



" . . . As long, indeed, as I am an apostle of the Gentiles, I will honor my ministry, in the hope that I may provoke to jealousy those who are my flesh, and may save some of them. For if the rejection of them is the reconciliation of the world, what will the reception of them be but life from the dead?"  
(Romans 11:13-16).

# LETTERS

*Hebrew-Catholic*

TO

MR. ISAACS

*By*

DAVID GOLDSTEIN, LL.D.

*Author*

*"Jewish Panorama"*

For copies address

FATHERS RUMBLE & CARTY  
RADIO REPLIES PRESS  
ST. PAUL  
MINN.



Copyright 1943 By Radio Replies Press

BM  
535  
.G56

*Nihil Obstat:* RT. REV. MSGR. EDWARD G. MURRAY, D.D.

*Imprimatur:* WILLIAM CARDINAL O'CONNELL  
ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON.

PRINTED AND BOUND IN THE U. S. A.

DEDICATED  
TO  
*The Sisters*  
of  
*Notre Dame de Sion*



---

---

*Introduction*

---

---

*Upon glancing at this correspondence the thought will naturally arise as to who Mr. Isaacs really is, and why the letters are addressed to him.*

*Mr. Isaacs is a composite personage, made up of the Jews contacted personally and by mail during my years of union with the Messiah in His Mystical Body, the Church.*

*The name was selected because all children of Jewish parentage, save converts to Judaism or descendants of persons who became Jews through conversion, are Isaacs in the sense of being descendants of the twelve patriarchal sons of Jacob, the son of Isaac. The Jews became the chosen children of God through God's promise that "in Isaac shall thy (Abraham's) seed be called" (Gen. 21:12).*

*The divine promise was developed to its fullness through Judah (one of the twelve patriarchal grandsons of Isaac) in his descendant, King David, and lastly in Jesus, the Messianic Son of David. Isaac prefigured Jesus Christ in his miraculous birth; in being offered for sacrifice by his father; and in being a demonstration of God's power to "raise up even the dead" (Heb. 11:17). Hence Isaac embodies all that I want My dear Mr. Isaacs to know.*

*These letters, though of a controversial nature, were written in a spirit of charity, which commands love of my fellow-Israelites for the love of God, irrespective of their philosophy,*



practices, and characteristics, among which is an intense hatred of converts from the Synagogue to the Church. Through these letters there runs an emotional strain due to an ingrained sympathetic appreciation of the pathetic lot of the Jews. Ability they have; so have they the zeal that enables many of them to be successful in almost any sphere of activity, in any country where they are not deprived of the right to exercise their natural rights. Everybody knows that the exercise of those rights is denied them in many instances. When it comes to social relations, there is a barrier raised that causes them to be segregated, even in our democratic America. The primary reason is dealt with in these letters to Mr. Isaacs. Yet a further word is in order.

Hostility towards Jews is all too often due to lack of Christian charity on the part of persons who are Christians in name rather than in practice. Yet in the Jews themselves, rather than in unchristian Christians, will be found the primary reason why they "are underlings," as some Jews realize themselves to be. Sin, personal sin, is the source of moral affliction, and man is the soil in which it grows. The source of the pathetic status of Jews is just as surely sin as it is the basic cause of the "blood, sweat and tears" that is afflicting the people of the whole wide world during our present generation. This universal principle was stressed recently by His Holiness Pope Pius XII in these words, which we all should ponder,

"God at times lets trials befall individuals and peoples, trials of which the malice of men is the instrument in a design of justice directed toward the punishment of sin, toward purifying persons and peoples through the expiation of this present life and bringing them back by this war to Himself."

Of this principle praying Jews are well aware, though they do not attribute it to the sin of sins, the denial of Israel's most sublime personage, the Son of David, their Messiah. He

comes unto His own today, as He did twenty centuries ago, and His own receive Him not (St. John 1:11). A more uncharitable act no man can commit than to deny his kith and kin. Such an act becomes the sin of sins when it is a denial of the Prophet whom Moses told Israel to hear. The words of God the Father, that came to Israel through Isaiah twenty-seven centuries ago, apply literally to their rejection of Jesus as their Messiah, viz.—

"The ox knoweth his owner, and the master his crib; but Israel hath not known me, and thy people hath not understood" (Isa. 1).

Just as David bemoaned the action of his fellow-Israelites, who stopped their ears to the voice of God, and foretold their punishment as a result of it (Ps. 57), so did the Messiah bemoan the deafness and blindness of Israel, and foretold the resultant affliction the Jews would suffer. This affliction Jews have suffered for nearly twenty centuries, it makes life hard for them today, and it will no doubt continue to keep them cast down until they salute Jesus as David saluted the Lord (Ps. 117:26), and as the Jews saluted their Messiah, with hosannas during His triumphal march through the Holy City on the first Palm Sunday,

"Jerusalem, Jerusalem! . . . How often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathers her young under her wings, but thou wouldst not: BEHOLD THY HOUSE IS LEFT DESOLATE. For I say to you, you shall not see Me henceforth until you shall say 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!' " (St. Matt. 23:37-39).

There is a great spiritual void in the hearts of many Jews that they long to fill. The Synagogue does not and cannot fill that void. It causes many Jews to enter all kinds of movements with but temporary satisfaction, as only a small percentage of them realize that in the Christian way of life, lived



*in union with the Messiah, can be found the soul-satisfaction they yearn for.*

*The hope of the Jews, the ultimate cure for the inhumanities they suffer, lies in their spiritual assimilation in their Messianic Lord. He compassionately awaits, with outstretched arms, their coming into the Kingdom He established as the father in the parable of parables awaited the home-coming of his prodigal son. The Kingdom is theirs, they are the original heirs, loyalty to the faith of their fathers of old in Israel commands them to accept the inheritance that awaits them. In these letters to Mr. Isaacs will be found the arguments which prove that passing from the Synagogue to the Church follows from belief in Old Testament Judaism. Jews who have seen in Jesus the Expected of Israel, have, from the days of the Apostles, considered their conversion to be the realization of the full-blossomed fruit that sprang from the seed that Moses planted, the prophets watered, and Israel prayed for.*

*May these letters lighten the burden my fellow-Israelites bear, by causing them to accept the invitation the Divine Son of the Lily of Israel extends to His stray sheep,*

*"Come to Me, all who labor and are burdened,  
and I will rest you.*

*Take my yoke upon you, and learn from Me,  
for I am meek and humble of heart;  
and you will find rest for your souls.*

*For My yoke is easy,  
and My burden light" (St. Matt. 11:28-30).*

---



---

## Contents

	PAGE
Introduction	vii
(Central theme of letters)	
1 Fear and Love of God	3
2 Reform Judaism Examined	5
3 Origin of Reform Judaism	9
4 Orthodox Judaism	11
5 Democratic and Authoritative Religion	13
6 Conservative Judaism	17
7 Laicized Judaism	19
8 Jewish Priests and Sacrifices	23
9 Are Temple Sacrifices Necessary?	27
10 Does End of Sacrificial Cult Matter?	31
11 The Soul of Judaism	35
12 Soul of Judaism Living On	39
13 Judaism Before Moses	45
14 Judaism and Dogmas	46
15 Israel and a Personal Messiah	49
16 True and False Messiahs	54
17 Genealogical Status of Jews	58
18 Jews Uninterested in Genealogies	64
19 Do Jews Proselytize?	68
20 His "Anointed of the Lord"	74
21 Was Jesus a Jew?	76



Considering that you believe in God, our start is easy. I am assuming, of course, that you believe in the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, whom I as a Catholic worship. Yet, even here, it were well to realize that when a Jew becomes a Catholic he gets a deeper and broader concept of God. That is because Catholics conceive God to be something more than the Creator of the world; a jealous God of an exclusive people, the children of Israel, with emphasis upon fear rather than love. God is looked upon by Catholics primarily as a loving Father of mankind. The emphasis of Catholics is upon the love of God, confidence in Him, and gratitude towards Him for all things, believing that the cross He permits them to bear is an opportunity to gain a crown. Catholic love of God leads the faithful to a realization of obligation to their fellow-man irrespective of his racial, national and religious affiliation, to a degree unknown to Judaism. In a word, Catholic fear of God is secondary to love of God.

While fear of God is the beginning of wisdom, it is not the end thereof, which is love. Yet filial fear of God, like love, is a grace wrought in the soul by God. This to me is very important, as it was the beginning of my realization that Judaism, as a whole, is a negative, whereas Christianity is a positive approach to God. One of the striking characteristics of the Christian religion, that follows from its concept of God, is its universality, whereas Judaism is primarily for the descendants of Jacob. That is one of the reasons why the Church of the Messiah is called Catholic.

My daily task, as a campaigner for Christ, will necessitate proceeding slowly in replying to the many points you thrust at me in your letter. Yet I promise to cover every one of them in between my engagements to address audiences in the streets, squares and parks of our country. My objective will be to make plain that affiliation of Jews with the Catholic Church is not a denial of the faith of their fathers of old in Israel. On the contrary, it is an affirmation of their belief in the religion of Judaism of old; the realization of the great spiritual inheritance which the holy writings of Moses and

the prophets foretold would come to those children of Israel who follow the faith of their fathers to its fulfillment in the coming of the Son of David.

This is the belief that led the Apostles, Jews, all of them, to follow Jesus as their Messiah at the cost of martyrdom.

This is the belief that brought three thousand circumcised Jews, through baptism, into the Catholic Church on her birthday, the First Pentecost Day.

This is the belief that converted Saul into St. Paul, for which he willingly bore forty stripes less one, was imprisoned, stoned, suffered shipwreck, and joyfully permitted himself to be beheaded.

This is the belief that, ever since the coming of the Messiah, caused the conversion of lovers of the faith of their fathers into an understanding that the Old Dispensation of Israel is fulfilled in the New Dispensation of Jesus. Pray God that Mr. Isaacs will be the next to be listed.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....



## 2. *Reform Judaism Examined*

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

It is of import that the Judaism you profess be examined, as I hold that you, not I, have denied the faith of our holy fathers in Israel.

You are a Reform Jew. That being so, then you have ceased to be an Old Testament Jew, if ever you was one; then are you not governed by the Law of Moses as set forth



in his Books, The Torah, as understood by our forefathers. Reform Judaism is as far from the Mosaic religion in the Old Testament as Unitarianism is from the religion of Christ in the New Testament. This is said because Reform Judaism and Unitarianism are alike in principle. That is why Alfred Segal, the Jewish columnist, asked—

“What is there in my Reform Temple which I could not get in the Unitarian Church down the street?” (*Am. Israelite*,” Jan. 14, 1937.)

That is why Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch, Sinai Congregation, Chicago, co-editor of the Jewish Encyclopedia, foremost leader of Reform Judaism for four decades, could say—

“If ever we come to consult who are our co-religionists, we will discover that we have much more in common with the Unitarians and the Ethical Culture people than with Orthodox Jews.”

If you were to substitute Reform Jew for “circumcised Jew,” I would agree with your contention, as no “Reform Jew could consistently (or rather logically) become a Catholic.” He would have to be converted to the basic principles of his forefathers in Israel before he could “consistently” become a Catholic. First, because the principles of Judaism proper are unchangeable, as the Jews of old and Catholics believe, and not evolutionary as Reform Judaism holds them to be. Second, a Catholic must believe in miracles, as did the Jews of old, he must believe that God, the Maker of nature, is above and beyond nature. Therefore God can and has acted directly without going through the ordinary, immediate cause leading to an effect, which we designate as natural. Here are ten Old Testament miracles Jews must believe.

1. The Ten plagues of Egypt—*Exodus*, chapters, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12.
2. Parting of the waters of the Red Sea—*Exodus*, 14.
3. Feeding with manna—*Exodus*, 16.
4. Death of Cor, Dathan and Abiram for rebellion against the authority of Moses and Aaron—*Numbers*, 16.

5. Budding of Aaron's rod, as sign that he was God's priest—*Numbers*, 17.
6. Feeding of one hundred men by Elisha with twenty loaves—*4th Kings*, 4.
7. Resurrection from the dead by touching the bones of Elisha—*4th Kings*, 13.
8. Deliverance of three children from fiery furnace—*Daniel*, 3.
9. Deliverance of Daniel from lions—*Daniel*, 6.
10. Deliverance of Jonah from sea monster—*Jonas*, 2.

Reform Judaism denies these, and other miracles, the denial of which relegates the Old Testament from the reading desks of synagogues, and the pulpits of churches, to the folklore shelves of libraries.

Again, Reform Judaism denies belief in a personal Messiah. This in itself is an utter denial of the divine promise around which the Judaism of our fathers of old in Israel centered. Belief in a personal Messiah is the central hope of Israel, for which all true Jews have prayed morning, noon and night throughout the Jewish ages. That is why Rabbi Schecter said, while president of the Jewish Seminary of America,

“The statement of some moderns, to the effect that Rabbinism did not hold the belief in a personal Messiah essential, is unscientific and needs no refutation for those who are acquainted with the literature” (*Some Aspects of Jewish Theology*,” p. 110).

From the literature to which Rabbi Schecter refers, I present for your consideration the opinion of Moses Maimonides, the greatest Jewish authority on the Torah during the past eight hundred years. He said—

“One must believe and regard it as true that the Messiah will come. One must not think that his coming will be postponed; if he delays his arrival, wait for him. One must not fix the date, for, nor read into the Bible one's opinion concerning his coming—. One must believe that, in accordance with the predictions of all the prophets from Moses to Malachi, the Messiah will be more exalted and more



honored than all the kings that ever existed. Whoever harbors and doubts or whosoever lowers his dignity, such a one denies the Torah.—It is a part of this tenet that Israel will have no king except one from the house of David and the progeny of Solomon. And he who opposes this dynasty denies the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the words of his prophets" (*Commentary on M. Sarh,* 10, *principle 12*).

Reform Judaism is a man-made religion; it originated in Germany during the first part of the last century. True Judaism is God-made, it dates back to the covenant made by God with Abraham in Ur of the Chaldees twenty centuries before the Christian ages.

Thus it ought to be plainly evident to you, Mr. Isaacs, that when it comes to things basic to Judaism—its unchangeable principles, miracles, and belief in a personal Messiah—I, a "circumcised Jew" transformed into a Catholic Christian, am in harmony with the faith of our saintly fathers of old in Israel from Abraham to Moses to Malachi. On the other hand, you are in harmony with Rabbis Samuel Holdheim and Abraham Geiger, of Germany, the ex-Orthodox Jews, who originated Reform Judaism, and not with the faith of the Torah Jews of old.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....



### 3. *Origin of Reform Judaism*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

I am in receipt of your letter of recent date, in which you object to my classification of Reform Judaism as "man-made." I hasten to reply thereto, though the answers to your first letter have not yet been completed.

My declaration is so firmly an established fact, that it surprises me to have you ask, "Is not ancient Judaism 'man-made' according to your line of reasoning? Did not the understanding of it come through a man? Is it not called the Mosaic Law?" It is so designated, yet it is not man-made, as Moses was not its author, and has never been so declared in Israel. He was only the human instrumental agent through whom God placed His Law in the keeping of the Children of Israel. It was to be obeyed, and carried forth by Israel, until the "Prophet God will raise up" came, as Moses said, whom "thou shalt hear" (*Deut. 18:15*). He came. He is the Messiah, Jesus, whom you refuse to hear as God said you should. Converts from the Synagogue to the Church giving Him ear, cry out, as did Nathanael, who became St. Bartholomew the Apostle, "We have found Him of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets wrote" (*St. John 1:45*).

Reform Judaism is man-made, because it was introduced into Jewry by men who had no authority whatsoever to modify the Law that came from God through Moses and the Prophets, for instance, by repudiating belief in a personal Messiah. Jewry has not, and never did have, any more power to repudiate belief in the coming of a personal Messiah, than the Catholic Church has to repudiate belief in His second



coming. The Messiah made His first appearance out of Bethlehem Ephrata, as foretold by Michas (5:2); and the Messiah promised to come again, this time in all His glory.

While Reform Judaism claims Moses Mendelssohn (Berlin, 1729-1786) as its progenitor, its real existence as a Judaic sect is due to the work of the two German modernized rabbis mentioned in my last letter. As proof of its human origin, I herewith present a quotation from the "Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge" (N. Y., 1934, p. 267)—

"Reform Judaism began in Germany in the first quarter of the 19th century, and there particularly under the great leaders, Samuel Holdstein and Abraham Geiger, experienced its largest initial growth and achievement."

It is most important to keep in mind the fact that ancient Judaism was the product of the covenant God made with Abraham, the ancestor of Israel, about the year 2083 B.C.; and that God did not make any covenant with Moses Mendelssohn, Samuel Holdstein, Abraham Geiger, or any American rabbi, thirty-nine or forty centuries later. Its importance lies in that the only religion man is morally obligated to obey is a God-made religion. Ancient, and not modern Judaism is therefore the religion to which man is duty-bound to submit his will for direction in matters of faith and morals, if the Law of Judaism has not been fulfilled in the coming of Jesus as the Messiah, and the establishment by Him of the Church to take the place of the Temple and the Synagogues.

My desire to follow the will of God would lead me prayerfully to wear the tephillin \* in the synagogue today, instead of praying with beads in the Church, if the King of the Jews, predicted to come, had not come and had not substituted one spiritual society for the other.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D. . . . G. . . . .

\* Tephillin, phylacteries, made of two leather boxes which contain pieces of parchment (with texts from Exodus and Deut.) and leather straps. One box is worn on the head near where the hair begins to grow, the other box is strapped to the left arm, near to the heart. They are a reminder to every male Jew that he must study and obey the Torah each day.

---

#### 4. Orthodox Judaism

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

You are correct in concluding, from my style of writing, that I purpose to publish my letters. Thus, if I fail to induce you to return to belief in Judaism proper, and then to graduate to Judaism full-blossomed, the letters may be of use to those Jews who will examine the arguments presented in them, with minds that are not obscured by dislike of the writer. It is my love of you, as a soul made in the same image and likeness as mine, and not fear of your expressed hostility towards converts from Judaism to Catholic Christianity, that prompts me to continue. I do not think you are as dangerous as you appear in your letters, save to yourself, for, as a writer once said,

"The greatest hatred, like the greatest virtue and the worst dogs, is silent."

You may continue to write in your unrestrained manner, if you so will, with the assurance asked, that your letters will not be published, nor your identity revealed.

Now that another obstacle to an examination of the matter at issue has been brushed aside, a return may be made to the question of Judaism.

You no doubt know, that, when speaking favorably of the religion of Israel, I have in mind the Judaism of old, which has been called Orthodox since the days of the Paris Sanhedrin assembled by Napoleon 1. It represents the major portion of the synagogued Jews. Its voice on the platform, through the etheric waves, and in the press, is not as loud as the number of Orthodox Jews, relative to the number of



Reform Jews, warrants, as the Rabbis in the limelight are, with a few exceptions, of the Reform variety. Perhaps that is why Professor Horace M. Kallen, the active Zionist member of the American Jewish Congress, said:

"The religion of orthodoxy is more organic than reform, however, for orthodoxy is a *way of living*, while reform is only a *way of talking*" (*Judaism at Bay*, N. Y., 1934, p. 84).

If God has not as yet made the "new covenant" predicted by Jeremiah (31:31); if the thousands of millions of Christians have been in error in believing during nearly twenty centuries, and continuing to believe, that Jesus is the expected of Israel, the Messiah foretold to come by the greatest and holiest Jews, then is Orthodox Judaism the only Judaism of the Torah, despite the many Talmudic additions that have made obedience to its mandates a burden that many in Israel have found to be unbearable.

Of course, to hold any Judaism to be true Torah Judaism, as is sincerely believed by members of synagogues, is an unsound notion. First, because ancient Judaism was a divinely instituted, authoritative religion. Its authority centered in its priesthood. Its high priest was, as Vallentine's Jewish Encyclopedia says, "the supreme ecclesiastical authority and chief representative of Israel before God" (*London, 1938, p. 284*). This priesthood exists no more. The worship of ancient Judaism centered in divinely ordered sacrifices, which are no more, as there are no priests to offer the oblation called for in the Torah. Besides the Temple, the single central sanctuary, where "the burnt offerings and sacrifices and tithes" were commanded in Deuteronomy 12 to be offered has not existed since the days of Titus nineteen centuries ago.

These three holy things, basic to the Mosaic religion—priests, sacrifices and Temple—being of the historic past, the Orthodox Judaism of today is but a reflection of what has "gone glimmering through the dream of things that were."

If reasons in the minds of Jews for adhering to Orthodox Judaism, or any other present-day Judaism, were as plentiful

as blackberries in the summer season, it would be a difficult task to find one sound one among them with which to refute the last two paragraphs of this letter.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....



## 5. *Democratic and Authoritative Religion*

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

Looking at my last letter, in order to bring to mind the point dealt with therein, I realized that the closing words were in the nature of a challenge. Hence there was no need of an apology for immediately coming back at me with a reply thereto. It places upon me however the responsibility of dealing with the two points you raise—authority and priesthood—instead of continuing to answer some of the points in your first letter, as planned.

You want "democracy in religion, and not a religion governed by a priesthood that claims divine authority." I regret your failure to see that the issue is not what you want, but rather what Old Testament Jewry calls for. Yet your demand will no doubt be seconded by many persons who do not discriminate between a God-made and a man-made religion. Your viewpoint will no doubt be applauded during these times when the battle is on for the "four freedoms" that totalitarianism denies. That is because many persons fail to discriminate between the authority of the Church, which comes from above, and the exercise of the authority of the state which rightly comes through the consent of the popu-



lace. While all power comes from God, the authority of the persons who exercise such power, in a God-made spiritual society, is made known to man through revelation. It was set forth by Moses, and defined, as occasion necessitated, by the high priests and Sanhedrin (the high court) for the Jews; and by Jesus Christ, and the Church to which He delegated His power, for all the people of the world from the time the sojourn of Christ on earth ended. The exercise of the power of the State in the U. S. A., is by the consent of the governed, as defined in the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights.

The Jewish priesthood was an aristocratic caste of the tribe of Levi. Supreme authority centered in the house of Aaron, of the tribe of Levi, the office of High Priest, when vacant, being assumed by the eldest son, if he had the qualifications. This hereditary, genealogical priestly caste, was displaced by the priesthood without genealogy, in the Catholic Church. It is democratic insofar as the men ordained for service at the Altar of the Catholic Church are selected solely on the basis of their moral, intellectual and physical fitness, irrespective of their racial, national, or social status, or lineage. This democracy of the Catholic Church was recognized by President Woodrow Wilson, who said in his "New Freedom,"

"The only reason why government did not suffer dry rot in the Middle Ages under the aristocratic system that then prevailed, was that most of the men who were efficient instruments of government were drawn from the Church—from that great religious body which was then the only Church, that body which is now distinguished from other religious bodies as the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church was then, as it is now, a great democracy. There was no peasant so humble that he might not become a priest, and no priest so obscure that he might not become a Pope of Christendom; and every chancellery in Europe, every Court in Europe, was ruled by these learned, trained and accomplished men."

Of course, a man-made church may be as democratic as a social club. It may not only select its own rabbis or ministers,

and govern itself by the will of the majority, but it may also shape its principles by vote of its membership, as it often does. But right reasoning compels the conclusion that a God-made Church if such exists, must be governed by the will of God (as defined by its priestly authority) and not by the will of man in a democratic or an autocratic manner.

There is but one Infinite God, hence there can be but one Church of God, especially when that Church is the Body of the Lord Jesus, as St. Paul declared the Church of Christ to be (*Eph. 1:23*). There was but one spiritual society of God's making before the thirty-third year of Christian reckoning, and that was the Church of the Jews. It ceased to be of God when it ceased to have a priesthood, sacrifices, and a Temple, though many Jews believed, and still sincerely believe, otherwise. Only one organic, visible, spiritual society of God's making has existed since then; that is the Catholic Church, the one and the only Christian Church that dates back historically to the first century of the Christian era. And the Catholic Church would cease to exist if the existence of her priesthood and sacrifice were no more, if that were possible.

Members of such God-made spiritual societies know that true religion is of God. They are governed by divinely revealed principles which bind man to God; as from God man came, and his primary purpose in life is to attain to an eternity of happiness with God. Ancient Judaism, like the Catholic religion, held God to have willed that man be directed and served through His ordained priesthood. Its head in the Old Law was Moses who lived on through Aaron and his successors in the high priesthood. That is why Jesus, the Messiah, said to the crowd and the disciples,

"All things, therefore, that they (the Scribes and Pharisees) command you, observe and do—for they have sat on the Chair of Moses" (*St. Matt. 23:1-3*).

The Jewish religious system, as I said, was hierarchial. It had its Sovereign Pontiffs, its High Priests. It had one visible head in the beginning, Moses, who annointed his brother



Aaron as the first High Priest, followed by Aaron's son Eleazar, and in turn by successive first sons of the family of Aaron, who sat on the chair of Moses. Jesus, the Messiah, is the High Priest of the New Dispensation. He lives on through His bishops and priests, chief of whom are the occupants of the Chair of Peter, which was instituted by the Messiah. The Jewish priesthood ceased to speak with authority when the Veil in the Temple was rent, for shortly thereafter, on the First Pentecost Day, the Church of the New Dispensation began to function. Yet the Jewish priesthood continued to live a precarious existence, though without divine authority, until the destruction of the Temple in the year 70 A.D. Its "last High Priest," says the "Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge" (p. 428), "was chosen through political intrigue. He was not of the high-priestly (Aaronic) lineage, nor was he in any way worthy of the office."

A Jewish religion without a divine priesthood, such as it had when the high priest functioned, as commanded in the Torah, is like a horse without a bridle, there is no telling into what doctrinal road it will run. It is lack of coherent, priestly authority in Jewry that accounts for its doctrinal intellectual chaos. It fails today to agree on the simple primary questions, "What is a Jew?" "What is Judaism?" My prayerful hope is that you will get a proper understanding of the faith of your fathers of old in Israel. Then will you realize that the Judaism which added glory to Israel; the Judaism of the priestly days of Israel, is no more, as it was divinely displaced by the priesthood and Church of the "New Covenant." Then will you understand that when a Jew enters the Catholic Church, he continues his religious life with the God of Israel, under the guidance of the priesthood of the Messiah.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....

---

## 6. Conservative Judaism

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

Having noted that no mention has been made of Conservative Judaism in any of my letters, you inquire whether I line it up with Orthodoxy or Reform Judaism in principle.

I have deliberately refrained from mentioning Conservative Judaism, in order not to confuse the issue, which is Orthodox Judaism as the Judaism of our fathers of old in Israel, or the non-existence of any Judaism to which the sons of Jacob are obligated to pay sacred allegiance, because it has been displaced by Christianity.

The clear-cut issue is Orthodox Judaism versus Christianity, that is because Orthodox Judaism may claim some degree of continuity with Judaism of old, as it stands for the God, the Messiah, the priesthood, the sacrifices, belief in revelation, resurrection, etc., as set forth in the Old Testament; while Reform Judaism is the opposite, being a denial of all that is basically Jewish from a doctrinal point of view, even to the point of being indoctrinated sympathetically in many instances with the God of Spinoza, though mouthing the God of Moses.

Conservative Judaism, as an organized division of American Jewry, is of a later date than the Reform sect. Its influence has been due largely to the work of Rabbi Solomon Schechter, the founder of the United Synagog of America (1913). Its center of operation is the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, N. Y. C., of which Rabbi Louis Finklestein is president.

While Conservative Judaism stands for more Hebrew and



tradition than does Reform Judaism; while it has always stood for a homeland in Palestine, which the Reform division of Jewry opposed until the advent of Hitler to power, and then only as a place of refuge for the unfortunate Jewish exiles, nonetheless its middle-of-the-road position in doctrine has caused it to be classified as neither "fish, flesh nor good red herring," as Moses is not divided in the Conservative Judaic way. If anything in Moses is to be amended or abrogated, it must be done with authority of a divine nature, which neither the Orthodox, the Reform, or the Conservative wing of Judaism possesses.

The best evaluation of both Conservative and Reform Judaism that I have come across of recent date in the Judaic world came from the pen of an Orthodox Rabbi, Morris Besdin. I present it to you as my answer to your inquiry—

"In vain will you search for a clear definition and concrete exposition of the philosophy and ideology and Conservative Judaism. It is in its very nature a shifting and variable quantity, depending upon the form and shape given to it by individual exponents. There are congregations that style themselves conservative, whose avowed tenets of belief and whose mode of worship approximate those of traditional Judaism, while there are other congregations in the conservative fold which both in theory and practice are hardly distinguishable from Reform Judaism.—They do not recognize the absolute authority of the Shulhan Aruch (code of Jewish law, standard authority for Orthodox Jewish practice), nor do they regard Jewish custom and tradition as binding."

"It is obviously very convenient to retain verbal allegiance to the Jewish faith without abiding by its restrictive statutes."—"Conservative Judaism is a new pattern of Judaism in accordance with the latest mode. It is essentially the developmental evolutionary view of religion adopted by the Reform movement."

"Conservative Judaism differs (from Reform Judaism) only in this respect: that while the reformers followed a process of systematic amputation, their moderate representatives are content with plastic surgery. The former killed the

patient; the latter disfigured him beyond recognition." ". . . And here is the dividing line between Orthodox and Conservative Judaism. To us the existence of God and the authenticity of tradition are accepted as absolute truths. One who denies these beliefs cannot claim allegiance to the Jewish faith. The Commandments of the Torah, we view as eternal verities not subject to time and space" (*"The Jewish Outlook," N. Y., Dec., 1940*).

Nothing further need be said about Conservative Judaism. Hence I purpose to refrain from discussing it in the future, as in the past, unless you raise some issue specifically related to that appeasing sect in Jewry.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....

---

## 7. Laicized Judaism

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

I had occasion to read my letter on Reform Judaism, and your reply thereto, to a friend, in order to get his reaction. His response was "That fellow does not know when he is down and out." My friend's remark was appropos, for after setting down the well established fact that Judaism proper was a divine, priestly, hierarchical, authoritative religion; that its divine character became a thing of the past when its priesthood was no more, you hitch-hike to polemical fields entirely foreign to the issue dealt with in my letters. Your reply called to mind the parson in Goldsmith's "Deserted Village"—



"In arguing, too, the parson own'd his skill,  
For even though vanquished, he could argue still."

Yet among your verbal briers there is an argumentative bud, faded though it be, that may be impetated, belonging, as it does, to the species I have dealt with in my last letter. It is that there is no need of "such Judaism" as existed in the past, as "the sacrifices in the Book of Leviticus have been abrogated." You are partly correct, there is no need of "such Judaism" today, or any other kind of Judaism, as all that was great and glorious in the Judaism of the historic past has been divinely elevated to a sublime, supernatural status such as Judaism had never before attained, and embodied in the religion of the Messianic Kingdom, the Church, that Jesus the Messiah instituted. The part of your statement that I have just quoted, relative to the abrogation of the sacrifices, is only a half-truth, hence not relevant. The Mosaic sacrifices ended, or more correctly, were displaced by the New Sacrifice which the Jewish prophet Malachi said would be instituted, and which was instituted by the Messiah before the gesture of abrogation took place.

You should have said, as do Jewish writings, that Rabban Johanan B. Zaccai and his associated teachers, assembled at Jabnah, voted to "abrogate the sacrifices and (also) the laws of purification," AFTER the Temple was destroyed; AFTER the high priesthood of Aaron and the Sanhedrin ceased to be. Heinrich Graetz, Jewry's leading historian, says—

"Without the altar, it seemed as though it were impossible to approach God, or as though God had forsaken his people. The festive seasons used to be determined by the Sanhedrin. But the Sanhedrin was no more; who was to regulate and announce the time for the festivals?" There came forth Rabban Johanan ben Zaccai. He set up a Sanhedrin (*Vol. 2, p. 248*). "By transferring the Sanhedrin to Jamnai (Jabnah, Jabneel, a coastal town south of Jaffa), and separating its functions from the temple site, Rabban Johanan likewise separated Judaism from the sacrificial cult and made it independent."

"He cherished the hope that Jerusalem and the Temple would soon be restored by a Messianic miracle and that sacrifices would then be reinstated" (*p. 250*).

Great is Diana of the Ephesians, when sacrifices can be "abrogated" after they had ceased to exist, when the high priesthood and Sanhedrin were no more! Here are two of a couple of dozen quotations, taken from Jewish writings, which prove that Judaism as a divine, authoritative, priestly sacrificial religion had ended with the destruction of the Temple, an event that took place before Rabban Zaccai abrogated the unabrogatable sacrifices, and assumed to substitute prayers in place of them.

The "Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge" says:

"The fall of the Temple and the disappearance of the high priesthood occurring at the same time, that form of intercession, ground for possible belief in human symbols of divine authority, vanished. Nothing remained but the sublime faith in the indivisible, omnipresent Creator . . ." (*p. 364*).

The same thing, though more clearly expressed, is found in "Mid Channel," by Ludwig Lewissohn, viz.—

"With the destruction of the Temple the sacrificial cult of the Jews was destroyed. For among the people there was but one temple and one altar.—Hence the Jewish people were suddenly laicized. Priests and sacrifices and tangible mysteries were no more" (*p. 259*).

A Mosaic religion "laicized," as is the Judaism of the diaspora,\* is a supernatural, priestly, sacrificial religion secularized. A Mosaic religion "laicized" is not the Mosaic religion of our fathers of old in Israel. It is not a religion to which you, I, or any other person of Jewish parentage is morally obligated to give allegiance.

Pardon me for repeating that there was no Temple, high priesthood or sacrifice when at the meeting in Jabneh their abrogation was brought about, and still more, there was no

\* Diaspora, Jews living outside of Palestine, voluntarily or through exile.



Sanhedrin. The end had come to the supreme juridical court of the Jews, with its high priests officiating, such as summoned Herod before it for transgressing the law, by putting Hezekias and the men with him to death; the Sanhedrin that condemned Jesus for claiming to be the Messiah.

The high priests, and the Sanhedrin, legislated and interpreted the Law with divine authority in pre-Temple days. They exercised the power to amend and set aside some of the requirements of the Law, such as the decree issued in the days of Ezra, when the giving of tithes to the priests, referred to in Numbers 18:21, was abrogated. But they, who spoke with authority such as the assembly at Jabneh never possessed, did not assume to have the power to issue decrees that would put an end for all time to Israel paying divine homage to Almighty God, and atoning for sin, through the Torah-commanded sacrifices. The true religion of God in Israel ended with the end of its priesthood and sacrificial cult. The same principle applies to the Catholic Church. The popes, or bishops in union with the pope, may abrogate such laws as the eating of meat on Friday, and the celibacy of the clergy, but they have not the power, nor would they assume to have the power, to abrogate the Sacrifice of the Mass, which was instituted at the Last Passover feast of Jesus and His Apostles, displacing it with prayers. The religion of Catholic Christianity would end, as a divine religion, with the end of its sacrificial cult, assuming this impossible thing to be possible.

I will deal further with this matter in my next letter. In the meantime, please to weigh carefully the foregoing as it is vital to the understanding of why Catholic Christianity is held to be Judaism full-blossomed.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....

---

## 8. Jewish Priests and Sacrifices

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

I believe that the foundation cause of the differences between Jews and Catholic Christians lies in the question of authority. That is my excuse for endeavoring to throw further light upon the subject dealt with in my letter on democracy in religion. Also because in it lies the justification for passing from the Synagogue to the Church.

God, the Creator of the Universe, man included, is Authority per se. He is the Maker of the laws that manifest within His creation. He made not only the natural law, but also the moral law which governs man in relation to his fellowman, and to the Maker of the law. God rules the universe. He rules the relationship of husband and wife through the Church and the State; children through their parents; citizens through their legitimately instituted civil authorities; and rules man, in things that concern his spiritual welfare, through His priesthood. "He who resists" such "authority," says St. Paul, "resists the ordinance of God; and they who resist bring on themselves condemnation" (*Rom. 13:2*).

The Jewish Church was governed by the priestly authority God designated. The main religious function of the priests was to conduct the worship that the Jews were commanded by God to offer to Him through sacrifices, going so far as to set forth the details of the sacred rites, which Moses recorded in the Torah. The authority of the priests of Jewry lasted until the Veil in the Temple was rent, the Veil that hid from view the inmost and exclusive sanctuary of the high priest.



That took place at the moment the body of the Messiah was rent upon the cross.

The Jewish priesthood was exclusive and temporary, being composed of the sons of Levi, the high priest being the first sons of one family therein (Aaron), and limited to the time preceding the coming into being of the promised new priestly order. That priesthood of the Messianic dispensation, foretold to displace the priesthood of Aaron, was to be a continuation of the Messiah in the world, who was "called by God a high priest according to the order of Melchisedech" (*Ps. 109; Heb. 5:10*). Its public work began after the Holy Spirit, sent by the Messiah, descended upon the Apostles. The Jewish priesthood, sacrifices, etc., were, as the Evangelists and Apostles believed, but a shadow and figure of the priesthood of the Universal Church the Messiah established.

The Jewish priests paid homage to God through bloody sacrifices; the priests of the Messiah, through an unbloody sacrifice, the "clean oblation" foretold by Malachi over four hundred years before it was instituted (*1:2*). One is as high above the other as the Jesus is above Moses. St. Paul said,

"If the blood of goats and bulls and the sprinkled ashes of a heifer sanctify the unclean unto the cleansing of the flesh, how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the Holy Spirit offered Himself unblemished unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God" (*Heb. 9:13-14*).

The priestly occupants of the Chair of Moses commanded obedience by God's mandates under the severest penalties—

"He that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the priest,—and the decree of the judge, that man shall die" (*Deut. 17:12*).

The occupants of the Chair of Peter also commanded obedience, having been given the power to bind and to loose (*St. Matt. 16*), though through moral suasion, the penalty being excommunication in extreme cases. During the middle ages, when heresy, for instance, was considered by the state to

be a crime, the culprit was turned over to the civil authorities, if he insisted upon being unrepentant. The civil sentences meted out were at times of too extreme a nature.

The children of Israel were a "peculiar people," a people especially favored by God, a people who were spiritually far above the peoples who surrounded them. They were "a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation," as Moses told them they would be when he came down from the Mount of Sinai (*Exod. 19:5-6*). This was all conditioned upon their obeying the covenant God made with them. This they promised to do, and "a priestly kingdom," in Hebrew a "kingdom of priests," they became. Thus were the Jews sanctified. That did not mean that all Jews were kings in the sense that Saul, David and Solomon were kings; that did not mean that all Jewish men were priests as were Aaron, Eleazar, and their successors. The kings had to be of the house of David, and the high priests of the house of Aaron, and only a minority of the Jews belonged to these two houses.

Of course, Jews were also priests in the sense of offering themselves to God in spirit, in the conduct of religious services in the home, as well as ministering to the halt, the lame, and the blind. All Catholic Christians are considered to be priests in the same sense as all Jews were priests from the days of Moses, and more so, for they unite with the priests at Mass in offering the Sacrifice to God the Father.

In order properly to understand the issue, I hope you will keep this fact in mind, that God commanded worship through sacrifices, that is definitely designated sacrifices which were to be offered to God by specially designated priests: that Jews, like Catholics, considered sacrifices and priests to be correlative terms, as one implied the other. Also that the priest who offered the sacrifice acted as mediator between God and man, and man and God.

The days of Jewry as a "kingdom of priests and a holy nation" are no more; no more has Jewry a divinely ordained priesthood, sacrifice, or mediator. Why? Because Jesus took the place of Moses; because a new priesthood, with the Sacri-



fice of the Mass, displaced the priests, sacrifices, and Temple of old; because the followers of Jesus, the Messiah, became the chosen people of God, being, as St. Peter said, "A chosen race, a royal priesthood, a purchased people" (1 Peter 2:9). And, as St. John said, "Jesus Christ, the prince of the kings of the earth, hath made us a kingdom of priests to God the Father" (Apoc. 1:6).

Surely it is an indisputable fact that the Jewish priesthood is of the historic past. Surely the priesthood must have been of divine, spiritual import to Judaism proper, otherwise Orthodox Jews the world over would not have prayed since Temple days, and continue to pray daily, for the Aaronic priesthood and sacrifices to be reinstated. Surely the laicizing of Judaism, through the ending of its priesthood and sacrifice, ended Judaism as the religion of God, judged by the requirements of the Old Testament. Surely the cessation of divine leadership, oblation, and mediatorship, cannot reasonably be called a temporary affliction, for it has lasted through a period of nineteen centuries. Surely God, who guided man in his moral journey from earth to heaven through His priests, in the days before His Only Begotten Son came upon earth, did not leave man without priestly guidance for over nineteen Christian centuries. Such a concept borders on blasphemy, for it charges God with having abandoned man, leaving him to drift spiritually with every kind of glimmer that enters his unguided mind.

If a sacrificial and mediatorial priesthood has existed during the Christian ages, and continues to exist, it must be in the Catholic Church. She is the only spiritual society with a priesthood and sacrifice, that rightly claims to be the perfection of the priesthood and sacrifice of old; and to have had a continued historic, active existence from within two months after the Veil in the Temple was rent, over thirty-five years before the Temple was destroyed.

If justification for passing from the Synagogue to the Church is desired, it will be found in the ground covered in this letter. Sons of Israel who take part with Catholic priests

in offering sacrifice to God, in lieu of the priests and sacrifices of the Old Testament which are no more, remain true to the Mosaic principle of paying homage to God through sacrifice. They remain true to the Mosaic principle of submission to the will of God as taught, interpreted, and served in the Church of God's making.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....



### 9. *Are Temple Sacrifices Necessary?*

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

I am pleased to learn that some of your Orthodox Jewish friends have been reading and commenting on my letters, and that in the future their opinions are to be included with those you express. I am pleased, because the Judaism your friends profess is the only existing Judaism that has any legitimate right to claim relationship, in principle, with the Judaism of old, even though it lacks Mosaic vitality, being minus a priesthood, sacrifice and Temple.

You ask whether I object. My answer is, certainly not. You may not only show my letters to your Orthodox friends, but you may also publish them in the Jewish press. This is only said tauntingly, for the possibility of a convert from the Synagogue to the Church getting into the Jewish press is as remote as that of a defender of the Synagogue getting his letters into the Nazi press of Hitler's Germany.

You emphasize one point in particular in your letter re-



ceived today, which will be dealt with at once. It relates to sacrifices. You hold that "sacrifices do not necessarily have to be offered in a temple, and on an altar." That is true of personal sacrifices, but not of the public, the collective sacrifices recorded in the foremost writings of Israel. You cite the subjugation of the desires of the flesh by the spirit; the widow giving her much needed mite to a holy cause; and the devotion of Jews (you should say Orthodox Jews) in their synagogues on the Sabbath Day, at the cost of a day's wage each week. Those are laudable personal sacrifices, which no doubt bring blessings from Almighty God. But they are not distinctively Jewish sacrificial acts, save going to synagogues instead of churches to pray. They are not sacrifices demanded exclusively of Israel by God, as recorded in the Torah, hence they are foreign to our discussion.

Salvation from spiritual death was the objective of the Mosaic sacrifices. It was to be obtained through public, exterior, animal, burnt, meat, incense, and first-fruit offerings. Thus a public acknowledgement was made of dependence upon God; of thanksgiving for His bounty; of desire of peace of heart, home, and Israel; and especially as an atonement for sin. Such sacrifices were offered to God by the priests and the priests only.

Before the Mosaic revelation, every man was his own priest, minister of his own sacrifices, such as Abel, Melchisedech and Abraham offered to God. The sacrificial function was generally exercised by the heads of families, the princes, ancients, and persons of high virtue. Such persons needed no special authorization to offer sacrifices, as was given by God exclusively to the sons of Aaron for the Torah sacrifices.

It is too bad to have to repeat, in order to direct your mind to the central point, that God commanded sacrifices to be offered by the priests of Aaron, who are no more; in a central place, which is no more. The Jews of those sacrificing days had one God, one ritual, were one exclusive religious family of God's making, being aided in this union by having one center of worship. The principal bloody sacrifice, the sin

offering, was a ram (a he-lamb) "without blemish" (*Levit. 1:1; 3:3*). It was slaughtered and offered to God by the priest. This was the God-commanded way to obtain remission of the sins of Israel under the Law.

The blood of the lamb having been given to the priest, was poured round and about the altar, thus offered to Jehovah. Through the blood of the victim, and the scapegoat driven into the wilderness with the sins of Israel on its head, God was adored, petitioned, and atoned for sin. The blood being the life-stream of the animal, symbolized the pouring out of life as a libation of love. God gives life, and thus life is given back to Him. The object of this immolation was to remind Jews that they are sinners, as we all are; that their offenses warranted death; and that they desired to make amends. St. Paul, advanced in the Law above many of his contemporaries in Israel (*Gal. 1:14*), said,

"With blood almost everything is cleansed according to the Law, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness" (*Heb. 9:22*).

You, and your Orthodox friends, know that the Jews of the diaspora have been unable to worship God with sacrifices as did our fathers of old in Israel, as with the end of the Aaronic priesthood and the fall of the Temple, all sacrifices ceased. Why? Why? Why have Jews no more sacrifices? Answer, if you can. It is the question of questions that Jews should ponder, for it embodies the primary cause and cure of the affliction Jews have suffered throughout the Christian ages.

The Catholic answer to the question is Jesus the Messiah. He is, as the Jew John the Baptist hailed Him, "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (*St. J. 1:29*). There was no need any more of priests offering God the blood of lambs, as the Lamb of God (slaughtered by His enemies), who was "without blemish," offered His Blood, once and for all, "for the sin of the world." No longer were sacrifices to be offered for an exclusive circumcised people; henceforth all baptised persons who worshipped the Lamb of God, who offered Himself as a sacrifice, were to be God's chosen chil-



dren. The high priest of Israel sacrificed exclusively for the children of Israel; while the Messiah, as High Priest of all humanity, offered Himself as a sacrifice for all humankind during all time. Christ, who could have called "twelve legions of angels" to check the action of the high priest, the Sanhedrin, Pilate, and the Roman soldiers, permitted Himself to be put to death, thus laying "down His life for us." Isaiah foretold it over seven hundred years before the Messiah came in these words:

"He was led like a sheep to slaughter; and just as a lamb dumb before its shearer, so did he not open his mouth" (*Isa. 53:7*).


Aaron, and his descendants, were high priests of Israel, succeeding to the post at the death of the incumbent. Jesus, the Son of David, is the one and the only High Priest of the New Covenant, being, as King David foretold, "a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech" (*Ps. 109:4*). His name is Jesus, whom you, my dear Mr. Isaacs, and all your fellow-Jews unfortunately reject. This Lamb of God died but once, that was on the Cross. Yet He Lives on in the priests of the Catholic Church He established, which is His Mystical Body. Through these priests, the Sacrifice on the Cross is continued in the Mass, though in an unbloody manner, in "remembrance" of Him, as He commanded at the Last Passover Supper of the Old Law (*St. Luke 22:20*).

The Mosaic sacrifice was a bloody one, as you well know; whereas the Sacrifice of the Mass, in which Christ is remembered, which unfortunately you know not, is the unbloody Messianic Sacrifice that Malachi, the last of the prophets recorded in the Old Testament, called a "clean oblation," which would be offered, as it is, "from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof" (*Mal. 1:11*).

The Mosaic sacrifices are no more, having been pre-ordained by God to be but temporary. The Sacrifice of the Mass is eternal. It bears within it a divine appeal to the stray sheep of Israel to come to their Messiah in and through His blood.

The ending of the priesthood and sacrifices of Israel would not be bemoaned by the Orthodox Jews of our day, were they to realize that they were displaced by the Jew of Jews with a Sacrifice that is as much more potent as Jesus is more potent than Moses.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....



### 10. *Does End of Sacrificial Cult Matter?*

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

Your comeback to my explanation of the sacrifices of the Law, in relation to the Sacrifice of the Mass, is that I "scribble along as if there were not two sides to a question." This fling could be dismissed with the equally terse and trite statement that there are two sides to a fly-paper as well as two sides to a discussion. Though there is a world of difference to the fly whether it gets on the sticky or the smooth side of the fibrous material; just so it makes a world of intellectual and spiritual difference which side you or I get on in the discussion of Judaism and Christianity.

It were well to hold in mind the fact that there are two sides when discussing Reform Judaism in relation to Orthodox Judaism. Reform Judaism denies what Orthodox Judaism affirms regarding (1) a personal Messiah, (2) miracles, (3) the priesthood and (4) sacrifices, therefore one of these two sides must be wrong. I have held that Reform Judaism, according to the requirements of the Torah, is to Judaism of



old what Unitarianism is to sound Christianity, biblically in error. Is that not a recognition that there are two sides to our discussion? I, who am contemptuously branded as a "meshumad," for passing from the Synagogue to the Church, firmly believe in these four-square fundamentals of Torah Judaism, while you deny them, and assume at the same time to be one of the faithful of Jewry. While I am one with the Orthodox Jews in upholding those basic Mosaic principles, just enumerated, I have found myself conscience-bound to break with them, because the Messiah they look for I believe to have appeared on earth nineteen hundred years ago; that their hope for the reinstatement of the Aaronic priesthood and sacrifices is in vain, as they have been displaced by the priesthood of the Catholic Church and the Sacrifice of the Mass. That's my side. It is explicit and affirmative; whereas your side is a negation, a rejection of the faith of your fathers of old in Israel. Reform Judaism is as far from having any right to claim to trace its source in the Books of Moses as its rabbis have for claiming to trace the origin of their bodies from the Pithecanthropus Erectus. The Orthodox Jews rightly declare Reform Judaism to be:

"Essentially a developmental evolutionary religion. It has reduced Judaism to the status of an abstract missionary faith and removed the bonds of religious duty and obligation.—It retains verbal allegiance to the Jewish faith without abiding with its restrictive statutes" (*"The Jewish Outlook,"* N. Y., Dec., 1940).

Secondly, you present a sort of a I don't care a d—— statement, from the "Book of Jewish Thoughts" (*p. 189, N. Y., 1941*), to sustain your side of the argument, imagining it to be indisputable because it came from Rabbi Kaufmann Kohler, the editor of the department of theology and philosophy of the Jewish Encyclopedia, viz.:

"What did it matter, if the Temple fell prey to the flames for the second time, or if the whole sacrificial cult of the priesthood with its pomp were to cease forever? The soul

of Judaism lived indestructibly in the House of Prayer and Learning" (the Synagogue).

It seems to matter a great deal to the Orthodox Jews, who comprise the great majority of the synagogued Jews of the world. They bemoan the loss of the Temple and the culmination of the sacrificial cult continually in prayer and fastings.

If it matters not, then why is the 14th of the "Eighteen Benedictions" recited by Orthodox Jews three times a day, thus calling for the return of the Shekinah (special presence of God) which took place in the Holy of Holies of the Temple and for the restoration of the sacrificial ceremonies (Abodah)?

If it matters not, then why are special prayers said on Sabbath days, called musaf (addition), in sorrowful commemoration of the loss of the Temple and sacrifices?

If it matters not, why is instrumental music forbidden in Orthodox synagogues? Why are Jews forbidden to use exact replicas of the utensils used in the Temple until the Temple is restored?

If it matters not, why is the destruction of the Temple remembered by the bridegroom breaking the glass, from which he drank wine, during his wedding ceremony?

If it matters not, why is deference paid to the Temple by forbidding kneeling in prayer, save on New Years Day and Yom Kipper (Day of Atonement)? Why are Temple prayers, including those of the high priest, recited on Yom Kipper?

If it matters not, then why is Capuroth (means of atonement) celebrated the day before Yom Kipper reminiscent of the scapegoat in the Temple?

If it matters not, why is the loss of the Temple, and its sacrificial cult, solemnly remembered on the Ninth of Ab (5th month), Tisho B'ab, the day of mourning, with a strict fast, reading the Book of Lamentations, etc.?

It is an anomalous thing for rabbis to claim to be Jews, in the Old Testament sense of the term, and to dismiss the non-existence of the priesthood, sacrifice and Temple, as if they mattered not to Judaism, imagining that the synagogues fill



the void. Yet these same rabbis (as well as others) celebrate the Feast of Chanukah every year. This is the feast of the rededication of the Temple after the destruction of it by Antiochus Epiphanes, King of Syria, who despoiled the Altar with a burnt offering of swine. This feast is the remembrance of the reinstatement of the sacrificial worship in the days of the Machabees, as well as the miracle of the cruse of undefiled oil, which burned for eight days, when formerly the oil therein lasted but one day.

The greater part of the story of this feast is in the Books of the Machabees; books (rejected in the canon of the Jews of the diaspora) which the Catholic Church placed in the Canon of Holy Scripture. It is the story of Mattathias, the High Priest, who refused to respond to the King's command to begin a pagan worship in honor of Zeus, the Greek god; the priest who seized the sword and killed the apostate Jew who attempted the blasphemous worship. This challenge of the High Priest, the defender of the priesthood and sacrifices that the editor of the theological and philosophical departments of the Jewish Encyclopedia says matters not, was followed by his brave battle cry, "Whoever wishes to support the Covenant of the Lord, follow me."

The Feast of Chanukah is in remembrance of Judas Machabees, who took up the sword, when the high priest was killed, and led the defenders of the faith of Israel of old on to victory. It is the story of the heroic martyrdom of Hannah and her seven lion-hearted sons, whom the Catholic Church honors in the Sacrifice of the Mass annually on August first; whose alleged relics rest today beneath the altar of the Church of St. Peter in Chains, in Rome. After encouraging her seven sons to die rather than forsake the true faith of Israel, Hannah bared her breast to receive the death blow rather than to deny belief in the One True God; rather than to deny the priesthood and sacrifices as called for in the teachings of Moses, things that matter not to modernized rabbis.

Chanukah is an inspiring feast that helps to keep alive the love of the faith of Israel of old in the hearts of converts from

the Synagogue to the Church. My hope is that Chanukah will some day be made a first class feast in the Church. It would then be devoted entirely to the principle of religious faithfulness, and not a prayer for the impossible, the rebuilding of the Temple Herod desecrated and the soldiers of Titus destroyed; nor the reinstatement of the sacrifices of those intense historic days, as God displaced them with a priesthood and Sacrifice of a higher order.

I will return to your letter again next week. In the meantime, permit me to say, prayerfully, that if ever the grace of God leads you, as it did me, into the Catholic Church, it will be because you believe the Aaronic priesthood, its sacrifices and Temple, to have been of vital import to the Judaism of the days before the Messiah rose from the dead and ascended into heaven; and that the same God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob who instituted them instituted the priesthood and Sacrifice of the Catholic Church.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....

---

## 11. *The Soul of Judaism*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

I regret my inability to respond to your assertions as tersely as you respond to my "discourses." One need not read many of my letters to realize that I am not an elegant or terse writer, due to lack of literary ability and an ardent, sometimes over-ardent desire to substantiate what I say with perhaps too



much data, and with what I consider to be sound arguments.

For these reasons, I must ask to be excused for not adopting your "which nobody can deny" style, that makes you feel cocksure that "the existence of Jews is all that needs to be pointed to in order to prove that Judaism lives on." Your terse declaration that "Jews without souls would not be Jews" may or may not be as sound as it is nice-sounding. It depends upon what you mean by Jews, and whether by souls you refer to the life principle of the persons, or the belief they profess.

When you speak of "Jews," you enter the intellectual graveyard of the Judaic world, as there is no agreement in Jewry as to "what is a Jew?" That question has been discussed so often in the Jewish press without coming to a consensus of opinion, that I found it necessary to begin my "Jewish Panorama" with the chapter "What Is a Jew?" When Jewry lists atheists of Jewish parentage and devout Orthodox Hebrews as Jews in its "Who's Who in American Jewry" (1939), it has lost its religious intellectual bearings. I have before me some evidence of this intellectual confusion-confounded that has engulfed Judaism. It is a "Self-Analysis of a Modern Jew," that appeared in the "Jewish Voice" of Los Angeles, California, July, 1936. It was written by William Kadison. He begins by dismissing the racial and nationalist theories, as Jews are not a distinctive race or nationality. He claims not to have attended a synagogue service since his thirteenth birthday, when he was Bar Mitzvah (confirmed). He questions "the deeds and miracles recorded in both the New and the Old Testaments," brazenly declaring, "I'm an atheist." He has no use for what is called "Jewish culture," being "in discord with most hebraic philosophy." When asked regarding "his faith," "my friend straightened up—not in unconscious defiance—and there seemed to be a glow in his eyes when he replied; 'I'm a Jew.'"

Looking at persons calling themselves Jews as a whole, their existence implies the existence of Judaism, whatever its status may be. Yet there is a world of difference between Jews and Judaism. One refers to persons, the other to principles.

"Jews without souls would not be Jews," if referred to as persons, for I assume you hold that the soul is the life principle of man. Therefore, when the material soul leaves the body, he no longer trods the earth. If your dogma refers to religion, the spiritual soul (in the sense of belief), as I assume it does, kindly remember that the soul of Judaism is the Mosaic Law, the vital principles that classified Jews doctrinally as a distinctive religious division of society. Judaism proper, that is as it is set forth in the Old Testament, is organic. Some of its requirements, for instance, its dietary regulations, could be modified by priestly or Sanhedrin authority, when the Sanhedrin existed. But abrogation or repudiation of its primary requirements would virtually be repudiation of Law, insofar as it repudiates the Author of those requirements, who is God. The decalogue of those requirements I have found to be as follows: Belief in the Oneness of God; the coming of the Messiah; the Commandments; submission to the spiritual authority of the Aaronic priesthood; sacrifices of a public nature; circumcision; purifications; prayer; dietary regulations; and benevolences.

Considering that the God concept of Reform Jews has a tendency to veer towards the spiritual pantheism of Spinoza; that it denies belief in a personal Messiah, a priesthood and sacrifices; its soul, though sentimentally Mosaic, is devoid of the supernatural spirit and heavenly flame that gave the world a Moses, an Isaiah, a Job, a Tobias, a David, a Daniel, and a Mother of the Maccabees. "Jews" with such wishy-washy Judaic souls would still be Jews, but in name rather than in fact, when judged by the above enumerated decalogue of Mosaic requirements.

The Orthodox Jews, for whom I have a friendly sympathetic regard, despite their bitter hostility towards converts from the Synagogue to the Church, affirm those things that Reform Jews deny, as you well know. The Orthodox Jews bemoan the non-existence of the priesthood of Aaron, its form of worship, and the destruction of the Temple, and prayerfully look for the coming of the Messiah. Unfortu-



nately, they fail to realize that the holy Jewish and Christian principle of the resurrection of the body, in which they continue to believe, applies not to the Judaism of old, for which they yearn. They fail to appreciate the fact that that holy Judaism has passed from its caterpillar stage to which it will never return, for it was divinely metamorphosed into the butterfly stage nearly twenty centuries ago.

The eyes of both Reform and Orthodox Jews seem to be held, for they see not that the soul God implanted in the faith of their fathers of old is not in the Judaism of our day, because (with apology to Pope)—

The vital spark of Mosaic flame  
Quit, O quitted its Judaic frame.

Fortunately, Jews, in growing numbers, are coming to see that the death of Old Testament Judaism was a blessing, and not an affliction. Just as temporal death, of those who die in the Lord, means a new, a higher, an everlasting life, so does the demise of old Mosaic Judaism mean a new, a higher supernatural life here on earth and in the world to come. It portends the shining sun of the Messiah, the "horn of salvation for us in the house of David—, as He promised through the mouth of the holy ones, the prophets of old," of whom Zachary, the father of St. John the Baptist, told us in his "benedictus." Hence, converts from the Synagogue to the Church, quickened by the grace that comes to them through the holy waters of baptism, seeing that "Death (of Judaism, as well as physical death) is swallowed up in victory," exultingly cry out, "O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?" (*1 Cor. 15:55*.)

Sincerely in the Messiah  
D.... G.....

---

## 12. Soul of Judaism Living On

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

There is much more of import to be said than was covered in my second last letter regarding Rabbi Kaufman Kohler's flinging to the wind the loss of the Jewish priesthood, sacrifices and Temple, as if they were not vital to the life of Judaism. Therefore, I am writing to clinch the fact that Judaism minus the holy Mosaic triad of divine worship, that is assumed not to matter, is Judaism secularized, hence not of God as was the Judaism of our fathers of old in Israel.

I would refrain from dealing further with the statement of Rabbi Kohler were not his attitude, towards those things I hold to have been vital to all the great in Israel of old, quite common among the publicly known rabbis of our country. A review of the latest edition of the Union Prayer Book, issued by the Central Committee of American Rabbis (1940), enforces this fact, which is not as well known outside as inside present-day Jewry. It was written by Rabbi Beryl D. Cohon, of Temple Sinai, Brighton, Mass. He rightly insists that the changes in the Union Prayer Book leaves the "quality" of Reform Judaism entirely different than the "quality" of Orthodox Judaism. He emphatically insists that the introduction into the Prayer Book of more Hebrew than appeared in earlier editions; also the "Yizkor" (Orthodox memorial service), etc., "does not mean that the Union Prayer Book marks a return to Orthodoxy.—Orthodoxy and Reform (Judaism) do not differ merely in terms of more or less Hebrew, more or less custom, more or less tradition. *The differences are in content and quality, and not quantity*" (Empha-



sis mine). The difference in "quality" of these two Judaism is seen in what does not appear in this Prayer Book, which "reflects the collective mind of the Reform rabbinate." Let the Rabbi proceed—

"The present prayer book has not restored prayers for a personal Messiah, nor for the resurrection, nor for a miraculous revelation, nor for animal sacrifices in the Temple on Zion. There is no compromising with Orthodoxy" (*Jewish Advocate*, Boston, April 12th, 1940).

You will no doubt agree that the "holy wrath of the Orthodox," which the Rabbi says was aroused by the earlier editions of the Reform Prayer Book, would be aroused today, at the appearance of this latest edition, were not the minds and hearts of all divisions of Jews centered in counteracting the Nazi-inspired brutality, rather than in defending doctrinal differences. Hence the rabbis who believe in a personal Messiah, miracles, divine revelation, the resurrection of the body, sacrifices and the Temple, have refrained from declaring, as did the English rabbis when the earlier edition appeared, that it is "a great evil," "an abomination," "that must not be brought into a Jewish home."

If it does not matter to the modern rabbis that the priesthood, sacrifices and Temple are no more, it does matter much to the religious Orthodox division of Jewry. It also matters much to converts from the Synagogue to the Church, insofar as it is the basis for the belief that their non-existence is due to having been displaced by the priesthood and Sacrifice of the Messiah as predicted by Moses and the prophets of Israel. To such converts, it marks the difference between the darkness of present-day Judaism and the light that is the Messiah. The light of Jewry is unfortunately darkness, hence Reform rabbis dismiss the ending of the priesthood, sacrifices and Temple of old as of no import; while Orthodox rabbis appreciate the loss, but are blind to the cause. It has been truthfully said by the religious-minded author of "Guesses at Truth,"

"In darkness there is no choice. It is light that enables us to see the difference between things; and it is Christ who gives us the light."

"Oh, let it slide by, a fig we Reform rabbis care. We have the synagogue, the house of learning and prayer," is, in a word, what the Rabbi Kohler says. That is like saying (imagining the impossible, the non-existence of Catholic worship)—"What do we care if there have not been any cathedrals, priesthood or Sacrifice of the Mass for centuries, the soul of Catholicism lives on industrially in the Holy Name Societies." Synagogues were not basic to the Law, as were the Ark of the Covenant, the Tabernacle, the Holy of Holies in the Temple. Synagogues were instituted to teach the Law that Reform Judaism denies almost in its entirety; while Orthodox Judaism clings to its dead carcass. Synagogues, which meant places outside the Temple, where the Jews assembled for study and prayer, were not contemporaneous with Judaism in the earliest centuries of its existence. They date back to the Babylonian captivity, that is six hundred years before the Christian ages; nearly four centuries after the Temple of Solomon was built; about nineteen centuries after the Ohel Moed, the portable sanctuary, was used for prayer and sacrifices by the priests in the wilderness. The synagogues in the days when the Temple existed, were places of assembly for prayer and study of the Law that centered in a priesthood, sacrifices and Temple. Darkness, if not wilfulness, alone can account for failure to see that synagogues can no more be substituted for the Temple than reading desks can take the place of the central altar called for in the Torah.

Then, again, you do not seem to realize that Rabbis can no more take the place of the priests of Jewry than Sunday School teachers can take the place of priests in the Catholic Church. Rabbis are not ordained, like the priests were in Jewry. Joseph Leftwich, formerly editor of the Jewish Telegraph Agency says,



"There is no such thing as a centralized Jewish body, religious or secular. There is certainly no Jewish church, with a hierarchy, and a centralized rabbinate, and ecclesiastical or administrative government. Each congregation of ten Jews or more is autonomous, completely independent, and may elect its own Rabbi and arrange its own service. Judaism has only the Torah. The Rabbi is not a priest. The priesthood passed with the Temple. Even the Rabbinical diploma, unlike the Christian ordination, confers no sacred power and is not a license. It is simply a testimonial of ability of the holder to act as Rabbi if he wishes and is elected" (*"What Will Happen to the Jews," London, 1936, pp. 131-132*).

There is no such thing as the consecration or ordination of ministers, teachers of the law in Jewry, as that ceremony ceased with the ending of the Aaronic priesthood. Jacob Berab, the Talmudist, endeavored in 1520 A.D., "without success," to

"reintroduce the Semichah (laying on of hands) institution, for ordination had lapsed—and restoring the jurisdiction of the Synhedroin, in order to create one of the necessary conditions of the Messianic redemption" (*"Valentine's Jewish Encyclopedia," p. 84*).

Rabbi, which means master, was originally a title of respect given by pupils to their teachers, or to any one more learned than themselves. Priests, on the other hand, were ordained of God, not only to teach, but also to offer sacrifices for sins, etc., functions that could not and cannot be assumed by rabbis (*Levit. 4; 5; 6; 12; 13; Num. 5:14-15*).

While the rabbis of the leading synagogues of our country have been graduates of Hebrew seminaries, you know as well as I do, that most of the rabbis have assumed the title themselves or been given it by the groups of ten or more Jews over whom they have officiated, as "no one can effectively deny them the title rabbi," as the American Jewish Committee says, in the "U. S. Report of Religious Bodies." That is why time and time again the discussion has gone on in the

Jewish press as to "Who is a Rabbi?" especially during "prohibition days," when "boot-leg Rabbis" made their appearance. Adolph Kraus, in his retiring address as president of the B'nai B'rith, said—

"As the right to expound the Jewish law has been assumed by schochets (slaughterers of ritually pure meats) who are called rabbis, for any congregation, no matter how small, any one of its members may be elected as a Rabbi. Under such circumstances is it any wonder that a 'Rabbi,' so-called can be found who will be very liberal in issuing certificates for "sacramental wine" (*B'nai B'rith Magazine, May, 1925*).

The declaration of Rabbi Kaufman Kohler, that the "soul of Judaism lived on indestructibly in the House of Prayer and Learning," may sound pleasing to the ears of Jews, but it lacks religious sense, as the Mosaic "soul of Judaism" died with the death of its priesthood, sacrifices and Temple. Jews, not the Judaism of Moses the Law-giver, lived on, many of them, especially among the Orthodox, having been God-fearing men and women. I have had to limit this last statement to the Orthodox Jews, as the spiritual life of Reform Jews is at a low ebb. This is vouched for by many Reform Jews, three of whom I will quote, though your Orthodox friends need no evidence to prove this point. Dr. Louis I. Newman, author, one of the leading New York Reform rabbis, asks,

"Do modern synagogues give to Jews a sense of 'holiness'? Most of them do not.—Though Jews have a reputation for being a people of prayer, and though they have through their poets created the Psalms, the modern Jew is looking for a religious emotionalism of which he is incapable. A prominent clothing manufacturer—very generous in his charities and very sympathetic as a human being—remarked that the synagogue 'bored him'; the rabbis could not interest him—" (*July 19, 1940*).

Alfred Segal, Cincinnati, the able Jewish columnist, said, in his "Plain Talk," after having been one of the eight who



paraded through the synagogue with the scroll of the Law,

"You, I mused, have written about the imminent death of Orthodoxy, but today you seem like a pall-bearer of Reform and a hired pall-bearer at that . . . A stooge! . . . Consider: Which is the more vital . . . Orthodoxy or Reform?"

"And Reform rabbis are conscientious doctors doing their best to make the blood flow again in the hardened arteries of Reform Judaism. Oh, there are plenty of temples, plenty of rabbis, plenty of dues-paying members, plenty of everything but life in the stiffening bones" ("*Am. Israelite*," *Cinn.*, Oct 22, 1936).

Rabbi S. H. Markowitz, Ph.D., of Fort Wayne, Ind., said in a lengthy article telling of his seminary days, in the Hebrew Union College, Cinn., when "we rebelled against tradition"; when "we sophisticated intellectuals, product of the pragmatic age, snickered," at some of the ancient practices. Reform Judaism, said he, is "a lovely theory, but it just doesn't work out in practice,"

"Reform Jews simply threw overboard all traditions, all ceremonies and institutions. And with what results? Our people are bereft of religion. Those practices by means of which our people manifested and gave expression to their religious idealism were cast aside. Reform Jews became religionless.

"Some of our people seized upon Gentile good will as their religion; others made patriotism their supreme emotion." "We have loud Jews, we have aggressive Jews, we have servile, submissive Jews, we have Jews who are blatant and Jews who are cringing. We have Jews who are afraid of any gesture that the non-Jewish world might make. Anti-Semitism is their religion. It is a far greater concern to them than Judaism" ("*Indiana Jewish Chronicle*," April, 1938).

Jews do live on indestructibly, despite the persecutions they undergo. They seem providentially destined to keep up their existence as a distinctive group in human society, as St.

Paul foretold nineteen hundred years ago in his Epistle to the Romans (10; 11). They live on as witnesses of the Old Law fulfilled in the New Law. They seem destined to live on until the end of time, when the veil over their hearts will, by God's grace, be lifted; when the remaining remnant of them will see, what converts from the Synagogue to the Church have seen since the days of the Apostles, Jesus as their Messiah; and in the priesthood and Sacrifice He instituted the full-blossoming of the faith of their fathers of old in Israel.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....

---

### 13. Judaism Before Moses

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

Your command will be obeyed. My reply to your query will be "short and to the point." My agreement with you makes that possible, as "Jewish religious history did not begin with priests and sacrifices at a central altar," etc., as you say. Judaism began with Moses; Israel began with Abraham.

About four hundred years before the world heard of the sacrifices recorded in the Torah, God made a covenant for the Jews with Abram, who, through his son Isaac, followed by his son Jacob (father of the twelve tribes of Israel), became the patriarchal ancestor of the Jews. God changed Abram's name to Abraham (raham, in Arabic, being a vast number), signifying him to be the "father of the multitude." God commanded circumcision of Abraham as a token of the covenant (*Gen. 15; 16; 17*).



The Law, which includes the Commandments, the Aaronic priesthood and sacrifices, came from God through Moses. Moses is the Law-giver, the founder of the Jewish religion; the inspired writer of the Torah which all Jews were morally obligated by God to obey. The Commandments you can, and I assume do, obey; but Jewish worship of God, as God commanded in the Torah, is a thing impossible to obey, being of the long gone past. God has not ceased to demand worship through sacrifice at the altar. Then where can such sacrifice be offered? In one place only, in the Church of the Messiah, through the Sacrifice He commanded to be offered in remembrance of Him. That's to the point.

Sincerely in the Messiah  
D.... G.....

---

#### 14. *Judaism and Dogmas*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

The poetic spirit of Emerson, rather than the exact intellectual mentality of Moses, must have guided your pen during the visit to California you so graphically described. Or was it the balmy atmosphere of the City of the Angels that caused you to relax into saying one thing, while presenting me with evidence to prove the contrary?

You must be one of those souls in the mind of the author of "Self-Reliance" when he said—

"With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do.—  
Speak what you think today in words as hard as cannon

balls, and tomorrow speak what tomorrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict everything you said today."

If that be not so, then how account for quoting Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner of Cleveland, as saying, that

"By the Messiah, Judaism means not a person, but a time of peace, brotherhood and righteousness" (*National Message of Israel Broadcast*)?

while enclosing with it a marked page of the "B'nai B'rith Messenger" (*Los Angeles, Jan. 16th, 1942, p. 6*) for my enlightenment, containing "Maimonides' Articles of Faith—which were accepted by Israel as binding on every Jew, and were thus embodied in the daily prayer book?" Maimonides' Article No. 12 says—

"I believe with perfect faith in the coming of the Messiah," a person.

Such contradictoriness seems to be a Judaic affliction, when religion is the subject being considered; for when dealing with economics, law, etc., Jews are consistent. If that be not so, how account for the B'nai B'rith Messenger saying that "Judaism is neither frozen dogmas nor static religion. It is simply a body of spiritual truths?" Is Judaism really without dogmas? that is positive, declared beliefs "spiritual truths," to which Jews are religiously obligated to adhere? All kinds of synagogued Jews of all nationalities declare that Judaism, as a religion, demands expressed belief in the Sh'ma, "Hear O Israel, the Lord thy God, the Lord is One." Is that not a dogma? Is it not an unchangeable dogma, which, in the words of the B'nai B'rith Messenger, is "frozen," being "static"? Is it not a Jewish "spiritual truth" dogmatically set forth?

If Judaism is entirely devoid of "frozen dogmas, static religion," then why does the marked article you sent me contain "Maimonides 13 Articles of Faith"? Are they not Jewish "spiritual truths," "static" principles, dogmatically declared, and "embodied (as such) in the daily prayer book," as your



Jewish paper says? All the Brickner rabbis in the world today dwarf into intellectual insignificance when compared to Maimonides, the "Jewish Aristotle" of the thirteenth century, who dogmatically asserts in his 12th Article—

"I believe with perfect faith  
in the coming of the Messiah."

The term "Messiah" is used by Maimonides as a personal noun, as it was used by our ancient fathers in Israel. It referred to the Anointed One, whom Hannah said would be exalted (*1 K.—1 Sam.—2:10*), and not merely to a time of peace and plenty. The Messiah was expected by the Jews of old to usher in the Messianic Age when He came; the age of "peace, brotherhood and righteousness" for those persons who would use the instrumental means of His making to that end.

The mistake of those Jews who rejected Jesus as their Messiah, when He was among them in Palestine; the mistake of the Jews of today who "believe—in the coming of the Messiah," is that their hearts were and are centered on a worldly instead of a spiritual Messiah, a King who would bend the Caesars to their Hebraic will. The Messiah prophesied to come came in the time, place and manner that the prophets of Israel foretold. His name is Jesus. He laid down the principles, set forth the practices, lived the life, and instituted the means that alone would have brought "peace, brotherhood and righteousness" into being twenty centuries ago, would bring it into existence today, or in the future, were man to will to obey the will of Jesus the Messiah. Just as God's love can only be properly appreciated and enjoyed by man when he loves God and keeps His commandments; so does the realization of the joy of the promised Messianic peace depend upon man. Man's power to obey or disobey the God who made him, or the Son of God who redeemed him, was never expected to be taken from him by the Messiah. The Messiah was never expected by the prophets of Israel, to take man by the nape of the neck and force him into an earthly paradise

where "peace, brotherhood and righteousness" would reign until the end of time.

The evidence to show that the hope of Israel centered in a personal Messiah will be presented to you in my next letter, I hope to your satisfaction.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....

---

### 15. *Israel and a Personal Messiah*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

My task today is to present you with some evidence and arguments to prove that the hope of Israel centered in the coming of a personal Messiah, as it does among the Orthodox Jews of today.

There was a time, not very many centuries ago, when such a task was unnecessary. Everybody believed that the line of demarkation between rabbis and priests was that rabbis prayed for the promised personal Messiah to come, whereas priests prayed to Him as having come in the person of Jesus twenty centuries ago, believing Him to be at the right hand of His Father, whose mission He carried out among the children of Israel in Palestine. But that clearcut dividing line is no more, having been obscured by America's most popular rabbis, who declare that "by the Messiah Jews do not mean a person." Therefore no petitions for the Messiah to come are printed in the prayerbooks of "Liberal," Reform synagogues.

Belief in a personal Messiah is so plainly set forth in the



biblical and traditional writings of Jewry, that Rabbi Solomon Schecter, formerly president of the Jewish Theological Seminary (whom I referred to in one of my letters), dismissed such "moderns" with the remark, that "it is unscientific and needs no refutation of those who are acquainted with the literature of Judaism." Those Reform rabbis do not lack acquaintance with Jewish literature on the question of a Messiah. They are intellectually afflicted with a debunking spirit, which causes them to read out of Jewish literature the age-old Hebraic belief in a personal Messiah, revelation, miracles, resurrection of the body, yes, even the divine character of Holy Writ. The trouble with these "Reform Jews" is, as Louis Minsky, editor of the Jewish Religious News Service, said they had been told, that they "were more concerned with being liberal than with being religious" (*"Commonweal,"* Dec. 31, 1930).

The question of a personal Messiah is of religious import, as in it centers all that is basically both Jewish and Christian in principle, worship and hope. It is second only in import to their belief in the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in fact it is part of that belief. If the Messiah be not a person, then have the truly great, both in Jewry and Christianity, been grossly deluded.

An amazing reason for the rejection of belief in a personal Messiah is given in "The Jew and His Religion: A Guide for Confirmation and High School Classes," written by Rabbi Leon Fener of Cleveland, and Rabbi B. Benedict Glaser of Pittsburgh. It is that the task of ushering in the Messianic Age is too big for one man. Let the Rabbis tell it—

"Our people used to believe that the Messianic Age would be ushered in suddenly, with the coming of a Messiah in the person of a descendant of the ancient house of David. We have been forced to revise the idea. The world is too vast, humanity so large and the problems of modern life so many and so complicated that it is impossible for one man to accomplish so tremendous a task during the course of a single lifetime" (*N. Y., 1931, p. 128*).

This modern rabbinical assumption, that has long been instilled into the minds of those Jewish youths who go to modern American Rabbis for instruction, makes one wonder, to paraphrase the words of Cassius, upon what meat these rabbis feed, that they think themselves clothed with authority to revise the promise of God expressed through Moses and the prophets? Why, they do certainly bestride the part of the religious world in which they function like a Colossus.

If such rabbinical views be your view, my dear Mr. Isaacs, and they must be if your Judaism is of the Reform variety, then would you have to reject them, by becoming Orthodox in your Messianic concept, before any priest would hold you intellectually competent to be regenerated through the holy waters of baptism. For keep this fact in mind, which I am continually calling to your attention, that no Jew who denies the basic teachings of his fathers of old in Israel can become a Catholic. And one of those teachings is that the Messiah is a person. Is God's world too big and complicated for God to deal with its many problems of life through the leadership of His Messianic Agent? Not if He is what David and Isaiah said He would be, and what the Catholic Church believes Him to be, the Only Begotten Son of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Jesus, the Messiah, did not think it too big a job to undertake, for He is the "Emmanuel, the God with us," "God the mighty," whom Isaiah foretold to come (7:14; 9:6).

He came out of one of the most obscure cities in the world; carried on a public mission within territorial limits that did not exceed the size of the State of Delaware, for a period of only thirty-six months, during which time He revolutionized the whole wide world of His day, our day, and all the days to come. During these three dozen months, He, the Messiah, outlined principles, set the example, and instituted the means, that alone can solve the grave individual, domestic, economic, social, and international problems of humanity in our extensive, complicated, wicked world. The non-existence of peace, righteousness and plenty in the Messianic Age, Jesus, the



Prince of Peace, inaugurated, is no more the fault of this One Man than is God to blame for the wars going on in the hearts, homes, industrial, commercial and financial relations of man, and between nations.

The Messiah came. He is the "Prophet" Moses said God would "raise up" whom "you" shall hear (*Deut. 18:15*). He said that "without Me you can do nothing," that is nothing of permanent value to solve the problems of life; nothing to gain salvation. God made man; God gave man dominion over the whole of creation, and endowed man with the power to properly use, or to abuse the use of the forces and substances of nature. God gave man the standards to follow in his relationship with Him and his fellowman, through Moses, and then more perfectly through the Messiah, the Mighty Man of men. Hence, if the peace of the Messiah does not obtain in the hearts of men, it is not due to the task being too great for a personal Messiah to accomplish. Rather is it due to wilful disregard of the will of that One Man, the Son of God.

The proof that the Messiah promised to Israel was to be a person is so numerous in Holy Writ that only some of the main texts can be presented in this letter. Immediately after the fall of man, due to the sin of our first parents, God promised, as Moses tells us, that the "seed" of a woman, not a man, would crush the head of the serpent. That woman was the Second Eve, the Lily of Israel, who brought forth the Second Adam, the Messiah, a person (*Gen. 3:15*). Then came the promise to Abraham (*Gen. 22:18*), that through his descendants all nations would be blessed. He was called "The desired of all nations" by Aggeus (*2:8*). Isaiah referred to Him when he said, "There shall come forth a rod (a particular line of family descent) out of the root of Jesse (father of David, *11:1*)." Zacharius (*9:9*) cried out to Israel—"O daughter of Jerusalem. Behold thy king will come to thee, the just and saviour; he is poor and riding on an ass." Surely it must have been a person and not an era that was to ride upon an animal. It was Jesus, riding into Jerusalem on an ass: "Hosanna to

the Son of David. Blessed is He who cometh in the name of the Lord" (*St. Matt. 21:9*).

The description of this personal Messiah in the Old Testament fits Jesus so truly, that only pride, ignorance or wilful blindness can account for not accepting Him as the High Priest (*Ps. 109*) of the Jews; their Prophet (*Deut. 2:15*); and the Prince of Peace (*Is. 9*).

Jesus was born in the house of David, of the tribe of Judah, as foretold in *Genesis 49*.

Jesus was born in Bethlehem, under the star of Jacob, after the sceptre, the political independence of Judah, was taken away, as foretold in *Michaels 5:2; Numbers 24:17; Genesis 49:10*.

Jesus was born of a virgin mother, as foretold by *Isaiah 7:14*.

Jesus was born in the time foretold by Daniel, nearly five centuries before His mother brought Him forth in the City of David (*Dan. 9:24-26*).

Jesus was called "God the Mighty," the "Prince of Peace," was adored by kings, as foretold in *Isaiah (9:6)*.

Jesus was conspired against; betrayed, sold for thirty pieces of silver; led like a sheep to slaughter; suffered His hands and feet to be pierced; and withal arose from the dead, as foretold in *Psalm 40:10; Zacharias 11; 12-13; Isaiah 53:7; Psalm 21; and Isaiah 11:10*. All of these Messianic prophecies refer to a person and not an era.

While nearly all of the Jews rejected Jesus as the Messiah, they never lost sight of the fact that He was to be a person, until the Made-in-Germany brand of Judaism entered the Judaic world. The expectation of a personal Messiah was more prominently in the minds and hearts of Jews during times of affliction than during days of peace.

The length of this letter compels me to wait until next week before taking up the subject from the standpoint of Jesus designating Himself as the Messiah.

Sincerely in the Messiah  
D.... G.....



## 16. True and False Messiahs

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

It is simply amazing for descendants of Abraham to claim to be Jews, in the religious sense of the term, while dogmatically asserting that the Messiah is not a person. Yet that absurd claim is made by the most prominent rabbis in America. Surely they will not deny that Jesus was a person, even if they refuse to acknowledge Him to be the Messiah. Speaking of Himself, this is what Jesus said to the Jews—

“You search the scriptures, because in them you think you have life everlasting. And it is they that bear witness of Me, yet you are not willing to come to Me that you may have life” (*St. John 5:39*).

Jesus, claiming to be the Messiah sent by God, quoted Isaiah 61, while in the Synagogue at Nazareth, saying,

“The Lord—hath anointed Me to preach the gospel . . . to heal the contrite of heart.” “Today this scripture is fulfilled in your hearing.”

Jesus talked to the Samaritan woman at the well, who said—

“I know that the Messiah is coming, and when He comes He will tell all things.” Jesus replied, “I who speak with thee am He” (*St. John 4:26*).

While on the road to Emmaus with His disciples, who failed to recognize Jesus as the Risen Messiah, *St. Luke* says—

“Beginning then with Moses and with all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the scriptures, the things referring to Him,” as the Messiah. (*24:27*).

Professor Joseph Klausner, of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, in repudiating some rabbis who held that it was the followers of Jesus, and not Jesus Himself, Who declared, after His crucifixion, that Jesus is the Messiah, said—

“A theory has been put forward that Jesus never regarded Himself as the Messiah and only after His death was He acclaimed as Messiah by His disciples. But had this been true it would never have occurred to His disciples (simple-minded Jews) that one who had suffered crucifixion (‘a curse of God is he that is hanged’) could be the Messiah; and the messianic idea meant nothing whatever to Gentile converts. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*: when we see that Jesus messianic claims became fundamental principles of Christianity soon after His crucifixion this is standing proof that even in His lifetime Jesus regarded Himself as the Messiah” (*“Jesus of Nazareth,” N. Y., 1929, p. 255*).

These four quotations, sustained by the declaration of a Jewish professor, the first Jewish writer of a book in Hebrew on the life of Jesus, ought to make you realize how distorted is the interpretation of Moses and the prophets by the Reform Rabbis, who deny that the Messiah is a person; and the Orthodox Rabbis, who reject Jesus as the Messiah foretold in Holy Scripture. Jesus reprimands them today, as He did the Jews in Jerusalem—

“If you believed Moses you would believe Me also, for he wrote of Me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe My words” (*St. John 5:46-47*).

If the Messiah expected to come be not a person, then how do you account for the Jews rallying to the call of about twenty false Messiahs, who have appeared in Jewry since the completion of the Messianic mission of Jesus? Jesus foretold that the Jews who rejected Him would follow a pretender when he made his appearance, viz.—

“I have come in the name of My Father, and you do not receive Me. If another come in his ‘own name, him you will receive’ ” (*St. John 5:43-44*).



The "first false Messiah of prominence in Jewish history (after the coming of Jesus) was Bar Cochba" ("*Vallentine's Jewish Encyclopedia*," p. 242), who "claimed to be divinely appointed redeemer of Israel." He was supported by almost the whole of Jewry. Foremost among those supporters was "Akiba Ben Joseph, the great Palestinian Tanna (authority on the oral law), founder of the rabbinical system; organizer of the material in the Mishnah (the digest of Jewish ritual jurisprudence, which forms the text upon which the Talmud comments); who is responsible for the canon of the Old Testament" "He accepted Bar Cochba as the Messiah." ("*Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge*," p. 21).

Instead of following the true Messiah, the most prominent persons in Jewry followed this pretender, Bar Cochba (whose name means "Son of the Star," real name Simeon, afterwards called Bar Kozeba, which means "Son of Lies"), with the result that battles ensued, lasting for nearly four years (131-135 A.D.), in which 580,000 Jews are said to have been killed, and hundreds of thousands of other misled unfortunates perished through sickness, starvation, etc. Besides, Jerusalem was razed to the ground, as Daniel predicted would happen in the very text wherein the Jews were told of the coming of the true Messiah, who would be slain. (*Dan. 9:26*).

False calculators, as well as false Messiahs, presented themselves by the dozens since the Jews were dispersed by Titus. They afflicted the Jews, as William Miller, the father of the Adventist Church, afflicted those dupes who sold their property, and hysterically prayed on mountain tops, while awaiting his falsely calculated second coming of the Messiah. At least there was some truth in the prediction of William Miller, in that there is to be a second coming of the Lord. But there never will be a first coming of the Messiah, as the first coming of Him took place in Bethlehem in the year One of the present calendar.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver told of these false Messiahs in "The Messianic Speculation in Israel," a thesis written for his doctorate in the Union Hebrew College. He tells of—

"All the ingenuity of a rabbinic method in hermeneutics and homiletics was therefore brought into play and words, phrases and letters, vowels, accents and tropes, and all the mystic science of letter and numeral were marshalled into service" to prove that the Messiah would come on this, that, and the other date.

Such calculations offended Maimonides, who said in his Comment on the Sanhedrin—

"It is a fundamental dogma to believe in the coming of the Messiah; even if he is delayed long, wait for him. But no one should attempt to fix the time, nor find Biblical texts to deduce the time of his coming."

It is a pitiable thing for thousands of persons to be praying in the synagogues of the Orthodox Jews, and at the Wailing Wall, for the coming of the Messiah, who has already come. It is an offense to them, and to Christians as well, to be told, by persons who claim to be Jews, that the Messiah is not a person. Also to declare, as does the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, now in the making, that the hope for a Messiah, on the part of our fathers in Israel of old, arose with the loss of the kingship of the Jewish nation, when the promise, and the hope, of the Messiah dates back to the fall of our first parents.

The hearts of all true Christians are sympathetically with the Jews of today in their affliction, who are crying out, as did Ephraim ben Jacob of Bon, the thirteenth century Talmudist and liturgical poet,

"And I, how long shall I hope for Redemption at the hands of the son of David and the prophet Elijah?"

The answer is, until you recognize Him in Jesus of Nazareth, and submit to His will.

These substantial facts ought to convince you, Mr. Isaacs, that the hope of Israel centered in a personal Messiah, and that He came in the person of Jesus. If they do not convince you, then in the class of the unconvincibles you belong. Yet I will continue to write. Perhaps my next letter will convince



your Orthodox friends, who believe in a personal Messiah, that such a thing as the coming of a Messiah from the house of David, and the reinstatement of an Aaronic priesthood in the future, is an impossibility.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D. . . . G. . . . .



### 17. *Genealogical Status of Jews*

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

I ardently hope my last two letters convinced you that belief in a Messianic kingdom, or era, minus a personal Messiah, has no warrant in the Judaism of the Old Testament, or the traditions of ancient Israel.

I purpose today to fulfill my promise to prove the impossibility of ever reinstating an Aaronic priesthood, or of a future Messiah being born in the House of David. In so doing, I am addressing your Orthodox friends rather than you. That is because your Reform Judaism must be dropped out of consideration at present, as it expresses no desire for an Aaronic priesthood; and its concept of a Messianic age, minus a personal Messiah, is like looking forward to a wedding minus a bridegroom.

The Orthodox Jews, true to historic Judaism, believe the Messiah to be a person. Though the Messiah prayed for "tarries," as they say, they pray daily for Him to come from the house of David, for their Talmud tells them, that "all the prophets prophesied only until the days of the Messiah"

(*Berachdoth*, 34 b). These Orthodox Jews also pray for the "Lord our God to restore the priests (of Aaron) to their service and the Levites to their song and psalmody."

Your Orthodox friends believe, and I assume you also, that if there are no houses of Aaron and David existent, there is no possibility of reinstating the priesthood of ancient Israel; nor of a Messiah being born of the family of David, as the "prophets prophesied."

To begin with, it may be positively declared, that there are no known Jews in the world today who can begin the story of their lives, as Flavius Josephus began his life story, by saying—

"I will set down my progenitors in order," I have descended all along from priests of "the first of the twenty four courses."

"I have set down the genealogy of my family, as I have found it described in the public records."

Here Josephus gives us an eminent historic example of the care with which Jews, especially the priests, kept their pedigrees, safeguarding them in "public records." This was necessary to protect the purity of descent of the Aaronic priests; and the Davidic ancestral hope of being the mother of the Messiah. "The Jewish Encyclopedia" says—

"The very division of Israel into 'houses' presupposes the existence among them of well-authenticated genealogies" (*Vol. v, p. 597*).

"The Jewish Encyclopedia" proceeds,

"The genealogies (of priests) were scrupulously kept and, when necessary, they were minutely investigated.—A special officer seems to have been entrusted with these records, and a court of inquiry is mentioned as having been instituted in Jerusalem."

"A priest was bound to demonstrate the (Aaronic) purity of the priestly maiden he desired to marry, even as far back as her great-great-grandfather and great-great-grandmother" (*Vol. v, p. 587*).



These genealogical records seem to have been kept in the Temple in Jerusalem. The destruction of these records began when Herod desired to hide his origin; and those that remained entirely disappeared with the destruction of the Temple in the year 70 A.D. The Jewish Encyclopedia says, that "the loss of official genealogies was deeply deplored as a calamity—" for many reasons (*Vol. v, p. 597*). The dispersion of the Jews, after the rebellion of the spurious Messiah, Bar Cochba, the end having come to the priesthood and sacrifices, entirely obliterated the distinctive connection of Jews with the priestly and kingly houses of the tribes of Levi and Judah.

There are Cohens (Hebrew Kahan, which literally means, one dedicated to the altar, priest) who are given special honors in synagogues today, as claimants of male descent from Aaron. There are so many of them, that a stock joke in Jewry, which you no doubt have heard, is that if you want to know how many Jews there are in the city, find out how many Cohens are listed in the directory, and figure accordingly.

These Cohens have a sentimental, but not any known genealogical connection with the family of Aaron. The Jewish Encyclopedia says that the claim of this large contingent of Cohens "is a matter of dispute" (*Vol. 4, p. 144*). Again, under the headline "Pedigree," this statement is made—

"Jews have always carefully recorded their genealogies, but owing to their wide and frequent dispersions, very few can trace their descent further back than a couple of hundred years. All persons by the name of Cohen claim descent from Aaron the high priest, but no attempt has even been made by any Cohen actually to trace his descent through well-authenticated sources" (*Vol. 9, p. 577*).

While these Jews, whose family names are Cohen, Kahn, Cahanowitsch, and a dozen other derivatives of the Hebrew priestly name Kahan, bear witness of the once existing priesthood in Jewry, their lack of genealogical evidence enables none of them to meet the requirements of purity of descent that the Torah calls for. This being so, the 1941 Hebraic authority, the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, takes a sort of

a "I should worry" attitude towards the ending of the Aaronic blood line, as the "aristocracy of the intellect" has taken its place. Let's quote—

"After the Second Temple was destroyed and the priesthood lost its paramount position, however, there was a complete decline of interest in genealogy. The aristocracy of the blood was replaced by the aristocracy of the intellect" (*Vol. 4, p. 526, N. Y. C.*).

Indeed, it was quite natural that Jewish interest in genealogy should decline when the Aaronic priesthood was no more; for the priesthood ended with Samuel B. Phineas (A.D. 68) holding the office of High Priest, who was not of "Aaronic lineage," having obtained office by "political intrigue, being in no way worthy of the office," as the "Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge" informs us (*p. 426*). It is a far stretch of wishful imagination that prompts the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia to assume that God's priesthood in Jewry can be "replaced" by an "aristocracy of the intellect," for instance, America's popular Rabbis. If such an "aristocracy" were to be of a Maimonides-Spinoza-Einsteinian intellectual order, it could never take the place of an Aaronic blood aristocracy of God's selection, which was divinely authorized to render religious sacrificial service such as all the Rabbis in the world today, individually or collectively, cannot render.

The non-existence of genealogical records, etc., not only eliminates the claim of the Cohens that they are of Aaronic priestly stock; but it also throws out of court any claim of Jews that they are of Davidic kingly stock. Jewish claims of blood relationship with David have been very few, save among the false Messiahs, when compared with the Cohens who claim to have priestly blood coursing through their arteries. That may be partly due to the name David (beloved) not signifying Messiah, whereas the name Cohen signifies priest. Yet the same evidence and arguments I have presented, regarding the missing genealogical records, apply to Jews who may claim to be of the house of David. All that I have said



goes to show that Israel was divided into houses, descendants of distinctive families, those of Aaron and David being foremost; that the Judaic worship centered in sacrifices offered to God through priests, and that its hope centered in the coming of a personal Messiah.

Looked at negatively, one must conclude from the non-existence of these families, that if no priesthood has displaced the Aaronic priests, then has God left man without any priestly guidance; and if Jesus is not the Messiah, then is there no hope whatsoever of a Messiah coming from the house of David in the future. Then are the Reform Jews logical in eliminating from their books the Orthodox Jewish prayers for the coming of the Messiah, and the reinstatement of a priesthood, sacrifices and Temple. If Jesus be not the Messiah, why expect the unrealizable? Then may the Reform synagogues, the Unitarian, Adventist, Holy Roller, and every other religious group claim to speak with equal authority, as no church would be able to claim to be God-instituted, as did the Church of our fathers of old in Israel. The logic of such an unsound premise would warrant substituting the "Origin of Species" for the Bible as man's authority as to his origin and destiny. An absurd result of an absurd notion.

I submit, it were well for Jews to ponder the question whether the disappearance of the priestly and kingly houses, of the tribes of Levi and Judah, is merely accidental or providential. Again, was it merely accidental that the priestly and Messianic houses of Aaron and David were preserved, that they were not among the houses that disappeared, until after Jesus was born and the Temple destroyed? If so, then must you be prone to disbelieve that there is a Divinity that shapes things of spiritual import to His designs, things that God told man of through the prophets in Israel. Longfellow knew better. He said that "It is a thing fundamental, that with God nothing is accidental."

Catholics believe, and with good reason, that the end of the Aaronic priesthood meant that the priesthood foretold, "according to the order of Melchisedec" (*Ps. 109*), had taken

its place; partly in order to fulfill God's promise made through the Jewish prophet Malachi, that a "clean oblation" would take the place of the bloody oblation offered in the Temple; that it would be offered to God in all parts of the world, instead of a central place; and that the Gentiles would share in it, instead of being a sacrifice for Jews only.

Catholics hold the genealogy of the house of David to be of great spiritual import, as Jesus, the Messiah, came from that house, seventy years before the records were destroyed. Therefore, when the Catholic Church made the Christian Bible, she gave the Book of St. Matthew first place in her New Testament. That Gospel was written by a convert from Judaism for Jews, in the language of Jews, primarily to prove that Jesus is the Messiah. The Book begins with a prelude, announcing that this "is the Book of the origin of Jesus Christ, the son of David." Then comes the rise of God's chosen children in Abraham, through forty generations, including "David the king," ending with "Joseph, the husband of Mary, and of her was born Jesus who is called Messiah."

This letter is further evidence that converts from the Synagogue to the Church do not deny the faith of their fathers of old in Israel, a faith that exists no more. What they do is to pass, as would the prophets of Israel were they in the world today, from the seed of Judaism, planted in Old Testament inspired writings, to the faith of Israel full-grown in the inspired writings of the New Testament.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....







"THE BOOK OF THE ORIGIN OF JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF DAVID."

It is certainly in order to ask, "What evidence is there to prove that Jesus came from the house of David?" The same question came to my mind at one time, knowing that the prophets of Israel declared that the Messiah had to be born in the house of David. The Christian claim that Jesus is the Son of David, recorded on the first and the last pages of the New Testament, and on many pages between them, impressed me favorably after discovering that the claim had not been questioned until the fourth century of the Christian era. It was then that the bitter hostility towards Jesus on the part of the Roman Emperor Julian, who had apostasized from Christianity to Paganism, prompted, not only his denial that Jesus was the Son of David, but also his attempt to set at naught the prophesy of Jesus that the Temple would be destroyed, by attempting to rebuild it. His work was frustrated by the miraculous burst of flames that destroyed the foundation that had been built.

Tradition, including the writings of St. Ignatius of Antioch (67-107 A.D.), St. Justin (103-167 A.D.) and other fathers of the church, attests to an unbroken record of claims that Jesus is the Son of David. In the Dialogue of St. Justin, the great Christian apologist, with Tryphon, one of the leading authorities on the oral law of the Jews, contains strong evidence, though of a negative character. Therein, St. Justin speaks of Mary, mother of Jesus, as "of the race of David" (12:1). This was not questioned by Tryphon, who denied that Jesus is the Messiah.

The positive, and most convincing evidence, that Jesus came from the house of David, is in the New Testament, which would have been questioned by the Jews of the first century, who were keen and skeptical, if it were not true. Here are some texts, which cannot be reasonably questioned. Zachary, in his canticle, thanks the God of Israel for having "raised up a horn (symbol of power and strength) of salvation for us in the house of David" (St. Luke 1:68-69). St. Luke

tells of Joseph going "to the town of David, which is Bethlehem—because he was of the house and family of David—to register, together with Mary his espoused wife, who was with child," Jesus (2:1-4). St. Paul told Timothy to "Remember that Jesus Christ—was descended from David" (2 Tim. 2:8).

In the Acts of the Apostles, we read that "God according to the promise brought Israel a Saviour, Jesus, from the offspring of David" (13:23-24).

St. John exclaims, "Behold the lion (symbol of the house of David) of the tribe of Judah, the root of David" (Apoc. 5:5).

The Canaanite women (St. Matt. 15:22); the blind men (St. Matt. 9:27-28) cried out "Jesus Son of David"; "have pity on us Son of David."

All four Evangelists record the great multitude of Jews who joyously hailed Jesus as the "Son of David," as He drove through the streets of Jerusalem, the royal city of Jewry, with these Messianic words:

Hosanna to the Son of David!

Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord!

Hosanna in the highest! (St. Matt. 21:9.)

The acceptance of this royal greeting on the part of Jesus is evidence that He considered Himself to be the Son of David. When questioning the Pharisees, Jesus laid claim to being the "Lord" David called "my Lord," his Son (St. Matt. 22:41-44).

The claim that He is of David was revealed by Jesus to St. John in these words:

"I, Jesus, have sent my angel to testify to you—I am the root and offspring of David" (Apoc. 22:16).

If this evidence does not convince you that Jesus is the Son of David, then are you left to continue in that spiritual darkness that denies belief in a personal Messiah. Then has God made a promise that has not been fulfilled, and that cannot be fulfilled, as no house of David exists in which a Messiah can be born. As for your Orthodox friends, this evidence proves that they must either accept Jesus as the Messianic



Son of David, or like the child running after the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, keep on looking for the impossible, the coming of the Son of David from a non-existing house of David.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....

---

### 19. Do Jews Proselytize?

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

I am in agreement with you, "Opposition to Judaism will never convince a Jew that he should become a Christian." Especially so, when the opposition is bad-spirited, based, as much opposition is, upon unwarranted charges, such as the "blood ritual," the Protocols of the Elders of Zion etc. It naturally arouses resentment, and closes the Jewish mind to arguments favorable to Christianity, however sound they may be. Jews can no more be brow-beaten into hailing Jesus as their Messiah, than they can be brow-beaten into sincerely Heil-Hitlering Hitler in Nazi controlled territory.

I do not think your Orthodox friends suggested your declaration, for they know I have not been attacking the Judaism of our forefathers in Israel. While history compelled me to declare that your brand of Judaism came from Germany, instead of Sinai, and therefore is not Jewish in principle, judged from the standpoint of the Old Testament, my pen was not guided by bitterness of spirit, as bitterness towards my fellow-man, thanks be to God, is not one of the many weaknesses in

my makeup. I am conscious of the fact that "he who hates his brother is in darkness," and therefore lacks the light that love generates, as St. John, the Jew who became the Apostle closest to the heart of the Messiah, said in his first Epistle.

My contention has been that knowledge and love of Judaism of old are the basis for a sound understanding and appreciation of things Catholic. Surely that is favoring, and not opposing Judaism. No Catholic can rightly hate the Judaism from which his religion originated, any more than he can hate the seed from which he came into being.

Your comeback to my last letter, I cannot say answer thereto, is so far removed from what I said that it is not even of secondary import. While I will digress from the issue discussed to answer your protest against "trying to convert Jews to Catholicism," and the assertion that "Jews never proselytize," please do not let the points I made in my last letter slip out of your memory. They are, first: that the Mosaic Law calls for a priesthood from the house of Aaron, and the coming of the Messiah from the house of David; Second: that all divisions in Jewry agree that the priesthood of Aaron ceased to function with the destruction of the Temple in the first century after the coming of the Messiah; that the last priest of Jewry was Phineas, who had no Torah right to that office; Third: that there is no possibility of an Aaronic priesthood being reinstated; nor a Messiah being born in the future, as there are no known houses of Aaron and David in existence from which such personages can come; Fourth: the termination of these houses was no doubt providential, as the Messiah came in the person of Jesus, Who instituted the new, universal, prophesied priesthood.

Evidently you must have found the data and arguments in my letter too positive, clear, and well authenticated by quotations taken from Jewish sources, to try and refute them. If not, what made you switch to a question entirely foreign to the issue? Jews have been, but are not now, more intense in their effort to circumcise non-Jews than Catholics are to baptize Jews. In fact, judging by the activities of Catholics



during the thirty-six years that I have been in the Church, there has been less work done by the Catholic Church to convert Jews than has been done to convert any other group of non-Catholics.

In the first place, please to bear in mind the fact that only a very small percentage of Jews have any affiliation with synagogues; that three-quarters of them, if not more, do not even utter the Sh'ma—"Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is One God." Many of them say, what Walter Lipmann says in the opening words of his "Preface to Morals," that "there is a vacancy in the lives—of those who no longer believe in the religion of their fathers." As for Liberal Judaism, it is so far from Judaism of old, and so near Unitarianism, that Prof. A. A. Roback said, in his "Weekly Survey of People and Ideas," that appeared in the Jewish press of our country, on the last week of January, 1940.

"Shortsighted people (referring to some Jewish leaders) do not realize that many of the grandchildren of the so-called liberal Jews today will become Unitarians or Christian Scientists fifty years hence, for the reason that there is only a hairbreadth's difference between the credo of the 'liberal' Jew and the liberal Christian."

To win such persons to the Catholic Church is to win them back to the faith of their Mosaic Law-loving fathers of old in Israel, to the Judaism full-blossomed that the prophets they honored foretold. My letters aim to get such Jews, as well as those in synagogues, to see the soundness of Catholic claims, hoping that once they know them as they really are, they will be blest with the courage equal to their understanding, and thus influence the Holy Spirit to bestow upon them the gift of regeneration at the baptismal font of the Church of the Messiah. That is a perfectly legitimate ambition, so long as proper means are used to bring the result desired, your protest to the contrary notwithstanding.

Surely it is not a virtue to know and enjoy the benefit of truth without regard for your brother who is in error, espe-

cially when it involves his spiritual well-being. Knowledge is responsibility. It obligates us to endeavor, by example first, and then by word of mouth or pen, to lead our fellowman from error to truth, from evil to good, from indifference to spiritual insight, from a false to a true means of obeying the will of God, for we are our brother's keeper. That is why the Midrash (study and exegesis of Jewish scripture) says, "He who brings a heathen next to God is as though he had created him anew."

It was the laudable desire to serve God, and to bring non-Jews to the knowledge of the one True God, to obedience to God's Commandments, and to living according to the Mosaic Law, that prompted the faithful Jews of old to proselytize. You, like most of the Jews of our day, seem to lack the knowledge that Judaism was a missionary religion in pre-Christian days, and rightly so, though its methods at times were reprehensible. A study of Jewish histories would cause you to change your assertion that "Jews never proselytize" to read, that "Jews do not do any public proselytizing work today."

Provisions are made for proselytes in the Shulchan Aruch (code of Jewish law) which guides Orthodox Jews, a special division therein being devoted to the subject. Proselytes of different grades are defined in the Jewish codes. The Gere Tzedek, for instance, are proselytes of righteousness, because "they are sincere," that is, they are not prompted to be circumcised by marriage, desire to gain popularity, or fear of persecution. They are given an equal status with persons of Jewish parentage, therefore it is forbidden "to annoy them" by saying, for instance,

"Yesterday you were a worshipper of vanity," or "Pig's flesh is still between your teeth."

Evidence of the intense endeavor to convert heathens to Judaism is found in the writings of Cicero, Dio Cassius, Horace, Juvenal, Seneca, Tacitus, Josephus, and the New Testament.

The ire of the authorities in Alexandria and Rome was



aroused by the proselytizing activities of the Jews. Poppa, the wife of Nero; Aquila of Pontus; Consul Flavius Clemens, nephew of Roman Emperor Vespasian and his wife, Domitilla, the cousin of Titus; King Monobaz of Abiabene, his wife, Helena, and many nobles of his court; King Dhu Nuwas of Yemen, are but a few of the prominent proselytes. Some rabbis claimed that Nero and Marcus Aurelius were converts to Judaism, though other Jews deny that it is so. If Jews did not proselytize, then how account for the black Jews (Falashas) of Ethiopia, who have congregations in our country? It was proselytizing work that encouraged the conversion of the Chazars, the Turkish tribe, and its King Bulan. It is an indisputable fact that converts were made by force on the part of officials of the highest standing in Jewry, especially during the days of the Maccabean warrior kings. These leaders of Jewry gave the Idumeans they subdued, the choice of becoming Jews or getting out of the land in which they lived.

Josephus, who believed in the worship of God according to the dictates of conscience, condemned Jewish forced circumcision. Writing in his "Life," of men who surrendered in battle, he said:

"When the Jews would force them to be circumcised, if they would stay among them, I would not permit any force put upon them, but said, 'Every one ought to worship according to his own inclination, and not be constrained by force.'"

The common practice of circumcising slaves, caused legislation to be enacted against Jews owning slaves who were Christians. On the other hand, Jews who became Christians were so severely dealt with, by their former religionists, that one of the first edicts dealing with religion, issued by Constantine the Great (Oct. 18, 315, A.D.) was as follows:

"We wish to make known to Jews and their elders and their patriarchs that if, after the enactment of this law, any

one of them dares to attack with stones or some other manifestation of anger another who has fled their dangerous sect and attached himself to the worship of God (referring to Christianity), he must be speedily given to the flames and burnt together with all his accomplices."

It was "the missionary spirit of the Jews," which the "Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge" says, "was often fanatical" (p. 358), and the hypocrisy of the leaders of the Jews the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ met in Jerusalem, that brought from His sacred lips one of the severest indictments He uttered:

"Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! Because you traverse sea and land to make one convert; and when he has become one, you make him twofold more a son of Hell than yourselves" (*St. Matt. 23:15*).

This letter ought to convince any one, who will read it dispassionately, that Judaism was a proselytizing religion; that it was within its province, aye, it was its duty, to convert non-Jews to belief in and worship of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to the Mosaic way of life, in the days when Judaism alone was the divinely instituted religion in the world.

With the coming of the Messiah; with the institution of the Messianic priesthood and Sacrifice, that took the place of the priesthood and sacrifices of the old covenant, the authority to represent God in the world was transferred to the Apostles selected by the Messiah and their successors.

Their universal commission was given by Jesus in these words:

"All power in heaven and on earth has been given to Me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (*St. Matt. 28:18-20*).

This was a commission to make converts of all peoples, Jews included. To ask Christians to cease "trying to convert



Jews to Catholicism," is equivalent to asking them to stop doing what Jesus Christ did and instituted His Church to continue.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....

---

## 20. His "Anointed of the Lord"

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

You ask my opinion of the following quotation, taken from "What We Jews Believe," in which Samuel S. Cohon, professor of theology in the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, declares that the term anointed referred not, in the Hebrew Bible, to a "unique and mysterious personage," like Jesus Christ:

"... The title M'shiah Adonai—the anointed of the Lord—is used in no supernatural sense throughout the Hebrew Bible. It is applied to Saul, to David, and to other kings of Israel, in the same sense in which we speak of a king as 'crowned.' The term referred to no unique and mysterious personage of the perfected kingdom of the future may be seen from the application by the prophet to the gentile king like Cyrus" (*Is. 45:1*).

It is an indisputable fact that the kings of Israel, and Cyrus were referred to as anointed; so were the priests of the Hebrew Bible (*Lev. 4:3*)—"Moses poured oil on Aaron's head, and anointed him" (*Lev. 8:12*). But the term applied in a unique way to the M'shiah, called the Anointed One.

The claim that the term referred not to the M'shiah, the Christ, in a unique way, because it was applied to others, Cyrus for instance, is refuted in Psalm 2:2 and Psalm 109:4 (*Hebrew Bible, 110:4*), in which a "unique" priest, the Christ, is referred to, who was to be "begotten," instead of being made in the natural way as were the members of the house of Aaron, who were priests. Instead of being a figurative, successive, transitory priest, as were those of Aaron, He was referred to as an eternal, unchangeable "priest according to the order of Melchisedec." He was not to be anointed in an external way, with oil, as was Saul, David and Solomon; His anointing being an internal unction of the Holy Spirit, being the High Priest of heaven. Hannah, the mother of Samuel, alludes to a "unique" personage (*1 Kings 2:10; Hebrew Bible, 1 Sam. 2:10*), in her canticle, at the time when there was no king of the Jews, as the "horn of His (God's) anointed," who is the M'shiah.

Cyrus, though referred to as anointed, was never consecrated with oil by the Jews, as were their kings. He was honored as a saviour of the Jews, having issued the edict that enabled them to return to Judea to rebuild the Temple. He prefigured the M'shiah, the Anointed One, whom Isaiah said (45) would bud forth from Israel as the Saviour of mankind.

The understanding of Jews, who look objectively at Christian truth, would be greatly furthered by a comprehension of the plainly evident fact that present-day Judaism is a mass of negatives; a denial of this, that, and everything else that is basically Christian. Its mind is set upon denying Jesus to be the Anointed One, the M'shiah, terms rightly used interchangeably.

The holy Jews of the days when Jesus "came unto His own" in Palestine, who were not swayed by the worldly priests who disgraced Israel, recognized Jesus as their M'shiah, the Anointed of God. Simon-Peter spoke for them, when in answer to the question, "Whom do men say the Son of man is?" (using the title, Son of man, which Daniel used to designate the M'shiah, *Dan. 7:13*), replied, "Thou art the



M'shiah, the Anointed One (*Matt. 16; Luke 9:20-21*). Jesus, the M'shiah, is the Prophet King and Priest of Israel, according to the Hebrew Bible. He is the Prophet Moses said God would raise up for Israel, whom "thou shalt hear" (*Deut. 18:15*). He is the King prophesied by David to be the Only Begotten Son of God (*Ps. 2*). He is "the Priest forever" who, as prophesied in Psalm 109 (*Hebrew Bible, 110*), would make His enemies His footstool, be the Judge of nations, etc. I would recommend a study of the seventh chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews for a profound, yet clear understanding of the uniqueness of Jesus the Anointed, the "M'shiah Adonai," the non-genealogical, eternal, Messianic Priest, in contrast to the anointed priests of the house of Aaron, whose transitory nature is shown, as is those of Israel's kings, by their being personages of the historic ages long gone by.

Sincerely in the M'shiah  
D.... G.....

---

## 21. Was Jesus a Jew?

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

I find it incumbent upon myself to say at this point, while the doctrine in my letters is Catholic, that I do not assume to speak for the Catholic Church, as you imagine. I merely "echo," as a layman, those doctrines I understand the Church of my adoption to teach. In the words of Pope Leo XIII (changed to the singular), I have taken upon myself "the task of communicating to you what I have myself received (thanks

be to God), being, as it were, a living echo of my masters (the bishops and priests) in the faith."

The question of Jewish genealogical records, save those in the Bible, is not a matter upon which the Catholic Church has expressed an opinion. Hence I merely presented my personal study, backed by Jewish authorities, which warrant the conclusion that there are no genealogical records known to exist with which to prove any ancestral connection of present-day Jews with the houses of David and Aaron, due to the destruction of the Temple in which they were preserved. These ancestral lines were obliterated through intermarriage of the existing tribes, mixed marriages, as well as outright rejection of all religion by many Jews. Hence those Jews whose sentimental regard for ancient Jewish tribal relation prompts them to declare, as do the Cohens, that they are of the blue blood of Israel, lack any evidence to substantiate their claim.

History warrants the assertion that the kingly and priestly status of those children of Israel, who were privileged to belong to the houses of honor in the tribes of Judah and Levi, which began with David and Aaron ended with Jesus as the Messiah, as King of the Jews and as "priest according to the order of Melchisedec."

But, assuming for the nonce, that there are Jews living today who trace their lineage to the houses of David and Aaron, the historic fact remains that the Judaism of yore is no more. This the Catholic Church teaches, as the Messiah, in the person of Jesus, came to fulfill the mission of Israel that God foretold the Son of David would fulfill. He instituted a new, a universal priesthood, as a continuation of Himself in the world; and established a Church, which took the place of the Temple that was destroyed, and the Aaronic priesthood that ceased to function in the first century of the Christian era.

You say that "Jesus was a Jew, and not a Christian," to which Catholics say, "that is undoubtedly true." That has been affirmed by Catholics the world over millions of times.



Yet every now and then some prominent Jew will proclaim it in words that assume it to be unknown and unappreciated by Christians in general, and Catholics in particular. I have had occasion to discuss it years ago in an open letter to Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, and more extensively recently in the "Jewish Panorama."

Jesus held, as the Catholic Church holds today, that the Jewish religion was the one and the only religion of Almighty God during the thirty-three years of His earthly life. Jesus was born of a Jewish Mother, whom Catholics designate the Lily of Israel. Jesus was born in Bethlehem, the City of King David. Jesus was circumcised, an event the Catholic Church celebrates in all parts of the world every single New Year Day. Upon arriving at religious age, Jesus went up to Jerusalem to read the Torah in the Temple, for He was Bar Mitzvah, called "confirmed" by Reform Jews. Jesus took part in the Passover and other Jewish services. He prayed daily in the Temple, and did every other thing a truly faithful Jew was obligated to do according to the Mosaic Law, for He was the Jew of Jews. Jesus, the Jew, being Obedience Personified, willingly submitted to the requirements of the Mosaic Law which, by the will of our Father in heaven, was in full force during the lifetime of Jesus, up to the time when He on the Cross, and the Veil in the Temple, were rent. Jesus not only obeyed the Jewish Law, but He counselled others to be obedient to it, even when commanded to do so by the scribes and Pharisees, who placed burdens upon the people from which they exempted themselves, saying:

They "have sat in the chair of Moses all things therefore, that they command you, observe and do. But do not act according to their works; for they talk but do nothing" (*St. Matt. 23:1-3*).

How could Jesus be called the Son of David if He were not a Jew? Every year Catholics hear the story read of the Magi who went from the East to Jerusalem to see "the newly born King of the Jews" (*St. Matt. 2:2*). Jesus was hailed as "King

of the Jews" while riding through Jerusalem, at the time the multitude sang out, "Hosanna to the Son of David." Would it not be gross ignorance to claim that Jesus was not a Jew, when he acknowledged before Pilate that he was the King of the Jews (*St. Matt. 27:11*)? This was appreciated by the Jews themselves, for when Pilate, passing sentence upon Jesus, ordered the inscription, "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews," to be placed upon the Cross in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, the Jews cried out, "Do not write 'King of the Jews,' but 'He said, I am the King of the Jews.'" (*St. John 19:21*).

You say correctly, "Jesus was not a Christian." Being a practicing Jew, He could not be a practicing Christian at the same time, as the religious worship and ceremonial requirements of Jews differ from those of Christians. The designation "Jewish-Christian," used at times by indiscriminating persons, is a contradiction, if the terms are used, as they should be used, to signify religious beliefs and practices.

Considering that a Christian is a believer in, and follower of Christ, to call Jesus a Christian would be calling Him a believer in and follower of Himself. Besides, a Christian is a person who is Christlike to some degree; hence to call Christ Christlike would be calling God Godlike.

No one is known to have been called a Christian during the years that Christ lived in Palestine. The followers of Christ are recorded to have been called "Christians" for the first time while in Antioch (*Acts 11:26*), the city in which the first Catholic Church was planted among the Gentiles. The followers of Christ designated themselves "brethren" (*Acts 15:1, 23*), "disciples" (*Acts 9, 26*), "believers" (*Acts 5:14*), "saints" (*Rom. 8:27*).

Those Jews who rejected Jesus as their Messiah would surely not call His followers Christians, as the term Christ is the Greek (*Christos*) form of the Hebrew term *Mashiach* (Messiah). Hence calling persons Christians would be calling them followers of the Messiah, whom Jews claimed not to have made his appearance upon earth.

Jesus belonged to the Synagogue, for, as I said in the be-



ginning of this letter, the Jewish Church was the only existing spiritual society then functioning by the will of God. The Catholic Church did not come into existence as a distinctive spiritual community until the First Pentecost Day, fifty days after the Passover service, the last religious ceremony in which Jesus participated. Yes, Jesus was a Jew, the King of the Jews. He is your Messiah. Therefore let it not continue to be said of you, what St. John said of the great majority of our forebears in Jerusalem, "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." Line up with the holy minority in Israel, of whom St. John could say, "But as many as received Him He gave the power of becoming sons of God" (*Chap. 1*).

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D . . . . G . . . . .

---

## 22. *The Trinity*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

I am glad that your Orthodox friends are this time to the fore. The issue they raise is apropos. The gist of it is this—"The Messiah is a man in the eyes of Judaism and not God. Jesus never called himself God. In the eyes of Jews, God is One, and not divided into three Gods, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. We Jews hold God to be a transcendent, infinite, personal being; the Creator, Author, and Supreme Lord of the Universe."

Those primary characteristics of God named in the last

sentence, above quoted, are entirely in accord with the Catholic concept of God. Especially pleased am I to have you designate God as "a personal being," as did the great in Israel. This is noted because there is a tendency among prominent persons in Jewry, some of them rabbis, towards a pantheistic concept of God. Their use of biblical terminology often beclouds the fact that they lean theologically and philosophically more towards Spinoza than Moses. Einstein, who ranks high in mathematics, but low in theology, leads in that misconception in Jewry today. He denies belief in a personal God, substituting a "cosmic God" for the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. If the God of Israel is not a Personal Being, then have the learned in the Jewish and Christian world throughout the ages been grossly in error when they declared that God created and rules the universe; God loves; God made the moral law that we are obligated to obey; God rewards; God punishes. Surely no "cosmic God" could do such things, as it has no intelligence, no self-consciousness, no will, no personality. Besides, without the existence of a personal God, there is no way of accounting for the origin of human personality.

In order properly to understand Catholic belief, it is necessary to dismiss from your thought the notion that Catholics believe in the existence of three Gods, because they pay homage to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It is as incorrect as saying that the Jewish homage paid to the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob means that Jews worship three Gods. Your definition of God is in agreement with Catholic teaching, that God is Infinite Being, who embodies within Himself all perfections in the absolute sense of the term. Hence the existence of three such Infinite Beings—one in the Father, one in the Son, and still another in the Holy Spirit—is an intellectual and spiritual impossibility. For the three to be Infinite each would have to possess all perfections. Therefore each would be independent of the others, hence none of them would be Infinite, as only one Being can possibly be absolutely all-inclusive.



the Life of the soul. Cry out, as did I, in the concluding words of one of the meditations in "Our Divine Friend"—

"Jesus! Divine Jesus, I love you; I will never cease to repeat my act of love. Penetrate all my powers, fascinate all my senses, captivate my mind, and enchain my heart to Thine forever!"

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D . . . . G . . . . .

---

## 25. *The People of the Book*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

You have no doubt noted that I have been stressing those principles I believe to be of basic religious import, and in so doing have had to revert back to things already dealt with, though from a different angle. I insist that a Judaism which exists without divine authority; a Judaism of descendants of a people who have already fulfilled their mission, is not the Judaism of God as outlined in the Old Testament, and therefore has no moral right to command man's obedience. The dignity of man permits of, in fact demands obedience to the authority of a God-made religion, if such exists. Prior to the First Pentecost Day, the one and the only religion that could command obedience, in the name of God, was the Judaism under the God-given authority of the High Priests and the Sanhedrin. Since that historic ecclesiastical dividing day, the one religion that could rightly exercise authority in the name of God, and demand obedience thereto, centered in the Church under the supreme guidance of the Vicar of the High

Priest of the New Covenant, St. Peter, and those who were to succeed him, as Bishop of Rome.

To synagogians this is tabooed. This is not surprising, for they know not the Judaism of the Old Testament as an organic, unchangeable doctrinal belief that was to culminate in a Messiah, who, by His atonement, would open heaven's gate for man, which was closed by the sin of Adam. A realization of this comes like a revelation to Jews who pass from the Synagogue to the Church. They have to unlearn nine-tenths of the historical and doctrinal notions in which present-day Jewry is intellectually submerged.

Repeating what Mohammed said, Jews pridefully declare themselves to be the "people of the Book." Yet that "Book," the First Volume of God's Library, indicts the Judaism of today with being unauthoritative, as it lacks the credentials to enable it to function as a God-made religion, being devoid of a priesthood with sacrificial, interpretative and judicial power.

The Book, like our American Constitution, is of no use, as far as carrying out its purpose is concerned, unless there are legitimate authorities functioning, designated in the Book, who conduct, define and enforce its mandates.

God wants His will obeyed; therefore it is reasonable to expect God to make provision for man to be guided, and to be furnished with the means by which His will can be carried out. What it is reasonable for man to expect God to do, God has done. God inspired the Book. In it are the provisions made for the priesthood of Aaron to interpret His will, to offer sacrifices, with authority to enforce penalties for disobedience thereto. The Book commands absolute obedience to the decrees of the priests and judges under the severest penalties (*Deut. 17:12*).

Here are some of the death penalties, by stoning or burning that are recorded in the Book. Adultery (*Lev. 20:10*), (*Deut. 22:18-21*); blasphemy (*Lev. 24:14*); habitual drunkenness (*Deut. 18:21*); false testimony (*Deut. 19:16, 19*); harlotry (*Gen. 28:24*); idolatry (*Lev. 20:2*); incestuousness (*Lev.*



20:11); man-stealing (*Ex. 21:16; Deut. 24:7*); rape (*Deut. 22:25*); sabbath-breaking (*Ex. 31:4; 35:2*); striking parent (*Ex. 21:15, 17*); unchastity (*Lev. 21:9; Deut. 22:21, 23*); witchcraft, false prophesy (*Ex. 22:18; Lev. 20:27; Deut. 13:5; 18:20*).

The sins just enumerated, like the crimes named in civil statutes, evidence the existence of an authority to enforce them. Where is that authority in Jewry today? Nowhere, having been superseded by the authority instituted by the Messiah, the King of the Jews, who imposed spiritual in place of physical punishments for disobedience. The story of it is told in the Second Volume of God's Book, which is an extension, elevation, and fulfillment of the things basic to Christianity to be found prefigured in Volume One. No one can properly understand what is in Book One without studying Book Two; nor can he properly understand Book Two unless he studies Book One. An intelligent, prayerful study of them leads from the Synagogue to the Church; from the High Priest who once reigned in Jerusalem to the Pope in the Vatican City.

To assert that God, who provided man with priestly guides, from the days of Moses and Aaron until the last high priest of Israel, left man to wander spiritually without any priestly aid since then, seems to border on blasphemy. Such a notion inferentially charges God with being unmerciful; with having abandoned man to his capricious tendency, by leaving him without priestly guidance. If that were true there would be no remedy for the doctrinal chaos seen in present-day Jewry, and in Protestantism as well. No, God is not unmerciful, He fully provided for the spiritual guidance of man. God gave man the two volume Book of Books. But before so doing God provided the means by which its contents could be known in an intelligent and orderly manner including the carrying out of His will which is expressed therein. Immediately after God gave Israel the Law, she was given her priesthood of Aaron. Immediately after mankind was given the Gospel, the Law in its fulness, the Son of God instituted His

"MY PARENTS' RELIGION IS GOOD ENOUGH FOR ME" 101

universal priesthood, without genealogy, for guidance of man through life to salvation. I regret to say that the Jews of our day are not the "people of the Book." If they were, they would accept the proffered outstretched arms of Jesus as their Messiah, for He is what the Book said the Son of David would be.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....

---

### 26. "My Parents' Religion Is Good Enough for Me"

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

Knowing the Jewish mind, it did not surprise me to be told that:

"The religion good enough for my parents is good enough for me. Even if I were convinced of the correctness of what you say, which I am not, I would rather remain a Jew than break the hearts of my parents by becoming a Christian."

I can well appreciate the sentiment you express, as that sentiment was once mine. I, like other converts from the Synagogue to the Church, have suffered the soul-racking experience of bringing sorrow to the hearts of my father and mother on account of entering the Catholic Church. It was not so much a matter of religious belief on their part, as the knowledge that the son they loved would be looked down upon with contempt by their Jewish relatives and friends.

Even when convinced that Jesus is the Messiah; that Christianity is not a denial of Old Testament Judaism, but rather



its full-blossoming; that the Catholic Church speaks with God's authority, as does no other church or synagogue, I endeavored to smother my favorableness towards the Church by trying to dismiss it as a delusion. The emotional conflict continued within me, even though I kept from reading and speaking of things Catholic, until the desire for peace of soul aroused in me a determination to follow the dictates of conscience to the baptismal font. A period of deep sorrow followed for me as well as for my parents, as I had to leave their home to which I was devoted. Thanks be to God, the hostility of my parents changed to admiration for their son long before they died. Their sympathetic regard for me, caused them to see in the Christian way of life I followed something to which they had never before paid any serious attention. They became interested in Catholics in general, though their acquaintances were nearly all Jewish. They saw in them an adherence to religious principles and practices such as is seen only incidentally among present-day Jews, and then invariably among the Orthodox division of Jewry. They contrasted the regular church attendance of Catholics with the indifference of their Jewish relatives and friends. It was a common thing for them to hear Jews who attended synagogue services, usually twice a year, on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kipper, say, apologetically, that they went "to shule for the children's sake," instead of for their own soul's satisfaction as well.

Love of parents is a commendable thing, and, thank God, it abides to a great degree among Jews, even among those who do not go to synagogues. We are all obligated to love and obey our parents, and that includes refraining from things that will disturb their peace of heart. There is but one consideration that takes precedence to parents, that is God, the Author of the Commandment to "honor your father and your mother." God has the first claim to our affection. We belong to Him more than to our parents. We owe our lives primarily to God, who brought us into the world through our parents; and we are here on earth for one great purpose, to return to God for eternity. Therefore, God's will must be our will,

even at the cost of unhappiness on the part of our parents, due to our determination to do the will of God as He makes it known to us.

Both the Jewish and the Christian religions teach that God comes first in all things. That is why the first three of the Ten Commandments deal with the love and worship of God. This principle is announced by Moses in Deuteronomy 33:9, wherein the duty of the priest is declared to precede all consideration of flesh and blood. If interfered with, the priest is told to say to "his father and to his mother: I do not know you; and to his brethren: I know you not—."

Our own fathers and mothers become our enemies, as well as God's enemies, when they protest against our following the will of God as God makes it known to us through the voice of conscience. "A man's enemies will be those of his own household" (*St. Matt. 10:36*) said Jesus, who fully realized that fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, would be obstacles at times to Jews following Him as the Messiah.

Jesus, the Prince of Peace, brought a "sword," a spiritual sword, to man which is "keener than any two-edged sword," when He commanded man to follow Him as their Messiah:

"Do not think that I have come to send peace upon the earth; I have come to bring a sword, not peace. For I have come to set a man at variance with his father, and a daughter with her mother, and a daughter-in-law with her mother-in-law; and a man's enemies will be those of his own household."

This is the cross, the affliction, the price, Jews would sometimes have to pay for love of Him, said the Son of God, if they remain true to conscience. Continuing, Jesus said:

"He who loves father and mother more than Me is not worthy of Me; and he who loves son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me. And he who does not take up his cross and follow Me, is not worthy of Me" (*St. Matt. 10:33-39*).

Jesus, being true God as well as true man, has a right to command supreme obedience. That it did not conflict with



the love due to parents, was shown by Jesus when He took the "hypocrites" to task for making void the Commandment to "honor thy father and thy mother" (*St. Matt. 15:4-7*).

When Jews become Catholics, they take up the sword of truth to cut themselves away from the error of present-day Judaism. It often makes life hard for them among the people they love, especially when their motives are questioned, as they invariably are, often by "Jews" who are Jews in name only. It sometimes causes the tenderest of human relations to be severed, yet it must be bravely met to be true to one's self and to God.

The Catholic Church is a Church of converts and descendants of converts. Jesus, His Blessed Mother, and St. Joseph were Jews. So were the Twelve Apostles; so were thousands of converts from Judaism who made up the first members of the Catholic Church; as well as Saul of Tarsus, and a host of others, some of them sons and daughters of parents who were hostile to Christianity. Being convinced that Jesus is the Messiah, the expected of Israel for whom their forefathers prayed and suffered, these converts held themselves conscience-bound not to permit any misunderstanding on the part of their parents to prevent them from following the light with which God had blest them. In many instances determination to be true to principle finally brought their hostile parents to the peace of heart that comes with being one with the Messiah in His Church.

You cannot rightly claim to believe in God, and in religion which binds you morally to listen to and obey God, and say at the same time that even "if convinced" that the Church has by God's will displaced the Synagogue, you would not enter the Church because it would grieve your parents. That is a false concept of duty, according to Jewish as well as Christian principles. Both religions hold that the voice of conscience is the voice of God speaking through the soul of man:

"Whatever creed be taught or land be trod,  
Man's conscience is the oracle of God"

(Byron, "The Island").

Just think what would have happened if our great patriarchal ancestor, Abraham, had refused to follow his conscience, to the extent of leaving his country and the house of his idolatrous father Thare (*Gen. 12:1*), saying, as you say, "the religion good enough for my parents is good enough for me"? All that was great and glorious in Israel would have been lost to humanity.

Thank God Abraham followed the voice of his conscience. Conscience confirms what is right and wrong. Conscience commands you and me, individually, to do right and to avoid evil. Conscience is retributive, punishing failure to adhere to its commands, while it rewards obedience. God guides the soul of man through his individual conscience, His priestly agents safeguarding man against the danger of a false or erroneous conscience which is likely to lead to a false or immoral action. "Labor" therefore, as George Washington said, "to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire, conscience." If ever it tells you that the Catholic Church is the only Church instituted by God, remember that your duty is to fan that spark into the heavenly flame that regenerates. Remember that in things human, your first duty, unless married, is to your parents.

In things spiritual, love of God, expressed through obedience to the voice of conscience, comes first.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....



---

27. *Converts: "Jews" Who Are Not Jews*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

The more I think of your last letter, the more do I appreciate your frankness in setting down, in a word, the thought in all too many Jewish hearts, that even if convinced of the correctness of Catholic claims you would not become a Catholic.

I have found that sentiment in Jewry to be due not merely to fear of offending parents, but largely due to fear of the intense hostility of nearly all Jews towards converts from the Synagogue to the Church. That does not mean that Jews are hostile towards "born Catholics." On the contrary, they are friendly towards them nowadays, especially towards priests. They are flattered by the attendance of prominent Catholics at their banquets and public gatherings. It furthers the standing of the Rabbis who get them to attend; and, inferentially, it salves their Jewish inferiority complex, with which you know Jews are badly afflicted.

Unfortunately, the Jews of our country are generally Jews by force of hostility towards them, rather than by belief in the Mosaic Law. Of course, you know that this is an accepted fact appreciated by America's foremost Jews. Albert Levitan expressed it as follows in the *Christian Century*.

"The vast majority of Jews do not remain Jews by choice. Basically, the Jew hates his Jewishness, and bewails his fate. The only force that stiffens his neck—is the opposition of the outside world. Anti-Semitism is what keeps Judaism alive—."

The claim often made, that "religion is the bond that keeps Jews Jews" has no foundation in fact in this country, within the borders of which nearly one-third of the world's Jewry reside. In fact over three-quarters of the Jews do not know what Judaism is, save that it calls for worship on Saturday instead of Sunday, and that they are not allowed to include pork in their menu. Rabbi Solomon Goldman, Chicago, noted this recently. In answering the question, "What is wrong with the Jew?" he replied.

"Nothing but his ignorance." "Jewishly, the Jewish adult is uneducated. He may be, and he often is, a skilled lawyer, a celebrated physician, a talented journalist, a far-seeing social worker, a benign philanthropist, an astute politician, a gifted artist, and in every way a gentleman, but he is unfamiliar with his people's past, its current history in literature, its religion or philosophy" (*"The Sentinel," Jewish weekly, Jan. 1, 1942*).

It is this lack of knowledge of Judaism, that compels priests to teach prospective converts from Jewry some of the basic principles of Judaism before baptising them. Without that knowledge, such prospective converts cannot properly appreciate who Jesus is, and the historic part the Church plays as the divine successor of the Aaronic priesthood, sacrifices, and Jewish ceremonialism.

I have found that though American-born "Jews" are generally rationalists, they are not devoid of interest in religion. They are ever ready to talk religion, but it is generally merely talk, talk, talk, and it invariably includes saying something disparagingly about rabbis who are in the front pages of the public press, as no persons have less regard for their ministers than Jews have for rabbis.

I regret to say that whether Jews are inside or outside the synagogues; whether they be Orthodox, Reform, Conservative, or Rationalist; they are unified in their prejudicial attitude towards converts from the Synagogue to the Church. This prejudicial trait in the Jewish make up, which is a factor in preventing conversions, is reprehensible, as no



persons have suffered more from prejudicial judgments than have Jews themselves.

The impression is deliberately fostered in Jewry that conversions are rarely, if ever, sincere. In Charles H. Joseph's "Random Thoughts," published in the Jewish weekly press throughout our country, this commonplace affrontery appeared—

"When a Jew says he is converted, he has been converted for money."

If an attempt is made to refute such an insult, by giving reasons for sincerely believing that Jesus is the Messiah, and the Catholic Church the Messianic kingdom prophesied by the prophets of Israel, the Jewish satirical response is likely to be—"Sag das dem Goy" (Tell that to the Gentiles). This would be equivalent to saying, "Tell that to the marines," were it not generally said with a shrug that dismisses the convert as unprincipled. I dealt with this question of "money, money, money" as the motive of conversion somewhat in detail in my Autobiography, and I have been sorry every since for dignifying it with an answer.

No such hostility is manifested in Jewry nowadays towards persons who break away from Judaism as a religion. For instance, to deal with but three out of a hundred of the world's most prominent "Jews," as they are called in Jewish books. In a review of "Faithful Rebels," Isaac Levine, the author, informs us that the "participation of Jews in philosophy" is said to have begun "with Spinoza"; and, that "with the emancipation from the Ghetto, the Jew contributes bountifully to the universal stock of culture." As evidence of this cultural work, there is presented the "19th and 20th century remarkable succession of Jewish thinkers, some of whom like Marx, Freud, and Einstein, were seminal pioneering minds."

Let us look at these three men of world-wide fame, who are hailed as Jews, with encomiums of delight, by the very persons who condemn converts from Judaism to the Church. It is enough to say of Marx, that he is the author of the phrase

—"Religion is the opium of the people"—which visitors to Moscow saw prominently displayed in Red Square. Socialists the world over, whatever their party affiliation may be, though bitterly opposed to the tactics of the Soviet Union, are one in approving of the application of the principles of Marx to religion in the Soviet Union. Lenin could say, without a word being uttered to the contrary in any Socialist publication, that "Atheism is an integral part of Marxism" ("*Religion*," *Lenin, International Publishers, Inc., N. Y., 1933*).

Next comes Freud, the father of psychoanalysis. In "Moses and Monotheism" (*N. Y., 1939*) we find him one with Marx in hostility towards religion. He declares therein that Moses was the bastard son of an Egyptian princess; that the "God of Moses" was a "volcanic God"; that the "Jews depend upon the myths of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" for their belief in Jahve, their God; that the Jews took their form of worship from the Arabic tribe of Midianites."

Marx held the capitalist class to have fostered religion for its doping effect upon the working class, whereas Freud attributes religion to nervous disorder. He says, still quoting from his latest book, "Moses and Monotheism," "I have never doubted that religious phenomena are to be understood only as a model of neurotic symptoms of the individual." He praises the Soviet Union for its war against religion, saying that "The authorities were bold enough to deprive a hundred million people of the anodyne of religion and wise enough to grant them a reasonable measure of sexual freedom." Mistaking atheism and sexual license for freedom, it was no surprise to find Freud writing disparagingly of the Catholic Church as an implacable enemy of all freedom of thought." Freud proceeds to say,

"Psychoanalytic research is in any case the subject of suspicious attention from Catholicism. I do not maintain that this suspicion is unmerited. If our research leads to a result that reduces religion to the status of a neurosis of mankind and explains the grandiose powers in the same way as we should neurotic obsession in our individual patients, then



we may be sure we shall incur in this country (Austria) the greatest resentment of the powers that be."

The third in this triad of the great "Jews" in modern Jewry is Einstein, who has been hailed, like Spinoza, as "God-intoxicated." In answer to Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein, Einstein cabled from Germany—

"I believe in Spinoza's God who reveals himself in the harmony of what exists, not in a God who concerns himself with fates and actions of human beings."

Such a concept of God is in line with Marx, Lenin, Freud, and every other enemy of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Some of the Reform Rabbis came to the support of Einstein's God of Spinoza, whose pantheistic, anti-Jewish concept of God caused him to be excommunicated from the Synagogue in Amsterdam in 1656 A.D. Rabbi Abba I. Krim of Newark, N. J., is an exception. He said, in taking the editor of the American Israelite to task—

"In your opinion, then, every Reform Jew has the right to believe in God or disbelieve. For to deny God's providential care of individuals, as Einstein and Spinoza do, is the same as Atheism. If you approve of Einstein's view of God, you must abolish the religious services in Reform temples. To whom does the Reform Jew pray? Does he pray to the heavenly harmony merely? Does he not come to the Temple because he believes that God listens to his prayer and takes care of him and every action? This is what the Union Prayer Book maintains. To pray to Spinoza's God would be absurd" (*Am. Israelite*, July 5, 1929).

The "first and foremost Jew" brazenly called upon the people of this, his adopted country to discard "the concept of a personal God" in a religious Conference at the Jewish Theological Seminary in which Christians participated. Einstein's denial was defended here in Boston by Rabbi Joshua L. Liebman, whom I heard say in Temple Israel, that "Traditionalists in religion (which means Orthodox Jews and Catholics) might not agree with Einstein's idea of God

(he did). But this is a democracy and people have a right to express their opinion." It is not a question of expressing an opinion, it is a matter of principle. Is a man a Jew who denies belief in a personal God? Surely not from an Old Testament point of view.

The very title of the book—"Faithful Rebels"—in which these three "Jews" are praised for their contributions towards "the universal stock of culture," infers that sons of Jewish parents can rebel against Judaism in principle and yet remain faithful Jews. The B'nai B'rith Magazine declared this book to be "popular in the best sense of the word and ought to meet with acclaim."

If "Jews" may repudiate belief in the God of Israel without losing favor among Jews, your parents no doubt included, what, save ignorance and prejudice, can account for the bitter hostility towards converts from the Synagogue to the Church, who love and worship the God of Israel?

The length of this letter, prompts me to put off until next week a few more pages regarding this matter.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....

---

## 28. Responsibility to Parents and to God

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

My last letter ought to have convinced you of the inconsistency of Jews. They look down with contempt upon the convert from the Synagogue to the Church, who continues to cry out, as did his forebears—



*"Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, is one God";*

while they admiringly clasp to their bosoms a Spinoza, Marx, Freud, and Einstein, who hold the God of Israel to be a myth, and that revealed religion, as set forth in the Bible, is a mental aberration, and so teach the world.

How can Jews consistently call themselves "the people of the Book," when they repudiate Hebrew Christians who look upon that Book as the Word of God, while lauding in terms of the highest "Jews" who publicly discredit the origin and content of the Book? Converts do not pass from a God-made to a man-made religion; from a religion that was true in principle, to a religion that is basically false. What they do is to pass from a religion that was of God, a religion that had fulfilled its mission, to a religion that goes forth from where Judaism left off, to a higher spiritual height, by the will of God. What converts do, is to pass from Judaism in its caterpillar state, to Judaism metamorphosed into its butterfly stage.

To hold, that if you were convinced of the fact just mentioned, you would refuse to be true to your understanding, on account of your parents, is unethical, to designate it mildly for which you deserve to be deprived of God's favor. On the other hand, your parents may not be culpable for opposing your entrance into the Catholic Church, on account of ignorance of that truth with which we are assuming that God has illumined your mind, as no one is responsible for actions due to involuntary misunderstanding.

Assume that your parents are Christian Scientists, instead of Jews, whose God concept is a denial of the teachings of Moses and Jesus; who deny the reality of matter, and the actuality of sin. Assume that after an unbiased study and prayerful consideration, you are firmly convinced of the falsity of these teachings of Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy, the founder of Christian Science. Suppose you found that the teachings of Judaism or Christianity alone are the teachings of God, could you justify remaining a Christian Scientist

because entering the Synagogue or the Church would offend your misunderstanding parents? Certainly not.

Again, is not a Jew more justified in going back to things basic to the Judaism of his forebears, and then on to their fulfillment in Christianity, than going from Orthodox Judaism to the Reform sect that is Jewish in name, but anti-Jewish in principle from the standard of Orthodoxy? Certainly he is, if he so believes.

Does not love of parents include leading them from darkness into light, from error to truth? If they are looking for the Messiah to come, and you know, as do converts from the Synagogue to the Church, that He came over nineteen centuries ago in the person of Jesus, are you justified in letting your parents continue their unanswerable prayers, and tearful presence at the Wailing Wall of Orthodox Judaism for His coming? Certainly not.

What conscience dictates to be done, that are we morally bound to do. Strange, indeed, is it, in these times when the battle is on for the maintenance of the right to worship according to the dictates of conscience, instead of according to the will of dictators, to claim if convinced of Catholic truth, you would not become a Catholic. Remember, please, that there is no such a thing as a right without a correlative duty. The right of conscience, properly understood, is something more than a right, it is an obligation to follow that light of conscience in the direction it logically points. I am assuming, of course, that everything within reason has been done to make sure that you are not inwardly being prompted to obey an erroneous concept.

Let me draw to a close, by saying that love of parents is a most commendable thing, which obedience to both Judaism and Christianity commands. Yet both Judaism and Christianity teaches, that when human love conflicts with divine love, God calls upon us, not to love our parents less, but to love God more. You and I are responsible to our parents for but a little while; whereas we are responsible to God for eternity.



As for the bitter hatred of Jews towards converts from the Synagogue to the Church, only a craven person would permit such an unholy spirit to keep him from going into the outstretched arms of Israel's Messianic King.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....



### 29. *Why Did the Jews Reject Jesus?*

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

It is interesting to note, that nearly all the questions you put up to me, are questions I have asked myself while studying, doubting, and fighting off Catholic claims. One of them, taken from your first letter, is—

“If Jesus is the Messiah, as Christians claim him to be, do you think the Jews of his time would have rejected him?”

Yes, is the answer. The Jewish leaders of those days, and not the Jewish populace, were the cause. That was partly due to the desire for a monarchical personage, if any, to free Jewry from the tyranny of Caesar, rather than an humble, spiritual personage, an advocate of a kingdom that is not of this world.

Annas and Caiaphas, the high priests, and the controlling members of the Sanhedrin, who were mainly Sadducees, the Pharisees (also enemies of Jesus) being in the minority, were the cause. These Sadducees were the Protestants of Jewry. The leading authoritative Jewish writings inform us, as you very likely know, that they opposed many of the primary Old Testament teachings that Jesus advocated. They denied belief in spiritual beings, the immortality of the human soul,

a future life of rewards and punishments, and the resurrection of the body. They ignored the Messianic teachings of Moses and the prophets, and looked forward for freedom from Rome rather than emancipation from the affliction of original sin. The Sadducees were a wealthy, arrogant class, who were hated by the Jewish populace. Jesus openly warned the people to “beware” of them (*St. Matt. 16:6*).

The Talmud says that the benedictions in the Temple used to end with “blessed be the lord God of Israel unto eternity,” but when the Sadducees corrupted the Jewish faith by denying the immortality of the soul, it was enacted that the benedictions should end with, “from eternity to eternity” (*Berachotd, fol. 29, col. 1*). In *Derech erez Zuta*, chapter 1, the Jews were cautioned to “Learn or inquire nothing of the Sadducees, lest they be drawn into hell.”

In these times, when one man in Germany, who is not a German, could plunge the world into a total war, the evil result of which cannot be estimated at present, it is easy to realize how the populace could be misled by the leaders of first century Judaism. And remember that we Israelites have inherited a false concept of the character of Jesus, which has been intensified by the injustices suffered during the centuries that have sometimes been Christian in name rather than in fact.

The hope of Israel then, as it is among the Orthodox Jews of our day, was for a Messianic temporal ruler or emancipator. Jesus to such people was a disappointment. He was the opposite of their cherished worldly expectation, for

“He came not in regal splendor drest,  
The haughty diadem, the Tyrian vest;  
Not armed in flame all glorious from afar,  
Of hosts the Captain, the Lord of war.”

The power of Jesus aroused the envy of the rulers of Israel, for the common people loved Him. They flocked around Jesus by the thousands. The most dramatic occasion was on the Sunday before His crucifixion, which we call Palm Sun-



day. The "common people" gathered with palms, which they waved with joy at the coming of their Messianic King. They took off their garments and laid them on the dusty road, for Jesus to ride over them in His triumphal procession through Jerusalem on an ass. They hailed Him as their Messiah, with words that have rung down through the Christian centuries, royal words that will be heard until the end of the world—

"Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest."

So great was the enthusiasm for Jesus that fear entered the hearts of the leaders. The Pharisees pleaded with Jesus to check the populace, to "rebuke" His disciples. Jesus replied—

"I say to you that if these (people) keep silence, the stones will cry out" (*St. Luke 19:40*).

In other words, no power on earth can smother the fact that I am the Messiah. If the enthusiasm for Me is repressed, the very stones will make known that I am your King.

The Sadducees and Pharisees in power would have hailed Jesus on His triumphal journey through Jerusalem, if He had come as a warrior seated on a horse, instead of as the King of Peace, meekly on an ass.

It is well to digress here for a moment, to say that the ass, which in our country is known to be stupid and stubborn, was known in the East for his patience, gentleness, submission, and great power of endurance. The animal Jesus rode, on that historic occasion, was the fulfillment of one of the incidental Messianic prophecies. The Midrash (explanation of biblical texts) says that just as Abraham and Moses rode on asses, so "the Son of David also shall ride" (*Pirke de R. Eliezar, Chap. 31*).

Abraham saddled his ass and rode with Isaac, carrying wood along with them for the holocaust which God had commanded (*Gen. 22:3*). This prefigured Jesus carrying His cross to the holocaust on Mount Calvary.

Moses took his wife and sons, set them on an ass, and drove back to Egypt, "for they (his enemies) are dead who sought

his life" (*Exod. 4:19-20*). Herod also was dead, who sought the life of Jesus. Hence, Joseph could take Mary and her Son Jesus, on an ass, back from Egypt to Nazareth.

Thus it is plain that the "common people," not the leaders of Jewry, saw in Jesus mounted on the ass, in the City of Peace, the fulfillment of the prophesy of Zacharias (*9:9*)—

"Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Sion, shout for joy, O daughter of Jerusalem: Behold thy King will come to thee, the just and saviour: he is poor, and riding upon an ass—."

To come back directly once more to your question, please to see that the Jewish populace did not reject Jesus. You need but to recall Anthony's famous oration over Caesar's body to realize how easily the honest sentiment of the populace can be changed to the very opposite. It was the clever and powerful influence of the rulers in Jewry that caused the Hosanna's to the Son of David to be changed to "Crucify him. Crucify him," for "both the Pharisees and Sadducees tried (with success) to weaken the influence of Jesus with the populace," as the Jewish author, Prof. Solomon Grayzell, tells us in Vallentine's Jewish Encyclopedia. If the minds of the Jews had not been beclouded, and their hearts hardened, by spiritual darkness engendered by the unworthy leaders of Israel, the principles, life and miracles of Jesus, as well as what He said of Himself, would have convinced them that He is their Messiah.

The day will no doubt come, please God it will be soon, when the hearts of the remnant of Israel, who believe in the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, will turn from their misguided forebears, who rejected Jesus, to those who accepted Him as their Messiah. Then will their hearts leap with joy because from the Jews came the King of Kings, the Apostolic Band, the teaching Church, the first thousands that were incorporated into the Mystical Body of the Messiah. Then will their song be changed from the mournful melody of the Kol Nedri to the joyful "Hosanna to the Son of David."

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....



## 32. Jews Have Moses: Christians Jesus

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

If proposals for settling the differences between Jews and Christians were as flawless as their sponsors are earnest, the issues that divide Jews and Christians would long ago have been settled. This declaration came to mind upon reading your statement, that:

"The Jews have Moses, the Christians have Jesus. Then why does not your Church let it drop at that and give up the idea of bringing 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel' into their fold?"

"Why?" Because your proposal has a flaw in it that makes it untenable. It is the assumption that Moses is on one side of the religious dividing-line, and Jesus on the other side. That is not so, and was never so, even before the religious line of demarcation between Jews and Christians began to exist. Jesus was always in Moses, potentially, in prophecy; while Moses abides in Jesus the "Prophet," Messiah and High Priest. That may be the reason why Moses is the only character in the Old Testament whom Jesus likens to Himself. (*St. John 5:46-47*.)

The Jews of today do claim Moses, but they have him only in part, sentimentally. That is because Moses was, above all else, the high priest of Israel, who functioned sacerdotally at the altar through Aaron and his successors, who are no more. On the other hand, Jesus is the High Priest forever, presented in type in Genesis 14:18, He continues to function in the priests of His Church. That is why they are called, alter Christi, other Christs.

Christians have not Jesus to the exclusion of Moses. They have both, for Jesus is the "Prophet of thy nation and thy brethren like unto me," said Moses, whom "thou," that is you and me, and every other Israelite, "shalt hear" (*Deut. 18:15*). That is why Jesus could say, "Moses wrote of Me" (*St. John 5:46*). Moses was the first prophet; Jesus was the last and the greatest Prophet of Israel. Jesus carried to perfection the principles Moses proclaimed.

Your proposal embodies a failure to realize that you can no more separate Moses from the man-God Jesus than Solomon could divide the child between the women who claimed it and leave each with the child as a living organism. You can no more separate Moses from Jesus than the Ten Commandments can be denied the followers of the Messiah, and leave a moral organism of God's making in the world intact. Moses may be said to represent the negative, and Jesus the positive side of God's law. The two make the whole moral code, as seen in the "Thou shalt nots" of the Commandments, and the "Blessed be they" of the Beatitudes.

The doctrine of Judaism of old was personified in Moses. The doctrine of Christianity is personified in Moses plus Jesus, for while the Mosaic sacrificial worship ended, the moral law lives on forever, though elevated by Jesus.

Moses was the first to proclaim the nature of God, His Oneness. Jesus was the first to proclaim the triadic characteristic of that same God, whose Oneness manifests as the Creator, the Redeemer, and the Sanctifier.

Moses was the Law-giver, whereas Jesus, in His prehuman existence, made the Law that Moses expounded to the children of Israel. St. John tells us that "the Law was given by Moses, but grace (the supernatural favor) and truth (complete knowledge of God) came by Jesus Christ" (*1:17*).

Moses said to the murmuring Jews, "this is what the Lord hath spoken" (*Exod. 16:23*); whereas Jesus commanded in His own name, "I say—" (*St. Matt. 5; 6*).

Moses permitted divorce followed by remarriage (*Deut. 24:1-2*); "but I say to you," said Jesus, that is adultery.



Moses proclaimed the sacrificial worship of the Old Law. Jesus instituted the sacrificial worship of the New Law.

Moses used the blood of beasts for sacrifice; whereas Jesus gave His own blood, being the last lamb to be offered, "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (St. John 1:29).

Moses declared the terror of sin; Jesus forgave sin.

Moses was a sinner, "I have sinned against the Lord" (Deut. 1:41); whereas Jesus never sinned, "which of you can convince (that is convict, prove me guilty) of sin?" (St. John 8:46).

Moses called upon the Lord to show him the way (Exod. 33:12-13); whereas Jesus said, "I am the way" (St. John 14:6)

God spoke through Moses; whereas God spoke in Jesus.

Moses, great though he was, was only a man; whereas Jesus was more than human, He is the "I Am," "He Who Is."


Moses foregleamed Jesus, being the Light that Moses foreshadowed.

The doctrine of Judaism is personified in Moses; whereas the doctrine of Christianity is personified in both Moses and Jesus. That is the basis for maintaining that conversion from the Synagogue to the Church is an affirmation, and not a denial of the faith of our fathers in Israel.

The Catholic Church could no more "drop" the thought of bringing Jews into the Church than she could give up her claim that Jesus is the promise of Moses fulfilled. Jews, and not Christians, must make a choice. They may remain minus Moses as he is in the Torah, or come to him in his fulness in the fold of the Good Shepherd. The unity of the two was seen in the Transfiguration. It was the triumphal occasion when Moses came from his spiritual Jerusalem to appear face to face, in his glorified body, with the "Prophet" he said "thou shalt hear." No separate tabernacle was ever to be erected for Moses, as the voice from heaven said of Jesus, "This is My Beloved Son, hear ye Him," words identical with those uttered by Moses fourteen centuries before, "him thou shalt hear."

The Catholic Church pays great honor to Moses. Her Roman Martyrology lists him as one of the great saints of the Old Law, paying reverence to him especially on the sixth of each August. His figure, chiseled by Michael Angelo in massive proportions, stands in the Church of San Pietro in Vincoli, on the Esquiline Hill, Rome, commanding, by his expression of intellectual and moral strength, an appreciation of the high regard with which Catholics honor the great leader of Israel.

Sincerely in the Messiah  
D.... G.....



### 33. Faith and Reason

My dear Mr. Isaacs:

You charge Catholics with "abrogating reason . . . , substituting faith in its place," holding Judaism to be "based upon knowledge, and not faith."

Your charge is based upon a misapprehension as to what faith really is, and the assumption that faith excludes reason, and reason excludes faith. What is faith? My dictionary definition will suffice for the present—

"Faith is a firm conviction of the truth of what is declared by another, simply on the ground of his truthfulness or faithfulness."

That is human faith, whereas divine faith is the acceptance of truth on the authority of God, instead of man. Are you not guided in your action by faith when ill? or in a legal entanglement? Or do you study the materia medica to find out



the nature of medicinal substances before taking what the doctor prescribes? Do you set faith aside and take to the study of Blackstone's Commentaries, the statutes, and court decisions, as well as legal procedure, before submitting to the judgment of your lawyer for guidance? If so, you would be either unable to write to me, or have to address your letters from some penal institution.

Do not scientists depend upon faith, as well as reason, in their investigations and the formation of their conclusions? They speak of the "law of gravitation," which you and I accept as a scientific fact upon their authority. Yet no one ever saw that "law," for it is a mere hypothesis, a thing assumed to exist, as a basis of reasoning regarding the attraction of bodies. Yet it does not explain how it anchors this revolving earth upon which we live to a central sun ninety-five million miles away, or even how it causes an apple gently to fall to the earth. All that the scientists know is that there is something, called a force, that attracts bodies towards each other. But that does not tell us what it is in itself; or why it does not repel instead of attract bodies. What, but faith, causes us to assent to the existence of such a "law"? Would it be a sign of intelligence or ignorance to refuse to believe in the existence of the law of gravitation upon faith in the knowledge and integrity of the scientists?

If it is wise to accept upon faith the knowledge and guidance of experts in medical, legal and scientific matters, who are fallible, why does not the same principle hold good in matters of a religious and moral nature, which deeply affect our human relationship and eternal well-being? Catholics hold such faith to be wisdom of the highest possible order, as it is submission to divine, infallible authority, to God who never deceives nor can be deceived.

You may rightly ask, "Where does intelligence come in, when guidance in matters of faith and morals is accepted upon authority?" The answer is, in determining the knowledge, truthfulness and faithfulness of the authority to whom the mind says it is wise to submit for guidance, and assenting

thereto, which is the rational mental process man follows.

"Oh, but you do not see God," was the response once made to me when discussing this question. My reply is neither have you seen, or do you know what the soul looks like. Did you ever see a soul? Did you ever see ether? or love? or democracy? yet you believe they exist. What you have seen are manifestations that postulate their existence. You do not need to see God to know He exists. Manifestations are seen continually about us that make denial of His existence a sign of ignorance. David says, in Psalm 18:1.

"The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of his hands."

We accept belief in the existence of God upon faith, yet it is not against reason so to do. Our intelligence, that is our mental comprehensive ability, informs us that just as an effect must have a cause, so must the universe as a whole, man included, be an effect, due to a great first cause, which in religion we designate as God. There is design and order manifesting in the universe, which postulates the existence of a great designer whom we call God. It is a self-evident fact that there is a moral law to which we are subject. It postulates the existence of a Law-maker, called God. Hence it is reasonable to expect God to make known to man what that law is, otherwise man could not know the divinely prescribed line of conduct he must adhere to or avoid. What it is reasonable for man to expect, that God has done. When that knowledge is made known in an extraordinary, a supernatural way, it is called divine revelation. It is the basis of supernatural religions, Judaism and Christianity.

Reason tells us that God made man, and in so doing endowed him with the power of communicating his thought to his fellowman. If God could, and did give such a communicative power to finite beings, no rational person will question the ability of God to exercise that power Himself. That God has done, therefore the Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge could say.



"Scripture teaches, and Orthodox Judaism postulates that the Jews received the words of the living God and Ruler of the universe as a revelation for all time and all generations" (p. 461).

The greatest divine revelation that Jews cherish is the Law, given by God to Israel on Mount Sinai through Moses, upon which their knowledge of God is based. Part of that revelation is the Ten Commandments, which are binding upon all mankind for all time. Do Jews, or Christians abrogate reason for faith when they accept the Ten Commandments on the word of Moses, whose truthfulness and authority cannot be reasonably questioned? Certainly not. They accept those Ten Commandments upon faith, and use the knowledge of their origin and binding force to determine the reasonableness of them, and the degree of their obligation to obey them.

While God revealed the Ten Commandments to fortify the consciences of mankind, nine of them could be known without God giving them in a special way to Moses. They may be known through the light of reason, as God has engraved them on the hearts of men. One of them, "Thou shalt keep the Sabbath holy," could only be known by divine revelation.

Faith does not reject reason, though it is superior to it, neither does reason contradict faith; they are co-relative. That is why the Vatican Council of the Catholic Church declared in 1870:

"Although faith is above reason, there never can be a disagreement between faith and reason, because the same God who has revealed the mysteries and communicated faith, has also given to the human mind the natural light of reason, and we know that God cannot contradict Himself, nor can truth ever be in contradiction with truth." Not only can faith and reason never be in discord, but they lend each other mutual help; right reason *demonstrates* the foundation of faith, and enlightened by the light of

faith, it *developes* the science of divine things; faith, on the other hand, frees and protects reason from error and enriches it with knowledge of many kinds. The Church, therefore, far from being opposed to the study of the arts and sciences, favors these studies and propagates them in a thousand ways."

I would not go into this matter at length were not your charge a common thing in Jewry that darkens the Jewish intellectual mind. For instance, the intense Jewish intellectualist, Dr. True Weiss Rosmarin, says—

"Judaism is a religion of reason. . . . Christianity, on the other hand, exalts belief and makes light of reason and knowledge."

A simple test, that will prove the falsity of the assumption of the intellectual superiority of Judaism to Christianity, is a study of the articles in the Catholic Encyclopedia in contrast to the articles in the Jewish Encyclopedia, the old one as well as the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, now in the making, six volumes of which have thus far been published. No impartial student, who studies Catholic books on theology, the science of God and things related to God of a religious and moral nature, would conclude, if capable and honest, that Christianity "makes light of reason and knowledge."

I doubt if many Jews realize that the theology, which is the reasoning side of religion and morals, in the Jewish world is due largely to Christian contact, as is the music and art in Jewry. Rabbi Lee J. Levinger, Ph.D., of Columbus, Ohio, said,

"There is a peculiar contradiction in Judaism, that the people who laid greatest stress on religion has contributed little to the development of theology, the science of religion.—Theology as a science grew among the Jews chiefly by contact with Christian and Moslem theologians who constituted a challenge to Jewish thinkers" ("*Ency. of Jewish Knowledge*," p. 558).



Whenever an intellectual Jew has the good fortune, by God's grace, to become a Catholic, the light of faith invariably causes him to marvel at the profundity of Catholic teachings as set forth by Catholic theologians, and the unity of them in principles that are of basic import to religion. One need not study the "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas to learn that the Catholic Church appeals to the highest faculty in man, his intellect, in matters of faith and morals. All he needs to do is to study the catechisms that Catholic youth study in kindergartens, high schools and colleges, and to compare them with Jewish catechisms, or that conglomeration of wit, fantasy, nonsense, and wisdom, called the Talmud, to realize the unsoundness of the claim of Jewish intellectual superiority to Christianity in religion.

Faith is the chain that binds man to God, it is intelligence at its apex. The Catholic Church calls faith a theological virtue infused by God into the soul. It is an illumination that causes revealed truths to be seen and believed without doubting. It causes the intellect to assent on account of the absolute reliability of the source from which it comes, God. Catholics accept those revealed teachings as taught by their Church, and recorded in the Bible, because the Church is the "pillar and ground of truth," as St. Paul called her. They accept those truths from the Church, because she is infallible, being protected from error in matters of faith and morals by the Holy Spirit.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....

---

## 34. *The Sabbath*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

Following the practice quite common among persons unfavorable to things Catholic, you utterly disregard the answer I made to your assumption, that the mentality of Catholics is submerged by the acceptance of Catholic belief upon authority, and launch forth on some incidental point that is entirely off the compass.

The subject of my last letter was faith. I tried to get you to realize how natural and necessary it is to have faith, even in purely human affairs; how impossible it is to go through life without depending upon authority for knowledge and guidance; how the principle applies to affairs of a supernatural character; how Catholic faith, resting, as it does upon infallible truth, cannot conflict with reason. This is your response,

"You said that 'Jesus came to fulfil the Law, and not to destroy it.' How can you reconcile that with changing the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday? I am prompted to ask this by your statement, just received, that the Commandment to 'Keep the Sabbath holy' came by revelation from God, and that it is 'binding upon mankind for all time.' To me that is a contradiction."

Perhaps my dissertation upon faith was not entirely in vain, even though you side-stepped the issue. It may have brought you to the realization that there is no use arguing against the inevitable, the use of faith as a guide through life, and to an eternity with God as well. That may be the reason



"O day of rest! How beautiful and fair  
 How welcome to the weary and the old!  
 Day of the Lord! and truce to earthly care!  
 Day of the Lord, as all our days should be!"

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
 D.... G.....

---

### 35. *The Law Fulfilled*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

My attention will be given this day, as promised, to the declaration of Jesus, the Messiah, that He came to fulfill and not to destroy the Law and the Prophets.

I will proceed on the assumption that the letter I sent you a few weeks ago proved conclusively, even to your satisfaction, that the change of the Sabbath Day from Saturday to Sunday did not violate the Commandment; nor did the declaration of Jesus that He came not to destroy the Law do so. You no doubt noted that the point made was that the vital principle in the Commandment, to "keep the seventh day holy," was not changed. The change made was in the point of beginning the reckoning of the seven day week. Christians, believing Jesus to be true God as well as true man; believing Him to be "Lord even of the Sabbath," as He claimed to be (*St. Mark 2:27*), hold that He could have changed the Commandment, if He so willed to do, directly or through His Church.

To get directly to the question, I herewith present, with

comment, the words of Jesus, which appear in the Sermon on the Mount (*St. Matt. 5:17-19*)—

"Do not think that I have come to destroy the Law or the Prophets."

This is held to refer to the Old Testament, its principles and prophecies, and not merely to the five books of Moses.

"I have come not to destroy, but to fulfill them."

This fulfillment came in the perfection of the Law, in the sense that the acorn unfolding its design, which God had implanted in it, lives on in perfection in the beautiful spreading oak, "the patriarch of trees." What we see in the oak tree existed potentially in the acorn, as what we see in the teachings of Jesus existed potentially in the Law and the Prophets, whose prophecies He fulfilled. The same thing is evidenced in the caterpillar metamorphosed into a beautiful butterfly. The passing of the caterpillar does not really mean destruction, as does the death of an ordinary worm, for, like the acorn, the caterpillar passes into a higher form of life. So with many of the teachings in the Old Testament, they live on in New Testament teachings and practices, but in a higher state.

"Amen I say to you"

Jesus was speaking to the Pharisees, who charged Him with breaking the Sabbath by healing on that day; by permitting His disciples to pluck corn while in the cornfield, in order to satisfy their hunger, etc. The petty, unreasonable restrictions placed upon the Jews by the Pharisees were a burden to them, as are the Orthodox Jewish restrictions of today, due to trivial interpretation of God's Law to such an extent that the Ten Commandments were extended to 365 prohibitions. Then, as now, they lost sight of the fundamental teachings of the Old Testament by stressing incidentals to their breaking point.



"Till heaven and earth pass away, not one jot or tittle shall be lost of the Law 'til all things are accomplished."

This Hebraism means that the Law was to end, but only after its purpose was accomplished, when the "new covenant" that God promised had come into being, for, as St. Paul says, after quoting the prophesy of Jeremiah 31:31-34, that

". . . in saying 'a new covenant' he has made obsolete the former one; and that which is obsolete and has grown old is near its end" (*Heb. 8:13*).

Please note that Jesus spoke in the first person. The "I say" this, and "I say" that, shows that He spoke as one having authority such as no other prophet ever could or did assume to speak including Moses the Law-giver. Only a God-man could legitimately use this form of address in proclaiming divine Law. You know the warranted contempt with which Louis XIV of France is spoken of for the arrogant declaration, "*I am the State*," attributed to this enemy of the Catholic Church. He was not the State, though he did usurp its powers. But Jesus could claim universal, supernatural authority, laying down the Law, for He is the Law in its perfection. It was therefore entirely within His province to declare, "I have come to fulfill" the Law. Come from whence? From the place where the Law originated, heaven. Come to destroy? No, to fulfill, to bring out in its fulness the principles and prophesies actually and potentially in the Old Testament. The Law, the expressed will of God, was virtually the law of expectation; it was what was to be. Jesus, the Messiah, is the realization, the fulfillment of that expectation.

Before citing instances of Jesus having fulfilled, and not destroyed the Law and the Prophets, I want to forestall the possibility of your coming back at me with the commonplace Jewish claim, that the teachings of Jesus were not new; that they were not fulfilment of Old Testament teachings; that they were but a repetition of teachings taught by the Rabbis of Israel. I refer, for instance, to the Golden Rule—

"Therefore all things whatever you would that men should do to you, even so do you also to them" (*St. Matt. 7:12*).

The saying of Rabbi Hillel, in a controversy with Rabbi Shammai (leaders of two opposing schools of thought and controversy that flourished at the time of the coming of Jesus), is usually presented to try and prove that Jesus taught nothing new in ethics or morality. Let Dr. Maurice Simon, Editor of Zangwill's *Speeches*; joint translator of the *Zohar* and *Babylonian Talmud*, tell it—

"Once a heathen came to Shammai and mockingly asked him to teach him the Torah while he stood on one leg. Shammai drove him away with his measuring-rod. He then went to Hillel, who said to him 'WHAT IS HATEFUL TO THYSELF DO NOT TO ANOTHER. THIS IS THE WHOLE TORAH; GO AND STUDY IT: THE REST IS COMMENTARY.'"

It is strange that Jewish university men, intellectually keen in things that are other than Christian, should fail to see, what any unbiased beginner in the study of logic can observe, that the negative pronouncement of Hillel differs as greatly from the positive pronouncement of Jesus as the Christian religion differs from Judaism. Hillel's Rule is purely naturalistic. Self-love, self-protection, not love of fellowman, not self-sacrifice, is the basis of counselling not to do what you hate to have done to yourself. It ought to be called the *Leaden Rule* instead of assuming to be the *Golden Rule*, as it only keeps a man from blackjacking his neighbor with a lead pipe because he does not want to be blackjacked himself. The *Golden Rule* of Jesus is based on the principle of love, and not hate. It is spiritual in its nature, and therefore requires the aid of God, God's grace in one's heart, to obey it.

The difference between the *Golden Rule* and this *Leaden Rule* is plainly seen when applied to the question of democracy, which is uppermost in the minds of the citizens of the "United Nations" at war to safeguard the exercise of the rights it embodies. Following the *Golden Rule*, the Christian demands freedom of worship, of balloting for public officials,



of speaking, printing, being educated, and equality before the law, on the ground that he is a person; because he is a human entity who has unalienable rights with which God had endowed him. He wants others to be permitted to exercise those same rights, because they also are persons made in the image of God, and endowed with the same unalienable rights. Following the Leaden Rule, the Jew would demand those freedoms for the other fellow because he hates to be deprived of those freedoms himself. One might logically stretch such an irreligious principle to the point of saying, that if depriving the other fellow of the exercise of those rights were not likely to cause him also to be tyrannized, he would not bother about the other fellow's rights at all.

There has come a frank acknowledgment in Jewry that the ethical code of Jesus is of a distinctively higher order than the "Hebrew ethical code," which is further evidence of the elevation and perfection of the Mosaic code. It refutes the assumption that Hillel's standard is the same as the standards of Jesus, and preceded it. The teachings of Jesus are so far above those heretofore taught, that Prof. Joseph Klausner, of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who rejects the Messiahship, miracles, mysticism, and other things that prove Jesus to be the God-man, ends his 414 page "Jesus of Nazareth," with this statement,

"But in his ethical code there is a sublimity, distinctiveness and originality in form unparalleled in any other Hebrew ethical code; neither is there any parallel to the remarkable art of his parables. The shrewdness and sharpness of his proverbs and his forceful epigrams serve, in an exceptional degree, to make ethical ideas a popular possession. If ever the day should come that this ethical code be stripped of its wrappings of miracles and mysticism, the Book of Ethics of Jesus will be one of the choicest treasures in the literature of Israel for all time."

The more one studies the Christian contrast to the Jewish religion, the clearer is seen that one is the positive, while the other is the negative of God's Law. This fact so deeply im-

presses converts from the Synagogue to the Church, whose spiritual life is nourished regularly with the Bread of Life, Jesus Himself, that they can never again return to the Judaism of our day with any religious satisfaction. Those Israelites who do "back-slide" are usually from Protestantism, where baptism is generally conferred upon the mere request for it. Yet there are exceptions, such as Dr. Alfred Edersheim of Oxford University, a learned Hebrew Protestant Minister. In his informing work, "The Life And Times Of Jesus The Messiah," after telling of the sublimity of the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, including the text which is the subject of this letter, in contrast to the teachings of Judaism, even in the use of similar terms, says—

"He who has thirsted and quenched his thirst at the living fount of Christ's Teaching, can never stop to seek drink at the broken cisterns of Rabbinism."

Having forestalled your possible comeback, it is in order to return once more directly to the text of this letter. I have endeavored to prove that Jesus fulfilled the Law and the Prophets, being the realization of them; having elevated the Law to spiritual heights never before attained. This is seen in the Eight Beatitudes, the counterpart of the Ten Commandments, which bestow blessings upon the poor, the meek, the mournful, those who seek justice, are merciful, clean of heart, peacemakers, and the persecuted. They taught man that he is subject not merely to the Law written on tablets of stone, but also to the spirit of God that is written on the fleshly tablets of the heart.

The fulfillment of the Law by Jesus is seen in the declaration that set the standard of marital relation back to the design of God, when man and wife were made two in one flesh. Perfection is seen in the pronouncement, that "what God hath joined together" no man has a legitimate right to "put asunder"; by declaring that the remarriage of either separated party to a marital union is adultery.



The fulfillment of the Law is seen in the spiritual food given to man by Jesus, the Blessed Sacrament, the Bread of Eternal Life, in contrast to the Manna that typified it, upon which our fathers in Israel lived in the wilderness (*St. John 6:48-52*).

The fulfillment of the Law is seen in the Messiah as High Priest, promised in *Genesis 14:18-20* and *Psalms 109* to be "According to the order of Melchisedec, that is, without genealogy, not of the Levitical order, not local or national, but universal, catholic.

The fulfillment of the Law is seen in the Sacrifice Jesus instituted at the last Passover gathering of the Old Law, called the Last Supper. It is the "clean oblation," which Malachi (*1:11*) said would supersede the bloody sacrifices of Israel. It was to be for "the Gentiles," as well as the Jews, whereas the Mosaic sacrifices were exclusively for Jews. It was to be offered on altars all over the world, instead of the oblations offered from one altar, in the Temple in Jerusalem, which is no more.

In the Church established by the Messiah (*St. Matt. 16*) is seen the fulfillment of the promised kingdom of the seed of David, that was to last "forever" (*2 Kings 7:13*). Thus the Kingdom of Israel lives on in the Kingdom of God, as the Church is called.

If the fulfillment of the law is not seen in the institution of a new priesthood and Sacrifice, then how account for the end having come to the Mosaic priesthood and its sacrifices, as well as the Temple? If that convinces you not, then there is Jesus, who, in Himself, is the Law fulfilled. He is the predicted Messiah, who was born in the time, place and manner; lived, suffered and died, as foretold in about a half a hundred texts in the Old Testament. If all the evidence presented in this letter is not sufficient to get you to realize that Christianity has displaced Judaism by its fulfillment, then there remains but one thing more the claim of Jesus on the Cross that He had fulfilled His Messianic mission, to bring the Old Law to fruition, *St. John* says—(*19:28*)

"Afterwards Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, said, 'I thirst.'"

This thirst was not for drink, as the Roman soldiers imagined when they put a sponge soaked with gall and vinegar into his mouth. It was the eagerness, the longing in the heart of Jesus for your soul and mine, and every other soul, for His mission was to bring man to the Eternal Jerusalem. That thirst you refuse to satiate with your love, for which your Messiah yearns today, as He did nineteen hundred years ago on the Cross. The very last word that Jesus uttered, while in agony on the Cross, was—"It is consummated." This means that Jesus had completed, had brought to perfection, had fulfilled the mission that the law and the Prophets said the Messiah would fulfill.

If, after all that is related in this letter you are not convinced that Jesus did not destroy but fulfilled the Law, my only satisfaction is that I sincerely tried to dispel the cloud that keeps you from realizing the glorious inheritance that awaits Jews in Jesus as their Lord and their God.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*

D.... G.....

---

### 36. *The Jewish Name*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

You amuse me by asking, "Why, so long as you denied Judaism, didn't you also deny your Jewish name?" concluding that "If it were not that your name's Goldstein, I would



judge by your extreme Catholicism that you were to the Catholic manor born."

The answer to your query is very simple, I am proud of my Jewish name, and not ashamed of it as are some of the Goldsteins who have changed their family name to Goldin, Gerard, Giddings, and Gould, and their given names from Isaac to William, Israel to Percival, Rebecca to Rosalind, and Rachel to Phyllis, to mention only a few of the hundreds of Jewish name-dodgers read about in the Jewish press. They are like an occasional half-baked Catholic who names his children after nuts—Hazel and Hickory—instead of saints.

You bring to mind a conversation regarding ancestors, that took place during a dinner at which a friend and I were being entertained. The honors seemed to go to the lady who proved to be of real New England "blue-blood" stock, as she could trace her family tree back to the Cabin of the Mayflower. Noticing that I kept on silently eating while that part of the conversation was going on, the host good-naturedly asked, "How far back do you go?" My instant proud response, "I date back to Abraham," caused the descendant from the first Cape Codders to be laughed into the discard.

While an entire change of name on the part of persons who enter the religious life is obligatory in some religious orders, being an act of severance from all worldly relationship, no such an obligation is imposed as a condition of baptism. Hence, while Jews in growing numbers have been trying to dodge their Jewish origin, long before the Jew-hater Hitler had afflicted the world, I took great satisfaction in parading a name that is as Jewish as Murphy is Irish. It made me feel closer in human relationship with Jesus, Mary, Joseph, the Apostles, and St. Paul than are Catholics to the manor born.

Besides, a Catholic with a Jewish name,—Goldstine, not Goldsteen—emphasizes the fallacy of the notion from which I have been endeavoring to wean you, that the acceptance of God's New Testament principles is a denial of God's Old Testament principles. What you call "extreme Catholicism"

is no more a denial of Judaism of old than the majestic oak is a repudiation of the acorn from which it came forth. One is the full-blossoming of what existed potentially in the other.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....

---

### 37. *Adam's Fall*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

It is interesting to learn that you discussed my recent letter with Rabbi S.... I would like to have listened-in on the discussion, even though it was very likely one-sided.

One part of the Rabbi's statement is correct, "The starting point of Christian belief is the fall of man, 'original sin.' Jesus is supposed to have come to atone for the sin of Adam by suffering, and dying on the cross." But when he says that "Jewish writings repudiate belief in 'original sin,' and vicarious atonement," then must he exclude the Old Testament, which Rabbi S.... knows to be a library of Jewish writings of the highest order.

I will deal largely with the last statement first, and devote the following two letters to a more complete answer to the question of why, and how

"In Adam's fall—  
We sinned all."

Rabbi S.... would not deny the fall of Adam through sin, as Jewish theologians are agreed on that point. What he, and other Rabbis deny is the real seriousness of it; the result at-



tributed by Christians to that first sin of humanity. He would deny that the sin of Adam affected the nature, the spiritual status of man; that it required a Second Adam to restore man to the favor of God, through sacrifice, such as the Messiah made on the Cross. I assume we are all agreed that the Old Testament is the best authority on the subject. Yet what appears therein is but the fore-shadowing of what is seen in the New Testament, as the content of the seed is not seen in its fulness until it blossoms forth.

Yet the evidence in the Old Testament is sufficient to show that the Jewish repudiation of original sin, in the Christian sense of the term, is unsound. David says of himself,

"Behold, in iniquity was I brought forth; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (*Psalm 50:7*).

What other than original sin can here be referred to? It could not refer to the moral conduct of his parents, as David is declared to have been the offspring of a marriage that was "honorable and undefiled."

In the Wisdom of Solomon, we have more definite evidence, as one of the results of original sin, death, is mentioned,

"God created man incorruptible, and to the image of his own likeness he made him.

"But by the envy of the devil, death came into the world" (*2:23-24*).

The "devil," referred to in the Wisdom of Solomon, came in the form of a serpent, as Moses tells us in *Genesis 3:1*. This vile creature lured Eve, who in turn ensnared Adam into doing what God forbade, eating of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (*Gen. 2:9*). Adam as head of the human family, the source of the nature of man, Eve included, is the responsible cause of the affliction called the sin of our first parents, but more correctly the sin of Adam. We are, in our humanity, the inheritors of the condition that existed at the point of origin of humanity, Adam. Therefore what Adam

lost we are deprived of, such as freedom from the drudgery of toil, pain, death, etc. This is not a personal sin on our part, as it was on the part of Adam, it is a condition of deprivation called original sin. We suffer from the war of our first parents against God, just as coming generations are going to suffer financially for the expenditures of the present war of nations, a war that was not of their making, an indebtedness they had no part in determining.

When discussing questions of this kind, it is necessary to go back at times to some things of simple, yet basic import, upon which, fortunately, there is an agreement, even though we disagree when drawing conclusions therefrom. One of these things is the principle of holding man, not God, responsible for the transgressions of man. God made everything "good," Adam included, that is perfect of its kind, as Moses said,

"God beheld everything he had created, and it was very good" (*Gen. 1:31*).

While Adam was made perfect, as were all animals, he differed from other creatures in that he was endowed with free will. That means he had the faculty of choosing good or evil; the power of obeying or disobeying God's will, as have you and I. Animals below man, being devoid of that faculty, can neither do a moral nor an immoral act, for they are non-moral beings. Only Adam and his descendants were subject to dishonorable thoughts, false hopes, pride, lust, in a word, sin. Though Adam was made perfect; though he had the innocence of a child, he had the powers of a man. Those powers permitted him, if he so willed, as they permit us, to defy the very God that made him. As a result of the abuse of those powers he lost his innocence, the Garden of Paradise, and other things that will be mentioned in my next letter, not only for himself but for his descendants. It will be sufficient to name two of those things that are plainly evident. Adam was punished with hard labor, and death, that man has since suffered,



"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the earth,—for dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return" (*Gen. 3:17, 19*).

Adam's rebellion against God, caused him to be punished. He and his descendants had to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. The things that God made to serve man without hardships, such as the land, man had to till and to struggle to bring forth its fruits. That original sin of Adam was the sin of humanity, for Adam was humanity in the beginning. He was punished by bringing death to himself and thus to all humankind, for he was condemned to return to the dust from which he came. That is, the basis for St. Paul's statement,

"Therefore as through one man sin entered into the world and through sin death, and thus death has passed unto all men—" (*Rom. 5:12*).

The same principle St. Paul set forth in his Epistle to the Romans was enunciated by the Son of Sirach, known in the Talmud as Ben Sira, in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, about 250 years before the Apostle to the Gentiles, viz.,

"By the disobedience of one man, many were constituted sinners" (*5:19*).

Enough has been said to settle one point in particular, that is that there is warrant in Jewish writings, in the Old Testament, for belief in original sin, which has wounded human nature. More will follow, as promised.

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....

---

## 38. *Effects of Original Sin*

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

In considering the question of original sin, I naturally look back to my own experience, having taken to things Catholic in my manhood after studying the teachings of the Church. Having arrived, step by step, to belief in God, in revelation, in Judaism fulfilled in Christianity, in the Catholic Church being the Church of the living God, and her being protected from error in matters of faith and morals, some of her teachings, such as the Trinity, the immaculate conception, the assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, were accepted by me on her infallible say so. This seemed quite reasonable to me, for if God speaks through His Church, as I believe He does, then can she no more be in error than could God be in error, in such a thing as original sin.

Yet I had to be convinced that what the Church taught on the subject is not contrary to right-reasoning. Believing that God made all things "good," including man, I began to ask some searching questions: "Why are we living in a valley of tears, instead of a terrestrial paradise such as was the abode of our first parents during their days of obedience to God's will?" "Why do women suffer the pangs of childbirth, whereas animals bring forth their young unaided, without suffering?" "Why does man, and not animals, suffer the affliction of concupiscence?" "Why, like a furnace from which all sinful notions as so many sparks continually arise, is man kept struggling against the rebellion of his passions?" They are physical afflictions which must arise from the soul, which is the vital, the animating principle in man. The soul must



is most likely to be, "If the Catholic Church is a miracle, then are the Jews a greater miracle, for they have existed long before Christianity and its Catholic Church."

The Jews are an enigma rather than a miracle, for while the Jewish Church existed before the Christian era, the Jews have not existed as an organic religious, authoritative group since the end of their priesthood, sacrifices and Temple. The Jews live on as a people, just as the Egyptians, Greeks and Chinese live on, though they seem to have a providential reason for their existence that the other people have not. They are held together by persecution, not by religious principles. That alone accounts for many among them being called "Jews" by Jews, even when they go so far as to utterly repudiate belief in God.

Jews seem destined to live on all over the world as witnesses of the Law fulfilled in Christ that they as God's chosen people had in their keeping. They seem destined to live on, as a persecuted people, until their minds are illumined and their hearts mellowed by the recognition that their inheritance is Jesus as the Son of David. The Catholic Church holds with St. Paul (*Romans 2*), that "God has not cast off His people"; that the day will come when there will be a general conversion of the Jews, which will mark the time of a final triumph of Christ and His Church throughout the world.

Doctrinal unity, which does not exist in Jewry, is one of the marks by which the Church God established is identified, be it Jewish or Christian, a question that was dealt with in a former letter. Only by the miraculous power of God is it possible for a spiritual society, such as the Catholic Church, to maintain its doctrinal integrity, to exist for over nineteen centuries, holding strictly to every article in the Creed of the Apostles. I refer to oneness in faith and in moral standards, and not to political oneness, economic oneness, oneness of judgment as to how the present world conflict will end, or whether the "new world order" contemplated on both sides of the firing line will stabilize interna-

tional relations any better than did the Versailles Treaty that was "to make the world safe for democracy." The miraculous nature of the Catholic Church was noted by St. Thomas of Aquin in the following words,

"It would indeed have been the most amazing of miracles if, without any miraculous prodigy, a few simple, unknown men had persuaded the world to embrace a Faith containing mysteries so far beyond man's comprehension, which entailed obligations so onerous, and anticipated a future so sublime" (*Contra. Gent., 1, 6*).

Sincerely in the Messiah  
D.... G.....

---

## 55. Gentiles and Jews

---

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

If it were not that inexact terminology leads to false concepts, I would laugh and pass by your references to me as a Jew, and then as a Gentile, when, as a Christian, I am neither.

It is all too common a practice to call Christians Gentiles, just as the Mormons classify all non-Mormons. It caused Simon Bamberger (Jewish), the Governor of Utah (1917-1921), jokingly to say, "in my State I am both a Jew and a Gentile." I also find it all too common for editors, and Christian speakers (when addressing Jewish groups) to write and talk of "Jews and Gentiles." To me it is hiding, if not denying their Christian faith. Gentile is a term of Latin origin that has no equivalent in the Hebrew language. The expres-



sion nearest to it is "Goy" (pl. Goyim), a national designation that means a "stranger," a person belonging to a non-Jewish nation, a "heathen." Hence the term "Goyim," generally used contemptuously, means heathens. The Pharisee drew back the hem of his garment when he passed a "Goy," as the Pharisee's concept of God was a "respector of persons." No doubt it was this contempt for the "Goyim" that caused Shakespeare to make Shylock say,

"I will buy with you, sell with you, walk with you, talk with you; but I will not eat with you, drink with you, nor pray with you."

This contempt for the Gentiles did not die out immediately in apostolic time with the conversion of the Jews to the Catholic Church, which was made up in the first years entirely of converts from Israel, hence they demanded that the Gentiles be made Jews by circumcision before being baptized. This question had to be settled at the Council of Jerusalem, sixteen years after Christ ascended into heaven.

In pre-Christian times, it was both proper and comprehensive to speak of society being divided between Jews and Gentiles, as Jews were then God's chosen children, the keepers of God's Law, worshippers of the one true God, in contrast to the Gentiles, who were idolators, who worshipped many gods. But with the coming of the Christ, with the beginning of the Messianic Age, a new religious division of society took place, henceforth only those who were neither Jews nor Christians could be properly designated as Gentiles. St. Paul referred to the Gentiles as Greeks (*Rom. 1:16; 2:9, 10; 10:12*), perhaps because they spoke the Greek language, or perhaps because he did not want to refer to them in a term that had on odious significance, as "with God there is no respect of person."

When it comes to the term Jew, the mind halts, as such a thing as a clear-cut meaning of it is not in the lexicon of Jewry today, the place where it ought to be found. As Jews, so-called, do not agree on this point of beginning an evalua-

tion of themselves, Judaism has logically become what it is intellectually, religious confusion.

This is very much of a surprise to prospective converts from the Synagogue to the Church. They seriously study the Old Testament to find out if the Catholic claim is true, that its principles and prophecies are fulfilled and perfected in the New Testament. They find Old Testament Judaism to be organic, it being more of a text book of Judaism than the New Testament is of Christianity, though the teachings of Christ are therein set forth. They conclude that Judaism is the religion of the children of Israel as set forth in the Old Testament, especially in the Torah, the five Books of Moses. That is as our Fathers of old in Israel define a Jew, for

"Curseth is he that abideth not in the words of this Law, and fulfilleth them not in work," said Moses (*Deut. 27:26*).

Even since the destruction of the Temple, up to about a couple of hundred years ago, a Jew who repudiated belief in the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (even for lesser offenses) was "cut off" from Israel. That is why Spinoza was excommunicated, cursed and driven out of Amsterdam by the Synagogue of that city (1656), for expressing belief in a pantheistic concept of God. But not so today, leading "Jews" have publicly repudiated belief in a personal God, yet they are classified as Jews in Jewish encyclopedias and the Jewish Who's Who. One leader said, "We Jews need not believe in our religion—, the Jew needs believe nothing" to be a Jew (*Ludwig Lewisohn, quoted in "From Pharaoh to Hitler," p. 42*).

I do not mean to infer that Israelites are of the non-believing type. There are a multitude of them, Orthodox Jews, though they are a dwindling group, who cry out to God in their suffering, as did Job, "Behold though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him" (*13:15*).

Jews are not a distinctive race, as they rightly say; and only a minority\* look upon themselves as belonging to a

\* World War II has greatly increased their number.



Jewish nation, something that they were unitedly at one time in the history of Israel. Their desire for a Jewish State in Palestine is largely as a place of refuge for persecuted Jews.

Of course, as a whole, persons called Jews may be called Israelites irrespective of their beliefs, as they are descendants of Jacob (Israel). But that does not tell us what the distinguishing characteristic is that determines a Jew. When religion, the *raison d'être* for being a Jew, is eliminated, what remains? The answer is, made by some Rabbis, the "Zionist Jew," the "B'nai B'rith Jew," the "philanthropic Jew," the "social-climbing Jew," the "Christian-Jewish good will Jew," who is usually ignorant of what Old Testament Judaism is, never utters a prayer, and generally sticks to association with Jewry because he has a kinship of suffering or defense with it, as well as family association, to state it at its best. Some one has said, I do not recall his name, that "a Jew is a person who calls himself a Jew." On the other hand, there are Christians who call everybody a Jew who is born of Jewish parents be he an Atheist or a Catholic.

What is a Jew? The answer of the Israelites of today is like the answer of the Yankee farmer, who was asked the price of land in his community, "Good high land is worth considerable; low boggy land ain't worth quite so much." While it is not within my right to define the term Jew for "Jews," to me the only correct definition is, one who believes in the Mosaic religion. I cannot let this opportunity go by without calling your attention to the fact that the convert from the Synagogue to the Church is more of an Old Testament Jew, in the sense of believing and worshipping the God of Israel than are three quarters of the nearly five million "Jews" in our country. It was perfectly proper to speak of "Jews and Gentiles" in pre-Christian but not in Christian times. Hence it is an offense (though not so intended) for Jews and others to designate an analysis of the Jewish question, "Jews In a Gentile World" (1942).

*Sincerely in the Messiah*  
D.... G.....

56. *Infallibility of the Pope*

*My dear Mr. Isaacs:*

A request came to me two weeks ago to dine and sit in with a group of Jews, Harvard students, who were to discuss religion, to which I responded.

They, all strangers to me, were moved by a discussion of my "Jewish Panorama" to have me "add spice to the con-fab." All eyes were centered upon me, often more than their ears, as never before had they met such a strange thing as a "Goldstein-Catholic," to quote one of them. They knew not that there was a family of eight Baltimore Goldsteins and a New Hampshire Goldstein of artistic musical skill in the Church, and that a lady who had that precious name is doing service as a Dominican Nun. It was a hard night's work, as their questions and objections seemed to cover almost the whole gamut of things Catholic. While some of them were sceptical about this, and others about that, they all seemed to scorn belief in the infallibility of the pope, as do you.

Keen though these young men were, they had a doctrinal concept of infallibility that was as far from the Catholic concept of it as was that of the youngster I heard of recently, though not as humorous.

*Youngster:* "Mother, I wouldn't be a Catholic for anything."

*Mother:* "Why, my dear?"

*Youngster:* "I don't believe the pope is God."

*Mother:* "Why, my boy, I do not think Catholics believe that."