



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 32, Folder 1, Jewish-Christian relations, 1987.

Ideas for acceptance/rejection/adaptation sent by M.Travers to J.Banki
copy to J.Schonavald

S I D I C

SERVICE INTERNATIONAL DE DOCUMENTATION JUDEO-CHRÉTIENNE

VIA DEL PLEBISCITO 112, INT. 9

TEL. 875307 - 00186 ROMA

OVERCOMING PREJUDICE -AN EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGE

Fribourg 12-17 July 1987

Action-oriented workshop 2. Eradicating anti-Judaism from Christian catechesis and religious instruction in schools.

Four aspects to be considered: Scripture, Worship(liturgy), History, exemplary Witness.

Session I.

1. Opening presentation (approx. 30 mins.each)

J.Banki - Scripture and Worship

M.Travers - History and exemplary Witness

2. Subdivision into 4 groups to work on:

- general objective - basic questions to help teachers assess - programs
- texts

(SIDIC XIX,2,1986 and ICCJ consultations offer material help here)

- specific objective

a) Scripture - negatives to be located/removed

- positives to be improved/inserted ,

cf SIDIC XIX,2,1986 Fournier pp.43-45, Cavalletti pp.50-51, Remaud pp.3

b) Worship(liturgy) taken as an instrument of education

- Advent/Christmas

- Lent/Easter Negatives/positives (as for a.)

cf SIDIC Pawlikowski pp.38-39, Niesz pp.41-42

c) History of "Christendom" ! - what cannot be left to the history teacher

cf SIDIC Remaud pp.27-33 + ICCJ consultations.

d) Exemplary witness - learning through identification with parents/teacher

- learning through identification with "the other".

cf SIDIC Travers pp.52-53

Session II.

Continuation of group-work, with the last hour given to sharing results
(15 mins each group).

BASIC TEXTS to be available to each participant:

SIDIC XIX,2,1986 (I would bring them)

From the Martin Buber House No.4, August 1983 pp.34-39

No.8, June 1985 pp.14-15

No.9, Nov. 1985 pp.5-17

(Would it be possible to have photocopies of these)

SECRETARIAT FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN UNITY
COMMISSION FOR RELIGIOUS RELATIONS WITH THE JEWS

Vatican City - Tel. 698.4386/698.3071

Prot. N. J. 244/87/a

Vatican City, July 29, 1987

Rabbi A. James Rudin
Ms Judith Herschopf Banki
Interreligious Affairs Department
The American Jewish Committee
165 East 56 Street
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2746, USA

Dear Rabbi Rudin,
dear Ms Herschopf Banki,

I wish to thank you for your letter of July 8th and appreciate very much the project for a religious conference/dialogue. While I was not in Rome on July 22nd, Fr Fumagalli met with Ms Banki when she visited our offices. I too would suggest that you continue to deal with your project in close cooperation with

Professor Clemens Thoma SVD
Institut für jüdisch-christliche Forschung
Dufourstraße 26
CH-6003 LUZERN
(Telephone: (41) 24 55 35.)

For further details, you can contact either Fr. Pierre Duprey, Vice President of the Commission, or Fr Pier Francesco Fumagalli, Secretary.

At the same time I express the wish that your strong support of IJCIC will continue in the same fruitful and intensive way, according to the appropriate level of this forum, and I look forward to the next occasion to meet you personally.

With best regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,


Johannes Card. Willebrands
President

**overcoming
prejudice -
an
educational
challenge**



**international colloquium
fribourg, switzerland
12 - 17 july 1987**

**international council of
christians and jews**

invitation

The International Council of Christians and Jews (ICCJ), in conjunction with its Swiss member organization, the Christlich-Jüdische Arbeitsgemeinschaft in der Schweiz / Amitié Judéo-Chrétienne en Suisse / Amicizia Ebraico-Christiana Ticino, has the pleasure of inviting you to participate in its annual colloquium of 1987. Forty years after the historic conference at Seelisberg, we meet again in Switzerland. The "Ten Points" which issued from that conference have remained important guidelines for Christian-Jewish relations.

More and more in recent years, the ICCJ's work has been focussed on education. Through a number of scholarly consultations, we have been enabled to publish a series of texts which will serve as working documents for this conference.

It is our purpose to direct our efforts towards practical action: to examine means of improving the content, quality and sensitivity of the teaching received by schoolchildren, by university students, by future religious leaders — and by teachers. It is our hope and objective that, at the close of our deliberations, we shall have laid the foundations for plans of action in each of our participating countries.

Much has been accomplished in these forty years; much nevertheless remains to be done. Our discussions have been valuable and fruitful. We hope now to plant, in Fribourg, the fruit of action.

On behalf of the ICCJ:

Lord Coggan (former Archbishop of Canterbury), Honorary President
 Dr Victor C. Goldbloom, O. C., President
 Sir Sigmund Sternberg, KCSG, JP, Chairman of the Executive Committee
 Dr Jacobus Schoneveld, General Secretary

Address: Martin Buber House
 Werléstraße 2
 6148 Heppenheim
 Federal Republik of Germany
 Tel. (0) 62 52 / 50 41

* Each registrant will receive the set of ICCJ Guidelines in advance of the conference, as well as the Ten Points of Seelisberg.

programme

Sunday, 12 July 1987

- 13.00 – 18.00 Arrival and Registration at the University of Fribourg
- 18.00 Supper at the Mensa of the University
- 20.00 "Forty Years After the International Conference of Christians and Jews at Seelisberg in 1947 — Where do we go from here?"
 Address by Chief Rabbi Alexander Safran (Geneva). Panel discussion with former participants in "Seelisberg 1947"

Monday, 13 July 1987

- 8.15 – 8.45 Denominational Morning Prayers
- 9.00 – 9.15 Joint spiritual considerations
- 9.15 – 10.00 Plenary session
 Lecture on: "Our own prejudices — a psychological point of view" by Dr Emanuel Hurwitz (Zurich, Switzerland)
- 10.00 – 10.30 Coffee Break
- 10.30 – 12.30 Joint Bible study in groups (Exodus 23:1–13)
- 13.00 Lunch at the Mensa of the University
- 15.30 – 17.30 Issue-oriented workshops
- 18.00 Reception at the Townhall given by the City and the Canton of Fribourg. Meeting with representatives of the religious communities of Switzerland and others (with light buffet)
- 20.30 (to be announced)

Tuesday, 14 July 1987

- 8.15 – 8.45 Denominational Morning Prayers
- 9.00 – 9.15 Joint spiritual considerations
- 9.15 – 10.00 Plenary session
 Lecture on "The Future of Jewish-Christian Dialogue" by Professor Clemens Thoma (Lucerne, Switzerland)
- 10.00 – 10.30 Coffee Break
- 10.30 – 12.30 Plenary session
 "The Role of Agents of Education (Parents, Teachers, Educational Authorities) in Overcoming Prejudice". Short presentations by Mrs Judith Banki (USA), Prof. Pierre Pierrard (France) and Prof. Paul Roest (The Netherlands)

- 13.00 Lunch at the Mensa of the University
- 15.30 - 18.00 Action-oriented workshops
- 18.30 Supper at the Mensa of the University
- 20.00 "Market-place of Ideas and Methods"

Wednesday, 15 July 1987

- 8.15 - 8.45 Denominational Morning Prayers
- 9.00 - 9.15 Joint spiritual considerations
- 9.15 - 12.30 Continuation of the action-oriented workshops
- 13.00 Lunch at the Mensa of the University
- 15.30 — Opportunity for participants to meet in national or regional groups
- Meeting of workshop leaders and representatives of the working group on "Women and Religion" to prepare the final plenary session together with the panelists of this session
- 18.30 Supper at the Mensa of the University
- 20.00 Final plenary session:
"Towards a Programme of Action"
Panel discussion with Dr Eugene Fisher (Washington, D.C. USA), Dr Ruth Kastning-Olmesdahl (St. Augustin, FRG), Prof. Chaim Schatzker (Haifa, Israel)

Thursday, 16 Juli 1987

- 9.00 Annual General Meeting of the International Council of Christians and Jews
On the agenda i. a.:
"The Implementation of Recommendations emerging from the Colloquium"

For those who don't participate in the annual general meeting a bus tour may be organized to Jewish communities in the German-speaking part of Switzerland.

worship, bible study and spiritual considerations

Separate morning prayers, along denominational lines (e. g. Catholic, Jewish, Protestant) will be held on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday morning from 8.15 to 8.45. Members of other denominations than the one conducting the prayers are welcome to attend.

In addition there will be opportunity for spiritual sharing across denominational lines in "joint spiritual considerations" in a Bible-study session.

workshops

Two types of workshops will be held. One type will concentrate on certain issues relating to antisemitism and other forms of prejudice, and will take place on Monday afternoon.

In a second type of workshops — on Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning — the emphasis will lie on action, i. e. on methods and how to do things in overcoming prejudice. Certain methods may be tried out or simulated during these workshops. Participants are asked to indicate on their registration form their first, second and third choice for each type. In the interest of balanced composition of each workshop and because of the language used in it, it may not always be possible to assign a participant to the workshop of his / her first choice.

Issue-Oriented Workshops (Monday Afternoon)

- A. Forty years of Christian-Jewish Dialogue — What have we accomplished? (Leader: Prof. John T. Pawlikowski, Chicago, USA)
- B. The Changing Faces of Antisemitism (Leader to be announced)
- C. What makes Antisemitism a Unique Form of Prejudice? (Leader: Prof. Franklin H. Littell, Merion, Pennsylvania, USA)
- D. Socio-psychological Mechanisms of Prejudice (Leader: Dr Emanuel Hurwitz, Zurich, Switzerland)
- E. The Stranger in Our Midst (Leader to be announced)
- F. Relating to Islam (Leader to be announced)
- G. Martin Buber's Approach to Education (Leader to be announced)

(meeting with one of the following aspects)

(Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning)

1. "My own prejudices — how do I deal with them?"
2. Eradicating anti-Judaism from Christian catechesis and religious instruction in schools (Leader to be announced)
3. Relating to Children and their Parents (Leader: Ms Cherie Brown, Arlington, USA)
4. Teaching Teachers (Leader: Prof. Paul Roest, Voorburg, The Netherlands)
5. Educating Future Ministers, Priests, and Rabbis (Leader: Dr Eugene Fisher, Washington, USA)
6. Relating to Public Authorities in Matters of Education (Leader to be announced)
7. Relating to Public Opinion (Leader to be announced)

Special Working Group on Women and Religion

(meeting on Monday afternoon, Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning)

Concurrently with the above-mentioned workshops a special working group on "Women and Religion" will meet on Monday afternoon, Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning. The desire for establishing such working group was expressed at the 1986 ICCJ colloquium in Salamanca. Those interested in participating in it, are requested to indicate this on the registration form.

market place of ideas and methods

In order to stimulate among the participants the exchange of ideas and methods in education towards overcoming prejudice an opportunity will be given (especially on Tuesday evening) to exhibit relevant didactic material of various kinds: textbooks, pictorial and audiovisual materials, games, etc.

Participants or agencies who would wish to contribute to this aspect of the colloquium are asked to contact the general secretary of the International Council of Christians and Jews at the Martin Buber House, Werléstraße 2, 6148 Heppenheim, Federal Republic of Germany, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

practical information

Accommodation

The University of Fribourg, Switzerland, has generously made its premises available to the colloquium.

Simple accommodation (cold and warm water in single rooms, toilets and showers on the corridors) is offered at two student colleges in the immediate neighbourhood of the university: at the "Convict Salesianum", avenue de Moléson 30, and at the "Foyer St. Justin", 3, route de Jura. There are only a few double rooms available. Bookings and payments for this type of accommodation (bed and breakfast for SFr. 26,— per night and person) will be handled by the ICCJ.

Hotel accommodation is available through the Tourist Office of Fribourg. Prices (bed, breakfast, taxes and service) per person per night:

*** A1 - SFr 78.— / 98.—	(in double room: SFr 73.—)
*** A - SFr 69.—	(in double room: SFr 59.—)
*** B - SFr 63.—	(in double room: SFr 53.—)
** C - SFr 55.—	(in double room: SFr 48.—)
(* w/o bath or shower: SFr 43.—) (* w/o bath or shower: SFr 37.—)	

Bookings can be made with the enclosed yellow card which is to be sent direct to the Tourist Office, Grand Places 40, 1700 Fribourg, Switzerland, Tel. + 41.37.81 31 75. (Payments direct to the hotels).

Participation Fee

(including meals at the Mensa of the University) SFr 260.—
(from Sunday supper through Wednesday supper)

There is an extra charge for meals (SFr 20.—) for those who will participate in the ICCJ Annual General Meeting.

Food

Fish, dairy and vegetables will be served. Kashrut arrangements under rabbinical supervision.

Languages of the Conference:

English, French and German with simultaneous translations in the plenary sessions.

For each workshop one of these three languages will be chosen. Participants are therefore asked to indicate the language(s) they speak so that they can be assigned to an appropriate workshop as far as language is concerned.

Registration

It is intended to limit the number of participants to not more than 180. Therefore early registration is recommended. Closing date for registrations: 15 May 1987. Please return enclosed registration card before that date to the ICCJ Secretariat, Martin Buber House, Werléstraße 2, 6148 Heppenheim, Federal Republic of Germany (Tel. (0) 62 52 / 50 41).

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

date August 10, 1987
to Rabbi A. James Rudin
from Judith Herschopf Banki
subject ICCJ Colloquium, Fribourg, Switzerland, July 12-17, 1987

The 1987 International Colloquium of the International Council of Christians and Jews, which commemorated the fortieth anniversary of the founding of that organization and the enormous contribution of Jules Isaac, turned out to be a lively and interesting meeting with a large turnout (approximately 250 participants), some distinguished visitors, and an increasing representation of Christians and Jews from Eastern Europe.

In the interest of brevity I will give you a rough breakdown of participation from various countries and some of the key actors. As might be expected, the largest delegation came from the host country, Switzerland, with approximately 38 participants, including Allan Brockway of the World Council of Churches, Professor Jean Halperin, Rabbi Alexander Safran, Chief Rabbi of Geneva and one of the few at the conference who was an original participant forty years ago, and Professor Clemens Thoma, who made a singular contribution.

The substantial delegation from Israel (36 on the list of participants) included Christian, Jewish and Arab participants (I suspect most of the Arabs were Christians). In addition to the expected participation of Joseph Emanuel and the Resnikoffs, the Israeli delegation also included Haim Shapiro of The Jerusalem Post, Dr. Aharon Agus, a nephew of Jacob, Dr. Geert Cohen-Stuart and Michael Krupp, distinguished Protestant clergy originally from Holland, Professor Hava Lazarus-Yafeh of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and Michael and Sally Klein-Katz, a young couple seriously interested in advancing Christian-Jewish relations in Israel who will be in touch with this department upon their arrival in the United States. Peter and Pnina Levinson, retired now, also count themselves among the Israeli delegation.

The 27 participants from Great Britain included Lord and Lady Coggan -- he a former Archbishop of Canterbury -- Lord and Lady Sigmund Sternberg, the Rev. William Simpson, another of the very few remaining veterans of the 1947 Conference, who celebrated his 80th birthday during the course of this symposium, and Bishop Gerald Mahon, who has recently been appointed to hold the position which is the equivalent of Eugene Fisher's with the British Conference of Catholic Bishops -- not very knowledgeable about the subject, but a very decent and open person and a

quick learner.

The Dutch delegation (23) included Rabbi Rodrigues Pereira, to the best of my knowledge the only Orthodox rabbi who regularly participates in the ICCJ.

The delegation from the United States included the Fishers, Riffat Hassan, Elliot Wright of the NCCJ, Cherie Brown, David Blewett, and some youth participants in addition to myself. Father John Pawlikowski, who was scheduled to be on the program, cancelled last minute because of his mother's illness.

The German delegation included such stalwarts as Ruth Kastning-Olmesdahl and Brigitte Freudenberg of Heidelberg.

In addition, there were sixteen participants from Sweden, fifteen from France, four from Ireland (plus two from Northern Ireland), nine from Canada, three from Belgium, two from Austria and two from Australia, in addition to one each from Luxemburg, Spain, Uruguay and Venezuela.

As for participation from the Eastern European bloc countries, there were nine from East Germany, probably five Christian and four Jewish, and there were seven from Hungary, including the Roman Catholic Archbishop, Dr. Jozsef Kacziba, Dr. Bertalan Tamas, ecumenical officer for the Reformed Church in Hungary, and both the new chief rabbi and the editor of the Hungarian Jewish newspaper.

There was only one participant from Poland, but a most important one, Bishop Henryk Muszynsky, who has responsibility for Catholic-Jewish relations for the Polish Bishops Conference. I spent as much time as I could with Bishop Muszynsky and believe that I was able to help him understand the reasons for the intensity of Jewish reaction to the Carmelite convent at Auschwitz and the fear that the church, in its desire to memorialize its own martyrs, seemed to be trying to "baptize" the Holocaust for its own ends. I believe I made a friend of him. I reminded him of Marc Tanenbaum's hope for a forthcoming conference on the meaning of Auschwitz for Christians and Jews. He is open to future programming and thinks that the idea is an excellent one, but he has a primary and prior commitment for a conference with the ADL to take place in Poland next year. That one is already on the books.

It should be noted that Father Pier Francesco Fumagalli of the Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews was an observer at the Conference and attended almost all of the sessions. He also socialized in an very open way during meals and coffee breaks. Unfortunately, he is still in serious pain from his accident in the winter, had to rest frequently and had to go back to his room either to put on or take off a back brace which he is required to wear for several hours a day.

I should also note the participation of the Rev. Dr. Lois Wilson, a vice-president of the World Council of Churches, who co-chaired the

women's working group, which met regularly throughout the colloquium.

I won't go into much comment about the program itself, since a copy is attached. I should note that my own presentation was extremely well received. In addition to making a plenary presentation, I also headed up a workshop on catechetics along with Sister Mary Travers, a Sister of Zion from SIDIC in Rome. That was a 5 1/2 hour workshop, 2 1/2 hours one day and three hours the next. It had an extremely responsive group of participants, and someone who put together the ultimate workshop reports said that it was clear to her that our workshop was the best. Not having attended the others, I was in no position to judge.

I did, when possible, sit in on the women's workshop, which I found particularly interesting. However, I have some doubts as to whether it is the appropriate co-sponsor for the kind of conference that we were considering for a post-Nairobi women's program, since it is religion-centered and focused on Bible study, etc. (It seems to me to be more of a Women of Faith type program.) However, we should take some time to discuss this with Linda Greenman and other people who are considering using the ICCJ as a vehicle for an international women's conference.

I had to lay the groundwork for a visit to Fumagalli in Rome at the meeting in Switzerland, which was tricky, since he had not received the letter we sent him or a copy of our letter to Cardinal Willebrands (nor had I received copies of any of these things -- although they were supposed to have been sent express mail to him in Rome and to me in France. They never arrived in Paris and I never got copies of them at my hotel in Switzerland.) I did set up the meeting with him; report attached separately.

One final bittersweet observation. After the conclusion of the formal proceedings of the conference on Wednesday night, I had the choice of staying and attending the ICCJ annual meeting in Fribourg, to be followed by a reception in the very beautiful home of the former head of the Jewish community of Fribourg, or to go on a bus tour to some of the Jewish communities of Switzerland and a nostalgic visit to Seelisberg, from whence the original eighteen points of Seelisberg issued, resulting in an audience for Jules Isaac with Pope John XXIII, and -- some say -- the genesis of Nostra Aetate. I chose the latter for sentimental reasons. It was a bad mistake. The day was deadly hot, the bus was not air-conditioned, the rabbi of the Orthodox synagogue in Lucerne who was supposed to greet us and lead us through the synagogue never showed up. With the exception of the visit to Rabbi Marcus' synagogue in Bern, which was inspiring and a vital institution, one had the sense of a decimated Jewish community. Perhaps saddest of all, the site of the original Seelisberg conference was unavailable to us for visiting because it is now a Zen Buddhist meditation center! Sic transit.....

JHB:ls

cc: Marc Tanenbaum
Bertram Gold



THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

date August 10, 1987
to Rabbi A. James Rudin
from Judith Herschopf Banki
subject Visit to the Vatican, July 22

I laid the foundation for a follow-up trip to Father Fumigalli in Rome during the course of the ICCJ Conference in Fribourg. Since Fumigalli had not received any of the documentation that was express-mailed to him before the conference in Switzerland, I decided to wait until he returned to Rome to pursue the appointment, so that he could read the letter that had been sent to Cardinal Willebrands and to himself. Accordingly, I called him at his office after his return from Switzerland and set up an appointment with him on Wednesday, July 22nd.

On the way down to Rome by overnight train I considered our options, trying to focus on an area of programming which would have some integrity and which would not: a) undermine our participation in IJCIC; b) be imitative of ADL activities; and c) be completely hostage to the existing uncertainty as to whether or not the Jews were going to meet with the Pope in Miami and the continuing fallout from the Waldheim audience. I also considered what kind of program areas would be congenial to AJC style and the inclinations of our own leadership. All things considered, I felt that a conference or colloquium confronting the history of Christian-Jewish relations at certain key episodes in the relationships between the Church and the Jewish people would be a good area to begin. I sketched out in outline form a program focusing on a solid exploration of: 1) The first three centuries of Christianity; 2) The period of Reformation-counter-Reformation; 3) The Enlightenment; and 4) The challenge of modernity to Judaism and Christianity, to the Jewish people and to the Catholic Church. I thought this approach would give us a somewhat unusual and fresh perspective on Christian-Jewish relations.

I presented the outline to Father Fumigalli, who was most enthusiastic about its content. However, he noted that as conceived, this approach would not fall under his commission -- the Vatican Commission on Religious Relations with the Jews -- but would more logically fall under Cardinal Baum's commission, which handles matters of culture and education. He said he would suggest to Cardinal Willebrands, to whom our correspondence had been addressed, that Willebrands discuss the prospect of our carrying on this program or colloquium under the jurisdiction of Baum's Commission on Education and Culture, with the approval and/or cooperation of the Commission on Religious Relations

with the Jews. Assuming a cooperative attitude on the part of Cardinal Baum, this would constitute a wonderful solution for us. Since IJCIC works directly with Fumigalli and Willebrands, it would give us an approach to a creative program with an entirely different commission in the Vatican. It would not represent direct competition with IJCIC, and it would open up the possibility of new contacts within the Vatican for AJC.

Fumigalli also suggested we should try to implement our programming away from Rome, and particularly touted Clemens Thoma's relatively new institute on Christian-Jewish relations in Lucerne, Switzerland, which, Fumigalli said, is more free-wheeling, more creative and less under the thumb of the Curia. (He suggested that a substantive conference elsewhere than Rome could be combined with a ceremonial visit to Rome if it was felt that a Papal audience or some other ceremonial recognition of Catholic-Jewish programming is required.)

Fumigalli also suggested two other places for possible programming in the area of Christian-Jewish relations, one the Ratisbonne Center in Jerusalem, which is a Pontifical Center for Jewish Studies and the other the Institute Catholique de Paris. (However, Claire Bishop, later advised of this suggestion, noted that the Institute has a reputation for being extremely conservative in theology and outlook.)

Fumigalli suggested we wait for a response from Cardinal Willebrands. This has since arrived (copy attached) and is encouraging. Note that the cardinal is also pushing Thoma's institute.

My historical approach is not written in stone and we are perfectly free to submit alternate suggestions. It just seemed to me that I had to come into Fumigalli with something in hand for him to react to, and this proved to be a sensible move.

I should also note that prior to my appointment with Fumigalli at the Vatican, I paid a call to SIDIC, in order to bid farewell to Sister Sedawie, who is retiring after a career of notable service and going back to Australia.

By a lucky coincidence I ran into an American priest who was visiting SIDIC at the same time and who turned out to be a valuable contact. He is on staff at the Gregorian, a pontifical university in Rome, and he was unusually frank and open about the problems we confront. He forthrightly acknowledged a "wide stream of anti-Semitism in the Church," including his own university which is under the direct supervision of Cardinal Silvestrini, "a known anti-Semite" (his own words). He noted that an endowment for a school of Jewish studies at the Gregorian University, offered by a "generous American midWestern donor" was turned down by the Curia because of fear that something positive about Israel might be incorporated into the curriculum. I considered the meeting with him accidental at the time, but on later reflection I realized that SIDIC is a natural magnet for theological liberals who may be stifling otherwise in Rome, and that the center attracts people who

may do nothing more than come into the kitchen -- as this priest did -- have a cup of coffee with the Sisters and feel emotionally and religiously at home.

Fumigalli strikes me as an essentially decent and reasonably open person, a little overwhelmed and baffled by the task he has been assigned. He is not politically very knowledgeable about the Jewish community, although he is something of a scholar and has a respectable background as an archivist of Hebrew manuscripts. He has little or no political clout, a fact of which he himself is acutely aware, and for which I suspect he is somewhat grateful. By his own suggestion, future contact with the Vatican Commission on Religious Relations with Jews should also involve Father Pierre Duprey, who is vice-president of the Commission, because -- in Fumagalli's words -- "the middle man gets the work done."

All this considered, I think we got off to a good start. We will need to go slowly and carefully, but we are encouraged to move.

JHB:ls

cc: Marc Tanenbaum
Bertram Gold





RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER • UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS
PRESIDENT 838 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N.Y. 10021 (212) 249-0100

September 8, 1987
14 Elul 5747

FROM: Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

TO: Board of Trustees, UAHC

REPORT ON ROME MISSION

Dear Friends:

I missed a UAHC Executive Committee or Board meeting only thrice in my thirty years with the Union and fifteen years as your president -- on two occasions because of illness and, in the most recent case, two week-ends ago, when I went to Rome as part of a Jewish delegation to meet with Vatican officials and with the Pope. Chuck Rothschild agreed that it was more important for the Union to have me as its representative in Rome than to be in attendance at our business sessions. In any event -- so Al Vorspan assures me -- my absence was scarcely felt, in fact, it actually "raised the quality of our Executive Committee meeting," whatever he may have meant by that.

Please consider the following report as confidential. It will allow me to be less restrained in my commentary, without fear that my words will find their way into print.

Let me confess that I went to Rome with one goal in mind: to find an honorable way to repair the breach in Catholic-Jewish relations created by the Waldheim affair. These relations had dramatically improved over the last two decades, especially here on the American scene, and I thought it folly to allow one incident, however, painful, to retard if not to end our fruitful exchange. Happily, my expectations were exceeded, for our dialogue, far from being ruptured, was considerably advanced.

The negotiations were long and complex, spanning nearly three days and nights, for when the Jewish representatives were not meeting with Vatican officials, we met in caucus to hammer out our own positions -- not always an easy task. In formal conference, we spent about eleven hours with Cardinal Willebrands and his associates of the Commission on Religious Relations with the Jews. (A representative of the Vatican's Secretariat of State, Msgr. Gatti, and two representatives of the Conference of Catholic Bishops of the U.S.A. -- Bishop William H. Keeler, and Dr. Eugene Fisher -- were also in attendance at these

meetings .) On Tuesday morning, we met with Agostino Cardinal Casaroli, the Vatican's Secretary of State. And on Tuesday noon, we were received by Pope John Paul II at Castel Gondolfo, his summer residence.

Let me emphasize that this was not an "audience" but rather an open conversation during which all participants had an opportunity to say what was on their mind -- and they did. Indeed, the Pope made no opening statements; he merely welcomed us and invited us to speak our minds and hearts. All other meetings were of a like kind. No holds were barred. Everyone expressed himself with candor, though in a friendly, dignified tone, and all agenda items were fully explored.

Our agenda was not limited to the Waldheim affair. That was only the catalyst and point of departure for our discussion. Its substance was of a wider and more significant nature. We dealt essentially with four major issues affecting our mutual relationship:

1/ We spoke of the Shoah and the current efforts to universalize the holocaust, to minimize if not to deny the uniquely Jewish component of this tragedy. We asserted that the Catholic Church, far from resisting, at times even contributes to this inimical process (e.g. the beatification of Edith Stein as if to say: the only Jewish martyrs worthy to be remembered were those who converted to Catholicism). The Waldheim affair was raised in this wider context.

2/ We discussed the current state of anti-Semitism, noting its current rise in France and Austria and in some parts of Latin America. We sought to enlist the Vatican's help in the struggle against religious bigotry everywhere, but especially in those countries where the Church's influence is significant.

3/ We raised the matter of the Vatican's contradictory statements about Jews and Judaism -- its affirmations of the "Nostra Aetate" process on the one hand and, on the other, countless homilies, some offered by the Pope himself, that are more in tune with a pre-Vatican II theology. (Since I was asked to focus on this point in my representations, I append my paper for your perusal).

4/ Lastly, we focused on the issue of the Holy See's reluctance to establish full diplomatic ties with Israel.

Were our meetings fruitful in their effect? In my view, they were -- pre-eminently so. All other members of our delegation agree.

Some contrary voices are heard now -- without exception from amongst those who were not in Rome -- belittling the results. These critics, so it would appear, expected nothing less than a formal apology for the Waldheim meeting and the promise that full relations with Israel would forthwith be established. Such expectations were and are politically naive. (Can one reasonably expect a pope to apologize? Why should the Vatican announce its decision to offer Israel full diplomatic relations to a delegation of American Jews? That should more properly be proffered to Israel's own political leadership, should it not?) These expectations are also politically short-sighted. They blithely ignore the fact that there are fifty-one million American Catholics who would be offended were we to boycott the Miami meeting -- and justly so, because the American Catholic hierarchy, and lay leadership for that matter, was vigorous in representing our complaints to the Vatican.

Marginally noted, some Roman Catholic observers were even more upset by our Rome mission than the Jewish critics. Thus the headlines of one Conservative Catholic publication blazoned forth: "The Pope Surrenders to the Jews!"

Be that as it may, my reasons for deeming our Rome encounter a success rest on the following grounds:

To begin with, we were given precisely what we asked for -- an opportunity to make our case to the Vatican without restraint. Again, we did not seek an apology for the Waldheim affair. We asked that our voice be heard. It was heard and the Catholic leadership acknowledged "the seriousness of and the Church's sensitivity to" our Jewish concerns. (I quote now from the Text of the Joint Press Communique appended to my report with the pertinent passages underlined).

Secondly, the Jewish-Catholic dialogue was lifted to a higher hierarchial level within the Vatican. Heretofore, discussions were limited to the theological realm with members of the Holy See's Commission on Religious Relations with the Jews. This time 'round, we met with the Vatican's Secretary of State as well as with the Pope. Never before, as far as anyone knows, did such an informal and frank discussion between representatives of the Jewish people and the supreme head of the Roman Catholic Church take place.

Moreover, this higher level of interchange has now been institutionalized with the establishment of a "special mechanism that would more closely follow the trends and concerns within the world Jewish community." Implicit in this newer format is the recognition that Jews are not just a faith-community but a people whose concerns "intertwine religious and political issues." Future exchanges with the Secretary of State were also assured.

On the subject of establishing full diplomatic relations with Israel, the Vatican leadership affirmed that "there exist no theological reasons in Catholic doctrine that would inhibit such relations," and Cardinal Casaroli pointed out that while diplomatic relations with Israel have not been "perfected" there do exist "good relations on many levels including official visits to the Holy See by Israeli leaders." In his welcoming comments, Pope John Paul II also made a pertinent comment when he welcomed us as "the representatives of the Jewish people to whom the existence of Israel is central." (Sometimes we forget how far we have come, even in this political realm. There was a time, not too long ago, when the word "Israel" would not cross the lips of a Vatican spokesman. As a case in point, some years ago, the Israel Symphony Orchestra gave a performance in the presence of the pope and the Vatican's official newspaper subsequently reported that a "group of Jewish refugee musicians" played before him.)

Lastly, and perhaps most important of all, Cardinal Willebrands announced the intention of the Vatican to "prepare an official Catholic document on the Shoah." I underscore the term 'official,' for this will not be a private communication to an American prince of the church or perhaps an address to a Jewish audience, but rather a theological statement addressed to the Church universal which will explore the religious roots of modern anti-Semitism as well as the Vatican's role during this period of our history. Jewish scholars are to be involved in the evolution of this document, and there is little doubt in my mind that

such a statement will significantly strengthen our effort to combat those who would deny the reality of the Shoah and trivialize the tragedy.

These then are the reasons that lead me to ascribe success to our Rome mission. The agreements are substantial. Their potential is even greater if we are wise enough to exploit it. At the very least, rupture was avoided, with Jewish dignity fully preserved, and the Dialogue continues. At this writing, I can only hope that the Miami meeting is conducted in the same positive spirit.

* * * * *

Be well, and let me take this occasion to wish you and those you love a year and years of life and good health.

Fondly.



Richard Cohen

A 'Tradition' Of Silence On Israel

In September the American Jewish Congress released what to most Americans must have seemed an unremarkable document. It endorsed the call for an international Middle East peace conference—an idea whose time has still not come and whose success is far from guaranteed. Nevertheless, all hell broke loose. The remarkable had happened: a mainstream American Jewish organization had opposed Israeli policy.

In both Israel and the United States, the reaction to the AJC proposal was immediate. Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir rejected it. In a letter to yet another Jewish organization, he called the AJC statement a "regrettable" attempt to circumvent Israel's democratic process "by appealing to friends abroad who do not vote in Israel." And Morris Abram, the chairman of an umbrella group comprising 45 major Jewish organizations, assured Shamir the AJC initiative would not be duplicated: "Such restraint in giving public advice to Israel on matters of security has been the tradition."

But this is a "tradition" that ought to be junked. First, neutrality is in itself a policy—and one that is not neutral. By shutting up, by only writing checks, American Jews come down on the side of the status quo—on the side of the recalcitrant Shamir. He is unwilling to trade an inch of the occupied territories (especially the West Bank) for concessions from the Arab states and the Palestinians.

As a result, American Jews practice a kind of valueless philanthropy. They write checks for Israel, but hesitate at enclosing a note. In the Middle East as in other places, silence can be construed as consent.

Second, what Abrams labels "matters of security"—an intimidating phrase—are really nothing of the sort. An international peace conference has the vigorous backing of Israel's former prime minister—and current foreign minister—Shimon Peres. Neither he nor the other Israelis who support him are eager to endanger the security of their country. In fact, their intentions are just the opposite. Only by making peace with the Arabs can Israel in

Third, Jews, above all, know the sound of silence for what it is: indifference. But how can Jews, of all people, be indifferent to the plight of the Palestinians; the incessant cycle of riots and repression on the West Bank; the violence of Arab against Jew, Jew against Arab and Arab against Arab? Who can be indifferent to an Israel where a minority of Jews rules a majority of West Bank Palestinians, where the specter of a South Africa-like repression looms? Is this the dream of Zionism? Is this justice?

The reality is that American Jews have limited influence over Israeli politics. And the further reality is that they would do well to be sparing with their advice. American Jews are not Israelis and do not have to live with the potentially bloody consequences of a policy they might help set. After all, debates about the future of the West Bank have an immediacy in Jerusalem that they do not have in Chicago.

But on questions concerning both justice and the role the United States might play in pressuring Israel, there is no reason that the voice of American Jews should not be heard. Whether it likes it or not, the American Jewish community is a player in the Middle East. It is incredibly influential in shaping American policy, and it has been incredibly generous toward Israel.

Israeli politicians, for one, know clout when they see it. They are forever entreating American Jews to endorse this or that policy. And it was Peres, the frustrated peacemaker, who called on American Jews to back him against Shamir.

An international peace conference for the Middle East may well turn out to be yet another worthless meeting. The Palestine Liberation Organization may remain intransigent and the Soviets, in the end, may not play a constructive role. But the issue is not a particular meeting in a particular place, but whether or not Israel will strive for peace. On that issue, the silence of the American Jewish community is not the continuation of a worthy tradition, but a rebuff to a Jewish one.

Peace in the Middle East affects us all. Whether citizens of Israel or not, we all have a stake in an area that has several times had strong men in Washington weak with anxiety. Any Arab-Israeli war could eventually involve the superpowers. You don't have to be Jewish to speak up on the Middle East, but if you are, you don't have to keep silent, either.

PERSPECTIVE

The Pope's visit more political than pastoral this time around

The Pope cut a varied and at times contradictory figure on his second visit to the Federal Republic of Germany: smiling, thoughtful, hesitant and determined.

He is both a modern and a most conservative pope.

Has he sparked the hoped-for spirit of renewal in the Catholic Church in Germany, or has he, by recalling history, turned back the wheel of time?

He certainly covered a wide range of issues, extending from pastoral difficulties to urgent social and societal problems.

His brief five-day stay may have been billed as a pastoral visit, but it was unquestionably far more political than his first, in 1980.

So the Pope may have countered accusations that the Catholic Church constantly sidestepped important problems, but he also laid himself open to tougher criticism.

A political pope is a pope who is more readily open to attack, and the Holy Father will have to live with attacks after this particular visit.

The ceremonies at which Fr Rupert Mayer and Edith Stein were beatified

STUTTGARTER NACHRICHTEN

were worlds apart from his instructions on current affairs.

In the Ruhr Pope John Paul was seen as the modern pope and a warning voice with progressive views.

He warned employers and trade unions not to sacrifice the Lord's Day for the sake of Sunday working.

He made it unmistakably clear to industry and the state that unemployment was not in keeping with human dignity and could not simply be accepted as a fact of life.

It was, he said, a social scandal that the work available was not fairly shared. There can be no doubt that the Pope here took up and continued Catholic social teachings.

His views on the oecumenical movement were far less progressive. Indeed, he took great care to avoid committing himself on Christian unity.

What other interpretation could be given to his statements to representa-

tives of the Protestant Church that premature decisions need not be expected?

On the oecumenical movement the Pope currently creates the impression of being a brakeman rather than a driving force.

This is probably the background against which the warning by Bishop Kruse of Berlin, council chairman of the German Protestant Church, against beating a retreat to traditional denominational viewpoints must be seen.

Moves toward rapprochement between the Catholic and Protestant churches have indeed grown weaker. There is sand in the works.

That is hardly surprising. With his marked tendency toward adoration of the Virgin Mary and toward beatification John Paul created the impression of being a strictly conservative, backward-looking pope.

In Munich and Münster, Cologne and Kevelaer he took the opportunity of refurbishing the Christian virtues of piety, humility and chastity in terms of obedience to the faith and unswerving trust and confidence in the Church's teachings.

Edith Stein and Rupert Mayer, undoubtedly great personalities, were made out to be blameless believers who had never sinned or been guilty of human error.

Does the Church's process of glorification leave no leeway for a modicum of humanity? If not, one is bound to wonder whether beatifications really make sense and whether the beatified can really serve as models.

Do they really help believers by being set on a pedestal to such an extent? Are they not in reality "instrumentalised" as witnesses on behalf of the Church and its policies?

At times one is bound to wonder whether beatification is not increasingly the result of a disconcerting degree of local patriotism.

In the Federal Republic alone 14 dioceses have submitted 33 candidates for consideration!

They stand a fair chance of being beatified. Vatican statistics show John Paul II to have carried out 163 beatifications and 110 canonisations — an inundation when compared with his predecessors' track records.

Canonisations were the climax of his second visit to the Federal Republic, and that could, in the long term, have alarming repercussions for the Church and its believers.

There is a risk of the sense of revolutionary progress soon losing momentum and of the Papal renewal giving way to a Papal restoration.

Anton Notz

(Stuttgarter Nachrichten, 5 May 1987)

[start]

Original documents
faded and/or illegible





Rupert Mayer... ready for martyrdom.

(Photo: Süddeutscher Verlag)

The Pope's beatification (first step towards sainthood) of two victims of the Nazis, Edith Stein and Rupert Mayer, were the most controversial aspects of the Pope's tour of Germany. Father Mayer was a Jesuit priest who criticised the Nazis. He died in 1945. Edith Stein was born Jewish but converted to Catholicism and became Sister Theresia Benedicta. She was arrested in 1942 in Holland and died the same year in Auschwitz. Jews object to the idea that she was a Catholic martyr. They say she was killed because she was Jewish.

Both Rupert Mayer, a Jesuit priest, and Edith Stein, a Jewish-born Carmelite nun, may have led saintly lives, but whether their sufferings during the Third Reich are to the greater glory of the Catholic Church is another matter.

There is a case to be made for the claim by a Roman Catholic pep group that the beatifications were an attempt to paper over the opportunism embarrassing silence of the Catholic Church after the Nazi came to power 1933. Ru-

and priest Nazi victims

pert Mayer, a Stuttgart businessman's son, came from a staunchly conservative, nationally-minded home.

He might have sensed in July 1937 that he couldn't rely on his ecclesiastical superiors in fighting the Nazis.

When he was sentenced to six months in prison by a special court (a sentence that has yet to be declared null and void) he appealed to his Jesuit superiors not to intervene in a bid to reduce the sentence.

Rupert Mayer wanted both martyrdom and to resume his sermons to full houses in his Munich church.

A protest note was written by his superiors in Munich. It was doubtless well-meant, but it now reads oddly.

"Rupert Mayer," it said, "really has no need to prove his patriotic sentiments. He is universally acknowledged to have given exemplary service in the Great War.

"He fought the 1918 revolution. He was seriously wounded. He has made countless patriotic speeches in the struggle against Communism and Marxism, once even alongside the Führer.

"All these points are surely sufficient (evidence of his patriotic spirit)."

The reference to the speech "alongside" Hitler in the early 1920s was a misrepresentation.

He had actually said that a practising Catholic could never be a Nazi. For that he was booted out of the assembly hall.

As a young Jesuit he had made a name for himself before the Great War helping poor industrial workers in Munich.

He was constantly in debt to butchers and bakers and frequently attacked rich Catholics, accusing them of lacking charity and stealing from the poor.

In 1914 he volunteered as a chaplain, saw active service in Rumania, where he lost a leg.

In 1919 he returned to his pre-war pastoral work in Munich, where from 1933 he was kept under constant surveillance by the Gestapo, who had stenographers record his sermons word for word.

After serving his prison sentence for "reprehensible attacks on the Party and the state" he refused to tone down his sermons and was sent to Oranienburg concentration camp.

When his health deteriorated the Nazis were worried he might come to be seen as a martyr and set about finding a more "elegant" solution, succeeding with the aid of Church authorities.

He was released from concentration camp in mid-1940 but sent to Ettal, a Benedictine monastery, and strictly forbidden by the Church to make public appearances or deliver sermons.

He was freed by the Americans in April 1945, returned to Munich and died there, on All Saints' Day 1945, after a stroke.

Edith Stein was beatified as a martyr for the Christian faith, which is not strictly true. She was sent to her death in the gas chamber at Auschwitz in 1942 as a Jewess, not as a Catholic nun.

She was born in 1891 in Breslau, where her father was a Jewish timber merchant. Many comments she made before her death make it clear she saw herself as a Jewish martyr.

She expressly saw her imminent death as participation in the sufferings of her Jewish people and a succession to Christ's death on the Cross.

Until the age of 21 she saw herself as an atheist. She studied philosophy in Freiburg and graduated summa cum laude under Edmund Husserl.

She later converted to Catholicism and was baptised in 1922, aged 31. At the end of 1933 she took orders as a Carmelite nun in Cologne.



Edith Stein... Catholic convert.

(Photo: Werek)

In the 1938 elections she came to notice as a "non-Aryan" who was not entitled to vote. On New Year's Eve 1938 she was taken to a Carmelite nunnery in Holland for safety's sake.

Once the Wehrmacht invaded Holland she was no longer safe there. She was to have been transferred to neutral Switzerland, but the Swiss aliens' police raised objections and the Vatican created bureaucratic difficulties too.

On 2 August 1942 the SS moved in. Edith Stein, her sister Rosa and 1,200 other Catholic Jews were deported. A week later she died in the gas chamber.

She had written to Pope Pius IX in spring 1933 requesting a private audience in which she hoped to persuade him to issue an unequivocal encyclical against the persecution of Jews in Nazi Germany.

The Pope's reply was merely a formal blessing. The Vatican had already concluded a concordat with the Nazi regime, entrusting the Third Reich with a substantial fund of goodwill.

Peter Abspacher

(Nürnberger Nachrichten, 29 April 1937)

[end]

Original documents
faded and/or illegible



OCT 13 1987

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Israel Office

memorandum

date September 29, 1987
to Marc Tanenbaum/George Gruen
from M. Bernard Resnikoff


subject

Attached is a copy of an article by Michael Lerner entitled "Moments of Cowardice" which appeared in the Sept. 29, 1987 issue of The Jerusalem Post.

I have a feeling that this was published elsewhere and you may have seen it already. Still, to make absolutely sure, I am sending it along.

I consider this article a disservice to the Jewish people. If it isn't downright maleficent, it is ill-advised.

cc: Bert Gold
Shimon Samuels
James Rudin/Judith Banki



Moments of cowardice

HOW COULD IT HAPPEN that a group of nine national Jewish representatives, people who deserve respect for their lives of service to the Jewish community, could orchestrate an orgy of servility before the pope that could only remind us of the days of powerlessness in medieval European ghetto life?

Desperate to legitimate their own ceremonial Miami meeting with the pope, Jewish leaders sought a way to deflect attention from his outrageous act of contempt for the Jews: hailing the world's highest-ranking former Nazi, Kurt Waldheim, as "a man of peace." What they sought was a serious dialogue in which they could at least hear from the pope how he justified his actions — and why he continued to oppose Vatican recognition of Israel.

What they actually got was a humiliating partial gesture. Each spokesman made a statement to the pope — and the pope then gave a 15-minute response, totally ignoring the Waldheim issue and sidestepping the Israel issue by saying that he has no theological objections (which, the Vatican later explained, meant that they have only political objections. Wonderful!).

Imagine that we had sent a delegation like this to ask Gorbachev to let Jews emigrate freely. What if Gorbachev had listened patiently and smiled approval — and then given a general talk about how much he appreciated the special pain of Jews, their special sufferings during the Holocaust, and their great contributions to the Soviet Union. Imagine that he had topped this by saying he had no reason based on Marxist doctrine for preventing Jews from emigrating (but Kremlin officials later explained that there were many political reasons why this could not be done). Would anyone in his right mind call this a dialogue, or a basis for holding a ceremonial event to honour Gorbachev in Miami?

The meeting with Waldheim strengthened the pope's hand with the traditionally anti-Semitic sectors of the Church in Europe, but it intensified the crisis of his moral legitimacy in America. The threat that his American tour would be marred by Jews refusing to go to Miami and by public demonstrations by Jews was significant precisely because the Waldheim issue seemed to crystallize the Vatican's moral illegitimacy.

For the first time in living memory the Jews had something the pope



Pope John Paul II meets American Jewish leaders, Rabbi Mordechai Waxman, centre, and Rabbi Gilbert Klapermann in Italy earlier this month. (AFP)

Michael Lerner

needed. But instead of demanding recognition of Israel, they made completely clear even before they left that for this delegation of Jews the fact of the Rome meeting itself was all they really yearned for. Because the meeting was all they demanded, it was all the Vatican had to give in return for obtaining the Jews' willingness to forget about Waldheim (and the pope's coming trip to Austria) and the legitimization ceremony in Miami. Instead of demanding recognition of Israel, they settled for recognition of themselves.

No mature observer of the Vatican would expect miracles — our relations with them will take time and patience. But it is self-destructive to declare victory and honour the other side for its great strides forward when the other side is giving nothing and is actually stonewalling. This encourages the other side's intransigence, rather than creating incentives for serious advances in the dialogue.

There are several ironies here: • These same Jewish leaders condemn meetings with the PLO — because the PLO doesn't recognize Israel. Historically, the Vatican has been responsible for far more Jewish deaths than the PLO. Yet the Vatican refuses to recognize Israel. And, far from being

shunned, it was given public testimonials, first in Rome, then in Miami.

• The pope intends to meet with Waldheim again when he visits Austria next June. Who in the Catholic world will take Jewish protests seriously — now that the Jews have shown how easily their anger can be bought off?

• We in the liberal wing of the Jewish world are often dismissed as "only caring about the problems of others: blacks, third-worlders, the poor, the unemployed, but never to be heard from when Jewish issues are primary." Yet it is we who are challenging the Jewish establishment to stand up more forthrightly for Jewish interests in dealing with the pope, and it is we liberals who are insisting that nothing short of recognition of Israel will satisfy us.

JEWES MUST give up their ghetto mentality and demand respect. Far from endangering us, as the men in charge of the Catholic dialogue seem to think, it is precisely the opposite: Jews are taken seriously when they demand respect, and they are in greatest danger when they are most obsequious and fawning.

One of the saddest parts of the current debacle is that Jews have betrayed their historic role as the challengers to unjust constituted authority. It is the Jews who have always refused to bow down, physi-

cally or symbolically, to *melech basar vadam*, a king of flesh and blood. As the Purim story reminds us so well, it was this very obstinacy that accounts for so much hostility from the rulers of the world.

This is our unique function as a people: to remain witnesses to the One God even in the face of the many forms of idolatry that pervade the earth. If Jews could stay true to this mission even in times of severe physical insecurity, it seems all the greater a betrayal for us to abandon that role at a time when we live with the greatest physical security.

And this betrayal of Jewish ideals was also a betrayal of the needs of other Americans who might have followed us in questioning the ceremonial circus that was staged. The shameful capitulation in Miami will encourage all other Americans to fall into silence about their own moral problems with the pope.

If Israelis organized a peaceful but public demonstration at one of the Catholic offices or churches in Jerusalem as an act of solidarity with those of us who demonstrated in the U.S., it would be a clear message to American Jews: we want Jews to stand proud and angry *vis-a-vis* the Vatican. Far from hurting Jewish-Catholic relations, such a demonstration would help us to put it back on a track of mutual respect.

Dr. Lerner is Editor of *Tikkun* magazine, a bi-monthly Jewish critique of politics, culture and society.

BREAKING THE SILENCE

KLAUS BARBIE & CHURCH DIPLOMACY

KATHLEEN McCAFFREY

Lyon, France — Once again the role of the Catholic church in World War II has emerged as a subject of controversy, this time in Lyon. Since May 11, Klaus Barbie, Gestapo chief here from November 1942 to August 1944, was on trial for crimes against humanity. On July 4 he was found guilty and sentenced to life imprisonment.

Religion itself was not a theme at the Barbie trial. But the subject matter of the trial — crimes against humanity — cannot be separated from the concerns of religion, and of the Catholic church.

In the recurring silence of the courtroom, the voice of the witness breaking with emotion, the omni-presence of Catholic Lyon was palpable in the tolling bells of the nearby Cathedral of St. Jean, the seat of the archbishop of Lyon. And from the street in front of the courthouse, along the river Saône, the image of church and state, an old story in France, could not be more aptly embodied than in the towering presence of the Basilica of Notre Dame of Fourvière, built into a precipice almost directly above the Palace of Justice, where the trial was unfolding.

In the shadow of the basilica, considered the symbol of Catholic France, the question arose: In the period when Klaus Barbie was torturing even children in the cellars of his prisons and at Gestapo headquarters and deporting thousands to the death camps, what action was the church taking to prevent a human tragedy of unspeakable dimensions?

One would prefer to believe that the official church, in Rome and in France, worked to its greatest capacity to protect human lives and dignity, even in the most difficult and dangerous of circumstances. But from a variety of sources — research, court testimony, conversations with historians and citizens of Lyon, as well as current French press reports around the trial — a clearly disappointing picture emerges of church failure to speak and act forcefully and publicly at crucial moments when its opposition might have made a difference. Church action might have proved particularly effective in Lyon, the center of the French Resistance, one of the most important strategic areas in Western Europe as the war progressed, and the center of Catholicism in France.

In general, the French church followed the Vatican's position. In 1928, Pope Pius XI, in a decree of the Holy Office, condemned racism and anti-Semitism. And on September 6, 1938, the pope issued, before a group of Belgian pilgrims, the now famous and often quoted statement: "Anti-Semitism is inadmissible; we are all spiritually Semites."

Overall, however, signals from the Vatican were perceived as mixed. Pope Pius XII was elected in March 1939 and thereafter adopted a course of quiet diplomacy, which amounted to his now much-discussed policy of silence.

In France, where tens of thousands of Jewish refugees had fled during the 1930s to escape the mounting danger in the East, a sensitivity to anti-Semitism and its alarming proportions sharpened. In 1938, Cardinals Verdier of Paris and Gerlier of Lyon condemned Hitlerian racism and anti-Semitism and sent messages of solidarity to the heads of the Jewish communities in France. Individuals and small groups took action. But these efforts were isolated and few.

As the internment camps established by the French collaborationist Vichy government swelled with foreign Jews by late 1940 — including women and children kept there in the most abominable circumstances — and as the intentions of the Nazis toward all Jews, foreign as well as French, were made clear, the response of the French church was mainly one of



KATHLEEN McCAFFREY is a free-lance writer based in New York City.

indifference and embarrassment. "On the Catholic side, confusion was such that many people allowed themselves to be persuaded that responsibility for the disaster befalling the Jews belonged to the Jews themselves," notes François Delpech, a French Catholic historian. "The bishops of Grenoble and Chambéry, some priests, in particular in Bordeaux and Toulouse, and of course the high Catholic officials in the Vichy government publicly approved the measures taken against Jews."

In August 1940, following the German occupation of the northern zone, and in knowledge of the repressive Jewish statute soon to be passed by Vichy, defining as "Jewish" persons with a specified number of Jewish grandparents and eventually dismissing Jews from jobs and professional positions, the assembly of cardinals and archbishops met — and remained silent. In July 1941, after a section of the Interior Ministry for "Jewish Questions" had been put under the direction of Xavier Vallat, a conservative Catholic and outspoken anti-Semite, which in turn brought about the even harsher second Jewish statute, followed by a police section for "Jewish Problems," the ecclesiastical assembly again met and declared its purely religious nature. It proclaimed itself "detached from all party politics despite any appeal that may be addressed to us." At the same time, individual priests were speaking publicly against the increased repression of Jews and taking action.

In his actions and omissions, Pierre Gerlier, cardinal of Lyon during the war, represented the ambiguity of the church. As the archbishop-cardinal of Lyon also bears the title "Primate of the Gauls," Gerlier's early sympathy for the Vichy regime was particularly resonant. During the Barbie trial, Gerlier's official statement of November 18, 1940, "Pétain is France, and France is Pétain," was repeated often outside the courtroom, as well as in the French press.

Equally compromising was the case of Cardinal Gerlier's private secretary, Msgr. Charles Duquaire, who died this June 9, at the age of eighty.

Msgr. Duquaire worked for years to protect one of France's most vicious collaborators, (Paul Touvier), head of intelligence for the French Milice (the French equivalent of the Gestapo) in Lyon, condemned to death in 1946 and in 1947 for treason, and again sought in the 1980s under an international arrest warrant for crimes against humanity.

Touvier was implicated notably in the assassination in January 1944 of Victor Basch, former president of the League of the Rights of Man, and his wife. The assassinations had been ordered by the Gestapo.

After the liberation, Touvier was hidden in various monasteries in the Lyon area. Later, from 1950, when Msgr. Duquaire became Cardinal Gerlier's private secretary, through a period in Rome from 1967 to 1979, when he acted as private secretary to Gerlier's successor, Cardinal Villot, named secretary of state at the Vatican, Msgr. Duquaire sought the rehabilitation of Paul Touvier.

In contrast to the Duquaire case, Cardinal Gerlier is credited with certain steps, some highly courageous, that took place

after his pro-Pétain statement of 1940. In early 1942, he lent his name and support to help establish Amitié Chrétienne, an organization of Catholics and Protestants struggling to help Jews. Toward the end of the same year, he sent a letter to all the churches in his region, explaining the danger facing Jews and urging that protection be extended. Later he sheltered the Grand Rabbi of France from the Gestapo, and prevented the arrest and deportation of some fifty Jewish children. Alexandre Angeli, the prefect of Lyon and a Nazi collaborator, threatened Gerlier with arrest unless he handed over the children. He refused, and was not arrested.

During the trial of Klaus Barbie in Lyon, the issue of crimes against humanity crystallized around the arrest and deportation, ordered and supervised by Barbie, of forty-four Jewish children from a hiding place in the small farming village of Izieu, about forty-five minutes from Lyon. Early in the morning of April 6, 1944, the children were surprised at the breakfast table by German soldiers who ordered them into trucks just outside. The children arrived at the extermination camp of Auschwitz in mid-April and were sent immediately to the gas chamber. They ranged in age from three to seventeen. Two of the older boys were deported to Lithuania where they were shot.

It is from such a fate that Cardinal Gerlier saved his fifty children. And testimony at the trial revealed that other members of the clergy behaved similarly.

Sabina Zlatin, now eighty-four, a nurse dismissed from her job under the anti-Jewish laws, had devoted herself to saving children, often taking them from their mothers' arms in the internment camps. Working tirelessly, she found safety for many in private homes or in convents. And after a long search, she settled on the house in Izieu as a refuge for others.

In the period before Izieu, November 1942, as she testified at the trial, she had approached two priests for help, the Abbé Prévost and Father Chaillet, a distinguished Jesuit active in the Resistance. Without hesitation, they accepted. The Abbé Prévost told the superior of the convent welcoming the children that it was not necessary to make them attend Mass, as they were Jewish. "That went right to my heart," said Madame Zlatin.

But another witness told of church doors being closed, even to children, because they were Jewish. Leon Reifmann, who was present at Izieu the morning of the roundup and escaped by jumping out of a window, had earlier in 1942 contacted a certain Msgr. Costa de Beauregard for assistance. "But how do you expect us to mix Jewish children with non-Jewish children?" said the priest to Dr. Reifmann. He replied that in the dangerous circumstances this was perhaps not of the greatest importance. The monsignor replied that he would consider the proposal. Three days later, Dr. Reifmann received a card with a definitive "no."

The murder and the memory of the children of Izieu is of deep concern to the current successor of Cardinal Gerlier, the archbishop of Lyon, Albert Cardinal Decourtray, vice-

president of the French episcopate (and rumored to be its next president). Cardinal Decourtray is one of the church's foremost spokesmen on behalf of Jewish-Christian relations.

On the morning of June 2, Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel, who testified later in the day at the trial as a survivor of Auschwitz where he, too, had been deported as a boy in the spring of 1944 with his family, met privately with Cardinal Decourtray. The meeting was reportedly requested by Mr. Wiesel, who had been struck by several of the cardinal's statements. Some days earlier, the cardinal had evoked the memory of the children of Izieu. Speaking of the contemporary necessity to struggle against despair without hiding from reality, he had said: "I do not believe that an adult can achieve the state of true theological hope if he refuses to contemplate the forty-four children of Izieu, deported and burned — as were about a million others in the Nazi death camps."

Late in the afternoon of June 5, Klaus Barbie was brought into the courtroom to be identified by witnesses who had not done so earlier. By now his presence there was unimportant — even unwanted. What had been told in the preceding, unbelievable weeks had been told in the intimacy of a courtroom without Barbie.

The cracking of bones in repeated beatings; torture by near drowning in ice water; the pulling out of fingernails; sexual torture of young girls; all the anguish of interrogation in specially equipped rooms by laughing, often drunken SS.

The endless voyage in sealed cattle cars and the nightmare of the death camps: of nakedness and frostbite in winter, disease, filth, slow starvation; of babies grabbed from their mothers' arms by soldiers in black boots; of newborns drowned or thrown alive into the fire; of the separation of children and parents at the selection; of the lines leading to the gas chambers, the constantly smoking crematoria, the smell of burnt flesh everywhere.

All told without Barbie, and when he entered a shiver ran through the hall. An unwanted presence, something evil from which the entire assembly seemed to recoil together.

The witnesses accused him of tortures. "*Nichts zu sagen.*" Nothing to say, replied Barbie.

Pierre Truche, the general prosecutor, rose. "I would like," he began, "to speak of another Barbie, the Barbie of 1933, a young man of twenty years of age, who spoke movingly of the death of his father, and who — as a young Catholic — had even devoted himself to others, visiting prisons, full of respect then, it seems, for human dignity. How was this young man, this other Barbie, to become the hardened SS we know? What happened between 1933 and 1937, when he had become deeply impressed by the wave of national socialism? You should answer me, Klaus Barbie, for you know that my question is not only the key to this trial, but also the key to your life." With this, the audience froze. Would he recall his Catholic upbringing? His desire, at one time, to become a priest . . . ?

Barbie declined to reply.

SCREEN

SLOW & BURNING

'MY LIFE,' 'FLORETTE,' & 'WITCHES'

My *Life as a Dog* is an amusing Swedish coming-of-age story. It suffers slightly from an ironic sentimentality familiar from recent European films like *My Sweet Little Village*; indeed, some scenes of jolly bonhomie among rural folk could be xeroxes. But the sentiment of *My Life* is always kept in control by the acting of Anton Glanzelius as ten-year-old Ingemar — mischievous, imaginative, and resourceful in facing difficulties, especially his mother's tuberculosis. His proneness to creating disasters is as endearing as his wit in escaping their consequences.

My Life is flavored by some rustic scenes of Swedish village life in 1961, complete with colorful old wood barns and a grimy glassworks that provides the town's one industry. Ingemar must go to his uncle, who works there, when his mother becomes progressively more ill. He gets to meet a crew of country eccentrics: old Arvidsson, who has Ingemar read him lingerie catalogs; old Fransson, who works incessantly on his roof; and a grandfather who rigs up a play "spaceship" for the local children. The nostalgia here verges on the saccharine but evades it.

A slyer subtext involves Ingemar's search for a mother. In flashback he humors her through storytelling; in the country, we see him work out his sense of loss while maturing from childhood to adolescence. At times he pursues Berit, a buxom older blond who takes him along as a chaperone when she models a nude statue for the local sculptor (aptly, the work will be named "Ur-Mother"). He also plays with a tomboy caught in her own sexual conflict between wearing boxing gloves or floral dresses.

Weaving these threads, director Lasse Halstrom traces a network of psychological forces, weak only when he underplays the real suffering a child feels when he loses a parent. Ingemar's love of his dog is treated with similar strengths and defects. In both the child's fantasies and some hilarious canine imitations, however, the film's title is fully explained and nicely fulfilled.

Jean de Florette is the first of two films based on novels by the neorealist filmmaker, Marcel Pagnol. After retiring from cinema, Pagnol wrote the novel *L'eau des collines*, which director Claude Berri has transformed into this film and one to come, *Manon des Sources*. Together, they garnered eight Cesar nominations.

Jean de Florette is beautiful, rich, full, and flat. Berri has

The Holy See and The Holy City

By Walter Eytan

There was a problem of Jerusalem long before there was a problem of Palestine. Even when the Crusaders set out for the Holy Land, they saw the Holy City as their ultimate goal. Much later, in 1757, the Turkish Sultan promulgated an edict for the maintenance of religious peace in Jerusalem, where Greek and Latin (Catholic) priests were fighting over the holy places. This edict, reconfirmed in 1852, established the "status quo" which governs these sites today.

It was not out of concern for the holy places that John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, journeyed to Jerusalem earlier this year. He went in response to an invitation issued last fall by Shimon Peres, then Prime Minister, who had been alerted to the Cardinal's pro-Palestinian sympathies. It is not clear what Peres, and those in New York who advised him, had in mind. Did they believe that the Cardinal's views were personal, that if he saw the situation as it really was, he would sway the Vatican's traditional stand?

At about the time when Peres was calling on the Cardinal, the University of Notre Dame Press published *The Papacy and the Middle East* by George Emile Irani, a Lebanese Christian working at the University of Southern California. The book is subtitled "The Role of the Holy See in the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1962-1984." Its first section deals with "The Holy See and the Israeli-Palestinian Dispute," the second with "The Holy See, the Holy Places, and Jerusalem," the third with Lebanon.

The whole Jewish world—as well

as some non-Jews—stood aghast when Pope John Paul II received Yasser Arafat, in September 1982, at the Vatican. Irani reminds us that Arafat had been received earlier, in 1975, by Cardinal Paolo Bertoli, whom Pope Paul VI had sent on a special mission to Beirut. This first high-level meeting between a representative of the Holy See and the chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Irani points out, "amounted to a semi-official recognition by the Holy See of the Palestinian guerrilla movement."

Arafat was received also by the

Not even the Archbishop of New York could deviate significantly from the Vatican line regarding Jerusalem.

Pope's special emissary, Monsignor Mario Brini, in 1976. John Paul II, six years later, was only carrying to its logical conclusion the line of conduct marked out by Pope Paul VI. Given the Papacy's consistency, there was perhaps no cause for surprise.

Irani recalls that Terence Cardinal Cooke, then Archbishop of New York, on his return from a visit to Lebanon in 1980, reported that a solution to the strife there depended on "finding a homeland for the Palestinians."

Irani, whose sympathies tend toward the Palestinians, tells us that "the Holy See is not an impartial actor in the dispute." Even in 1974 the Holy See was "contributing actively to establishing the seeds of a Palestinian homeland." In the future, he

predicts, "the Holy See will... maintain and enhance its principal guidelines toward the Middle East... opposition to any unilateral control over Jerusalem, calling on both Israelis and Palestinians to recognize each other's rights, while favoring the Palestinians."

The Holy See, of course, is entitled to its policies and views. As defined by Irani, they hardly differ from those of most West-European countries—and are less radical than those advanced by many members of the United Nations. Would or could an Archbishop of New York deviate significantly from this line? However sincere his concern for good Catholic-Jewish relations in his archdiocese and in the United States, he remains bound, in the strictly hierarchical church regime, to adhere to papal policies and politics.

□

The Vatican has always been sensitive to the subject of the Holy Land, and Jerusalem in particular. At the end of World War I, it was uneasy that the Mandate for Palestine was to be entrusted to Great Britain, a Protestant power. It preferred Italy or France, though in fact Britain faithfully respected the status quo.

After World War II, when Palestine's future was to be decided in the UN, it pressed strongly for the internationalization of Jerusalem. The object was not only to enhance its own influence there, but to ensure that the city should not fall into the hands of the Jews. When Count Folke Bernadotte, in 1948, recommended that Jerusalem be incorporated in the domain of King Abdullah of Jordan,

Rome did not object. Four hundred years of Turkish rule had accustomed it to Muslim government. To this day, because of rivalry between the Christian churches, the keys of the Holy Sepulcher are held by a Muslim guardian.

□

Fouad Ajami, a professor at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies in Baltimore, wrote not long ago that the United States's best attitude toward the Arab-Israel conflict is "benign neglect." No diplomatic activism from outside could hope for the present, to move things forward. This sage insight applies doubly to Jerusalem. The Vatican, according to Irani, has abandoned as no longer realistic its call for the internationalization of Jerusalem, but insists that all temporal rule there be subject to outside supervision. It believes that a solution to the Jerusalem question would be a catalyst for unraveling the imbroglio of Israeli-Palestinian relations. Certainly the opposite is true: There is no hope of agreement on Jerusalem as long as the overall Arab-Israel conflict endures. Once all other problems are out of the way, everyone would be more relaxed in devising an acceptable future for Jerusalem.

It is pointless to press for the Holy See's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. There is, indeed, no such thing as recognizing a country's capital. Each state determines where its capital is to be and its government to reside, not subject to recognition by anyone else. When Kemal Pasha transferred Turkey's capital from Istanbul to Ankara in 1923, he did not call for recognition. The foreign embassies moved there speedily and without quibble. The same happened when Australia established its capital in Canberra and Brazil left Rio de Janeiro for Brasilia. Currently, Nigeria and the Ivory Coast are busy building new capital cities hundreds of miles from Lagos and Abidjan. They are not asking for recognition—and no one has murmured. Jerusalem has always been Israel's capital; there is no question of recognition.

When Israel, in 1953, transferred its Foreign Ministry to Jerusalem from

the outskirts of Tel Aviv, foreign states reacted with indignation. Arab countries pressured other governments not to allow their ambassadors to present their credentials in Jerusalem. But after a single incident between Israel and Italy was amicably settled, the presentation of credentials in Jerusalem became routine. Israel made it clear that it would refuse to accept any foreign ambassador who did not present his credentials in Jerusalem.

At that time and for a little while after, each foreign government instructed its diplomats according to its own determination. At one stage, heads of diplomatic missions in Israel could be divided into four groups: those who were allowed by their governments to visit both the President and the foreign minister in Jerusalem; those who could visit the President, but not the foreign minister; those who visited the foreign minister, but not the President; and those who were forbidden to visit either. After a while, all this confusion—more comic than tragic—sorted itself out. A third of a century has passed, good sense has prevailed, and there have been no impediments since.

There is no hurrying the Vatican, however; hence, Cardinal O'Connor's discomfiture when he had to claim that he called on the President of

Israel, not in his office but in his study. Everyone—even in Rome—knew that the room was the same.

Different reasons have been given for the Holy See's refusal to establish diplomatic relations with Israel. At times, it is that Rome's policy is not to maintain relations with states whose borders have not been definitively delineated. At others, it is concern for the fate of Christian minorities in the Muslim world or unreadiness to take the plunge as long as the Palestinian problem is unresolved. Over and above these, however, looms the Church's theological discomfort at the idea of a Jewish state, that "the Jews" are sovereign in the Holy Land.

There is nothing that Israel, or Jewish leaders anywhere, can do to allay this distress. It lies at the heart of Catholic tradition and belief. Whatever progress may have been made in the field of Jewish-Catholic understanding, this cannot be part of any Jewish agenda: It is strictly a matter for Catholics. Whether the Holy See establishes diplomatic relations with Israel or not, for as long as it may be necessary, Israel can live without them. It is sad that Cardinal O'Connor has been embarrassed, but there was a lesson in his misadventure for everyone—and a chance that it may have been learned.

Man in the middle: O'Connor (second from right) visiting Israel



Chris Sheridan/Catholic New York

Catholicism in Poland rooted in patriotism

Country views church
as a national symbol

Banki, Tarnobag

□ AN ANALYSIS 6/1/87

By Kay Withers *Atlanta*
Special to The Journal-Constitution

WARSAW, Poland — Krzysztof is a Catholic.

He and his wife have just one child and plan only one more.

He laughs at the church's teaching on birth control. "I decide things like that," he said, "not the priest."

He accepts, however, Catholicism in general.

The immaculate conception, the virgin birth, the assumption of the Virgin Mary? Krzysztof looks faintly alarmed and says, "Well, I wouldn't go as far as that."

Krzysztof, who did not want his full name used, is typical of many of the 95 percent of Poles whom church figures classify as Catholics.

Catholicism of Polish young people "on a mass scale" is not religious, according to the Rev. Wladyslaw Piwowarski, professor of the sociology of religion at the unique Catholic University of Lublin.

So what can Pope John Paul II, on his third visit to his homeland beginning Monday, tell a flock that invests his office with immense authority but rejects Catholicism's discipline and takes little heed of its message?

His one safe bet is to preach patriotism, for that is the essence of Polish Catholicism.

Ruled, as they see it, by an alien system, Poles perceive the Roman church as the symbol of their national identity. Many, indeed, see the symbol rather than the reality.

"In Poland, many people who have lost faith in the official interpretation of Polish history are now very anxious to believe the church has always been with the people," wrote historian Jerzy Jedlicki in the Jesuit monthly *Przegląd Powszechny*. "This is a reassuring cliché, but unfortunately it is wrong."

The church today is revered as the defender of Polish nationhood against Russia, Prussia and Austria, which from the 18th century to the 20th century carved up Poland. Many priests stood by the people, but the Polish bishops initially urged obedience to the partitioning powers. Only when its properties were confiscated and its rights curtailed did the church switch sides.

The church regained its property and privilege when Poland regained independent statehood after World War I. And it then forced Catholicism as a state religion on the 35 percent of citizens of the second republic who were not Catholic.

Any modern secular state would have demanded change. But the secular regime that came to Poland after World War II was communistic, both promoter of an industrialization uncongenial to the rural, land-owning, church-going Poles and a puppet, in the popular view, of Poland's traditional enemy, Russia, with its Byzantine culture so different from Poland's Latin heritage.

The church's stock rose automatically as national identity again was threatened. "The church and the pope show that we are different from them," a pensioner said here.

Persecuted initially, the post-war church learned to juggle the carrot of cooperation with the stick of conflict. Thanks largely to the political skill of the late primate Stefan Cardinal Wyszyński, it re-

built its organization as never before, and now has more than double the number of prewar priests, bishops and churches.

"The Roman Catholic Church has the largest organization of all the social bodies active in Poland, incomparably larger than the organizations of the [Communist] party," said Adam Lopatka, former communist minister for religious affairs and a possible future ambassador to the Holy See.

Its ideological influence paralleled its material growth, and eventually morality and patriotism became equated with religiosity — and vice versa.

"People perceived as communists misbehaved, misused their ideology to gain privilege," said Wojciech Lamentowicz, an atheist and former party member who lectures, often in churches, from a dissident point of view.

"People on the outside quickly drew the conclusion that atheist equals immoral and there is no morality without religion," Lamentowicz said.

The other equation — patriotism equals religion — was reinforced in 1978 when Polish Cardinal Karol Wojtyła was elected pope and the church, not the government, assuaged Poles' hunger for "big international success," as a telephone technician put it.

The church appropriated even those symbols of Polish patriotism to which it had only a dubious claim. It had clashed, for instance, with prewar leader Marshal Jozef Pilsudski and had even objected to his burial in Krakow's Wawel Cathedral. But last month, on the 52nd anniversary of his death, well-publicized memorial Masses were said throughout Poland.

"There is nothing left but the church," said Lamentowicz, author of an article on the church's role here. "People are looking for an umbrella. The church is a black umbrella, which is sad, but it is the only one, and it is needed, for the rain comes down all the time."

The umbrella served a particular need when the other recent compensatory institution, the labor union Solidarity, was banned under martial law in 1982, and the church became the only legal organization not controlled by the party.

The present primate, Cardinal Jozef Glemp, is the first to promote at least a modicum of democracy. And he is perceived as weak and "soft on communism" by an episcopate that seems at times nostalgic for the days of a state religion.

The pope probably will preach patriotism, and as the symbol par excellence of Polish national integrity, he will be applauded wildly by crowds who interpret patriotism according to their own prejudices.

John Paul may suggest, as the government clearly hopes, that patriotism be manifested in hard work for the fatherland, which will win him less applause from a people with a historical bent for conspiracy rather than a work ethic.

He probably will downplay his brand of sexual morality in a country where there is one abortion for every live birth, for Poles will go their own way whatever he says.

But the words that Lamentowicz calls for — the encouragement of free intellectual inquiry; the condemnation of conformism; the development of critical faculties; and the advocacy of the ideas that could build a modern secular state — these words the pope will not pronounce at all, though they might be congenial to individualistic Poles. They are as much anathema to the church as to the Communist Party.