



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Preserving American Jewish History

MS-603: Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum Collection, 1945-1992.

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 30, Folder 10, Jewish-Christian relations, 1972.

memorandum

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

date FEB 4 1972
31 January 1972

to Marc Tanenbaum

FO-ISR

from M. Bernard Resnikoff

subject

As promised to you in an earlier memo, I enclose herewith an updated report on "Jerusalem and the Churches" designed as part of the monograph your office is preparing on the general subject of "Jerusalem".

Because the shots were called as they were seen and as a matter of good public relations, I am going to show this to a number of key people for their reactions. I will report them to you as swiftly as I get them. Meanwhile, I would welcome your reactions.

Kind regards.



MBR:n1

cc: Seymour Lachman
Zachariah Shuster

JERUSALEM AND THE CHURCHES

(Prepared by the Israel Office for the
Inter-religious Affairs Department)

There are 31 Churches in Jerusalem^(*) today, more than in any other city in the world. They are divided into three major groups: Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant. The first comprises the Greek Orthodox Church and those subscribing to the Monophysite heresy which split Eastern Christianity in the fifth century. The Catholic Church has three subdivisions: the Roman Catholic, which, using the Latin rite, is known in the Middle East as the Latin Church; the Greek Catholic, using the Byzantine or Constantinople liturgy; and the Uniate Churches. Both the latter are in full communion with the Holy See and are subject to its supreme jurisdiction, but they differ from the Roman Catholic Church in their organization.

The table below shows the main Churches in each group and, in round numbers, their approximate membership in Jerusalem and (in brackets) in the whole of Israel, including the administered areas. Like most of the sources on which they are based, they make no claim to accuracy, and are intended only to give some idea of the relative sizes of the communities in Jerusalem to one another, and of each to its complete body in the whole country.

Official recognition was given by the Mandatory Government to nine of the communities: the Greek, Armenian and Syrian Orthodox and the Roman, Greek, Maronite, Armenian, Syrian and Chaldean Catholic. This recognition was preserved by the State of Israel, with the recent addition of the Arab branch of the Anglican Church. The communities continue to maintain their own religious courts, which have jurisdiction in all matters of personal status, including marriage and divorce, and of inheritance.

There is no formal order of precedence, but the Greek Orthodox Patriarch is, by tradition, regarded as the senior member of the Church and acts as its spokesman on all official and ceremonial occasions.

* - The name here refers to the city in its widest sense. It is hoped that, throughout this chapter, it will be clear from the context whether it is used thus, or as meaning that part of the city formerly under Jordanian occupation, i.e. East Jerusalem, including the area within the walls.

ORTHODOX

Greek
4,000
(37,500)

Monophysites

Armenian
2,500
(3,500)

Coptic
500
(1,500)

Syrian
200
(1,100)

Ethiopian
50
(100)



Roman(Latin)
3,800
(24,000)

Greek
300
(25,000)

Uniates

Karonite
Armenian) 500
Syrian) (3,500
Coptic)
Chaldean)

PROTESTANTS

Anglican
200
(2,300)

Lutherans)
Church of Scotland) 300
Baptists) (2,500
Etc.)

The Greek Orthodox Church claims to be the oldest of all the Churches to be properly established in Jerusalem, with a See dating back to the early part of the second century. The first Patriarch was appointed in the middle of the fourth century, and it was during his term of office that the Church was proclaimed autocephalous. So greatly did it flourish during the two centuries of Byzantine rule, and so well entrenched had it become by the time of the Arab conquest in the first half of the seventh century, that the victorious Caliph Omar granted the Patriarch an edict which recognized him as owner of all the shrines, churches and monasteries in Jerusalem and throughout the country. He was also recognized as the spiritual leader not only of the Greek Orthodox community but of all Christians living within his See. It is this ahname, confirmed by decrees of later rulers of Palestine, that forms the basis of the struggle waged over the centuries between the Orthodox, Latin and Armenian Churches for the preservation or recovery of what each regards as its own rights and privileges.

Surviving -- at great cost -- the ravaging conquest of the Holy Land by the Seljuk Turks in 1072, the Orthodox Church was less fortunate when, less than 30 years later, the First Crusade brought Christians from the West to reopen the pilgrims' route to the Holy Land and to free the Holy Places from Moslem rule. The Crusaders accomplished the latter aim in 1099 and on their capture of Jerusalem -- accompanied by a fearful slaughter of Moslem and Jewish inhabitants -- ousted the Greek Orthodox from their position of Christian eminence. They recovered it when the Crusaders were expelled from the Holy City by Saladin in 1187, and a Greek Orthodox Patriarch had his rights in the Holy Places restored to him. The Church maintained itself with a fair degree of security under more than two centuries of Mamluk rule, and with the Ottoman conquest of 1517 had its rights reconfirmed. But the power of the Latin Church was bolstered increasingly by the Catholic powers of Europe -- especially France -- and the Greek Orthodox had to struggle vigorously against the Latins as well as against the Armenians. They finally found their own champion in Russia, whose interest in the Holy Land began to make itself felt in the 18th century.

It was with Russian influence that Greek pre-eminence was ratified by a Turkish firman, or edict, of 1757, which wrought the last changes ever to be made in the rights exercised in the Holy Places. It was also under Russian influence that

nearly a hundred years later, in 1843, the Patriarch, for the first time for centuries, took up residence in Jerusalem.

The Greek Orthodox Church today owns 90 churches and monasteries throughout the country: in Jerusalem alone it has 30 religious establishments. The Patriarch is assisted in his functions, spiritual and administrative, by a Synod of 14 members, ranging in rank from Archbishop to Archimandrite. All are members of the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre, the monastic order which has guarded the Church's holy places, ministered to its community and cared for its pilgrims since earliest times.

The hierarchy is almost entirely Greek, since very few Arabs become monks. Most of the parish priests are Arabs, ministering to a community that is estimated to number some 380,000 in the whole of Israel -- including the administered territories. The Jerusalem community of just under 4,000 consists mainly of Arabs, with a few hundred lay Greek nationals.

The Church is a poor one, and support comes from the Greek government and people, who also pay for the upkeep of the shrines and help to make possible the educational and charitable work of the Patriarchate.

The present Patriarch, whose writ runs on both sides of the Jordan, is the 80-year-old Benedictos I. Of Turkish birth, he was brought to Jerusalem as a boy of 14 to receive his secular and theological education in the seminary attached to the Patriarchate, and has spent the major part of his life in the city. He is a man of distinguished intellect and wide learning. His studies at Athens University included law and political science, and he was for many years, both during the Mandate and under Jordanian rule, legal adviser to the Patriarchate, to which he himself was elevated in 1957.

Evidence of a Latin Christian presence in the Holy Land is provided by the converts and martyrs of Roman times, and the 34 years during which St. Jerome lived in Bethlehem and produced the Vulgate spanned the final years of Roman and the first of Byzantine rule. But an organized Latin Church owes

its existence to the Crusaders, who established a Patriarch in Jerusalem as the 11th century drew to its close. Their hold on the city lasted only 88 years, but when Richard Coeur de Lion, as leader of the Third Crusade, made a treaty with Saladin in 1192 he was able to obtain permission for a few Latin priests to officiate in the Holy Sepulchre and for pilgrims to visit the Holy Places freely. The city itself, however, remained under Moslem rule and the capital of the much reduced Christian Kingdom of Jerusalem, for the last hundred years of its exiguous existence, was Acre.

The kingdom fell to the Mamluks from Egypt in 1291, and for the next five and a half centuries the Latin Church was represented by the Custody of the Holy Land, one of the Provinces of the Franciscan Order. This international province -- for by its rule the religious destined for service in the Holy Land must be drawn from all over the world -- was confided with the official guardianship of the Holy Places in the 13th century, and was granted extensive rights -- such as living and serving in the holy Sepulchre -- which persist to the present day. The Custody, which now has religious houses all over the Middle East, is ruled by a council elected in Rome and presided over by a Custos who is traditionally Italian. Its activities include ministration to pilgrims, assistance to the poor, and education -- a field in which it has a high reputation. For historical reasons, it is still the Custody which runs the Latin parishes throughout the country.

It was not until 1847, partly as a reaction to an emerging Protestant influence, that a Latin Patriarchate was reinstalled in Jerusalem. In its wake came many more orders of monks and nuns, and hospitals, orphanages, schools and hospices for pilgrims were established in great number. Activities were considerably restricted during the two World Wars -- between them political support came from the Vatican with the appointment, in 1929, of an Apostolic Delegate -- and there was considerable change in the shape of the diocese when the events of 1948 caused a redistribution of the community.

The Patriarch exercises authority over his native community through a bishop in Israel, with his seat in Nazareth, who has responsibility for Jerusalem, and a bishop in Amman, whose jurisdiction extends over the whole of the administered areas. The Patriarch, Monsignor Beltritti, who was born in Italy in 1910, has, like his Greek Orthodox counterpart, spent all but his boyhood almost entirely in the Holy Land. He came to study at the age of 16, was ordained here, and has spent his life in the service of the diocese and its institutions. A

man of great simplicity and dedication, he has a wide knowledge of languages which enables him to communicate directly with visiting personalities, both ecclesiastical and lay, from all parts of the world. In 1965, after having been Chancellor for many years, he was appointed coadjutor to the then Patriarch with automatic succession to his office. He was called on to assume the title in 1970.

The position of the Latin Church is complicated by the presence of an Apostolic Delegate. Since the Holy See has no diplomatic relations with Israel or Jordan, the cultivated and highly sophisticated Monsignor Pio Laghi is not formally or technically accredited, but he is in fact on extremely cordial terms with both Jerusalem and Amman. As far as Israel is concerned, he exercises diplomatic functions -- however informally -- which extend to matters concerning the local community. His direct access to the head of the government and other ministers gives him a status which cannot but be regarded with jealousy by the other Churches. Despite the progress that has been made, ever since the Pope's historic visit to Jerusalem in 1964, towards ending the 900-year-old schism between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, members of the Greek Orthodox hierarchy take little pains to conceal their inherited emotions about the Latins.

Traces of Armenian convents dating back to the fifth century have been found on the Mount of Olives, and Armenians were asserting rights in the Holy Places in the seventh century. They had a bishop in Jerusalem from then until the end of the Crusader kingdom, and while there are differences of opinion about the official establishment of the Patriarchate, there was certainly a Patriarch by the early 14th century. In the Ottoman period he was recognized as head of all the Monophysite Churches.

There has been an Armenian community in Jerusalem, living in its own quarter of the Old City, since the 13th century, and this has always preserved its ethnic identity, with no proselytisation and no intermarriage. The Church is therefore unique in being the only "national" church in the Holy Land. The community, which was greatly enlarged by the influx of refugees from the Turkish massacres in Armenia in World War I, is a community in the fullest sense. It finds its education,

its culture, and to a great extent its social life, within its own confines, and the Patriarch who guides their religious life is a very real father of his people.

That Patriarch at present is His Beatitude Yeghishe Derderian, who was born in Eastern Anatolia in 1910 and fled with his family from the massacres. He arrived in Jerusalem as an orphan in 1922, and has lived here almost continuously ever since. He received his education for the priesthood in the seminary which has become the most important training ground for clergy in the Armenian Diaspora -- a word which provides a clue to his and his people's understanding of Israel. He is, however, staunchly neutral in the Arab-Israel conflict, accepting that, having no foreign backing, the Armenians must give their allegiance to the power exercising sovereignty at any particular time (as one of his clergy puts it succinctly: "If the Chinese came, we would accept them"). A man of culture -- he is a poet who is regarded as an important contemporary figure in Armenian literature -- he not surprisingly welcomes the encouragement given to his community by Israel in this field after the somewhat arid years under Jordan's rule.

Derderian became Patriarch in 1960, after an intra-communal struggle lasting 11 years, and since his elevation has travelled widely, making repeated visits to Echmiadzin, the home of the mother church in Soviet Armenia, and to the dispersed communities in Europe, North and South America and South-East Asia.

Of the other Monophysite Orthodox Churches represented in Jerusalem the most important, in relation to the question of rights in the Holy Places, is the Coptic. This Egyptian Church, which was proselytising in Palestine in Roman times, has had its own bishop since the early 13th century. The Copts have for many centuries had possession of a small chapel in the Holy Sepulchre as well as rights such as the hanging of lamps and a part in processions, censuring and other ceremonies. This very small community of Egyptian nationals -- its 500 members in Jerusalem form about one third of the total in the whole of Israel -- is headed by Archbishop Basilios, who is assisted by 25 priests and deacons. They maintain two schools and an orphanage, but can hardly be said to play a significant part in the life of the country.

Like the Coptic Church, the small Syrian Orthodox and the still smaller Ethiopian Churches are both ceremonially subordinate to the Armenian. The Syrian may be one of the oldest of all the Churches in Jerusalem, its liturgy still being Syriac, which closely resembles the Aramaic of the Second Temple. The Ethiopians are mainly monks, with a few lay members who also lead a devoutly religious life.

Before leaving the Orthodox communities, mention should be made of the Russian Church, which is allied to the Greek and not the Monophysite Churches. Centered in the great Russian Compound in Jerusalem, the century-old complex which includes a cathedral and a hospital and buildings which now house Israel's Supreme Court, the Orthodox Palestine Society was active until the Revolution, after which the personnel of the churches, monasteries and hospitals gradually dwindled. The Mandatory government appointed an administrator of the properties, whose ownership is now in dispute between the Ecclesiastical Mission of the Moscow Patriarchate and the Church Outside Russia, which has its headquarters in New York. There is still a tiny, ageing Russian community, but the duties of the ecclesiastics are mainly administrative. The Soviet priests posted to Jerusalem are known to be sent officially by Moscow, but they are not regarded as exercising any political influence.

The second largest Church in the country is the Greek Catholic, which stems from a separatist movement in the Greek Orthodox Church in Syria and the Lebanon early in the 18th century. Its greatest strength in Palestine, however, was from the beginning in Gallilee and the north, and the Jerusalem community has always been a small one. It now numbers only 300. The only sanctuary it owns in Jerusalem is the Sixth Station of the Cross, and it has no rights in the Holy Sepulchre or any other Holy Place.

Like the other Uniate Churches, the Greek Catholics practise the Byzantine and not the Latin rite, but they have no doctrinal differences from Rome and acknowledge the supremacy of the Holy See.

The leader of the Jerusalem community is a Patriarchal Vicar, Archbishop Capucci, who is under the authority of the

Archbishop of Acre, Nazareth and Galilee, the head of the Church in Israel. This office is held by Archbishop Raya, who succeeded to it in 1967 and who, like his predecessor, has identified himself closely with Israeli life. He has visited the United States on a lecture tour arranged by the Histadrut, the Israel Labour Federation.

The Protestant presence in the country dates only to the missionary enterprises begun in the thirties of the 19th century. Its first community, organized in 1841, was a joint Anglican-Lutheran venture, conceived by King Frederick William IV of Prussia. A Church of the two denominations was established under the leadership of an Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem (care was taken not to offend the susceptibilities of other Churches by using the term 'of Jerusalem'), nominated alternately by the King of Prussia and the Queen of England. The early work of conversion, either direct or as a by-product of education, soon led to the establishment of an Arab community known as the Evangelical Episcopal Church.

The partnership came to an end in 1886 and the Anglican Church continued its mission independently, its impressive cathedral church, St. George's, being consecrated in 1898. The Church's most flourishing period was during the Mandate, although no special privileges were granted to it -- or to any other Protestant Church -- and the only official recognition was that given to the Arab branch in Transjordan in 1946. Similar recognition was granted to the Arab branch by Israel in 1970. The Anglicans had five schools in Jerusalem alone, catering either for the children of the Administration or for the Arabs. Numbers fell conspicuously with the end of the Mandate, but St. George's School now has its greatest enrollment ever -- nearly 700, which is more than three times the total Christian population of Jerusalem: 70 per cent of the pupils are Moslem.

The bishopric was raised to an archbishopric in 1957 and when Archbishop George Appleton was appointed to the See in 1969 he became head of five dioceses which comprise -- in addition to Israel with Cyprus and the Arab Trucial States -- Lebanon and Syria, Sudan and Jordan, Egypt and Libya and North Africa, and Iran. A man of peace, he makes no secret of the fact that he regards it as part of his mission to try to

reconcile Israel and the Arabs. He is respected and listened to by both sides, even if the Arabs regard him as too pro-Israel and the Israelis as too pro-Arab. The composition of his huge diocese, which he visits constantly, gives him a double influence; over the indigenous communities, and over the British and American personnel of the many oil companies in the area he serves.

The missionary, charitable and educational work of the German Protestants continued through and beyond their affiliation with the Anglicans, and was resumed after the break that occurred with the capture of Palestine by the British in World War I. The long-felt need for an Arab Evangelical congregation in Jerusalem was fulfilled in 1929, but German work again came to a standstill in 1939 -- this time permanently. After World War II, the affairs of the Church were entrusted to U.S. Lutherans, but there was time to do little before the end of the Mandate. After the division of Palestine, an Arab Evangelical community developed in the Arab areas, with one of its four congregations in Jerusalem. The Church prospered and in 1950 was granted official recognition by the Jordanian government. Membership over the whole country is now in the region of 1,500, mostly Arabs; but there is a small German Lutheran congregation in Jerusalem, which is the seat of the head of the Church, the Probst or Provost.

The other Protestant Churches in Jerusalem, whose total membership is but a few hundred, include the Church of Scotland, the Southern Baptist Convention, some Pentecostal groups, the Seventh Day Adventists and the Church of Christ.

The only Holy Place owned by the Protestant Churches is the Garden Tomb, identified by the Victorian soldier-administrator, General Gordon, and therefore known as Gordon's Calvary.

No formal definition of what constitutes a Holy Place appears to exist, but for the purposes of this study it is taken to be undisputed that any place which is regarded as holy by a particular faith is so recognized in national and international practice.

The difficulty of giving an accurate and comprehensive picture of the Holy Places in Jerusalem can be gauged from the fact that a list published by the United Nations in 1949 specifies 30 -- admittedly "Ancient and Modern Synagogues" appear only generically under one numeral and "Basilica of the Holy Sepulchre (inclusive of I to IX Stations of the Cross)" under another -- while the present master plan for the Old City designates exactly ten times that number within the walls alone.

When one speaks of the problem of the Christian Holy Places, however, it is not of every church, chapel or other religious building that one is thinking but of the churches, monasteries and shrines which have been erected on sites connected with the life, Passion and Resurrection of Jesus and which have, over the centuries, been the magnet drawing pilgrims to Jerusalem from the four corners of the world.

Many of these -- indeed the majority -- were built or acquired by specific denominations or monastic orders, and ownership or control of them is undisputed. But there are some in which more than one Church shares ownership and other rights which have been matter for dispute time out of mind -- disputes which have led to struggles, often physical, in which the interest of foreign powers has been engaged. An unseemly squabble over the star marking the very birthplace of Christ in the Grotto of the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem was a proximate cause of the Crimean War.

Chief among these sanctuaries in Jerusalem is the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, where major rights are owned by the Greek Orthodox, Latin and Armenians and minor ones by the Copts, Ethiopians and Syrians.

Disputes over their rights and privileges were a major preoccupation of the Churches for hundreds of years, and by the middle of the 19th century the interference in the matter by foreign powers was so great that the Turkish Government decided to put an end to the trouble once and for all by defining the respective rights of the communities. This it did by means of a firman of 1852 which, proclaiming the intention "to serve constantly and forever as the permanent rule," confirmed the prerogatives that had been specified a hundred years earlier, in the firman of 1757, and thus crystallized the position into what was to become known -- the term was first used in the Treaty of Berlin in 1878 -- as the status quo.

The status quo did not merely define the ownership and use of space in different parts of churches and shrines (certain chapels in the Holy Sepulchre, for instance, were indisputably owned by particular denominations). It allocated the times at which the different communities might conduct their services; it laid down who was to be responsible for precise repairs and replacements; it designated the permitted number and position of lamps, candelabra, icons and hangings for each community; and it even went into such mundane detail as the sweeping and washing of floors and steps, the numbers to be employed in these tasks and the implements they must use.

The status quo may have delimited the problem of the Holy Places: it did not solve it, and after World War I it became a major issue at the Peace Conference. No settlement could be reached there or, because of the strong Roman Catholic opposition, at the League of Nations when the matter came before its Council in 1922. Britain accordingly took upon herself, with the Mandate, full responsibility for carrying out the provisions which guaranteed respect for the various religious interests in Palestine and bound her to sustain existing rights and ensure free access to the Holy Places and other religious buildings and sites. This meant, in effect, the maintenance of the status quo. By an Order in Council of 1924, all power over the Holy Places was vested in the High Commissioner, who had the final decision in any dispute without recourse to the courts.

It is perhaps permissible to wonder here what obscure part Christendom's ancestral memory of the conflict over the Holy Places between the Churches themselves and the powers championing them has played, through all the argument of the past 35 years about a special status for Jerusalem (it was the Peel Commission Report of 1937, recommending partition, which first suggested the necessity for one), in the insistence that the Holy City needs to be protected against any individual national or religious sovereignty.

Once partition -- of Palestine as a whole and Jerusalem in particular -- became a bloodily-achieved fact, the status quo was maintained by Jordan, as was freedom of access and worship -- except for Israeli Christians, limited numbers of whom were granted severely circumscribed permission to cross the border to visit the Holy Sepulchre at Easter and the Church of the Nativity at Christmas.

Israel's position with regard to the status quo has already been put to legal test. Rights over a passageway and two chapels in the Holy Sepulchre precincts have long been disputed by the Copts and the Ethiopians. Control depends on who holds the keys to the passageway. While the Copts, the holders of the keys, were at their midnight prayers in the Sepulchre during the Easter celebrations in 1970, the Ethiopians managed to change the padlocks. This led to a petition by the Coptic Archbishop to the Supreme Court, which decided that its only right was to prevent anyone taking the law into his own hands and depriving another of property in his possession by force, and that the disputed claims between the two Churches were the exclusive province of the government. The Government accordingly appointed a commission to take evidence and make recommendations. So far there has been no decision, nor any response to an appeal by the Minister of Justice to the parties to find an amicable solution. The Minister has set aside the suggestion by two of the Supreme Court judges that the 1924 Order in Council is no longer in force, holding that this was not a British innovation but a continuation of a situation prevailing from time immemorial.

When the Israel Defence Forces entered the Old City on 7th June, 1967, the Minister of Defence, Moshe Dayan, said in his proclamation: "We have come to Jerusalem not to possess ourselves of the Holy Places of others or to interfere with the members of other faiths, but to safeguard the city's integrity and to live in it with others in unity."

On the same day the Prime Minister, Levi Eshkol, gathered the leaders of all the religious communities together to tell them of the happenings in Jerusalem. He informed them that instructions had already been given by the Minister of Religious Affairs for arrangements for the sacred places of each religion to be determined by a council of its own ecclesiastics.

Three weeks later, on 27th June, he called the religious leaders together again to tell them that "the Holy Places in Jerusalem are now open to all who wish to worship at them -- members of all faiths, without discrimination." He said that the Government of Israel had made it a cardinal principle of its policy "to preserve the holy Places, to ensure their religious and universal character and to guarantee free access," and expressed the hope that the religious representatives

themselves would feel free to put forward their own proposals in the consultations that were to take place in the future.

On the same day, the Knesset passed the Protection of Holy Places Law, which provided for seven years' imprisonment for desecration or violation of any Holy Place and five years for impairing freedom of access "or doing anything likely to hurt the feelings of anyone to whom the place is sacred."

On 11th July, the Vatican Under Secretary of State, Mgr. Angelo Felici, had a meeting with Mr. Eshkol. A joint statement reported that they had discussed "a number of possible formulae that might be taken into consideration for the purposes of an acceptable solution of the important issues connected with the Holy Places."

Meanwhile, practising Christians in Israel had had evidence of what the reunification of Jerusalem meant in the services in the Holy Sepulchre that they were able to attend freely, for the first time in 19 years, along with their uncles and cousins and friends from East Jerusalem and the West Bank.

Speaking on behalf of all the Church dignitaries at the Prime Minister's meeting on 27th June, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch had paid a graceful tribute to the Israel Army, all of whose men "have shown us kindness and a willingness to serve us. Everybody," added His Beatitude, "has displayed respect for the Holy Places and churches." The Government was to receive many expressions of gratitude along similar lines during the next few months, but it could not deny that considerable damage had been caused to churches and other ecclesiastical property during the Six Day War, and one of its early steps was to make compensation.

In November 1967 a special Cabinet Committee was set up under the Minister of Justice to examine claims made by the Churches. These were invited in respect of damage caused not only in the 1967 operations but also during the War of Independence in 1948, and without regard to the military forces by whom the damage was caused.

Following an examination of the claims, 19 agreements were reached with Churches and other ecclesiastical institutions -- the majority of them in 1968 -- in respect of nearly 40 properties in East and West Jerusalem. They included churches, monasteries and convents, hospitals, schools and cemeteries in the Old City, on Mount Zion and on the Mount of Olives. The total amount paid by the Government to date is estimated to be in the region of

IL 6.5 million.

Not all payments have related to damage to religious institutions: the principle has been that the property concerned must belong to a Church or other ecclesiastical body. The Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, for example, received money for the repair of some house and shop property it owned in former no-man's-land, while the Latin Patriarchate was compensated for damage to a hotel it owned within the Old City walls.

It is of interest that the French Government, owners of the church most badly damaged during the Six Day War, refused, presumably in order not to give even de facto recognition to Israel's sovereignty over the Old City, to accept compensation for the church itself, although they did allow Israel to pay for damage to the adjacent seminary.

Certain subsidiary agreements were reached in the wake of the main negotiations. Thus the Assumptionist Order came to an agreement with the Municipality whereby part of the garden of the Church and Monastery of St. Pierre en Gallicante on Mount Zion was made available for a road in exchange for the building of a wall to safeguard the monastery's privacy. And both the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate and the Custody of the Holy Land placed stretches of land at the disposal of the Government for incorporation in the park being planted by the Municipality around the periphery of the Old City wall.

The division of the country in 1948 and the consequent shifts of population created demands for increased Church activity on the West Bank and in and around Jerusalem, and there was a considerable amount of new building of churches, schools and charitable institutions between the War of Independence and the Six Day War.

Some of the Jordanian legislation during these years, however, seemed to the Churches to be designed to limit their influence, in that it affected their rights to own and acquire property. In the 1950s, religious and charitable institutions were forbidden to purchase real estate in the vicinity of Holy Places, and a law of 1965 prohibited religious bodies from buying, inheriting or leasing property within the Old City.

Once Jerusalem was reunified, the Churches regained the same rights to acquire property and build on it as any other

institution or individual in Israel. On the whole they are inclined not to sell their land -- of which they own an appreciable amount -- but to rent it on 49 or 99 year leases, on the expiry of which they repossess both the land and any buildings that have been erected on it.

Quite apart from the repair of war damage, there has already been considerable rebuilding and new building in Jerusalem since reunification. The latter includes a Benedictine seminary, completion of a Greek Orthodox Church begun many years ago but left untouched during the Jordanian occupation, and an Armenian theological seminary which will double the number of priests being trained in Jerusalem for service in the Western world.

The most exciting new buildings, both in its design and in its purpose, is the Ecumenical Institute for Advanced Theological Studies that is now nearing completion on a hill between Jerusalem and Bethlehem. The idea of this institute was put forward by the Pope during his visit in 1964, but it was not until after the Six Day War, and with the direct encouragement of the Municipality, that building was started. The project is designed to bring together distinguished theologians of all denominations for research into the history of the schisms that have divided Christianity over the centuries.

The greatest work of repair and reconstruction is that being carried out in the Holy Sepulchre. This massive task was held up for decades because of disputes between the three main Churches concerned. It was not until 1958 that agreement was reached, and it took another five years until the operation was started. An international team of architects appointed by the Churches is carrying out the work, which will be paid for mainly by the Greek Orthodox -- who hold the largest share in the basilica -- the money coming from the Greek Government.

Following the practice of earlier administrations, the Israel Government is allowing the material required from abroad for this purpose -- as for all other ecclesiastical building and repair work -- to be imported free of duty.

In all the building, repairing and maintenance of ecclesiastical property the Municipality plays an important part, and it gives technical and financial assistance in many directions.

Immediately after the Six Day War, and before the Government's plans for compensation were worked out, the Municipality used its own funds for immediate repairs required, for instance, by the Abbey of the Dormition, St. George's Close and School, and a hospice belonging to the Order of St. Vincent de Paul.

The Municipality makes itself responsible for the everyday services required by the Churches, and all their monasteries, hostels, schools and other institutions, and every effort is made to deal with needs and problems with a minimum of formality and a maximum of speed. The Patriarchates themselves are exempted from city taxes, as are pilgrim hostels, while certain churches, schools and charitable institutions pay at a reduced rate.

There is no doubt that the good relations existing between the Churches and Municipality owe much to the personality of Mayor Teddy Kollek, whose goodwill is admitted on all sides, and who has on many occasions made himself responsible for gestures of help to Churches which he has had subsequently to justify to his councillors. He has instituted a practice whereby each ecclesiastical institution is invited, twice a year, to send in a list of its problems. Two months later, a public meeting is held at which the results of investigations into the problems are supplied. The Municipality itself takes up with government departments any questions which may concern, for example, the Ministry of Interior or Police or Transport.

The tendency of all the Churches to regard the local authority as their address for everything can be an embarrassment, for they sometimes try to use it to bypass the central administration. The Municipality sees in this, however, a mature acceptance of the situation that came into existence in 1967. It also admits that, since the relationship between itself and the Churches is an entirely non-political one and a necessity for day-to-day existence, the ecclesiastical authorities are providing themselves with a useful defence against any charge of "collaboration" with Israel should the situation ever be reversed.

If relations with the Government are in general of a more ceremonious nature than those with the Municipality, they are nevertheless cordial, and steps are taken to accord the leaders of the Churches the privileges they would have if the diplomatic status they enjoy de facto were to be put on a more formal basis. Thus, while they cannot by law be exempted from customs duty on their imported cars, that duty is paid for them by the Ministry of Religious Affairs.

Following the reunification of Jerusalem, the Church was freed from the Jordanian education law which makes it mandatory for all schools to conform to the official curriculum and to teach certain subjects, and examine in them, in Arabic. They found themselves once again at liberty to choose their own curriculum and their own languages. The education provided by the Christian parochial schools, which generally has been of a higher and more sophisticated standard than that of Moslem schools, and which has a western linguistic and cultural orientation, is admitted by the Churches themselves to be an instrument with a double edge, for it opens up wider horizons for the ambitious young who are uncertain of what the future holds for them in Israel, and fits them for a life beyond the confines of the Middle East. In particular, it enables the most valuable human material of all -- the youngsters who have the intellectual capacity to be the leaders of their people to go to universities in all parts of the western world for their higher education. And to echo the question of one cleric: once they go, how many of them come back? This is one of the factors behind the discussions going on among the Churches -- with full Government support -- about the establishment of an Arab university in the Jerusalem neighborhood.

The hold of Jerusalem on its Christian population is a matter of great concern to all the Churches. The Holy City has no spiritual pull on Christian Arabs as a place in which they must live and die, except in the case of the few with a religious vocation. But the continued existence and development of a Christian community is of intense importance to all the Churches, both as a general proposition and as it affects the maintenance of their churches and their ecclesiastical and non-ecclesiastical institutions.

While spokesmen admit that there is complete religious freedom, and do not utter the word "discrimination," they point out that the Christian Arab finds it emotionally and psychologically difficult to accept the idea of living in a Jewish city under Jewish sovereignty. In Israel, he has had over two decades to adapt to this situation; in East Jerusalem and other areas which were under Jordan occupation it is too early for the adjustment to have been made. It must be remembered that the churchmen discussing this matter are themselves faced with the phenomenon of being a minority under Jewish rule, anywhere in the world for the first time in history. While most of them

would probably say, as do the Greek Orthodox, that the message from their pulpits is an entirely religious one, their own feelings cannot but influence the members of their congregations, either in direct contact or through the schools and communal youth and cultural movements.

The remarkable enterprise of the Roman Catholic nuns, the Sisters of Sion, who have set up an ulpan in which Arabs and Jews can study Hebrew and Arabic together remains unique in both senses of the word.

At the material level, the Church spokesmen stress the changed situation in which the Christian Arabs have found themselves since 1967 as far as earning their livelihood is concerned. In general more urbanised than the Moslems, and by reason of their education, the Christians have traditionally gone into the white collar and other occupations above the unskilled labour level. They have been shopkeepers and tradesmen, importers and exporters, craftsmen and artisans, clerks and secretaries. They were prominent as owners, managers or employees in the hotel business and in travel agencies and other branches of the tourist industry. Before 1967, one is told, they were able to compete with their Moslem brothers; now that they have Israeli competition to face, they feel themselves at a disadvantage.

Not to put too fine a point on it, if the Churches do not impute any lack of good intention to the Government, they make it quite clear that Christian Arabs do not feel themselves completely fulfilled in the Jerusalem of today and that many of them are still looking abroad for their future.

Christian emigration is one about which Israel feels extremely sensitive, for if the Churches are naturally anxious to fortify their position with a secure and contented lay community, the Israel authorities are equally anxious to show that it is perfectly possible to achieve this under Israel's sovereignty -- if it has not indeed already been achieved.

On one fact there is no disagreement: Christians have been leaving not only Jerusalem, but the whole of Palestine, as well as Syria and the Lebanon, for more than a century, lured by the material opportunities that await them in western countries. In Europe and, to an even greater extent, in North and South America, they have been able to establish themselves comfortably and with considerable success among Christian communities of their own confessions.

As far as Jerusalem is concerned, the charge has been widely laid that Christians are now leaving the city not in 'normal' numbers or on traditional grounds, but in a great flow and as a direct result of Israel's reunification of the city.

Accurate figures to prove either this, or Israel's contention, as stated by Mr. Eban in the Knesset in June 1971, that "the great emigration of Christians under the Jordanian occupation has come to a halt since 1967," are impossible to obtain. That there was a great drop in the Christian population between 1948 and 1967 is undeniable, and there is some evidence that it may have been even greater than the figure of 15,000 given by the Foreign Minister. But there will never be any telling how many of this number left, exodus fashion, in 1948 and 1967, at times of war and fearful apprehension -- which seems to be the fairly unanimous belief of local churchmen -- and how many went gradually during the intervening years, when the Jordanian part of Jerusalem was taking on an increasingly Moslem character.

Whatever the true facts may be, churchmen themselves do not speak of any specially remarkable flow of emigration during these 19 years, any more than they speak of a stoppage of the flow since 1967. The general opinion would appear to be that emigration is still going on as it has always done, and that it must now be attributed at least in part to Israel's presence.

An exception to the general opinion is that of a leading Anglican cleric, who believes that the Christian population of Jerusalem has grown by as much as one thousand since the Six Day War. But even if this could be substantiated, the fact remains that the Christian proportion of the city's population has decreased dramatically in the past 40 years. Whereas Christians formed over 21 per cent of the total population of Jerusalem in 1931, they were no more than 4 per cent by 1971. And from being roughly equal to the Moslem population in 1931, they had dropped to less than 20 per cent by 1971.

Church leaders emphasize that one of the needs of the Christian Arab in Jerusalem is to feel that he has his rightful share in the life and affairs of the city which is his home. Widening the opportunities for him to fulfill this need is an integral part of the ideas that are currently being canvassed about the possibility of dividing the single Municipality into a number of separate borough councils for the various areas of the city, Jewish and Arab, the Old City having its own council.

While this may commend itself to the Churches generally as a contribution to a civic solution of Jerusalem's problems, a scheme on these lines is being advocated openly from what might be called the politico-religious aspect by the only Church head who gives public utterance to more than vaguely generalised views on the future of Jerusalem. (Patriarch Derderian expresses the wish that it may become "a religious centre of all religions, of pilgrimage and of education, of peaceful dialogue between different faiths...the unique place of understanding and harmony.") Archbishop Appleton, who admits that he adopted the idea from an American Benedictine monk, sees the division of the city into boroughs as an alternative to internationalisation which evades the troublesome question of sovereignty. "Discussion on these lines," he said in a recent television interview, "might find the right pattern for Jerusalem, but it must wait upon a general settlement on secure boundaries, withdrawal, refugees and waterways." He declared in terms that since there is "no great enthusiasm" for giving Jerusalem international status, the solution has to be found "between Israeli and Arab statesmen."

However non-committal the upper echelons of the Greek Orthodox hierarchy, like the Armenians, may be about the future of the Holy City, it is not difficult to conclude that whether they like it or not -- and there are those who do not -- they regard an undivided Jerusalem under Israel's hegemony as an established fact. They appear to be satisfied that there is full freedom of worship and that their rights are properly safeguarded and not to be troubled about matters of sovereignty or internationalisation. In the long term, both the Greek Orthodox and the Armenian Churches would probably be satisfied with a formalisation of the present position by the conferment on them of the diplomatic status that Israel has declared herself willing to grant.

Catholic views are, of course, conditioned by the Vatican, and by the call of the Pope for a special status, internationally guaranteed, which will do justice to the "pluralistic character" of the Holy City and to the rights of the different communities established there or regarding it as their spiritual centre. In the course of a Christmas message published in the "Osservatore Romano" of 23rd December, 1971, His Holiness expressed his unwillingness to do more than repeat this basic outline of what he is seeking for Jerusalem, so that the public is still ignorant of what is meant by a "special status."

The comment of the Apostolic Delegate that "it must be related to international status and not to internationalisation" is less enlightening than his explanation of the disagreement between the Holy See and Israel on the subject of Jerusalem. Pointing out that the Vatican regards the Holy City as limited strictly to Mount Moriah, Mount Zion and the Mount of Olives and the valleys which enclose them, he says that it looks upon this as a single, indivisible Holy Place, "a Holy Place in itself, belonging to God and not to a nation." Israel, on the other hand, regards it as her sovereign territory, containing a number of isolated Holy Places over which Jews, Christians and Moslems have their individual rights. That an attempt is being made to reconcile these views must be inferred from the visit to Jerusalem in January 1971 of a very senior Vatican official, Archbishop Benelli, who, according to reports from Rome, discussed the future of the city with the Foreign Minister, the Mayor and others.

Despite the progressively improving relations between the Christian communities in recent years, and the growing sense of unity and fraternity of which they speak, there is no "Church position" on Jerusalem, nor any council of Churches or other organized body to act as the voice of Jerusalem. The extent of the influence of any individual Church head on the eventual status of the Holy City is questionable. The Greek Orthodox Patriarch may be highly regarded by the World Council of Churches in Geneva, where he is said to represent Israeli matters with great fairness. The Armenian Patriarch may have a wide audience when he visits Echmedzian, the seat of the mother church in Soviet Armenia, and the countries of his Diaspora in Europe, North and South America and South-East Asia. Given the blessing of

Cantebury, the ideas of the Anglican Archbishop may be acceptable to the world's Protestant confessions. But the Vatican is an independent sovereign State exercising spiritual authority over more than five hundred million souls. When the question of Jerusalem is discussed at the United Nations, the Christian voice that echoes through the corridors is the voice of Rome.

* * * * *



31 January 1972
Vol. III. Nos. 1-2.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
ISRAEL OFFICE
9 Ethiopia Street
Jerusalem

72-585-7

FROM THE ARAB PRESS....

In the interests of improving Jewish-Arab understanding, the Israel Office of the American Jewish Committee translates and distributes, twice a month, material appearing in the Arab Press. Though material is sometimes extracted for brevity it is extracted in context and there is no attempt to editorialize. The selection is based on an objective judgement of relevance. Comments or reactions are welcome.

The material is generally taken from AL-QUDS, an independent daily published in East Jerusalem; AL-BASHEER, a weekly newspaper published in Bethlehem; ALWAN, a monthly for literature and the arts published in East Jerusalem; AL-MIRSAD, a weekly published in Tel Aviv by Mapam; and AL-ANBA, a Jerusalem daily sponsored by the Israeli Government.

* * *

WEST BANK ELECTIONS

11 January 1972; AL-QUDS:

"West Bank Municipal Elections: Jordan Decides not to Interfere in Them."

AL-QUDS has learned from reliable sources that the Jordanian Government has decided not to interfere in the subject of municipal elections in the West Bank.

It is understood from these sources that the Government has taken this decision after lengthy deliberations - and that as a result of this it has decided to terminate the propaganda campaign which used to urge West Bankers to boycott the elections.

Mr. Hagzi Melhis, Member of the Jordanian Chamber of Deputies and of the Nablus Chamber of Commerce, has the following to say concerning municipal elections in the West Bank: "I took the opportunity of my sojourn in Amman a few days ago and made enquiries concerning the stand of some Jordanian officials on the subject of municipal elections. Their reply was that the Jordanian media of communication will stop taking any hostile attitudes to elections in the West Bank until a thorough investigation of the subject has been completed through direct personal contacts with those coming from the West Bank - especially that there is a period of about three months between now and the date fixed for the first stage of these elections."

* * *

(More)

10 January 1972; AL-ANBA: "Ask the People" by Muhammed Abu Shilbaya - East Jerusalem.

We should not, under any circumstances, discuss the subject of municipal elections in the West Bank or formulate our attitude to them in the light of the position which the present regime in Amman adopts toward these elections or what it or any other quarter thinks about them. Our attitude to these elections, as well as to any other subject, must spring from the fact that it is we who have the right to decide on these matters more than anyone else. We know best where our interest lies and what our circumstances are like - better, at any rate, than those who formulate stands and draw blueprints from their positions of security behind their luxurious desks. These do not live our problems and can do nothing besides pontificating on our situation, and making statements that show only how completely ignorant they are of our conditions and circumstances.

Our stand vis-a-vis the municipal elections must rest on the fact that many peoples before us have lived under occupation, and that living under conditions of occupation never meant that these peoples condemned themselves to immobilisme. On the contrary, they acted in all directions to improve their lots, and this gradually led to safeguarding a secure and free existence to themselves, and their offspring. This is what happened in Egypt under British occupation, and this is what is happening now in Germany and Japan.

The quietist slogans raised by the inactive, and which call for waiting on "the great saviour" that would liberate our places holy and not holy, not only fail to serve any good purpose but go contrary to the experiences which nations living under the same conditions as those under which we live had undergone. The call to refrain from doing anything or saying anything under the occupation is a subversive one which contradicts all those healthy calls sent forth by national heroes throughout the world such as Mustafa Kamil and Sa'ad Zaghlul in Egypt, Ghandi and Jawaharlal Nehru in India. These called upon their peoples to act and carry on the burden as far as prevalent conditions allowed - and as a result they enabled their peoples to make great steps forward. Had Amman enjoyed even a fraction of awareness and sincerity it would have realized these truths and would have desisted from the crude, stupid, stubborn and subversive path it has taken.

Taking our point of departure from these premises, we therefore want these municipal elections to be a step forward in our long and difficult march towards a peace that would grant us our sacred right to self-determination in freedom and enable us to draw the blueprint for a secure and stable future, as well as laying the foundations for the healthy democratic regime to which we aspire and which we demand.

We believe, however - and everybody else agrees with us, including the Israeli authorities themselves - that the Jordanian municipal election laws do not enable us to take any steps forward, but rather compel us to go backwards or at best to stay where we are. This is because these laws are based on narrow and egoistic considerations of class: they disenfranchise the overwhelming majority of the population males and females alike; they rob the intellectuals and the educated classes of the right to present their candidacy and from the right to vote - making this the monopoly of the wealthy and the capitalists who constitute no more than ten per cent of the population.

(More)

As experience of municipal elections held prior to the June war of 1967 has shown, these laws do nothing more spectacular than replacing members of local councils by other members belonging to the same class and working for the promotion of the same interests, which are usually quite remote from those of the public.

This being the case, we demand the amendment of these laws. We also appeal to all liberal groups and individuals in Israel herself to join their voices to ours in this demand to amend those laws.

To be quite candid, we believe that the determination on the part of the Israeli authorities that the elections be held in keeping with Jordanian laws is not calculated to contribute to the growth of that mutual confidence which we all want to be the basis of security, stability and just peace in days yet to come.

The Israeli authorities are therefore called upon, and urgently, to show their goodwill by amending these laws for the people's good. I hereby raise the slogan calling for such amendment - and I ask readers to state their views candidly on this matter, so that the authorities may know the people's real view on this vital subject.

ARCHIVES * * *

18 January 1972; AL-ANBA: "Concerning the Municipal Election" by Abu Suleiman
(Pen name of Muhammed Al-Sa'ad - Umm al-Fahm)

Municipal elections in the West Bank have been the talk of the town for a whole month now. Press and public alike have been debating these elections, and opinions differ widely although there is a consensus in the West Bank that they should be held, while Amman shows fierce opposition. What remains quite true, however, is that the present local councils have long finished their terms of office and that new ones must be elected according to the wishes of the populace.

Conducting debates and controversies concerning these elections at this particular juncture is a waste of time. Efforts must concentrate on drawing election lists and voting to office candidates whom the people want and trust. Similarly unavailing, I believe, is talk about the shortcomings of the Jordanian municipal election laws and the call for amending these laws. After all, these shortcomings date back to quite some time ago and are well-known to the inhabitants of the West Bank, who had experienced them themselves. Moreover, existing political conditions and international agreements would not permit such amendments so long as the West Bank is considered internationally to be part of the Kingdom of Jordan.

Some may well say: And what is the use of holding elections according to a law that disenfranchises half of the population? I believe that, despite all the shortcomings, the inhabitants of the West Bank will be able to elect the persons who are able to serve their towns and villages. I also believe that West Bankers know these persons fairly well, their past and their present. Should the inhabitants of the West Bank be able to free themselves of various personal, family and other subjective considerations, they will then be able to elect municipal councils which would render society good services despite all the shortcomings of the law.

* * *

24 January 1972; AL-ANBA: "To Those Who Advocate Amendment"
by Ihsan Abdul 'Aziz - East Jerusalem

Needless to say, every citizen has the right to hold and express his view on any subject that is of interest to him or to the public. Those who are demanding that the existing Jordanian municipal election laws be amended in order that they become identical to Israeli municipal laws must therefore allow me to whisper the following word in their ears, hoping that they will be receptive to it.

At first, you called for holding municipal elections in the West Bank; this is your own affair, whether your objective is to serve the public interest or to unseat those who in your opinion do not deserve to sit in positions of public management. The Israeli Government has responded to this call and decided to terminate the services of the existing municipal councils and to hold new elections in accordance with Jordanian laws. So far, no one can have any reasonable objection. What one finds it difficult to understand is that you have gone on record as demanding, now that the Jordanian law be amended, now that the Israeli law of municipalities be enforced in these elections.

One may be permitted to ask here: Is our problem at an end, so that all that has been left is the problem of amending laws and regulations? Have we become Israeli citizens, so that our representatives in the Knesset can discuss these laws and decide to amend them? The truth, of course, is that our problem has not been resolved yet: We still consider the West Bank a part of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan which happens to have fallen under Israeli military occupation. Israel, moreover, recognizes this - and the whole world alongside with her. Now, then, can we demand the amendment of a law or the enactment of another law while we are still under a military occupation that does not possess the right to amend any laws other than those which involve military and security matters - and only in extreme cases at that?

Moreover, even supposing - for the sake of argument - that the Jordanian law was amended and became similar to Israeli municipal laws, do you forget, or pretend to forget, that municipal councils in Israel finance schools and universities, security and other public services? By demanding that the old laws be amended you are thus asking that the inhabitant of the West Bank pay at least ten times as much as he is paying now in municipal taxes. This would mean that he will be made to pay what he cannot possibly pay unless he decides to liquidate his property and leave to wander in God's wide world!

I wish these brethren of mine had scrutinized Israeli municipal laws. I wish, too, that they had contemplated the implications and ramifications of enacting such laws in our towns and villages in the West Bank!

* * *

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE

7 January 1972; AL-QUDS Editorial: "In Whose Interest?"

At a time when U.N. emissary Dr. Gunnar Jarring leaves Moscow for New York to resume his mission concerning the Mid-East crisis, the United States has found it fit to announce its dissatisfaction with his attitude and his tactics - and to declare that his chances of success seem very meagre indeed. Also, that Washington will continue with its own efforts aimed at reaching an interim settlement of the crisis.

In addition, the United States tries to persuade Jordan not to raise the issue of Jerusalem in the Security Council since it believes that this would affect adversely its own efforts to overcome the present deadlock in the Middle East. Again, the United States announces - in a statement made by its Secretary of State, Mr. William Rogers - that it hopes that negotiations for an interim settlement will be started soon.

Now the question which raises itself is: Why does the United States insist that it and it alone should father any settlement of the problem, away from the United Nations? Why does the United States insist on ignoring the International Organization and its emissary, Dr. Gunnar Jarring?

In whose interest does the United States thus ignore resolutions adopted by the United Nations, and first and foremost Resolution 242 adopted by the Security Council in November 1967 - and also the Resolution adopted by the General Assembly last month?

Why does the United States prefer the fragmentation of the issue under the banner of an interim settlement - thus trying to ignore the fact that the crisis is an indivisible whole and that its kernel is the problem of the people of Palestine and their right to live and to decide their own destinies? (This is the problem), rather than the one of opening a waterway, the passage of ships, or the stationing of a number of Egyptian soldiers, armed or unarmed, clad in uniforms or in civilian clothes, on the east bank of the Suez Canal!

* * *

13 January 1972; AL-QUDS Editorial: "U.S. Peace Efforts"

Some have believed that Washington's positive response to Israel's request for fighter Phantom planes may in some way contribute to persuading Israel to conduct negotiations with Egypt under U.S. auspices for an interim settlement.

However, the view which now predominates in political quarters is that the United States has adopted as its own a number of fundamental points in Israel's stand concerning the interim settlement and the reopening of the Suez Canal.

A brief recapitulation of the facts shows that the fundamental points in the Israeli stand consist of opposition to the Egyptian stand which requires that Egyptian forces must cross the canal and that an interim settlement must be linked to the

(More)

eventual overall settlement - in addition to the condition made known recently by President Anwar al-Sadat to the effect that Israel must reply to Dr. Jarring's memorandum (of February 1970) in the affirmative before entering any talks concerning an interim settlement.

In the light of all this it becomes abundantly clear that the belief that supplying Israel with Phantom planes would contribute to persuading her to conduct talks is an erroneous one - as long as Israel has now guaranteed Washington's adoption of her stand.

This state of affairs certainly imparts a grim impression both of the present situation and of the chances of attaining any serious progress toward peace in the future.

* * *

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

THE PALESTINIANS

3 January 1972; AL-QUDS Editorial: "Steadfastness"

What is called "the steadfastness of the inhabitants of the occupied territories" has become a rather common phrase these days in Arab political pronouncements. We hope that it will be more than a mere phrase when it comes to statements made by Jordanian officials.

During the debate in the Jordanian Chamber of Deputies in which the Government sought a vote of confidence, Prime Minister Ahmed al-Lawzi lauded the steadfastness of West Bank inhabitants and said it was greater than that displayed by Arab armies. He greeted these inhabitants, adding that "their steadfastness has contributed greatly to the preservation of our land and of our holy places..."

This gesture, coming as it did from the Prime Minister, is not enough. More than any other Arab country, Jordan is called upon to give generously and make sacrifices for the sake of West Bank inhabitants, if it really believes that "national unity is a sacred necessity for Jordan," (to quote Al-Lawzi's own words).

We do not suppose that the Prime Minister is unaware of all the existential circumstances in which the inhabitants of the occupied territories live. We cannot under any circumstances accept the claim that he is not cognizant of the complexities and obstacles which face the inhabitants of the West Bank in the East Bank.

The least that the Jordanian Government has to do in these circumstances is speed up and facilitate the needs and requirements of the inhabitants of the occupied territories, and to give them priority of place as far as implementation is concerned. Suffices it here to mention only a few of these: issuance of passports, marketing the products of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, Higher Education for the children of those who "stand fast," the civil servants' frozen salaries, visa permits for embarkation from Amman Airport, intelligence clearance, and so on and on.

(More)

Finally, a whisper in the ears of those honourable Deputies who proclaimed their adherence to the national unity of the Jordanian people and praised "the steadfastness of the Arabs of the West Bank and other occupied territories." To them we say: Your duty as the representatives of the people does not end with the adjournment of your respected Chamber!

* * *

23 January 1972; AL-ANBA: "Geographical Rectification of the Status of the 'Two Banks'"
by Yusuf Abdul Majid - Hebron

Following the annexation by Transjordan of the West Bank, the geographical position of the latter underwent a complete transformation: Instead of being Transjordan's "foreland" it became its backland and its interior; instead of constituting Transjordan's passageway and outlet, the West Bank was placed in a position in which it needed Transjordan as a passageway and as an outlet to the outside world.

As a result of this geographically anomalous situation, the desert enclave called Transjordan became, for the first time in history, a significant passageway in that it was the only way to reach the Holy Places and all that these places signify in terms of history and civilization.

In this sense, the status of Transjordan during the years in which the West Bank was annexed to it meant turning things upside down -- and this state of affairs, at least as far as the inhabitants of the West Bank were concerned, remained in need of a rectification that would restore the West Bank to its true geographical status and to Transjordan its true geographical status.

The re-establishment of the link with Israel has thus resulted in linking the West Bank again to the sea, which geographically and economically will go on constituting its natural lungs, through which it can breathe naturally and not in a roundabout way. The argument, moreover, that the West Bank -- even after having been linked with Israel and attained an outlet to the sea -- will continue to need Transjordan cannot be maintained, even on the grounds of what is termed marketing the products of the West Bank.

For the fact is that the open bridges which now link the two Banks have only one function and benefit -- namely as a means of maintaining human links between the Palestinians here and the Palestinians there. Apart from this, everything else is extremely secondary and can be arranged by other means in a way that would not affect either the commercial or the agricultural interests of West Bank inhabitants.

There is no doubt but that the only damage which has resulted from the rectification of the geographical positions of the two Banks has affected the East Bank, which has now been restored to its natural size and status as a semi-isolated enclave in the desert. As proof of this, suffices it to be pointed out that neither Iraq nor Syria, nor Saudi Arabia nor Israel needs the East Bank either as a passageway or as a market -- whereas the East Bank is and will continue to be in need of all of them in order to be able to breathe and go on living.

(More)

This being the case, it is not in the least surprising to find Jordan so desperate about restoring the West Bank to itself - or to see Amman becoming so helpless as a result of the fact that it cannot find a way of realizing this objective in any way.

* * *

THE ADMINISTERED AREAS

21 January 1972; AL-ANBA: "Family Reunion - Not Temporary Import!"
by Fuad Jabr - East Jerusalem

It is reported that the authorities intend to import labourers from the East Bank for work in the West Bank. The report has given rise to much discussion and speculation among the inhabitants of the West Bank, and many questions are being asked.

We do not know how much truth is there in the report; nor do we know anything about the scope of the proposed operation. Assuming, however, that the report is authentic, what sort of "import" is this going to be? Is it going to be like the import of goods from abroad, which are imported because of their shortage on the local market and sold at prices determined by a price-control commission? Is "import" the right term to use in this case? And what is to become of the goods imported - in this case labourers from the East Bank?

To my mind, there is something much better and far more justified than such an import operation. Every day a line is formed by citizens of the West Bank at the entrances of military government offices to submit applications for reunion with a son, a brother or a father. I suggest that the West Bank Command speed up its approval of these applications, thus catching two birds with one stone - as the popular saying goes: On the one hand, this would satisfy the demand for more agricultural labourers and workers - if such a demand does exist; on the other, the authorities will have responded to the call of families from the West Bank for reunion with those of their members who want to come and settle here in their homes among their kith and kin.

I believe that this "permanent import" will be as good as the proposed temporary import of working hands. Among other things, it will mean that the father will be able to reunite with his children or his younger brothers - and this humane act will inspire gratitude and appreciation on the part of those West Bank inhabitants whose reunion with their families is under consideration.

Will the authorities, then, consider substituting the decision to allow temporary import of labour - if such a decision has indeed been taken - by one calling for doubling the number of permits issued for family reunion?

* * *

"Where is the Arabic Language?" by Muhammed Abu Shilbaya.

It is said that Arabic is one of the two official languages in Israel. In fact, it is more than just that: It is the main language in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and Jerusalem, where the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants are Arabs.

(More)

It seems, however, that it is not quite so! It seems, in fact, that Arabic is not the main language - not even an official language. Proofs to this effect are too numerous to mention here. Most of the letters sent by official and public institutions do not contain a word in Arabic. Even branches of certain Government Departments in East Jerusalem do this.

Indeed, Arabic words have been erased from signs in bus stops - or Arabic is not even used in these signs to begin with. What is more, Israeli banks with branches in (East) Jerusalem, which deal with thousands of Arab inhabitants every day, in most cases fail to use in their correspondence any language other than Hebrew; Arabic does not exist at all.

Needless to say, all this entails many difficulties for the Arab inhabitants. Israeli officials can easily obtain an idea of these difficulties if they imagine an Arab receiving an official communication in Hebrew. He would make the rounds trying to find someone who reads Hebrew, or ask a Jewish acquaintance to read it for him - only to discover that he does not know any Arabic. Thus anxiety grows, and the whole thing may well cause considerable damage, since the communication in question may be important and may require the addressee to do certain things urgently....

We feel confident that the authorities are quite aware of all this - and that they realize that all communications ought to contain an Arabic text. Indeed, the authorities know that many complaints have been lodged concerning this matter many months ago. Still, things continue to be where they had been, and Arabic remains neglected and virtually non-existent - and this despite what is being said about its being the main language in certain areas, and an official language in certain others.

We demand that each and every department and institution, whether official or public, print new forms containing Arabic as well as Hebrew texts, to be used in all their communications and dealings. Insistence on keeping the old letter forms, which contain only Hebrew texts and which were meant to be sent to Jewish citizens, means simply that Arabic is neglected and the Arab inhabitants are ignored. It also entails many difficulties and obstacles which we feel certain no one wants.

* * *

5 January 1972; AL-QUDS: "To the Military Governor-General"
by Dr. Jamal Abdul Qadir al-Khayyat.

It is indeed painful to see a patient insisting on not entering a hospital - lest he should die! Health services for citizens are vital and very important matters which must always go on and develop and grow. Nevertheless, after more than four years of occupation, the inhabitants of the Nablus district have not noticed any progress in health services that can be said to be in keeping with the modern age.

The Old Government Hospital in Nablus, which has been functioning for a long time and making every possible effort, is no longer capable of fulfilling the tasks for which it had been established - despite the exhausting efforts made by the doctors, the nurses and the administrative staff to do their duty and give citizens the services they need.

(More)

What makes people feel deeply sad - and what raises questions in the mind of every citizen - is the spectacle of the new hospital building, standing there in our city, imposing but lifeless! This hospital was expected to become one of the greatest in the Kingdom (of Jordan); medical equipment had already reached it shortly before the occupation, including modern equipment in great quantities. All these, however, were never taken out of their boxes, since the authorities laid hands on all of them.

Since hospitals and their contents are not, according to all laws and traditions, considered military targets - and since the military government cannot consider them as war booty - we hope that the authorities will lend their attention to this vital matter and work for restoring medical equipment to the hospital as well as supplying it with what modern equipment it needs. The project, after all, is one of the greatest humanitarian enterprises in the district of Nablus.





PREFETTURA
DELLA CASA PONTIFICIA

Vaticano, 16 febbraio 1972

IL PREFETTO

Eccellenza,

mi onoro prevenire Vostra Eccellenza
che il Santo Padre La accoglierà in Udienza, con il Generale di riserva
Chayim Herzog, Presidente della Casa editrice Keter, e il Signor Meir
Mendes, Consigliere dell'Ambasciata, domani, giovedì, alle ore 11.45.

Mi è gradito l'incontro per esprimerLe i sensi del mio distinto
ossequio.

Di Vostra Eccellenza

J. Marty

A Sua Eccellenza
il Signor Amiel E. Najjar
Ambasciatore d'Israele in Italia

Documentation Catholique
5 novembre 1972

ALLOCUTION AU SECRÉTARIAT POUR LES NON-CHRÉTIENS

Paul VI a reçu le 5 octobre les participants à la réunion organisée à Rome du 3 au 6 octobre par le Secrétariat pour les non-chrétiens sur le thème : « Les différentes religions non chrétiennes devant les problèmes de l'homme moderne. » Voici l'allocution qu'il leur a adressée en réponse aux paroles de présentation du cardinal Marella, président du Secrétariat, qui a regretté que les représentants des religions non chrétiennes qui avaient été invités à la réunion n'aient pu y venir, sauf un qui a pu être présent pour une journée, les autres ayant envoyé leurs notes et observations par écrit (1) :

MONSIEUR LE CARDINAL, CHERS FILS ET CHERS AMIS,

Nous saluons avec joie et affection les participants du Congrès réuni à Rome par les soins du Secrétariat pour les non-chrétiens.

Venus de tant de pays, vous voici rassemblés à Rome, ville antique et sacrée à tant de titres, pour progresser dans la connaissance des grandes traditions religieuses de l'Asie et de l'Afrique, pour analyser ensemble comment elles font face aux expériences singulières que vivent nos contemporains. Cette connaissance que vous recherchez, aussi importante qu'elle soit en elle-même, a essentiellement pour but d'établir l'amour, le dialogue et la coopération sincère et fraternelle entre les hommes.

Un climat nouveau dans les rapports entre l'Eglise catholique et les autres grandes religions du monde

Vous ne l'ignorez pas, en effet, un tel dialogue avec les différentes formes de religions, ou les divers patrimoines de sagesse de l'univers, a été l'un des soucis du Concile, tout comme nous l'avions recommandé nous-même dans notre encyclique *Ecclesiam suam*. C'est en vue de le favoriser que nous avons fondé, il y a huit ans, le Secrétariat pour les non-chrétiens, en en confiant la charge au cœur et à l'intelligence du vénéré et cher cardinal Paolo Marella. On peut constater, nous semble-t-il, que ce Secrétariat, grâce à un labeur silencieux et fidèle, a contribué grandement à établir un climat nouveau dans les rapports entre l'Eglise catholique et les adeptes des autres grandes religions du monde. Le souvenir vivant que nous avons gardé de notre récente rencontre avec

(1) Texte français dans *l'Osservatore Romano* du 6 octobre 1972. Les sous-titres sont de notre rédaction.

le suprême patriarche bouddhiste de Thaïlande en est un témoignage et nous espérons n'être encore qu'au début du chemin sur lequel tous sont appelés à progresser.

Sans amour il n'y a pas de connaissance vraie

Mais, c'est évident, ce chemin est onéreux pour tous : il n'y a pas de dialogue possible sans une compréhension approfondie de notre interlocuteur, ou, comme on se plaît à dire aujourd'hui, de l'autre. Ce noble programme exige un sens généreux de l'homme, un véritable ascétisme ! Il est nécessaire de dépasser les limites qu'imposent tout langage, les réflexes culturels, même les polémiques et la méfiance, pour s'ouvrir au dépassement de soi et à l'universalité. Pour un chrétien, un tel effort peut représenter une partie du grand précepte de la charité qui invite « à porter les fardeaux les uns des autres pour accomplir ainsi la loi du Christ ». (Gal 6, 2.)

Oui, chacun attend légitimement de l'autre d'être pleinement reconnu et aimé pour lui-même, avec les valeurs et les différences de sa propre culture. Combien d'incompréhensions, de rancœurs, de conflits sont nés, au cours de l'histoire humaine, de cette orgueilleuse fermeture sur soi qui empêche de comprendre son frère ! La réussite, au contraire, de telles rencontres, est liée à une volonté résolue de respect et d'amour, avec toute la patience nécessaire. Car — la psychologie le montre, et même la méthode de la recherche scientifique semble le requérir — sans amour, il n'y a pas de connaissance vraie ! Et là-dessus, c'est notre conviction, l'Eglise catholique possède, dans son patrimoine spirituel et surtout dans l'exemple de son fondateur, les raisons et le stimulant d'un amour efficace de l'homme, à quelque formation culturelle ou religieuse qu'il appartienne. Pour nous, en effet, tout homme participe au mystère insondable de Dieu, est créé à son image (Gn 1, 26), représente l'humanité du Christ (cf. Mt 25, 40, 45). Chaque peuple est né de la Providence et de la bénédiction de Dieu (cf. Gn 9, 7 ; Ac 17, 26), et Jésus est mort pour réconcilier les hommes dans l'unité (cf. Jn 11, 52). Le récent Concile a largement invité les chrétiens à reconnaître, dans un dialogue sincère et patient, les richesses que Dieu, dans sa munificence, a dispensées aux nations (cf. *Ad gentes*, 11).

Mais, de notre côté, pourquoi cacher notre désir de voir les adeptes des grandes religions non chrétiennes manifester aussi le souci de connaître davantage l'Eglise, de la même façon que notre cœur s'est ouvert à leur égard ? Car vous le savez, l'Eglise, par amour, ne désire rien tant que de faire connaître à tous les hommes « la sagesse multiforme de Dieu » (Ep 3, 10) qui lui a été révélée pour la paix et le salut de tous. Nous reprenons à notre compte les paroles du Seigneur Jésus à la Samaritaine : « Si tu savais le don de Dieu. » (Jn 4, 10.) C'est dans cet esprit que nous faisons le premier pas dans le dialogue avec nos frères qui ne partagent pas notre foi.

Collaboration pratique au service de l'homme

Mais cette estime et cet amour réciproque doivent trouver leur expression dans une collaboration pratique. Nous souhaitons voir prochainement le jour où toutes les religions ront concrètement leurs efforts au service de l'homme, de sa liberté, de sa dignité. Et encore, l'Eglise catholique ne voudrait le céder à aucune autre sur ce terrain, à l'exemple du Seigneur qui est venu, « non pour être servi, mais pour servir et donner sa vie » pour les hommes (Mc 10, 45). Ne croyez-vous que l'humanité a besoin aujourd'hui plus que jamais de trouver une aide et une orientation près des hommes foncièrement religieux ? Vous le savez, les religions contribuent à la paix, à la fraternité, à la justice ; elles inspirent la morale, elles suscitent l'espérance. Même les rapports sociaux deviennent difficiles lorsque n'intervient plus cette référence aux forces vives de l'esprit, dont les religions sont l'expression la plus haute et la plus universelle.

Collaboration et dialogue ne signifient pas syncrétisme

Cette collaboration pratique qui est à mouvoir, comme cette connaissance mutuelle dans le dialogue dont nous avons parlé, ne doivent évidemment pas être confondues avec un syncrétisme qui ferait fi du problème de la « vraie religion ». Ce problème demeure entier, et il est posé à la conscience de chaque homme et de chaque groupe humain, ce que précisait la Déclaration conciliaire sur la liberté religieuse (*Dignitatis humanae*, n. 1, § 2). Nous serons d'ailleurs d'autant plus aptes à comprendre et à aimer les autres que nous serons plus fidèles à la vérité unique et transcendante de notre religion, qui puise sa certitude et son autorité dans la réalité de la Révélation, univoque et universelle.

C'est dans cet esprit que nous vous encourageons à poursuivre le dialogue engagé, à l'approfondir, à l'élargir. Et nous invoquons de grand cœur sur vos travaux et sur tous ceux qui vous sont devenus proches les bénédictions abondantes du Très-Haut.

— *Les Cahiers d'Elisabeth*. Hostiam laudis. Présentation par Dom Vincent Aaruz, OSB. — Un vol. 32,5 x 19 cm, de 296 pages. Prix : 22 F. Editions Rosine. B. P. 6 — 53150 Montsurat (CCP 1596-10 Rennes).

Une âme raconte sa vie que Dieu mène par des chemins de traverses, mais une âme disposée à toujours faire la volonté de Dieu quelle qu'elle soit. Vie mystique, certes, où charismes et manifestations spirituelles ne manquent pas ; mais toujours dans la soumission à un directeur spirituel, ce qui est une sauvegarde pour l'âme qui en est l'objet.

— *L'Enseignement de Paul VI, 1971*. — Un vol. 24 x 17 cm, de 352 pages. Prix : 30 F. Editions Polyglotte vaticane. Office général du livre.

Ce volume réunit, en traduction française, ou dans leur texte original français, les textes les plus importants de l'enseignement de Paul VI pendant l'année 1971. Comme ceux qui l'ont précédé, il veut prolonger l'écho de la parole du Pape qui demeure, au milieu des rumeurs contradictoires, la référence sûre de toute authenticité dans l'Eglise.

Nous accueillons avec reconnaissance, Messieurs, et pour plusieurs motifs, le beau cadeau que vous Nous offrez.

Nous aimons à relever, d'abord, la courtoisie de votre geste d'hommage, à laquelle Nous sommes vivement sensible.

Il s'y ajoute ensuite la valeur culturelle que représentent ces volumes: ils constituent sans nul doute une remarquable documentation sur votre peuple, dont Nous connaissons et admirons les mérites dans ce domaine de la culture et les remarquables capacités de réalisation.

Mais Nous voudrions insister surtout sur une troisième considération: celle des sentiments que cet hommage suscite dans notre âme. Comment pourrions-Nous oublier les liens historiques et spirituels qui relie l'Eglise catholique à la tradition biblique du peuple juif? Vous savez comment ce point a retenu l'attention du récent Concile oecuménique, et avec quel soin il s'est appliqué à le mettre en lumière, plus que n'avait fait jusqu'ici, Nous semble-t-il, aucun document du Magistère ecclésiastique.

Et puis: comment pourrions-Nous oublier les souffrances endurées par votre peuple, notamment au cours de la dernière guerre mondiale! Souffrances - vous le savez aussi - que l'Eglise s'est efforcée, comme elle le pouvait, d'empêcher et d'alléger.

Enfin Nous ne saurions oublier en quels termes émouvants et prophétiques le grand apôtre S. Paul parle de vous, de votre peuple, de l'espérance qu'il nourrit dans son coeur pour ses frères israélites. Tout cela, vous le voyez, constitue un lien bien fort entre nous!

Nous ne pouvons taire que cette rencontre éveille en nous d'autres sentiments, encore, concernant la situation qui s'est créée au Moyen-Orient au cours de ces dernières années, et où la présence d'Israel est un facteur d'une importance considérable.

Notre position à ce sujet est bien connue, et ce n'est pas le moment d'en parler, sinon pour souhaiter que les questions graves et complexes que pose cette situation trouvent promptement une solution pacifique et juste, satisfaisante pour tous, et faisant leur place, en particulier, aux droits légitimes des populations arabes intéressées. Ainsi peut-on espérer une paix qui ne soit pas précaire, mais solide et durable: une paix non seulement des armes, mais aussi des esprits et des coeurs.

C'est cette paix que Nous vous souhaitons, Messieurs, avec la pleine lumière spirituelle: deux dons célestes qui ne peuvent venir que de la foi à l'unique Dieu vivant et vrai, dont Nous invoquons sur vous en ce moment, d'un coeur reconnaissant, l'assistance et la protection.

April 26, 1972

Pastor Reuel J. Schulz,
Woodlawn Ev. Lutheran Church,
2217 S. 99 St
West Allis. Wis. 53227

Dear Reverend Schulz,

Allow me to thank you for taking the trouble to discuss some of the points I made in my lectures in Milwaukee on April 13 and 14 in connection with Prof. Isaac's book, Jesus and Israel. I am sending a short reply to the Milwaukee Journal, but I wanted to let you know personally that I appreciate your concern.

Since what I said in Milwaukee covered some of the questions fully dealt with by Jules Isaac, the best I can suggest, in response to your arguments, is for you to read Jesus and Israel. I think that you, as a committed Christian, will appreciate Prof. Isaac's effort. This is a truthful book, exempt from any bitterness or polemic.

With very best wishes,

Sincerely,

Claire Huchet Bishop

April 26, 1972

"View from the pulpit",
THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL
333 W. State St.
Milwaukee, Wis. 53202

It would take much more space than I am allowed here, to answer all the Reverend J. Schulz's statements regarding Jews and Christians. ^(April 22) May I suggest that he will find his commentaries of Gospels quotations fully answered by Prof. Jules Isaac in his book Jesus and Israel, on which I lectured in Milwaukee on April 13 and 14. A sincere Christian like Rev. Schulz will find that such reading purifies and strengthens our Christian faith.

It is gratifying to see that a Lutheran minister agrees with the Sixteenth century Council of Trent regarding those responsible for Jesus' death: "In this ~~guilt~~ are involved all those who fall frequently into sin;" (Catechism of the Council of Trent, Art. IV). These words were further clarified by the 1965 Vatican II Statement on the Jews: "True, the Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead pressed for the death of Christ; still what happened in his passion cannot be charged against all the Jews, without distinction, then alive, nor against the Jews of today."

Indeed, Jesus himself took care of naming in advance those who, at that time, were to be the guilty ones: the Elders, scribes and chief priests - Mk. 8:31, 10:32-34, Mt. 16:21, 20:17-19, Lk. 9:22 Those who "received Him not", (Jn. 1:12 quoted by Rev. Schulz) were the Establishment, that is the collaborators with the enemy occupying power. (Jesus also mentioned the "Gentiles"). Isn't this

a far cry from the Jewish people, who, anyway, for the most part, never heard of Jesus and never met him. And those who did, according to the Gospels, received him with enthusiasm. Out of 50 encounters mentioned in Mark, Matthew and Luke, 46 are favorable. Even John, who uses the word "Jews" in a confusing way requiring exegesis, even he, records outright 10 friendly meetings out of the 20 he mentions. The hostile rabble in front of Pilate's palace could not have been large, as anyone can conclude who visits Jerusalem.

In turn, may I offer a commentary regarding conversion and the dogmatic St John's statement quoted by Reverend Shulz: "no man cometh unto the Father but by Me," (Jn. 14:16)? Who is to decide who is "to come"? Could not Christians accept that some are already there?

Claire Huchet Bishop



COLLEGE OF MOUNT ST. JOSEPH ON THE OHIO

May 15, 1972

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Director of Interreligious Affairs
165 E. 56th St.
New York, N.Y. 10022

Dear Rabbi Tanenbaum:

Enclosed is a brief summary of the lectures which Rabbi Roy Tanenbaum will be giving during our Institute.

We will be most grateful if you will kindly send your summaries as soon as possible as our printer is waiting for this copy.

When you have made your reservations for travel to Cincinnati, we will appreciate your letting us know your arrangements so we can plan to meet you.

With all good wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Rev. Angelo della Picca

AdP:aae

A SEMINAR ON ISRAEL

9:30-11:30 a.m. Israel as a Theological Issue

Dean

Dean Krister Stendahl, John Lord O'Brian Professor of
Divinity, Dean of Faculty of Divinity, Harvard University

Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, Director: Interreligious Affairs,
American Jewish Committee

Lunch

12:15-2:00 p.m. The State of Israel in the Twentieth
Century: an Historical Perspective

Dr. Howard M. Sachar, Professor of Modern European and
Jewish History, George Washington University

Dr. Fred J. Khouri, Professor of Political Science,
Villanova University

2:00-3:30 p.m. Panel: The Religious Traditions and the
Quest for Peace in the Middle East

Dr. Yonah Alexander, Professor of International Studies,
State University of New York, Senior Fellow, American
University Law School

Dr. J. Deotis Roberts, Professor of Christian Theology,
Howard University School of Religion

Dr. Muhammad Abdul-Rauf, Director of the Washington
Islamic Center

* * * * *

R.S.V.P. (card enclosed)
Council of Churches of Greater Washington
1239 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Cost: \$5.00 per person
(includes informal lunch)

THE COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF GREATER WASHINGTON

in cooperation with The National Presbyterian Center

Cordially invites you to participate in

AMERICAN JEWISH

'A SEMINAR ON ISRAEL'

for Washington Area Clergy and Religious Educators

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

9:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

*

The National Presbyterian Center
4101 Nebraska Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

[start]

Original documents
faded and/or illegible



Lincoln. LN2 1PX

11th October 1972

Neil C. Sandberg Esq.,
The American Jewish Committee,
590 North Vermont Avenue,
Suite 259 Los Angeles,
California 90004.

Dear Mr. Sandberg,

I am so very sorry that you were distressed by the Mystery Play in the Cathedral. These plays always present a problem. They are based on the original text of the Mystery Cycle and in terms of literature this is a very significant and important piece of medieval work. We realised the difficulties, from the point of view of the Jewish community, and we did make a certain number of adjustments to the text in order to minimise these. However, if one was to be true to the literature of the Mystery Plays one was bound to use the original theme, and that we did. The attitude of the Cathedral authorities towards this medieval tradition is most clearly expressed in the notice placed above the shrine of "little St. Hugh". It reads as follows:-

The Shrine of Little St. Hugh.

Tragedy stories of "Ritual Murders" of Christian boys by Jewish communities were common throughout Europe during the Middle Ages and even much later. These fictions cost many Jews their lives. Lincoln had its own legend, and the alleged victim was buried in the Cathedral.

The shrine was erected above and the boy was referred to as "little St. Hugh". A re-construction of the shrine hangs near. Such stories do not rebound to the credit of Christendom, and so we pray:-

Remember not Lord our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers.

I am wholly convinced that the performance of medieval Mystery plays does not, in any way at all, engender anti-semitism. You may be interested to note that the actor performing the parts of Pilate and the High Priest (amongst others) was himself a Jew and that it was only after careful discussion with him that the play was performed in the form which we finally chose.

However, despite all this, please accept my sincere regrets for any offence that was caused to you.

Yours sincerely,

Dean of Lincoln.

[end]

Original documents
faded and/or illegible



FO-W

October 24, 1972

Dr. Gerald Strober
Neil Sandberg

Please note the attached response to my recent letter to the Dean of the Lincoln Cathedral in England. I am wondering if I should continue the dialogue with some further commentary on the editorial version of the Mystery Play which was presented. Since they were aware of the possible impact of the play, and altered it to soften its harshness regarding the Jews, why not editorialize further to make it more acceptable? If this is not possible, why not suggest to the Dean that in his blessing to the audience following the play he indicate it is not an acceptable version? He might also point out to the audience the historic injustices to the Jews which are mentioned in his letter to me.

I am interested in your advice, Gerry, along with that of others to whom I am addressing copies of this memo. Also, would it be useful to send him a copy of your analysis of "Superstar?"

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards.

NCS:hw
cc: ~~Rabbi~~ Marc Tanenbaum
Morton Yarmon
Will Katz



Memo From

RABBI HENRY SIEGMAN
EXECUTIVE VICE-PRESIDENT

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA

432 PARK AVENUE SOUTH, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10016 • (212) 686-8670

December 1, 1972

Enclosed is a draft of Walter Wurzburger's paper
which he wrote for the Vatican study.

Kindest regards.



Walter S. Wurzburger

One of the hallmarks of Judaism is its pronounced dialectical tension between universalistic and particularistic components.

On the one hand, the entire structure of Judaism revolves around its most ^{vc} pital thesis - the monotheistic doctrine, which possesses universal validity and relevance. It affirms that God, the source of all value and existence, demands that all of mankind acknowledge His absolute sovereignty and adhere to a variety of ethico-religious norms (the seven Noahide Commandments). On the other hand, Judaism is a religion restricted to a particular community of fate and faith; one cannot profess Judaism without belonging to the Jewish people. Judaism is not reducible to a set of dogmas, creeds, rights and prescriptions because it rests upon the belief that God's covenant with Israel has singled out a concrete historic community (the people of Israel) for a unique religious vocation to form a "Kingdom of priests and a holy people." In most cases, one automatically qualifies for membership in this particular historic group by the accident of birth. No further religious rite is needed to gain full-fledged status as a member of this covenantal community. While converts are admitted, they, however, can gain entrance into the covenantal community only when in addition to accepting "the yoke of the commandments," they also declare themselves ready to become part of the Jewish people and share in the vicissitudes of its fate.

This procedure follows the pattern set by the classic conversion of Ruth, the Moabite, who faithfully pledged "Your people shall be my people" before she proceeded to declare "Your God shall be my God." For that matter, a sense of identification with the Jewish people is essential for the spiritual welfare of any member of the Jewish community.

Even a Jew by birth, no matter how qualified he may be in terms of his personal piety and devotion to the Torah, is not deemed worthy of gaining a portion of the world to come, if he fails to identify with the fate of his fellow Jews. The mere fact that one does not experience a special sense of kinship with other members of the people of the covenant is sufficient ground for being excluded from the spiritual benefits vouchsafed to the members of the covenantal community.

The great emphasis which is placed upon the belonging to the historic community of Israel and the responsibility to concern oneself with its welfare and survival reflects the deep-rooted conviction that Judaism is not merely the religion of individuals who are confronted with a divine mandate. What is so indispensable to any understanding of Judaism is the realization that Judaism involves the Jewish people collectively in a religious vocation. According to the provisions of its covenant with God, Israel is summoned to fashion the entire structure of its national life in accordance with the divine norms revealed in the Torah. And even the individual Jew fulfills his personal religious mission not so much as an individual, but as a member of the Jewish collectivity. It is for this reason that a popular Kabbalistic formula, recited by many Jews before the performance of a religious rite, affirms that the religious act in question, in order to achieve its true religious objective, is carried out "in the name of all of Israel."

The mystery of the election of the people of Israel for a unique role in the divine plan is closely associated with another mystery - the designation of a particular land as the specific site in which alone the spiritual objectives of the people can be fully attained. Significantly, the very first covenant between God and Abraham provided a special link to the land and the people of Israel. Abraham's journey to the land to be shown to him by God was the beginning of the formation of a people through which ultimately Abraham was "to become a blessing for all the families of the earth." According to the Biblical account, the bond between the land and the people was not created by the convergence of a variety of natural factors and conditions. It was rather a divine imperative that established an irrevocable connection between the people and the land. It was not merely a Promised Land, but one to which the people was summoned for its covenantal destiny. It was forever to remain, as God said to Abraham, "The land which I will show you." Similarly, the unique sanctity that permeates the Land of Israel is not due to any specific historic events that are associated with any particular locale. After all, ~~MEMBERXSIMILIXONES~~ by far the most central and most holy event in the entire history of the Jewish people was the

✓ Revelation at Mount Sinai. Yet, Mount Sinai, the site where the theophany took place, was not accorded any permanent sanctity. For the Jew, the sanctity of the Holy Land is not a function of the various "holy places" which are situated within its borders. Apart from any particular historic events or associations, the Holy Land, literally, is the land which, in its own right, is endowed with an all pervasive holiness. To be sure, the city of Jerusalem, especially the site of the former Temple are invested with additional sanctity which derives from the fact that these sights were specifically consecrated for certain religious purposes. But the general holiness permeating the land of Israel, recognizes^{no} differences in degree insofar as specific locations are concerned.

The special status of the land manifests itself not only in the existence of a vast body of religious duties which can be fulfilled only within the land of Israel. (Commandments which are dependent upon the land.) A well-known rabbinic text goes so far as to assert that the only reason why the Jews must keep the Torah even outside the land of Israel is to guarantee that upon their return to the land, they will not have become totally alienated from the practices which, alas, possess intrinsic value only when performed in the land. It is also revealing that the notion of collective responsibility did not become operative until after the Israelites had crossed the river Jordan and had entered the holy land. Apparently, ⁱⁿ the opinion of the Talmudic sages, as long as Israelites did not occupy the land of Israel, they still were lacking one essential prerequisite for the formation of the kind of collective, communal existence which is presupposed by the notion that all Israelites are responsible for each other. Nachmanides, one of the most influential Medieval rabbinic authorities, attributes so much weight to the spiritual importance of the land of Israel for the entire scope of the Jewish religious life that he expressed the rather startling opinion that the Patriarchs who on a voluntary basis abided by the regulations of the Torah did so only within the territorial limits of the land of Israel.

To be sure, not all Jewish thinkers would be prepared to subscribe to this particular formulation of the relationship between Torah and Land, which reflects

the influence of various mystical doctrines. Yet however much they may diverge in their respective conceptions regarding the exact nature of the centrality of the land for Israel's spiritual mission and vocation, all classic thinkers who are rooted in the tradition agree that the eschatological goal of Judaism necessarily includes the return of the Jewish people to the land to which it is committed by an irrevocable divine covenant. It was only in a setting that deliberately denied the ethnic features of Judaism because they seemed to interfere with the full acceptance of the Jew as an equal by non-Jewish society that, in the wake of the Enlightenment and of the Emancipation there could arise philosophies of Judaism which were so universalistic in conception as to view the exile from the land not as a calamity but as a blessing. Viewed from the perspective of this one-sided universalism, the exile allegedly "liberated" the Jewish people from the shackles of particularism enabling it to perform its mission for all of mankind. Such a conception was totally foreign to classic Judaism, which unabashedly looked upon the exile as an unmitigated tragedy. In the words of the Jewish liturgy, "because of our sins we were exiled from our land."

The intrinsic connection between the Holy Land and its divinely elected people is irrevocable. No matter how far Israel may stray from its appointed task, failure to carry out its spiritual mandate cannot result in Israel's forfeiting its pre-eminent status. The provisions of the covenant assure that under no circumstances can the particular historic community, which is comprised of the descendants of the Patriarchs, be ever displaced from its unique position in the divine scheme of Redemption.

The survival of the Jewish people, through the vicissitudes of history, therefore, is not a mere contingent fact of history, but a religious necessity grounded in an unconditional divine covenant. Hence, Judaism constitutes a "religious ethnicism," not only because the Jewish people was originally founded upon the bedrock of a religious faith commitment, but also because the very existence of the people is indispensable to the realization of the religious mission intended for it.

It must not be overlooked that survival of the group is merely a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the fulfillment of its historic mission. Judaism is not a "religion of survival" per se, but rather a religion that views its survival as a prerequisite to functioning as "witnesses" to "the God who is to be sanctified amidst the children of Israel." The pattern for sanctification of life does not call for suppression of any of the components which are vital to the functioning of a natural community. Within the framework of Judaism the natural is not the antithesis of the spiritual. Since Judaism objects to the bifurcation of reality into material and spiritual domains, even the exercise of political power lies within the province of proper religious activity. It is revealing that for Maimonides even the fulfillment of human history at the time of the ultimate Redemption does not lead to the abrogation of political power. The Messiah is not merely a towering spiritual figure, but he is "the Messianic King." There are, of course, Jewish thinkers who adopt a far more negative stance towards political power and regard it as an historically necessary evil brought about by human sinfulness. But even those who envisage the Messianic future in terms that may render the need for an exercise of political power obsolete will readily agree that the unredeemed world cannot dispense with the trappings of political organization and instrumentalities of power. If Israel is to function effectively as a holy people, the entire sphere of socio-economic and political relations no less than the area of purely personal behavior must be governed by the divine norms through which Jewish society acknowledges the "absolute sovereignty of its God."

While there is complete unanimity regarding the desirability of the ethnic distinctiveness and cultural identity of the people of Israel ("I have separated you from the nations that ye shall be mine" Lev. 20:26), we encounter differences of opinion with respect to the intrinsic value of distinctive ethnic and cultural identity on the part of other nations, whose national diversity is not founded upon the need for a special consecration to the service of God. There are those who envisage the ideal pattern of humanity in terms of cultural and national

homogeneity and who view the present division of mankind into divergent historic communities as a punishment inflicted upon mankind. According to this school of thought, the building of the Tower of Babel proved that mankind was not worthy of the blessing of complete unity. Hence, it was only because mankind was implicated in guilt that separate ethnic cultural communities emerged. Others maintain, however, that the diversity of cultural and ethnic patterns was an integral feature of the original divine plan inasmuch as linguistic and cultural diversity characterized mankind even prior to the building of the Tower of Babel and the ensuing confusion of tongues. Similarly, there is no consensus as to "whether at the end of days" the nations of the world, while submitting to the authority of "the word of God that will go forth from Zion" will retain their cultural and national identity or whether they will completely abandon their cultural identity and merge with the people of Israel. But in whatever form the eschatological goal may be conceived with respect to "nations of the world," insofar as the people of Israel is concerned, reunification of the entire people with the land is not merely a desideratum but a sine qua non for the realization of its ultimate religious objective - to help usher in the Kingdom of God over all of mankind.



THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

PARIS OFFICE: 30, Rue La Boetie, Paris 8, France • Elysees 69-11, 83-63 • Cable: Wishcom, Paris

Abraham Karlikow, European Direct

FO-Eur

November 16, 1972

NOV 20 1972

MEMORANDUM

To: Marc Tanenbaum
From: Nives Fox
Subj: Vatican -- Non-Christian Religions

At an audience given to the participants of a meeting held in Rome (October 3-6) of the Secretariat for non-Christian Religions, headed by Cardinal Marella, Paul VI addressed the group at length on his conception of dialogue and relations with non-Christians. Though the themes described by the Pope were intended for other religious groups, we think they could have relevance to the position that may be adopted vis-a-vis the Jewish religion.

Below is a summary of the address, made from the full French text published by La Documentation Catholique of November 5, 1972, enclosed herewith.

* * *

Evoking the work of the Ecumenical Council in this connection and his own encyclical recommendations in Ecclesiam Suam as the beginning of a new climate in the relations with non-Christians, Paul VI outlined what he believes to be the most important bases for continuing and enlarging this dialogue.

-- A deepened understanding between religions, going beyond the barriers of language, culture, mistrust and self, so that it can transcend into universality: Each individual expects of another to be fully recognized and loved as the product of his own culture and in spite of differences. "Without love there is no true knowledge," said the Pope, "and surely the Catholic Church holds this love as part of its spiritual patrimony, especially in the example of its founder."

-- But why hide the fact that the Church, too, wishes to be more known and understood by non-Christians, in the same way as it opens its heart to them?

-- This reciprocal love and comprehension should find expression in practical cooperation. "It is our hope that all religions unite their efforts for man, his freedom and dignity, in this concrete fashion." Mankind today, more than ever before, needs the help and direction of fundamentally religious men, to inspire it with justice and brotherhood.

HOFFMAN, President ■ RICHARD MAASS, Chairman, National Executive Council ■ DAVID SHER, Chairman, Board of Governors ■ ELMER L. WINTER, Chairman, Board of Trustees ■ BERGREEN, Treasurer ■ MRS. LEON C. SUNSTEIN, JR., Secretary ■ GERARD WEINSTOCK, Associate Treasurer ■ Honorary Presidents: MORRIS B. ABRAM, LOUIS CAPLAN, ENGEL, ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG ■ Honorary Vice-Presidents: NATHAN APPLEMAN, MRS. JACOB BLAUSTEIN, JACK A. GOLDFARB, JOSEPH KLINGENSTEIN, FRED LAZARUS, JR., JAMES MARSHALL, LOSENWALD ■ MAX M. FISHER, Honorary Chairman, National Executive Council ■ MAURICE GLINERT, Honorary Treasurer ■ JOHN SLAWSON, Executive Vice-President Emeritus ■ JENTS; BERNARD ABRAMS, Hartford; JEROME M. COMAR, Chicago; CARL M. FREEMAN, Washington; MRS. RUTH R. GODDARD, New York; DAVID GOLDWASSER, Atlanta; GOODMAN, New York; ARTHUR N. GREENBERG, Los Angeles; LEWIS S. GROSSMAN, Detroit; EMERY E. KLINEMAN, New York; RAYMOND D. NASHER, Dallas; ALFRED I. SOLTZ, Cleveland ■ BERTRAM H. GOLD, Executive Vice-President

-- This practical collaboration and mutual knowledge of each other should be fostered, and must not be confused with a syncretization that would deny "true religion." A profound belief in one's own faith and freedom of conscience, as declared at the Council, can but make each of us more able to understand and love others.

"It is in this spirit," concludes Paul VI, "that I urge you to pursue and strengthen the dialogue that has begun."

cc: Dr. Lachman

