

4/18/62
RABBI MENACHEM M. SCHNEERSON
Lubavitch
770 Eastern Parkway
Brooklyn 13, N. Y.
HYacinth 3-9250

מנחם מענדל שניאורסאהן
ליובאוויטש

770 איסטערן פארקוויי
ברוקלין, נ. י.

By the Grace of G-d
Erev Pesach, 5722
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Mr. Chayim Yaakov Lipschitz
168 Warburton Avenue
Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y.

Greeting and Blessing:

I am in receipt of your letter of April 12. I do not know if you expect me to return to the subject of our correspondence, since it is evident from your letter that you ~~know~~ ^{know now} my point of view. I find it necessary, however, to refer to two points which have been raised by you. Firstly, in connection with Mr. B.R. mentioned by me, and the question you ask, what would be the reaction if he had made such a gift to a Yeshiva? Needless to say, this is besides the point. The point which I made was that if it had been a person of a different background and profession, it would have not surprised me so much that you should consider it a worthy association, and I would have considered my chances of dissuading you much slimmer. But seeing that it is this particular person that is involved, it made me wonder all the more why you should consider it a worthy association, and it had also raised my hopes that on further reflection you might not like the company after all.

Secondly, your suggestion to leave our divergent views to the Supreme Judge, is something that I cannot accept, since it is not a matter of theoretical differences, nor am I G-d's policeman. I am hopeful that both of us will for many many years to come do our share to spread Yiddishkeit and strengthen our traditions. But I considered it my duty to try to prevent a Jew from doing something which, in my opinion, was not commendable, especially a Jew who is close to my heart.

As for citing the case of Prof. Boris Schatz, I trust you will forgive me when I say that the facts were not quite the same as you seem to think. At any rate, I have no desire to go into this matter, for it is not important what any other individual did, since in this matter we have a clear ruling in the Shulchan Aruch, and when a person deviates from the Shulchan Aruch he cannot be cited as an example to follow. Here lies one of the fundamentak differences between the Jewish religion and others, for our Torah is an open book, and everyone can find out for himself what the Jewish law is; and there is no authority that can change it.

Since I have clarified my views, there is no point in my prolonging the discussion. On the other hand it is my policy in my relationship with other people to seek out points of agreement

rather than of disagreement. Therefore, seeing that for the time being, at any rate, we have reached an impasse on this question, I prefer to turn my attention to points of mutual agreement.

At this time on the eve of the Festival of Our Liberation, I send you my prayerful wishes for a kosher and inspiring Pesach. I trust you will find the enclosed copy of my Pesach message of timely interest.

With kindest personal regards, and

With blessing

M. Schmerson

P. S. With reference to the question of carbon dating, which you mention in your letter, this method is precisely one of *(also)* those that has all the weaknesses which I noted in my letter. Thus, this method has only fairly recently been discovered and has not been tested over a long period; it belongs in the category of extrapolation, where a relatively very short period of observation is used as basis for inferences going back to the distant past; it is based on some illogical and unscientific assumptions. For example, there is no logical basis to assume that certain carbons could not have been produced except by the decay of other carbons, while those other carbons came into being in some other way. This is an arbitrary assumption. In view of the above, and other reasons, this method is a doubtful criterion even in regard to a not too distant past, and is certainly of very doubtful validity *(y)* in regard to the distant past.