

Goldstein, David
Jewish problems by
ADQ 3892

JEWISH

Problems

by
**A CHRISTIAN
ISRAELITE**

DAVID GOLDSTEIN, LL.D.

Fathers Rumble and Carty

Radio Replies Press

St. Paul 1, Minn.

Copyright 1944
by the
RADIO REPLIES PRESS
Printed in U. S. A.

CONTENTS

1. Rabbi Levin.
2. Jews a Problem.
3. The Jewish Panorama and Letters of a Hebrew-Catholic to Mr. Isaacs.
4. Anti-Christian Books.
5. Sholem Asch.
6. "The Apostle".
7. "The Nazarene".
8. The Crucifixion.
9. "The Devil and the Jews".
10. Palestine-Zionism.
11. Refugee Problem.
12. Federation of Arab States.

Deacidified

JEWISH PROBLEMS
BY A
CHRISTIAN ISRAELITE

DAVID GOLDSTEIN, LL.D.

Rev. Charles M. Carty
Radio Replies Press
St. Paul 1, Minn.



Dear Father Carty:

I am responding herewith at length to the request made during our conference in Chicago, that you be presented with a detailed writeup of the things Jewish we talked about that have occupied my mind since the publication of the Jewish Panorama and the Letters of a Hebrew-Catholic to Mr. Isaacs.

Though I promised the writeup, I hesitated somewhat to send it to you upon my return to Boston. This was due to fear that such matter, if given publicity, might add to the hypersensitiveness of Jews told of in my books, which has been intensified of late by the horrible persecution, robbery, expatriation, and slaughter of Jews by the Hitler regime and the countries it dominates. Besides, this hypersensitiveness tends to cause Jews to dub all persons, even some of their fellow-Jews, who are not one hundred per cent in agreement with them, as anti-semites, a designation I hope never to have added to my name.

N.B.—Dr. Goldstein calls himself a Christian Israelite rather than a Christian Jew. See Jewish Panorama for the explanation of this distinction.

RABBI LEVIN

It was the appearance of an attack upon the Church by Rabbi Hershel Levin, reported recently in the press of Springfield, Mass., that prompted me to go ahead and fulfill my promise, from which I was about to ask to be excused. My reply to Rabbi Levin, that appeared in two daily newspapers and the Catholic Mirror of Springfield, was as follows:

To the Editor:

Dear Sir:

If the charge, made at the luncheon of the Kiwanis Club in Hotel Kimball, by Rabbi Hershel Levin of Sinai Temple, that anti-Semitism is to be blamed on the early church, is correctly reported in the Springfield newspapers, then it is as un-historic as it is unwise.

That there are instances, and all too many of them, of Catholics participating in hostile actions toward Jews in the ages gone by, is admitted by the foremost Catholic historians. But the Catholic Church of those ages was no more to blame for those anti-semitic acts than is the Church of today responsible for the action of Catholics who disregard the official condemnation of anti-semitism as a sin against Christian charity.

By the early Church, Rabbi Levin very likely means the Church of the Middle Ages. This is said upon the assumption that he knows that from the days when Constantine made it a criminal offense to stone converts from the Synagogue to the Church, back to the days when St. Stephen was stoned to death, Christians suffered at the hands of Jews rather than Jews at the hands of the Church.

Jews did suffer at times during the Middle Ages on account of the action of Catholics, but they were Catholics who refused to obey the

mandates of their Church. This was recognized by Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, provost of the Jewish Theological Seminary, who, evidently not knowing of the sentiments of Rabbi Levin, said in the New York Times (March 26, 1940):

'No keener rebuke has come to Nazism than from Pope Pius XI and his successor, Pope Pius XII. Mindful of history, the Jew will remember that while all medieval European states expelled his ancestors, it was in the Papal States alone that they were spared such treatment. Indeed, it is not too much to say with Professor Salo W. Barron that 'It may be asserted that, had it not been for the Catholic Church the Jews would not have survived the middle ages in Christian Europe.'"

Despite the injustices meted out to Jews by Catholics who refused to give ear to the voice of the Church, there is no more warrant for holding the Jews to have been 'forced to be money lenders', as Rabbi Levin is reported to have said, money lenders who exploited the Christian populace by usurious exactions, than there would be for graduates from Judaism to Christianity becoming anti-semites on account of the bitter hostility toward them on the part of their former coreligionists.

Modern anti-semitism is an abomination that every sincere Christian deploras. It centers today in Germany and Palestine, and it would take an abnormal stretch of the imagination to attribute it to the Christian Church of our age or any other age.

It is unwise, to say the least, to charge its source to the Church while discussing the timely topic, "To Bigotry, No Sanction," in face of the fact that it has been condemned by the Catholic hierarchy in Germany, Italy, Poland, Great Britain, the United States, and other countries, under the leadership of Popes Pius XI and XII.

It is unwise, to say the least, for a Jewish Rabbi

to attribute the anti-semitism of our time to the Church that is a world-wide friend of the Jews, during these days when the growing anti-semitism of the Arabs (92 per cent Moslems) is likely to result in an armed attack upon the Jews in Palestine should they succeed in their campaign for a "Jewish Commonwealth," through the abrogation of the British White Paper of 1939.

These are the days when good will should obtain between Jews and Catholics. To this the wise in both camps assent. Therefore, "To Bigotry, No Sanction" should be given, whether the bigotry be anti-Jewish or anti-Catholic.

Respectfully,

David Goldstein, LL.D.

Astor P. O. Station, Boston, Mass.

JEWS A PROBLEM

Jews seem to be a problem in almost every country they inhabit, as they themselves are forced to realize, sometimes on account of the Rabbi Levins. The principal exception seems to be the Soviet Union, where the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" has been proletarianizing, dereligionizing, and gradually assimilating into its Marxian "Mass-man" those Jews it does not "liquidate." To that end, the Soviet Union has declared anti-semitism to be a crime, for Stalin knows that it has a tendency to make Jews more Jewish than they would otherwise be, and thus retard their assimilation.

Considering that one-third of the Jews of the world reside within the confines of the United States, there is every reason to believe that Jews are likely to become a problem in our country after victory comes to the United Nations. The signs of it are already on the American horizon.

Jews are so well aware of this threatening un-Americanism, that they ought to watch their step, so as to ward off this possible avalanche of hostility which would make life hard for them. Two of the many ways by which I believe this hostility may be restrained is by calling a halt, or, at least, by repudiating the assaults made by some of their foremost writers upon things that are dear to the hearts of Christians; and by ceasing their high pressure, undemocratic opposition to the demands of the Arabs whose desired friendship with the United States their propaganda hinders.

THE JEWISH PANORAMA and LETTERS OF A HEBREW-CATHOLIC TO MR. ISAACS

What I am driving at, Father Carty, is but an amplification of what is said in the Jewish Panorama and the Letters of a Hebrew-Catholic to Mr. Isaacs. You know that therein is presented some of the things I hold to be the cause of Jews becoming a problem in our country. Therein I have set forth and analyzed present-day Jewry; its teachings; doctrinal and organizational differences and divisions, as well as their attitude towards things Christian. Therein is outlined some of the characteristics of Jews; the oppositions they encounter and the causes of them; also the injustices they suffer today, and those they have suffered in the centuries long gone by that they woefully recall. Therein is presented what I believe to be the ultimate solution of their problems. You have noted that under the caption "Statistical View of the Jews," I have shown, often with

figures taken from Jewish sources, their numbers, the countries they inhabit, their migration, emigration and immigration numbers, their declining birth rate; industrial, commercial and financial status; the extent of their ownership of theatres, scenario producing and playing houses, newspapers, broadcasting stations, etc., etc., etc. Over fifty pages of the books are devoted to Zionism. Its origin, principles, objectives, and those dangers of their making are dealt with that are expected to climax in a clash of the Jews in the Near East with the Arabs, which may possibly force Great Britain to militarize Palestine and its environs before the present World War comes to an end.

I have plainly stated that the primary purpose of the Jewish Panorama and the Letters of a Hebrew-Catholic to Mr. Isaacs is to make present-day Jewry and Judaism better known to Christians, and Christianity better known to Jews; and to make the relationship of one to the other better known to both Christians and Jews. You yourself have noted, as have others, that while my books are not a defense of the Jews, they do defend them at points against the gross misrepresentation of things Jewish that form, to some extent, the basis of the anti-semitism and its inhumanities that Hitler, the twentieth century Haman, personifies. You have also noted that while my books are not an indictment of Jews, there are points at which I have found it necessary to take them to task, though, as the Telegraph-Register of Cincinnati stated "without prejudice, without animosity, and in all charity." And why should this be otherwise? All intelligent Christians know that the indebtedness of Christianity to Israel is eternal; that without Judaism, Christianity would never have come into existence; that Christianity owes all that is great and glorious in personages, prin-

principles and practices as recorded in Holy Scripture, including Holy Scripture itself, to the forebears of present-day Jews.

ANTI-CHRISTIAN BOOKS

With this as a foreword, I come more directly to the matter you and I discussed at our Chicago conference. You will recall that I stressed the unwisdom of Jewish writers of prominence in our country making assaults upon things dear to the hearts of Christians in general and our Catholic Church in particular. I say unwisdom, because these are the most trying times that Jews have encountered since the days of Bar Kokba, when, rallying to the leadership of this pretended-to-be-Messiah, as many Jews were slaughtered as live in Palestine today, and not a stone was left upon a stone in the whole of Jerusalem, a slaughter Jews should do all in their power to avoid being repeated.

In presenting some of the matter I referred to in our conversation as an assault upon things Christian, I purpose to confine myself entirely to some of the writings that have come from the pen of influential Jews in our country since Hitler afflicted the world in general and Jews in particular by precipitating the present World War.

SHOLEM ASCH

First to be considered are the writings of Sholem Asch, in which things vitally Christian are dealt with, on account of their popularity. His two books, *The Nazarene* and *The Apostle*, translated from the Yiddish, that followed and may have been inspired by the Jesus of Nazareth and *From Jesus to Paul*, written in Hebrew by Professor Joseph Klausner of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and translated into English in 1926 and

1942. While the viewpoints of these two Jewish writers are the same in all but a few particulars, Klausner's books are non-fictional argumentative, while Asch's writings are fictional, imaginative, inventive.

Sholem Asch is a skillful litterateur, character constructor and narrator, who vividly and interestingly sets forth Jewish customs, liturgy, sects, dissensions, and the Palestine of the days of Christ and St. Paul. His description of Mediterranean cities, as well as the story of the burning of Rome, Neronian persecution, etc., etc., are presented so graphically that the popularity of the books is not surprising.

"THE APOSTLE"

The Apostle (1943), to deal with the last book first, is a graphic travesty on St. Paul, who is presented as a religious fanatic and obsessed individual, an epileptic, etc. This is rather strange, for the author tells of some of the strenuous work that Paul carried on; some of his trying missionary journeys; dangers encountered; persecutions, trials and imprisonments, which could never have been endured for thirty years by a person who was subject to epileptic fits, and other physical and temperamental afflictions ascribed to Paul The Apostle. He is portrayed as drinking to intoxication, and indulging in the debauched rites of pagan worship, waking in the morning with his head in the lap of an adulterous woman. Paul's vision of Christ, which Christians hold undoubtedly to have been miraculous, followed by his conversion, Asch holds to have been a delusion brought about by the terrifying wind storm and lightning flashes as well as his intense, sickly nature.

Asch stresses the oft-repeated claim of Jewish

writers, that Christianity is of Paul and not of Jesus, which has been made in Jewry only since the advent of Reform Judaism during the last century. Paul is held to have transformed a Jewish messianic faith into a Gentile Christianity; converting a purely Jewish movement which was minus pagan accretions, into a new Jewish sect. This perversion of New Testament truth is so common in Jewry that I found it necessary to devote a part of the JEWISH PANORAMA to it under the heading PAULINISM. This assumption classifies believers in Jesus Christ throughout the Christian ages as ignorant and deluded, for they all believe, and continue to believe, that Christianity is of Christ and not of Paul; that the Church is the "Body of Christ," which began functioning before Saul became Paul, and with which Christ promised to remain until the end of the world. It was not and is not a "Jewish sect" of Paul or anyone else's making; it is the religion of the Church Christ established.

This Paulinism is not of Sholem Asch's making, as I said a moment ago. It is proclaimed in all the Jewish encyclopedias, and in dozens of other Jewish publications, the latest is the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia (N.Y. 1939-1943) in which it is said that

"Paul was the great organizer of the Christian Church . . . he set up Christianity as a separate religion opposed to Judaism."

and, strange to say, he did not know what he was doing, for the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia goes on to say,

"Paul himself had neither the consciousness that he was founding a new religion nor the intention of so doing" (Vol. 8, p. 616).

To the credit of Prof. Klausner, be it said that he knew better. He says in his Jesus of Nazareth:

"ex nihilo nihil fit; had not Jesus' teaching contained a kernel of opposition to Judaism Paul

could never in the name of Jesus have set aside the ceremonial laws" (which were set aside by the Council of Jerusalem, and not Paul).

"Paul carried the teachings of Jesus to their final conclusion," otherwise, "Paul could never have supported himself on Jesus . . ." (pp.369, 371).

What the American Hebrew said of Klausner's *From Jesus to Paul*, upon the appearance of the English edition (1942), can be said of Asch's *APOSTLE* (1943) as well, the book "will give little hurt to Jewish sensibilities and much to fundamental Christianity" (*American Hebrew*, N.Y. Feb. 22, 1943).

"THE NAZARENE"

As a piece of literature, *The Apostle* is considered to be second to *The Nazarene*, which is Sholem Asch's masterpiece. One of the objections to it, expressed by foremost Christian reviewers, is that being historic fiction, and not pure fiction that deals with puppets instead of real persons, the author had no legitimate right to misrepresent the personages dealt with, especially when one of them is adored as the Lord God, and the other revered, by nearly half a billion people. This view is further warranted by the author's claims of the New Testament as his historic source-book. The major part of *The Nazarene* is a rewriteup, or dramatization of the Gospels, emasculated so as to distort them. Some of the miracles in the Gospels are ignored, such as the resurrection, without which Christian faith is in vain. The only thing suggesting it is, that there were "secret rumors current that the Rabbi had disappeared from the grave" (p. 691). Other miracles are misrepresented, such as the daughter of Jairus, claimed to have been merely asleep; and Lazarus, who is presented as a nit-wit, "I

suppose he was a man" (p. 393), who had a long faint instead of being dead for four days, as St. John's Gospel says. The old story, that St. Jerome refuted fifteen centuries ago, is insisted upon—that Mary, the Mother of our Lord, was the mother of "four sons and daughters" (p. 262), including Jesus. She is held to have been unlearned in the law (p. 257), and to have had no appreciation of the fact that her son was the Messiah, neither did Nicodemus. Even Simeon, who prayerfully awaited the presentation of the Messiah child in the Temple, did not know (as the Gospels say he did) that the child Mary brought to him was the expected of Israel, "for it may be the portion of any Jewish mother to bring forth the Messiah" (p. 259). In fact, the only convinced believer in the messiahship of Jesus presented in The Nazarene is Pan Viadonsky, a fanatical Polish anti-semitic and "forger of ancient documents" (pp. 14, 16).

Sholem Asch makes the usual claim of Reform Jews, which is not made in the Talmud nor in other early Jewish writings, that the Romans, and not the Jews, were guilty of the death of Jesus, which is entirely contrary to the history of the crucifixion in the New Testament. In order to exonerate the Jewish authorities of this crime of crimes, Asch names only one Sanhedrin (the one of 23) as having tried Jesus, that was made up of the Sadducees whom the people hated, disregarding the fact that He was also tried by the Great Sanhedrin (of 71 members) that was made up of both Sadducees and Pharisees. At these trials Jesus was found guilty of blasphemy, a sin punishable by death according to the Mosaic law. This in itself was warrant enough for the declaration of Jesus to Pilate "he that hath delivered Me to thee, hath the greater sin" (St. John 9:11).

The Nazarene is a denial of the Divinity of Christ, without which we know the Church can

claim no more spiritual authority than the B'nai B'rith or the Red Cross Society; without which man is no more morally obligated to obey the teachings of Jesus than he is obliged to obey the teachings of Mohammed or Mary Baker G. Eddy. It is true that "every Jew has the right to call himself God's son" (p. 672), as Asch says in his denial of the Divinity of Christ, but not with a capital S, as the story of the Nazarene in the New Testament proves Him to be. Surely Asch must know that denial of the Divinity of Christ is an assault upon the basic principle of Christianity; that it is basic to the belief of Protestant churches that have adhered to the teachings of their sixteenth and seventeenth century founders, as well as the Catholic Church, and non-Catholic Eastern churches.

Rev. Henry Wallace Dowding, Episcopal Minister, Norfolk, Va., says:

"If Christ is not Divine, then the whole system of His teachings, miracles and sacrifices loses its significance and power as a world religion . . . then is He no longer in the world by His spiritual presence, to see, to hear, or to save. He simply was, but is no more, only as a memory, a recorded fact of history."

Rev. John S. Kennedy, Catholic Priest, Hartford, Conn., says:

"The Central, turning point of the Gospels, is the Divinity of Christ. If Christ is not Divine, the significance of His story shrinks almost to zero. His commands lose their binding power, His Sacrifice loses its character and its force.

"If you read the Gospels, you will see that Christ called special attention to His miracles as proofs of His Divinity. He told the people that, if they were unwilling to believe Him, at least they ought to consider the nature and the import of His marvelous works."

Denial of the Divinity of Christ is what we expect to see in a book written by a Jew on the life of Our Lord and of St. Paul, save he be on his

way from the Synagogue to the Church. But, with the New Testament as his source book, we know that such a denial is not warranted. While Sholem Asch was expected to take this usual Jewish attitude, it did not justify his ignoring, misrepresenting, and giving a fantastic twist to those things in the New Testament that affirm the Divinity of the Nazarene.

From the point of view of good-will, which Catholics, Protestants and Jews are trying to further, one would expect this writer to refrain from attempting "to bring the light of Jewish faith to the world" in books that attack the foundation principle of Christianity at the time when Jews need, and are receiving the aid of Christians throughout the world against anti-semitism. Surely anti-Christianity will not counteract anti-Semitism. Of course, if it is the applause of Socialists and Christian Scientists, that was aimed for, Asch has hit a bull's-eye. The "New Leader," Socialist weekly, said:

"Sholem Asch divests Jesus of the withered mustiness with which the pietists have endowed him," such as "Papini, the Christian, and other Christian writers" (Chicago, Nov. 11, 1939).

The Christian Science Monitor of Boston said:

"The reconstructed life of the Master in THE NAZARENE may be quite repellent (as it is) to those who look to Him as Lord and Saviour, as Wayshower to mankind out of self-imposed bondage in which humanity has become completely enmeshed."

Whether intentional or unintentional, The Apostle and The Nazarene are an offense to traditional Christians who worship Jesus as their Lord and their God; and have a deep admiration for St. Paul, Christianity's great theologian, inspiring teacher of "Christ and Him Crucified," and exemplar of charity, even towards the Jews who persecuted Him.

After carefully reading Sholem Asch's skillfully distorted rewriteup of the New Testament, of which most of his two books are composed, one is forced to the conclusion that if his power of discernment were equal to his literary ability, he would not assume to have

"presented (his work) without detracting from the spiritual and religious value of fundamental Christianity . . . (and) as a bridge between the two faiths . . . Judaism and Christianity" (emphasis mine).

If *The Nazarene* and *The Apostle*, which Sholem Asch calls "one work," were intended to "build a bridge between the two faiths," his evaluation of our Lord in his non-fiction "What I Believe," written between the time his two other books were published in English (N.Y. 1941), blasted it to smithereens. Therein he presents Socrates as superior to Jesus.

This superiority is based upon the claim that the Athenian philosopher died more heroically, by taking the hemlock, than did the Redeemer, Who, through His love for man, permitted Himself to be misrepresented, falsely charged with blasphemy, mocked, spat upon, scourged, crowned with thorns, and crucified, when He could have called "twelve legions of Angels" to His defense. Here is the blasphemy:

"Let us contrast the heroic and God-like death of Socrates with the weak, human death of Him who became for a great part of mankind the symbol of divinity. Socrates died like a god, Jesus died like a weak man" (p. 40).

I have been asked:

"Is not some good likely to come out of the writings of Joseph Klausner and Sholem Asch, which have been widely praised?"

Perhaps, said I, for good has been known to come as a result of evil. I appreciate the fact that they are the first four books written by Jews, in the languages of Jews, that deal with the lives

of Our Lord and St. Paul. They mark a break in that Jewish bitterness of spirit among Hebrew and Yiddish writers that would not tolerate a word favorable to anything in the New Testament, especially for the purpose of claiming Jesus as a Jew of Jews, who died a Jew.

If anything good comes from these books, it will very likely be because some Jews may be encouraged by them to study the New Testament itself, instead of relying upon Jewish opinion for an understanding of its contents. If so, some of them may, by the grace of God, be brought to the realization that Jesus is the Messiah the prophets of old in Israel foretold to come; that He established a Church to take the place of the Temple which is no more; and that that Church is the Jewish Theocracy universalized. They may learn in the New Testament that the faithful Christian hating Saul, who, finding the religion of the Messiah to be Judaism full-blossomed, devoted his life to teaching and practicing those Christian moral, sacrificial and sacramental principles that are the perfection of the Jewish way of life to salvation.

THE CRUCIFIXION

I have been much interested of late in the more-than-ever-before attempt being made in our country to further an anti-New Testament concept of the crucifixion of our Lord. It is an attempt to take advantage of American sympathy for the Jews, on account of the persecution suffered from Hitlerism, to further the notion that the Romans, and not the first century Jews, are solely to blame for the death of Jesus. Jews are encouraged in this view of the crucifixion by a number of doctrinally de-Christianized ministers, to whom Christ is only a great and good man.

This shifting of guilt is practically new to Jewry. It came from the made-in-Germany Reform Judaism that came into existence during the first half of the last century. No such claim had been made by traditional Jews. "The Talmud knows nothing of an execution of Jesus by Romans, but makes it solely the act of the Jews," says Prof. Travers Herford, a Protestant authority on the Talmud, who is in high favor in Jewish intellectual circles. I quoted him in the JEWISH PANORAMA, along with Josephus, who said in the Antiquities of the Jews, that "Pilate at the suggestion of principal men among (the Jews) had condemned Him (Jesus) to the cross."

A well financed campaign is being carried on with the slogan "Anti-Semitism Is a Christian Sin," in which this issue is used as a means of arousing hostility towards the Catholic Church, though this unhistorical claim regarding the crucifixion is an assault upon the belief of traditional Protestant churches as well.

A "Textbook Commission" has been organized to lead in this agitation, headed by the editor of an anti-Catholic, pro-Communist magazine, that has obtained Jewish support in many ways. The claim of this Textbook Commission, which aims to censor school books, catechisms, and even the New Testament, in order to take some Christian historic truth out of them, or to amend them so that they may be given a naturalistic slant, is right up the Socialist-Communist alley. It was therefore no surprise to find the Socialist Party official weekly dealing with "the ghastly melodrama of the Passion, in which the Saviour of humanity is killed by the Jews," under the headline, "The Question of Anti-Semitism." In it the false and offensive conclusion is drawn, that "Jew hatred is the keystone of the theological system of Christianity" ("The Call," Chicago, March 2, 1940).

The latest Jewish book on the subject is "Who Crucified Jesus?" (N.Y. 1942) written by Solomon Zeitlin, professor of Rabbinical literature in Dropsie (Jewish) College, Philadelphia. In this claimed-to-be learned, objective history of the crucifixion, New Testament texts are emasculated and misused to fit in with the author's thesis. The blame of the Jews, for contriving the death of Jesus by the Roman soldiers, is shifted to "traitorous Jews," "Quislings," "puppets of the Roman authorities," who were not a part of the highest existing Jewish tribunal of the time. By the way, it is very interesting to note that the "Textbook Commission" followed Professor Zeitlin's "Quislings" concept, in "The Pledge," signed by 1951 "Free Church Ministers" (who had evidently freed themselves from the Gospel story of the crucifixion), that appeared in full page advertisements, published in a number of daily papers, under the sensational, large, across the page headline—

"SMASH ANTI-SEMITISM."

The pledge says in part:

"Jesus was not murdered by the Jewish people . . . but by their enemies, the Quislings of that day hiding behind a synthetic 'Jewish Front' . . ."

The assertion that "the Jewish people" of Sanhedrin-Herodian-Pilate days were not guilty of the crucifixion is so plainly a denial of the authentic story of the passion in the Gospels, that it is surprising that ministers would sign their names to such a denial.

That the Jews of Christ's day were led by corrupt, grasping, politically-minded intriguing leaders is a fact, sustained by what is said of them in the Talmud, which I quote in the Jewish Panorama. They tried Jesus, but, as "day broke," He was led by them into the whole Sanhedrin in which others besides these leaders were in at-

tendance, most of them Pharisees, though the priests were Sadducees. It was "the whole assemblage that rose and took Jesus to Pilate," after they, in the smaller Sanhedrin had adjudged Him guilty. And the only reason they took Jesus to Pilate is because the power to inflict the death penalty had been taken away from the Sanhedrin by Rome. That Sanhedrin was the Supreme Court of Jewry, it acted with authority for the whole of Jewry, the high priest in it occupying "the seat of Moses."

Prof. Zeitlin, and the "free ministers," as well as the Textbook Commission they support, disregards the fact that the "crowds," who were part of the "Jewish front," "persuaded" by their unholy leaders, called for Pilate to release Barabbas to them in preference to the release of Jesus, crying out, "let Him be crucified." St. Matthew tells us of it in his Gospel (27:20-23), which is authentic history.

The author of "Who Crucified Jesus?" endeavors to exonerate the Jews of the first century from guilt by an ingenious claim, that two Sanhedrins existed at the time of the trial and crucifixion, one political, made up of a group of "Quislings" subservient to Rome; and the other a Religious Sanhedrin, which alone could rightly claim to have spoken with authority during the days of Jesus. This claim may be quickly dismissed as unhistoric and unsound. It has no standing in the history of Jewry. It is a modern invention that was conjured up in the mind of Adolf Buchler, principal of the Jewish College in London, England, about a half a century ago.

I do not purpose to go into the question of the effect of the story of the crucifixion upon Christians, as I did in both the Jewish Panorama and the Letters of a Hebrew-Catholic to Mr. Isaacs. Suffice it to say, that while there is a tendency

of rough-necks and "kids" to call Jews "Christ-killers" when in bad temper; as they call Negroes "Niggers;" and Italians "Wops" (just as Jews contemptuously call their fellow-Jews "Yids," "Kikes," "Lutvaks," etc.), we Christians know that the study and love of Christ nailed to the Cross; the meditation upon His Passion, leads to love and not hatred of the Jews of today. Christians know that no one truly loves Christ who loves not his neighbor, though we know, to our regret, that there are "Christians" who fail to include Jews in their love of neighbor.

I was pleased with the timely address of Bishop J. Francis A. McIntyre of New York the other day, in which he dealt with the anti-Christian work of the Textbook Commission and Prof. Zeitlin's "Who Crucified Christ?" It was delivered before the "Ladies of Charity" in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. The Bishop said:

"If one believes in the inspiration of the Scripture, particularly of the New Testament; if one believes in the Divinity of Christ; if one believes in the crucifixion and the Redemption of Christ—he is anti-Semitic. This contention is a diabolical expression of an absolute falsehood. It is difficult to attribute such a statement to ignorance, and one is compelled to view it as intellectual dishonesty.

"The movement behind this is entirely irreligious . . ."

The Bishop had the Jews in particular in mind, who were being misled by the propagation of the notion that the story of the crucifixion is the cause of anti-semitism, when he said, what every other bishop and priest would say to faithful Catholics,

"As members of the Ladies of Charity you know that charity does not envy, is not self-seeking, does no evil, does not rejoice over wickedness, but rejoices with the truth.

"The charity which you profess is the charity of Christ as exemplified in that your mark of dis-

tion is the Crucifix worn on your breast. The charity which you practice is the charity which is anti--no-person. It is only anti-sin. You are not anti-anyone, you are even pro your enemies."

"THE DEVIL AND THE JEWS"

I wish Jews could be brought to the realization of the universality of the Catholic sentiment voiced by Bishop McIntyre, that the Catholic Church is anti-sin, and not anti-any persons, no matter what their religious belief may be. I say this because only a few Jews realize that faithful Catholics are even pro-enemies, as the Bishop said; that they are faithful to Christ, who said of His crucifiers: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they are doing."

If, as 1 John 3:15 says,

"Everyone who hates his brother is a murderer,
And no murderer has eternal life abiding in
Him."

then is it hellish to further anti-semitism which originated in hatred and continues so in spirit. Therefore it did not surprise us, nor any of our fellow-Catholics, to read of our late holy pontiff, Pope Pius XI, telling the world in general, and Hitler and Mussolini in particular, that "anti-Sem- itism is a movement in which Christians cannot share."

If anti-Sem- itism is hellish as we, in union with the Jews, believe, then should Jews realize that anti-Catholicism is equally hellish, for hatred is as much the basis of one as it is of the other. This hatred is engendered by anti-Christian books from the pen of Jewish writers. Jews know that the Catholic Church is the only world-wide Christian Church, and that it is "not politic," to say the very least, to alienate her children from friendship for the Jews, especially during these inhuman times, by writings that offend the faith they hold

dear to their hearts. The wisdom of this was recognized by Rabbi Joshua Trachtenberg of the Temple of Peace, Easton, Penna., in his essay on "How to Combat Anti-Semitism in America."

He said:

"It is not politic to press an argument which might alienate a great many non-Jews," especially when Jews "must turn to their Christian friends for defenders of democracy, for an effective force behind its program."

But, strange to say, this timely advice was entirely disregarded by the Rabbi of the Temple of Peace himself, in *The Devil and the Jews* (Yale Press, New Haven, 1943), a book he wrote that is bound to "alienate" many "Christian friends" to whom Jews "must turn for defenders" of their rights.

The Devil and the Jews deals with what its subtitle designates "The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Anti-Semitism." It is not one-hundred per cent wrong in its indictment (for that's what it is), as it lists injustices Jews have suffered at the hands of persons who were Christian in name rather than in spirit during the Middle Ages. But they were injustices for which the Church was not responsible, as I said in my reply to Rabbi Hershel Levin of Springfield, Mass.

To analyze *The Devil and the Jews* would be to write a book, for it is a mass of charges against the Catholic Church, as well as misrepresentations and misunderstandings of Catholic teachings, and the historic conditions that necessitated her pronouncements.

The Devil and the Jews is as anti-Catholic as "The International Jew," published by Henry Ford some years ago, is anti-Semitic. It attributes to the "Church of the Middle Ages" (which was, of course, The Catholic Church, as Protestant churches did not then exist) belief that the Jew is

the "devil incarnal," the "anti-Christ," has "horns and tail," is "full of socery," has a "distinctive and unpleasant odor," is a "host and image desecrater," "ritual murderer," "infidel," "heretic," etc., etc., which is believed by modern anti-semites.

"We need not quarrel," says Rabbi Trachtenberg, "with how far back we must trace Germany's psychic atavism" (whether to Nietzsche, Wagner or others), for as far as the Nazi program is concerned, "in the matter of Jewish policy it assuredly—harks back to the Middle Ages" (p. 5).

Even the anti-semitism in Protestantism is attributed by the Rabbi to the Middle Ages, for while "The Reformation produced a marked change in the superficial culture pattern of a large part of the West, yet under the surface the Middle Ages still dominate—and dominates—its approach of the masses toward the 'Jewish question' . . ." (p. 217).

The Devil and the Jews is a vicious assault upon the Catholic Church, which Rabbi Trachtenberg holds to be the source from which present-day Anti-semitism stemmed. It goes beyond the question of anti-semitism into an assault upon the the use of sacramentals by Catholics, as well as their prayerful "resort" to the intercession of "the saints and martyrs of the Church," and to sacred objects, which are listed in the book as part of the "Sacred magic" of the Church. The Jewish press hailed this assault upon Catholic belief and practice as:

"A brilliant and challenging book that demonstrates how utterly irrational hatred of the Jew today stems from the conditioning success, created by the Church, which for centuries has made the Jew and the devil synonymous . . . The book will not help the prejudiced mind. But it should bring home to a minimum of intelligent readers the enormity of Christianity's crimes of propaganda and bestiality against twenty centuries of battered sons of Israel" (American Hebrew, "N.Y.,

Aug. 13, 1943; "The B'nai B'rith Messenger," Los Angeles, Sept. 10, 1943).

I believe, Father Carty, that I am putting it mildly when I say that the publication of these books, during the present Jewish crisis, is unwise, for they appear to me to be sharper than serpents' teeth. You and I know that the ingratitude of such writers wounds the souls of Christians in general, and Catholic Christians in particular, who are one in sympathy, material aid, and prayers for the rehabilitation and repatriation of the persecuted Jews on the basis of equality with all other citizens in their respective countries.

PALESTINE-ZIONISM

My mind was very much occupied with the question of Palestine while with you in Chicago, not merely because I was booked to speak there on the subject, but on account of the unwisdom of the high-pressure campaign the Jews have been conducting in our country for the transformation of the whole of Palestine into a Jewish State. This was due to three reasons in particular. First, because I firmly believe that the Zionists are leading "an already agonized Jewry along a heart-breaking path of disillusionment and frustration," to use the words of the American Council of Judaism, Inc., a maligned minority group of Rabbis and prominent Jewish laymen who are opposed to a Jewish State, holding that Jews are a religious community and not a nationality. Second, because I believe that success in propagandizing Great Britain, through the United States, into making Palestine a Jewish State against the will of the Arab population, would very likely result in a slaughter of the Jews now inhabiting Palestine. Third, because I believe that such agitation is injurious to the war

effort of the United Nations, as did Sir Isaac Isaacs, former Governor of the Commonwealth of Australia, who called upon his fellow-Jews recently to abandon their Zionist pressure upon the British Government, since "everything depends upon victory, therefore we cannot afford to antagonize the Moslem world."

The Zionist campaign centers, as you know, in the demand for the abrogation of the British White Paper of 1939, which I enlarged upon in the recent edition of the Jewish Panorama. The primary objective of this White Paper was to emphasize the fact that the British Government does not, and never did express itself as favorable to transforming the whole of Palestine into a Jewish State; and to make known that, after a certain date, no further Jewish immigration into Palestine would be permitted against the will of the non-Jewish part of the population.

To analyze the Zionist-Arab-Palestine situation, it is necessary to hark back to the Balfour Declaration (1917) in which the Zionists were told that:

"His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people . . . "

The discussion of this "view" of Great Britain centers on the question of the term "Homeland." Does it mean "the establishment in (that is within) Palestine of a National Home"? as the words permit us to conclude, or that the whole of Palestine was to be transformed into a homeland? which would make it a Jewish State.

The term "Homeland," never before used in a constitutional charter, was evidently deliberately selected in order to avoid a revolt on the part of the Arabs, which the term State was considered certain to arouse. The Arabs understood the ruse. They had lined up with Great Britain against the

Turkish ruler of Palestine during World War I, in the belief that Palestine was to be a part of the "Arabian Empire of their dreams," and they were determined not to be sidetracked by the term "Homeland" into believing that no attempt was being made to thwart their expected Palestine State. The Arabs went on strike as a protest against the Balfour Declaration as soon as it was proclaimed; followed later by riots, in which Jews, Arabs, British officials, police and soldiers were injured and murdered. Thus Great Britain was forcibly informed of the unwillingness of the Arabs to tolerate their native land being transformed into a Jewish State.

The Balfour Declaration was the real beginning of the clash of these two peoples—both Semites—who were insisting upon their conflicting national ambitions. Their differences have increased with the years, as the *Menovah Journal*, the leading Jewish cultural quarterly, noted recently:

"For two decades the Arabs have resisted the building of a Jewish National Homeland with mounting fury and cumulated effectiveness" (N.Y., 1943).

The protests of the Arabs forced Great Britain to more and more clearly define her intention.

Sir Herbert Samuel, a faithful Jew, who was the British High Commissioner in Palestine (1920-1925) until disturbed conditions compelled a change from a civil to a military High Commissioner, said (1921):

"The Balfour Declaration means that the Jews, who are a people scattered throughout the world . . . shall be enabled to found here their home . . . within the numbers and the interests of the present population."

The continuing disturbances caused Winston Churchill, as British Minister of State for the Colonies, to issue the White Paper of 1922, in which

he plainly declared:

"When it is asked what is meant by the development of a Jewish National Home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a centre (emphasis mine) in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride."

In this 1922 White Paper, Secretary Churchill went on to say, at the time when there were only 80,000 Jews in Palestine, that a "home" already existed as was promised, which had "characteristics" that are "national," viz:—

"Its own political organs; an elected assembly for the direction of its domestic concerns; elected councils in the towns; and an organization for the control of the schools. It has its elected Chief Rabbinate and Rabbinical Council for the direction of its religious affairs. Its business is conducted in Hebrew as a vernacular language, and a Hebrew press serves its needs. It has its distinctive intellectual life and displays considerable economic activity. This (Jewish) community, then, with its town and country population, its political, religious and social organizations, its own language, its own customs, its own life, has, in fact, 'national' characteristics."

Proceeding still further, Churchill said,

"This, then, is the interpretation which His Majesty's Government place upon the Declaration of 1917, and, so understood, the Secretary of State is of the opinion that it does not imply anything which need cause alarm to the Arab population.

The growing hostility of the Arabs of Palestine—supported by the whole Arab world—due to the highly financed, world-wide propaganda for the transformation of Palestine into a Jewish State continued. Besides, the threatening war with Germany, which Great Britain was expecting to take place any moment, caused the British Gov-

ernment to issue the White Paper of 1939. In it the Jews were told in a positive manner that Great Britain did not intend to establish a Jewish State against the will of the Arabs,

To quote:

of Palestine or disappointment to the Jews."

"The terms of the Balfour Declaration do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish national home, but that such a home should be founded in Palestine . . . His Majesty's Government now declares unequivocally that it is not a part of their policy that Palestine should become a Jewish State . . . that the Arab population should be made subjects to a Jewish State against their will."

This 1939 White Paper, issued a few weeks before World War II began, limited immigration of Jews into Palestine to 75,000 during a period of five years, which ended March 31, 1944. After that date, further immigration unto Palestine was to depend upon Arab acquiescence. This immigration provision is the crux of the Jewish opposition to the White Paper of 1939. With immigration unlimited (which no country permits), the Jews, who far outdo the Arabs in business, building, and propaganda ability, would supplant the natives with an immigrant population, and thus make the expected Palestine State a Jewish State.

The Zionists claim that the immigration provision in the White Paper is a violation of the Mandate under which Great Britain governs Palestine, as Article 6 says that "the Administration of Palestine shall facilitate immigration."

The Mandate does so declare, but it is preceded with the declaration that the Administration should see "That the rights and position of the other sections of the population (in Palestine) are not prejudiced;" and the obligation, to "facilitate immigration" is followed by the qualifying clause—"under suitable conditions." Conditions were considered to be unsuitable for further immigra-

tion when Malcolm MacDonald, Colonial Secretary, reported (1939) that:

"Arab hostility towards the Jews in Palestine has been whipped up to a passionate heat; there is no security of life, or limb for the citizens of the Jewish National Home; their orange groves have been destroyed; countless acts of sabotage have disturbed and hampered the economic life of the community, which is only being maintained at the present level by an extraordinary expenditure of money and lives . . ."

Conditions were considered to be unsuitable for further immigration, as I think they were, when the protests of the Arabs against being displaced and governed by a foreign population in their native land, which protests had the support of the whole Moslem world, might hinder the progress of the war that Great Britain was on the verge of entering, which took place shortly after British White Paper of 1939 was issued, in which a limit was set for Jewish immigration into Palestine.

This action on the part of Great Britain is not to be dismissed by derisively dubbing it "appeasing the Arabs," as the Zionists have been doing. If it is appeasement, then is it so in the best sense of the term, for it minimized the unrest due to insistence on the part of the Arabs upon their right to govern their own land.

When Zionists declare that article 6 of the Mandate was violated, they close their eyes to the fact that the Administration did "facilitate" the immigration of about half a million Jews into the "National Home in Palestine" since the Balfour Declaration was issued.

The seriousness of the immigration question was first brought to the attention of the British Government by High Commissioner Sir Herbert Samuel when he advised his Government of the hostility towards Jewish immigration. This continued to be the crux of the Palestine question

with "growing fury," as Sir Herbert Samuel said nine years after he ceased to govern Palestine:

"No one thinks that the political situation shows any appreciable improvement. Arab antagonism to the whole enterprise of the Jewish National Home persists; it is especially directed against the continued Jewish immigration" (N.Y. Times, July 29, 1934).

The hearts of Americans of all religious faiths were touched, as they should be, by the persecution the Jews had suffered, and continue to suffer, in Nazi dominated lands. The Zionists took advantage of that sentiment to cause a nation-wide demand to be made upon Congress to call for the abrogation of the British White Paper of 1939, so as to allow an unrestricted number of refugee Jews to be admitted into Palestine, without any consideration of the will of the Arabs. So successfully did the Zionist propaganda misdirect this laudable sympathetic feeling of Americans for the persecuted Jews, that the Foreign Affairs Committee would have reported a resolution to the House of Representatives for the abrogation of the White Paper were it not for General Marshall who checked the action, by convincing the Committee of the unwisdom and the danger of such a resolution as the Zionists demanded, because it "would be prejudicial to the prosecution of the war."

Many of our unwise, good-hearted non-Jewish Americans, who have been propagandized into demanding an unrestricted immigration into Palestine, are unaware, or disregard three facts. First, "A national home in Palestine" was promised in 1917 as a religious and cultural world—centre for the Jews, and not a place for refugees, for there were none in the world at that time. Second, that only a maximum of 100,000 Jewish immigrants per year could be accommodated, to use Zionist figures, which means that it would

take twenty years to get the estimated two million Jewish refugees into Palestine. Third, the Zionists with British Government aid, have been unable to get the 75,000 Jews into Palestine during five years, 1939-1944, that the British White Paper permitted legally to enter. Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden said in the House of Commons:

"We have 30,000 vacancies in Palestine. We want to get the children there, and, despite the transport difficulties, we would like to make special efforts to do so, but we cannot get them out without the aid of Sofia and Berlin."

The Zionist propaganda seems to have caused right reasoning to flee from the minds of many persons who usually take a sensible view of the application of democratic principles. Dr. Daniel Marsh, president of Boston University, is one of many persons I have in mind, whose printed statements are on my desk. While sharing the platform at the New England Zionist Convention with Chairman Weizmann, the World's foremost Zionist leader, he is reported in the "Jewish Advocate" to have declared:

"In favor of applied democracy . . . wherever in the wide world the people are willing to give it a trial. I am therefore in favor of giving Palestine to the Jews as a National Home."

The first part of the Doctor's declaration swears at his conclusion. It is like the logic of the English woman in an American hotel, who, holding her menu card at arm's length, spoke in a tone of horror, "Baked Indian pudding! Can it be possible in a civilized country?" Is it possible that the president of Boston University imagines democracy is given a trial by transforming Palestine into a Jewish National Home against the will of the majority of people who inhabit the country? Yet this concept of "applied democracy" was made at a Zionist Convention that demanded not only "a Jewish Commonwealth in

Palestine," but one "in which Transjordan (an independent State in the Eastern side of the River Jordan) be included as an integral part" (Boston, July 18, 1941).

The Palestine Royal Commission of Inquiry, in its Report to Parliament (1937), expressed a more rational, and therefore more logical concept of "applied democracy" than did Dr. Marsh." I quote from its Report:

"To foster Jewish immigration in the hope that it might ultimately lead to the creation of a Jewish majority and the establishment of a Jewish State with the consent or at least the acquiescence of the Arabs was one thing. It is quite another thing to contemplate, however, remotely, the forcible conversion of Palestine into a Jewish State against the will of the Arabs. For that would clearly violate the spirit and intention of the Mandate System. It would mean that national self-determination had been withheld when the Arabs were a majority in Palestine and only conceded when the Jews were a majority. It would mean that the Arabs had been denied the opportunity of standing by themselves; that they had, in fact, after an interval of conflict, been bartered about from Turkish sovereignty to Jewish sovereignty."

If the sincere proponents of the proposition to make the whole of Palestine a Jewish State, against the will of the people who have inhabited it for more than a thousand years, were to study the Balfour Declaration, along with the Mandate and the official documents issued by the Mandatory power since the Declaration was proclaimed, instead of depending upon the opinions of Zionist propagandists, they would very likely realize that there is no sound basis for their concepts.

The promise in the Balfour Declaration "in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people," is followed by this qualifying clause:

"It being clearly understood that nothing shall

be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine . . . " (emphasis mine).

This is but a repetition of Article 2 of the Mandate, viz:

"The Mandatory shall be responsible . . . also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine . . . "

The question of import is, whether the "civil rights" of the Arabs are "prejudiced" by an influx of immigration who propose to out-number, and to out-buy the land, of the native majority? I believe they are. The warrant for fear on the part of the Arabs, that their majority status in Palestine is endangered, is evidenced by the fact that the Jews, who only represented 9 per cent of the Palestine population in 1917, when the Balfour Declaration was issued, represented 35 per cent of the population in 1939, when the British White Paper was issued. This large increase of percentage of Jews was due almost entirely to immigration, whereas the growth in the number of Arabs in Palestine was a natural increase; as Arab fecundity is four children per family, whereas the average of the "Westernized" Jews that entered Palestine is one child per family.

You and I are well aware of the love in the hearts of Jews for Palestine. Their mournful holy cry, "How shall we sing the song of the Lord in a strange land," where their faith was scoffed at, has echoed throughout the centuries from the time they were held captive in Babylon. But that was the prayerful heart-longing of religious Jews, of whom the Orthodox Jews of today are the descendants in faith. They longed to return to the land where their Temple was located; the only place where their priesthood could function; where they could "sing the song of the Lord" while the sacrifices ordained by God, through

Moses, were offered to God; things that traditional Jews continue to pray for today, even though they exist no more, and can never exist again, as I prove in the Letters to Mr. Isaac. But Zionists do not want to go to Palestine to sing the song of love of the Lord, as nine-tenths of them are non-believers in a Jewish priesthood, temple, sacrifices, or prayers at the Wailing Wall.

I continue to hold to the view expressed in the Jewish Panorama, that the only claim that the Jews of the world could possibly make to govern Palestine, if there is such a thing as a legitimate claim, is a religious claim on the part of those Jews who want to go to Zion to prayerfully await the coming of the Messiah (whom they do not recognize to have already come in the person of Jesus). Any other claim made by Jews for Palestine would be political or racist. The political claim is invalid as it is a violation of the principle of government by the consent of the governed; and the Zionist racial claim is as objectionable as Nazi racialism to those persons who believe in the equality of all races in the sight of God, Who has endowed all men with natural rights whatever the race may be to which they belong, or the religious faith they profess.

Zionists, with minor exceptions, are not yearning to sing a song to the Lord in Palestine, as I said a moment ago. Organized Zionism is political and not religious in origin, principles and objective, which I made plain in the Jewish Panorama. George Finkel, a Zionist leader, expressed the view of all Zionists when he said in the Jewish press,

" . . . the injection of a religious argument into the Palestine question is off tangent. Zionism is not an anti-religious movement . . . it is not a religious movement either." "B'nai B'rith Messenger," Los Angeles, March 19, 1943).

The secular character of the World Zionist Movement was seen in the makeup of the delegates in its last Congress, just prior to the outbreak of the present World War (1939), who were largely rationalists. Only 67 of the 532 delegates represented the Midrachi, the Orthodox religious Zionists. They seek:

"A Jewish State in Palestine on the basis of the Torah (Books of Moses). It is the Zionism of the synagogue and the liturgy, with no secular restrictions. It is primal Zionism of Jewish tradition, of the Torah, Prophets and the Talmud. It arises from the pure fount of Israel's faith." (Editorial, "The Jewish Outlook," N.Y., Nov., 1943).

A Jewish State in the Orthodox sense of the term is a Theocratic State, and the Zionists have no use for such a Torah State. The Orthodox Jews lived in harmonious relations with the Arabs before the advent of political Zionism, for their objective was religious, not political. They believed that with the coming of the Messiah Palestine would be restored to the children of Israel, and not by political means. Were it not for Hitlerism it is very likely that they would never have sent delegates to the World Zionist Congress.

The irreligion of the political Zionists caused the Mizrachi, the Orthodox Jews, to dedicate a Sunday to fasting and prayer. In reporting it, the Christian Science Monitor's Jerusalem correspondent, said that "a special service was held at the Wailing Wall, where divine aid was invoked against the law 'giving Zionist free-thinkers an opportunity to establish in Palestine a community bereft of holiness and imposing an alien culture and moral turpitude upon just men'" (Jan. 24, 1928). The Orthodox Jews also protested against the granting of immigration certificates to the Zionists. The Palestine Royal Commission of Inquiry said in its report to Parliament:

"The non-Zionist Orthodox Jewish Community (in Palestine), is known to have deplored the increasing tendency towards secularism, and it has long carried on a stubborn dispute with the Jewish Agency with special reference to the allotment of immigration—certificates" (1937).

Joseph G. Harrison, another staff correspondent of the "Christian Science Monitor," reporting recently to his paper from Jerusalem, after telling of "the Jewish attitude in Palestine towards the Arabs," proceeds to say:

"A still further complication is introduced by the fact that modern Jews from western Europe and America have little sympathy and much contempt for the Orthodox Jew who wears sidecurls and gabardine and mourns at the Wailing Wall" (Boston, June 17, 1943).

Modern Zionism is universally recognized by Jews to be political Zionism, therefore its claim to Palestine is political, nationalistic; and on this ground I hold Zionists have no legitimate claim whatsoever. Aside from the principle of self-determination (which alone gives the Arabs a right to object to Palestine being made a Jewish State), the principle that Blackstone applies to property, applies to the right of the Arabs to rule Palestine (though always with due regard for the rights of minority groups), viz, that effluxion of time matures into the right of ownership. The Arabs have been the overwhelming majority of the Palestine population for nearly thirteen centuries before Modern Zionism was known, during four centuries of which they were forcibly subjected politically to Turkey. Again, the dictum "possession is nine parts of the law," demands that those who seek to deny the Arabs the right to political control of their land must show the existence of flaws in their title. This the Zionists have not done, and cannot do.

There is no need of my telling you, Father Carty, of my feeling of good-will towards my

fellow-Israelites, for you have read of it in the Jewish Panorama and the Letters to Mr. Isaacs, and have heard expressions of it to you personally, and in my public addresses. To feel otherwise toward them, especially while they are suffering hardship beyond the power of the pen to depict, would be a sin against Christian charity, of which I would hate to be guilty. But Christian regard for their suffering does not demand that I becloud my vision of the unwisdom of the Zionist campaign, good-intentioned though it be, especially when I am firmly of the conviction that the "already agonized" Jews are being led along the road, not only of "disillusionment and frustration," but physical agony as well.

I believe, as stated before, that the Zionist propagandized demand for a Jewish State has intensified Arab hatred of the Jews and Jewish hatred of the Arabs, and that, if continued, it will most likely end in the slaughter of the Jews living in Palestine, or, at best, the militarized ghettoizing of them. One does not have to assume the attitude of a prophet to come to this conclusion, as the evidence at hand plainly foretells it. Of the many expressions of opinion along these lines from the pen of keen observers, I have selected one from a Jew, C. L. Sulzberger, who, in a wireless from Cairo to the New York Times, whose representative he is in the Near East, says, under the following headlines:

PALESTINE FACES CLASH AFTER WAR

Jews and Arabs Are Arming and Training Guerillas for Expected Conflict

BOTH SIDES HIDING GUNS

Outbreaks Are Not Likely as Long as Big Allied Forces Remain on Guard

"Cairo, July 31, 1943—The turbulent question of Palestine and the rival interests in that holy land of Jews and Arabs is becoming of paramount importance to the United Nations . . .

"Dangerous potentialities are shaping themselves. While there is no reason to anticipate an immediate explosion while many allied troops are present, if the situation is ignored by the United Nations it is likely to end in terrible bloodshed.

"Already determined factions of Jews and Arabs are secretly engaged in preparations for militant action. Arabs and Jews have been buying arms and ammunition. One observer estimates that the Arabs have hidden 80,000 rifles and a large supply of ammunition and machine guns, mortars, and hand grenades.

"The Jews, as well as the Arabs, are building a formidable secret force. It is estimated they have 30,000 rifles and revolvers, about 2,000 larger weapons, much ammunition and grenades and infinitely greater scientific resources for the manufacture of explosives. About 20,000 young Jewish men and women, who have been in various Allied services, will return to Palestine after the war as experts in the handling of arms.

"The training of guerrilla fighters has been proceeding secretly among Jews and Arabs throughout the war, while it is common for Arabs to carry arms there are scant signs of organization of their preparations.

"The Jews have two schools of thought, the Socialist party and the Middle-class elements, who believe in self-defense only, and the militant Revisionists in the Nationalist Military Organization, who believe that offense is the better part of defense.

"Most of the Arabs' arms are hidden in mountain caves, orange groves, and out-of-the-way places

. . . "

"United Nation leaders cannot ignore these preparations which may lead to riots and programs throughout the Near East unless the entire Palestine question is handled with fairness and firmness."

TWO CONSTRUCTIVE PROBLEMS

Two things in particular were in my mind while writing this all too long an epistle. First, the unwisdom of Jews who put out books during these anti-Jewish days that offend Christians; and the injustice from a democratic point of view, as well as the futility of the Zionist-Palestine propaganda of my fellow-Israelites, for whom I have a natural affection, even though I am separated from them in religion. Second, the consideration of a constructive suggestion regarding two immediate issues, which are of Christian as well as Jewish concern. They are the refugee problem; and safeguarding the exercise of the rights of minority groups in the Near East in the constitutional makeup of the coming Federation of Arab States.

REFUGEE PROBLEM

The issue of immediate import is rescuing refugees from the clutches of the Nazi dominated countries. It was the special concern of the Bermuda Conference of the United Nations. We have only been given a glimpse of its proceedings, no doubt, for good and sufficient war reasons.

The Bermuda Conference was a disappointment to the Jews, who held that it "constituted a sad and sordid chapter in the most tragic volume—that of 1943—of Jewish history," on account of refusal to give Jewish refugees special consideration. This matter was brought up in the House of Commons, where Anthony Eden said that measures were designed at the Conference to

improve the chances of all, and not only the Jewish unfortunates who want to escape from Nazi savagery. And the Undersecretary of Home Affairs, who had attended the Conference, told the Commons that

"Not only Jews, but a majority of the 120,000,000 victims of Nazi aggression in occupied Europe, would for the most part, if they could, escape from the territories in which they are held prisoners. The problem far transcends consideration of nationality or religion . . . "

Palestine may be dismissed as a solution of the Jewish part of the refugee problem. Palestine as a whole is not at all likely to become a Jewish State. The best that may be expected is some kind of a compromise, which we may rest assured both Churchill and Roosevelt would like to bring about. The chances are that such a compromise, whatever it may be, will not be to the liking of the Jews or the Arabs. Whatever the settlement may be, even if it includes the abrogation of the British White Paper of 1939, it would only permit a small percentage of refugee Jews to become part of the "homeland" during the present war, the period during which the harboring of Jewish and Christian refugees is of vital humanitarian import. I am therefore convinced that the Zionist propaganda has been a disservice, in that it has built up an unattainable hope in the minds and hearts of persecuted Jews, which adds to their affliction.

The harboring of refugees is a Christian as well as a Jewish problem; a fact that the Zionist propaganda has virtually ignored. I am a great admirer of the propaganda ability and zeal of the Zionists. Their lobbying, mass meetings, banquets, advertising, broadcasting, clever newspaper service, and other high-pressure propaganda has led millions of Americans to imagine that the refugee problem is a Jewish problem only, and that the remedy lies almost exclusively in the

abrogation of the British White Paper of 1939. I believe that their propaganda skill would be of constructive value, if used, in co-operation with Christians, for the creation of a public sentiment that would influence the non-Hitler countries of the world to harbor proportionate numbers of refugees, without regard to their nationality or religion, at least until they are repatriated.

FEDERATION OF ARAB STATES

I am of the conviction that one of the best services the Zionists could render, in addition to working in co-operation with Christians for the welfare of refugees of all faiths, is to awaken Jewry to the import of the Federation of Arab States, now in the making; and encouraging a constructive attitude towards it. This was suggested to me by an article that appeared recently in America, from which I purpose to quote a little later on. To the coming Federation of Arab States the 600,000 Jews in Palestine will most likely be subject; therefore Zionists throughout our country should be awakened to the realization that the interests of the Jews in Palestine as well as the interests of Christians throughout the Near East, are dependent upon provisions in the constitution governing the Federation that will safeguard their liberties.

I believe it would be wise to awaken a fuller realization on the part of Jews than now exists, that Palestine is as much an Arabian world issue as the Zionists have made it a Jewish world issue, with the Arabs having territorial advantage, as nearly all of them live in Asiatic and African lands that virtually surround Palestine. This was noted by Dr. Abram Leon Sacher, the Jewish historian, who says, in *Sufferance is the Badge*, under the headline—**Arab World: Semites Become Anti-**

Semites, which in itself tells the story, that:

"the whole Arab world has been taught to believe that the issue in Palestine is not local, but it concerns the honor of race and (Moslem) faith. Hence half a million Jews in a vast sea of Arabs see lengthening, creeping doom in every passing crisis."

Christians in the Near East are somewhat in the same danger as are the Jews, in the sense of that part of Dr. Sacher's observation I have underscored. This unity of interest a representative of the Jewish Agency (that governs Jewish affairs in Palestine) learned and reported to the Jewish Chronicle of London, Eng. (Oct. 29, 1943). This report came after "a visit to Lebanon to sound its new president, Sheikh Bishara Khowry," a Christian Arab, who favors a Federation of Arab States. The report says:

"It was pointed out (to the Jewish representative) that both Christian Lebanon and Jewish Palestine occupy similar positions—namely, isolated minority islands in a large Moslem sea, and it might accord with their common interests to find a broader political understanding . . . Consequently, if a proper approach can be found between Palestinian Jewry and independent Christian Lebanon, both would benefit, the latter principally through having a friendly neighbor helping to withstand the effects of oriental intrigue."

The American Jewish Committee notes a serious cause for fearing possible doom for both Jews and Christians in the Near East, in its study of Jewish Post-War Problems (Unit VI, 1943). To quote:

"According to the tenets of the Moslems, Church and State are merged . . . Liberal religious tendencies such as are found among Jews and Christians have only recently begun to appear among them . . . The political rulers are also the religious heads . . . According to Islamic theology, both Jews and Christians are looked upon as 'unbelievers' who must not exercise any rule over believers, and must not even be allowed to enjoy equal rights."

Thus we see the danger that confronts Christians as well as Jews in the Near East, though to a lesser degree, as Christian Arabs in Palestine and Lebanon have not been taught a nationalism that assaults the nationalist rights of the Moslem Arabs in Palestine as have the Jews.

This question is dealt with in an able article in "America" (N.Y. March 4, 1944), from the pen of Rev. Thomas J. McMahon, S.T.D. National Secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, under the informative headline—Islands of Christianity in the Rising Moslem Sea. It is the recognition of the fact, of which only a small number of Jews are conscious, that the hostility of the Arabs towards political Zionists is due to the clash of their European mentality, customs, manners, and ambition, with the Asiatic mentality of the Arabs; whereas Arab opposition to Christians has invariably been centered in religion.

Dr. McMahon notes a new stage in the development of the Near East. This has very likely been caused by the enterprising Jewish introduction into Palestine of modern buildings, welfare works, agriculture, etc.; the Arab contacts with Americans and Britishers during the present World War, as well as the prospective development of the wonderful Arabian oil resources.

Dr. McMahon says:

"We can look forward to a close collaboration of an Arab Nation with the nations of Europe in the field of technical progress and economics, if only because such will promote the self-interest of the Moslem rulers. Yet these purely material exchanges and relations will mean practically nothing if the Arab world of tomorrow . . . continues to practice within itself a spiritual life which is intolerant and exclusive."

Having a constructive conception of the Near East situation, Dr. McMahon suggests a safeguard against Islamic intolerance, which I believe it were well for the Zionists to echo throughout the

world. Its adoption is most timely and necessary to safeguard the life, liberty and property of the Jews living in Palestine, whose future may be a bloody one if not safeguarded. It is the adoption by the coming "Arab Nation," or Federation of Arab States, of a constitutional provision that will guarantee the free exercise of the liberties of minority groups in Arab lands, as those liberties of minorities are guaranteed and safeguarded in the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations. To quote from America:

"Genuine guarantees can come to the minorities (in the Arab world) only through the adoption of a constitution which will rise above consideration of sectarianism and will apply to every citizen, with respect for his opinions and religious beliefs."

"The citizen of the 'Arab Nation' must not be ostracized for racial or political beliefs and he should never have to suffer persecution from civil authorities or others because he has abandoned the national religious faith, or because he follows the faith of his fathers. There are humanitarian considerations which, because of tragic events over thirteen centuries, should be a constant pre-occupation of postwar planners."

With these two positive proposals, which I hope the Zionists will consider, I come to the end of my story. I prayerfully hope the good God will give Jews the blessed wisdom that will cause them to refrain from penning books that offend Christians; and to cease their hostility—provoking Palestinian demands that is as far from realization as the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. Thus will the co-operative action of Jews with Christians be possible for the establishment and maintenance of peace and good-will in the land that should be Holy in spirit as well as in name.

With friendly greetings, I am,

Sincerely yours in The Lord

DAVID GOLDSTEIN.

Astor P. O.
Boston, Mass.

INDEX

"America"	42, 43
American Council of Judaism.....	23
"American Hebrew"	10, 22
American Jewish Committee.....	41
Anti-Christian Books	7
Anti-Semitism	12, 16, 19, 40
"The Apostle"	7, 10
Arabs.....	4, 5, 24, 26, 29, 31, 32, 35, 37-43
Asch, Sholem.....	7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14
Balfour Declaration.....	24, 25, 26, 27, 28
Barron, Dr. Salo W.....	3
Bermuda Conference	38
Birth Rate	6
"B'nai B'rith Messenger".....	22, 33
British White Paper (1922).....	26
British White Paper (1939).....	4, 24
"The Call"	16
"Christian Science Monitor".....	13, 35
Churchill, Winston.....	25, 26
"The Crucifixion".....	13, 15, 19
"The Devil and the Jews".....	20-23
Divinity of Christ.....	11, 12
Dowding, Rev. Henry Wallace.....	12
Eden, Hon. Anthony.....	30
Federation of Arab State.....	40-43
Finkelstein, Rabbi Louis.....	3
"From Jesus to Paul".....	7
Herford, Prof. Travers.....	16
Hitler.....	1, 6, 7, 40
Immigration.....	6, 27, 28, 29, 32
Isaacs, Sir Herbert.....	25, 28
Isaacs, Sir Isaac	24
"Jesus of Nazareth".....	7, 9
"Jewish Advocate".....	30
"Jewish Chronicle"	41
"Jewish Outlook"	34
Jews a Problem	4

Kennedy, Rev. John S.....	12
Klausner, Prof. Joseph.....	7, 8, 9, 10, 14
Levin, Rabbi Hershel.....	2, 3, 4, 21
Marsh, Dr. Daniel.....	30
Marshall, General.....	29
"Menovah Journal".....	25
Mizrachi.....	See Orthodox
Middle Ages.....	2, 22
McDonald, Hon. Malcolm.....	28
McMahon, Rev. Thomas J.....	42
McIntyre, Bishop J. Francis A.....	19, 20
"The Nazarene".....	10-14
"The New Leader".....	13
Orthodox Jews.....	34
Palestine.....	7, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28-33, 38-42
Palestine Royal Commission.....	31, 34-35
Palestine-Zionism.....	23-38
Paulinism.....	9
Pius XI.....	3, 20
Pius XII.....	3
Reform Judaism.....	9, 16
Refugee Problem.....	38-40
Sacher, Dr. Abram Leon.....	40
Sanhedrin.....	11, 17, 18
Socialists.....	13
Soviet Union, Stalin.....	4
Sultzberger, C. X.....	36-37
Talmud.....	11, 16
Textbook Commission.....	16, 19
Trachtenberg, Rabbi Joshua.....	21
Two Constructive Problems.....	38
Universal Jewish Encyclopedia.....	9
Weizmann, Prof. Chaim.....	30
Zeitlin, Dr. Solomon.....	17-19
Zionism.....	6, 23, 24, 28, 31-36, 38, 39

LETTERS
Hebrew-Catholic
TO
MR. ISAACS

By **David Goldstein, LL.D.**

These Letters To Mr. Isaacs are the first of their kind, as was the author's **JEWISH PANORAMA**, of which it is a companion book.

Price \$2.00

Jewish Panorama

by

David Goldstein, LL.D.

The JEWISH PANORAMA is what the Table of Contents suggests—both comprehensive and informing.

“The Jewish Panorama is a storehouse of valuable information regarding this timely controversial question. After reading it one will have a clearer view of the entire Jewish question from ancient days to the present world status” (Sign Magazine, Union City, N. J.).

Price \$3.00