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May 10, 1961
Dr. John Slawson, David Danzig, Simon Segal,
Zachariah Schuster, Judith Hershcoff, Milton Himmelfarb
Rabbi Marc M. Tanenbaum

RE: INTERVIEW WITH RABBI SOLOVEICHIK RE EUCUMENICAL COUNCIL

Yesterday afternoon I had a very useful and fascinating two-hour interview with Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveichik at the residence hall of Yeshiva University.

After a brief background statement on our interest in the Ecumenical Council, I posed to him the first approach that we had agreed to submit to the Jewish scholars; namely, that we invite them to prepare a "theological" statement on what the Jews would like to see come out of the Ecumenical Council. Dr. Soloveichik responded with a remarkable analysis of Christian-Jewish relations, concluding that he would be opposed to any "theological" presentation to the Vatican. Some of the reasons he gave:

(a) The Catholic Church is proud and would resent suggestions from Rabbis and Jewish scholars that call for a revision of the fundamentals of their faith;

(b) No matter how carefully one phrases this theological "bill of particulars" this will become a "theological dispute" and he would want no part of it;

(c) A "theological" statement, assuming one could obtain a concensus, will invariably touch on the complex organization of the nation Jewish religious agencies and he wishes to keep the rabbinic and synagogue agencies out of this;

(d) There are "theological traps" in such a presentation already suggested by the public statements on the "Christian-Jewish Continuum" issued by Cardinal Bea, Father Boyer, and others. J.E.S. said - I don't trust ourselves in this kind of encounter. None of us are as strong as our fathers were in their religious commitment. The line separating Christianity from Judaism has become increasingly thin, so much so that the distinctions that separate Christians and Jews are primarily abstractions. Should the Ecumenical Council seek to minimize these abstract distinctions by emphasizing the continuum between
Christianity and Judaism and that the New Testament is the progressive revelation of the Old, we will find that this will over the years become a peril for the many thousands of our people who are weak in their Jewishness.

J. B. S. said that there is no question that a new temper prevails in the Vatican and that the Ecumenical Council provides an opportunity for removing the basis of credal anti-Semitism. He underscored that the memorandum to be submitted to the Vatican should be on the level of the social and human relations consequences of the church's attitudes, teaching, and behavior toward Jews.

Significantly he reported that he had discussed these questions with Professor Harry Wolfson at Harvard University who agreed entirely with his views expressed above. J. B. S. asked for a copy of our draft memorandum (which I gave him), offered to read it during the next several days and to give us his reactions by next Tuesday, May 16th. He also volunteered to submit a copy of the memorandum to Prof. Wolfson and would ask him to respond in writing with specific recommendations.

J. B. S. urged that the memorandum be submitted through a prominent Catholic layman, not a cleric, in order to minimize the theological setting of our activity.

Of passing interest, he reported that he had told Dr. Nahum Goldmann that he preferred to work with The American Jewish Committee on this issue because he felt that the Committee would behave responsibly and would not exploit this issue for its own interests.
May 11, 1961

Dr. Joseph E. Soloveitchik
34 Hutchings Street
Brookline, Massachusetts

Dear Dr. Soloveitchik:

I am very grateful to you for the appointment you granted me on Tuesday, May 9th.

Your views were most helpful in guiding us in our approach to this complex problem.

I had hoped to be able to send you the enclosed draft memorandum before you left for Boston, but regrettably, on returning to the office, I found that these had not as yet been mimeographed. The second copy is for transmittal to Professor Harry Wolfson.

I would be grateful if you would send me your response to the memorandum during the early part of next week and would appreciate your indicating to Dr. Wolfson that we would welcome his early response. Please keep in mind that this is a tentative formulation and that we would welcome any observations, comments, and particularly recommendations (beginning on page 25) that you may be inclined to offer. It would be helpful if you could also communicate to Professor Wolfson that we would be interested similarly in his detailed response and also, particularly, in his recommendations.
Again with deepest appreciation and warmest good wishes.

Sincerely,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department

P. S. When you have finished reading the memorandum, would you and Professor Wolfson kindly return these to me?
June 8, 1961

CONFIDENTIAL

Dr. J. Mawson, B. Barsig, Z. Bluster, S. Segal, J. Kepsoop
Rabbi Marc H. Tannenbaum

RABBI SOLOVEITCHIK ON RABBI GOLDMAN

Rabbi Soloveitchik telephoned me yesterday about our Ecumenical Council memorandum, and during our conversation I told him about Dr. Goldman's reported meeting in progress at Geneva. While I indicated that I had not been able to check the facts, he responded immediately with serious concern. His comments on the J.F.A. carried a report that Goldman had set up a committee to draft a memorandum for the Vatican and that he appointed to this committee several Hebrew University professors. Rabbi Soloveitchik said that he met with Goldman and expressed to him his disapproval of his approach; Goldman denied outright the reports of his activities.

At any rate, Rabbi Soloveitchik said that he appreciated receiving the information and that he was going to communicate immediately with Chief Rabbi Enoch of Britain, Chief Rabbi Kaplan of France and others urging them not to become involved in any of Goldman's efforts in connection with the Ecumenical Council. He felt certain that they would share his thinking.

Also, yesterday I spoke with the Junior Executive of the Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox) and the Rabbinical Assembly of America (Conservative) and they both shared Rabbi Soloveitchik's reaction. Rabbi Klavan, the Rabbinical Council Executive Vice-President, said that he was going to ask for a meeting with Goldman and would reflect to him directly the distress of his group over Goldman's free-wheeling activities regarding the Ecumenical Council. Rabbi Klavan said that if Goldman refuses to contain himself and does not behave more responsibly that his group would condemn him publicly and seek to undermine his presumed authority to be a spokesman for the Jews. The Conservative group would be prepared to join with the R.C.A. in their condemnation of Goldman. In a very general way, they are both aware of what we are doing and approve of our efforts.

Rabbi Soloveitchik regretted that Harry Wolfson had not made available his recommendations on our memorandum this week, but indicated that he would have them with him by next Tuesday.
June 20, 1961
D. Danzig, S. Segal, Z. Shuster, G. Salomon, J. Horshoof
Rabbi Marc H. Tannenbaum

COMMENTS ON OUR ECUMENICAL COUNCIL MEMORANDUM FROM RABBI J. B. SOLOVEITCHIK, PROFESSOR HARRY WOLFSON, AND OTHERS

Following is a summary of the reactions to our Ecumenical Council memorandum given to me by Rabbi J. B. Soloveitchik (JBS), Professor Harry Wolfson (HW), Mr. Abraham Carmel (AC) formerly Father Kenneth Cox, and Rabbi Soloveitchik's son-in-law, Dr. A. Lichtenstein (AL), a Jewish scholar who teaches religious literature at Yeshiva University.

(These comments are based on a mimeographed version of the memorandum).

Paragraph 2 and 3 - MHT feels these two paragraphs are too colloquial and should be rephrased. (Page 1)

Page 1, Par. 2, line 6 - "the reality of spiritual things" substitute "spiritual order or spiritual values" (JBS)

Page 1, Par. 2, line 9 - "false religious badge" - (AC) suggests we "pinpoint atheistic communism" - "I think the Catholic Church is cynical about the Jewish attitude to communism".

Page 2, Par. 1, line 1 - JBS suggests "reaffirmation" instead of "reappraisal".

Page 2, Par. 1, line 5 - JBS suggests leaving out sentence beginning "we understand ... directives". Or substitute "we understand this Council will concern itself mainly with concrete issues and practical directives". MHT feels we ought to leave it out.

Paragraph 3, line 1 - The tensions between Catholics and Jews, instead of Jews and Catholics.

Paragraph 3 - JBS feels that "the moral motive, that is, the ethics of the Church attitude toward the Jews must be stated."

Paragraph 3, line 9 - "The spiritual heritage of the Bible" - JBS suggests, "a common spiritual heritage that affirms human dignity, etc., or that embraces all mankind," He suggests we eliminate "of the Bible" so that the statement will embrace Buddhists, Hindus, etc.

Page 3, Par. 2 - JBS says the Hitler tragedy deserves greater emphasis; he feels it is passed over too easily.

Page 3, Par. 2, Line 6 - JBS; omit Pope Pius the XII among them.

Page 3, Par. 3, Line 2 - substitute "countries" for "country", JBS refers to Poland, Lithuania, Latvia which, he says, participated in the murder of Jews as much as did the Germans.
Page 4, Para 3, Line 4 - JBS: "bring those violations which contradict" instead of "bring this violation of the precepts."
Page 4, Para 3, Line 5 - Omit "and to ask that it be stopped at once".
Page 5, Para 3, Line 3 - JBS suggests we omit "the gross historical and spiritual ties between them". On theological grounds he is opposed to our emphasizing the continuum between Judaism and Christianity which implies the "progressive revelation" theory.
Page 5, Line 1 - JBS raised the question about "words and rituals"; MHT earlier suggested substituting "teachings, prayers, and rituals".
Page 5, Para 1, Line 4 - JBS urges we omit phrase, "thus ... reintroduced"; he is opposed to our recognizing the good Friday practice of "Flectamus Genua" for the Jews.
Page 6 Professor HARRY WOLFSON feels the entire page 6 should be eliminated. He argues that the Vatican knows what Roman Catholics like Father Deegan and others are doing; that it is impudent for us to tell them what is going on in Church circles. HW says too, that the Vatican's possible response to this information may be that the Church, according to our own report, has done a good deal, therefore, what else do we want?
Page 6, Para 3 - HW feels that the Vatican disapproves of much of the studies by the Jewish scholars listed here, and that it would be advisable to omit reference to them. HW also does not think too much of this Jewish scholarship.
Page 6, after Para 3 - omit headline, "Destroying the Roots of Hate".
Page 7; Para 2: JBS: omit "no danger to doctrine"; JBS suggests leaving out first sentence, paragraph 3, "it is presumptuous to tell the Vatican that these revisions must not falsify their beliefs".
Page 11, after Para 1 - AC: "in the stations of the Cross, portrayed in the stained glass windows of churches around the world, very often the Jews are depicted in an ugly way, with cruel expressions, prefiguring the Strieker caricatures".
Page 15, Para 1, Line 2 - MHT suggests we omit sentence, "for example ... shocked by them".
Page 16, Para 3: AC: "it might be worth mentioning that the Sermon on the Mount is largely rabbinical in source and origin".
Page 21, item 4 - JBS: omit "continuity between old and new testaments". JBS objects on theological grounds, as before, on our emphasizing the continuity between Christianity and Judaism. Also, he says that we ask too much, in effect, ask for gratitude, by pressing the Church to proclaim its indebtedness to us.

JBS regards Section II "as the best sections of the memorandum; it is well documented, but the innuendoes are unnecessary". JBS suggests that we be careful not to cite the Gospel references, but only those paraphrases which contain negative statements about Jews. We cannot ask the Church to revise the Gospel to suit us.
Page 22, after Para 3 - omit headline, "Catholics vs Jewish American".
Page 24, after Para 3: AC: "His Holiness should discourage pulpit references which reflect upon the Jews as a body" (AC: "this is important").

Page 25, Para 4 JBS: omit entire paragraph on "continuity between the Jewish and Christian faiths."
February 23, 1962

Rabbi Dr. Joseph B. Soloveitchik
34 Hutchings Street
Brookline, Massachusetts

Dear Dr. Soloveitchik:

It was very good speaking with you again. We are very grateful for your continued interest and helpfulness in clarifying some of the issues that we have been discussing.

With regard to the question of the position of the American Jewish Committee in connection with attendance by Jews at the Ecumenical Council, I am herewith stating the official position taken by our agency at a meeting held here on December 29, 1961. The following paragraph is excerpted from the minutes of that meeting:

"V. JEWISH REPRESENTATION AT THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.

After discussion, it was AGREED that the American Jewish Committee would not request nor stimulate an invitation for a Jewish observer or representative to the Ecumenical Council. The hope was expressed that other Jewish groups would similarly not seek representation at what is in the last analysis an internal Christian doctrinal meeting. It was our opinion that we should consider an invitation only if other non-Christian groups were invited, such as, Moslems, Buddhists, Hindus (which presently appears highly unlikely). If Jewish representation is requested by the Vatican then it should be extended to religious rather than political agencies. (For example, World Council of Synagogues, World Union for Progressive Judaism, World Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, Synagogue Council of America)."

While I am more than happy to share the above with you, you can understand that this information in the wrong hands could be
used to embarrass us. Therefore, I would ask you not to make this quotation available to anyone, but you are certainly at liberty to quote the substance of this in your personal conversations with interested and responsible parties.

I will telephone you next Wednesday morning and will look forward to meeting with you some time that day.

Warmest best wishes.

Respectfully,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department
August 3, 1962

Dear Rabbi Janowicz,

I just received your letter with the enclosed draft of the letter you want me to sign.

In all candid, I do not like the contents of the letter. The letter is extremely apologetic, bordering on servility. We thank the Cardinal for a good intention which has never been implemented, and the expressions of gratitude are to profess as if we addressed ourselves to some great benefactor of ours. Basically, the elimination of inciting and prejudicial
sections from the Catholic liturgy is not our problem but theirs. Let no Church dignitary be led to believe that our destiny and future are dependent upon this good will. A more articulate and firmer approach would pay a higher dividend in all respects.

I do not know the reaction of Dr. Heschel and Dr. Frechhof to the letter. As far as I am concerned, I am not ready to sign it. However, I wish...
emphasize that my refusal to sign this letter should not be misconstrued. I can visualize a different sort of letter to that the Cardinal that I might sign.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

Joseph [Signature]

1961
Dear Rabbi Tannenbaum,

I acknowledge receipt of your letter. With the exception of the letter by the apostolic delegate to the Agudas Israel I was acquainted with the material you sent me.

I regret to say that I do not share the optimism of others concerning the sincerity of the Catholic dignitaries. All the statements they make lack an absolute assurance that no rent-to-own ventures are being contemplated. No Catholic representative in a responsible position has stated that the blank day proposal is out of consideration. The letters are very vague and equivocal and are typical of the time honored pattern of Vatican policy which has always been elusive and devious. I am afraid that it would border on almost criminal negligence if we were to put naively our trust in declarations which don't say
much and promise nothing. We might be unpleasantly presented with a fait accompli.

Therefore, I feel that it is essential to increase continued vigilance and to do whatever possible to prevent the disaster (it would indeed be great that) from occurring.

The question which we are confronted is one of method. I am inclined to agree with Cecil Roth that direct pleas and memoranda from the Jewish community to the Vatican on this subject of calendar reform would be not only futile but harmful. If the Vatican were inclined to endorse the blank day proposal out of sympathy for our cause, or the decision in the wrong direction, the only course of action left open and subtly and thus see that that seven day week be preserved. By this I mean that prominent Catholic laymen
should voice their concern to the members of the hierarchy that the calendar reform, if adopted, might further strain relations between the Catholic and non-Catholic communities. The Vatican must be given to understand that any change in the Calendar will encounter rough sailing in the U.S. and that many segments to the American community, both Jewish and non-Jewish, would oppose it with all their might. Realpolitik is not unknown to the hierarchy and practical difficulties will be appreciated by members.

You understand it very well that time, in this matter, is of the essence since the ideal solution would be to prevent the general planning committee from placing the blank day proposal on the Agenda. I believe that the American Jewish Committee can do more
than any other organization in this matter and I know that your
group will display diligence, intelligence, and tact.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

Joseph Soloveitchik

[Handwritten text]
August 10, 1962

Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik
P. O. Box 1033
Onset, Mass.

Dear Rabbi Soloveitchik:

Pursuant to our conversation over the telephone yesterday, I am sending you a rough draft of a proposed letter to Cardinal Bea.

In light of our information from Rome the affects of the Goldmann-Wardi episode have been "calamitous" and we are advised strongly that a letter of this kind signed by eminent Jewish leaders like yourself would be exceedingly helpful.

I have read the text of this letter over long distance telephone to Rabbi Necheil who is presently in New Hampshire. He generally agrees with its content and would be prepared to sign it. Of course, he wants to see the written text and I have just sent it to him. Our thought, too, was to invite Dr. Solomon Freehof to be the Reform signator.

I am pleased to know that you may be coming into New York City this coming Tuesday or Wednesday and will look forward to meeting with you. Should your plans change, I would be most grateful if you would telephone me collect on Monday and let me know your decision with regard to signing the enclosed letter. It is, of course, understood that this is to be a private communication, with no publicity, and both the contents and the signators to the letter are to be kept entirely confidential.
With warmest good wishes for a Shabbat Shalom,

Respectfully,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department

MHT:as
Enc.

CC: Rabbi A. Heschel
August 31, 1962

Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik
P. O. Box 1033
Onset, Massachusetts

Dear Rabbi Soloveitchik:

Pursuant to your suggestion, I spoke with Rabbi Haschel today with regard to your meeting at the beginning of this coming week. If you would be good enough to telephone Rabbi Haschel when you come into the city, he will be glad to meet with you at a mutually convenient time and place. His telephone number at his study is, Riverside 9-6000 and at his home, Academy 2-5833.

Rabbi Solomon E. Freehof of Pittsburgh is eager to meet with both of you, however, he just informed me that his schedule of commitments does not allow his coming into New York City during the coming week. He said that he would be in touch with us in regard to setting up a later date for the three of you.

With warmest good wishes, I am,

Respectfully,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department

P.S. Enclosed is a copy of the editorial from America magazine, "To Our Jewish Friends" and our reply, "To Our Catholic Friends".
August 1, 1962

Rabbi Dr. Joseph B. Soloveitchik
34 Hutchings Street
Roxbury, Mass.

Dear Dr. Soloveitchik:

Pursuant to your request and that of Dr. Heschel, I have asked our Paris office to make inquiries regarding the position of the Vatican in relation to the calendar reform proposal.

The enclosed reply, I believe, will bring you up to date.

After you have had a chance to read this material, I look forward to discussing with you what the next steps are to be.

Warmest best wishes,

Cordially yours,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department

MFT:as
Enc.
June 14, 1962

Rabbi Dr. Joseph B. Soloveitchik
34 Hutchings Street
Roxbury, Massachusetts

Dear Dr. Soloveitchik:

Enclosed please find another copy of the story that we talked about yesterday.

Should you cable to Dr. Warkaftig or to others and receive a reply, I would be grateful if you would keep me informed.

Would you please return to me the draft memorandum that I recently sent you.

Warmest regards.

Sincerely,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department
April 16, 1962

Rabbi Dr. Joseph E. Soloveitchik
34, Hutchings Street
Roxbury, Massachusetts

Dear Rabbi Soloveitchik:

It is always a pleasure to be in your company, and I am particularly grateful for the time that you were able to give me today on Erev Pesach.

Enclosed is the copy of the third memorandum that we discussed. It is sent to you as a confidential document. We are very grateful to you for offering so graciously to read it and to give us the benefit of your thinking and reactions. As you understand, it is now in a draft form.

I look forward to hearing from you at your early convenience. In the meantime, my warmest good wishes for a Chag Kasher V'Sameach.

Sincerely,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department

MHT:fb
Encl.
B.C. J.S. DD, SS, GH
February 23, 1962

Rabbi Dr. Joseph B. Soloveitchik
34 Hutchings Street
Brookline, Massachusetts

Dear Dr. Soloveitchik:

It was very good speaking with you again. We are very grateful for your continued interest and helpfulness in clarifying some of the issues that we have been discussing.

With regard to the question of the position of the American Jewish Committee in connection with attendance by Jews at the Ecumenical Council, I am herewith stating the official position taken by our agency at a meeting held here on December 29, 1961. The following paragraph is excerpted from the minutes of that meeting:

"V. JEWISH REPRESENTATION AT THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.

After discussion, it was AGREED that the American Jewish Committee would not request nor stimulate an invitation for a Jewish observer our representative to the Ecumenical Council. The hope was expressed that other Jewish groups would similarly not seek representation at what is in the last analysis an internal Christian doctrinal meeting. It was our opinion that we should consider an invitation only if other non-Christian groups were invited, such as, Moslems, Buddhists, Hindus (which presently appears highly unlikely). If Jewish representation is requested by the Vatican then it should be extended to religious rather than political agencies. (For example, World Council of Synagogues, World Union for Progressive Judaism, World Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, Synagogue Council of America)."

While I am more than happy to share the above with you, you can understand that this information in the wrong hands could be
used to embarrass us. Therefore, I would ask you not to make this quotation available to anyone, but you are certainly at liberty to quote the substance of this in your personal conversations with interested and responsible parties.

I will telephone you next Wednesday morning and will look forward to meeting with you some time that day.

Warmest best wishes,

Respectfully,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department
March 8, 1962

Rabbi Dr. Joseph B. Soloveitchik
34 Hutchings Street
Brookline, Mass.

Dear Rabbi Soloveitchik:

As you know, I tried to reach you several times by telephone this past Wednesday and regrettably missed you.

If you will be in New York City next Wednesday, I would very much welcome an opportunity to meet with you. If you would call my office Wednesday morning, or if that is difficult I will try to reach you, then perhaps we can arrange a mutually convenient hour that day.

Enclosed is the press release we issued in connection with the chair on human relations at Pro Deo University in Rome. I will be glad to discuss this with you when I see you.

Warm regards.

Cordially,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department

MNT: as
Encs
[start]

Original documents faded and/or illegible
Rabbi Soloveitchik Wants United Action Against Missionary Threat

by Steven Prystowsky

Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik addressed the students and faculty of the three Hebrew divisions in a special assembly convened to meet one of the most awe-inspiring challenges in the millennia of our history.

Rabbi Soloveitchik discussed and analyzed the evangelistic mission of the Christian Church in Israel and the Diaspora and the Ecumenical Council schema on anti-Semitism. This was the first time that Rabbi Soloveitchik has lectured before the student bodies on modern problems facing Jewry. He spoke at Nathan Lammport Auditorium on Thursday, November 21.

Eternal Problems

The problems facing Jewry today, stated Rabbi Soloveitchik, are the same that faced Jacob: 'How are you—and where are you going?' These two questions are now being asked by another Esau in a new guise—'the Church; both Protestant and Roman Catholic. They ask to whom do you belong as a spiritual personality and what is your ultimate goal and way of life? Who is after G-d?'

'Our answer now,' declared Rabbi Soloveitchik, 'are no different from those in the time of Jacob. Jacob and what he represented are highly relevant in 1963. 'We are committed to Jacob and the G-d of Israel.' This is our only answer... No compromise and no retreat... We follow our destiny; we defy even our own common sense. We have our commitment.'

Rabbi Soloveitchik's address returned to Zion because they reco

Rabbi J. B. Soloveitchik addresses students on missionaries in Israel. He was fervid and emotional, but he spoke clearly and lucidly. 'The Church suggests to us directly and indirectly a revision of our 2000 years old decision against Christianity and its founder. The Church has decided to approach us again. The aim of the Church is to convert the Jews in Israel to Christianity and they are approaching us with these [Esau's] questions.'

Church Dogma

'The evangelistic mission of the Church is unequivocally a part of its dogma. Both Protestants and Catholics believe that Jesus is the Son of God, that Jesus is the Messiah, that Jesus is the Son of Man. The Church is committed to the conversion of Judaism, to the conversion of Jewry, to the conversion of the entire Jewish people.'

Reconciliation

'The Church now feels that it is possible to explore a reconciliation.'

(Continued on page 3)
Rabbi Soloveitchik Concerned

(Continued from page 1)

Dr. Soloveitchik's speech was

addressed to the Jewish communi-

ty and was in part a statement of

the unique responsibility of Jews in

the world. He argued that Jews

ought to be the bearers of a unique

message, one that could bridge

the gap between Eastern and West-

ern cultures.

One important theme of his speak-

ing was the need for Jewish self-

knowledge and self-confidence. He

said that Jews must recognize their

special place in the world and

assert their unique identity.

Dr. Soloveitchik also spoke about

the importance of education and

study. He believed that through

study, Jews could understand their

past and present and prepare for

the future.

He concluded by emphasizing the

importance of maintaining a strong

Jewish identity in a world that

often tends to homogenize cultures.

Dr. Soloveitchik's message was a

call for Jews to be proud of their

heritage and to live up to their

potential to make a unique contri-

bution to the world.
[end]

Original documents faded and/or illegible
Office of the  
Executive Vice-President  

February 11, 1964

Dear Simon,

Stenographer's notebook jammed so for the present  
will resort to this way of acknowledging yours re Leger  
and McGuigan and to tell you I am both interested and  
anxious to comply.  

More at another time.

Regards,

s/ Saul
Dr. Simon Segal,
American Jewish Committee,
165 East 56th Street,
New York, 22,
N.Y., U.S.A.

Dear Simon,

Thank you for your letter of the 7th inst. after our telephone conversation. I am always amazed by your resilience. You sounded much brighter, more awake and more cheerful at 4.30 in the morning your time than I felt at 10.30 a.m. which it was here. A story from Dick Yaffe is on the way, and after I read it I will look at the position with regard to an editorial.

So far I have had no reaction whatever to the Soloveitchik story we published last Friday.

It will, I am afraid, not be possible for me to go over to Brussels, but we shall be represented by our Foreign News Editor, Geoffrey Paul, who is a nice fellow, and I hope you will meet him.

Is there any possibility at all of your coming over to London before or after Brussels?

Sincerely yours,

William

P.S. Thank you for your letter of the 6th inst. and for your help on David Kessler's visit to Latin-America. I have passed over the information to him.
New York

With the Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity still canvassing opinions on the final form of the schema dealing with relations between the church and the Jews, to be submitted to the Ecumenical Council when it resumes in the autumn, Jewish circles here closely concerned with Christian-Jewish relations have voiced amazement and dismay about last week's attack by Rabbi Dr. Joseph B. Soloveitchik on only one version of the proposed decree.

Neither Cardinal Bea, head of the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity, nor these Jewish groups are completely satisfied with the draft criticised by Rabbi Soloveitchik as “nothing more, nor less than evangelical propaganda.” There has been no suggestion, however, that the draft which drew his ire is the final one and it is known here that Cardinal Bea has received more than 1,000 suggestions in reply to his invitation to bishops to submit any amendments they might have by mid-February.

“Every step approved”

It is claimed by these Jewish circles that Rabbi Soloveitchik is fully aware of these circumstances, having been consulted on, and approved of, every step taken by American Jews to make their views known to the Vatican.

His criticisms about groups and individuals establishing contact with the church in Rome particularly caused raised eyebrows since prominent Orthodox leaders close to Rabbi Soloveitchik have been in contact with high Catholic officials—both here and in Rome—without apparently earning his displeasure until last week.
February 14, 1964

Rabbi Israel Klavan, Executive Vice-President
Rabbinical Council of America
34 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

Dear Israel:

I hope this finds you, your family, and the RCA well.

If a text of Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik's last address before the Rabbinical Council of America Mid-Winter Conference is available or a press release containing the substance of his remarks, I would be grateful to you if you could share this with me.

Warm regards.

Cordially,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department

MHT: fb
The American Jewish Committee

DATE: 2/7

TO: Rabbi Tanenbaum
FROM: Morton J. Gerber

For approval
For your information
Please handle
Please talk to me about this
Read and return
Reply for my signature
Returned as requested
Your comments, please

Remarks:

182-9-6
SOME ISRAELIS DOUBTFUL ABOUT JOHNSON PLAN

From our Correspondent

JERUSALEM

The Israeli Prime Minister, Mr. Eshkol, has expressed his 'Government's satisfaction' at the offer by President Johnson to co-operate in research on the use of the peace-keepers that could lead to the disposal of salt water and has promised Co-operation offer on water

Continued from page 1

Neither American nor Israeli sources will comment. But there is a belief that the top secret talks on the project are expected to take place in the Negev, will part in the matter.

Mr. Johnson spoke about the assurance of the possibility of obtaining the services of the Dimona plant in the Negev, but there have been previous discussions with the Dimona plant in the Negev, which are not part in the matter.

Neither American nor Israeli sources will comment. But there is a belief that the top secret talks on the project are expected to take place in the Negev, will part in the matter.

Israelis generally were flattered by President Johnson's announcement of co-operation between his country and Israel, its peaceful uses of atomic energy is expected to turn salt water into fresh water.

There had previously been reports of this from Dr. Elisha Weisman and Israel, but now the 1,700 diners in the Grand Ball Room of the Waldorf- Astoria were unknown to the Vatican. However, they had given the project some support.

Mr. Johnson went on:

This project poses a challenge to our scientific and technical skill, but the opportunities are so vast and the stakes are so high, it is difficult to remain on an equal footing with the mighty United States. This is, as it were, a new form of research, not confined to the U.S.A. and other countries, but on issues such as the Arab refugees and the cost of the project is expected to reach $1,000 million.

Unfortunately, some of the opposition to the project, which was already underway and unfortunately, some of the opposition to the project, which was already underway and unfortunately, some of the opposition to the project, which was already underway.

Riss for the crowd

Soloveitchik under fire

From our Correspondent

NEW YORK

With the Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity still canvassing opinions on the final form of the schema dealing with relations between the church and the Jews, to be submitted to the Ecumenical Council when it resumes in the autumn, Jewish circles here closely concerned with Christian-Jewish relations, have indeed, an amazement and dismay about last week's attack by Rabbi Dr. Joseph B. Soloveitchik on only one version of the proposed decree.

Another Cardinal, Bebe, head of the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity, nor these Jewish groups, are completely satisfied with the draft, criticised by Rabbi Soloveitchik as 'nothing more nor less than evangelical propaganda'. There has been no accurate estimate, however, that the draft which drew his ire is the final one and it is known here that Cardinal Bebe is waiting for suggestions in reply to his invitation to bishops to submit any amendments they might have by May 1st.

Every step approved

It is claimed by these Jewish circles that Rabbi Soloveitchik's comments on the draft have been consul ted on, and have been approved, every step taken by American Jews to make their wishes known to the drafting committee.

His criticism about groups and individuals establishing contact with the church in Rome particularly sensitive have since prominent Orthodoxy leaders close to Rabbi Soloveitchik have been in contact with High Catholic officials, and in Rome, and 1961, without apparently earning his displeasure until last week.

Ort expansion on three fronts

From a Correspondent

GENEVA

The 1964 budget of the World Orts, a Jewish educational and charitable organization, will amount to $3.685,000. The American Jewish Distribution Committee, which receives its funds from the Unitarian Jewish Appeal in America, is expected to provide $1,500,000 (about £696,400) of this sum.

More than fifty delegates from Britain, Israel, America, France, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, and Holland, are expected to take part in last week-end's convention in New York.
**Soloveitchik denounces Vatican schema**

**Vatican schema**

**FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT**

**New York**

Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik has attacked the Vatican document on the Jews as "nothing more or less than evangelical propaganda," and sharply criticised religious dialogues between Jews and the Church and attempts by Jews to bring about changes in the texts of Christian prayers and dogmas.

He was speaking at the midwinter conference of the Rabbinical Council of America.

**Shimon Peres in London**

Israel's Deputy Defence Minister, Mr. Shimon Peres (right) being greeted on his arrival at London Airport on Tuesday by Mr. E. Eyvon (left), Minister at the Israeli Embassy, and Colonel D. Hiram, the Military Attaché.

**Soloveitchik flops in New York**

**From our Correspondent**

**New York**

George Lincoln Rockwell's long-awaited and debated appearance at Hofstra University, Long Island, finally came about on Monday and was a resounding failure. After a rambunctious speech devoted mainly to his questionable army career, the self-styled American Nazi Fuehrer indicated his pleasure at the chance of "gaining converts to my philosophy." His audience, half of them Jews, did not share his pleasure. They just sat and yawned.

Rockwell courted arrest by appearing in New York City, because the police hold a warrant ordering his arrest on sight. However, they ignored his presence here.

**No Common Market accord**

**Continued from page 1**

again at the proposals for an agreement with Israel—whereas the previous negotiations had asked the Ministers to guide them on the form the agreement should take. Unless there is a formal meeting with the French Foreign Minister, there can be no agreement.

Earlier, the two Ministers met at a dinner party given by the Israeli Ambassador, Mr. Walter Elyan, which was also attended by the Israeli Deputy Minister of Defence, Mr. Shimon Peres, and senior French officials.

Agency for the Investigation of Anti Semitic Crimes in Dortmund. Hoechst, the West German Minister of the Interior, successively Peter after the arrest of the German police. The case was treated "top secret" and the author refused to disclose details of the arrest or the charges.

A spokesman of the Minister of the Interior said, however, that an examination a few years ago of the visit to Egypt and the taking off of the having an admittance of the Federal Department of Criminal Investigation had not yielded any new or additional evidence against Ewald Peters. Peters was a member of that department.

[See Editorial Comment]

**German expels three visit Egypt**

**From our Correspondent**

A group of 12 members of the German Federal Parliament received permission to inspect a new aircraft factory at Helwan, where they visited the Egyptian government and technicians working on the factory.

According to reports from the Germans, the factory was well-run. The German delegates were impressed by the efficiency of the workers who were given suitable jobs at home.

The German deputys received by President Mursi the week-end. They went to the challenge, cultural, and political relations with the Egyptian Government.

**Right-wing trials in South Africa**

**From our Correspondent**

Johannesburg

Several leaders of British South Africa at a rally on the early 50s, and at a Pacific Society. (League of Empire Loyalty: Oswald Mosley (Union Mso and Blyth Thompson African Society).
Would Deal with Gentile Communities on Religious Level
Orthodox Units Considering A New Agency—Soloveitchik

NEW YORK (P-O) — Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, the leader of the modern Orthodox Jewish community in the United States, has said that the major Orthodox organization is considering establishing a separate agency to deal with the non-Jewish communities on a religious level.

Rabbi Soloveitchik said that the setting up of such an agency is only in the “thinking-out-loud” stage. However, should it be established, it would virtually replace the Synagogue Council of America, which the Orthodox are concerned with the function of.

Rabbi Soloveitchik said that if this agency were formed, it would not mean that the Orthodox groups would pull out of any other representative body. However, if Orthodoxy’s policy-making decisions were channelled through this body, it would

RABBI J. B. SOLoveITCHik

Dissatisfied

make the Synagogue Council a paper organization for its member groups, the Rabbinical Council of America and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations.

Rabbi Soloveitchik, speaking in an exclusive interview from his home in Brookline, Mass., said that the Orthodox might also be making a joint statement regarding the currently pending schema on anti-Semitism before the Vatican Ecumenical Council at the RCA convention June 22. If some statement is forthcoming then, it is expected that it would call for the schema to be adopted in its present state and or that American Jewish groups refrain from urging its passage.

Jewish statements urging the passage of the schema are believed to be the major bone of contention that is causing the Orthodox to examine setting up a separate agency for its dealings with non-Jewish groups.

Rabbi Soloveitchik maintained that he is opposed to Judaism being presented within the frame of reference of Christianity at the Council. He said that the portion dealing with the Jews “should be taken out of the section on Christian unity” so that it would not seem as though Judaism is subservient to Christianity.

Rabbi Soloveitchik said that he had quarreled with the Church but that he is “critical of Jews who want to deal with the Church on unequal terms.” The document depicts Jews as paving the way for Christianity. It says we should enjoy equality because we were the forerunners of Christianity.

He said that Jews who urge the passage of the schema on these terms are insulting the dignity and independence of the Jewish religious community.

“We want to be recognized as a religious entity in our own right and prefer a document in human, not ecumenical, terms,” Rabbi Soloveitchik said. “Ecumenism is not a unity of mankind but the Church.”

Rabbi Soloveitchik said that four organizations — UOJC, RCA, the Religious Zionists of America and the National Council of Young Israel — are engaged in considering setting up a separate agency. He said these groups were also talking to Agudath Israel of America about possible participation.

Rabbi Soloveitchik said that if this agency were set up, it would be open to all Jewish groups. However, if other organizations wished to join, they’d have to agree that any statements dealing with non-Jewish bodies at the religious level must be channelled through the agency,” Rabbi Soloveitchik said.

He stated that the Orthodox were not acting out of vengeance or retribution over other matters, such as the cable the seven non-Orthodox organizations sent to Prime Minister Eshkol on the missionary question.

Eternal Body

Dead Man

presiding as judge, assailed this policy, however.

“We must not always look at the legal rules of the game,” he said. “We must look at what is morally right.”

“The case never should have reached the Conciliation Board,” he said. “The widow should have been refunded the money at once. The Circle may be growing old and it may be time to reappraise its values.”

Allen first offered to personally reimburse Mrs. Bogdanow, who had been left no insurance by her husband, but she refused on principle.

He then directed the Circle to refund the $8 which it did without comment.
June 15, 1964

John Slawson
Marc Tenenbaum

RABBI JOSEPH SOLOVEITCHIK—

Following is the information that I have received from generally reliable sources regarding the problem of Rabbi Soloveitchik’s attitude re the Jewish decree at the Vatican Council.

1. Rabbi Soloveitchik has given an interview to the Anglo-Jewish press in which he declared that he would ask the Orthodox Rabbinical Council of America at its convention on June 22 to adopt a resolution in which it would reject the Jewish decree in its present form.

2. He also said that the present decree is evangelical and that the only decree that Orthodox Jews would accept would be a human not an ecumenical document. He rejects Jews being seen as solely in terms of forerunners to Christianity.

3. It is of utmost importance that someone persuade Rabbi Soloveitchik of the following:

   a. He is making public statements based on outdated information. For example, contrary to his statement to the press, the Jewish decree is not part of the schema on Christian ecumenism; it is a separate declaration.

   b. The evangelical references have been removed owing to our intervention.

4. An attack on the declaration by Orthodox leaders at this time especially would be disastrous. It would play directly into the hands of the Arab States and anti-Semitic elements in the conservative Curia who are determined to forestall this declaration.

   It is of the greatest importance that during this very delicate stage nothing be done to undermine an already weakened situation with regard to the Jewish decree.
5. We have been informed that Dr. Nahum Goldmann has met with Rabbi Soloveitchik and has informed him that he supports completely the Rabbi's position. Dr. Goldmann is reported to have declared that he regards it as a mistake to be involved in any religious relationship with the Vatican. Goldmann also stated that he would prefer that the resolution be solely a condemnation of anti-Semitism phrased in human relations terms and that no reference to the relationship of Christianity to Judaism, etc.

Dr. Goldmann, who is known to have said such things to Rabbi Soloveitchik in the past while carrying out an exactly opposite program is apparently giving the Rabbi support in a way which can only reinforce his coming out publicly with a rejection of the proposed Vatican action.
Original documents faded and/or illegible
June 16, 1964

Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik
34 Hutchings Street
Roxbury, Massachusetts

Dear Rabbi Soloveitchik:

I hope this finds you and your family well.

A report in the National Jewish Post and Opinion dated June 5, 1964 reports several observations that you have made with regard to the Ecumenical Council and the Jewish question. On the assumption that the NJP has given an accurate account of what you said, I think it very important to call to your attention several new developments. I can only assume you are unaware of them, otherwise, you would not have expressed yourself publicly as you did.

1. The proposed declaration on the Catholic Church's attitude toward the Jews has been reformulated as an independent declaration. It will not be presented at the third session within the context of the schema on ecumenism. While it may be introduced by Cardinal Bea, it will be unrelated to the subject of Christian unity. The title of the latest version of this declaration is "The Attitude of the Catholic Church Toward the Jewish People and the Whole Human Family."

2. The Jewish declaration has been revised at least three times since the version that you had received and on which you based your comments about its evangelical intention.

As soon as the text of the decree was distributed, very strong representation was made. Toward the end of last year, we sent representatives to Rome who met with Cardinal Bea and with members of his Secretariat and explained that certain language in
the declaration was seen by Jews as evangelically motivated, and causing concern. To the best of our knowledge, the present version contains no references of this character. Nor does it deal with Jews and Judaism as preparatio evangelica, in the sense that you are quoted as saying.

I think it is important that you know what is happening on an up-to-date basis because your several recent public statements have led to misunderstanding, especially among Orthodox Rabbis, in many parts of the country where I have been visiting in recent months. The impression that is abroad is that the sole or primary content of this proposed decree is evangelical. Most Orthodox Rabbis who have discussed this with me in the major cities that I have visited had no idea that this document had anything to say about a vigorous condemnation of anti-Semitism or that it contained a strong appeal to all Catholic preachers, teachers, and to all who communicate the message of the Catholic Church that they are obligated not to teach about the Jews or Judaism in a way that would lead to injurious or hostile attitudes toward our people. These injunctions to Catholics are contained in the present text of the declaration even though references to the decidere issue are still unresolved.

We are especially disturbed about your comment to the National Jewish Post that you expect the forthcoming RCA Convention to call for the schema not to be passed in its present state. If the language and content of the draft declaration have been changed according to our understanding, it should be welcomed, I would think, with appropriate dignity and good will. An attack on it by Orthodox leaders would play directly into the hands of the Arab states and anti-Semitic elements in the conservative Curia who are determined to forestall this declaration. The enemies of our people who wish to keep alive the sources of anti-Semitism in Catholic teaching will seize on any pretext to defeat this measure.

Please understand that I would not wish to impose uniformity of opinion, nor suggest that debate on this matter be avoided in the Jewish community. On the contrary, we would greatly welcome, as we have in the past, genuine discussion and analysis of all sides of this issue.

I hope you will find an opportunity very shortly to clarify at least the facts of this situation to the Orthodox community which so widely and justifiably respects your opinions andship.

Frankly, I very much regret that for one reason or another which is not altogether clear to me, that our contact has been
broken. I would welcome a chance at an early date to meet with you and to share with you as I have in the past whatever information we have about the latest developments in Rome and with the hierarchy in this country in order that you may have the benefit of accurate and up-to-date information upon which you could make your interpretations to the public.

With warmest good wishes,

Respectfully yours,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, Director
Interreligious Affairs Department

MFT: fb
Encl.
[end]

Original documents faded and/or illegible
June 19, 1964

John S Lawson
Marc Tanenbaum

I have just talked with Jack Weiler who told me that he discussed the Soloveitchik matter with Rabbi Belkin. 'There will be no statement by Rabbi Soloveitchik at the Rabbinical Council of America Convention which begins on June 22', Weiler said with certainty. Soloveitchik sent a message through one of his disciples to me this morning that he would like to meet with me. I will try to get over to the Rabbinical Council Convention one day next week during which they will be discussing Christian-Jewish relations.

At a meeting yesterday with Rabbi Norman Lamm, Leo Jung's assistant I became aware of how seriously the Orthodox group has reacted to AJC's meeting with the Pope on Saturday. Attached is an article from the latest issue of the Rabbinical Council's official journal. I think we need to talk about this before it gets to be a wider problem in the Jewish community.

MHT:fb
Encl.
CONFIDENTIAL

DRAFT

Dr. Julius Mark, President
Synagogue Council of America
1 East 65 Street
New York, New York

Dear Dr. Mark:

I am very pleased to learn from Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum that you have accepted our invitation to meet with Cardinal Bea at a confidential, unpublicized meeting to be held on Sunday, March 31st, 5:00 P.M. at the building of the American Jewish Committee.

As you know, the purpose of this meeting is to discuss with Cardinal Bea a number of the basic issues of Jewish concern that the Second Vatican Council is expected to deal with when it reconvenes on September 8th. Among the questions we hope to be able to explore with Cardinal Bea, are those outlined in the attached proposed agenda. I should be grateful if you would study this agenda and let me have the benefit of your thinking as to whether it should be modified or enlarged. We will have approximately one and a half hours for our conversation with Cardinal Bea and it will therefore be prudent to confine our discussion to the key issues listed in the agenda. For your personal information, these questions are among the major propositions submitted to Cardinal Bea in the two documents presented to him during 1961 and 1962 by the American Jewish Committee, as well as in my own memorandum to him submitted last year.

In order to assure the maximum effectiveness and the representative nature of our conversation with Cardinal Bea, I have consulted with Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik
and they join with me in inviting you and several others who will be involved in this consultation to meet together on Sunday afternoon March 31st at 3:00 P.M. at the American Jewish Committee building. The purpose of this preliminary consultation will be to clarify for ourselves our approach to this discussion. It may also be advisable to invite AJC officials to brief us on the latest situation at the Vatican insofar as it will affect our discussion with Cardinal Bea.

Sincerely,

Abraham J. Heschel

AJH:fb
February 4, 1963

David Danzig
Marc Tanenbaum

SUGGESTED LIST OF JEWISH PARTICIPANTS AT APRIL 1st AGAPE
FOR CARDINAL BERGIS

Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel, Jewish Theological Seminary of America
Louis Finkelstein, Yeshiva University
Joseph B. Soloveitchik, Yeshiva University
Samuel Belkin, World Union of Progressive Judaism
Solomon B. Freeh, Pres., World Union of Progressive Judaism
Nelson Glueck, Pres., HUC-JIR
Dr. Samuel Sandmel, HUC-JIR
Dr. Salo Baron
Prof. Harry Wolfson
Rabbi Julius Mark, Pres., Synagogue Council of America
Theodore Friedman, Pres., Rabbinical Assembly
Abraham Avrutick, Pres., Rabbinical Council of America
Albert Minda, Pres., Central Conference of American Rabbis
Mr. Moses Feuerstein, Pres., Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations
Mr. George Meisler, Pres., United Synagogue of America
Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, Pres., Union of American Hebrew Cong.
Bernard L. Bamberger, Reform leader
Dr. Will Herberg, Drew University
Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg
Joseph Glueckstein, Orthodox leader
Mr. Max Stern, Orthodox lay leader
Rabbi Leo Jung
Oscar Fasman, Pres., Hebrew Theological College, Chicago
Simon Greenberg, Pres., Union of Judaism, Los Angeles
Dr. Abraham Neumann, Pres., Dropsie College
Dr. Eric Werner, HUC-JIR

Dave, if more names are needed, I will be glad to pull them together.
March 11, 1963
John Clavson, David Janzig, Zach Shuster, Simon Segal
Marc H. Taconbeam

MARCH 31st MEETING WITH CARDINAL SHEA

This is an interim summary of where we stand in relation to the Jewish scholars who will participate in the March 31 meeting that we are arranging with Cardinal Shea:

Among those who have thus far accepted to attend and who have also approved the agenda are:

Rabbi Heschel (who will serve as chairman)
Rabbi Louis Finkelstein
Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik

Rabbi Freedhof will not be able to attend. We are presently discussing the possibility of having Dr. Nelson Glueck or Rabbi Allan Mindel, President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. We are also discussing the possibility of inviting the other two presidents of the Conservative and Orthodox rabbinical associations, namely, Rabbi Theodore Freedman, President of the Conservative, and Rabbi Abe Avrutich, President of the Rabbinical Council.

Attached is a copy of a letter from Cardinal Shea received earlier this week by Rabbi Heschel with regard to the March 31st meeting. I think you will agree that this is a warm and friendly statement.

cc: J. Hersheopf
R. Friedman
COPY OF LETTER FROM CARDINAL BEA

Via Aurelia 527
Roma
March 4, 1963

Professor Abraham J. Heschel
3080 Broadway (corner 123rd Street)
New York 27, New York
U.S.A.

Dear Professor Heschel:

Please accept my sincere thanks for your letter of February 6 and for kindly sending me volume I of your work on Main Currents of Jewish Theology in the Formative Era of Rabbinical Judaism. I am delighted that you found it possible to complete this fine work, and hope that Volume II will appear soon. These studies in history, and in the history of religion, are indeed of the greatest importance if we are to understand correctly the origin and development of great many ideas.

I hope we will meet in the near future in New York; I have been told that you will preside over our private conference there and submit the questions. I will gladly give you any information I can, but I would like to ask at this early date that this conference not be publicized; at the present moment that could only be harmful.

So much for today; I must be brief since at the moment we are overloaded with meetings in preparation of the second period of the Council. Again, please accept my sincere thanks and permit me to wish you God's abundant blessing for your personal well-being and for your work.

Yours, with sincere regards,

(Signed): Aug. Card. Bea
Sehr verehrter Herr Professor!


Ich hoffe, daß wir uns demnächst in New York sehen werden; man hat mir gesagt, daß Sie dort unsere private Zusammenkunft präsidieren und die Fragen vorlegen werden. Röch gerne würde ich Ihnen alle Aufschluß geben, die ich geben kann, bitte aber schon jetzt, daß keine Publizität über diese Zusammenkunft gemacht werden; im gegenwärtigen Augenblick könnte eine solche nur schaden.

Soviel für heute in aller Kürze; da wir augenblicklich für die Vorbereitung der 2. Konzilsperiode mit Sitzungen geradezu überladen sind. Indem ich Ihnen nochmals aufrichtigst danke und Gottess reichsten Segen wünsche für Ihr persönliches Wohlergehen und für Ihre Arbeiten, bin ich, mit vorzüglicher Hochschätzung

Ihr sehr ergebener

ANGELAUDEL
March 4, 1963

Professor Abraham J. Heschel
3080 Broadway (corner 122nd Street)
New York 27, N.Y.
U.S.A.

Dear Professor Heschel:

Please accept my sincere thanks for your letter of February 8 and for kindly sending me volume I of your work on Main Currents of Jewish Theology in the Formative Era of Rabbinical Judaism. I am delighted that you found it possible to complete this fine work, and hope that volume II will appear soon. These studies in history, and in the history of religion, are of the greatest importance if we are to understand correctly the origin and development of a great many ideas.

I hope we will meet in the near future in New York; I have been told that you will preside over our private conference there and submit the questions. I will gladly give you any information I can, but I would like to ask at this early date that this conference not be publicized; at the present moment that could only be harmful.
So much for today; I must be brief since at the moment we are overloaded with meetings in preparation of the second period of the Council. Again, please accept my sincere thanks and permit me to wish you God's abundant blessing for your personal well-being and for your work.

Yours, with sincere regards,

(Signed:) + Aug. Card. Bea