* laws, versus seemingly ‘peripheral’ *halachic* law. This distinction, on the face of it, is not organic to Jewish law, whose provisions are densely interwoven, and whose rigid taxonomy, although it exists, is not one of its distinct characteristics.[[44]](#footnote-44) Thus, it can be argued, that in the *Raskin* case the Court also created a meaningful determination on the question of ‘how the *halacha* works’ or ‘what is Jewish *halacha*’ when it outlined core and periphery. This distinction has continued to accompany *kashrut* law in Israel.[[45]](#footnote-45)

The *Asif* Affair – A National ‘Sales Permit’ (*Heter Mechira*)

Let us review another example of a ruling on *kashrut* matters. The year 2007-2008 (5768) was a *shemita* (fallow year) year. Over the course of the year, petitions on behalf of farmers and merchants against the Chief Rabbinate came before the Supreme Court. They claimed that the demand set by local rabbis (including the rabbis of Herzliya and Jerusalem) of making the grant of *kashrut* certification to the farmers conditional upon refraining from ‘*Heter Mechira*’, should be abolished,[[46]](#footnote-46) and that the Chief Rabbinate should be instructed to require the local rabbinates to rely on a ‘Sale Permit’. The Chief Rabbinate, for its part, argued that the decision should be left to each and every local rabbi according to his location and ideology. This case was came to be known as the ***Asif*** affair. HH Justice Eliakim Rubinstein wrote the leading opinion of the judgement, and his use of Jewish sources is evident over many pages in which he extensively expanded on the *halachic* issue known as the “*Shemita* Controversy.”[[47]](#footnote-47) This extensive review of sources was preceded, as in other instances, by Rubinstein’s affirmation that the Court was not in any way a *halachic* authority.[[48]](#footnote-48) For our purposes, I would refer to such statements as ‘lip service’ – not because the declarant secretly sought to issue a *halachic* ruling, but because in practice, that is exactly what he was doing.[[49]](#footnote-49) It should be noted, that the very issue of the statement itself raises the suspicion that the actions here are not purely judicial, and that the rules of *halacha* are intertwined in it without any possibility of separating the two, even in the mind of the judge / arbitrator himself.

After fully presenting the *halachic* debate regarding *shemita*, Judge Rubinstein rejected the Chief Rabbinate’s position, and ruled that the issue must be resolved at the national level. In contrast to the pluralistic model of ‘each and every one has his own doctrine’, which Rubinstein saw as a “local diminishment of the institution of the national ‘sales permit’”,[[50]](#footnote-50) he preferred a centralist model, and held that the Rabbinate should not shy away from a *halachic* decision on a “very serious issue… a matter that the greatest rabbis throughout the generations dealt with from Rabbi Yitzchak Elchanan Spector of Kaunas in the nineteenth century, to Rabbi Kook and all his successors in the Chief Rabbinate in the twentieth century, and on the other hand, Rabbi Yaakov Dovid Wilovsky and Avrohom Yeshaya Karelitz (a.k.a. *Chazon Ish*) – could such a grave matter be handed over to the determination of every individual local rabbi, respected as he may be?”[[51]](#footnote-51) The solution to the *halachic* difficulty presented by rabbis who did not allow the use of a ‘sales permit’ was found, quite simply, in the appointment of a replacement of the local rabbi who ‘refused’, for that year; Rubinstein rejected the claim that this would be a serious violation of the city rabbi’s *halachic* standing, because “in the circumstances [such an infringement] is a necessity.”[[52]](#footnote-52) His ruling reveals, quite openly, also his personal *halachic* ideology, rooted in the duty to assist Israeli agriculture in the State of Israel, and therefore has a clear dimension of ‘*Erez Yisraeli*’ *halacha*. For Rubinstein’s part, the *halachic* need for a ‘sales permit’ was necessary and mandated, since “the controversy falls on the back of agriculture. Agriculture is the very issue of *shemita*; to it, to working the land, the *shemita* is directed. … the inspiration in fulfilling the *mitzvah* of *shemita* cannot ignore agriculture’s interests.”[[53]](#footnote-53) See also his remarks in which he mobilizes the “*halachic* knowledge” of the farmers alongside the “sale permit”:[[54]](#footnote-54)

“*Jewish farmers, who cultivate their fields, are called in halachic literature” “His angels, those mighty in strength, who perform His word, to hearken to the voice of His word” (Psalms: 103:20); This is explained by Midrash Tanchuma (from Buber and Leviticus 1) in the name of R. Yitzchak Nafha, “And why were they termed his angels, since he sees his field abandoned, and his trees abandoned, and the fences broken, and his fruit eten, yet he masters his passions and says nothing.” And also Midrash Tehilim (Buber) 103, according to R. Yitzchak: “It is the custom of the world that a person does a mitzvah for an hour or a day, but for a year? And Israel shall do for a year, and this is the matter of shemita” (Deuteronomy 15: 2), this in Gimatria is twelve, like the months of the year”. The heroism is thus in the face of the state of the field for a whole year. These farmers, these heroic angels, are entitled to follow the path of their own conscience, and their own halachic understanding...*”

Under the prism of the article, it seems to me that it is not difficult to read this ruling as a real *halachic* ruling, preferring one tradition over another. And all in an issue that is at the core of the laws of *shemita,* and at the core of a *halachic* controversy that is both weighty and has significant implications. From entering into the thick of the *halacha*, through focusing on the main issue according to Rubinstein – agricultural farming, and finally to the coercive power of a legal injunction that obliged the rabbis to use their authority and grant *kashrut* certificates based on “sales permits” – we have before us a *halachic* decision that is binding in the entire sphere of the Israeli public.

However, the judgement in the *Asif* case is interesting not only due to the *halachic* position of Justice Rubinstein, but also due to the *halachic* position expressed by Chief Justice Beinisch, who joined in his opinion. Beinisch also believed that the Rabbinate’s view of the laws of *shemita* was lacking, and chose to express an alternative religious position: “… the Rabbinate missed one of the most lofty purposes underlying the idea of *shemita*, which was to give the poor and needy, as they were described in the Torah, all the fruit growing in the field – which is the social design which originates in the commandments of the Torah: “And [the produce of] the Sabbath of the land shall be yours to eat for you, for your male and female slaves, and for your hired worker and resident who live with you, And all of its produce may be eaten [also] by your domestic animals and by the beasts that are in your land.” (Leviticus: 25, 6-7).[[55]](#footnote-55) Whether unintentionally or intentionally, Beinisch used here a *halachic* technique of employing the Biblical supralinear punctuation (‘*Ta’ama De’kara*’), and used it to draw a conclusion with religious-practical implications.[[56]](#footnote-56)

Moreover, in clear language, Beinisch presents the position, which had already been expressed in several previous judgements,[[57]](#footnote-57) that when the Rabbinate is faced with a *halachic* dilemma, it must choose the *halachic* solution that will minimally violate the fundamental rights recognised by the Israeli constitutional legal system:

“*When there is a halachic solution to the fundamental issue of maintaining kashrut laws, the Rabbinical Council is not authorised to expand its halachic policy and alter it to a stricter position, thus intensifying the violation of human rights, when doing so is not for the clear purpose for which it was granted the legal authority*.”[[58]](#footnote-58)

Indeed, this is the position of Israeli constitutional law regarding the effect of constitutional principles on religious law. **But this is also an explicit directive in religious law rulings for the Israeli public**. A serious study of its meaning, demonstrates that it obliges the religious arbiter to include in his basket of considerations human rights doctrine as a binding, even decisive, factor. This approach is fundamentally dramatic, since, ostensibly, by virtue of it, institutionalised Jewish law is subjected to modern-liberal constitutional jurisprudence.[[59]](#footnote-59) By virtue of them, the new ‘*Erez Yisraeli*’ *halacha*, as long as it is proclaimed by a competent institution, is committed to extra-*halachic,* or ‘secular’, values. Even if it transpires that such values can be deduced from Jewish law itself in any event (such as equality, dignity, individual liberty, distributive justice), in any event, the competent *halachic* arbiter may not ignore them in his ruling.[[60]](#footnote-60)

Even though this may be construed as creating a legal hierarchy, in which ancient religious law is subordinated to modern secular law, thereby losing its vitality, even becoming ‘secularised’, my suggestion is that it is actually an open statement about the symbiotic system underlying the state, of which the ‘sales permit’ affair is just one example of many. It seems that where national *halachic* ruling is forced, methodically, to “converse” with modern constitutional values, both metamorphosise. They merge into a unified Jewish-Israeli law.

The Marbak Affair – Marketing Unkosher Meat to Jews

A third case that establishes the background to the phenomenon of changing *kashrut* law under the auspices of the state, is the Supreme Court’s decision regarding the treatment of unkosher meat and the marketing of kosher meat only to *kashrut* observers, which found its embodiment in the **Marbak** case.[[61]](#footnote-61) Even prior to the enactment of the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act of 1983, in the 1960s, a dispute arose between two slaughterhouses and the Chief Rabbinate, regarding the *kashrut* certificates they applied for. The Rabbinate, which at that time acted mainly by virtue of British Mandatory arrangements that remained in force,[[62]](#footnote-62) refused to grant the certificates until two conditions were satisfied, that were at the centre of the dispute: (1) That the slaughtered meat would only be marketed to butchers holding *kashrut* certificates on behalf of the Rabbinate (*viz*., that it could not be marketed to a butcher who did not hold a Rabbinate issued *kashrut* certificate); (2) That the parts of the meat that remain after the slaughter, and are presumed unkosher, would not be marketed to Jewish merchants or butchers, but only to non-Jews, even to the extent of obtaining guarantees from the latter that they would not resell the produce to Jews. The matter was brought before the High Court. The Rabbinate’s position was that these conditions are integral parts of *halachic* requirements, and that “according to *halachic* considerations, the Chief Rabbinical Council decides when and how a *kashrut* certificate will be issued, according to its instruction, and it cannot depart from these considerations.”[[63]](#footnote-63)

The High Court’s decision does not specify the *halachic* considerations on which the Rabbinate relied, but at least with regard to the second condition (of marketing the unkosher meat only to non-Jews), it is likely that these are the rules relating to “selling forbidden things” (*HaMocher D’varim HaAsurim*), mainly a *halachic* ban on trading in forbidden foods.[[64]](#footnote-64) The five judges in the panel ruled, in a reasoned opinion, that the conditions set by the Rabbinate, in simple terms, are not rules of *halacha* regarding the grant of *kashrut* to meat slaughtered in slaughterhouses.[[65]](#footnote-65) The justices viewed these conditions as an attempt to “impose a regime of *kashrut* on Jews, who have no interest it such”, and a deviation from the authority granted to the Rabbinate to “Supervise *kashrut* for Jews interested in *kashrut.*”[[66]](#footnote-66) The Marbak case later served as an anchor for the extensive case law that followed the enactment of the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act, in which the Court clarified more than once that the Rabbinate has limited authority in complying with *kashrut* law, and cannot include extra-*halachic* considerations under the guise of *halacha*. In the critical words expressed by Chief Justice Olshen: “In its opinion it is enough that it [the Rabbinate] ... says loud and clear, that it does not always calculate its actions according to the rules of the *halacha,* and that is enough.”[[67]](#footnote-67)

Here, too, my contention would be that when the Court ruled on the issue of marketing unkosher meat, it produced its own *halachic* rule in state *kashrut* law. It prevented the Rabbinate, ostensibly the supreme religious institution,[[68]](#footnote-68) from employing the additional conditions it sought to impose, thus redrawing the boundaries of *halacha* within the borders of the State of Israel.[[69]](#footnote-69) The outcome, some believe, has led to a duplicitous *halachic*-religious price: Both a compulsion to sell unkosher meat to Jews, and an increasing infiltration of unkosher meat into the kosher meat market. For this reason, Tnuva’s rabbi, Rabbi Zeev Whitman, for instance, suggested marketing the unkosher meat in stores with a caption that clarifies to the buyer that it is an ‘unkosher’ product, but he encountered opposition, surprisingly, from ultra-Orthodox circles who believed that labelling the products highlighted the transgression of trading in forbidden foods, and that it would be better to leave the situation *halachically* ambiguous.[[70]](#footnote-70) His remarks testify to his feeling that the *halachic* outcome whereby unkosher meat is marketed and sold alongside kosher food is quite difficult: “*It is better to make sure that in the kosher food market everything is indeed kosher [by marking products with the label ‘unkosher’], rather than embody a general concern that the entire Israeli market be kosher, especially when as a result, the exact opposite happens*.”[[71]](#footnote-71) Rabbi Whitman’s proposal was not accepted. It seems that if it is possible to *halachically* permit the reality, after the fact, or whether it is possible to bring about a change in reality by means of various *halachic* solutions, the Marbak case constitutes another real *halachic* decision on the part of the Court. Reinforcement for this conclusion can be found in two ways:

*First*, today the Rabbinate does not try to impose those conditions in order to issue a *kashrut* certificate to a slaughterhouse.[[72]](#footnote-72) It can be assumed, that the Rabbinate itself sees this as a forceful manoeuvre on the part of the judiciary, and believes that it (the Rabbinate) is the entity that should decide questions of what the *halacha* is, but that it is *forced* to act in accordance with the Court’s instructions ‘retrospectively’ and having no other choice.[[73]](#footnote-73) However, even if it is just a power struggle driving *halachic* change, this does not dispel the binding validity of the *halacha*, even if it was created in retrospect. Throughout the ages many different constraints have forced *halachic* arbiters to shape their laws ‘in retrospect’ [*Bedi’avad*], to take into account the ‘hour of distress’ and the factors of the times, whether we call such factors ‘external’ or ‘internal’. In fact, there is extensive *halachic* ruling, even in the area of ​​prohibitions, which is shaped in retrospect.[[74]](#footnote-74) As the researcher of Jewish law, Wesner, points out: “Sometimes it seems that the law in retrospect does not only refer to the consequences of violating the prohibition, but “reopens” the question of the relation to the forbidden act itself, and ostensibly reflects a **change** in the *halacha’s* attitude tothe act which was forbidden in the first place.”[[75]](#footnote-75) The line between subordination to the norm adjudged by the legal system, and assimilation of the norm so that it becomes a ‘real’ binding *halachic* rule is, as stated, largely vague and diffuse.

*Second*, further reinforcement of my explanation in relation to the Marbak issue as a ‘*halachic* ruling’ can be found in the criticism voiced about the decision in that case, which says exactly that, albeit employing the language of grievance. Prior to his appointment as a judge, Yitzhak Engelrad devoted an article to the Marbak affair, that discussed the status of the Chief Rabbinate at the time. His main criticism revolves around the Court’s encroachment upon a subject it should not, because, in accordance with the “religious approach”, as Engelrad called it, the Chief Rabbinate is “the supreme *halachic* institution for all Jews in Israel. The *halachic* powers are not granted to the Chief Rabbinical Council from the secular regime, but from the *halacha* itself.”[[76]](#footnote-76) Following this line of thinking, Engelrad writes:[[77]](#footnote-77)

“*The secular government can recognise or not recognise the supreme halachic authority of the rabbinical institution, but it cannot become a halachic authority itself... The considerations employed by the Chief Rabbinate, acting as the supreme halachic institution, are by their very nature always halachic considerations… As a matter of principle, there is no halacha contrary to the halacha declared by this institution, just as there is no law contrary to Knesset law*.”

Engelrad relates here to the concept which he presents at length in his writings, of separation of church and state.[[78]](#footnote-78) In his view, religious law rules its own realm, just as secular law rules its own realm, and it is wrong for the two to meet, except for the point where secular law granted autonomy of action to religious law. From a religious point of view, Engelrad himself acknowledges the fact that from an internal *halachic* point of view, the status of the Rabbinate is not self-evident:

*“From the internal point of view of the halacha, the status of the Chief Rabbinate’s is quite problematic. Judaism has not recognised, since the abolition of the Great Sanhedrin, a supreme halachic institution. There are strong de-centralist currents in it. And indeed, as aforementioned, various religious circles do not recognise the Israeli Chief Rabbinate.”*

However, this does not dispel his critique: “But the argument is that if the state has already recognised a supreme *halachic* institution, it cannot be its business to examine whether that institution deviated from the powers conferred on it by a normative system **outside the state** [*i.e.,* the *halacha*].[[79]](#footnote-79)

The difficulty in applying Engelrad’s approach to modern reality, lies in the fact that in establishing an institution such as the Chief Rabbinate, that normative system was introduced *into* the state, and did not remain outside it.[[80]](#footnote-80) Thus, it seems that in the evolving Israeli reality of the intermingling of realms, Engelrad’s view reflects the matter as a negative: When the secular system is required to address religious law, which it enacted as one of its own, and when it has decisive authority to determine its character, content, and scope, it shapes it in a manner that necessarily (also) echoes in the realm of religion. For this reason, Engelrad’s critique demonstrates in our case to what extent the Court’s ruling in a matter such as Marbak, penetrates the world of *halacha* to the point that a scholar such as he is, rushes to ‘defend it’.

We will consider another critique of the Marbak affair and similar cases. Aviad Hacohen reviews in one of his articles various *halachic* arguments for and against judicial intervention in *halachic* questions. First amongst the ‘counter’ arguments, he claims that “a court is not a *Beit Midrash*, and a judge is not a *halachic* arbiter.”[[81]](#footnote-81) And thus he writes:[[82]](#footnote-82)

“*... From a halachic point of view, a “halacha” that emanates from the court has no meaning. Even if an unquestionable halachic sage sat in judgement, whatever he writes in judgment sitting on the bench, will not have the “halachic validity” it would have, had he written an “Answer”, and published in a ‘halachic treatise’*.”

We must ask, if the Court’s ruling is indeed not a ‘ruling’ in the *halachic* sense, why is this an argument against its intervention? After all, the adoption of the argument will indicate that, at most, when the Court intervenes in the *halacha*, it does not increase or decrease its validity and purity, and it is a religiously ‘neutral’ argument (although perhaps an argument that is valid on the political-social level). But it is not for no reason that Hacohen counts this as a *counter*-religious argument, and this becomes clear with the reading of the second *halachic* counter-argument he makes: The fear of a ‘secularisation’ of the *halacha*. The concern here is that a ‘secular’ preoccupation with *halachic* questions leads to a diminishment of the value of *halachic* law, and ultimately to the loss of its religious affiliation.[[83]](#footnote-83) The combination of both arguments demonstrates their shared concern about the intermingling of realms. This secular-religious hybrid creature is, at worst, a ‘secularised *halacha*’, and in the moderate case a valid *halacha* in which alien hands have meddled. This is enough to understand that the Court’s actions resonate in the religious world, and affect it. And on closer examination of the issue: They have an affect not only at the ‘technical’ level of obedience to state courts, even if it means acting contrary to a *halachic* position, but also on the substantive level of the ways in which *halachic* decisions are made, and the way the religious process itself operates in the Israeli sphere. When the Rabbinate was *de facto* forced to change the laws of *kashrut* following the Court’s ruling, the national public of kosher food consumers changed its conduct following it. But how do we know if the ‘tainted’ laws of *kashrut* are still *halacha* at all? Ostensibly, Hacohen’s critique that the ‘true’ *halacha* does not change at all, refutes my claim, at least from the introspective point of view of the *halachic* sages. But even Hacohen admits in this context that the question of what is a ‘true’ *halachic* ruling, is not simple at all:[[84]](#footnote-84)

“*This issue involves the complicated and complex issue of what a “halachic ruling” is, and how – in the absence of a single authoritative body accepted by all (such as the “Sanhedrin”) – can it be distinguished from just an academic paper. As opposed to the complex theoretical level,* ***on the practical level*** *its acceptance as a “halachic ruling” is to a large extent determined voluntarily by the public who consider itself subjugated to it*.”

His conclusion is that the answer can be found on the level of the public’s *practical* conduct. Remember, this was also our analytical conclusion. Examining the level of practice in the context of *kashrut,* reveals that not only do publics apply to the Court *on behalf of* Jewish law and religion in order to obtain a ‘*ruling*’ on *kashrut* matters,[[85]](#footnote-85) but other entire communities, consciously or not, act in accordance with the Court’s *halachic* rulings, thus reinforcing its authority to produce binding religious law for them.[[86]](#footnote-86) In our case, the fact that the Chief Rabbinate acts in accordance with the judgements in the *Raskin*, *Asif* and *Marbak* cases as stated above, even if simply absent any other choice, has the effect that the test of outcomes in this context has proven itself. The Israeli and non-Israeli public that rely on the *kashrut* certificates issued by the Rabbinate rely, knowingly or unknowingly, in fact (also) on *kashrut* law outlined by the state courts.

Intermezzo: The Target Audience of the Supreme Court’s *Halachic* Ruling

Before we examine the fourth case (the *Gini* affair), a significant point must be raised, which will come up again in the *Gini* case, and that is the question of the target audience of Israeli case law. In the rulings in the cases of *Raskin, Asif* and *Marbak*, the question arises whether the *halachic* point of view of the Rabbinate is intended to serve a limited audience, who can be defined as religious or ‘very religious’, or whether the Rabbinate is intended to serve the general Jewish-Israeli public (and perhaps even non-Jews)? And should the Rabbinate’s point of view, as an arm of the executive branch, concerning the target audience it is meant to serve, be adopted by the judiciary? In all three judgments, it seems that the Court does not address the same focused sector of the public that follows the Rabbinate, but employs an ideological expansion of the target audience: in the *Raskin* case it does so by legitimising a certain form of entertainment (belly dancing) as not contradictory to religious practice, and in the *Asif* affair by applying the ‘sales permit’ as a solution for the entire public, even if that means a frontal contradiction to the city rabbi’s personal *halachic* approach. Strong evidence of this is found in Justice Rubinstein’s rejection of the position expressed by Rabbi Yaakovovich, the rabbi of Herzliya, in that case, who argued that farmers are in any case able to sell their produce to those who do not adhere to *kashrut* law at all, and therefore should not be required to adopt a *‘*sales permit*’* solution.[[87]](#footnote-87) Rubinstein, who did not even dignify the claim with a reasoned rejection, believed that it was not appropriate to address it at all.[[88]](#footnote-88) In other words, in the eyes of a Court that considers itself as a judicial *halachic* arbiter for the *entire* public, the broad point of view cannot afford to assume that Israeli agricultural produce will find its “*halachic*” solution with an audience that does not consume kosher food. In other words, notwithstanding the *minimisation* of the religious target audience, and with it the limits of the concept of *kashrut*, the Court chose to *expand* them to include as many communities as possible, even if these are not necessarily interested in one or other *halachic* solution for the issue of the *shemita* year.

The *Marbak* affair also illustrates a redrawing of the target audience of the ‘consumer of religion’. The decision that it is not permissible for unkosher meat to be marketed exclusively to ‘non-Jews’, and that unkosher meat must be marketed alongside kosher meat, takes an active part in dismantling socio-*halachic* partitions that have been practiced in Jewish law from ancient times, between Jews and Gentiles. The ban on the sale of unkosher meat is, ostensibly, a fundamental and clear *halachic* prohibition. The *halacha* forbids Jews from selling unkosher meat to Gentiles as well, but has created a series of reliefs in the matter.[[89]](#footnote-89) The sale of unkosher meat to Jews is all the more so prohibited, either because “You shall not place a stumbling block before a blind person” [*Lifnei iver lo ti'ten michshol*] or because of “aiding a transgression.” [*Si’yu’a ledvar ave’ra*].[[90]](#footnote-90) The historical logic in the creation of such *halachic* rules stems simply from a society in which the distinction between a Jew and a Gentile is the crucial social distinction. However, in the context of Israel in the 1960s, when the *Marbak* judgement was rendered, the Jewish-secular status was the prototype for the average Israeli. The decision rendered by the Court, which *de facto* also granted a *kashrut* certificate to places where unkosher meat was sold to secular Jews and to Gentiles, drew the social divisions in Israel elsewhere: In stead of between Jews and non-Jews, the divide transferred to separate the secular from the religious. Thus, the definition of the religious identity gained centrality.

The *Marbak, Raskin,* and *Asif* cases seem to provide a relatively long-term perspective of about 40 years, during which issues that were at the core of *kashrut* law (according to the Rabbinate) were discussed and reshaped with modern Jewish-democratic law tools, giving rise to various *halachic*-religious conclusions that are prevalent today. Similar cases have raised similar questions in the past.[[91]](#footnote-91) In relation to each one of them, it can be argued, that the Court ruled on the question of what the religious *halacha* is, when formulating, by means of its legal authority and tools, the definition of the religiously-loaded term ‘kosher’.[[92]](#footnote-92)

What is the significance of the fact that the Court justifies its ruling with *halachic* rhetoric, and not just with analytical legal rhetoric drawing from administrative law? Why was it not satisfied with reasons of acting *ultra vires,* or legal stopcock concepts such as reasonableness or administrative discretion? In the eyes of many, this implies a significant deviation from its role as a neutral judicial authority trusted with the application of legal principles in an egalitarian manner. But this is of course a non-binding assumption. Under the idea that judges are authentic actors within an institution that is (also) religious, religious rhetoric is not disingenuous, it stems from being an integral part of the Jewish-legal narrative that established the Supreme Court in Israel. In Robert Kaver’s terms, the Court does not function as an ‘imperial’ entity – applying abstract norms to the neutral masses in equality, but as a ‘paideic’ entity – operating from within the community, for its future education with respect to a set of common values.[[93]](#footnote-93) Due to the proximity of religion and law in Israel, there is a real difficulty in separating the elements which maintain a symbiotic relationship.

To sum up thus far, we have seen how the Court’s ruling on a focused issue, *kashrut* law in Israel under the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act, has led to a renewed *halachic*-religious processing of key basic concepts in Jewish law. Whether by creating the distinction in the *Raskin* case between a ‘hard core’ of *kashrut* laws and other laws that are, ostensibly, on the periphery of the *halacha* – a distinction that is not organic to the *halacha,* and may be producing a new legal division; or in the merger between traditional *halacha* and the values ​​of Israeli constitutional law, to which *kashrut* laws are subjected, a merger that found expression in the *Asif* affair which dealt with the ‘sales permit’; or whether in the rejection of *halachic* rule demands for a prohibition on the sale of unkosher meat to Jews, demands that directly affect the religious sphere in Israel, and the *halachic* conduct of the Rabbinate (and the public who listens to it), which were set forth in the *Marbak* case. In all of these, the Court played a key role in shaping and formulating the face of Jewish law in the Israeli sphere, and to a large extent served as the ‘decisive *halachic* arbiter’. After establishing the historical and case law background on the subject of *kashrut* under the prism of the theory of designing the *halacha* by the state, I will now turn to review the recent *Gini* affair, which is something of a ‘peak’ of the phenomenon.

The *Gini* Affair

“It is true that you are kosher people, but that was not my intention” (the words of Rabbi Nachman of Breslov, as quoted by Justice Solberg in his judgement in the *Gini* *I* case).

The *Gini* affair dealt with the question of the interpretation of Section 3(a) of the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act, which stipulates: “A restaurant owner shall not present the restaurant in writing as being kosher, unless he has been issued with a *kashrut* certificate.” My interest in it stems from the fact that the controversies in this affair go to the root of a question with meta-*halachic* religious implications: ‘Who determines what is kosher?’ That is, who is the religious authority in whose hands the *halacha* entrusts the power to determine what is kosher. As we will see, the controversies that arose in the *Gini* case touched on fundamental questions such as how ‘*kashrut*’ status is granted. What is required to grant this status? And what are the *halachic* consequences of the status? The affair is therefore an infrastructural test case for one of the most critical aspects in the world of religious Judaism – the laws of forbidden foods and *kashrut* laws in their encounter with the Jewish-democratic state. The nexus is the state institution of the Rabbinate, that draws its power from two wells: The well of *halacha,* and the well of state law.[[94]](#footnote-94)

The disagreement in *Gini* arose when two restaurant owners in Jerusalem who held “alternative” *kashrut* certificates from an organisation called “*Private Supervision: Community Trust According to Halacha*”[[95]](#footnote-95) received a fine from the Rabbinate for hanging a *kashrut* certificate in violation of Section 3(a) of the Act. This was preceded by the fact that the same restaurants had previously operated under Rabbinical *kashrut*, but abandoned its certificates after, according to the owners’ claims, the Rabbinate were not sufficiently strict about *kashrut* law, and they lost faith in it.[[96]](#footnote-96) It is easy to analyse the affair also as a reflection of a controversy not only in matters of church and state, but also as a critical manifesto against the Rabbinical *kashrut* supervision system, that suffers from many dysfunctions.[[97]](#footnote-97) Despite the disagreements amongst the panel judges, which we will discuss below, it appears that this was a key point on which all the judges agreed.[[98]](#footnote-98) In the background of the case, therefore, was a deeper conflict over the question of the privatisation of religious services in the country, and the separation, at least in matters of *kashrut*, of religion from the realm.[[99]](#footnote-99) The petitioners not only sought the fine be quashed, but sought to challenge the very constitutionality of the provisions of the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act, and in particular the provision stipulating that only the Rabbinate may issue *kashrut* certificates. They argued, that if the law cannot be interpreted in a way that recognizes a ‘free market’ in *kashrut* certification, then the provisions contradict Basic Law, and in particular: Basic Law: Freedom of Occupation, and therefore must be declared unconstitutional. The first judgment (*Gini* *I* case) was rendered in 2016, and rejected the petition by a majority opinion. The minority opinion, from the single Justice Uri Shoham, was that a business may present an alternative *kashrut* certificate as long as the term ‘kosher’ is not used.[[100]](#footnote-100) Following the publication of the judgement, the petitioners submitted a request for a re-hearing at the High Court. Exceptionally, the application was granted, and in 2017 the second judgement (*Gini* *II*) was rendered, reversing its predecessor.[[101]](#footnote-101) I will attempt to briefly outline the power play behind this interesting affair, and afterwards attempt to elucidate what this has to do with the question of shaping Jewish law in Israel.

*Gini* – The First Incarnation

The legal battlefield in the *Gini* case looks something like this: On one side of the barricade stood private entities, in this case the organisation ‘Private Supervisors’ as well as the restaurant owners, who believed that a business owner had a right to present his goods as being ‘kosher’, even if he did not hold a *kashrut* certificate issued by the Rabbinate of Israel. It is interesting to note, that ideologically, these parties were supported by many other groups, including the ultra-Orthodox community, who also do not recognize state *kashrut* certificates, and rely only on the *kashrut* certificates issued by their own communities. Although they were not directly involved in the *Gini* case (they were not parties to the dispute),[[102]](#footnote-102) their voices were heard over the pages of the judgement,[[103]](#footnote-103) as well as at *Knesset* debates concerning the enactment of the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act in 1983.[[104]](#footnote-104) On the other side of the barricade, stood the state Rabbinate. As far as they were concerned, the legislative conception in the State of Israel grants them complete exclusivity in the question of classifying food as being ‘kosher’, in accordance with Jewish law, and in issuing *kashrut* certificates attesting to this fact. These placed their faith mainly in the language of the Act, which states that only the Chief Rabbinate is allowed to issue *kashrut* certificates.[[105]](#footnote-105) In the midst stood the Attorney General and the Ministry of Justice. They sought to find a compromising interpretation, that would allow a business to present a ‘*kashrut* presentation’ without literally using the term ‘kosher’ and its various grammatical inflections, and as long as it is stated that the certificate was not issued by the Rabbinate.[[106]](#footnote-106)

The controversy was reflected in the composition of the judges sitting in judgement. Justice Solberg, who wrote the majority opinion, sided with the Rabbinate. His view, which deviated from the previous case law traditions regarding the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act, found in the Act a purpose *additional* to the consumer-secular purpose that had been the customary interpretation in case law until then.[[107]](#footnote-107) Solberg believed, that the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act was also simply intended to “ensure that a product presented as kosher, is in fact kosher.”[[108]](#footnote-108) This purpose, later referred to as the ‘*halachic*-religious purpose’,[[109]](#footnote-109) focused on the fear of misleading the consumer in relation to the product *itself*, rather than focusing on misleading the consumer in relation to the *identity of the person* certifying the food as kosher. In Solberg’s words:[[110]](#footnote-110)

“*The purpose of the Prohibition of Deceit in Kashrut Act is not only to prevent deceit or misleading in relation to the* ***identity*** *of the person on whose behalf the kashrut certificate was issued. The purpose of the law is broader, and is to prevent deceit or misleading in relation to the* ***very kashrut*** *of the product sold. That is to say, that even if restaurants are forced to make it clear… that their certificate of supervision is not on behalf of the Chief Rabbinate (and I am prepared to assume that the vast majority of consumers will not be mistaken in thinking otherwise), there is still a concern that the food presented as kosher* ***is not in fact kosher****, whether due to lack of the necessary proficiency on behalf of the party supervising the laws of kashrut, or whether because of a deliberate deceit driven by economic interests.*”

For this reason, Solberg opined that the Act could not be interpreted in a manner that does not grant a *kashrut* monopoly to the Rabbinate.[[111]](#footnote-111) On the other hand, was the judge who sought to remain on the tested path of previous case law, according to which, the purpose of the Act is primarily consumer-secular, opining that the *halachic*-religious purpose was irrelevant. Justice Shoham believed that there would be no contradiction of the Act’s language, or its purpose, if a business owner does not wish to receive and present a *kashrut* certificate on behalf of the Rabbinate, and presents a different *halachic* presentation in relation to his wares. He saw this as an interpretation that gives due weight to “different views held by *kashrut* observers in Israel” among which are various *Badatzim* [*Translator’s Note*: Acronym for *Beit Din Tzedek*, which literally means court of justice, but in its most common use refers to organisations in the ultra-Orthodox community that issue their own *kashrut* certificates – g.m.], as well as the ‘Private Supervision’ organisation, saying: “This customer base **puts its trust** in the restauranteur, that he is in fact strict about the *kashrut* laws prescribed by the certificate presented at the restaurant, and **on the basis of this trust**, they consume the food sold there.”[[112]](#footnote-112)

In the middle stood Judge Rubinstein, who joined Judge Solberg’s opinion, but added a reservation that the judgement would only be applicable for two years.[[113]](#footnote-113) Of the panel, Rubinstein was the only one to colour his opinion in shades of “*halacha*” or “Jewish law”, as was usually his custom. He devoted two paragraphs to describing the importance of *kashrut* in the Jewish world, and alongside quoting Maimonides and Rabbi Yechiel Yaakov Weinberg on the importance of *kashrut*, he also quoted Rabbi Chaim David Halevi who stated: “But it is simply clear that one should not rely at all on the ordinary *kashrut* of a butcher with a restaurant, unless one if very familiar with the owner and knows him to be trustworthy, and as I often say by way of jest ‘I don’t eat at places that have a Rabbinate *kashrut* certificate’”.[[114]](#footnote-114) But Rubinstein did not choose, at least not in open rhetoric, a certain *halachic* opinion that aids his legal decision, and as aforementioned, he joined the position of Justice Solberg, on the basis of his understanding of the purpose of the Act, “It literally means what it title says, that the person coming to a restaurant should know whether the restaurant is kosher or not, without needless complexity.”[[115]](#footnote-115)

What Does All This Have To Do With The *Halacha*?

Even before addressing the second and decisive incarnation of the judgment, it seems that the first incarnation of the *Gini* affair did not significantly affect the field of *halacha* or religion. Justice Solberg’s position, which was adopted in the first judgement, dismissed the attempt to ‘circumvent’ the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act, or disqualify it directly, and preferred to fortify the meaning accepted in respect of it by the public – The Chief Rabbinate of Israel has a monopoly over *kashrut* matters in the public sphere, because it was granted, by law, the authority to declare a product or business as “indeed kosher”. But deeper delving into the matter may inspire different insights.

The majority opinion gave the Act another ‘*halachic*-religious’ purpose, thus adding it to laws which are clearly religious. If until that point the legislature and the judiciary saw the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act as an integral part of consumer protection legislation, and therefore as essentially a ‘secular’ or ‘national’ law, the judgement, and in particular Justice Solberg’s opinion, gave the law another, central, different tone – it strengthened the connection between it and the *halacha*.[[116]](#footnote-116) Although the Act was not intended to increase consumption of kosher food in Israel (it does not require or encourage businesses to operate with rabbinical *kashrut*), it was intended to prevent, or at least restrict, consumption of ‘other’ kosher food – food that was not granted rabbinical *kashrut*. For this reason, it is legislation that serves a religious and particular standard.

Contrary to the position that the purpose of the Act was to prevent deception in relation to the identity of the *kashrut* supervisor, Solberg argued that the law’s focus was on preventing deception in relation to the *very* *kashrut* of the product itself, and not in relation to the *identity* of the supervisor.[[117]](#footnote-117) This transfer from ‘*Gavra*’ [The person] to ‘*Heftza*’ [The object], was an innovation in the judgement, and it raises certain *halachic* questions. One can argue that Judge Solberg’s interpretation of the law as intended to achieve the purpose of a ‘true presentation’ in relation to the very *kashrut* of the product *itself* is inconsistent with the essence of the *halachic* idea regarding the relationship of human and subjective trust that generates the concrete *kashrut* status, which we discussed at the beginning of the chapter.[[118]](#footnote-118) Yet interestingly, this purpose has been referred to in the judgment as ‘*halachic*-religious’.[[119]](#footnote-119) It is not disputed that Solberg does not directly argue with the *halacha* over the pages of the judgement (on the contrary, he probably believes he was correct in his understanding of the spirit of the *halacha*), but his interpretation assumes that there is a particular and definitive status of *kashrut* deception, **which** **is precisely** what the Act was intended to prevent.[[120]](#footnote-120) However, *halachically* speaking, the status of *kashrut* is achieved not only by completing a series of actions with respect to the food, but also requires the testimony of the trustworthy witness in respect of the prohibition, which in turn depends on the witness’ credibility in the eyes of the audience to whom he is testifying. In fact, it is the testimony of the credible witness that generates the *kashrut* standard.

It was actually the opinion of Justice Shoham, the most secular of the panel judges, which captured the spirit of *halacha* in this context in a more convincing way. Shoham interpreted the Act as intended to prevent deceit in relation to the *identity* of the supervisor. According to this approach, the deception that the Act sought to prevent, lies in the witness trusted by the audience interested in *kashrut*, and it is not limited to a mechanical order of operations. From Shoham’s approach it becomes clear that as long as the test of the fiduciary relationship between the consumer and the testifying supervisor is satisfied, and as long as the business clarifies that the *kashrut* is not on behalf of the Rabbinate, the result will be adhering to the basic *halachic* principle of ‘one witness is credible in matters of prohibition’, and therefore the business is not committing *kashrut* deceit under the Act.

The judges’ disagreement over the substance of the Prohibition of Deceit in *Kashrut* Act therefore goes to the very root of the religious question ‘How is *kashrut* achieved?’ It also demonstrates how the judgement was based on the fundamental dispute over the question of how the *halacha* should operate in the State of Israel, which returns to the question of the *target audience*: Who does the Rabbinate rule for? Is it for ‘All of *Yisrael*’ – in which case the justification for an exclusive *kashrut* monopoly prevails, or does it serve as a *halachic* arbiter for certain sectors, more or less pious – in which case it is not appropriate for the Rabbinate’s method to be the only method in *kashrut* matters, since it is a field in which, as stated, there have been many disputes and different practices. Said dilemma concerns the sensitive nerve of the social status of the institution of the Rabbinate. If the Rabbinate determines *kashrut* law for all of the People of Israel who are interested in it, is it not required, from a *halachic* point of view, to be ‘trusted’ by them? If different communities do not trust the Rabbinate’s ruling, has it not lost, as far as they are concerned, its *halachic* status as a ‘credible witness’? Ostensibly, the *halachic* sin here is twofold: It is not only a matter of monopolising the term ‘kosher’, in a way that goes against fundamental *halachic* intuition, but also of entrusting the monopoly to those who, in the eyes of many, do not meet the basic ‘credibility’ requirement.

2.C. *Gini* – The Second Incarnation

As aforementioned, the businesses that submitted the petition in the *Gini* *I* case, applied for a re-hearing before a wider panel of judges, and the Court granted their application. In the setting of the re-hearing, there was a shift in the position of the Attorney General, who opined that the majority opinion from the previous hearing (Justices Solberg and Rubinstein) should be adopted, subject to the reservation that the judgment will be effective and binding only for two years.[[121]](#footnote-121) The disagreement therefore remained between the petitioners – the restaurant owners, and the respondents – the Chief Rabbinate of Israel, the Ministry of Religious Affairs, and the Religious Council for Jerusalem. In the second incarnation, the Court created an intermediate-solution, and held, by a majority led by Chief Justice Naor, that a business is entitled to declare the nature of its goods, and provide detail pertaining to the actions it takes in relation to the food, and how they comply with *kashrut* laws, as long as it does not generate any general proposition on the basis of the information – *i.e.* it does not conclude and declare, in writing, that the business is ‘kosher’, and does not present a ‘presentation of *kashrut*’. According to Naor, “Kosher is kosher is kosher – and those not in possession of a *kashrut* certificate, cannot use the title ‘kosher’.”[[122]](#footnote-122) Although this rhetoric approximates Justice Solberg’s view that there is *one* true *kashrut* to which the Act directs, Naor’s later words demonstrate otherwise:[[123]](#footnote-123)

“*At the same time... I cannot accept the respondents’ determination that a restaurant can enter through only one of two gates – the “kosher gate” the keys to which (the kashrut certificate) are held by the Rabbinate, and the “unkosher food gate” in which a restaurant will be considered unkosher regardless of the type and quality of the food it sells. This is a far-reaching determination, and fails to give proper weight to the diner’s autonomy…* ***There is also a “Third Gate”****. A shopkeeper can testify with respect to his wares. There is nothing in the law that shows that a restaurant cannot present a true presentation pertaining to the food it sells.*”

Naor’s approach separates the mechanical actions from the provision of testimony concerning their nature, and in this respect seems to create a new, third, *halachic* approach. Moreover, as long as a credible witness testifies that the business’s actions are indeed kosher, one can argue that the rule of ‘one witness is credible in matters of prohibition’ has been restored. Admittedly, this is a somewhat emasculated testimony, since the witness must refrain from using the term ‘kosher’ or the symbiotic field that surrounds it. He must not impersonate the issuer of a *kashrut* certificate, and must conceal the *halachic* conclusions of his testimony. On the face of it, we have returned to the pluralistic *halachic* model, albeit a reserved pluralism. For this reason, some have described the judgement as “opening the door to breaking up the Chief Rabbinate’s monopoly in the *kashrut* market.”[[124]](#footnote-124) Now a business may plant in the minds of its customers the impression that it adheres to *kashrut* laws ‘to some extent’, and these may choose whether to eat there or not in accordance with that presentation and the credibility of those who attest to it. Justice Solberg’s position was rejected, and a ‘free market’ of *kashrut* continues to exist, albeit under linguistic and formal restrictions that are far from simple: Can the testimony of the credible witness that the food is kosher without using the term kosher, be considered credible testimony? On the other hand, if a business owner is allowed to present a document specifying the manner of preparing the food according to *kashrut* laws, he can also specify in which dishes the food was cooked, and whether this was done by a Jew, as well as whether the Jew is an observant Jew.[[125]](#footnote-125) The test, as recalled, is the test of *credibility* – and as long as there is a Jewish community that puts its faith in the testimony of someone or other (whether an official supervisor, or another credible witness) it may be enough to also bring about a real *halachic* conclusion.

Evidence for the existence of such communities, for which *kashrut* is established *only* upon the realisation of the relationship of trust permitted by the *Gini* affair in its second incarnation, is presented by Justice Shoham:[[126]](#footnote-126)

“*In my opinion in the Gini case, I referred to various groups of food consumers. The first group, includes those who observe kashrut, who only enter restaurants that hold a kashrut certificate issued by the Chief Rabbinate. Alongside this group, there is a second group, which can be divided into two subgroups. One, is a subgroup whose members will only patron eateries that provide food that has received the approval of private oversight bodies (such as Badatzim or certain rabbis), as to the approach of those persons, such oversight bodies set stricter criteria than those set by the Chief Rabbinate. The second subgroup, includes observers of kashrut who want to eat kosher food, “but the question of whether the food received the Chief Rabbinate’s national seal of approval is not a significant consideration for them.” This consumer public trusts the restaurant owner, who presents in writing the manner in which he purchases and prepares the food he serves, and from the point of view of this public – this meets its kashrut demands.*”

**I would therefore argue that the opening of the ‘third gate’ for those businesses that want to pass through it, which the *Gini* case did, constitutes for those communities a religious *halachic* ruling by the Supreme Court, as well as an extension of the *target audience* of *kashrut* consumers.**[[127]](#footnote-127) This point is crucial in reality, and is also significant evidence of the strengthening of the thesisof *halachic* design by the state, since for those persons who will patron a businesses *only* if it presents the alternative certificate established under the auspices of the ‘third gate’, but will *not* patron them if no certificate or information is presented at all, the Court’s ruling *de facto* provided the seal of *kashrut*. It granted a ***halachic* permit** to go eat in such places, which previously, especially under the judgement of the previous panel, did not exist. Indeed, following the judgement, an established national-religious organisation called ‘*Tzohar*’ formed a parallel and well-established *kashrut* system, which currently operates alongside other private organisations that provide “*hechsher*” without *kashrut* from the Rabbinate, while ensuring that no ‘kosher presentation’ is presented.[[128]](#footnote-128) In this way, it is possible that the Supreme Court’s judgement changed the religious practice of some in the Israeli public. This also clarifies the extent to which the state authority, in a Jewish state, takes part in shaping and expanding the religious target communities. In accordance with its decision, residents who may previously have preferred eating in a business without a *kashrut* certificate over a business holding a *kashrut* certificate from the Rabbinate, whether for ideological or financial reasons, may prefer eating in places that hold an ‘alternative’ certificate, thus preserving (even if solely in their own eyes) some live religious dimension.[[129]](#footnote-129) Of course, the opposite is also true: Persons who previously used to eat only in places with a *kashrut* certificate from the Rabbinate, may now also eat in places that hold alternative *kashrut*, since it has been ‘made kosher’ by the Supreme Court.

Judge Solberg opened his opinion in the *Gini* *I* case by quoting a saying attributed to Rabbi Nachman of Breslov, “True, you are kosher people, but that was not my intention.”[[130]](#footnote-130) In doing so, I believe, he was trying to defend the restaurant owners who petitioned him, and avoid hurting their feelings. True, in their eyes their *kashrut* is *kashrut*, but there is no escaping the fact that this was not the legislature’s intention. The complete irony, through which Solberg winks at the reader, is revealed only when reading Breslov’s full statement: ‘Though you are kosher people, but that was not my intention, I meant that I would have such people roaring to the blessed Lord night after night like wild animals in the forest’.[[131]](#footnote-131) The intention of the poet from Breslov was almost the opposite of the intention of the Israeli legislature, as Solberg understood it. According to the Breslavian conception, ‘really’ kosher behaviour is not necessarily derived from strictness with respect to food. It is derived from man’s passion and striving towards the divine regardless of the dictates of society, and perhaps even contrary to them. Examining the issue from such an angle will reveal, perhaps, that the petitioners in the *Gini* case, the applicants for the ‘other’ *kashrut* certificates which are trusted by *them*, are the ones who met this ‘*halachic*’ criterion. Apparently, more so than the Rabbinate met it.

**Conclusion**

In mid-June 2021, a new Israeli prime minister was sworn in by the *Knesset* plenum. Naftali Bennett, who wears a *yarmulke* on his head, is also the first prime minister to be identified with Orthodox religious circles, and who hails from the National-Zionist camp. Among the many pressing issues that the new prime minister could have mentioned in his speech, he chose, *inter alia*, to state his intention to open up the *kashrut* market, and break the Rabbinate’s monopoly in the field. Presumably, many saw this as an expression of an economic agenda in line with his liberal-capitalist spirit. Others, certainly those from the ultra-Orthodox community, saw this as an opportunity for political point scoring, even though many of them do not consume the services of the Rabbinate at all, but comply with additional, private, *kashrut* in addition to the Rabbinate’s *kashrut*. For members of religious Zionism and the wider traditionalist public who value the rabbinical institution, it is possible that Bennett’s approach is also portrayed as anti-*halachic* and anti-state. I do not seek to decide the matter. I only wanted to shine a spotlight on the insight into how Bennett’s solemn proposal, whether it fits the *halachic* approach in its original form, or whether it errs against it, focuses on a religious subject of the highest order, and seeks to shape it using the tools of government given to him, and one can assume also from a religious perspective.

This chapter also generates another insight, which is to what extent the Court functions, *sotto voce*, as a party to whom the assets of the Jewish religion and *halacha* belong, no less than to the Rabbinate. This is a perception that involves the essence of the state as ‘Jewish’, and the religious validity of this term, on which I expanded in the methodological chapter. The aforesaid symbiotic practice did not end with the *Gini* affair of 2017, and it must be assumed that Bennett’s statement will only fulfil it more forcefully.

In stead of a conclusion, I would like to mention a recent case that strengthens the Court’s place within this process of designing Israeli *kashrut* laws, and blurs the boundaries between secularisation and religion in the State of Israel. In 2020, the High Court published its judgement on the issue of *chametz* ]leavened food] in public hospitals during the days of Passover.[[132]](#footnote-132) The petition was filed by an organisation called “The Secular Forum Society”, which objected to the practice employed by hospitals in Israel to prohibit visitors and patients from bringing *chametz* onto the hospitals’ premises during the seven days of Passover. The practice entailed a pedantic search of the personal belongings of each and every visitor. The judgement held, by a majority, that there was no source at law that gave the hospitals the *legal* authority to search visitors’ belongings, and prevent them from bringing *chametz* onto the hospital premises. The hospitals’ argument that the actions were forced on them by the demands of the Rabbinate, as a condition for the grant of a *kashrut* certificate, was rejected. The hospitals were caught up therefore, in the words of Justice Hendel (who was in the minority) “between a rock and a hard place.”[[133]](#footnote-133) The Rabbinate’s position, that the aforementioned rule was based strictly on *kashrut* considerations and the rules of observing Passover, was indirectly dismissed when the Court ruled that a more lenient *halachic* path could be adopted.[[134]](#footnote-134) And thus, although this was not explicitly stated in the judgement (since the Court order issued was directed at the hospitals, prohibiting *them* from conducting a *chametz* search), the Rabbinate must decide whether it can grant a *kashrut* certificate to a public institution which formerly – according to *its own* perception of the rules of *halacha* pertaining to Passover – could not be issued with a *kashrut* certificate.[[135]](#footnote-135) The question of how the Rabbinate will act in this matter, as in the many cases presented above, will constitute further evidence for the claim that the decision on the manners of expressing and shaping the Jewish religion in Israel, is often made by its “secular” authorities, acting as “*halachic arbiters*”. In this context, it is worth noting, in brief, the minority opinion of Judge Handel, the most religious of the panel judges. Handel believed that the petitions should be dismissed, and that there was no scope for the Court to intervene. Although this was his legal position, he did not shy away from expressing his displeasure with the Rabbinate’s approach for not employing some *halachic* solution that would have obviate the need for the Court’s intervention:[[136]](#footnote-136)

“*I will not hide my personal view that the power of halacha is reflected in its ability to find “live with them” [VeChai Ba’hem] solutions for different places and in different times.... It does not seem that the halacha – for all its creativity and depth – is not able to solve the problem of food in a hospital, in a way which requires a decision by the Court.*”

All that one can say of this matter, is that one must wonder whether the judgment of the Court does not itself produce the creative *halachic* solution where the “representatives of *halacha*” failed to do so?
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