

## **Catholics Falling for Jewish Errors**

### **A Reply to Ben Douglass**

As Sister Lucia of Fatima warned us of our present days, in and out of the Catholic Church there is a “diabolical disorientation” occurring worldwide. One of the main forces of that disorientation is the surge among liberal, neo-conservative and Jewish groups to disregard the Church’s previous understanding of the Jews. As a result, various Catholics have introduced strange and perverse doctrines about the Jews that have never before been taught or sanctioned.

Today, there are many voices uttering these errors. Some say the Jews have their own covenant with God and don’t need Christianity to be saved. Some claim that the Jews are still the chosen people of God. Some say that the Jews, based on nothing but their race as Jews, are a blessed people, in spite of their lack of faith in Christ. Some claim that Jews and Jewish converts should re-institute ancient Jewish festivals and ceremonial rites and encourage Catholics to practice and venerate them. Some claim that the nation state of Israel is a God-ordained fulfillment of prophecy, and that the Israeli military is guided by God to defeat its enemies. Some believe that Temple worship will be restored in Jerusalem under the favor of God. Some say that Arabs are evil people by nature and that they are the cause of much of the turmoil in the world. All kinds of strange and novel ideas about the Jews are being propagated today by Catholics, Protestants and Jews themselves.

We know from Tradition and Scripture that the above claims are totally erroneous and often heretical. But when we forcefully register our objections, we are often labeled as “anti-semites.” In fact, some of these people have even dared to dilute the definition in order to label anyone an “anti-semite” who harbors even the slightest reservations against Jewish ideas and designs.

It is now time that we answer these critics with reciprocal terminology. There is an appropriate label for those who hold to any or all of the above erroneous claims. They are

“Jewish racists.” Essentially, they think that the Jews, just because of their race, are a chosen and special people above all the other people of the world. They believe that, basically, nothing has changed since the Old Testament, except, perhaps that the Jews are in some kind of interlude until their inherent superiority once again meets its counterpart in the current events of the world.

I’m sorry to say that a fair share of these Jewish racists reside in the Catholic Church, and unfortunately they are some of the most boisterous and bellicose voices of any in the Church’s cadre of theological misfits. They will say and do just about anything they can in order to further their agenda and silence anyone who disagrees with them. Of course, you can tell them by their fruits. Pharisaical self-righteousness is usually the greatest indicator. It was the same problem the Jews had when Jesus confronted them (John 5-9). God himself said the Jews were one of the most stubborn and stiff-necked people ever to walk the face of the earth and it was precisely the reason he rejected the Jewish nation 2000 years ago (Mt 23:35-37; Ac 7:51-52; Ex 32:9; 33:3-5; Lv 26:41; Nm 27:14; Is 63:10; Jr 6:10; 9:26). That same stiff-necked posture exists today, but it is not only among the Jews, it is also among those whom the Jews have convinced to be their partners in crime, which includes a large contingent of Catholic and Protestant collaborators. Together they have become Jewish racists.

I have been on the forefront of Catholic apologetics exposing the errors and agenda of these Jewish racists for the last five years. You can imagine what they have tried to do to me. Relentless attacks on my personal life, my academic life, my theological and biblical knowledge, my apostolate, even my wife and children.

As you will see below, the newest Jewish racist claims that I am mentally unstable and need to see a psychiatrist. (As you will also see, it is not the first time that he has tried to diffuse objections by claiming that his opponent is mentally unstable). Obviously, they will stop at nothing. Even when I complain about their attacks they accuse me of making myself into a martyr. My conclusion is that there is no reasoning with these people. They are stiff-necked Jewish racists and they will not change. But I will not change either. I

will be a thorn in their side as long as God keeps me on this earth. So the war will go on. Every time they attack me, I simply take it as an opportunity to expose their errors and tell you, my dear Catholic brothers and sisters, the God's honest truth. As long as they keep trying to elevate the Jews above everyone else, I will keep putting them in their proper place.

Below is Mr. Ben Douglass' latest attempt to add to the smear campaign. Although Mr. Douglass purports that he is critical of Jewish ideas and practices, you won't be able to see that claim in his present essay. His present essay gives the distinct indication that he believes many of the very same erroneous things being taught by other advocates of the Jewish agenda. The only conclusion I can reach is that either Mr. Douglass is duplicitous in his thinking, or he hasn't been perfectly honest with us in the past about his allegiances.

I must warn you: the content you are about to read from Mr. Douglass' essay may not be suitable for children. He flies off the handle quite often. You can tell by his opening line below what is in store. Perhaps my previous response to Mr. Douglass (<http://www.catholicintl.com/catholicissues/bdcc.pdf>) must have rattled him, which tends to happen when I expose the errors of my opponent. In response, they usually include in their next response all kinds of exaggerated accusations, innuendos and *ad hominem* attacks. Observe for yourself:

**B. Douglass:** You maniac You're blowing up Ah, save you. God save you from hell

**R. Sungenis:** Perhaps Mr. Douglass is going to have a nervous breakdown. I don't know. He has five exclamation points in his title besides making himself the judge of my eternal destiny. This is an amazing thing to watch.

To be fair to Mr. Douglass, I will include all of his latest essay, but I will interrupt it with correction and admonishment as we go along.

**B. Douglass:** Robert Sungenis recently wrote an article entitled, I'm mad, and I'm not going to take it anymore in response to my previous defense of Roy Schoeman against his scurrilous charges. One wonders how incredibly angry Sungenis must be if he feels the need to draw attention to the special intensity of his anger at present, given that he has been quite mad for a very, very long time.

**R. Sungenis:** No, I haven't been "mad for a very, very long time." My life is very happy and joyful. I only get mad when attacks from former friends get very personal and when false allegations comprise most of the evidence. You'll get another dose of it in Mr. Douglass' present essay.

**B. Douglass:** In fact, for one who has read some of the nastygrams he has been periodically sending to Michael Forrest and David Palm for the past several months, it is hard to imagine how someone could make him even angrier. But apparently I have managed, as Sungenis now announces to anyone who will listen that I have made him especially angry. Moreover, unfortunately, I suppose the present essay will make him even angrier.

**R. Sungenis:** "Nastygrams"? What Mr. Douglass is referring to are the emails I send Forrest and Palm saying I will not back down to the pressure they are trying to force upon me to stop my criticisms of the Jewish racism they are propagating.

**B. Douglass:** Sungenis begins his response by claiming that I exploited a private e-mail of his concerning a sensitive subject, when I made it publicly known that he had inquired whether I had Jewish ancestry. However, this is a rather silly argument, since the reason he wanted to know whether I had Jewish ancestry is so that he could call my objectivity into question, and publicly suggest that I was letting my family bias cloud my judgment and compete with Catholic truth for the loyalty of my heart. In this very essay, he publicly, openly states that the reason people like Jim Scott IV, Sandra Miesel, and Bill Cork are so critical of him is because they have Jewish family relations, and therefore have a conflict of interest between their Jewish heritage and their Catholicism. He has

also openly suggested that the reason Michael Forrest, David Palm, and Jacob Michael have attacked him is because they might have Jewish ancestry. So, I have every reason to believe that, had I answered Sungenis' inquiry in the affirmative, he would have exploited his newfound knowledge publicly. He would be able to claim that I was putting tribal loyalty ahead of the Tradition of the Church, represented of course by Sungenis himself.

**R. Sungenis:** Yes, that is exactly why I asked the question. Since Miesel, Cork and Scott do, indeed, base their criticisms of me on their tribal loyalty to Jewish heritage, it only makes sense to wonder if Mr. Douglass, and the others, have the same motivation. Along those lines, Mr. Forrest refuses to answer the question (which makes me suspect that he does, indeed, have tribal loyalty to the Jews) and Mr. Michael and Mr. Palm have not volunteered any information. Mr. Douglass claims he has no Jewish ancestry, but now I'm not so sure, since above he says that if he had answered in the affirmative, I would have exploited the information.

**B. Douglass:** For that matter, this is not the only reason it is silly of Sungenis to fault me for publishing his private correspondence: later in this essay he does the exact same thing to me. And this is not the first time he has published my private correspondence against my will and over my objections.

**R. Sungenis:** The difference is that I published only Mr. Douglass' theological views on Roy Schoeman's book (matters dealing with Schoeman's ideas on the Temple), not personal matters.

**B. Douglass:** Incidentally, Sungenis is even wildly wrong about Scott, Miesel, and Cork. Jim Scott IV is half Italian, a quarter English, and a quarter Scottish. He is a cradle Catholic, not a convert. His wife is entirely Italian and also born and raised a Catholic.

**R. Sungenis:** Wildly wrong? I think that someone who identifies himself as "Yakov ben Yakov" (aka James Scott IV) on all the internet forums in which he participates is either Jewish by heritage or someone who wants to be Jewish so bad that he has developed a

Jewish alter ego. For what it's worth, the Scotts are well known for having many crypto-Jews in their lineage.

**B. Douglass:** Sandra Miesel does have significant Jewish ancestry, but she is not a convert either. Again, she is a cradle Catholic.

**R. Sungenis:** Here are the facts. Sandra Miesel is on record pleading with fellow Catholics to allow her to practice Jewish festivals and ceremonies because of her ties to the Jewish race. She is on record defending the Talmud, the very book against which Mr. Douglass wrote a detailed critique. Miesel wrote an article for Crisis denigrating those who point out the errors of the Jews. I think you get the picture.

**B. Douglass:** Lastly, Bill Cork's wife has a grandmother surnamed Levi, but her last ancestor who was Jewish by religion was baptized in 1758. None of these people are converts from Judaism, and only one has significant Jewish heritage.

**R. Sungenis:** Here are the facts. Bill Cork says publicly that his wife and two children are Jewish. In the first essay he posted against me in 2002, Bill Cork accused me of wanting to put his wife and kids in a gas chamber. Why would he be so concerned if he didn't consider his wife and children Jewish?

**B. Douglass:** Sungenis also faults me for using a harsh tone with him, and not phrasing my thoughts in a more discrete and inoffensive manner. However, the passion of ire is supposed to be aroused when one sees justice being violated (cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, par. II-II, q. 158, art. 8). If Sungenis detects ire in my writing, that is because I am irate, and it would be a vice if I were not so.

**R. Sungenis:** So we can thank Mr. Douglass for admitting that his language DID have the invective I sensed. As for his rationale, I'm not so convinced.

**B. Douglass:** Next, Sungenis tries once again to claim that he is the innocent prophet who is merely pointing out the theological errors of Judaism and the Talmud, and that his critics are just berating him because they don't want to admit that the Talmud is blasphemous and anti-Christian. This is manifestly not the case. Jim Scott IV admits that the Talmud contains several blasphemous statements against Our Lord and Our Lady.

**R. Sungenis:** Is that why Jim Scott wrote Mr. Douglass a tersely-worded rant a couple of months ago because of Mr. Douglass' critique of the Talmud that he put on the CAI website? Mr. Douglass sent me a copy of the email. It showed that Jim Scott (aka Yakov ben Yakov) was incensed at Mr. Douglass' article against the Talmud.

**B. Douglass:** For that matter, Roy Schoeman points some of these out on pp. 132-134 of *Salvation is from the Jews*.

**R. Sungenis:** Yes, because any sensible person can see that the Talmud is so blasphemous that even a devotee of the Talmud has problems with it. That's why even the Jews themselves have edited the Talmud to take out the more offensive statements.

**B. Douglass:** What these people object to most strongly is the way Sungenis has uncritically latched onto (and regurgitated on his website) every salacious claim he could find on the internet or in print about Talmudic iniquity. This is part of a pattern of Robert's deep-seated bias, animus, and suspicion against anything and anyone Jewish, and too-eager willingness to believe and to repeat anything evil he reads of them.

**R. Sungenis:** And what objection does Mr. Douglass have if I print all the iniquities I find in the Talmud? Should I just display 50% of them? Should I ignore the more salacious ones? Would that make him and Mr. Schoeman happy? But notice, Mr. Douglass' real motivation is to use this to say I have a "deep-seated bias and animus" against the Jews, which is false. He can have "ire" against me, but I can't have any ire against Jewish authors, even when they fill their books with insulting epithets against Jesus and Mary. Mr. Douglass seems to live in a world of double-standards.

**B. Douglass:** In fact much of what he has posted on his website about the Talmud is false. What he has done is akin to spreading around the accusation that Bill Clinton strangled his second child; that Bill Clinton has done a number of quite evil things for which he may legitimately be criticized by no means justifies propagating such unfounded claims. Calumny is calumny, whether its victim is Christ or Balaam. It is sinful to propagate falsities about the Talmud regardless whether it is an anti-Christian document, and legitimately awful in other ways as well.

**R. Sungenis:** And what examples does Mr. Douglass bring forth to prove his point? None, of course. And wasn't it me who endorsed Mr. Douglass article critiquing the Talmud and who allowed him to put it up on the CAI website? Again, the double-standards are plainly evident.

**B. Douglass:** Sungenis has exhibited none of the due devotion to fairness and charity in his attacks on the Talmud.

**R. Sungenis:** Notice that Mr. Douglass is demanding that we play by his rules – we must give due devotion to a book that says Jesus is in hell boiling in human excrement and that Mary was a whore. Why doesn't Mr. Douglass then give the same “due devotion” to Mien Kamph or the Communist Manifesto? I'm sure he could find something good in them if he really tried.

**B. Douglass:** In fact, I'm not even sure he has actually spent any significant amount of time reading the Talmud. That is certainly the impression he has given me in all our voluminous correspondence.

**R. Sungenis:** So if Mr. Douglass is admitting that he is “not sure,” then why does he feel the right to imply to his reader that I haven't read significant portions of the Talmud? That is called calumny.

**B. Douglass:** On occasion he also gives public expression to extreme ignorance of Judaism, such as in his recent response to Michael Forrest in which he suggests that if Forrest wants to know the real scoop about the Jews, he ought to read the Talmud, the Kabbalah, the Zohar and other such Jewish literature... Of course, Kabbalah is not a book; it is an ideology.

**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Douglass is just showing his ignorance. The sayings of the Kabbalah can be bought in any New Age or Judaistic bookstore.

**B. Douglass:** The Zohar is a book of Kabbalah. Thus, to someone who knows what he is talking about, Sungenis' statement above sounds about as goofy as saying people who want to know what Christians believe should read the Bible, Lutheranism, the Augsburg Confession, and other such Christian literature.

**R. Sungenis:** The only thing “goofy” is Mr. Douglass’ analogy.

**B. Douglass:** Furthermore, Sungenis' criticisms of the Talmud have always relied entirely on secondary or tertiary sources. For example, back in 2002 he plagiarized 4 pages from a book on the Talmud by Jack Mohr.

**R. Sungenis:** There was no plagiarism. I’ve explained this about a dozen times before, and most recently to Mr. Douglass in a private email, but since it makes for good demagoguery, Mr. Douglass continues to use it. Second, Mr. Douglass is trying to give the impression that secondary sources are unreliable. Not true. They are only unreliable when it can be proven that the secondary source is untrue.

**B. Douglass:** He has also repeatedly imbibed and regurgitated salacious little tracts on the Talmud by Ted Pike and Michael Hoffman II. It is not difficult to demonstrate that these men are exegetically incompetent, and that their critiques of the Talmud consist in large part of tendentious, agenda-driven interpretations of passages which they do not

understand. I told Sungenis repeatedly not to use these men, and showed him instances of their blatant falsity.

**R. Sungenis:** Actually, I'm coming closer to the conclusion that Ted Pike and Michael Hoffman may be better representatives of truth than Mr. Douglass. At least they don't try to glorify the Talmud and make excuses for Jewish errors. Despite their shortcomings, they can be great sources for information and courageous reporting. Mr. Douglass, on the other hand, hasn't even graduated from college, and has had no theological training, yet he often presents himself as the final authority on these matters. Considering the way Mr. Douglass has slandered me and filled his rants with nasty invective, he simply displays to the world that he is biased and cannot be trusted to treat these issues fairly.

**B. Douglass:** For example, in Ted Pike's article *The Talmud: Wellspring of Jewish Pornography Industry* he claims that the Talmud teaches that Jews are exempt from punishment for sodomizing a beast (Sanhedrin 55a). However, this is merely the expressed opinion of one rabbi, and the Talmud immediately rejects his opinion by quoting a Baraita to the effect that bestiality is forbidden by means of any orifice. Granted, it does not reflect well on the Talmud that its sages seriously and freely debated such strange opinions, but nevertheless it is still slanderous to attribute this position to the Talmud.

**R. Sungenis:** Notice how Mr. Douglass likes to nit-pick through Pike's criticism rather than admitting that the Talmud is simply a blasphemous book that no Christian should be exonerating. At this point I would trust Pike's attempt to expose the pornography in the Talmud than I would Mr. Douglass' attempt to exonerate it.

**B. Douglass:** Similarly, Michael Hoffman II claims that in Sanhedrin 74B the Talmud teaches that Gentiles are non-human animals. As Sungenis regurgitated the charge: Gentiles were considered 'non-human' and 'animals' (Sanhedrin 74b, Yebamoth 98a), and 'the best of them should be killed' (Abhodah Zarah 26b). However, Sanhedrin 74a says nothing of the sort. The passage is talking about the distinction between public and

private acts. In private, there are only three sins a Jew is supposed to refuse even under pain of death (idolatry, forbidden sexual relations, and murder). In public, on the other hand, a Jew is supposed to die rather than consent to anything a Gentile wants him to do, if the Gentile's intent is specifically to make him violate or appear to violate his religion (e.g. tie his shoes in front of an idol, cut grass on the sabbath). The sages define public as being in the presence of at least 10 Jews. The reason the 10 people must be Jews is supposedly because of Lev 22:32, which says My name will be sanctified among the children of Israel. The rabbis conclude that it is unacceptable to have God's name profaned in the presence of 10 Jews, but it is acceptable to have God's name profaned (e.g. by a Jew tying his shoes in front of an idol, thus appearing to bow to it) if only Gentiles and maybe a few Jews can see it. This is why the rabbis say that the 10 people quorum for a public act must be Jewish, not because Gentiles are not human, as Hoffman concludes. The Talmud's point is that it is worse to cause scandal in the presence of Jews than in the presence of Gentiles; this passage is far from claiming that goyim are animals. To use this passage as Hoffman has, and Sungenis has quoted him, is wildly slanderous. The fact of the matter is that there is not a single clear, unambiguous passage in the Talmud which teaches that Gentiles are sub-humans, and in fact there are many which express or seem to express the contrary idea.

**R. Sungenis:** I think Mr. Douglass' explanation is erroneous. Douglass thinks that just because the Talmud makes a convenient distinction between public and private, this gets it off the hook. It does not. Besides, the bottom line is that the Jews of the Talmud despised the Gentiles and considered them worthy of cheating and maligning. This is well documented. But Mr. Douglass avoids all that plain information. His goal is to make Hoffman look bad but Mr. Hoffman knows much more about these issues than Mr. Douglass.

**B. Douglass:** Incidentally, after much belabored argumentation, I did finally convince Sungenis to stop using Pike. The way I did it was I sent Pike an e-mail taking him to task for his affiliation with National Vanguard, which is a neo-pagan, naturalistic, pseudo-scientific racist organization.

**R. Sungenis:** Notice that Douglass calls it a “neo-pagan, naturalistic, pseudo-scientific racist organization,” but when Roy Schoeman says in his book that the Jews are “blessed by nature...despite their lack of faith,” we never hear the same word choice from Mr. Douglass. In fact, as you will see later, Mr. Douglass agrees with Schoeman that the Jews are “blessed by nature...despite their lack of faith.”

**B. Douglass:** Pike never responded, so that finally convinced Sungenis that he should not be trusted. On the other hand, in spite of all my remonstrations, Sungenis is still an avid reader and propagator of Hoffman.

**R. Sungenis:** Actually, as of now, I trust Michael Hoffman a lot more than I do Benjamin Douglass. Even though I’ve disagreed with Mr. Hoffman on various occasions in our email exchanges, at least he is a gentleman and an honest man. I truthfully cannot say that about Mr. Douglass any longer. I, frankly, don’t know who Mr. Douglass is.

**B. Douglass:** While we are on the subject of Sungenis' propensity to uncritically imbibe salacious material on Judaism, it is worthwhile to note that in 2002, in addition to copy-pasting Mohr, he also plagiarized from a Nazi propaganda tract (about a third of the way down the page) by Dr. Robert Ley, Labor Minister for the third Reich, about Roosevelt's Jewish ancestry. He didn't know that it was a Nazi propaganda tract at the time, and only found this out later, much to his embarrassment and chagrin. So, he is indeed correct in denying that he deliberately plagiarized a Nazi propaganda tract. But that's not really the point. Neither is it relevant to the present point whether some of what Dr. Ley was saying might be factual. The point is that Sungenis regurgitates denigrating claims which he finds about Jews and Judaism, without first making sure they are accurate. He just found something salacious about Jews on the Calvin College website, so he copy-pasted it without attribution, without fact-checking, and without even knowing who wrote it.

**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Douglass never copies and pastes anything that is questionable or a secondary source? I don’t think so. In his mind, only Robert Sungenis does this, and even

though he knows the accusations come from one occurrence five years ago, that is enough to hang me and keep repeating the charges. This is the typical slash and burn approach that my opponents have been using for the last five years.

Be that as it may, here are the facts he's not telling you. The original source for Ley's information was six U.S. newspapers. Roosevelt was trying to hide his Jewish ancestry but it was uncovered by these papers, to his political chagrin. Shouldn't we be interested as to why a man running for president was hiding his ancestry, and who, when he got into office, hired many people from his own ancestry and placated his ancestral constituents with liberal social programs? Yes, I think the people of the 1930s should have been informed of Mr. Roosevelt's hidden allegiances before they decided to vote for him.

**B. Douglass:** Following the same pattern, more recently Robert copy-pasted two articles without attribution from National Vanguard, which as noted above is in fact racist in the strictest, biological definition of the term (though for what it's worth, once again Robert did not know who wrote these articles; he just passed them along after someone e-mailed them to him). National Vanguard wants to kick all the blacks and Jews out of America, and even turns eugenics into a religion, advocating a secular apotheosis through the manipulation of DNA. And I don't think Robert even read one of these articles completely before he posted it, since the headline he slapped on it contradicted the contents of the article (Robert called it, Jerry Falwell says Jews don't need to believe in Christ, but the article was about how 2 prominent figures claimed Falwell said this, but Falwell himself denied it). I prodded Sungenis to take these articles down; I sent him a note objecting to the way one of them talked about White people a capital W, which is a red flag and usually indicates a white supremacist author. Robert let Jason Corsetti take out the word White, but left the article up. I also copied Robert on an e-mail to Stephan Trottell acknowledging that NV was a racist source. What it took to finally get these articles to come down was Matt Anger publicly taking Sungenis to task, and me sending him a long, belabored e-mail arguing why he shouldn't be uncritically regurgitating articles by racists.

**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Douglass' details are a little askew, but the bottom line is that when I became aware of National Vanguard's white supremacist stance, I took their articles off our website, and they haven't been on since.

**B. Douglass:** Yet more, Sungenis has obstinately defended the use of fraudulent quotes of Albert Einstein and Roy Schoeman (though he eventually gave in over the Schoeman quote).

**R. Sungenis:** There is no "fraudulent" quote of Einstein, there is just a difference of interpretation of the quote between Forrest and myself. As for Schoeman's quote, I didn't "give in," I merely said that I would give him a conditional apology and take down the quote as a measure of good will, even though I have no proof that he didn't write the quote.

**B. Douglass:** And similar to the incident with the National Vanguard articles, he recently posted an article by Israel Shamir without even reading the whole thing. Again, much to his embarrassment and chagrin, it turned out that the article expressed racist and Marcionite ideas. It did not belong on a Catholic website.

**R. Sungenis:** The Shamir article was posted for what it said about Israel and the Jews, not for its reference to Schmitt or what Mr. Douglass perceives as "Marcionite ideas." And I will be posting a few more articles from Mr. Shamir in the near future.

**B. Douglass:** But to return to Sungenis' present article, he next says of Bill Cork that he claimed I would have put his kids in a gas chamber. Having read Cork's article, he says nothing of the sort. He warns against the dangers of anti-Semitism in general, and persecutions against Jews throughout history. He does specifically mention the Holocaust and the Nazis, but he does not say that Sungenis would take part in their murder of Jews, merely that he expresses ideas which have led to this and other persecutions. (Mind you, I'm not endorsing what Cork said, merely pointing out that Sungenis has blatantly misrepresented it.)

**R. Sungenis:** No, because I'm referring to Mr. Cork's first version posted in 2002. That's why I referred to it as the "original." At least he had the sense to delete the offending accusation, but replaced it, as Mr. Douglass said, with the implication that I would have done so.

**B. Douglass:** In summary, it is false for Sungenis to claim that Scott, Miesel, and Cork are merely reacting hysterically out of a deep-seated allegiance to their Jewish ancestry.

**R. Sungenis:** No, it is false for Mr. Douglass to claim the opposite. Miesel and Cork have admitted it. I suggest Mr. Douglass modify his position.

**B. Douglass:** Continuing on, Sungenis claims that Michael Forrest, Jacob Michael, David Palm, and Mark Shea have an overweening bias towards Jews and Israel which they have imported from their Protestant Zionist backgrounds, and that this bias renders them incapable of rationally and objectively criticizing Jewish errors, or tolerating Sungenis' allegedly rational and objective writings on this theme. He goes so far as to say most of them have never published a criticism of the Jews, Zionism, modern Judaism, the Talmud or the Kabbalah. A few facts render this accusation quite silly: Michael Forrest thinks the Antichrist will be a Jew, and told me something in private which would put him on the Anti-Defamation League's hit list as well.

**R. Sungenis:** So it's okay for Forrest to talk about these things in private, but not in public? I don't think so. If Mr. Forrest thinks that there is information about this burning issue that is so important that he should share it with Mr. Douglass, what about the rest of us? Mr. Forrest writes all kind of articles about me, looking into every nook and cranny of my life and accuses me of all sorts of malicious things. He broadcasts these all over the Internet, yet when it comes to revealing facts of what he thinks about the Jews, and things that would make the ADL condemn him, Michael Forrest is suddenly silent.

**B. Douglass:** Further, he has published two articles, which Sungenis has kept up at CAI against his will, criticizing Jews.

**R. Sungenis:** Those articles aren't really critical of Jews. Besides, they are not on our website any longer as far as I am aware. But are they on Mr. Forrest's website? No. If he feels so strongly about them, where are they? The bottom line is, Mr. Forrest is not critical of Jews or Israel or the Talmud or Zionists, period. Similar to the instance in which he tells his views in private to Mr. Douglass, Mr. Forrest is mum when it comes to public criticism of the Jews and Israel. But he is not mum when it comes to me and my criticisms of the Jews. It is a double-standard.

**B. Douglass:** Next, Jacob Michael says in his book *Never Revoked by God* that he thinks the beast of the Apocalypse is institutional Judaism.

**R. Sungenis:** The only reason Mr. Michael says so is that he is not talking about the Judaism of today, but the Judaism of the first century. That is because he is following the novel eschatology of Scott Hahn who claims the millennium of Apocalypse 20 began in the OT and transpires until the First Coming of Christ. Since the Jews were Christ's antagonists and believed in Judaism, THAT is Mr. Michael's "Beast." Mr. Michael has nothing but good things to say about Jews today.

**B. Douglass:** Next, during the recent war in Lebanon, Mark Shea favorably quoted Pat Buchanan accusing Israel of war crimes, and took neoconservative warmongers like Rod Dreher to task over their rejection of Catholic just war doctrine.

**R. Sungenis:** Wonderful. Now all Mr. Shea has to do is look at the whole history of war crimes committed by the Israeli's ever since they entered Palestine in 1948. There have been at least three dozen instances of such atrocities and "war crimes." But I get accused of being an anti-semite for listing these instances. Be that as it may, I suggest that Mr. Shea write to Abe Foxman of the ADL and tell him that he thinks the Israelis committed war crimes against Lebanon. We have no doubt what Mr. Foxman would say, and then

Mr. Shea will be in my camp – being accused of being an anti-semite when, in fact, he is not an anti-semite but is only against Israeli atrocities against the human population.

**B. Douglass:** And lastly, all of the men whom Sungenis mentions have reacted favorably to my review of *Salvation* is from the Jews and my previous defense of Schoeman, both of which essays express ideas which would make me an anti-Semite according to the ADL, the Southern Poverty Law Center, and quite possibly the Bush administration. In the eyes of Abraham Foxman, we're all anti-Semites here.

**R. Sungenis:** And thus Mr. Douglass is just admitting that the term “anti-semite” is very much abused today. It is applied to people who are not anti-semite. In fact, in the normal definition of anti-semite (one who hates the Jewish race) no one here is an anti-semite. But Mr. Forrest has invented a new definition, just so that he can call me an anti-semite! Mr. Forrest now says that I’m an anti-semite in the sense that Protestants are “anti-Catholic.” Mr. Forrest allows himself to shift his weights and measures (which the Lord abhors) just so I can be saddled with his favorite label. (Pro. 20:10: “Diverse weights and diverse measures are both alike an abomination to the Lord”). Then they wonder why I say they cannot be trusted.

**B. Douglass:** Sungenis goes on to emphatically deny the charge of anti-Semitism. Let me say up front that Sungenis is not an anti-Semite in the strictest, biological sense of the term, such that he will claim there is something wrong with Jewish chromosomes which causes the Jews to be degenerate. Sungenis' anti-Semitism is not that principled, rational, and explicitly, consciously articulated. Neither do I think Sungenis hates the Jews in a sense exclusive of a Christian love which wills their conversion, sanctification and salvation. But in the sense I have articulated above, namely that Sungenis has a deep-seated and irrational bias, animus, and suspicion against anything and anyone Jewish, and a too-eager willingness to believe and to repeat anything evil he reads or hears of them, I think it is fair to say that he is materially anti-Semitic. (I do not accuse him of being culpable for anti-Semitism because I am unsure of his mental health.)

**R. Sungenis:** Well, let me return the favor. Actually, I'm unsure of Mr. Douglass' mental health. I think Mr. Douglass could be suffering from delusions of grandeur, thinking that he is some well-known and respected authority on these and other issues when, in fact, Mr. Douglass was an unknown in the apologetics world until he came to work for CAI. If I'm not mistaken, Mr. Douglass has published exactly one article in his career (an article, critical of the Talmud, no less). Like Jacob Michael, no one recognizes him as an authority; he's written no books, he has no degrees; he's not been invited to be on television or radio to express his views; he's received no Imprimaturs from the Church, etc. In short, few people pay attention to what Mr. Douglass has to say. That being the case, perhaps Mr. Douglass is a nobody pretending to be a somebody, i.e., delusions of grandeur. Mr. Douglass is a very young and impressionable lad who has come to think that he knows more than everyone else about certain things, and he is also very stubborn.

In addition, a few months ago, a lady named Kim from New York called me to complain about Mr. Douglass. She said that Mr. Douglass was telling other people he was in a romantic relationship with her when, in fact, Kim told me there was nothing happening. From what Mr. Douglass was telling Kim's friends, the friends, in turn, were accusing Kim of having a sexual relationship with Mr. Douglass. She called me several times and was crying on the phone, pleading with me to tell Mr. Douglass to stop. At that time I just told her that she and Mr. Douglass would have to solve it, since I put trust in Mr. Douglass that he was innocent. But now I'm not so sure. Perhaps I should have investigated Mr. Douglass spiritual health as well as his mental health. In any case, Mr. Douglass dismissed Kim's claims by saying to me that she was "mentally unstable," the same accusation he will accuse me of in this essay.

As for Mr. Douglass' opinion of whether I'm anti-semitic, well, he's adopting the same new definition that Mr. Forrest has invented. These men think that have garnered so much authority that they can arbitrarily modify the definition of anti-semitism! What chutzpah! Perhaps they are suffering from delusions of grandeur. It looks like a classic case. As for his accusation that I hold in suspicion "anything and anyone Jewish," no, that is certainly not the case. I only hold those Jews in suspicion who make it their business to

harm the Catholic faith, especially when it comes in the form of Jewish racism as we see today. Most Jews I know personally and who are my friends don't really care about Zionism, Judaism or national Israel, and if they do, they do their best not to harm or injure the Catholic faith. I'll tell you this much: I trust my Jewish friends a lot more than I trust Mr. Douglass, of Forrest or Michael or Palm or Shea.

**B. Douglass:** Next, Sungenis refers to his enemies as a bunch of Jewish critics and Neo-conservative patriots. Again, a few facts stand in the way of Sungenis' charge, namely, of all the people he has mentioned, only one of them is even ethnically Jewish, and few if any could possibly qualify as neoconservatives. And personally, I would think that I have sufficiently established my anti-neocon credentials with a subscription to New Oxford Review, a publication in Culture Wars, and the following sonnet entitled Neoconservatism :

**R. Sungenis:** No, Mr. Douglass has his facts wrong. Miesel is Jewish. Cork has a spouse and children he says are Jewish. Scott calls himself "Yakov ben Yakov," and thus if he's not Jewish he pretends he is. Mr. Shea is an admitted neo-con (at least he was until they tried to trick him), and I don't know any Neocon who doesn't favor Israel and the Jews above everyone else in the Middle East. Forrest and Michael are Israeli and Jewish sympathizers and neither of them has denied they are Jewish. As for Mr. Douglass, he doesn't have any "credentials," so I don't know upon what he is basing his opinion.

**B. Douglass:** Hark, ye blinded fools, I bring you freedom  
To speak, to live, to vote howe'er you please.  
Bring your poor to me and I will feed 'em.  
I am your white messiah 'cross the seas.  
If I killed your son don't be offended;  
He was a martyr for democracy.  
Women will now go to school bare-headed  
And have far greater sexual liberty.  
And if I killed your other child, your daughter,

I really hope you'll come to understand,  
What I did was for the best, this slaughter,  
For I have brought my gods unto the land.  
In fact so wond'rous is this gift I give,  
I'll give it to your neighbors if they live.

So, it is absurd for Sungenis to claim that his critics are just pursuing a smear campaign against him and trying to destroy him in order to remove the obstacle he poses to their Judaizing agenda.

**R. Sungenis:** No, it is not absurd. It is absurd for Mr. Douglass to rationalize all these attacks when just last year he was defending me against them. All one need do is read some of the statements defending me that come into our QA board at CAI and his previous dialogues with James Scott IV on Dave Armstrong's website forum. I have my supporters and they too believe that it is a giant smear campaign. It's not any more irrational for me to accuse them of a smear campaign then it is to accuse Mr. Douglass of blaming it on me that he wasn't getting any responses to his applications to engineering jobs. As I mentioned in my previous essay, it was Sandra Miesel and Bill Cork who collaborated with Mark Shea and others to try to smear me by writing their screed against me for critiquing the Talmud.

**B. Douglass:** I for one think that Judaizing is a serious problem in today's Church, and hope to be an effective opponent of it. The reason I don't want Sungenis writing about Jews and Judaism is not because I oppose any and all criticism of them, but because after such and so many egregious violations of justice and charity, Sungenis has disqualified himself from engaging these issues. He ought to go back to the deal I proposed to him when Michael Forrest first published *Sungenis and the Jews* : back off of these issues and let me handle them. Because right now, he is gravely damaging the credibility of the cause of opposition to Judaizing; to recuse himself from these issues is by far the best thing that he could do for it.

**R. Sungenis:** Violation of justice and charity? Like what? Mentioning 100% of the “salacious” material in the Talmud instead of just 50%? Mentioning all of Roy Schoeman’s erroneous ideas instead of just a few of them? Mr. Douglass is not facing reality. He and his cohorts don’t like me simply because I use the same detailed analysis against the Jews that I used against the Protestants when I wrote my “Not By” books and debated them in public. All of a sudden, the Sungenis apologetic of “seek and destroy” against the Protestants is now “unjust and uncharitable” when it is targeted against the Jews.

Mr. Douglass wants to assume reign of the Jewish critique all by himself. A man who doesn’t have a theological degree to his name and hasn’t even graduated college is now considering himself the expert par excellence and the main authority to be presented to the world on these issues. If Mr. Douglass’ biased and invective-filled rant in this present essay is any indication of the irrationality he might show us in the future regarding the Jewish issue, he’s certainly not qualified to handle it, no matter how highly he thinks of himself.

**B. Douglass:** Also, based on my experience over the past several months, I'd like to add a further stipulation to the deal: Robert, see a Catholic psychiatrist. I hear nothing but good things about Fr. Tom Acklin (my spiritual director's spiritual director).

**R. Sungenis:** Is there any limit to how far Mr. Douglass will stoop? Is there any insult too great for him to levy? Is there any more backstabbing he will do to me after his departure from CAI? This man, barely out of his teen years and who hasn’t even entered the job market is implying that I am crazy, and simply because I don’t agree with him and his colleagues on various theological issues concerning the Jews and how to handle them. This is what Jewish racism does to a person. It makes them irrational. As I said in my opening, the slander machine is now in high gear.

**B. Douglass:** Moving on, what follows is one of the strangest and most paranoid things that Sungenis has ever said:

The above Jewish critics and Neo-conservative patriots seek for nothing less than to get me entirely out the way so that they can proceed with their agenda. Sandra Miesel was bold enough to say it in her above email, and Mark Shea wrote an email to me a few months ago demanding that I get out of Catholic apologetics. In other words, they want to kill me. If they can't do it physically, then they will do so spiritually...

First off, Shea did not demand that Sungenis get out of apologetics. He told Sungenis to temporarily recuse himself, get spiritual direction, and get a formal theological education from a Catholic institution.

**R. Sungenis:** No, that is a lie. I have the email Mr. Shea sent. Mr. Douglass does not have it.

**B. Douglass:** Second, Bob, no one wants to kill you.

**R. Sungenis:** I'm talking about spiritual killing. When Miesel says she wants me out of the business and Shea sends me a letter to the same effect, THAT is an attempt to kill spiritually.

**B. Douglass:** For all of Shea's faults and erroneous ideas (some of which I have argued with him about), his recent correspondence with you was a model of Christian charity. He was kind and compassionate even in the face of your cheap insults about his weight.

**R. Sungenis:** The context was the following. I took the initiative to offer an olive leaf to my critics and I appealed to Mr. Shea as a go-between. Mr. Shea responded by saying that I needed to repent, but I have nothing for which to repent. I told Mr. Shea to take the log out of his own eye in order to see the speck in mine. He wasn't willing. He wanted to blame me for everything. He kept bringing up false, exaggerated and unproven accusations. His last letter to me was to repent. I retorted by telling Mr. Shea to repent of his two obvious sins. One is gluttony, which anyone can tell by his picture on the front

cover of Culture Wars, and the other is heresy, which Mr. Shea now commits because he holds to the novel view that “the Old Covenant is still valid for unbaptized Jews.”

**B. Douglass:** There is a tremendous willingness to forgive you and welcome you back in the whole Catholic apologetics community. When you wrote your Open Letter and people still thought you planned on abiding by it, reaction was overwhelmingly positive. Steve Ray wrote a post on his blog entitled Welcome Back Bob and Bill Cork took down his article Anti-Semitism and the Catholic Right. If you exhibit genuine repentance and make real reparation, Catholics will accept it. They will even let you disagree with them about important issues without this destroying fraternal fellowship.

**R. Sungenis:** I really don't want Mr. Douglass' or my other critics' friendship. Not anymore. I don't think I would ever become friends with those who have so viciously attacked me, looking into every nook and cranny of my life to discredit me. Every time I try to reach an agreement with them, they merely make more demands and think up more accusations. And as long as they hold to the Jewish racist heresies of Roy Schoeman and refuse to condemn the USCCB and other hierarchy for their capitulation to the Jews, then they will never be my friends, they will be my enemies. God will be the judge of who of us has been right.

**B. Douglass:** Sungenis continues with more expressions of paranoia about people wanting to kill him, his words now clearly evincing a serious messiah complex:

The Jews did the same thing to all the prophets God sent them. They were notorious for that (Matthew 23:37). Why would they not try to do the same to me? Fortunately, my faith in God is great, and He has seen me through even worse trials than this. In fact, I believe he has been preparing me my whole life for this very moment.

Along the same theme of exalting the immensity of his own virtues, Sungenis has also claimed that he loves the Jews as much as St. Paul (Q&A 64, October 2006). Sorry, but there are only five people who have ever loved the Jews as much as St. Paul, and their

names are Jesus, Mary, Joseph, John the Baptist, and Peter. Robert Sungenis doesn't even come close.

**R. Sungenis:** I do love the Jews, despite Mr. Douglass' poor attempt to give the opposite impression. As for the "exalting the immensity of one's virtues," Mr. Douglass does that pretty well himself.

**B. Douglass:** Next, Sungenis goes on to propose to his readers a you are either with me or you are against me type decision, and implies that one's role in the drama of the eschaton will revolve around whether one sides with his critics or with him. His incredible words must be quoted at length:

Today, my friends, you are going to have to make a decision. Either you follow my critics and their belief that the Jews are still God's chosen people; that they have a special "charism" that others don't have; that they have their own covenant with God, the Old Covenant; that the nation of Israel and the Israeli army is a God-ordained, God-favored fulfillment of prophecy; that Arabs are evil troublemakers from bad seed; that the Talmud is not so bad after all; that Jewish festivals and rites should be re-instituted for Jews and Jewish converts; that, as even many of our top cardinals have stated, the Jews don't even need Christianity any longer in order to reach heaven; and, finally, that Robert Sungenis is a nut and an anti-semite for going against any of this; OR, you will believe me when I tell you, with the rest of the voice from the tradition of the Church, that the Jews will seek to take over and/or thoroughly weaken the Catholic religion, and perhaps someday be strong enough to place one of their own as its leader. I believe that those who follow the present trend are being deceived by the devil like he has never deceived before. I believe that he is coming as an "angel of light" (2Cor 11:14) and that he will lead many people into apostasy (2Thess 2:3) and that he will come with "power, signs and false wonders" (including being able to speak with heaven), and that he will lead the whole world astray. I believe that is happening right now and it will progress over the next few years to the point that it will become recognizable to all those who are seeking the truth, and I believe that, among other entities, various Jews and various strains of Jewish influence (Judaism,

Zionism, corporate media, etc.) are being used by the devil to accomplish this goal. I believe the time will come when it will be almost impossible to escape this onslaught, and anyone who speaks out against it will be summarily silenced by any means possible (John 16:2; Apoc 11:7-9).

A few reactions to these extraordinary words:

1. Every nation has a special charism to give to the world, including the Jews.

**R. Sungenis:** Unfortunately, Mr. Schoeman does not say that “every nation has a special charism,” unless there is a new sequel to his book that I don’t know about. Mr. Schoeman says that the Jews, no one else, are the “yeast” of God and have a divine “charism.” The reality is, of course, that the Jews are neither yeast nor charisma-filled. They are just like everyone else. But the sad thing about this is that Mr. Douglass can’t see it, and thus he exonerates Schoeman when, in fact, Schoeman is guilty of Jewish racism.

2. I certainly don't believe that the Jews have their own covenant, and I doubt that many of Robert's critics hold this view.

**R. Sungenis:** Try Mark Shea. He now believes that the Old Covenant is valid for unbaptized Jews. Try Palm and J. Michael. They defended Roy Schoeman’s view that the Old Covenant was not made null and void by the New, and with three different and distinct solutions! Try the USCCB catechism, which says that the Mosaic Covenant is still valid for the Jews. Try Cardinal Keeler, Kasper, Willebrands and a cadre of other hierarchs who preach the same thing. Yet it is Robert Sungenis who gets attacked because he points out the errors of all these people. Mr. Douglass’ doubt is thus based on his unwillingness to accept the facts.

3. Schoeman has never claimed that the creation of the nation of Israel was favored by God. The distinction between a thing being predicted by prophecy and a thing being positively willed by God as good seems to be lost on Sungenis, at least when Jews are the topic of discussion.

**R. Sungenis:** No, the only thing “lost” here is Mr. Douglass’ ability to understand what Schoeman is doing with Scripture. Isaiah 66 is a chapter of God-favored restoration of Israel, as are all the other prophetic OT passages that speak of the restoration of Israel. Since Mr. Schoeman uses these very passages as a prophecy of the creation of national Israel in 1948, it requires that he understand the nation of Israel as a God-favored, God-ordained, nation from the get-go, otherwise he is ignoring the clear meaning of Isaiah 66 and other OT passages. That Mr. Douglass can’t see this shows that he is incompetent to deal with this issue, blinded as he is by his devotion to Schoeman at the expense of truth.

4. Islam has certainly been one of Catholicism's most formidable opponents throughout history.

**R. Sungenis:** We aren’t talking about Islam being an opponent of Catholicism. We are talking about Roy Schoeman characterizing the Muslims as evil seed from his idea that Ishmael is a bastard child of Abraham, which he then interprets as the reason for Arab retaliation against Israel. That is pure racism, and if Mr. Douglass condones it, then he is a Jewish racist as well.

5. The Talmud is awful. Sungenis' critics may disagree about the degree of Talmudic depravity, but that is a disagreement we can maintain as brothers.

**R. Sungenis:** Then go tell Roy Schoeman that the “Talmud” is awful, since he believes that the Talmud correctly prophecies the return of the Messiah, yet it does not believe the Messiah is Jesus Christ. Ask him how the Talmud could predict the return of the Messiah (Jesus Christ) if the Talmud believes that Jesus is in hell for eternity boiling in human excrement.

6. None of the critics whom Sungenis mentions, aside from possibly Bill Cork, hold to dual covenant theology.

**R. Sungenis:** Look again at the list in #2 above. It is rather alarming that so many Catholics are pushing for some type of resurrection of the Old Covenant. The Old Covenant is dead. It no longer has any validity. The only things it provides us are general principles from which the New Covenant is formed. This is what the Church has taught for 2000 years. Anyone who says anything differently is preaching heresy.

7. A Marrano Pope? Will Sungenis become a sedevacantist then?

**R. Sungenis:** Leave it to Mr. Douglass to conclude that I referred to a Jewish pope. I stated no such thing. But this is just another example of Mr. Douglass' penchant to interpret things as he wishes and damn the precise words and the context.

**B. Douglass:** With that, leave we this discussion of Sungenis' introduction

Sungenis begins his rebuttal by stating, 'The Catholic Church has been going on now for two-thousand years, and no pope, council, saint, doctor or theologian has ever suggested that there be a 'Jewish rite of Catholicism,' much less allow one to be incorporated into the Church. He completely ignores the fact that one existed in the early Church: the Church of the circumcision, headed by St. James and his successors (cf. Eusebius of Caesarea, Ecclesiastical History, Book IV, Ch. 5).

**R. Sungenis:** The "Church of the circumcision" did not practice circumcision or any other Jewish festival. They used the word "circumcision" in reference to those of Jewish extraction who had become Christians. This was common in those days since there were so many Jewish Christians. But when Jewish Christians were no longer in the majority, this designation fell into disuse.

**B. Douglass:** As I said before, I believe it would be imprudent to resurrect a unique particular Church for Jewish Catholics; I believe it would cause confusion. However, there is nothing intrinsically evil or impossible about the endeavor. The salvific importance of Jewish rituals and laws may have ended with Christ. However, the Jews

continue to exist as an ethnic group, and in the Catholic Church, a great number of ethnic groups are represented by their own particular churches: Ruthenians, Ukrainians, Russians, Ethiopians, Copts, Armenians, and Romanians, among others.

**R. Sungenis:** Then Mr. Douglass is to be condemned as well. Jewish rites and festivals have been condemned by the Council of Florence. Anyone who resurrects them puts their salvation in jeopardy, so says the Council.

All, therefore, who after that time observe circumcision and the Sabbath and the other requirements of the law, it declares alien to the Christian faith and not in the least fit to participate in eternal salvation, unless someday they recover from these errors. Denzinger 712.

**B. Douglass:** Sungenis marshals Galatians 3:28 in support of his contention that Jews may no longer have any distinct identity marker. However, I think his previous interpretation is much more plausible: all St. Paul is saying is that salvation is equally open to all. He is not excluding unique corporate identities within the Church for Jews or any other ethnicity for that matter.

**R. Sungenis:** We are not interested in Mr. Douglass' opinion. We are only interested in what St. Paul and the Church taught. Of course salvation is offered to all. But that is not all that is involved, otherwise Paul would not make such a big issue of circumcision and accompanying Jewish rites in Gal 2:12; 5:1-6; 4:10; 6:12-15. There was no practice of circumcision or any other Jewish festival in the New Testament Church. The only thing that was allowed were three laws of not eating certain meat, but that was only put in force temporarily so as to not offend the Jews, not that the Church was sanctioning the perpetual use of these rules for some religious reason (Acts 15:13-29). In fact, the rules were relaxed in 1 Cor 8, 10. The commentary on Gal 3:28 is the rest of the New Testament, and in no place does the New Testament condone the practice of Jewish festivals, and, in fact, it condemns such practices in many places as mere shadows that have no reality (Col 2:13-17; Eph 2:14-16; Heb 8:1-13)

**B. Douglass:** Sungenis also marshals St. Thomas Aquinas and the Council of Florence in support, which at least are dealing with observance of Jewish rituals. But it is doubtful whether their condemnations would apply to the thoroughly baptized version of the Seder meal which Schoeman practices.

**R. Sungenis:** “Doubtful”? If Mr. Douglass doubts his own view, then he has no stance. There are no “baptized versions” of the seder meal any more than there are baptized versions of circumcision. Mr. Douglass does not understand Catholic theology. Incidentally, there are some places where “Jewish baptisms” are being performed. Give me a break. If there ever was a false gospel, this is it.

B. Douglass: As I said before (and this is something else which Sungenis completely ignored), Schoeman drastically altered his Seder supper by adding lengthy quotations from the New Testament and repeated and explicit references to the Trinity, Christ, the Passion, and the sacrifice of the Mass. He has not merely slapped a new label onto the pre-existing Jewish ritual, as Sungenis claims. And it is for the Magisterium to decide whether the condemnation of the Council of Florence applies to this new practice, not for Robert Sungenis. Incidentally, if there ever is a decision on this question, I highly doubt that the answer will be affirmative.

**R. Sungenis:** Then it behooves Mr. Schoeman FIRST to write to the Vatican about his idea of a “Christianized seder meal” rather than take it upon himself to claim that it is legitimate and to be practiced by Catholics. If not, then Mr. Schoeman is doing the same thing for which Mr. Douglass is trying to condemn me. But in Mr. Schoeman’s case, the burden of proof is on him, not me. He is the one introducing novel ideas into the Church, not me. I’m only pointing out that the Church never sanctioned such practices before and that the Council of Florence and Aquinas are quite clear that any such practices are anathema.

**B. Douglass:** Continuing on, Sungenis takes vehement exception to Schoeman's statement that the Jews have a blessing by nature which remains with them despite their lack of faith in Christ. Indeed, he has repeatedly insisted that this amounts to Jewish racism in religious garb. But as Mark Shea has tried to point out to Robert, it is only another way of saying that the Jews are beloved of God for the sake of the patriarchs (Rom 11:28). The Jews remain the natural, cultivated branches of the good olive tree (Rom 11:21), even when they are cut off from it. Therefore it is especially natural and fitting that they should be grafted back into their own olive tree, unlike Gentiles for whom it is contrary to nature to be ingrafted into the good olive tree (Rom 11:24).

**R. Sungenis:** Well, perhaps Mr. Douglass would be kind enough to also repeat what I said in rebuttal to Mr. Shea's erroneous idea. Romans 11:28 says that the ELECT (Greek: τὴν ἐκλογὴν) of Israel are beloved by God, not the nation of Israel. The ELECT of Israel are not those who are "blessed by nature...despite their lack of faith in Christ" (Schoeman's words on p. 42 of his book) but the very opposite. The whole context of Romans 11 separates the elect of Israel from the faithless in Israel, and they are two different entities. Paul already defined the ELECT in Romans 11:5: "a remnant according to election" (Greek: ἐκλογὴν), the very same Greek word used in Romans 11:28. Unfortunately, Mr. Douglass has fallen headlong into the *error de jour* of Catholic apologetics today – the failure to separate national Israel from spiritual Israel, and as long as they fail to make the distinction I will be here to point it out, for today it is the major heresy in both Catholicism and Protestantism, and the latter is the ring leader for the former.

They are wrong on an even more basic level. Being "beloved" by God does not mean that someone is "blessed by nature." "Nature," as Mr. Schoeman insists, concerns being blessed intrinsically merely because of race. It has little to do with love because love is voluntary where as race is intrinsic. It would be akin to saying that the Polish people are "blessed by nature" just because they are Poles. This is racism. God no longer looks upon race as a matter of divine favor. Those days were over with the completion of the Old Testament. God loves all people, but he no longer blesses particular races by nature. That

Mr. Douglass would confuse these two things shows his incompetence and the error into which he and his cohorts are so easily led. But this happens when they are blinded by pride against me, blinded by devotion to Jewish converts, and blinded by their lack of training in biblical interpretation.

**B. Douglass:** Now, a while ago Sungenis let me say this exact thing on his Q&A board, and he never accused me of being a Jewish racist. His present behavior is simply absurd. He even told Shea to go back to school for not understanding that only the elect of the Jews are beloved for the sake of the patriarchs, not unbelieving Jews. But the immediate context of this passage makes it clear that St. Paul is referring precisely to unbelieving Jews: As far as the gospel is concerned, they are enemies on your account; but as far as election is concerned, they are loved on account of the patriarchs (Rom 11:28, NASB). Clearly, Christian Jews are not our enemies as far as the gospel is concerned. Therefore this passage is about unbelieving Jews. Incidentally, readers may find the exact same interpretation in the Haydock Bible, which Sungenis has described as the best Catholic commentary currently on the market:

**R. Sungenis:** The Haydock Bible is good in certain places, poor in others. It is not an exegetically-based Bible but an historically-based one. I said it was a good commentary, not an infallible one. There are two groups St. Paul speaks about in Romans 11:28, unbelieving Jews and the elect Jews, which is the same distinction that he made in verses 5-10. The same distinction was laid out more clearly in Rom. 9:6 when St. Paul said: "Not all Israel is Israel." It couldn't be clearer that two distinct groups are being addressed in Romans 9-11. The unbelieving Jews refuse to hear the gospel, and that is why they are our enemies. The believing Jews have heard the gospel and because they have accepted it and become the elect, they are beloved. Very simple. There is no passage in the New Testament that says God loves and blesses Jews simply because they are Jews. That is merely the result of the Jewish racism hermeneutic so prevalent today.

**B. Douglass;** Ver. 28. According to the gospel, indeed, they are enemies for your sake. That is, enemies both to you, because they see the gospel preached and received by you,

and enemies of God, because he has rejected them at present for their wilful blindness: yet according to election, God having once made them his elect, and because of their forefathers, the patriarchs, they are most dear for the sake of the fathers: for the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance, in as much as God is unchangeable, and his promises, made absolutely, cannot fail. (Witham)

**R. Sungenis:** Romans 11:28 does not say “at present.” It does not say “according to election” means that God once made them elect and they still retain their election. There is no passage in the New Testament that says Israel retains their election. All the passages point to the Church as the elect of God. That is why St. Peter says TO THE CHURCH, these very words, which he took from the Old Testament and switched from national Israel to the CHURCH:

But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.

Note the words “chosen race” and “holy nation”! They are not being applied to national Israel. There is not one word of national Israel or the Jewish race of people. It is to the Church these words are spoken, which is the same reason that Vatican II refers to the Church alone as the “new Israel.” How much more information do we need?

**B. Douglass:** Perhaps Sungenis will tell the venerable traditional exegetes Witham and Haydock to go back to school. As should be clear, he is the one who has committed an immense and obvious exegetical blunder. Though I do not say he should go back to school to learn exegesis, since his problem here is deeply psychological and spiritual, and no amount of learning will fix it.

**R. Sungenis:** The hubris of Mr. Douglass is very apparent. If I disagree with his interpretation it is a matter of being crazy and sinful. It says more about Mr. Douglass than it does about me. It shows how desperate he is.

**B. Douglass:** On this same theme of exegetical blindness when the subject is Jews, Sungenis has tried to use two passages from St. Augustine to prove that the olive tree of Romans 11 is Christ and not Israel. Incredibly, not only did these passages not deny that the olive tree is Israel, they both explicitly affirmed it. They appeared in Chris Campbell's original review of Jacob Prasch's website, which I heavily edited. Campbell confirmed that it was Sungenis who gave him these quotes. I will simply repeat here what I told Sungenis in private a few months ago:

Come, then, and be grafted into the root of the olive tree, in his return to which the apostle rejoices, after by unbelief he had been among the broken branches. He speaks of himself as set free, when he made the happy transition from Judaism to Christianity. For Christ was always preached in the olive tree, and those who did not believe on Him when He came were broken off, while those who believed were grafted in. These are thus warned against pride: Be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, neither will He spare thee. And to prevent despair of those broken off, he adds: And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature, and were grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree. The apostle rejoices in being delivered from the condition of a broken branch, and in being restored to the fatness of the olive tree. So you who have been broken off by error should return and be grafted in again. Those who are still in the wild olive should separate themselves from its barrenness, and become partakers of fertility. (Augustine to Faustus the Manichean, Bk 9 2)

I think this passage is being misused. St. Augustine nowhere says in this passage that the olive tree is Christ. He says that Christ was preached in the olive tree. This only makes sense when we note that St. Augustine held the olive tree to be the holy stock of the Hebrews, as he says in the very book and chapter this quotation is taken from. You say that the apostle, in leaving Judaism, passed from the bitter to the sweet. But the apostle

himself says that the Jews, who would not believe in Christ, were branches broken off, and that the Gentiles, a wild olive tree, were grafted into the good olive, that is, the holy stock of the Hebrews, that they might partake of the fatness of the olive.

Therefore did the Lord at once graft the wild olive into the good olive tree. He did it then when He said, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. (Sermons, XXVII, 12).

This passage is also being misused. Again, from the very same sermon, chapter, and paragraph: So then for this reason that people did not come to Him, that is by reason of pride; and the natural branches are said to be broken off from the olive tree, that is from that people founded by the Patriarchs.

Since when has Robert Sungenis, erudite Catholic apologist and terror to Protestants who misrepresent the Church Fathers, ever been so sloppy as to take two passages, interpret them in a sense opposite to the true one, and ignore clear statements in the immediate vicinity of those texts which clearly refute his interpretation? I mean how much more obvious does it get? St. Augustine says that the olive tree is the holy stock of the Hebrews and that people founded by the Patriarchs, that is to say Israel. These words are right next to the words which Sungenis quotes in order to refute to so-called Zionist interpretation (Chris Campbell's words, probably taken from conversations with Sungenis), that the olive tree means Israel

**R. Sungenis:** First of all, St. Augustine was not the only Father who spoke on this issue. All the other Fathers have one view, Christ is the olive tree. Unfortunately, St. Augustine, as was his practice on many issues, had two or more views. Mr. Douglass is merely exploiting this weakness in Augustine. In any case, the preponderant view among the Fathers was that the Olive Tree was Christ, not Israel.

**B. Douglass:** In a similar vein, why does Sungenis accuse Schoeman of contradicting the Fathers, who applied to the Church many of the prophecies which Schoeman applies to national Israel?

**R. Sungenis:** Because there was no Father who did so, and there was nobody until Roy Schoeman came along who said that such patristic exegesis of the OT was an “error” held by tradition for “two thousand years.” There was no one in the patristic period who was applying those prophecies to the Old Covenant or claiming that by them the Old Covenant was not made null and void. Mr. Douglass and Mr. Schoeman and the rest of this cadre of theologically untrained people need to realize that the Old Covenant has nothing to do with those OT prophecies about the restoration of Israel. Schoeman is thoroughly confused about the Old Covenant, as are a lot of others today. The New Testament says the Old Covenant was set aside. How much clearer does it have to be (2 Cor 3:6-14; Heb 7:18; 8:13; 10:9)? Unfortunately, the devil is very crafty today, and he has made a whole lot of people suddenly believe that there is some validity to the Old Covenant. There is none, and those who claim there is are engaging in one of the biggest heresies ever to hit the Church.

**B. Douglass:** Where does Schoeman ever say that the Fathers were in error by applying these prophecies to the Church, as Sungenis claims he says (with quotation marks, mind you)?

**R. Sungenis:** Obviously Mr. Douglass doesn’t understand what he is reading in Schoeman’s book. Chapters 8-9 make it very clear that Schoeman is faulting the Fathers for saying that Isaiah 66:8 and other such OT passages that speak about the restoration of Israel refer to the Church. In fact, from what Mr. Douglass and Mr. Palm say, it is supposed to be Schoeman’s underlying interpretation to the use of the words “Old Covenant” on page 352 of his book. Schoeman does the same thing with the Temple issue, claiming that the Temple doesn’t refer to the Catholic Church’s spiritual temple but to national Israel’s physical temple, and blaming the Fathers for not seeing this part of the

prophecies. No, there is no prediction of a Temple to be built in Israel. This is just more Jewish-racist hermeneutic.

**B. Douglass:** Since when did Robert Sungenis forget that the same prophecy can have multiple applications, and that two different expositions of the same prophecy might not be contradictory but complimentary?

**R. Sungenis:** No Father who used dual-fulfillment ever said that the OT prophecies applied to a restored national state of Israel. The burden of proof is on the exegete who proposes such a novel interpretation. Mr. Schoeman has no proof for his burden, except his interpretation of the newspaper. Anyone who distorts the concept of the Old Covenant as he and others have done, simply don't understand theology. Anyone who claims that the Jews are "blessed by nature...despite their lack of faith" is a Jewish racist. Anyone who claims that the "fullness of the Gentiles" occurred in 1967 is an end-time date-setter, which was condemned by Pope Leo X at the Fifth Lateran Council. Anyone who claims that the Old Covenant was not made null and void by the New is in serious error.

**B. Douglass:** The fact of the matter is that Schoeman never says that the Fathers were wrong to apply these passages to the Church. On the contrary, I'd be willing to bet he believes they were right.

**R. Sungenis:** We aren't interested in Mr. Douglass' fortunes in betting. We are only interested in what Mr. Schoeman says in his book. If Mr. Schoeman can tell us one place where the Fathers interpreted Old Testament prophecy about the restoration of Israel as referring to a nation state of Israel in the future, then he has a case. If not, then he needs to burn his book. Mr. Shoeman himself has stated that tradition was in "error" for "two thousand years" because of its view of Israel.

**B. Douglass:** Moving on, Sungenis makes the laughable statement that Schoeman thinks that God has been basically done with the Gentiles since 1967. He bases this on the following passage:

Jerusalem will return again to Jewish hands shortly before the Second Coming (Luke 21:24): Jerusalem will be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled. (A description of the Second Coming then follows in verses 25-28). Jerusalem was in the hands of Gentiles continuously from the fall of the Jewish nation in A.D. 70 until it was recaptured by the modern State of Israel in the 1967 war. (Salvation is from the Jews, p. 306)

Clearly, when Schoeman says that the times of the Gentiles have been fulfilled, he means that the time for Gentiles to occupy Jerusalem is over. He in no way suggests, implies, or even leaves the impression that God is basically done with the Gentiles as of 1967. What Sungenis is doing here is tendentious, agenda driven, slanderous eisegesis of Jewish texts of the kind practiced by Hoffman, Pike, and Duke.

**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Douglass is wrong, of course, because the “fullness of the Gentiles” in Luke 21:24-25 is the end of the world, since verse 25 states it quite plainly. Thus, there can be no “fullness of the Gentiles” in 1967. Second, the “fullness of the Gentiles” in Rom 11:25 is when the time of salvation for the Gentiles is over. That being the case, if Schoeman says that the “fullness of the Gentiles” occurred in 1967, he is obligated to hold that there is no more salvation for the Gentiles, otherwise, he is contradicting both Rom 11:25 and Lk 21:24-25. But notice that I won’t call Mr. Douglass’ error “laughable.” I’ll just call it erroneous.

**B. Douglass:** Moving on, Sungenis says that he never condoned Schoeman celebrating a Seder supper in his own home, stating I merely said I wouldn’t bother him. There are a lot of undesirable things that Schoeman can do in his own home, but not things I would condone or practice myself, or that I think anyone else should practice. But if Schoeman's hyper-Judaizing is truly one of the most pernicious and nefarious heresies the Church has ever faced, then shouldn't Robert be condemning it even if he pursues his practices only in the privacy of his own home? After all, Robert would never say that he

wouldn't bother sodomites about their sodomy so long as they only sodomized each other in the privacy of their own homes.

**R. Sungenis:** Yes, Mr. Douglass is right. To be consistent, Schoeman should not be celebrating a Jewish seder in his purportedly Catholic home.

**B. Douglass:** A little later, Sungenis takes Schoeman's very clear and intelligible passage, in which he explains his belief that Jewish Catholics will fulfill their role in salvation history by disappearing into the Church and not by preserving a unique corporate identity, and attempts to make it ambiguous and obtuse. But even if I were to grant to Sungenis that his interpretation is even possible, the fact remains that Catholics are supposed to interpret their brothers' statements as charitably and positively as possible. Sungenis sees fit rather to interpret Schoeman's statements as heretically as possible. This is entirely un-Christian of him.

**R. Sungenis:** We are not supposed to *interpret obviously erroneous statements* as “charitably as possible.” Mr. Douglass is implying that we are supposed to somehow excuse the errors Catholics make. Rather, we *point out their errors* as charitably as possible. Unlike Mr. Douglass and his cohort’s attacks against me, I have never attacked Mr. Schoeman personally. I merely point out his errors, the same errors that others have pointed out, and I do it as charitably as the circumstances permit, and that means I engage in no personal attacks on Mr. Schoeman, only his theology.

**B. Douglass:** Continuing this tedious and exhausting study of Robert's screed, he claims at one point that Popes Innocent III and Martin V said that only a remnant of the Jews will be saved in the end times. He takes this to mean that these Popes did not believe there would be a mass conversion, but merely that a fraction of the Jews alive at the end of the world would be saved. This is evident from what he wrote in *The Latin Mass* in response to Schoeman's letter to the editor: several popes did not expect it to happen (*The Latin Mass*, Winter 2006, p. 5). Odd, it appears that Sungenis has decreased his number from several to two. In any case, the statements of Innocent III and Martin V

could more naturally be taken as endorsing the mainstream, patristic view in favor of the mass conversion. By remnant they could very well mean those Jews alive in the end times, out of the subset of all Jews through all of history. Let's take a look at the texts themselves:

Pope Innocent III, Regi Francorum: “not displeasing to the Lord, but rather, acceptable to Him that the Dispersion of the Jews should live and do service under Catholic Kings and Christian princes – the remnants of which then will finally be saved, since in those days Judah will be saved (Jeremiah 33:6-26) and Israel will dwell in mutual trust.”

Pope Martin V, Declaration on the Protection of the Jews, 1419: “Whereas the Jews are made to the image of God, and a remnant of them will one day be saved, and whereas they have sought our protection: following in the footsteps of our predecessors We command that they be not molested in their synagogues; that their laws, rights and customs be not assailed; that they be not baptized by force, constrained to observe Christian festivals, nor to wear new badges, and that they be not hindered in their business relations with Christians.”

Innocent III, by his formula the remnants clearly seems to be stating that whatever Jews are still alive in the last days will be saved.

**R. Sungenis:** Then he would have said “all of which will be saved.” At best it is ambiguous.

**B. Douglass:** Martin V could easily be taken in the same sense. How has expert textual exegete Robert Sungenis missed this?

**R. Sungenis:** No, the only thing that was missed was Mr. Douglass’ failure to contrast “the remnants of which” over against “all of which.”

**B. Douglass:** I will defer the task of refuting Sungenis' treatment of the Church Fathers, as well as answering his exegetical challenge on Romans 11, to a future project.

**R. Sungenis:** Congratulations, Mr. Douglass. You'll be the first and only one to accept the challenge. Just remember the 11 exegetical principles I listed for Mr. Michael.

**B. Douglass:** Moving on, Sungenis makes another silly claim when he says that Pius XII tried to put the clamps on Catholic belief in the mass conversion of Jews in the end times. Predictably, no actual quote from Pius XII is provided. Let's move on again.

**R. Sungenis:** No, I said that Pius XII put the clamps on the chiliastic thinking that was prevalent among the Dispensationalists, since they claimed that the rise of the nation state of Israel in 1948 was a fulfillment of divine prophecy, just like Mr. Schoeman.

**B. Douglass:** Next, Sungenis refuses to let Schoeman interpret his own words, and insists once again that on page 352 of Salvation is from the Jews Schoeman must be rejecting Tradition's teaching that the New Covenant replaced the Old. Given that elsewhere in his book Schoeman explicitly states that the New Covenant did replace the Old Covenant, one wonders why Sungenis is not more open to the possibility that his interpretation is wrong.

**R. Sungenis:** Because that means that Mr. Schoeman is saying two entirely different things in his book, and notice how Mr. Douglass blames me, instead of Schoeman, for the duplicity. This is a perfect example of how Roy Schoeman's erroneous words are excused by his supporters, yet they display their hatred against me for pointing out Schoeman's contradictions.

**B. Douglass:** Anyway, at the risk of sounding repetitious, I will try to explain this again: when Schoeman said that it is an error to say that the New Covenant made the Old Covenant completely null and void, he meant that it is an error to say that the people of the Old Covenant, that is, fleshly Israel, has been replaced such that it no longer has any

special role to play in salvation history. This is a perfectly orthodox statement, because it is an error to suppose that the Jews no longer have any special role to play in salvation history.

**R. Sungenis:** But the problem is Mr. Schoeman didn't say it in his paragraph on page 352. Mr. Douglass is trying to cover up for Schoeman, but the cover up is just as faulty as the Schoeman's paragraph. The fact is, whether the Jews have a "special role to play in salvation history" or not has NOTHING to do with the annulment or non-annulment of the Old Covenant. Why is this fact so hard for people to understand? Mr. Douglass is just showing his ignorance of theology. If Mr. Douglass continues to perpetuate the same error as does Mr. Schoeman, that is, that the role of the Jews in the future is dependent on whether we believe the Old Covenant is annulled, then Mr. Douglass is engaging in the same heretical notions as Mr. Schoeman, and I will condemn it accordingly.

**B. Douglass:** Move we on again. Let us address the issue of the reinstatement of the Jerusalem Temple, the most egregious example of Sungenis' calumny against Schoeman. He states the following: What is really amazing is watching Mr. Douglass do his two-step over this issue, and then pretend that he never did. Sungenis' behavior here is absolutely infuriating, un-Catholic, and execrable. He just keeps obstinately repeating an error I have probably corrected him over a half dozen times by now.

**R. Sungenis:** Apparently, Mr. Douglass thinks that just because he protests, everyone has to agree. It's only his pride that gets him so incensed. I just happen to disagree with Mr. Douglass' assessment of the situation. Schoeman may have meant something else, but that's not what his book says (by Mr. Douglass' own admission), and it is his book that people are reading. I have suggested to Mr. Douglass and Mr. Schoeman that Schoeman needs to recall his book and fix the offending paragraphs, as well as fix a lot of other erroneous ideas in his book, including but not limited to his apparent Jewish racism. But both of them just ignore my suggestion and instead blame me for pointing out the error in Schoeman's book. This is the sorry point at which Catholic apologetics has arrived today. Doctrine is decided based on the friends one has come to call his own. Errors of friends

and fellow ideologues are excused, and the corrections from enemies and those they love to hate are ignored.

**B. Douglass:** The e-mail record is clear enough. Ever since I received Schoeman's messages telling me that he did not look forward to the return of the Jerusalem Temple and its cult of animal sacrifice as good things positively willed and blessed by God, I have insisted that Robert cease to attribute this heretical belief to him. I have found it utterly indefensible that Sungenis has obstinately continued to do so, and even implied that Schoeman is lying when he affirms the contrary.

At the same time, I have always been open to the possibility that Schoeman is inconsistent, and constructs a premise from which this heretical conclusion necessarily, logically follows, without having realized the full implications of what he was saying. In that case, I have repeatedly informed Robert, the proper criticism of Schoeman is that is that he is inconsistent and constructs a dangerous premise. It is not to obstinately and repeatedly claim, in the face of his explicit denials, that he really does hold to the heretical conclusion. This is something I sent Sungenis several e-mails about even before that e-mail of January 15 which he quotes, in which I come to the conclusion that Schoeman is in fact inconsistent.

Dec 10: If Schoeman doesn't want to talk to you, that's probably because he sees you as having calumniated him. The fact that you've kept up your charge about him believing that reconstituted Temple worship with animal sacrifice will draw God's grace down on the Jews, even after he has explicitly said that (1) he agrees with the Fathers who taught that Temple worship after the Passion of Christ is illicit, and (2) what happened when Julian the Apostate tried to rebuild the Temple is evidence enough for him about what God thinks of the endeavor, is only going to reinforce this conviction. If you want to argue that he constructs premises which lead to this conclusion, that God will bless a rebuilt Jerusalem Temple and cult of animal sacrifice, fine. You can use this as a *reductio ad absurdum* argument against those premises. But it is simply indefensible to attribute

the conclusion to him when he denies it. This is simply below Catholic standards of charity.

Dec 25: [In response to the following statement of Sungenis:] So if Schoeman is basing the rebuilding of the Temple on OT prophecy, then he should be advocating the Temple as a positive thing.

Regardless whether consistent exegesis might demand that Schoeman advocate the Temple as a positive thing, the fact remains that he doesn't. If his premises logically require him to advocate the Temple, then he is inconsistent. In that case, be my guest and take him to task for being inconsistent, for constructing premises from which a dangerous conclusion follows, and therefore for possibly leading Catholics to said dangerous conclusion. But none of this changes the fact that he explicitly repudiates the idea you have attributed to him. Now, certainly you could be excused for initially thinking he believed this, if you saw it implicit in his premises. But now he has told you that he doesn't, so basic Christian charity demands that you retract this charge. To do otherwise is to commit the sin of calumny. This should be so simple. It's almost unbelievable that I've had to argue with you for this long about this.

Jan 10: What I have argued is that this statement is false: Schoeman fully anticipates a return of Old Testament cultic sacrifices as a primary source of divine blessing upon the Jews in the New Testament period. It misrepresents Schoeman's position. And at the risk of sounding like a broken record, if he constructs premises from which this conclusion follows, fine. Connect the logical dots, and use this as a *reductio ad absurdum* against his premises. But the fact remains that he explicitly denies this conclusion. He has told me the exact opposite:

I do not think at all that [the rebuilding of the Temple] would be a 'positive development'. What happened last time around that it was tried is telling enough for me (Julian the apostate). I agree with your Church Father cites [which show that animal sacrifice, after the passion of Christ, is illicit].

So, the proper course of action is to do what I did: admit that you had misrepresented this aspect of his position, apologize, and reformulate your critique. If there remain other problems in Schoeman's theology and exegesis, by all means continue to address them. But in at least this one respect, you were off the mark. If you thought Schoeman implied the ideas you attribute to him, you could be excused for making the mistake the first time. But now you know better, and obstinately attributing ideas to him which he repudiates will get you nowhere.

Then came my e-mail of January 15. On that day, basically, my position shifted from this:

(1) Schoeman does not believe that reinstated Temple worship could be licit after the sacrifice of Christ. He might construct a premise which implies the contrary proposition. If so, he is inconsistent and might unwittingly lead someone to this conclusion which he himself rejects.

To this:

(2) Schoeman does not believe that reinstated Temple worship could be licit after the sacrifice of Christ. He constructs a premise which implies the contrary proposition. Therefore he is inconsistent and might unwittingly lead someone to this conclusion which he himself rejects.

That Sungenis continues to call this a 180 degree turn even after I've explained the consistency to him so many times is utterly flabbergasting. Everyone else I've talked to about this issue, e.g., E. Michael Jones, has understood my distinctions immediately, so I'm pretty sure I'm not all alone in thinking they are obvious. I even tried to explain this to Sungenis two more times after the e-mail of January 15.

**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Douglass acts as if Dr. Jones is on his side. He's not. He's on nobody's side. That is why Dr. Jones told me last week that Mr. Douglass was writing a letter to

the editor of Culture Wars complaining about my insistence against Schoeman's error and Dr. Jones offered me to write a rebuttal to the charges, which I did, and which will be appearing in the next CW, along with the other problems of Schoeman's theology and eschatology (Incidentally, I asked Dr. Jones' permission to reveal that he told me about Mr. Douglass' letter to the editor).

**B. Douglass:** Jan 20: I have been perfectly consistent in what I have said about Schoeman. I have said this ad nauseam, so this will be the last time [would that it were actually so]: if Schoeman constructs premises from which it logically follows that the Temple is a good thing blessed by God, the proper critique of him is that he is inconsistent and constructs dangerous premises. To claim that he accepts the conclusion when in fact he explicitly rejects the conclusion is calumny. The only thing that has changed recently is that I have realized that my conditional statement is fulfilled: he does in fact construct premises from which it logically follows that the Temple is a good thing blessed by God. He is inconsistent. By constructing these premises he may very well have led someone to accept the conclusion. He does deserve to be critiqued on this count. But none of this changes the simple fact that he repudiates the heretical conclusion that a reinstated cult of animal sacrifice is a good thing blessed by God. You could be forgiven for thinking he believed this at first, since consistency would demand that he do so, but now you know he doesn't. He rejects this heretical belief, and logical inconsistency is not nearly so grave matter as heresy. It absolutely is calumny to obstinately attribute to someone a heretical belief which he explicitly repudiates. What could be simpler than this? Why have I even had to argue this point with you? Shouldn't kids know this before their first Communion?

And Schoeman is not calling people who believe that reinstated Temple sacrifice would be illicit and offensive to God agents of the antichrist. He is calling people who try to exterminate Jews or destroy Israel agents of the antichrist. Otherwise he would be calling himself an agent of the antichrist. You've read his e-mails. He himself thinks this sacrifice would be illicit. Good grief.

March 3: I'm going to have to object to the way you are using my words in two of your recent essays on Schoeman. In the first instance, you repeat an error that I have corrected you over in private: that I somehow saw the light and realized that you were right about Schoeman and the Jerusalem Temple all along. That is flatly false. My position has been entirely consistent from the time I received Schoeman's e-mail stating that no other sacrifice can be licit after the sacrifice of Christ: (1) It is calumny to continue to attribute a belief to him which he explicitly denies. (2) It might very well be possible that he said something in his book which is logically inconsistent with his stated position. (3) If you find such an inconsistency, the proper approach is not to assume that Schoeman must be lying, and that he really does secretly hope one day to kill goats on Mount Zion, but rather to assume he is simply inconsistent. He may not have realized all the implications of the premises he constructed; he may not have thought them all the way through. The only thing that has changed recently is I have come to the conclusion that Schoeman is, in fact, inconsistent. Actually this is something Michael Forrest already saw and wrote about in *Sungenis and the Jews*. He agrees that a false conclusion follows from Schoeman's premises. But again, the proper response to this is not to thump your chest and pronounce vindication, because you haven't been vindicated, and that would be an immature response even if you had been. All that has been proved is that Schoeman didn't completely think out the implications of one of his speculations, and didn't realize that it lead to a conclusion which he himself rejects. To call him a heretic because of this is calumny of the highest order.

Sungenis just can't seem to wrap his brain around this. He is clearly not properly exercising the faculty of reason. Whether this is due to impairment or simply unwillingness I do not know. In either case, he needs help.

Sungenis goes on to state, [S]ince Mr. Schoeman's private emails deny what Mr. Schoeman put in his book, then Mr. Schoeman is required to make a public retraction and revision of what he wrote in his book. But Schoeman's e-mails do not deny what he put in the book. Schoeman has not denied what he put in his book because he does not see the logical inference which connects the speculation in his book to the heretical

conclusion which he rejects. If someone makes him see this inference, then perhaps he will publicly admit that he made a mistake. But given that he has a wildly calumnious Alexander the Coppersmith breathing down his neck, it is quite understandable why he might be hesitant to make this admission. When I imagine what Sungenis' reaction would be to such a retraction, I am disgusted by it.

**R. Sungenis:** The only disgusting thing here is seeing how Mr. Douglass misinterprets the events. Notice how Mr. Douglass operates. In his above emails he admits that Schoeman's book logically leads to an erroneous conclusion, and thus, from Mr. Douglass' perspective, it must be either Mr. Schoeman's obstinacy or ignorance that is prohibiting him from seeing the contradiction between his book and his private emails. But instead of blaming Schoeman for the failure to see the contradiction, Douglass blames me for my reproach against Schoeman's book, and then adds insult to injury by using a person from the Bible who was an apostate, Alexander the Coppersmith. And all this in the face of the fact that Mr. Douglass has also admitted that he wrote FIVE emails to Mr. Schoeman trying to get him to admit or explain the erroneous words in his book, and all without one admission from Mr. Schoeman that there is the slightest problem. For that matter, Schoeman's denies that his book contains any error, let alone an error about whether Temple sacrifices are God-favored. But as one can see from the "Thirteen Problems with Roy Schoeman's Theology and Eschatology" I have posted (<http://www.catholicintl.com/book-recomendation/13.pdf>), much of his book is theologically erroneous as well as racist. And I'll say it again. If Mr. Douglass is going to defend Schoeman's book, then Mr. Douglass is to be shunned as well as one who leads people into error.

**B. Douglass:** A while later on, Sungenis states, I have never, and will never, classify Jews according to their race. The problem with this claim is that in the original version of his review of Mark Shea's article Devil Talk, Sungenis stated, John 8:44 has historically been directed to Jews as a race of people. That is to say, Jews as a race are children of the devil. It was only after I objected to this statement that he changed it to Jews as a distinctively ideological group of people.

**R. Sungenis:** It's hard to believe that Mr. Douglass would stoop to this kind of bait and switch. When I said "John 8:44 has historically been directed to Jews as a race of people," I was referring to the common interpretation given by the traditional understanding of the passage. The only reason I agreed to change it was so that the traditional view would not automatically be discounted by people like Mark Shea. It has NOTHING to do with whether I classify Jews according to their race. This is just one example of the constant calumny that is perpetuated against me.

**B. Douglass:** Still later, Sungenis faults me for having a mistaken recollection of his conversion story. But as I admitted I was going based on memory, and even if I was wrong about certain things, my point about judging a tree (i.e., a supernatural occurrence) by its fruits remains. The fruit of Schoeman's encounter with Our Lady is good: a zealous Catholic evangelist.

**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Douglass is not the judge of Mr. Schoeman's alleged experience, the Church is. As I said before, Mr. Schoeman is required to take this matter to his bishop to judge the authenticity of the experience before he publishes it as a real occurrence. This is no light matter. But again, Mr. Douglass just excuses any and everything that Mr. Schoeman fails to do, whether its five emails that Schoeman ignores about a crucial part of his book or whether it's getting Church approval for his claim that the BVM talked to him. Schoeman can do anything he wants and his Jewish supporters will back him up every time. I hope you're getting a flavor for how this game is being played. Yes, it is "disgusting," to use Mr. Douglass' own words.

**B. Douglass:** Therefore I have every reason to believe that it was genuine. I never claimed that Schoeman derived some of his more unique theological and eschatological beliefs from that encounter; Schoeman himself has never claimed this. On the contrary, Schoeman makes it abundantly clear in his book that he is proposing tentative and speculative ideas. They come from Schoeman's intellect; Catholics are under no obligation to believe them and may even freely discuss and dispute them. The only

qualification is that that discussion must take place according to truth, justice, and charity.

**R. Sungenis:** The word “speculation” is rarely used in Schoeman’s book, especially on the crucial page of 352 where he says that it was wrong for tradition to say the Old Covenant was made null and void by the New. There is no “speculation” when Schoeman is speaking about the Jews being “blessed by nature...despite their lack of faith.” In fact, of the 13 problems I listed, Schoeman claims few if any of them are “speculative” ideas. In fact, if Schoeman had said that all his ideas in “Salvation is from the Jews” were “speculative,” I wouldn’t be on this warpath at all. I would just chalk it up to someone who has some fanciful ideas who decided to test out the waters. But that is NOT the impression we get when we read Schoeman’s book. He writes as if he really believes what he is putting to print and that it is true. He says that previous theologians and doctors and saints were wrong about their interpretation of the Old Covenant, and so much so that all his defenders are bending over backwards to say that what he is proposing has no error. We’ve gotten three separate explanations for page 352 of Schoeman’s book from Palm, Michael and Douglass just so they can exonerate Mr. Schoeman from error, yet now Mr. Douglass is claiming that this all may be “speculation.” So, in essence we now have four explanations of page 352. The duplicity speaks for itself. The devil is the author of confusion, and Mr. Douglass and his cohorts are in confusion.

**B. Douglass:** Next, Sungenis quotes me as saying I agree that there is anti-Arab racism in Schoeman's political views. The only problem here is that I have never said that. Sungenis really needs to learn to stop putting his own tendentious paraphrases of other peoples' words in quotation marks as if they were their ipsissima verba. This is a nasty habit, and it keeps getting him in trouble. For example, in this instance, Sungenis' quote is blatantly false. I do not agree to it at all.

**R. Sungenis:** Then Mr. Douglass has the same problem of which he accuses Mr. Schoeman, that is, writing one thing and meaning something entirely different.

**B. Douglass:** Sungenis dives deeper into the realms of the incomprehensible when he accuses Schoeman of attempting a perverse resurrection of Talmudic Judaism when he spends pages 111-132 of *Salvation is from the Jews* talking about the Messiah in the Talmud. Oy Vey. Sungenis has reached a new low in scurrilous, slanderous charges, because what Schoeman does on these pages is eminently traditional. Schoeman quotes the Talmud as saying: (1) The Messiah was supposed to have come around 0 A.D. but didn't. (2) God stopped accepting Jewish animal sacrifice in the Jerusalem Temple around the year 30 A.D. (3) God destroyed the Jerusalem Temple because the Jews hated someone without a cause. (4) The Jews expected a suffering servant Messiah who would fulfill the prophecy of Zechariah 12:10. These facts are immensely valuable, because they are devastating to Jewish anti-missionary apologetics. What Schoeman has done is similar to the approach of the great medieval Dominican Hebraist Raymund Martini, whose work *Pugio Fidei Adversus Mauros et Iudaeos* was for a long period of time the standard manual for Dominican missionaries to the Muslims and Jews. Martini quoted extensively from Jewish literature, because he recognized that it made certain admissions and preserved many old traditions which pointed to Christ. Like Schoeman, he culled these texts which point to Christ out of the large body of false teachings. Martini pulled the pearls out of the dung heap, to use his own terms; he documented that Jewish literature such as the Talmud unwittingly, even against its will, helps to demonstrate that Christ is the Messiah. E. Michael Jones articulated these principles quite well in his review of Schoeman's book (*Salvation and the Jews*, *Culture Wars*, February 2004):

**R. Sungenis:** Sorry, it's not going to work. Using the Talmud to prove the coming of Christ is like using the Koran to prove the Trinity. In fact, there are many religions in the world that have a concept of a coming "Messiah" who will restore all things, but their Messiah is not Jesus Christ. The Talmud's concept of a Messiah has nothing whatsoever to do with Christ, even by extraction. It doesn't matter how close Schoeman makes the descriptions in the Talmud match Jesus Christ. The fact is, they don't speak about Christ because the rabbis who wrote the Talmud specifically deny it refers to Christ. In fact, the express purpose of the Talmud's prediction of a coming Messiah is to expose Jesus Christ

as an imposter Messiah. The Messiah of the Talmud is, essentially, the devil, for John tells us that whoever denies that the Son is God is of the antichrist, and the Jews hold that Christ was not God (1John 2:22: “Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, he who denies the Father and the Son”; 1John 4:3: “and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God. This is the spirit of antichrist, of which you heard that it was coming, and now it is in the world already”; 2John 1:7: “men who will not acknowledge the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh; such a one is the deceiver and the antichrist”). Hence, no matter how much ink the Talmud gives to a coming Messiah, every word of it is for the specific purpose of condemning Jesus Christ as a false prophet and replacing Him with a Messiah of their own making. In fact, many Jews today consider the Jews themselves as the “Messiah” of Isaiah 53. Unfortunately, the young and impressionable Mr. Douglass is being sucked into all this erroneous thinking by his devotion to Mr. Schoeman.

As noted previously, the Talmud has proven to those who want to read it that it considers Jesus Christ a false prophet and his Mother Mary a whore. Who in their right mind would want to extract prophecies about the coming Messiah from the Talmud and compare them to the coming of Jesus Christ? This is absurd.

**B. Douglass:** Like Caiphas who spoke more truly than he knew when he said that it was better for one man to die than for the people to perish, the Talmud admits the central role of Jesus in salvation history in a number of significant if indirect ways.

**R. Sungenis:** Mr. Douglass is also being duped by Schoeman’s attempt to attribute some mystical ability to the Talmud to express a “central role of Jesus in salvation history,” all the while keeping our eyes from the fact that the Talmud declares explicitly that Jesus was a false prophet. For example, Schoeman writes:

“So when the Talmud attributes the destruction of the Second Temple to “hatred without a cause,” it is exhibiting a gift of prophecy, stating a profound truth that unknowingly confirms Jesus’ identity as the messiah,

although unaware of the fact” (p. 125)

“A gift of prophecy”? It seems that Schoeman wishes to attribute some kind of divine prodding to the Talmud as if a third hand from heaven was writing it and giving it some secret meaning unbeknownst to the rabbi. No, the Talmud was given no gift of prophecy. This is all a figment of Mr. Schoeman’s furtive imagination. The Talmud may have a devilish ability to prophecy, but it is certainly not a divine gift. Knowing that the Talmud says Jesus is a false prophet and that Mary is a whore, Schoeman must enter into some kind of absurd duality of opposites, perhaps gnostic in origin, when he chooses to praise the Talmud and give it a mystical quality knowing that it is full of Christ-hating blasphemies. In actuality, there are no prophecies about Jesus in the Talmud, at least not any good ones. Mr. Schoeman strains to show some positive prophecies because it is his express purpose to exonerate the Talmud as a Christian-accepted book when in fact it is a book of Christ-hating and Christianity-loathing Jewish scholars who hoped to see the Catholic Church destroyed. Unfortunately, Mr. Douglass, probably because of his pride in seeking to denigrate me, has allowed himself to fall for this bit of spiritual chicanery.

**B. Douglass:** In order to ensure that the Temple sacrifice had been successful in expiating the sins of the Jews, the priests and rabbis would watch to make sure that a scarlet thread had turned white. Schoeman cites the Talmudic verse from Rosh Hashanah 31b, For forty years before the destruction of the Temple the thread of scarlet never turned white but it remained red. According to Schoeman, the Talmud itself unwittingly confirms that the Temple sacrifices failed 40 years before the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD (i.e., at the time when Christ died and the veil covering the Holy of Holies was rent in two) when it recounts that from that time on. . . the scarlet thread never again turned white.

**R. Sungenis:** Then the same rabbis should have also understood that the destruction of the Temple condemned Jewish writings denying Christ, such as the Talmud would later do, to oblivion, never to be resurrected again. But today, since we may be nearing the time of the Messiah’s return, all kinds of false attributions are being given to the Talmud

as a valuable book indirectly prophesying Christ's return. As Jesus said himself: "Then if any one says to you, 'Lo, here is the Christ!' or 'There he is!' do not believe it. For false Christs and false prophets will arise and show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect" (Matthew 24:23-24).

**B. Douglass:** According to the Talmud, the Temple was destroyed because therein prevailed hatred without a cause. From his vantage point as a Catholic, Schoeman can now see that the Talmud was referring in some mysterious way to Christ's own words in John 15:18-25: They hated me without a cause. The Talmud, in other words, is exhibiting a gift of prophecy, stating a profound truth that unknowingly confirms Jesus' identity as the Messiah, although unaware of that fact. Although suppressing that fact might have been a better formulation, but the point is clear enough. Augustine formulated the same truth in his own way: Even those who set themselves up against you, he wrote in the Confessions, do but copy you in a perverse way.

**R. Sungenis:** So if it's perverse, why is Schoeman making it look like it is not perverse? There is hardly a negative word about the Talmud in Schoeman's book. Not once does he cite the very controversial passages in which the Talmud condemns Jesus Christ, Mary and Christianity. Instead we are treated to a sanitized Talmud that has some mystical ability to praise and honor Christ as the Savior of mankind. This is totally absurd, and it only shows the lengths that Jewish ideologues will go to make Judaism look like a good thing when in fact it is an anti-Christian religion to the core.

**B. Douglass:** Now, I for one would find it hilarious if Sungenis were to accuse Mike Jones of attempting a perverse resurrection of Talmudic Judaism, because he is largely supportive of this section of Schoeman's book. Actually, Sungenis had better not say this because I think Jim Scott IV might die laughing.

**R. Sungenis:** Yes, Mr. Schoeman has tried his hand at "humor" in much of his essay, as you can tell by all the references to him "laughing" at me. But as the old saying goes, "he who laughs last, laughs the hardest." As for Dr. Jones, he doesn't adopt a smidgen of

what Schoeman is proposing, since he has been very vocal in condemning his theology. My guess is, if he is exposed to the other side of the story on the idea that the Talmud is engaging in prophecy, he will think twice about supporting such an idea. So far, no one has given the other side of the story.

**B. Douglass:** Moving along, Sungenis also faults Schoeman for publicizing his encounter with the Blessed Virgin Mary without episcopal approval. Here Sungenis is shooting from the hip, as he often does. It took me all of one e-mail to find out that Schoeman has the enthusiastic support of several bishops, and has been censured by none. Schoeman states:

I am always careful to describe the incident to which you, and Sungenis, refer to as a dream (which it was). You will never hear me refer to it, or write about it, in any other way. I do not think that Bishops are in the business of approving dreams

**R. Sungenis:** I'm not shooting from the hip. Schoeman's answer is typical of the duplicity he exhibits when confronted with contradictions. In his audio lectures, he treats the experience as if he really encountered the Blessed Virgin Mary, and that she really talked to him and answered his questions. He leaves the audience with the impression that he had a divine experience with Mary, regardless if it was a dream. I deplore Schoeman's present attempt to suggest to Mr. Douglass that his experience might now be emptied of divine origin simply because it was a "dream." If it was a natural dream from his own human subconscious then he should simply say so to his audiences rather than giving them the impression that he really talked to the BVM or that she talked to him. If it was a natural dream I would approve it also. But that is not the impression Schoeman leaves his audience. I've had several people listen to his lectures on this topic and they all with one voice conclude that Schoeman believes he had a real experience with the BVM. If that is the case, then some tacit approval by a bishop who liked his book is not going to authenticate Schoeman's experience. It can only be authenticated by an investigative committee organized by the bishop. Claiming to speak to heaven and have heaven speak

to you is no light matter. It is precisely the prescription that false prophets used in the OT and still do in the New (Cf. Dt 13:1-5; 2 Cor 11:13-15).

**B. Douglass:** However, that being said, my witness testimony -- including the dream -- has been read, and responded to enthusiastically, by a number of bishops including my own bishop at the time -- Cardinal Law; and three other bishops with very strong reputations for orthodoxy: Bishop Andreas Laun of Salzburg (who arranged the German translation and publication of the book), Archbishop Burke of St. Louis, and the new bishop of Phoenix, Bishop Olmsted, who even wrote a laudatory back cover blurb for my new book, in which an expanded version of the incident is recounted. I have had extensive personal discussions about my conversion (and my book) with the latter three bishops.

**R. Sungenis:** None of this amounts to much, because the bishops are not acting in an official capacity to approve Marian visitations. In private conversations, they are merely giving their opinion. Be that as it may, we don't have a written statement from any of them which says something to the effect: "I read Mr. Schoeman's experience concerning his conversation with the Blessed Virgin Mary, and I approve the dream and declare it legitimate to communicate to all the Christian faithful as a true experience from heaven." No bishop in his right mind would write such a thing, because he has no way of knowing, short of a complete investigation, whether Schoeman had a real experience with the BVM. As always, because he's an esteemed Jewish convert, Schoeman's words are accepted at face value and any contradictions are excused. Meanwhile, I'm excoriated for even bringing up the topic.

**B. Douglass:** Finally, to move backwards a bit in Sungenis' paper, he states A few months ago Mr. Douglass even accused me of being the reason he wasn't getting any engineering jobs from the applications he was sending out Well, my professors warned the graduating class that potential employers as a matter of course will google the names of their applicants in search of anything incriminating. They even gave us an article advising us to attempt to remove any drunken or otherwise compromising pictures of

ourselves from the internet, because they would influence companies not to hire us. That's right, a drunken picture on facebook can cost one a job. Now, how much more damaging was my position as Vice President to a man widely regarded as a notorious anti-Semite? In fact, I went to a large number of interviews, and the persons I talked with regularly expressed the greatest enthusiasm in hiring me. One even offered to fly me to Texas to visit their offices. Yet, not surprisingly, this initial enthusiasm was repeatedly followed by dead silence. Clearly, these people were googling my name and deciding they wanted nothing to do with the Vice President of a right-wing hate group.

**R. Sungenis:** The truth is that the ADL would consider Mr. Douglass an anti-semite by his own writings. In fact, in Mr. Douglass' previous essay he lists about a dozen things he holds against the Jews and Zionism that any Jew of an ADL persuasion would consider anti-semitic. In fact, according to Mr. Douglass' own description of himself, I am only slightly more to the right than Mr. Douglass, yet he calls me a "right-wing hate group." Mr. Douglass writings and ideas against the Jews are his own doings, not mine. He told me several times in his emails that he was "with" me and Dr. Jones on the Jewish issues. But it is interesting that Mr. Douglass escapes censure by my other critics when he appears to be against most things the Jews do. The reason I mentioned that Mr. Douglass was complaining to me that he may not be getting any engineering jobs is that it appears to be an unadmitted motivation for his sudden wish to depart from CAI, something which he had been hinting at for several weeks. In any case, I'm glad he is gone from CAI. With friends like him, who needs enemies?

**B. Douglass:** I suppose it was too much for me to expect of Sungenis that he might care that he was potentially destroying my livelihood and ability to support a family.

**R. Sungenis:** His livelihood? I have nine kids and a wife to support. Which one of Mr. Douglass' circle of anti-Sungenis friends cares a whit about my livelihood? Why didn't Mr. Douglass think about that before he wrote his present denigrating essay about me, complete with implying that I'm mentally unstable and need to see a psychiatrist? Mr. Douglass is a single man with no major financial responsibilities who is helped

financially by his parents with whom he is in frequent communication. He told my wife that his mother called him at 2:00 in the morning to remind him to do something. Besides, Mr. Douglass chose to come to CAI when the controversy about my alleged anti-semitism was already a popular topic. Why didn't he think about his future job applications then?

**B. Douglass:** I should have expected his behavior, given that when Michael Forrest told him that he was going to discredit the cause of traditional marriage, his response was, That's your problem. No Bob, the damage you have done to traditional Catholic faith and morality is everyone's problem. Repent and get help. I wish I could smoke that peace pipe with you, but there can be no reconciliation without contrition and reparation. Until then, all I can do is distance myself from you and try to contain the damage you have caused. To that end, I request that you remove my articles from CAI. I would like to make the same request on behalf of Michael Forrest, Jacob Michael, and Ed Snyder.

Ben Douglass

March 24, Anno Domini MMVII      Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, Ora pro nobis.

St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Ora pro nobis.

St. Dominic, Ora pro nobis.

St. Francis, Ora pro nobis St. Edith Stein, Ora pro nobis.

S Maximilian Kolbe, Ora pro nobis.

**R. Sungenis:** Actually, I'm the one who should have expected Mr. Douglass' behavior, since I've been through it a few times previously (e.g., Jacob Michael and Michael Forrest). Apprentices come to work for me and CAI because we are quite well known. Our website gets thousands of hits per week and I am well-known in the Catholic world for my books, articles and lectures. So they figure they can latch on to me and rise to the top of the apologetic world. But then they find out how deadly serious I am about apologetics and that I am willing to risk my own reputation for the truth. I wish I could count how many times my apprentices tried to dissuade me from dealing with controversial topics so that CAI could maintain the status quo like most other Catholic

apostolates. I guess from now on I'll have to give a detailed job description before I hire anyone, including the warning that CAI will put its own reputation on the line to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

It is unfortunate to see such self-righteous people as Mr. Douglass telling me to repent. Repent of what? That I disagree with Mr. Douglass' assessment of the situation and the extent to which we will deal with controversial figures such as Roy Schoeman? Am I supposed to repent to the cooked-up and exaggerated charges of plagiarism and ridiculous charges of quoting from Nazi websites? The request to "repent" is nothing but a power play to make my opponents feel they are superior and have seen everything correctly. There is nothing to repent of because I've done nothing wrong. All I have done is call a spade a spade. It is only because I have thechutzpah to uncover and publicize the errors and fallacious ideas of a popular Jewish convert that the rain is now falling upon me from his die-hard supporters. When I did the same against James White, I was declared a "genius." Now that I do it against Roy Schoeman, I'm a "slanderer" and "mentally unstable." Make your decision, folks. Is it really the case that I'm a "unstable," or is it the case that I have marshaled the talents God had given me to expose Protestant errors to expose Jewish errors? Which makes more sense?

I rest my case.

God be with you.

Robert A. Sungenis, Ph.D.

March 27, 2007