

VT-883 Transcription

Various news casts regarding prayer in schools, hostage crisis,  
terrorism, etc. 1985-1989.

DAN RATHER: Today's moment of silence ruling by the Supreme Court generated anything but silence among some of the nation's religious leaders, who are on opposite sides of this issue. By and large, today's ruling changed no sides or minds.

JERRY FALWELL: It's going to awaken Americans who believe in free speech and First Amendment rights for religious Americans. It's going to awaken us out of our apathy. We have not been pressing hard enough for a constitutional amendment.

MARC TANENBAUM: I think this is an important decision, against the background of enormous pressure to try to undermine the separation principle by ultraconservative groups in American society. It puts them on notice that the First Amendment, the separation of church and state, is still the basic foundation of this constitutional democracy.

JOHN KROL: There's no such thing as neutrality. You're either for or against. [00:01:00] And to quarantine the school and saying that, "Freedom of religion applies

everywhere but here," in my mind, my conviction, is unconstitutional.

RATHER: Some reactions after today's Supreme Court ruling on moments of silence in the public schools.

(break in video file)

*(Midday with Bill Boggs)*

REPORTER: -- came down hard on Berri and called the partial release "piecemeal exploitation of the hijack victims," and "uncivilized behavior in its worst form." And the State Department made it clear that Berri will be held responsible if the hostages are harmed. In the meantime, the hostages are tucked away somewhere in the battered city of Beirut, split up in groups, perhaps, to make a military rescue all but impossible. The plane they were originally taken in is still on the ground and, as far as we know, the cockpit crew is still on it, the terrorists inside, apparently feeling so confident and invulnerable that one of them came out, laid down his gun, washed himself, took off his shoes, and prayed.

BILL BOGGS: OK. Our other guests on today's program include Barry Rosen and Moorhead Kennedy, former Iranian hostages, retired Rear Admiral David Martineau, and Frank Bolz. Frank

Bolz is a former chief negotiator for the City of New York Police Department. Frank, it's good to have you with us.

FRANK BOLZ: Thank you.

BOGGS: I'm sorry that we have to be talking about this today. But what do you think should be done in this situation?

BOLZ: I think back to basics, gathering intelligence and attempting to find out who we can actually communicate -- who's in charge.

BOGGS: Also with us on today's program is Dr. Paul Jabber. He is a Middle East expert. Dr. Jabber, what do you think should be done in this situation?

PAUL JABBER: Well, I certainly think we should not try to use force in [00:02:00] resolving crisis. We should try to obtain the safe release of the hostages in exchange for the 700 Shiites in Israel. And we should attempt, after this crisis is over, to reestablish the credibility of our antiterrorist stance.

BOGGS: Thank you, Dr. Jabber. Also with us on today's program -- there you see him -- Middle East expert Leon Charney. Leon, what do you think should be done in this situation today?

LEON CHARNEY: I think President Reagan should strike a deal very quickly with Shimon Peres. I think they should cut out the cosmetics between them. I think the Israelis are ready

to move the 700 Shiites if they can get some type of signal from President Reagan. And I think it should be worked out very quickly.

BOGGS: All right. Thank you, Leon. And also on today's program is -- there he is -- Charles Wiley, National Committee for Responsible Patriotism. What should we do in this situation, Charles?

CHARLES WILEY: Stand tough, do not give them anything. If you reward the cold-blooded murder of one American and the torturing of 50 or 60 [00:03:00] or 100 more, then you are inviting it to happen over and over again.

BOGGS: All right. That's our subject on today's program. And we have the added benefit of being live, so you can call in with opinions and comments, 570-1199. We'll start out with Frank Bolz. Please stay with us. (program ID [00:03:15]-[00:03:33]) Frank A. Bolz, Junior, is our first guest. He was for 10 years a Chief Hostage Negotiator for the New York City Police Department. And he had a negotiating program which he helped found, actually, there. He's negotiated more than 285 incidents without the loss of one life of either a police officer or a hostage. Frank, before we get into this, believe it or not, fast-breaking news indicates that a bomb has exploded, I guess about three o'clock in the afternoon their time, in the Frankfurt

Airport [00:04:00], Frankfurt, Germany. What do we know about this?

BOLZ: Well, what we know so far is that three people have been killed, including a child, and 20-some-odd injure--

BOGGS: Has anyone taken responsibility for this?

BOLZ: No one has claimed responsibility. But I understand it was near an Olympic Airlines counter. And that's the Greek airlines. And so there may be a connection. Or it may just be accidental that it happened to be in that particular location.

BOGGS: OK. You're an expert on negotiating hostage crisis situations like this. President Reagan says in a way we're, in fact, at war with these terrorists. We... Are we interested in negotiating, when the president of the United States says we're at war?

BOLZ: Well, actually, when we say *negotiating*, when we say I'm a negotiator, I'm a crisis management consultant. And we deal in all kinds of crises.

BOGGS: But what I'm saying is, ultimately, when you're in that crisis, you're asking this for that. You're trying to ge-- you're trying to get everybody out alive. Correct?

BOLZ: Absolutely. And I think, in the short-term, that's what the president's looking to do, to get everyone out alive. But in the long-term, he wants to ensure [00:05:00]

that every American who travels anywhere in the world is safe, that we have a stature and a stance throughout the world.

BOGGS: What should our primary goal be?

BOLZ: I think the primary goal as been stated by the president, to get these people out alive. How it's done... We have to recognize that we're dealing with politics. We're dealing with the politics of Lebanon. We're dealing with the politics of Israel. We're dealing with the politics of the United States. And as the world turns, that's what makes the world go round, politics. And each one is concerned about their own stature among their own constituency, whether it be in Lebanon, whether Mr. Berri is worried about his position, President Reagan, and also Shimon Peres. He is also worried.

BOGGS: What are secondary demands? You frequently talk about this.

BOLZ: A secondary, it's an unstated demand or it's an unstated desire. Basically, that secondary desire is to get publicity, to get attention to their cause. They may state that they want 700 people released but basically the whole principal, if we go back to the basic principles [00:06:00] of hostage negotiation, of hostage-taking, is the hostage has no value to the perpetrator except for the audience it

can create. Those hostages, those people on board the airplane, notwithstanding the one passenger who offered \$3 million, they cannot accomplish anything. They're only used as leverage to get the other people, the authorities to accomplish things.

BOGGS: Former secretary of state Henry Kissinger says, "We should make no concessions. We should refuse to negotiate. We should extract a price from the Shiites that they are unwilling to pay." How do you -- how do you respond to that line of logic?

BOLZ: Well, from an international standpoint, I think it's an appropriate line of logic, in that we cannot yield. We... But we have to have various options.

BOGGS: How can we say that we cannot yield-- and negotiate at the same time?

BOLZ: Then...

BOGGS: There are people who say we should not negotiate with terrorists, that these people are hostages, they're pawns of history, we're at war, war is brutal, innocent people get killed in [a?] war.

BOLZ: Now, that comes down to the semantics of politicians. [00:07:00] What is negotiating? What is just talking? What is inquiring? What is making a formal inquiry or going...? See that's, I think, where people get all confused.

Negotiating means that they open up and they say, "This is a negotiation." But talking around the other side, that's not a negotiation. That's just talking. And I think it's perfectly legitimate in (gestures quotation marks) international diplomatic procedures to talk around left field.

BOGGS: If, 24, 48 hours from now, the 700-odd Shiites are freed, the hostages are flying back to the United States, does it not then give the general appearance that, because they took innocent American people, murdered one, beat up others, they got what they wanted?

BOLZ: That's what it'll appear. It will appear that way.  
So...

BOGGS: No, that's, in fact, true, is it not?

BOLZ: It, again, will appear that way. But if Israel is the one who releases them or if we do nothing to handle it, we can still, in the -- in the next stage, [00:08:00] say that we did not negotiate. Remember, Israel, going back into the '60s, in the mid-'60s, they used to negotiate with hostage-takers, they used to negotiate with hijackers. And it was only in '68, after the Dawson Field incident, that they changes and became very, very hard-line. And they did that because they recognized that one hijacking just brought upon another and another and another.



BOGGS: Frank, as you look at the situation and go back all the way to the beginning, what happened at Athens... These were innocent people, businessmen, tourists, families, and so forth, traveling from one place to another. Do you think it was a setup at the Athens airport, in order to get hand grenades, in order to get guns through those so-called x-ray machines?

BOLZ: Well, I wouldn't rule it out as a possibility. But so often the security procedures are so lax, are so horrendous in the way they work. And then sometimes you'll get an individual breach right here in the United States. I've gone through magnetometers with shield and keys and pens.

BOGGS: And you can get through.

BOLZ: And I walked right through.

BOGGS: One last question. I'll ask this a few times on today's program. And we should ask this of [00:09:00] ourselves. What have we learned -- or what did we learn from the Iranian hostage crisis that needs to be applied now, if anything?

BOLZ: I think, well, we learned that we have to, as a -- as a country, give backing to our president. The president also must take a stance for every American. And I think walking strong and carrying a -- carrying a big stick and talking softly is more important.

BOGGS: All right. Frank A. Bolz, I think you, very much.

BOLZ: Thank...

BOGGS: Good to have you with us. Let me move over to our next guest. You met him briefly at the beginning of the show. This is Dr. Paul Jabber. He is a Middle East expert, former Assistant Professor of International Affairs for the University of California in Los Angeles, and a consultant to several government agencies, author of many books and articles on the Middle East. Dr. Jabber, thank you, very much, for being with us today.

JABBER: Thank you.

BOGGS: What should our primary goal be, right now?

JABBER: Well, as I said, I believe that we need to secure the safe release of the Americans held hostage. And we should do so [00:10:00] in a manner that does not prove detrimental to our broader national interests, in Lebanon, in the larger Middle East arena.

BOGGS: What does that mean? How can we really do that without appearing to be weak?

JABBER: Well, that, of course, is the problem when you're dealing with an immediate situation, where so many of your own nationals have their lives at stake. It puts very severe constraints on what a political leader, particularly in a democratic country, can do. And we have seen President

Reagan, now, facing the same dilemma that President Carter faced several years ago in the Iran hostage situation.

BOGGS: Because you are an expert in this part of the world, let's take a moment or two and try to identify the players in this situation. President Reagan last night, in his press conference, used such term as the "unidentified people" -- the who. We don't know who we're really dealing with. In your view, why don't know who we're dealing with? [00:11:00] The United States, we have intelligence. They... After the 400 Marines were killed, there was no retaliation. We didn't know who did it. Why don't we know?

JABBER: Bill, we know who did it. And I believe the US government knows who did it, and not just who the immediate perpetrators were... In fact, these are not terribly important. They know who is behind them.

BOGGS: Well, why don't we have...?

JABBER: Well, the problem

BOGGS: Is...?

JABBER: -- is that, once you recognize that, in a -- in a formal, public way, then you have to do something about it.

BOGGS: All right. First, will you please give us your insight into whom you would say is responsible for this and then what you think should be done about it?

JABBER: It is very important to place this incident within its broader political context. This is not something that happened haphazardly. We are not here dealing with a couple of terrorists who one good day woke up and decided, you know, "We're going to vent our frustrations at the United States --"

BOGGS: This is carefully planned.

JABBER: "-- by going ahead and doing this." It was carefully planned [00:12:00], carefully orchestrated, timed -- logistics, preparations. And we have seen, in the unfolding of the affair, that it has been carefully put together.

BOGGS: By...?

JABBER: Now what is the purpose of this? I think that... And, of course, we're working on limited information. But as time goes by, as events unfold, it has become I think, in the last couple of days, fairly evident that what we're seeing here is very much a repeat of the hostage situation in Iran five years ago, when they took over our embassy there. The purpose of this operation, in its Lebanese political context, is to undermine the credibility, the legitimacy, and the political power of the moderate leadership of the Shiite community in Lebanon.

BOGGS: How is Syria involved in this?

JABBER: How Syria and Iran are involved, in the specifics, of course, is not something that you and I here [00:13:00] can speculate intelligently on. We don't have enough information. However, in the broader, more generic sense, the organizations that belong to the extreme end of the spectrum in Shia politics operate from areas under Syrian Army control. And they certainly -- if they were not operating from the areas that the Syrians control, Amal, the mainstream Shiite organization, that Berri leads, would have long time ago put a stop to their activities. Because the key to this whole issue is the struggle between this mainstream organization, Amal, and the other groups, some of which are offshoots, that -- they're splinters, that separated themselves from Amal several years ago because Amal was not fundamentalist enough [00:14:00], was not ideologically committed to principals of, you know, Islamic fundamentalism, of militant anti-Americanism. And these groups are now trying, at a time when the Israelis are leaving Lebanon, at a time when the Lebanese political system has to be put together again -- now the time has come to struggle for the hearts and minds of the Shiites, the largest single community in Lebanon.

BOGGS: Wha--? Just respond to this very quickly. If the president were to make the decision that these people who

are held hostage are unfortunate pawns of history and must be sacrificed for a larger goal, to protect other American citizens in the future, could we attack, clearly an enemy and destroy that enemy?

JABBER: I do not think so.

BOGGS: OK, fine. We have a viewer on the line right now.

Let's go to the phones. This is Bill Boggs with you on a live *Midday* program. Hello?

MELANIE: Hello. Good afternoon. This is Melanie. I'm calling from Tenafly, New Jersey.

BOGGS: Yes, Melanie.

MELANIE: [00:15:00] I'd like to ask Mr. Bolz or Dr. Jabber their opinion on the media coverage that the hostage crisis has got. Do they feel that this has been detrimental in any way or helpful?

BOGGS: All right. Let's go to Frank Bolz first. Every hostage wants good publicity. Is it...?

BOLZ: That's actually part of the basic reason for taking hostages, is to get publicity. And I think one of the keys is media must report the incident but they should not become part of it. We don't want to make it any bigger than what it is. However, on the other hand, some people have said we should have a blackout. I cannot subscribe to a blackout, because what would happen then is the terrorists

or the perpetrators would escalate to such a horrendous situation --

BOGGS: To finally --

BOLZ: -- that it would have to be televised.

BOGGS: -- turn the lights back on. All right. I'm glad you answered that. And I thank you for the call. Now we have a live phone call right now to Ambassador Clovis Maksoud, who is the permanent observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations. Ambassador, are you on the line?

CLOVIS MAKSOUUD: Yes, I am.

BOGGS: Thank you very much for joining us. And let me ask you this, to begin with. Whom should we hold responsible for this action?

MAKSOUUD: [00:16:00] Well, first of all, I think that the thrust of this hijacking can be pinpoint-- the responsibility for the hijacking are the hijackers themselves. Now, what is taking place, as a matter of fact, is the trap in which Israel is trying to put everybody in. First of all, Israel is illegally holding around 700 Lebanese citizens. It has decided to postpone their release because its surrogates, the SLA army in South Lebanon, have captured some of the UNIFIL Finnish soldiers.

BOGGS: Now...

MAKSOUD: Now, this was compounded in a manner to excuse themselves from releasing those who are held illegally. Now, what have happened is that the United States has taken a position condemning Israeli holding of these Lebanese citizens illegally, as a violation of the Geneva Convention. And I think [00:17:00] that the United States should pursue to the logical conclusion its condemnation of the holding of the 700, as a separate course of policy from the United States request to release the hostages in Lebanon unconditionally.

BOGGS: Now...

MAKSOUD: I think these are --

BOGGS: All right.

MAKSOUD: -- parallel and simultaneous processes, ra-- The linkage is being done deliberately by Israeli in a form to humiliate the United States.

BOGGS: That's a very succinct point, ambassador. But let me raise the obvious here. The qu-- the question then becomes... The overall gestalt of what happens during this two- or one-week period is that United States citizens are captured, one of them is killed by this group, and, as a result of that activity, the group gets what it wants, be it parallel or not.



MAKSOUD: No, the question is that the question of hostage-taking, in our view, is a deplorable method of achieving a legitimate end. [00:18:00] And I think, in our opinion, means and ends are interrelated and should be interrelated. Yet the question of hostage-taking, which nobody in the Arab world condones, however, should not be linked as Israel is trying to link it, with the question of releasing. Now, the United States, which has taken a position of the situation in the south of Lebanon, namely the illegality of --

BOGGS: Yes.

MAKSOUD: -- Israel holding these prisoners...

BOGGS: We've taken that position. Excuse me, will you, please, ambassador. We have two guests here.

MAKSOUD: All right.

BOGGS: Both are going to respond very briefly to what you said and we're going to move on to the next part of the program.

MAKSOUD: All right.

BOGGS: Dr. Jabber?

JABBER: Well, we have to be clear about two separate issues. One is whether we should be negotiating. And, of course, neither the United States nor Israel want to be put in a position of --

BOGGS: Negot--

JABBER: -- breaking --

BOGGS: Right.

JABBER: -- an important policy and a deterrent policy. On the other hand --

BOGGS: [00:19:00] If we don't negotiate, how do we get them back?

JABBER: -- on the other hand -- that's precisely the point -- we need to get beyond the crisis itself and secure the safe release both of the American victims and of the Shiite Lebanese victims.

BOGGS: How do we do that? We're talking about the Red Cross today.

JABBER: And that can be done through the Red Cross. It can be done through indirect contacts, non-publicized contacts between the United States and Israel, and with the cooperation of Mr. Berri in Lebanon, who himself is a main target of this operation.

BOGGS: OK. I must cut you off, because we have a lot on today's program. One last question. Dr. Kissinger has said we should extract from the Shiites a price they are unwilling to pay for doing this. What do you say to that?

JABBER: I believe that we must handle this crisis in such a way that we do not negatively affect our broader interests

in Lebanon and in other parts of the Middle East. Once this crisis is over, we will still have our interests and [00:20:00] our presence not only in Lebanon but many other Middle Eastern countries. And punitive acts must be taken in the broader context of the national interest. And they cannot be done in the middle of this crisis. They need to be done after the immediate crisis is over.

BOGGS: All right. Dr. Jabber, thank you, very much. Frank Bolz, thank you, very much. We have Barry Rosen and Moorhead Kennedy, two former Iranian hostages, with their thoughts, right after this. We'll be right back.

BOGGS: Welcome back. Our next guests have been in the situation of being hostages and they're here to talk about it on today's program. Barry Rosen is currently the Assistant to the President at Brooklyn College. And he is a former hostage held by the Iranians outside Tehran, from November 4<sup>th</sup>, 1979, till January 20<sup>th</sup>, 1981, 444 days -- as was Moorhead Kennedy. Moorhead Kennedy is currently executive director for the Council for International Understanding. Gentlemen, what do you see happening [00:21:00] here that gives you great concern, with regard to the way this hostage situation is being handled, in the media and by the government?

BARRY ROSEN: Well, first of all, I think, concerning the media, it seems to be doing the same things it had done during the Iran crisis. And I think it is energizing the situation, making it more difficult for people to make decisions. It's agitating the American public. Many of the television stations and networks are calling this a drama. It is not a drama. It is not the theater. And by counting the days, it only exacerbates the situation. I think we need cool analysis, and rather than very quick analysis. We need something that's thoughtful. And I don't the media is producing that at all now.

BOGGS: Mr. Kennedy, what are your thoughts on...?

MOORHEAD KENNEDY: Same idea. It's contrary to common sense, in any negotiation, which is what we're getting into, to have anger and to be in a hurry. And we've got to settle back and realize this is going to take a long time if we're going to keep these people alive and get them back.

BOGGS: [00:22:00] Yesterday or the day before, in reading an editorial in the *New York Daily News*, I wrote down a quote that I was saving for today's program. The quote was, really, talking about how America needs to support President Reagan for a retaliation for this. And it said, quote, "Private suffering," and that would be the suffering of the families, right now, and the people who are being

held hostage, "private suffering cannot be allowed to create a national policy that will inevitably lead to more and greater private misery.

ROSEN: Well, I can't accept that editorial at all. We're not the Soviet Union. And this is a very complex situation. Who do you retaliate against is a very difficult decision to make. And there are many innocent human beings, even amongst the Shia community. The Shia community is not a monolith. And to absolutely maintain that we should commit some sort of retribution against Muslims is an exaggeration, a simplicity that should not be accepted by the American public. [00:23:00]

KENNEDY: Furthermore, you're creating martyrs. And in the Shiite branch of Islam, particularly, martyrs play a very important role. They have to be avenged. The editorial is just absolutely backwards. If you build up the cycle of violence, then there's going to be more violence against us. And what they don't realize, those who wrote that editorial, is how vulnerable we are over here. It's not just planes and embassies in the Middle East. It could come right to New York or any major city.

ROSEN: And in addition too, I think we have to think about the overall US policy in the Middle East. We're out to produce a peace process between Israel and the Arab states.

This would not at all help in that peace process. And that is our overall and most important thing that we have to think about in the Middle East right now.

BOGGS: What about the individual who says, "If we give in to these terrorists now, if we negotiate with these terrorists now, you and I and everybody watching this program may not be safe to walk the streets. We have to draw the line someplace. We cannot negotiate"? [00:24:00]

KENNEDY: You always negotiate. The question is what you give. And I think the only thing that's going to prevent an increase in this terrorism, in my view, is the feeling we are listening to them. They're sending us a message via terrorism. It's a terrible way to send it. But there's enough desperation there to want to send that message in a way that will make the American people listen. You and I wouldn't be talking about Shiites if this event hadn't happened. And they're making themselves known to us. As one of our guards said to us in Tehran, "We're on prime time."

BOGGS: Can you...?

KENNEDY: And that's important.

BOGGS: (laughs)

ROSEN: I think -- I think we can negotiate, and in this instance. I think we don't have to directly negotiate. But I think, through the auspices of an intermediary, [a

vosate?], as they say in Arabic, or whatever, you can do it. I think, if we maintain, through some sort of secret negotiations, that we will help release the military members [00:25:00] of the Shiite group in Israel, help in that, within several days or within a week or so, I think that could succeed. And I think that we can all come out of this feeling quite good about it. I think the most important thing is that these people are human beings, the hostages, and that we have to try to save their lives.

BOGGS: We are going to go to the phones right now, take a couple calls. And I have some questions too, obviously. We're on the line right now, live on *Midday*. Hello?

STEVE: Yes. The name is Steve, from Brooklyn.

BOGGS: Yes, Steve.

STEVE: I'd like to know what the gentlemen think about the fact that the president said there's no one now that's going to be blamed, so you can't retaliate. He was president when these gentlemen were released. Why didn't he retaliate against Iran, which was a nation and he could pinpoint who created the whole problem.

BOGGS: There was a government there.

STEVE: Right.

BOGGS: Last night he was saying -- he was saying in that situation there was a government, in this situation we're

not dealing with a government. But really we're going back to 1981. What's your reaction to that? There was no retaliation for you. There was no retaliation for the 400 Marines who were killed. [00:26:00] There's been no retaliation.

KENNEDY: And the two American embassies that were blown up. Who are you going to hit and what do you accomplish when you hit them? And you don't retaliate. You don't do anything unless you can see very clearly what the consequences are going to be. And if the consequences are more violence, we achieved very little.

ROSEN: I think we also signed the Algiers Agreement, with a legal government, at that time, for our release. And that was a big debate at that time, should we commit some sort of retribution. And since we had dealt with a legal government, there was no excuse at all.

KENNEDY: Our name was on the line.

BOGGS: Just to use a little bit of street language here, what about the bully on the block theory, the person... You know, you grow up in a neighborhood and there's one kid who's beating up the other kids in the neighborhood. And unless somebody does something to that bully, he's going to keep beating up the kids in the neighborhood.



ROSEN: Well, I don't think we can use that analogy, because this is just too complex to use that analogy at all. I think this situation in Lebanon, as Fouad Ajami called this -- is a country of warlords. We have no idea of what's going on. And to use a very simple analogy makes it much more difficult. [00:27:00]

BOGGS: So would you...?

KENNEDY: Let me -- let me turn the analogy around, then. From the Middle East, who is seen as the bully on the block? It's the United States. And they find this way, which equalizes their strength and ours, to get back at us, for acts which they regard as illegal, including perhaps our support of Israel when Israel was taking these Shiite militia.

BOGGS: Two questions. First, I would like to hear your evaluation of President Reagan's handling of this situation so far.

ROSEN: Well, for one thing, I think President Reagan now realizes that Jimmy Carter understood the limits of power. And now...

BOGGS: The limits of power and the value of lives.

ROSEN: Of human lives.

BOGGS: That's the question, is whether or not President Reagan will respond differently to the value of human life in this situation.

ROSEN: I think he has now come to terms with the fact of being president of the United States and that we are Americans, that we feel that human life is more important than just very simplistic policies of effective and swift retribution. There's not effective and swift retribution [00:28:00] when there are American lives around, in a very difficult and complex situation.

KENNEDY: I would say the same but I would leave out the American lives and put it on a very practical basis. You don't serve policy ends by the kind of speeches he was making when he was a candidate. And now he knows things are far more complicated.

BOGGS: Well, on the press conference last night we saw some of his own language coming back.

KENNEDY: He's backing away from it. I think he's going to...

ROSEN: I wish he would call President Carter up after this is effectively resolved and apologize. And I think that would do everybody a bit of good in America.

BOGGS: Now, I think the key question I'd like to end with here would be this. What have we learned from the Iranian

hostage situation -- you two were hostages -- that needs to be applied right now in this situation?

KENNEDY: I would say patience. Wait. Time is on the side of the hostage. Wait for the intermediaries to show up. Don't expect, as every American wants to expect, that for every problem there's a solution right now.

BOGGS: The fact that President Reagan is a second-term president, does that in any way affect the way you think he's going to respond here?

ROSEN: No, I don't think so. [00:29:00] But I think one of the lessons is also the limits of power. There's a change in paradigm in this world, limitations of energy, limitations of power. The United States is not the sole and only power and simplistic answers are not the thing anymore.

BOGGS: All right. Gentlemen, I want you to say hello to Bob Molan. Bob Molan is host of *Sound Off*, WSB Radio in Atlanta. Bob, you're with us live here in New York. Welcome to our *Midday* program.

BOB MOLAN: Thank you, Bill. It's a pleasure to be with you.

BOGGS: Bob, we called you today because Charlotte Morris came into our office this morning and told us that you were starting something down there on your radio station about

turning on headlights. Will you tell us what you're encouraging people to do?

MOLAN: Let me preface my explanation on that just very briefly, Bill. Because as a talk show host, you can appreciate the tremendous volume of calls we've been getting since this situation developed on Friday. As a matter of fact, I've had to extend my program's usual hours one and two hours, just to handle the volume of calls.

BOGGS: I'd like to do that but Gary Collins won't let me.  
(laughter) He comes on after me.

MOLAN: [00:30:00] Well, I have that latitude to do, because we have nothing but music following my show. But any event, last night the temper of the people was such that I thought something needed to be done to have the American people express their outrage, if not their frustration, over the situation. So the idea came up why not have Americans across this country -- and our station reaches about 32 states -- to just keep your headlights on as a symbol that we are frustrated, we are angry and that we want our citizens back and that we will support any move to accomplish this end.

BOGGS: All right. Now, Bob, stay on the line. Because at the beginning of this interview... I don't know if you heard it or not. We're talking with Moorhead Kennedy and Barry

Rosen, two former hostages in Iran. And they were sharply critical about the media's drumming this up a little too much. Barry, what's your reaction to this headlight campaign?

ROSEN: Well...

BOGGS: Would you turn on yours?

ROSEN: I think, in terms of supporting the hostages [00:31:00], yes, absolutely, but not in the -- in the connection that I support my government no matter what.

BOGGS: Wha-- Yeah, that's a...

ROSEN: I think we have to be very thoughtful about what type of approach we're going to utilize in this situation. I think the negotiating process is the most important process to use.

BOGGS: All right. Bob --

MOLAN: Yeah.

BOGGS: -- Mohan, thank you, very much. Good to have you with us here. Let me just conclude this interview, gentlemen, by asking you this. Can you imagine or visualize what the conditions are like for these hostages now?

ROSEN: I think, as time goes on, the conditions get better, basically because the hostages become human beings. They're no longer symbols after the first few days. Then they know that these people have families. These people need to eat.

These people need to sleep. And I think that's a turn of events.

KENNEDY: They learn how to be hostages and the guards learn how to be guards. And that takes a certain amount of time. And once that's done, then you can make a life for yourself as a hostage, unpleasant though it can be.

BOGGS: Gentlemen, I really thank you for being here. I recognize you have your private lives, Brooklyn College and so -- but you're not professional former hostages --

ROSEN: (laughs) Thank you.

BOGGS: -- [00:32:00] and it is not pleasant to come on. But you really do us a service by being here today and I thank you, very much.

ROSEN: Thank you.

KENNEDY: Glad to see you again.

BOGGS: Nice to see you. We'll be back with Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum and Leon Charney, two Middle East experts, right after this break. Don't leave.

BOGGS: Welcome back. We're live. We'll take your phone calls. But first let me introduce you to our two next guests. Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum is the Director for International Relations for the American Jewish Committee. It's good to have you with us. He says the hostage crisis is a very

fragile situation, on several levels, the relations between the United States and Israel have become fragile. All right. Also with us is Leon Charney. Leon Charney served as special advisor to President Carter during the Camp David peace accords. He's also -- the highly acclaimed book *Special Counsel*. Leon, let's begin. What should our primary goal be right now?

LEON CHARNEY: Well, saving lives. And I think the way to do that is for President Reagan and Shimon Peres to get together immediately and to work out a face-saving situation so that these [00:33:00] Shiites can be released, providing, obviously, that the Americans can be released concomitantly. But the first priority is lives. Forget about retribution, retaliation. Forget about everything.

BOGGS: Do you forget about politics? Do you forget about the future? Do you encourage another generation of terrorists if you do a so-called face-saving thing?

CHARNEY: You know what? Barry Rosen said to me now, if I were not part of Jimmy Carter's administration --" I was part of the hostage negotiations and I went to Chancellor Kreisky in Austria -- he probably wouldn't be alive, nor would Mr. Kennedy.

BOGGS: That's correct, I think.

CHARNEY: So you must focus first on priorities. The first priority is to save the human being, save the human lives. And what Barry Rosen said before is absolutely true. The nation owes an apology to President Carter. And Ronald Reagan now understands the constraints of power. Someone quoted to me -- I did a television show the other day and they quoted to me the inauguration speech of President Reagan, "And we will not," and bih-bih bih-bih bih-bih bih-bih. [00:34:00] It wasn't that way last night. It sure changed. And at least Carter had -- and Carter said to me, "Leon, if I lose the presidency, I don't care. I want those 52 hostages out alive." And here I see these hostages. It makes me really feel good. Feels terrible to be here on such a program. But I never met Barry Rosen before. But I sure saw his name a lot. And we worked on... And that's the focus and that's where it should be. Israel wants to help. I don't want to see relationship between Israel and the United States become fragile over this. And I don't think it has to be. I think there's a problem there between Weinberger and Shultz. But that's my personal problem.

BOGGS: Well, let me move over to Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, for your answer to the same question. We're in a very delicate situation. Will you give us your 24-hour solution?



TANENBAUM: Well, I'm not sure I'm going to do that. In terms of what you quoted me as having said, first let me say the relationship between the United States and Israel are better than they've -- had ever been, [00:35:00] at least in my recollection. A strategic consensus is in place, the cooperation on military, economic, intelligence, high-tech. That's in place. This is an overlay on an existing very strong positive situation. I think what complicates the question for us is what Leon Charney has just said but it's also the Israeli side of that. The Israelis have a very special sense of anguish over the fact that these are innocent American civilians who are being held hostage. And they do not want to move in any way that might imperil the lives of the hostages. That's why they have, in fact, created a blackout on every Israeli diplomat saying anything about the situation. I think essentially what is emerging... I have talked to a State Department -- yesterday, the day before, to the people who are involved in negotiations now. They are moving heaven and earth to try to find some face-saving device, for the United States as well as for Israel, to allow this kind of simultaneous release [00:36:00] of the American hostages and the Shiite prisoners the Israelis hold.

BOGGS: Rabbi, do you believe that Israel was wrong, in the first place, in moving these 700 or so Shiite prisoners from Lebanon to Israel, which was, in fact, a violation of the Geneva accord? Why was that necessary?

TANENBAUM: Well, apparently there are security problems involved. One really has to enter into that situation to realize how threatening the Shiite Muslims in the south of Lebanon became to Israel's security. They were violating the borders. They were shooting at villages. Actually, I think the most important political fact that has emerged in the situation is that Berri, the head of the Amal, whom both the Israelis and the American government regard as a moderate pragmatist, will emerge with enough power to be able to bring about these negotiations. All of them are now talking about the International Committee of the Red Cross, emerging as that face-saving device. If the Red Cross asks for the prisoners from Israel, [00:37:00] Israel's indicated that it's prepared to consider to do that, to get them out, provided that there is a commitment from Berri, more importantly, from the radical Shiites, that they will allow all the American hostages out -- and all of them, including the other seven --

BOGGS: Who were...

TANENBAUM: -- who they have now held for months.

BOGGS: That's correct. Now, looking down the line, suppose we do this, we adopt a face-saving device, and we get our people back. And Leon's satisfied. The lives are saved. They have their 700 people back. Then what do we do? Do we retaliate in some form against those who -- be identified as being responsible? After all, they've murdered -- cold-blooded murder of an American serviceman -- beat up people on the plane.

TANENBAUM: Well, I think those people are gangsters. But...

BOGGS: What do we do to the gangsters? Do we punish them, after we get what we want?

TANENBAUM: Well, I, frankly, am less interested in the question of revenge than I am in trying to help contribute to working out a political solution, in which moderate elements [00:38:00] in Lebanon and the Shiite world --

BOGGS: In the long run.

TANENBAUM: -- are strengthened and confirm-- Because unless the Shiites themselves discipline their radicals, unless the Arab world and the Muslim world... And here's where I differ with Clovis Maksoud, whom you had on here before, who's constantly scapegoating Israel. I mean, if the Arab world stands by silently and, in fact, encourages terrorists and violence, if they continue to preach that the United States is the Great Satan and don't stand

against that, they are contributing an atmosphere of what one scholar in America called verbal violence, which leads to physical violence.

BOGGS: We will address the question of revenge before the show is over. But we have a phone call now. Let's go to the phone. Bill Boggs with you, on *Midday*. Hello?

RAMON LOPEZ: Hello.

BOGGS: Yes.

LOPEZ: My name is Ramón Lopez, from New York City.

BOGGS: Yes?

LOPEZ: And really, I am very upset, because the American people don't realize that the major obstacle to achieve the peace in the Middle East are based on the attitude of the Israeli government, [00:39:00] that for many year have been unable to negotiate seriously to bring about the peace in the Middle East. How would the panel react to this?

BOGGS: Leon, you were involved in those Middle East peace talks, so what do you say?

CHARNEY: Ramón, that's an outrageous lie. I personally know every member of the Israeli cabinet and I know every member of that Israeli cabinet is ready and willing and able to negotiate a peace. The lives of Israelis are very treasured and no one wants to see blood spilled in Israel. No one wants to see anything but peace. So anybody who gives you

that is giving you a lot of propaganda, which has been put out by the Arab Leagues. One more point I want to throw in here, that the rabbi probably thought about but maybe missed, is that Russia could be behind the whole business here. These people are supplied with arms. And we must source out where the arms are coming from. And once you source out the arms, then you can get to your question of revenge.

BOGGS: But then isn't it ultimately [00:40:00] the question of the old nuclear problem? And I'm not talking lightly about that. If we all of a sudden say, "We can trace this to this to this and it's Russia," and we attack someone in Syria, then aren't we back with another --

CHARNEY: Yes.

BOGGS: -- Cuban Missile Crisis or potential escalation to World War III?

CHARNEY: Well, again, we're back to Ronald Reagan, who said, "SALT II, never -- never, never." And Jimmy Carter's SALT II has now be reaffirmed by Ronald Reagan.

BOGGS: Going to take a break, come back. And we've got a hot debate coming up right after this.

BOGGS: All right, we're back. With me on the right here, literally, is Charles Wiley. He is the executive director

for the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism. He says we should be hard-lined against terrorists and not make any concessions.

CHARLES WILEY: Yeah. You know, if you were a terrorist or a potential terrorist, who had watched this show or many of the other shows of this kind, you tell me whether you would be encouraged to go grab hostages or you would be discouraged. We have heard over and over again the same clichés that human life comes first, [00:41:00] there are limitations of power. I've heard those same things over and over. They don't work. And what has to be done is to stop thinking... And I hate to say this. Because if my son was there, I obviously would be in a position -- or I probably wouldn't. But we've got to stop thinking all the time of saving these hostages. The problem is is that we know their names, we know their faces, we know who their loved ones are. And we keep trading them off against ten times as many hostages --

BOGGS: In the future.

WILEY: -- whose names we don't know, whose families we can't recognize.

BOGGS: All right. Also with us is Rear Admiral, retired, David L. Martineau, the United States Navy, a man who's been involved in warfare. He feels we should take a stiffer

position against terrorists, terrorism is a new form of warfare.

DAVID MARTINEAU: Well, this tragic instance that we're going through now is not just another act committed by a bunch of harebrained fanatics. This is war. It's a new form of warfare. Why do I say that? Because this act has thrown a nation, [00:42:00] a great nation, ours, into a sense of crisis.

BOGGS: If it's war --

MARTINEAU: And...

BOGGS: -- whom do we shoot?

MARTINEAU: All right. We're not going to sh-- we're going to treat this a little bit differently.

BOGGS: Thank God.

MARTINEAU: We're going to treat it differently. Because we first have to recognize it. And we are going to... We have to understand that it is an act of warfare, which is not costing the other side a cent. We are the victims. We are holding no cards right now. There's been a lot of talk here about negotiation, about retaliation. Negotiation, in my opinion, at this point, will not work. Because they hold all the cards.

BOGGS: What would --

MARTINEAU: So we have to make a --

BOGGS: -- you recommend?

MARTINEAU: -- we have to make...

BOGGS: Give us a couple of trump cards. What should we do?

MARTINEAU: We have to make a great... All right, what should we do? The first thing we should do is do everything we can to prevent this thing from ever happening again.

BOGGS: How do we do that?

MARTINEAU: Some of the steps were [00:43:00] announced by the president last night. We should put armed guards on the planes, especially those flying in the Middle East. We should take international measures to enforce security at every one of the airports, having in mind the tragic complicity of Greece in this one. This wouldn't have happened.

BOGGS: Let me shift over... Excuse me, Admiral. Let me shift to Charles Wiley, for more specific things that we should do.

WILEY: OK. The first thing that we should do is to get rid of these concepts of instant retaliation, putting air marshals on. Which, incidentally, a study was made some years ago, when we had airplanes being taken in this country, which showed that that was not going to be very effective. That's why we took them off the planes. What we need is a strategic concept. The strategic concept is very simple.



What you must do is to teach the man who might become a hostage-taker that there is nothing in it for him. For example, if there was an international agreement [00:44:00] that all captured terrorists would automatically be sentenced to death and then, in some cases, that death sentence would be reprieved based on good behavior of the prisoner and his colleagues and, when a colleague asked for his release, that would automatically set off the death sentence... And say these 700 include some who are terrorists. If the guys who grabbed that airplane knew that, the very moment they handed in their name, that those guys would be executed, there would no longer be any reason. Another thing to do is to find a leverage stick to make it costly. *I.e.*, if you made it clear that anybody that grabbed a hostage, that we would automatically, if you harm a hair on his h-- First of all, if you grab him, we'll give \$100,000 worth of hand grenades, mortar shells, machine guns, etc., to their worst enemy. If you harm them, it goes up to half a million. If you kill him, it goes up to a million. That means, if you're a Shiite Moslem [00:45:00] and you hurt an American, a half a million dollars worth of hardware to kill you goes into the hands of whoever our president thinks is most likely to use it to get back at him.

BOGGS: All right. Let's get a reaction to that specific proposal.

MARTINEAU: Well, that's all fine except how are you going to get ahold of this terrorist in the first place?

WILEY: No, I am saying, as a policy, the problem is --

BOGGS: That's...

WILEY: -- we're always talking about how to solve this one. I'm talking about solving them, period.

BOGGS: Le-- All right. That's true. I'm going to get Leon's reaction. Then let's try to get back to what we do today.

CHARNEY: Mr. Wiley, that's terrific for the future. And if we hold a symposium at Columbia University on what to do against terrorism, I would agree with you whole-heartedly. But the problem is today... And don't forget one thing.

BOGGS: Because we've got living people held hostage.

CHARNEY: You got living people there and you got kamikaze type people. You got Khamenei type people, who are willing to die. So the fact that you're going to kill them... They'll blow themselves up. You had a boy come with a car and blow up 300 Israelis down in southern Lebanon. They're taught -- they're indoctrinated to...

WILEY: And they would kill themselves in order to give a couple of million dollars to their enemies? [00:46:00]

CHARNEY: They would...

WILEY: That seems rather silly to me.

CHARNEY: Now, what --

WILEY: If I knew that --

CHARNEY: -- really...

BOGGS: No, wait.

WILEY: -- my killing myself...

CHARNEY: When you're...

BOGGS: Just a second.

CHARNEY: Then...

BOGGS: Leon doesn't disagree with that. We must address  
ourselves to what the situation is today.

WILEY: Right!

BOGGS: We've got hostages all over.

WILEY: Fine. And I am saying --

BOGGS: [What's?]....?

WILEY: -- what you do today. What's wrong with telling those  
hostage-holders, those murderers...? You say, "Hey, guys,  
you're holding Americans. If you hurt them any more, we're  
giving a million dollars per hostage to your enemies."

CHARNEY: It tha--

WILEY: Now why would they possibly --

BOGGS: All right. Let's...

WILEY: -- do anything to the hostages in --

CHARNEY: Mr. Wiley --

WILEY: -- a circumstance like that?

CHARNEY: -- if that helps save the hostages lives, I'm for it.

But I don't think that you're going to prevent future hijacking or future hostage-taking merely my what you implement. It all makes sense. But I'm telling you, if... I've lived in the Middle East long enough to know that, when you have a fanatic, and you have a religious fanatic and he doesn't care about his life, it doesn't matter. My trepidation Friday was that we had two fanatical people on that plane [00:47:00] who hijacked the plane in Greece. And by the way, I hold Greece responsible for this, because I think that they let them in there. I was afraid that they were going to blow up the plane with themselves, like they did --

BOGGS: Yeah.

CHARNEY: -- in southern Lebanon.

BOGGS: That's what I thought was going to happen.

CHARNEY: This was my fear. I want Barry Rosen to live, I want Kennedy to live today. That's what I'm worried about.

WILEY: Excuse me!

TANENBAUM: Could I...?

WILEY: How about the guy next month?

CHARNEY: I'm worried about today!

WILEY: I want him to live and I want the hostages now... But  
I also want --

CHARNEY: I...

WILEY: -- your son, that's going to be grabbed on an airplane  
three months from now to live.

CHARNEY: Great! I'll sit with you in long-range planning and do  
it. But I want President Reagan to move today. And I want  
him to do something very positive with Israel.

WILEY: And you're signing the death warrants of numerous  
Americans on airplanes all over the world, including over  
the United States.

TANENBAUM: So... Can I just say this? I appreciate your  
passion. And I share this great concern for the American  
hostages. The problem here is to contain the violence, not  
to intensify the violence. And during this interim period,  
there's an obligation first to seek, through negotiation...  
There are conversations going on [00:48:00] between our  
State Department and Berri and the Amal people and between  
the Israelis and Berri, with a view toward trying to work  
out a deal. That deal must be given an opportunity to work  
itself out. If it does not work, then we must consider far  
more stringent methods, some of which you may well be  
pointing toward.

BOGGS: All right. Excuse me for interrupting, rabbi. We must take a break. We'll come back and try to conclude right after this.

BOGGS: All right. Welcome back. Quickly, on tomorrow's live program we talk about, "Getting to the Top," with advice. And you can phone in with questions on consumer problems, how to be a successful model, comedians. Plus our new station manager, Kevin O'Brien. Talk to the general manager. That's tomorrow. You can talk to him about television programming, by calling our number tomorrow. Meanwhile, I did ask one question and that is this. If we do have a so-called face-saving solution, then the question of retaliation comes up. Suppose there is a face-saving solution, whether you like it or not. We get them back. They get what... [00:49:00] Then what do you think we should do?

WILEY: Oh, I think that we should establish a strategy of retaliation against the people who you know are responsible. I think that that's a problem, because we almost wiped out our intelligence network during the 1970s.

BOGGS: How do we do that?

WILEY: Those people who wanted to tie the CIA's hands...

"Don't deal with anybody who's not a nice guy. Don't deal

with informants. Don't deal with this. Don't deal with that." We have destroyed our intelligence community. And it's going to take a lot of years to get it back. And I am not in favor of retaliation against people who we don't know. But in this case, a guy has taken responsibility. I'm not sure that we should not have something, almost a declaration of war, in which you blockade Lebanon, you do anything you have to do to make it clear that it does not pay to hurt Americans. That is the absolutely crucial point.

CHARNEY: I think that what has to be done is to show, in the future, that we will not accept such conduct. But fo-- And what Bill is talking about, I think, he wants [00:50:00] to see a program develop so this will not happen again. And, Bill, I think you have to do that in context with the religious fanaticism of what happens in the Middle East. I don't think any of us here can come up with a program today and say, "Well, this will stop terrorism," if we bombard or blockade or we do something like that.

MARTINEAU: I'd like to make --

CHARNEY: You're dealing with --

MARTINEAU: -- a point here, if I...

CHARNEY: -- suicidal people.

BOGGS: OK.

CHARNEY: And you have a real problem. And there is a war going on. There is a war going on against the United States. And I agree with the admiral. And this may continue for a long period of time.

BOGGS: A quick point. Go ahead. We're just about out of time.

MARTINEAU: All right. It's all fine to talk about human life. And we're all interested in human life. But what are we going to do to prevent it? This is a war. This is a war at no cost to our enemy, the...

BOGGS: Right. No, I remember...

MARTINEAU: All right.

BOGGS: You me-- you mentioned this before.

MARTINEAU: With the support of Syria, with Soviet Russia smiling in the background. And everything is going the other way. What we have to do is to prove, in whatever negotiations we have, [00:51:00] that this is not going to work again.

BOGGS: Well...

MARTINEAU: And when they see it's not going to work again, then they'll try something else.

BOGGS: If I could do any--

MARTINEAU: The problem we also face, if I may say so --

BOGGS: Go ahead.



MARTINEAU: -- with future assassinations in this country...

We haven't seen the end of terrorism yet.

BOGGS: Well, there's no question about that. I guess the main thing that we could say is that so far there has been a policy of so-called not negotiating with terrorists. What we probably need to do is devise a future policy of what happens if A leads to B leads to C -- period. And that future policy may endanger lives.

MARTINEAU: May I...?

WILEY: There...

CHARNEY: That's correct.

WILEY: Bill, that's the point.

CHARNEY: And it's a misnomer. Bill, we always negotiate. And we have to negotiate. Because we're all Americans. And Americans care about fellow Americans.

MARTINEAU: We love negotiations.

CHARNEY: And the Israelis --

MARTINEAU: That's not going to work.

CHARNEY: -- gave up 1,000 of their worst prisoners --

BOGGS: Yeah.

CHARNEY: -- for three Israelis, because they cared about human life.

WILEY: And now we have --

CHARNEY: And they have the tough...

WILEY: -- the hostages being held in Beirut probably directly because they gave up the 1,000 for the three.

CHARNEY: I'm not sure...

WILEY: I would have rather have seen them giving up the 1,000 because [00:52:00] it was too costly for them to keep them than to trade them for three, because they encourage the hijacking --

CHARNEY: You --

WILEY: -- that you're seeing right now!

CHARNEY: -- may be -- you may be correct. And that's one of the problems that Israel's facing today. A lot of the population of Israel feels the way you do, that they should not have given up that 1,000. And therefore, Shimon Peres is in a very sticky political situation. And that's why he's looking for something from the United States, some kind of overt, face-saving act, so he can go back to his population. This could collapse the Israeli government.

TANENBAUM: And a quick point --

MARTINEAU: It's going to do more than collapse the Israeli gover--

BOGGS: Go ahead, rabbi.

TANENBAUM: -- quick point.

BOGGS: Let's hear from the rabbi. Quick point.

TANENBAUM:       The largest threat we face after that of Soviet expansionism, Soviet totalitarianism is the ri--

(break in video file)

*(Public Hearing)*

CAROL MARTIN:   -- this discussion on Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> of June. We are exactly one full week, seven days, into the ordeal of TWA Flight 847. As we tape today, we should say that, by most accounts, the negotiations for the release of the 40 American hostages are somewhat at a stalemate. For that reason, we have brought together four gentlemen, [00:53:00] each with sentiments on the Arab and the Jewish side, to hopefully help us understand exactly what brought about this crisis and how perhaps it could be brought to an end. We should introduce our guests to you right now. We have with us Dr. Kenneth Bialkin -- excuse me, not Dr. Bialkin but Kenneth Bialkin. He is the chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, also --

KENNETH BIALKIN:     It's American Jewish Organizations.

MARTIN:       -- Major American Jewish Organizations, also the chairman of the Anti-Defamation League -- Kenneth Bialkin. Also we have with us Shukri Salameh. He is a board member of the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee. We have

with us Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, the Director of International Relations for the American Jewish Committee. And also joining us, Sami Merhi. He is a Lebanese American, who also is an expert on Lebanese politics. Welcome to all of you gentlemen. And just so that we each get to know each of you better, I'd like to know a little more about your background. Mr. Merhi, for example, you say that you have actively participated in negotiations similar to those we're in the midst of now.

SAMI MERHI: Yes. I have been engaged in many occasion when [00:54:00] American hostages have been taken, like [a year -- a year, a summer ago?] and especially in the Jeremy Levin's case.

MARTIN: That's the CNN reporter who was --

MERHI: CNN reporter --

MARTIN: -- held for a year.

MERHI: -- who freed himself, really. And I am now engaged in bringing about the -- one of the hostages held in Beirut. That's Mr. Simon Grossmayer, whom -- I was made to understand that he is living with one lung, after an operation that was conducted nine years ago.

MARTIN: Now with whom are you speaking, Mr. Berri directly?

MERHI: I'm speaking with Mr. Berri and with his aides. And I'm pleading to them to leave this gentleman now, so that

we don't have another tragedy on our hands. And, of course, I'm ultimately asking them to release all American hostages.

MARTIN: All right. Thank you. Rabbi Tanenbaum, basically your group does...?

TANENBAUM: We're regarded as a pioneering human relations organization. We were involved in the drafting of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights. We're deeply concerned about international human rights, [00:55:00] international violence and terrorism, world refugee, world hunger problems.

MARTIN: All right. Mr. Salameh, Shukri Salameh, if you could explain for us the Anti-Discrimination Committee of the American Arab League?

SHUKRI SALAMEH: Well, I'm a member of the -- of the Arab American Anti-Discrimination Committee, whose purposes are to combat discrimination, wherever it is found, to uphold human rights in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to rehabilitate the terribly distorted image of the Arab Americans in this country.

MARTIN: Do you ever work with Jewish organizations to that end?

SALAMEH: I believe our organization has some relations with some Jewish organizations, which share the same -- the same motivation as we have.

MARTIN: OK. Thank you. And, Mr. Bialkin, your group.

BIALKIN: I'm chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, which is an umbrella group dealing with most major institutional Jewish groups in the United States today. But I'm also chairman of the Anti-Defamation League [00:56:00] of B'nai B'rith. And our charter is to fight anti-Semitism and, in doing that, fight for the rights of all people and against all discriminations, here and elsewhere.

MARTIN: OK. Thank you. Now, let's begin the discussion, if I could, with you, Mr. Bialkin. Since we're speaking about combating discrimination and the like... In the papers today, highly placed American sources are acknowledging that there seems to be a groundswell of American opinion turning against Israel, blaming Israel for the continuation of this particular crisis. Your comment.

BIALKIN: My comment is, when you introduced me and the rest of this morning, you said you had representatives here from the Arab side and the Jewish side. My impression was, if you'll pardon me, that this is not an Arab-Jewish issue. We have a bunch of thugs, a bunch of racist thugs, who have

hijacked an American plane and are holding American citizens, someplace where nobody knows. And somehow propagandists and publicists have all of a sudden converted this into a tirade involving Israel, which is not a party. [00:57:00] Now, Israel happens to be in a position to be helpful and is willing to be helpful and has offered to be helpful. And I have every reason to assume that our government and the Israeli government are in close touch. And in this very delicate issue, those people who have the least responsibility seem to have the clearest opinions. We have to support our government, our president, our administration in this extremely delicate time.

MARTIN: All right. Say...

BIALKIN: And for this to be converted to a grand-scale political tirade against Israel, our only reliable ally in the Middle East, the only free and democratic nation, the only one who has fought for years against terrorism, seems to me to be a charade, the most serious event that's occurred this year.

MARTIN: All right. The prominent demand -- the only demand stated is that Israel free the 766 Shiite Moslems who have been held there. [00:58:00] Mr. Merhi, if you could help us understand whether or not you agree with Mr. Bialkin's position, given that being the state of...

MERHI: Well, of course, I do not agree with that at all. The question, a very fundamental question... To defend a country is one thing and to speak of humanity is another. For 38 years the Shiites, who lives predominantly over south Lebanon, have never provoked Israel, have never hijacked an American plane. They were promised that Israel is going to invade Lebanon for 15 days, for 25 miles and out. Three years thereafter, the Shiites have been destructed brutally, killed. Their homes have been blown apart. Then, to add insult into that, occupation. Israel take their families with them. And I, as an American, do support the government and our president. And when the president of this country says that Israel have insulted not only America [00:59:00] but insulted the fourth article of the Geneva Convention, who prohibits an occupier to remove people from an occupied land to [others'?] land...

MARTIN: Violation of --

MERHI: Now...

MARTIN: -- international law.

MERHI: If it's an...

MARTIN: You would [say?] that it's a...

MERHI: It's a violation. President Reagan --

MARTIN: Let me get...

MERHI: -- said that.



MARTIN: All right. I need --

BIALKIN: Has any--

TANENBAUM: Can I...?

MARTIN: -- Rabbi Tanenbaum's co-- Yeah.

BIALKIN: -- [stated?] that issue?

MARTIN: Let's try to give --

BIALKIN: That's a possible mistake.

MARTIN: -- everyone a fair chance. Rabbi Tanenbaum?

TANENBAUM: In the first instance, in response to your earlier question, I've been in touch with the State Department, the people who are involved actively in the negotiations, the counterterrorism desk. And they have said to me, unequivocally, what Mr. Bialkin has just indicated, namely, the relationships between the United States government and Israel have never been stronger, the strategic consensus between Israel, which our president established with the government of Israel, is very much in place, that the military, economic, politic, diplomatic relationship between Israel, the United States has never been better. [01:00:00] Nothing's been modified there. This latest crisis, created by radical Shiite Muslims, in violation of all of the conventions of international law, taking innocent civilians hostage, has been a problem of great delicacy, which our government and the government of

Israel, together, is very carefully trying to explore, with a view toward assuring --

M: Yeah.

TANENBAUM: -- the safety of the hostages and their release. The American Jewish community and the people of Israel have very profound anguish over the suffering that has been afflic-- needlessly on our fellow Americans. And we want to see everything done to save their lives. The business of rehashing this kind of polemical debate over the past... You raise the question about the destruction -- the Shiite Muslims. Where were you in 1976, when the Syrians and the PLO were destroying Shiite Muslims and Christians, murderously? And we didn't hear this kind of voice --

MERHI: Could I --

TANENBAUM: -- from this communit--

MERHI: -- could I interject?

MARTIN: There could be a --

BIALKIN: One question.

MARTIN: -- historical... [01:01:00] But I want to get to Mr. Salameh, if we could. Yes, go ahead, sir, Mr. Me--

MERHI: My question to the rabbi is how would he categorize those 766 Shiites being held by Israel?

MARTIN: Why is Israel holding them?

MERHI: Why?

MARTIN: Yes. Let's get clear.

MERHI: Can you tell them?

TANENBAUM: Well, I can tell you. First of all, Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick said, forthrightly, after studying the international law at the United Nations, that Israel is entirely in conformity with Article 78 of the Fourth Geneva Convention and Article 49 of the Fourth Convention, which reads that occupying powers, "may undertake total or partial evacuation of a given area if the security of the population or imperative military reasons so demand."

MARTIN: It was threatened by -- Israel's...

TANENBAUM: These 700 people, like the 1,100 before, carried out...

MERHI: In other words, they are insurance, rabbi.

TANENBAUM: These...

MERHI: These are insurance for Israel.

TANENBAUM: International law, the Geneva Convention, provides that, if people attack another army [01:02:00] or if they carry out assaults across the border --

MERHI: But do you see, rabbi...?

TANENBAUM: -- of innocent villages --

MARTIN: So Israel contends it would --

MERHI: Exactly!

TANENBAUM: -- they have a right --

MARTIN: -- provoke --

TANENBAUM: -- to defend themselves by...

MERHI: Do you see, rabbi --

MARTIN: -- they'd...

MERHI: -- the Shiites did not attack Israel inside Israel,  
did not provoke Israel, did not shell on Israel.

BIALKIN: So the...

MERHI: The Israelis came --

BIALKIN: If I...

MERHI: -- to their very homes!

TANENBAUM: Yes.

MARTIN: Let me bring Mr...

TANENBAUM: They came in because the PLO had created --

MERHI: Israel --

TANENBAUM: -- a massive...

MERHI: -- what right, rabbi, what right have Israel, come  
into Lebanon, after the destruction and the -- you know the  
story -- to take innocent people with them? Now, I condemn  
terrorism. I condemn the Shiite militia, who takes our  
people.

TANENBAUM: Yeah, but you're supporting them.

MERHI: Excuse me! And I also condemn Israel kidnapping of the  
Shiites. Now you have to remember this country was burned

twice, because of Israeli activities in Lebanon -- twice.

It's not the first time.

MARTIN: Let me bring Mr. Salameh in, if I could, at this point. I want to know if we have a misconception here in this country of the intent of the Shiites in trying to retrieve their prisoners.

SALAMEH: Well, I don't know what conception there is.

[01:03:00]

MARTIN: I mean....

SALAMEH: First of all, let me -- let me tell you one thing, that nobody in his right mind, and including my organization, myself personally, would excuse, apologize for, or even -- or even condone hijacking of planes and civilians. But if you want to come to the root of the problem, why are the Shia is doing this? Why?

MARTIN: Yes, why?

SALAMEH: It's a -- it's a state of desperation, where exactly the rabbi has just said, that Israel and the United States are on such firm and close relationship together that nothing can shatter that, that Israel and the United States are what I would call accomplices, in many ways.

MARTIN: And so the US hostages --

SALAMEH: Israel...

MARTIN: -- become a pawn, basically, yes?

SALAMEH: Now when you are frustrated, when you are living in a country and you become totally frustrated because of injustices which are inflicted on you as a population, then naturally religion comes into politics. Because this is all politics and --[01:04:00]

MARTIN: That's...

SALAMEH: -- human suffering. Then religion comes into s-- bec-- in order -- in order to stir up the zeal of people. And certainly this is the element. I mean, the Shias --

MARTIN: I understand.

SALAMEH: -- the Shias are not a big power. The Arabs are not big powers. They are small powers. When they find that --

MARTIN: There are those who say...

SALAMEH: -- the most super power in th-- in the whole world --

MARTIN: I bowing to their demands.

SALAMEH: -- is bowing -- or is in link with Israel, is an accomplice with Israel --

MARTIN: Let's...

SALAMEH: -- or on the invasion --

MARTIN: Mr. Bialkin.

SALAMEH: -- on the invasion and the atrocities and everything that happened in Lebanon. This is --

MARTIN: Let's get a comment from Mr. Bialkin.

SALAMEH: -- on to frustration.

MARTIN: Sir?

BIALKIN: Let's try to keep in perspective exactly what we're talking about. I think it's wrong to criticize all the Shiites. This is not a Shiite problem. Initially there was a small group of radicals who happened to be Shiites, who committed a dastardly act. And I wouldn't suggest that this is necessarily representative of all Shiites --

MARTIN: All Shiites.

BIALKIN: -- of the world. We have here a lawless, [01:05:00] renegade, terrorist organization, that has to be dealt with. And let's not lose sight of what it is, the problem that we have to solve today. Secondly, let's assume for the moment, which I don't agree with you for a moment but let's assume for a moment, that Israel is illegally holding some number of Shiites in Israel for purposes of its own security. Does that holding, however improper and illegal it may be, which, I don't think it is...?

MERHI: Who said it is for security.

BIALKIN: However --

MERHI: How --

BIALKIN: -- does that --

MERHI: -- does that...?

BIALKIN: -- does that holding...?

MERHI: You say it's for its own security. How can --

BIALKIN: Sir --

MERHI: -- [it be?] for...?

BIALKIN: -- I didn't interrupt you when you spoke --

MARTIN: All right.

BIALKIN: -- and I'll thank you not to --

SALAMEH: Yes, you did.

BIALKIN: -- interrupt me when I speak.

MARTIN: A few more seconds. Then we will get a response,  
before I to go commercial.

BIALKIN: But let's assume that he's correct. What possible  
detention, under color of right, could possibly justify an  
intermediation stealing away more than 100 innocent  
civilians and holding them as hostage --

MERHI: No one said it justifies.

BIALKIN: -- under threat of death --

MARTIN: Let's get a response from... [01:06:00]

BIALKIN: -- and to convert that --

MERHI: No one said it justifies.

MARTIN: Mr. Salam--?

BIALKIN: -- and to convert that discussion away from the  
scourge of terrorism.

SALAMEH: Yeah.

BIALKIN: We have two people here implicitly justifying a  
terrorist act, which under no circumstances --



MARTIN: Well --

SALAMEH: No one -- no one --

BIALKIN: -- can be justified.

SALAMEH: -- is justifying.

MARTIN: The issue at the table...

SALAMEH: This is --

BIALKIN: Well, then you should --

MARTIN: Please go ahead.

BIALKIN: -- say so.

SALAMEH: -- this is again --

MARTIN: And...

SALAMEH: -- this is agai-- I did say that --

MERHI: Is...

SALAMEH: -- at the beginning. This is again an attempt to  
distortion.

BIALKIN: Excuse me.

SALAMEH: No one said... I deliberately said that no one can  
apologize, excuse, or even condone the hijacking of...

BIALKIN: I'll...

MARTIN: And there can be no...

BIALKIN: Let's agree on that.

MARTIN: Let's get a... Mr. Merhi.

MERHI: What is a very fundamental thing here, we want our  
people back here, the 41 of them. We want them back here

safe and sound. Now since this is the issue and since these people, who came out on television and said to the American people and to the American government, "Do not -- do not take any military action"... All these people want is what you want. The Shiite in Lebanon want their family, as much as you want us to go.

MARTIN: The question is how do we do it. [01:07:00] Let's take a short break.

BIALKIN: Well...

TANENBAUM: Well...

MARTIN: We'll speak about it while we're --

TANENBAUM: OK.

MARTIN: -- in commercial break and we'll --

BIALKIN: We'll do a...

MARTIN: -- come back and discuss the alternatives --

BIALKIN: Well, I'd like to make --

MARTIN: -- as *Public Hearing* continues.

BIALKIN: -- a point, about --

MARTIN: We are back here, on *Public Hearing*. And our discussion is the crisis in the Mideast, which goes on as we speak today. It's Friday, the 21<sup>st</sup> of June. I'd like you to meet our guests once again. We have four gentlemen with

us discussing the issues. We have Kenneth Bialkin, who's the chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations. He's also chairman of the ADL, the Anti-Defamation League. We have also with us Shukri Salameh, who is the board member of the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee -- Mr. Salameh and Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, the Director in International Relations for the American Jewish Committee and Sami Merhi, who is a Lebanese American who's also an expert on Lebanese politics and has participated in negotiations. Mr. Merhi, you were making a point --

MERHI: Yes.

MARTIN: -- you'd like to finish. And then we're going to hear from Rabbi Tanenbaum.

MERHI: The Israeli government have said it time again, that they had their own agenda, their own schedule of freeing these innocent people from Atlit in Israel. [01:08:00] Now regardless of this, if we could take the hijacking aside, why then will they come to the United States and say, number one, "We will not negotiate with terrorist. But if you come," publicly now, "publicly ask us to leave them, we will leave them"? And I see that an insult to the American government.

MARTIN: Rabbi Tanenbaum?

TANENBAUM: Very... I don't have to have your version of it. And talking with an ambassador in the State Department yesterday, he said the following to me, "It is the hostages who have linked together two issues which should not be linked together," namely the question of the freedom of the hostages and the matter of the Shiite prisoners who are detained in Israel. He said, had that not taken place on the part of the hostages, the Israelis, we knew for a fact, had a schedule. They were prepared, last week, to release 300 of the detainees and let them go. It was the Shiite radical Muslims who demanded a connection between the hostages and the --tainees. Now the Israelis will not let them go, this week, [01:09:00] because a gun is being put at their head by the terrorists, who are saying that, "These are the conditions. And you capitulate to us."

MERHI: You mean the Shiite...

MARTIN: But is the United States government also pressuring Israel to release them? What do you think, Rabbi Tanenbaum?

TANENBAUM: The government is not.

MARTIN: And is that fair?

TANENBAUM: The American government is not pressuring Israel to do anything, at this point --

SALAMEH: How do you know?

TANENBAUM: -- other than to dis-- Well, I can tell you, from  
my conversations --

KR: Well, this is...

TANENBAUM: -- with our government --

MERHI: Rabbi, let me...

TANENBAUM: -- our government is exploring a way of finding a  
face-saving device, including the International Committee  
of the Red Cross --

MERHI: I want to underline what you just said.

TANENBAUM: -- to allow the detainees --

MERHI: What you --

MARTIN: I want to bring Mr. Salameh --

TANENBAUM: -- to be turned over to them...

MARTIN: -- and Mr. Merhi...

BIALKIN: This is -- this is...

MERHI: -- what you just said underlines the following --

SALAMEH: This...

MERHI: -- that Israel is now then taking orders from the  
Shiites. Because they changed their timetable of freeing  
these hostages because of what the Shiites are saying.

TANENBAUM: Absolutely! The Shiites are putting a gun at the  
head, first of all --

MERHI: Oh...

TANENBAUM: -- of the international community. They're putting a gun at the head of the United States. They're putting a gun at the head of the state of Israel. And no one is going to capitulate to that kind of gangster behavior!

MARTIN: What do you say, Mr. Salameh?

BIALKIN: Exactly.

MARTIN: Let's bring you into the discussion. Please.

SALAMEH: Rabbi Tanenbaum said, a couple of minutes ago, [01:10:00] that Jeane Kirkpatrick said, in Washington, that the holding of the 700 or 800 Shias in Israel was in accordance with international law. Now, number one, Jeane Kirkpatrick is not a lawyer. Number two, I have listened to a number of lawyers, international lawyers, including Ramsey Clark, who all say that it is against international law. The Secretary General of the United Nations himself said it is contrary to...

MERHI: Even my acc--

MARTIN: So I want to get your point, sir.

SALAMEH: Basically --

MARTIN: Yeah. So the point is...

SALAMEH: -- therefore, it is not true, the image he's trying to give, that this is an illegal act, the other is not illegal and therefore one illegal act is being --

MARTIN: Cancels out the other.

SALAMEH: -- taken into [the?] --

MARTIN: So...

SALAMEH: -- which is not true! I'm not trying to justify --

TANENBAUM: That's not true but...

SALAMEH: -- I'm no-- I'm not trying to justify. But this is the distorted image. I mean, the first day -- the first day, on the 17<sup>th</sup>, Mayor Koch was speaking to a Jewish group in New York, on CBS, and I was watching him. And he said, quote, [01:11:00] "Why should it shock you that the Arabs are terrorists? This is how they are. They are savages." Savages! Quote, unquote.

MARTIN: And...

SALAMEH: This is in your records. I saw him on television. And I was so infuriated. I mean, if a responsible... Can you imagine if, as a result of Israeli bombing of Arab civilians, in Lebanon or anywhere, an Arab came out in this country and said -- a responsible American, sympathizer with Arab --

MARTIN: I understand what you're saying.

SALAMEH: -- came out and said, "Why do you think the Jews are not savages? The Jews are all savages"?

TANENBAUM: I think that's a legitimate...

BIALKIN: I didn't see...

TANENBAUM: If that is what was said...

MARTIN: So legitimate complaint.

TANENBAUM: I did not hear what the mayor said.

MARTIN: I can't see --

SALAMEH: This is what he said.

MARTIN: -- how he said...

TANENBAUM: But if that's what he said, I think that is a legitimate objection.

BIALKIN: And I...

TANENBAUM: I would certainly -- and I'm sure Mr. Bialkin and the Anti-Defamation League would join us in opposing that. There is a larger issue which is raised and we had better face it, namely that we have entered into a new international situation. I have a story here from the *Wall Street Journal* of a meeting -- describing in detail -- a meeting that has taken place between [01:12:00] Syria, Iran, and Libya in January, in Tehran, in which an agreement was made to set up a strategic anti-American terrorist organization to strike at the interests of the United States --

MERHI: But they...

TANENBAUM: -- throughout the Middle East.

MARTIN: Mr. Merhi.

TANENBAUM: -- and to drive --



MERHI: Real dangerous to s--

TANENBAUM: -- and to drive America out of the Middle East.

And that's why they have bombed --

MARTIN: This is a story reported in the *Wall Street Journal*?

TANENBAUM: -- that's why they have bombed American  
embassies...

MERHI: I think that, as an Arab, is a personal insult. And I  
think that does not have any base at all. Because the  
American people know that American personnel and American  
civilians, American institutions were never, never, prior  
to the 1982 invasion into Lebanon -- have been harmed or  
hijack or being killed or our institution is being, on a  
question... Are we then to understand that this is, all of  
a sudden...?

TANENBAUM: We-- I don't think that's the case.

BIALKIN: Mr. Merhi...

MARTIN: What happened with the...?

MERHI: Prior to 1982 --

MARTIN: Let me ask this --

MERHI: -- there was never...!

MARTIN: -- gentlemen, if I could.

BIALKIN: It's a private...

TANENBAUM: Khartoum --

MARTIN: What happens with the fragmentation -- [01:13:00]

TANENBAUM: -- in the Sudan.

MARTIN: -- issue, gentlemen, though -- and this point? King Hussein of Jordan, today, denounced the hijacking --

SALAMEH: Certainly!

BIALKIN: Right.

MARTIN: -- as -- "scum of the earth" --

TANENBAUM: Scum of the earth.

MARTIN: -- he called them. Yes.

BIALKIN: Of course.

MARTIN: And that is Arabs speaking against Arabs!

SALAMEH: Certainly.

MERHI: Exactly!

BIALKIN: Let's understand --

MARTIN: What happens...?

BIALKIN: -- each other.

MERHI: To say that a respectable country like Syria --

BIALKIN: [To arrive at a?] program...

MERHI: -- a respectable country like Syria, to have it here and say that they are trying -- or implicate them -- or trying to put together a --

MARTIN: An antiterror...

MERHI: -- an antiterrorist -- how could you say this about a country...?

MARTIN: Let me get a con--

TANENBAUM: Mr. Merhi, just--

BIALKIN: I mean...

MARTIN: Yeah, please.

TANENBAUM: -- Mr. Merhi, just take a look at that detail.

MARTIN: Yeah.

BIALKIN: I don't think that Syria is --

TANENBAUM: Hold onto this.

BIALKIN: -- such a respectable country. Mr. Merhi seems to forget that American planes have been hijacked by Arabs before. He forgets about the Judean Desert, when our planes were blown up there.

MEHRI: We're talking about the Shiite issue! We're talking about --

BIALKIN: I'm not talking about --

MEHRI: -- a [simplistic?] issue!

BIALKIN: -- Shiite now. Sir, I didn't interrupt you.

MARTIN: Please finish.

BIALKIN: He said something -- that we should listen to the hostages, about how we should handle this problem. The hostages are sitting there with guns at their head.  
[01:14:00] They saw, two days ago, a fellow American beaten to death by the hands of people. And you think that they're going to say anything, in the face of their captors, which wouldn't be thoroughly acceptable to them? It's like a

patient telling a doctor how he should be treated. Now, we're talking about terrorism. We are, in the Western world, in my opinion, reaping the harvest of inattention to the problems of terrorism and hijacking and radicalism throughout the world. We have ignored for years the financing of terrorist activities by Arabs, who do so -- Arab countries, who do so by reason of extortion and threat of subversion. We are witnessing a situation which is extremely dangerous. And we shouldn't over-generalize. The first thing that we have to do is return to a rule of law. And a rule of law means that, no matter what the provocation... And I'm not saying there are not serious grievances that every people have. [01:15:00]

MARTIN: Historically.

BIALKIN: And I wouldn't a--

MERHI: You said that.

BIALKIN: -- and I wouldn't associate myself with anything which generalized about any Arab or any Shiite, in terms of his personal attitudes. I would resent it --

MERHI: I'm glad you said that.

BIALKIN: -- if he did it to me. And I would concede that. But you cannot ignore that there are forces at work -- there are radical groups, there are people who take the law into their own hands.

MARTIN: And we have to get to --

BIALKIN: And that must --

MARTIN: -- the root of that.

BIALKIN: -- not be permitted. And we must not --

MARTIN: Let me [permit?] the other... Because...

BIALKIN: -- permit that to be converted into --

MARTIN: Strained...

BIALKIN: -- a war against Israel --

MARTIN: I understand.

BIALKIN: -- who is our only ally in the area.

MARTIN: Our time is getting so short. Let me interrupt you for a moment. Because I would like to get a final statement from each of you gentlemen. We want to return to the question at hand, which is the options, such as they are, for resolving this particular crisis. Do we continue to negotiate? Do we use military intervention, which the hostages have begged the United States not to do? Or do we simply wait it out? Mr. Salameh.

SALAMEH: My answer to that would be, Carol, that using force would lead to nothing but, you know, massacre and force. I think the [01:16:00] approach now being followed is the proper approach, that is, waiting. But there should be --

MARTIN: Simply continue to negotiate?

SALAMEH: -- there should be a little more flexibility on the part of the United States government, as well as Israel. Israel, it's very small price that Israel can repay to the United States, when the United States has supplied it with all the weapons which ha-- which has brought in rampage to the -- to the Shias and to the others.

MARTIN: I'll stop you at that point. Thank you, sir. Rabbi Tanenbaum, your thought.

TANENBAUM: Oh, I think there's no civilized person would want to go the military route before exhausting every possibility of negotiation. I do have one concern, which I put to my Arab cousins, namely, at what point are they going to speak out against the racist selection of six or seven Jews among the American hostages, who have been isolated and placed in the hands of the Hezbollah? And we are terrified of what may happen to them -- and that kind of Nazi-like selection.

MARTIN: We have one minute. Mr. Merhi, please?

MERHI: I, of course, as a humanist --

MARTIN: The resolution poss--

MERHI: -- [01:17:00] I would advise to keep on talking to them. Because on a political level we have succeeded. I would...

MARTIN: Can we trust Nabih Berri?

MERHI: Yeah, to a certain extent. Yes. But don't think that he has all the powers in his hand.

SALAMEH: Right.

MERHI: And by the same token, the American people are asking the following question. One, Israel have exchanged 3 for 1,100 Israelis. Will you now exchange 766 for 41 Americans?

BIALKIN: We mus--

MARTIN: Mr. Bial--

BIALKIN: -- we must --

MARTIN: Last comment.

BIALKIN: -- we must play out this process that, we're probably at the early stage. We have to rely on our leadership, who are working throughout the world in a diplomatic fashion. We can't substitute our judgment at this moment for factors that we're not aware of. I think we all agree, if this thing can be done peacefully, that's the only way to do it. If it can't, then we'll have to await developments. But at this moment, I think it would be wrong to take military action.

MARTIN: For all of your comments --

MERHI: It's wrong...

MARTIN: -- I must say thank you. And I have to [01:18:00] just end our program, because our time has run out. But once again, we are glad for your thoughts and discussion,

Kenneth Bialkin, also Shukri Salameh and also Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum and Sami Merhi. We hope to hear from you again, if necessary. But in the meantime, we'll all pray for a peaceful resolution to the crisis.

BIALKIN: So the...

TANENBAUM: Say amen to that.

MARTIN: I'm Carol Martin --

BIALKIN: Thank...

MARTIN: -- thanking you for being with us on *Public Hearing* today.

ANNOUNCER: Next Saturday afternoon at 2:00, Channel 2 public affairs brings you another edition of *Public Hearing*, fact-finding inquiries into major issues affecting our community. This broadcast *Public Hearing*, recorded yesterday, was spontaneous, unrehearsed, and not edited.

(break in video file)

(*Eyewitness News*)

ERNIE ANASTOS: Well, as you just heard, Israel might release more of its Lebanese prisoners tomorrow. When it released the first group, Israel emphasized that there was no connection between that act and the hostage situation. But many Americans do make a connection between the crisis and



Israel. And as our reporter now, Art McFarland, tells us, a new poll indicates the TWA crisis [01:19:00] could be changing our attitudes.

ART MCFARLAND: As in New York City, Americans in general have been overwhelmingly supportive of Israel and of the ties between our two countries. But that was before the hostage crisis in Beirut. A new *ABC News-Washington Post* poll suggests that, based on the hostage crisis in Beirut and based on the threat of terrorism itself, American attitudes toward US-Israeli relations may be changing. The poll, released yesterday, shows that 42% of the respondents favor reducing relations with Israel, while 41% would disapprove of such a move. That's a big difference from a similar poll released ten days ago, showing that only 32% of those polled favored reduced relations with Israel, while 53% disapproved of reducing relations.

HERZL INBAR: There is a well-rooted affinity between the United States and Israel. And I don't think that this contingent situation will last. I don't believe, even, that there is a lack [01:20:00] -- or less support today than it was before the crisis erupted in Lebanon.

TANENBAUM: I think American public opinion, first of all, quite rightly, is filled with anxiety and frustration.

MCFARLAND: Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum feels any idea among Americans that Israel encouraged the hostage crisis is absolutely wrong.

TANENBAUM: Israel undertook to break the cycle by allow-- by allowing the 31 Shiite prisoners out of prison, without anybody asking them. They wanted to start the cycle of deescalation. And I think Americans will understand that and appreciate that, once the hostages are out and the anxiety level is lowered.

MCFARLAND: You might think New Yorkers in general would be a lot less likely than people in other parts of the country to want to change things with Israel. And if you thought that, you'd be absolutely right.

M: If anything, I think our relationship with Israel should get stronger. Israel, right now, is our only bastion of hope in the Mideast, in a -- in a very mixed up climate there.

F: Israel is the only country in the world that has taken steps to prevent terrorism. [01:21:00]

M: We've gone so long with Israel and we have to stand behind them.

F: They should hold the position that they are holding now.

MCFARLAND: And remain close to Israel.

F: Remain close to Israel.

MCFARLAND: Art McFarland, Channel 7, *Eyewitness News*.

ANASTOS: OK. And we'll talk more about the re--

(break in video file)

(*Eyewitness News*)

KAITY TONG: -- a negotiation. Well, Syria and its president have gained a certain amount of prestige and recognition in their role in securing the hostages' freedom.

M: I have just welcomed our guests, the passengers and the crew of the TWA aircraft, on behalf of His Excellency, the president of the Syrian Arab Republic, Hafez al-Assad.

(applause)

TONG: Syria's President Assad and the major role he played in securing the release of the American hostages has improved his image in Washington and throughout the United States. But US officials caution they remain concerned about Syria's foreign policy, with its close ties to terrorism and its friendliness with the Soviet Union.

[01:22:00] Meanwhile, what about the image of Israel? They plan to release the 735 mainly Shiite Moslems held prisoner in their country. That was a condition of the hostage resolution. But Israel has always maintained they had planned to release those prisoners anyway, before the

hostage crisis even arose. And they say they will do it in their own way.

SHIMON PERES: If the hostages will reach their homes, they won't have the obstacles that we have had until now to proceed with our own way of releasing the prisoners.

TONG: And Israel's way of releasing the prisoners is to let 300 of them go tomorrow or Thursday and the remaining prisoners at a later date. They insist the release is in no way connected to the hostage crisis. Well, who came out the winners and losers in this hostage crisis? That is the topic of our, "Newslines 7," discussion today.

ANASTOS: John Johnson, as you know, is in West Germany. And so Doug Johnson is standing by with our guest today. Doug?

DOUG JOHNSON: Well, Ernie, thank you. Joining us now to talk about which nations emerged as winners and losers, if any did, Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, [01:23:00] who's the Director of International Relations for the American Jewish Committee, and Dr. M.T. Mehdi, who is the president of the American-Arab Relations Committee. Thank you both for joining us today. On this question of winners and losers, first of all, Rabbi Tanenbaum, there are some who think that perhaps Israel has lost some marks as a result of this. There's some feeling in this country that they were partly to blame. There have been serious questions about the holding

of the Shiites and their release. And before that was the release of the -- of the others, who were sent home in exchange for 3 Israeli soldiers. What's your analysis of that?

TANENBAUM: Well, I don't like the categories of winners and losers. This is not a cowboys and Indians story. It's a very complex geopolitical issue, which requires, I think, more careful analysis. First of all, Israel had declared a policy that it would not capitulate to terrorists, because it didn't want to reward them for their terrorism, thereby encouraging further terrorism. I think Israel did make a mistake, a major mistake, [01:24:00] when it traded the 1,100-and-some Shiite Muslims and Palestinians for 3 Israeli soldiers. Israel's feeling for the value of life, of saving the life of a single soldier of its own people was so great that it was prepared to make that exchange. But it established a precedent which many of us feel became an encouragement to the Shiite Muslim fanatics, now, to take the American hostages. Thank God all of that's over. If there is any winner, if one can use that term, it's the American people, who, all of us, I'm sure, join together -- and thanking God that the 39 hostages were returned safe and sound.

JOHNSON: Dr. Mehdi, Kaity, just now, in the profile of what has happened, suggested that President Assad of Syria was one of the winners, that his image is better than it was and that some people in this country saw him as something of the hero in this. I'm not totally sure that I agree with that. How do you feel about that?

MT MEHDI: First let me say that I agree [01:25:00] with Rabbi Tanenbaum. The real winners are the American people, not only because they have the hostages free and safe here but also because the American people today are more informed about the problems of the Middle East. The open society is becoming more open -- regretfully, thanks to the tragic circumstances. Now the original question. The president of Syria has done a great deal, deserves a great deal of thanks. And without his help, possibly the hostages still would be there, safe in Lebanon but still in Lebanon.

JOHNSON: Well, let's go back to this question of winners and losers. Now you suggested there aren't any. I think I agree with you. I mean, the antipathy still exists between Israel and Israel's enemies. Lebanon is still a divided country. I don't think that [01:26:00] President Assad has wiped out all of the other things that he's done because of this one act. So do you think there really are winners or losers, Dr. Mehdi?

MEHDI: Well, I think, to the extent that we are changing our perception of the things, we are all freer persons. Possibly then, the energy concerning Assad was not altogether correct. Possibly the image about the inner Shiite militia was not altogether correct. Now people see that they are human beings. They have their hopes, aspirations, frustrations -- right things, wrong things, what the captain of the hijacked plane said, stressing the fact that he has, for the first time, come to recognize that the people in the Middle East are human beings.

TANENBAUM: But I'm not sure that's the perception that has been changed. In fact, what I find troublesome, Dr. Mehdi, with all deference, is that you tend to suggest the justification for the terrorism, [01:27:00] now that the hostages are back, that somehow, through that evil, good has come. My own sense is... I watched some of the hostages this morning. One of them, Peter Hall, said that the term that the president of the United States used, that these were thugs, thieves, brigands, murderers, that that, in fact -- that, in fact, is the accurate explanation. The reason I have difficulty with the term winners and losers is that underlying all of this is the important need for the American people to understand that this is but the tip of the iceberg. In January, according to the *Wall Street*

*Journal*, there was a meeting of the foreign ministers of Syria, Iran, and Libya, who created a major antiterrorist strategy, whose purpose was to drive the United States and Western interests out of the Middle East. The tragedy is that we think that this has come to an end, it's like the end of a movie chapter. What we need to anticipate is that, unless we seize this occasion and use it for a means for mobilizing international cooperation [01:28:00] to put an end to this violent terrorism, this destruction of international mobility and transportation, we're going to face more American hostages being seized. So we need to keep our eye on the long-term issue here. And the short-term notion of winners and losers will delude us that this has come to an end.

JOHNSON: All right. We're going to pause for just a moment now. And when we come back, we'll continue our discussion about if there are winners and losers and who they may be, in this hostage ordeal. Stay with us.

(break in video file)

JOHNSON: --di, who is the president of the American-Arab Relations Committee. And we're talking about whether there were any winners or any losers in the hostage crisis which



has just ended. You talked a moment ago about President Assad of Syria. Now, he certainly has emerged as one of those who was instrumental in ending all of this. But when you talk about the region being better understood, you know, he has no love for the Shiites, traditionally. The Shiites have got problems with the Party of God. [01:29:00] I think all of those crosscurrents still exist in Lebanon and there. And also, we can't ignore that President Assad has done some mischief-making that has affected this country. Do you think, for instance, that he approves of terrorism?

MEHDI: As a matter of fact, no. And unlike what Rabbi Tanenbaum says, I am not justifying terrorism. I am trying to explain. And terrorism will continue -- I regret to say there will be more hijacking -- as long as the cause has not been addressed. And the Americans are all excited about the symptom of an issue. Why did these Lebanese terrorist engage in this horrible thing? Possibly their mothers, their sisters might have been killed by Israeli terrorist dropping American bombs when Israel invaded Lebanon in 1982. Violence beget violence. And we should address the cause of these horrors to eliminate future [01:30:00] miserable experiences. People who fail to examine the cause of a problem are doomed to experience the tragedy.

TANENBAUM: I agree. I think -- I think you're right. But the implication is that, somehow, had Israel not invaded Lebanon in '82, none of this would have happened. Do you suggest for a minute that the war between Iran and Iraq, where more than 140,000 people have been destroyed in four years, is happening somehow because of Israel's presence --

MEHDI: N--

TANENBAUM: -- or the destruction that Libya has sought to wrought against the president of Egypt, the effort to assassinate the president of the Sudan? I mean, what you have in the Islamic Arab world today -- and I don't want to generalize but there is a rise of fanaticism, which is given to violence and destruction of human life, in massive ways -- if Israel had not been there. I think the real issue, frankly... If I were an Arab Muslim, I would worry about that ideology, [01:31:00] which has resulted in so much internal destruction --

MEHDI: Rabbi, you are correct.

TANENBAUM: -- with Muslims to the other Muslims, Muslims killing Christians, Christians killing Muslims.

MEHDI: Rabbi, you are correct.

TANENBAUM: That's the issue for you to face, if you care about human life.

MEHDI: You are correct. There have been Muslims killing Muslim, just as there were Christians killing Christians -- and today, in Northern Ireland. But this does not mean that Israel is not an important factor in aggravating the situation. And in southern Lebanon, the Shiites, they never hijacked an American plane. They never attacked an American embassy. They never held an --

TANENBAUM: That's not true.

MEHDI: -- American hostage prior to the Israeli attack on Lebanon, with American tanks, with American airplanes, with American bombs!

TANENBAUM: Look, you've had Syrians destroying American embassies. You have had Amal --

MEHDI: I said the Sh--

TANENBAUM: -- Shiites --

MEHDI: It's Lebanese.

TANENBAUM: -- Amal Shiites blowing up Jordanian planes.

MEHDI: But they had not done --

TANENBAUM: The internal...

MEHDI: -- any of this to America. Their reaction against America is a direct reaction to Israeli invasion of Lebanon. [01:32:00]

TANENBAUM: What about -- what about four years ago, when a group of Arab Muslims killed two American ambassadors in

the Sudan, in Khartoum? What did that have to do with Israel?

MEHDI: Rabbi, why are you bringing irrelevant --

TANENBAUM: Well, I bring it in because --

MEHDI: -- evil thing?

TANENBAUM: -- I'm saying one has to face the ideology. When you have the Shiite Muslims, in the press conference last Sunday, declaring that what this is all about is that America is the Great Satan and, "We are justified by God, destroying the Great Satan," that's the core of the problem, a fanatic ideology which will not make peace with the present situation.

JOHNSON: Gentlemen, I'm afraid that we have not nearly enough time to discuss this very big issue. We've been talking about whether there are winners or losers. I don't know if we're any closer to a solution. But it's something that will be an ongoing discussion. Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum and Dr. M.T. Mehdi, thank you for being with us today. Now back to Kaity and Ernie.

TONG: All right. Thank you, very mu--

(break in video file)

TANENBAUM: I was recently in Rome. It's like a sieve. You can walk through that airport with guns and hand grenades. There's almost a sense of *La Dolce Vita* in that airport.

[01:33:00]

MCFARLAND: Well, there's no sense of *La Dolce Vita* here, in the Pan Am terminal at Kennedy airport. Thi--

(break in video file)

(*Live at Five*)

DAVID: --[mittees?], worked with Waldheim on some of the U.N. projects. And he's with us now. Rabbi Tanenbaum, welcome to *Live at Five*.

TANENBAUM: Thank you, David.

DAVID: First of all, you worked in committees involving Waldheim, during his time at the UN. At that time, were there rumors, indications at all? Was that something that was making the rounds of the UN halls, these allegations?

TANENBAUM: Well, there was an awareness, in parts of the Jewish community, that -- there were some reports that Waldheim had been a member of the Nazi *Jugend* movement. There had not been a full dossier yet on his involvement in Nazi military activity, including the absolutely despicable work of that particular branch of the Nazi army in Greece,

where they massacred and deported the whole population of Salonika. I served on a citizen's committee, affiliated with the United Nations, dealing with the world food and population problems. [01:34:00] And I had contact with Waldheim on several occasions. I always felt a strange kind of stress. It may be unfair in hindsight to say that. But there was always either a great reticence, a defensiveness, or an overcompensation of friendliness in relationship to me. And I always thought there was something in the closet about this guy. Well, I think the evidence that has come out now... And it's important to make the point that this documentation about his involvement in the Nazi military machine came from Austrian Christians, political opposition

DAVID: He's up for election for president of Austria, d--

TANENBAUM: He's up for election for president in May.

DAVID: In May. That's right.

TANENBAUM: And I think what is really important about this is how the Austrian people respond to this revelation, that a man who is running to be candidate of presidency of Austria -- how the people are going to respond to the revelation that he was a Nazi and was engaged in this violent destruction of human life.

DAVID: How d-- how do you come to terms with the fact that, given these [01:35:00] allegations now, what appears to be

documents about it, that he was Secretary General of the United Nations and, for him to get that position, he had to have been approved by both the United States, clearly, and the Soviet Union? And you wonder where was the investigation, where was the looking into this man's past?

TANENBAUM: Well, I think that's a very critical question. How is it possible that the leaders of all of the nations of the world could find no person other than that of Kurt Waldheim, a former Nazi, to be the Secretary General of the United Nations? You know, ironically, one of the candidates at the same time of the -- of the Secretary General of the UN was Olof Palme, of Sweden, who was just --

DAVID: Just assassinated.

TANENBAUM: -- killed. But it does raise some questions about the selection process at the United Nations.

DAVID: He says -- he says, for example, that, these Nazi youth groups that he joined in school, that his family was anti-Nazi, that he joined these groups almost as a cover to protect him and his family. And we do know that [01:36:00] during that era many people either claimed to have allegiance to the Nazis or waved the flag as a way of putting the Nazis off their door. Do you think there may be any --

TANENBAUM: Look, I've been --

DAVID: -- veracity to that?

TANENBAUM: -- I've been in Germany and Austria a number of times. The number of people who have come to us who've lived through the Nazi period, who claim to have saved Jews and been anti-Nazi, had the stories they told been true, there wouldn't have been a single Jew killed in Nazi Germany. Everybody saved Jews. And Austria too. Everybody saved Jews. Everybody saved gypsies. The plain fact of the matter is the issue is the moral question. Why did this man lie, deny, suppress information, which is now available from the Austrian Ministry of Justice and Foreign Ministry? I mean, this does not come out of the World Jewish Congress only.

DAVID: Yeah.

TANENBAUM: It comes out of Austrian sources. And he absolutely lied about it. In his own autobiography he ignores altogether his involvement on the Nazi military staff. It was --

DAVID: He does.

TANENBAUM: -- not just the...

DAVID: He also omits that period. [01:37:00] I'm afraid we're running out of time. I just wanted to add that, in fact, in a number of inquiries, he had specifically denied that he was a member of any kind Nazi organization. Our guest has



been Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, of the American Jewish  
Committee. Want to thank you for taking the time, stopping  
by --

TANENBAUM: Thank you, David.

DAVID: -- to discuss this with us. OK.

TANENBAUM: Glad to be here.

(break in video file)

(News 4 New York)

CONNIE COLLINS: -- and began this morning's homily by  
echoing the pope's reading of *Nostra Aetate*.

JOHN O'CONNOR: He deplores all hatreds, persecutions, displays  
of anti-Semitism leveled at any time or from any source  
against the Jews.

COLLINS: One issue that the pope did not touch upon was the  
Vatican's refusal to establish diplomatic ties with Israel,  
an issue that has some Jewish leaders upset.

TANENBAUM: -- Jordan.

COLLINS: Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum said he welcomed the symbolic  
gesture of the meeting. However...

TANENBAUM: It should open the door to further discussion  
about the complex Middle East situation. I happen to  
believe that the Vatican must take firmer positions with

extremists in the Arab world. Otherwise, they will invite further reprisals. [01:38:00]

RONALD SOBEL: I have expressed this very directly, face-to-face, in three meetings that I've had privately with Pope John Paul II, that the Vatican in fact recognize Israel, but it's absence ought not to stand in the way of the ongoing relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and the Jewish people.

O'CONNOR: The Holy Father is signaling to the entire world that he wants to see an end to anti-Semitism everywhere, however it is practiced. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that a pope has gone not only to speak but to listen. And I would think it most unfortunate if we -- if we didn't interpret this as an exceptionally encouraging sign.

[01:39:00]

COLLINS: Connie Collins, News 4, Manhattan.

(break in video file)

REPORTER: -- Jews, throughout the centuries. Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, of the American Jewish Committee, says the pope's visit has left many questions unanswered.

TANENBAUM: -- think the foremost question has to do with the moving from de facto diplomatic relations between the

Vatican and Israel to establishing full diplomatic relations. I believe it's on its way. I think the Jews in Italy, as well as throughout the world, including myself, think that there's just too much foot-dragging going on.

POPE JOHN PAUL II: --[*an associata?*] --

REPORTER: Vatican officials stressed today's visit was of a religious nature and the political questions would not be addressed.

(break in video file)

REPORTER: --graphy. The group, responding to the recent Attorney General's report on pornography, called, "child exploitation and the promotion of rape of women a direct assault on the human moral fiber." But civil liberties groups say the Meese Commission report and today's meeting are a direct assault on the First Amendment.

NORMAN SIEGEL? (mislabeled as Marc Tannenbaum [*sic*]): The climate that's going on in this country [01:40:00] with regard to censorship creates an atmosphere that, what we could be seeing is the early stages, the planning stages of a witch hunt.

TANENBAUM (misidentified as Norman Siegel): Pornography both contributes to that and is a symbol of that moral decadence which erodes the moral substance of our nation.

MARTIN: The group of religious leaders agreed unanimously on terms of today's meeting. They did not, however, say what they're going to do about it.

(break in video file)

REPORTER 1: Rabbi Tanenbaum, what can you say? Obviously, there must be a great sense of outrage in the Jewish community.

TANENBAUM: Well, it's horrible. It's a terrifying experience to witness 25 elderly people who come into a house of worship to pray and find themselves destroyed by these brutal killers. These are criminals, murderers of the worst sort. When you see what happened in Karachi, with the vicious hijacking of people in that airplane, 18 innocent civilians killed, [01:41:00] and now 25 worshippers in a Turkish synagogue destroyed, there's one thing in common. These people, these terrorists have utter contempt for the value of human life. They're out to undermine the basic values of Western civilization. And we've got to do

everything we can, all governments, all nations, to stand against them.

REPORTER 2: Rabbi, have you been in contact at all with anyone in Istanbul?

TANENBAUM: I've spoken today with the Turkish embassy, the political councilor there, who gave me a detailed report of what happened and who read to me the statement of the prime minister of Turkey and the Turkish ambassador to the United States. He expressed to me the condolences of the Turkish government and, very interesting, said to me... Turkey is predominantly a Muslim country. He said, "These killers are not Muslims. They're plain criminals. And we're determined to bring them to justice."

REPORTER 1: Rabbi, thank you, very much for joining us today on this sad occasion for the Jewish community. [01:42:00]  
We have more news from the --

(break in video file)

TANENBAUM: It became impossible to distinguish their remains.

MARCI REITMAN: Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum says this was not simply an anti-Semitic act.

TANENBAUM: -- hijacking is ultimately an anti-human act.

REITMAN: Just as the small Jewish community in Istanbul was mourning the deaths, so were members of the Shearith Israel congregation, here on the Upper West Side, halfway across the world in miles, perhaps, but much closer in spirit.

MARC ANGEL: We have families, still, in Istanbul. My mother's family came from Istanbul area. So I don't know if --

REITMAN: Rabbi Angel also has friends there, including Head Rabbi David [Aseo?], who reportedly was wounded.

ANGEL: He's an elderly man, very gentle man. We've known him for a while. We visited with him in his office when we were in Istanbul two summers ago. I wish him a speedy recovery and I hope it wasn't serious.

REITMAN: As the congregation finished its Saturday night prayers tonight, they expressed not only sadness but anger.

EVERY NEUMARK: We're all one family. We're Americans and we're Jewish people. And we must wipe out terrorism. We have to speak the language which they speak. [01:43:00] And if that's the only language they understand, we have to retaliate back.

IRMA LOPES CARDOZA: Israel has to show its strength -- now.

ELIZABETH LEVI DEMONTZIMOS: Now, I'm speaking as a person from Europe. About six million, inclusive my mother and my father. And we said, "Nothing can happen to us any longer."

REITMAN: But it did. Marci Reitman, *News 4 New York*.

REPORTER: Now the question, who did it and why?

(break in video file)

RUSSELL BARBER: As a result of this national assault on pornography, New York Archbishop John Cardinal O'Connor hosted an interfaith meeting in New York City of national religious leaders to document the seriousness of the pornography problem and to develop a response to it. With us today are three of those religious leaders who attended the cardinal's meeting, Father Bruce Ritter, founder of Covenant House, that safe haven in the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street district for New York's teenage prostitutes and runaways, Judith Mead-Atwell, member of the Council on Women and the Church, for the Presbyterian Church, USA, and Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, Director of International Relations [01:44:00] for the American Jewish Committee. Thanks, all, for coming. What is pornography? According to that report, there's no firm definition of it?

BRUCE RITTER: Oh, that's nonsense. I mean, obviously, the reporter had no-- (laughs) had not read the report. And that's the problem, Russ. The discussion has been carried on up to date by people who are either opposed to the report or supportive but haven't bothered to read it. The

commission adopted, as its definition of pornography the same definition adopted by the Fraser commission in Canada and the Williams commission in England, that pornography is sexually explicit material predominantly designed to arouse, were very clear about that.

BARBER: But then how do you make the distinction between that and art, for example? Some art forms might result in sexual arousal, although that wasn't necessarily the point of it.

RITTER: If it was predomin-- designed to arouse, if the intention of the artist was to arouse, and it was sexually explicit, then we designated that material as pornography.

BARBER: So that means that Justice Potter's line [01:45:00] that, "I know it when I see it," doesn't apply anymore. There are these limitations and definitions. Do you all agree with this definition?

TANENBAUM: Well, I think our religious traditions have some rather clear-cut notions of what constitutes pornography. We published a study, the American Jewish Committee, on Judaism and pornography, which is quite explicit in terms of what Jewish tradition teaches. The concentration on genitalia, that is, the reduction of sexuality to that sexual function for the sake of simple arousal, outside of an awareness of the dignity of the human personality and of relationships between people, in terms of mutual respect,



love, and caring, that kind of pornography is regarded as incompatible with the highest ethical teachings of Jewish tradition.

BARBER: The most controversial commission finding, I suppose, was the fact that pornography can cause sexual violence. And, of course, that's contrary, as the report pointed out, to a 1970 presidential commission, that indicated there was no harm from erotic material, necessarily. Why the difference? [01:46:00] What's changed in the meantime?

RITTER: Well, the 1970 commission, Russ, really did not have available for study the pornography that is present today. For example, computer porn or dial-a-porn or VCR porn or sadomasochism or child porn simply did not exist at the time. And so what was available for study in 1970, we would hardly even consider softcore porn today. And also, there were very, very few scientific studies available in 1970. Most of the studies examined by the 1970 commission were commissioned very hastily by that commission and used as the basis for its report. But there has been an extraordinary revolution in the electronic media in 15 years. And I think it was perfectly legitimate for the president to instruct his Attorney General to institute this commission to study what has become [01:47:00] a major problem.

BARBER: Ms. Mead-Atwell, what should be the religious community's response to this? How can the religious community help?

JUDITH MEAD-ATWELL: I think the religious community can help on many levels. One is the national level, that the Religious Alliance Against Pornography will be taking, which will -- it will bring to the forefront a united front against pornography. We are going to be having presidential seminar. We'll be having a press briefing. So it will raise sensitivity to the fact that the major religious denominations are caring about this subject, that we are looking at it.

BARBER: But your church doesn't have a position on this yet.

MEAD-ATWELL: We have instituted a study that will be completed in 1987 on the subject of pornography. And when that study is completed, we will be having recommendations and resources available. [01:48:00]

BARBER: The commission calls for, among other things, citizen watch groups, that should file complaints and pressure local authorities, local prosecutors and judges, for long sentences and real efforts to incarcerate people -- and, if necessary, even to boycott organizations that sell what they call pornography. Civil libertarians say that this is the beginning of moral vigilante-ism. Is it?

TANENBAUM: I think that's a real concern, Russ. And I think that all of us -- I know that, in our discussions within the Religious Alliance -- have been raising that question. We've made the point that the medicine must not be worse than the disease we're trying to cure and that we will not support vigilantism, we will, in fact, stand against it and be as critical against those forces that seem to take the law into their hand as we are against those people who are exploiting the dignity of the human person, through child pornography and hardcore pornography. [01:49:00] I think the important point about the Meese Commission report is that it must be seen as the beginning of a process, of a national dialogue about what is happening to the quality of moral life in American society. There's a moral ecology in this environment. And that moral ecology is leading to a whole range of socially deviant things happening, including very great destructive things, drugs, crime, violence. And this is an aspect of that. It cannot be seen in isolation from what is happening to the moral qualities of the life of society. And we hope, by raising that, we can begin to look at the -- at the whole question of the drift of the society into these moral dead ends.

BARBER: Marc, you mentioned earlier about the religious tradition that helps to formulate our ideas about what is

acceptable and not in our relationship there, the fact that pornography is immoral. The Supreme Court has declared, of course, that obscene material is not protected by First Amendment protection of free speech. But it also declares that judges may apply [01:50:00] contemporary standards, community standards to determine what is or is not pornography. And that would mean that some porn-- Or obscene, I should say. And that would mean that some pornography might be considered obscene in one community and not obscene in another community. Isn't there a serious First Amendment problem here, where groups can band together, even groups like yourselves, religious leaders like yourselves, who are very much aware of your responsibilities, both to the Constitution and your constituency and to -- and to society, where, when you try to limit your concern -- or limit the pornography because of your concern that it might be immoral, that you might be going a step too far, because it's not necessarily obscene and therefore illegal in this particular community?

RITTER: Well, Russ, in the first place, I don't think the churches are necessarily coming from the viewpoint that they can or should oppose pornography because it's immoral, although clearly many of us think that it is. A community decision that pornography is harmful to the young people,

to children, to women is not necessarily a moral or an ethical judgment. [01:51:00] It is simply that it really harms the community. It harms women. It harms individuals.

BARBER: Let's talk quickly about women and children. Because those are certainly... Let's talk first about kids. That's where it's really a serious problem, is it not?

RITTER: Yes. And most of the recommendations of the commission were designed to protect children. There were, I believe, 94 recommendations of our commission and more than half of them concerned itself with protecting children from either being exploited in pornography or being injured by exposure to it.

BARBER: Can you give me a very brief capsule of what's happening right here in this city, with kids, the teenage prostitutes, the runaways?

RITTER: Well, I'll give you an example. It is still legal in New York State for your 16-year-old son or daughter to make a porn film. And there's nothing you can do about it. Now that, to me, is absolutely reprehensible. We say that a young person of 16 can't drink, drive, or vote, because they're too immature, don't have the judgment, the insight. [01:52:00] But we say, "You can make a porn film." That's extraordinary.

BARBER: What about the impact on women?

MEAD-ATWELL: The violence that's in many pornographic movies, the sadomasochistic behavior, portraying women as enjoying rape, violence is very detrimental to women. It goes side-by-side with spouse abuse. It's integra--

BARBER: So it trivializes sex crimes.

MEAD-ATWELL: Oh, absolutely, absolutely.

RITTER: And it encourages them, actually. And it teaches men that women enjoy being raped --

MEAD-ATWELL: Sure.

RITTER: -- enjoy being abused.

MEAD-ATWELL: It reinforces all stereotypes.

BARBER: What is the relationship, if any, between softcore porn and hardcore porn? Because your groups seem to speak in a unanimous voice about hardcore but I heard very little --

MEAD-ATWELL: Well, the sex is the --

BARBER: -- about softcore.

MEAD-ATWELL: -- the sex is the link. But then the hardcore porn is violent, masochistic, where maybe softcore might be viewed as sexual explicit.

BARBER: Does one lead to the other?

RITTER: Well, let me -- [01:53:00] let me get back to the commission. The commission had a very hard time dealing with that issue. We were clear as a body that we opposed

and condemned violent, degrading pornography. When it came to the so-called softcore porn, there's a real split on the condition. In my view, in some ways, softcore porn is even more dangerous. The average, normal person is not going to think that sadomasochistic, violent, degrading porn is anything but harmful. It's softcore porn that teaches that sex has nothing to do with commitment, with fidelity, with caring, with constancy, with responsibility. That, in my view, in the long-term, has a much more dangerous impact on society, on family, on general attitudes toward relationships.

TANENBAUM: Except that hardcore pornography and child pornography are illegal.

RITTER: Yes.

TANENBAUM: And the law needs to be enforced on those issues. Look, our concern is to raise the consciousness of the American people, to stop indulging these depersonalizing, dehumanizing tendencies in the society, [01:54:00] which are being ripped off by cynical exploiters. You know, it's an \$8 billion industry. And much of it is run by crime syndicates. That is, these are people who are ripping off the American people for the sake of their own commercial profit. And they're doing it also in drugs and in other form of absolute destructive behavior to the quality of the

life of a society. I think that's the justification of our involvement in these concerns.

BARBER: I think it's interesting. The commission didn't ask for a broadening of the definition of pornography, just that existing laws be enforced, and pointed out there was only -- what? -- 71 convictions in pornogra-- or and for obscene material --

TANENBAUM: Yeah.

BARBER: -- since 1968.

TANENBAUM: Incidentally, the religious leadership will be as strong in upholding the constitutional rights of American citizens, in this case -- and will stand against vigilantism -- as they will stand against hardcore pornographers.

BARBER: But what about some of the tactics involved? A lot of people were very concerned about the fact that this letter was sent by the commission to the 7-Eleven and to the Rite Aid stores about, "You may be -- you may be cited for distributing and selling pornography."

RITTER: Well, Russ, that letter was dumb. [01:55:00]

BARBER: It was dumb.

RITTER: It was dumb. The commission did not see it. We did not endorse it. It was sent by the director. And unfortunately, it could have been interpreted as a rather repressive



action of the commission. But, you know, as commissioners we repudiated it. But what I -- what I'm concerned with is that you're identifying vigilantism, which is action outside the law, with actions recommended by the commission that are totally within the law. And it is not against the Constitution or against the law to express, by picketing or boycotting, your objection to violent, degrading pornography. And so to term that vigilante-ism is really feeding into that same extremist, censorship mentality.

TANENBAUM: No, but I think there's appropriate concern, though. The groups who've been bombing abortion clinics --

RITTER: Oh...

MEAD-ATWELL: Oh, sure.

BARBER: (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: -- represent some of the same fanatic mentality.

BARBER: And who knows where it's --

TANENBAUM: And they may begin --

BARBER: -- going to go next? That's it.

TANENBAUM: -- bombing adult stores. And we would oppose that.

MEAD-ATWELL: Yeah.

BARBER: Our time is gone. But I have one last quick question and that is... The American Civil Liberties Union termed

[01:56:00] the commission's findings a fraud. Quick reaction.

RITTER: Yes. They said that before the commission met for the first time. (laughter)

BARBER: All right. We know it's a serious problem. I want to thank you all, very much, for coming and discussing this matter of pornography, obscenity. And let's hope that we're raising the consciousness in a way that's going to be beneficial to society. Thanks, very much.

RITTER: Thank you.

(break in video file)

(*Straight Talk*)

DENISE RICHARDSON: --(inaudible) [of?] Austria led to renewed feelings of anti-Semitism in that country. Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum is Director of International Relations for the American Jewish Committee. And Frederic Morton was born and raised in Austria, is the author of several novels, including *The Rothschilds*. I want to welcome you both to *Straight Talk*. Well, was anti-Semitism something as an undercurrent in Austria, before Waldheim's election and before the campaign and all of the press that he received

during the campaign and the campaign just brought out that kind of hostility in people? Was that...?

TANENBAUM: Well, Austria incubated political anti-Semitism as we know it. [01:57:00] I think Mr. Morton may want to refer to that out of his own experience in Austria, having been born in Vienna. But part of the sense of outrage that the Jewish people and, I think, many others had, over the election of Kurt Waldheim, apart from the fact of his having lied to the United Nations for ten years, and to the world and to the Austrian people, is that Austria, in the nineteenth century, in the political parties that were organized by von Schonerer and later by the mayor of Vienna -- they became elected on the basis of using one issue, namely, political anti-Semitism. And in that incubus of political anti-Semitism, Adolf Hitler acknowledged that he learned -- he got his mother's milk on anti-Semitism in Austria. And so there is the feeling that there has been this very long tradition in Austria, certainly up until the period of the present, Second Republic.

RICHARDSON: There are 9,000 Jews in Austria now. How do those Jews live, [01:58:00] Mr. Morton? Are they middle-class and upper-class and are they living in Jewish communities? Or are they living all over Austria? That's a very small number of people.

FREDERIC MORTON: Very small number of people. The majority of those Jews in Austria now were not originally Austrian Jews. They came usually from the east, did very well in Vienna. That's why they stayed mostly in Vienna. Most of them are upper middle-class, live a very prosperous life, a life a little bit on the edge, I would say, since the Waldheim experience.

RICHARDSON: Now when you say on the edge, what does that mean?

MORTON: Well, the Waldheim experience, for the Austrians, has been very traumatic. They now feel that they are in the limelight, as the inheritors of Nazi Germany, in terms of image -- which is simplifying a very complex situation. [01:59:00] And in that respect, I would like to go back to von Schonerer, which Rabbi Tanenbaum mentioned, who was the founder, as he quite rightly said, of political anti-Semitism. But right there we get into the complex situation of -- or the complex phenomena known as anti-Semitism. Von Schonerer, he's a fascinating story. When I wrote *A Nervous Splendor*, which is a book of mine which deals with turn of the century Vienna, I discovered, to my own real surprise, that von Schonerer's father was the general manager of the Rothschild railroads in Austria. In other words, he worked for the largest Jewish commercial organization in Europe.

And he got his money from Jews, as it were, and worked with Jews constantly. He had two children. One of them was George von Schonerer, Georg von Schonerer, [02:00:00] who founded the anti-Semitic party, which was the first politically organized anti-Semitic movement. But who was his sister?

RICHARDSON: That was the name of it, the Anti-Semitic Party?

MORTON: No. The name of the party, I think, was *Gesamtdeutsche Partei*. Now, I may be wrong on this. It did not have the word *anti-Semitism* in it. But anti-Semitism was its chief political point. There's no question about that. The fact was that, at that time, intellectually and culturally, the Jews were dominant in Austria. The leading newspapers were run...

RICHARDSON: What kind of a population were you talking about then?

MORTON: We are talking about, I believe... Now arithmetically I may be a little bit off. But there were from 200,000 to 300,000 Jews in Vienna. And they were the leading cultural dynamic force, not just Sigmund Freud, not just Gustav Mahler, the great composer, not just Theodore Herzl, who, before he was the founder of anti-Semitism, was one of the great leading -- journalism. [02:01:00]

TANENBAUM: Founder of Zionism.

MORTON: Founder of Zionism --

TANENBAUM: Zionism.

MORTON: -- correct. But before that, even while he was founder of Zionism, he was also the leading cultural journalist in Vienna.

TANENBAUM: See, but that's the ambiguity of the situation we're trying to deal with today. That is, on the one hand, there must have been something in Austria, especially in Vienna, that was open and supportive to the possibility of Jews expressing their talents and their creativity, for them to become such a dominant factor. Austrian culture cannot be understood apart from the overwhelming creative contribution that Jews made to every part of Austrian life --

MORTON: Exactly.

TANENBAUM: -- intellectually...

MORTON: Exactly.

TANENBAUM: And at the same time, the seeds of envy and resentment also took place there.

RICHARDSON: Now how does...?

TANENBAUM: I think that's what we're trying to deal with today.

RICHARDSON: Well, here's where the Jewish Committee comes in. You're working with the Austrian government on a program

that would really enhance communication. What is the long-range goal of the program?

TANENBAUM: Well, and, first of all, [02:02:00] we have met with the Austrian Jewish community leadership, to have some understanding that we're sharing some of our goals and we have that with them. We have now... I've been to Austria twice in the past year, on a mission, that we met with the heads of both political parties, a chancellor of the government, foreign minister, and people in other parts of life. We are concerned about essentially two things. One is that Austria has a profound need, which is beginning to be met, of facing its past. There has been, over the period of the past 40 years, a denial of Austria's involvement in the Nazi Holocaust. Adolf Eichmann and Adolf Hitler were not accidents. Austrians played a significant role in the Nazi Holocaust. There also was an Austrian Resistance. There also is denial of the -- of the presence of anti-Semitism in Austria today. A great many studies are being done saying that no more than 10% or 15% of the population have been involved.

RICHARDSON: So what kind of a program are you proposing?

TANENBAUM: [02:03:00] Well, we're proposing a program based on the reality that two-thirds of the Austrian people were born either during World War II or since World War II, were

not personally involved in the Nazi experience. We've begun a program of planning a conference with Austrian authorities that is going to look at the Austrian past, the Austrian present, and also the Austrian future. Namely, what kind of new relationships, new understandings can we - - can we build together, with young Austrians, who want face the past, learn lessons from it, and build a new future committed to democratic, pluralist society and standing against racism and bigotry and prejudice?

RICHARDSON: It almost sounds as though, Mr. Morton -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- as though you need a middle person, who's neither Jewish nor Austrian, to kind of mediate the two.

MORTON: Well, not necessarily. Rabbi Tanenbaum, I think, would be, as an American, in a very good position to do what he just said he would like to do. There is a potential [02:04:00] in the Austrian people that is negative as well as positive. It's a double potential. When you consider that Austria was not only a seedbed of anti-Semitism but, at the same time, a seedbed of Jewish genius, on the -- on the other hand, when you consider that, after World War II, the Austrian anti-Semitic tradition among the older people undoubtedly continued... But on the other hand, and this is, again, the reverse side of this ambivalence, Austria



was the only country outside of Israel which, for 12 years, elected a Jewish chief executive, Kreisky. Now it is usually objected, as a -- as a sort of a rebuttal to this point, that Kreisky was and is anti-Zionist. But the Austrians who voted for Kreisky and who consistently kept voting for him as their prime minister, as *Bundeskanzler*, which means prime minister, didn't see him as an anti-Zionist. [02:05:00] They saw him as someone who is very, very smart. And they all knew, of course, he was Jewish. And this smartness of the Jew... And I, when I'm in Austria, move and speak as an Austrian. They don't know that I'm really an American. They speak, I think, more freely. And I can overhear --

RICHARDSON: They distrust Americans?

MORTON: -- and eavesdrop. Well, they distrust, let's say, an American Jew, an American writer who has come to write about them. But if I talk with my Austrian accent, somehow they relax.

RICHARDSON: Then does it follow that they are so concerned about their perception in the world that they would be open to this kind of dialogue and really pay attention to it and deal with it?

TANENBAUM: Oh, I think it's a very serious commitment on the part of the people, in both political parties.

RICHARDSON: But, you see, there are the people in the political parties and there are the real people whom you have to touch.

TANENBAUM: Well, politicians are real people too. They can be.

RICHARDSON: That's a [big?] question. (laughs)

TANENBAUM: But there -- but there are also people in universities, the press, the media, [02:06:00] the cultural life, who have rallied around this effort. See, one of the things we need to keep in mind in evaluating the picture is that Austria, remarkably, as a neutral country, has received more than a quarter of a million Jews from the Soviet Union, from Iran, and elsewhere. It has been a country of asylum. And we don't take that for granted. It means that there are commitments to certain basic human rights in Austrian society, which is a positive feature, which needs to be built upon. Also I can tell -- that, while we were there in August, we had meetings with people from all walks of life in Austria. A young man who's in the mayor's office of Vienna got up and made a speech that moved me to tears. He said, "I was born after the war. I had nothing to do with Austria's involvement in the Nazi Holocaust. Our country has been silent over our role in the Nazi experience, the Nazi trauma for 40 years. We find that

intolerable, we young Austrians. We are determined to break that silence." He's involved in a whole program with the Ministry of Education [02:07:00] and writing new textbooks, that faces up to the Nazi experience, that faces up to anti-Semitism and the roots of that and talks about a whole new way of relating to the Jewish people.

RICHARDSON: Well, that's an interesting question. How do the textbooks look now? I mean, are the--

MORTON: Well --

RICHARDSON: -- are they clean of involvement?

MORTON: -- I'm not really an authority on that. But I do know one thing that relates to that point, that, in talking, in lecturing before university students, I find that they keep accusing their elders of having saddled them, namely, the younger generation, with this enormous moral cloud that's overhanging them, even the young ones. And they feel...

RICHARDSON: Moral cloud, you were say--?

MORTON: Yes, the moral cloud of the Nazi issue, which has never [properly?] been faced or aired, until the Waldheim thing, which has really brought that whole thing out in the open again.

RICHARDSON: Well, how does Waldheim feel about this kind of dialogue?

TANENBAUM: Well, we're really not interested in him. I mean,  
I...

RICHARDSON: Have you heard them? I mean, you must have  
heard... He must know what's going on. [02:08:00]

TANENBAUM: We have made a determination, the American Jewish  
Committee, that we will have nothing to do with Waldheim.

RICHARDSON: But how can you --

TANENBAUM: The issue with Waldheim...

RICHARDSON: -- go into Austria and have nothing to do with  
the president?

TANENBAUM: Well, it's quite possible. We go into many  
countries where we do not have anything formally to do...

MORTON: Well...

TANENBAUM: First of all, we're not a government. Secondly,  
the people whom we work with, and both political parties,  
the socialist party, which now has the chancellor in  
office, Dr. [Vernitsky?] --

MORTON: And the chancellor is the chief executive. The  
president is just a ceremonial figure.

TANENBAUM: -- right --

RICHARDSON: S--

TANENBAUM: -- I think that's an important distinction -- as  
well as the new foreign minister, Alice [Moche?], of the --  
Moche, of the People's Party, during the course of our

conversations with them, both of them made, that is, Dr. Vernitsky, the socialist, and the People's Party, made very powerful public statements saying that neither of them will tolerate anti-Semitism, that, whatever happened during the presidential election, in terms of people exploiting anti-Semitism, will not be tolerated. And during the recent parliamentary election, they did that at the top of the election, [02:09:00] to make sure that there will be no sanctions for that kind of exploitation of bigotry.

MORTON: Yeah. And furthermore, the current chancellor is the first Austrian chief executive to have stated publicly that Austria must in some way come to decisive terms with its past when it comes to anti-Semitism. Kreisky never said that, though he is Jewish. None of Vernitsky's predecessors as chief executives ever said that. He's the first one to have said, "Yes, a very substantial part of the Austrian people have been involved in this anti-Semitic enterprise and we must acknowledge that."

RICHARDSON: Rabbi Tanenbaum, couple of words here. How long will the program take to, I guess, work?

TANENBAUM: Well, we've been working in Germany for 18 years. I don't expect this to happen overnight. What has accumulated, not only over the past 40 years but was accumulated over the past 2,000 years, is not going to be

changed overnight. But the most important thing is to take the first steps on a very long journey. And we plan to stay with it. [02:10:00]

RICHARDSON: Good luck. Thank you both, very much, for being with us. My guests, Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, Director of International Relations for the American Jewish Committee, and Frederic Morton, novelist. Stay with us.

(break in video file)

M: -- Jewish --

JACK CAFFERTY: Leaders condemned the session and accused the Vatican of a whitewash. A group of activists kept vigil outside. They were dressed in concentration camp uniforms. The leaders of America's largest Jewish organizations have loudly opposed today's meeting. Two men who have much to say on the subject are in our studio now. They're with Gabe Pressman. Gabe.

GABE PRESSMAN: Yes. Rabbi -- thanks, Jack -- Rabbi Mordecai Waxman, Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum both were at a meeting of Jewish leaders this afternoon and came out with a strongly worded statement. Rabbi Waxman, [02:11:00] why isn't it perfectly justified for the pope to receive the head of state of a large -- not a large but a very predominantly Catholic country, a next door neighbor of his?

MORDECAI WAXMAN: Mr. Waldheim is accused of a Nazi past he has not repudiated. He's lied about it. The American government has excluded him from these shores. Most Western states have refused to receive him. The pope is a symbol of moral authority. And if he receives Waldheim under these circumstances, he seems to be endowing him with clearance from his Nazi past. Symbolically this is a rejection of the tragedy of the Holocaust.

PRESSMAN: You're asking for a meeting with the pope with various American Jewish leaders and others -- to clear the air?

WAXMAN: We're asking for a meeting on substantive issues involving the relationships between the Jewish people and the Catholic Church.

PRESSMAN: Including --

WAXMAN: We have had -- we...

PRESSMAN: -- this issue.

WAXMAN: Including this issue. But I should say that we've had 20 years of very fruitful dialogue. And this is, [02:12:00] it seems to us, an unnecessary roadblock along the course of a rethinking of Catholic-Jewish relations both in this country and internationally. And we have been very satisfied with that. We're therefore appalled that this meeting is taking place.

PRESSMAN: Rabbi Tanenbaum, you've been a pioneer in ecumenical relationships between the Jews and the -- and the Catholics in the United States. Do you think that this is a very serious blow?

TANENBAUM: I think it is a blow between the Vatican and the Jewish community. The relationships between the Catholic Church and Jewish people in the United States is very strong. I'm sure it'll withstand this. I'm more concerned about what this message will mean to German Catholic young people, Austrian Catholic young people, who will feel now that the Nazi Holocaust is irrelevant and they don't have to face it, as they wanted to face it. That's my major concern. There's a revisionism implied in this, that somehow...

PRESSMAN: You mean rewriting history.

TANENBAUM: Yeah. That is, if you can meet with Waldheim and not mention the word *Nazism* and not mention anti-Semitism, [02:13:00] it means, in effect, that it's not an issue.

PRESSMAN: But isn't it the same pope who has expressed great concern about the tragedy of the Holocaust?

TANENBAUM: Well, that's what mind-boggling to us. In our meetings with the pope, we'd show... Mordy Waxman chaired a meeting we had with him in October '85. He was forthright in condemning Nazi anti-Semitism, the Nazi Holocaust. The



question for us is, you know, what is his mind on this issue. Was it the meeting we had with him in October in Rome or is it what happened with Waldheim today? Great confusion about that now.

PRESSMAN: Rabbi Waxman, Rabbi Tanenbaum, both perplexed and desirous of meeting with the pope, on this day of the visit with Waldheim. Back to you, Jack.

(break in video file)

(*MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour*)

REPORTER: Next tonight, we explore the controversial meeting today between Austrian president Kurt Waldheim and Pope John Paul II. Waldheim's reputed Nazi past has been the rallying point of Jewish groups opposed to the meeting. Vatican spokesmen defended the Waldheim visit, on the grounds that the pope [02:14:00] routinely receives all heads of state requesting an audience. Today, American Jewish leaders condemned the Waldheim visit, while American Catholic bishops defended the pope.

HENRY SEIGMAN: Is it possible that this man, who has become the symbol not only of an evil Nazi past but of current efforts to diminish, falsify, and forget the Holocaust, is just another unpleasant head of state for the supreme leader of

the Catholic Church? Is it possible, Your Holiness, that in Waldheim's forgetfulness there is an echo, however distant, of the church's forgetfulness, as well.

JOHN O'CONNOR: I think that the Holy Father does what he believes to be in the best interests of all people. Clearly there are those who question his judgment in this case. And that's perfectly legitimate. But I couldn't begin to question his intentions for a moment or his passionate commitment to the human rights of peoples of all backgrounds, [02:15:00] races, creeds, colors, and so on.

REPORTER: For more on the Vatican meeting and the fallout, we have Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, Director of International Relations at the American Jewish Committee, and Father Vincent O'Keefe, director of the Jesuit community at Fordham University, in New York. Starting with you first, Rabbi Tanenbaum, you heard what Archbishop O'Connor just said, you know, the judgment, the intentions, the passionate commitment to people of all races. What is it that you're -- is it all three that you're questioning or what?

TANENBAUM: I don't think that any of us in the Jewish community question the intention of Pope John Paul II. I think one thing ought to be made clear, that there is the greatest respect for Pope John Paul as a person. I've had

the privilege of taking part in three separate audiences with him. That's not the issue. The issue is that the pope, as Waldheim himself said today, [02:16:00] is the highest moral conscience in the world. He said that he is the -- he is the conscience of mankind. And in many ways, I think he is. For the pope, who represents such high moral standards, to receive Kurt Waldheim, an unrepentant Nazi, a man who has lied and denied his involvement as a Nazi war officer, who participated in the deportation of thousands of Greek Jews to certain death in Auschwitz, who was involved in the Yugoslav situation where three villages were burned and thousands of Christians, partisans were burned or killed, and then for that audience to take place and for Pope John Paul II not to say a single word about the Nazi Holocaust, not a single word about Waldheim's past and then, in effect, to talk about him and present him to the world as being an architect of international peace, a kind of moral hero in the world, is really mind-boggling.

REPORTER: If the pope had mentioned the Nazi business [02:17:00] and some condemnation and remembrance of the Holocaust, would that have ameliorated the outrage that is being heard across the country and the world?

TANENBAUM: No, I don't think it's a matter of simply being nice to the Jews and, you know, saying the right words to

them. The pope has repeatedly condemned the Nazi Holocaust and atrocities and anti-Semitism. And we honor him for that. But the Jews really do not have to hear that from the pope. We understand the meaning of that and how to deal with that. Waldheim is the person who needed to hear that from the pope. And he heard nothing of that in that audience today. And we really are deeply upset over that reality.

REPORTER: But is that the substance of your criticism, that the pope didn't raise that, or that the pope met with Waldheim? I mean, what is the most upsetting?

TANENBAUM: Well, I think first is the fact of the meeting itself. You know, somewhere there's got to be some kind of statute of limits on who you meet with. The notion of indiscriminate meeting [02:18:00] with any world leader, regardless of history or moral character, means that you have to own the consequences of that meeting. Waldheim will now take the results of this meeting and plaster it over the press of Austria and Germany, all German-language press, that he now is Mr. Clean as a result of what the pope said to him.

REPORTER: Father O'Keefe, all of this that you've just heard from Rabbi Tanenbaum was telegraphed in advance. Why do you think the pope went ahead with the meeting?

VINCENT O'KEEFE: I think, first of all, I'm very glad to hear Rabbi Tanenbaum say there's no questioning of John Paul II himself. His record is very strong on the condemnation of such terrible evil. I think the pope has to be free and he has to be independent to receive people. I think he counts on the understanding, and a sympathetic understanding, of other people. If the pope begins to set limits according to certain standards, on whom he can receive and not receive, that becomes a very, very difficult issue. [02:19:00] I would add this, that there are many of these audiences. I lived in Rome for almost 20 years and a number happen every week. There's some publicity. There's not much. However, it's the protocol of those visits, that the Vatican does not report on what went on in those visits nor does the other party, except where the other party will make outrageous statements and then they are corrected by the Vatican.

REPORTER: So what are you saying, that there's a possibility that the pope did say something about the Holocaust?

O'KEEFE: I think there's a real possibility. I don't know how the rabbi knows -- I think maybe he's going from just the statement that was made -- how anyone knows that no mention at all was made of these events that are so objected to.

REPORTER: Would it be your guess that the pope did?

O'KEEFE: Oh, I would guess tha-- I would guess that he did.

TANENBAUM: Father, what we have are the two official texts and all the press reports. And at least during that formal part of it, there wasn't a single reference to the issue. Might I just make this point about the matter or receiving leaders indiscriminately. [02:20:00] When Pope John Paul II received, and it was not an official audience, as you well know, Yasser Arafat, it was a gerrymandered audience, which, Arafat pushed himself to the head of a line of a general audience and then they maneuvered a photograph of it. Arafat took that photograph, splashed it (overlapping dialogue) newspapers throughout the whole Arab Muslim world and third-world nations, and the captions on it everywhere, "Pope Blesses PLO Program," the PLO, which is committed to the destruction of Israel, has the blessings of the pope. That's the exploitation of... Idi Amin did the same thing with Paul VI.

REPORTER: All right, let's --

O'KEEFE: Yeah.

REPORTER: -- just get Father...

O'KEEFE: I think, though, when such statements went out from Arafat or Arafat's followers, the Vatican clarified that, that he had been talked to during the audience on the question of terrorism and in no uncertain terms. Now, the

Vatican makes it a principle that it does not discuss what went on in those discussions and conversations, unless, as I say, there's been some bad misuse or some outrageous misuse. [02:21:00] If Mr. Waldheim does go back to Austria and tries to present himself as Mr. Clean, you know, in the sense that you're referring to, the Vatican, I'm sure, would make a clarification of that. But I'm sure also that there was no statement made that would cover all the things that were discussed during that conversation between the pope and Mr. Waldheim. That's not the policy -- so that...

TANENBAUM: But that's not tr-- As of today, that's not what the situation is. I mean, the press reports that I've seen... Frankly, I think Waldheim hijacked the pope and the Vatican today. In his language, in effect, he said, "The moral conscience of mankind, in effect, exonerated me," by not making any acknowledgment at all of the past. He's being presented as a international architect of peace.

REPORTER: How do you respond to that?

O'KEEFE: [I say?] that refers simply to Mr. Waldheim's term as Secretary General at the United Nations --

REPORTER: But can it be --

O'KEEFE: -- that that was his...

REPORTER: -- taken in is-- sorry, Father -- can it be taken in isolation?

O'KEEFE: I don't see how it can be. Because [02:22:00] the language was very carefully formulated. Obviously this was going to be a controversial issue, a controversial visit. I think the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II, realizing this, went ahead with it anyhow. I think that's the type of person he is. He feels he has to be free to receive these people. In his mind, whatever his mind was... None of us -- none of us can really penetrate that. But in his mind, there was a proportional good in doing this visit. That would...

REPORTER: Do you agree with that, Father O'Keefe --

O'KEEFE: That I...?

REPORTER: -- and do you think -- do you think generally that's what should have been done under the circumstances?

O'KEEFE: I find that very hard to say. Because my viewpoint is much more limited, much more narrow than the Holy Father's himself. There have been other visits... For example, the Holy Father received Archbishop Lefebvre, a French archbishop who, as the rabbi knows, was in severe disaccord with the whole of Vatican II, which the Holy Father defends very much. I would have preferred [02:23:00] that he had not made that visit. But I'm not the one to judge.



REPORTER: Sure.

O'KEEFE: Nothing came out of that visit.

REPORTER: Rabbi Tanenbaum, Jewish leaders, today, call this meeting a historic lack of respect for Jews and Judaism. Can you explain that criticism?

TANENBAUM: I was present --

REPORTER: And do you agree with...?

TANENBAUM: -- I was present at that meeting and present at the other meetings and helped participate in writing our statement. Yeah, well, there's something of a watershed character about what has happened. Because what is implied in the meeting today is a kind of revisionism of history. One of the great concerns we have is that there are elements in the world, the Soviet Union, East European blocks, neo-Nazi groups, who have set about systematically to say that the Holocaust was a hoax or it didn't happen or the Jews invented it for their own purposes. To go through this experience with Waldheim and not to acknowledge in any way his Nazi involvement and what his past was like and his denial and lying of that, in fact, confirms that lying and denying about the Holocaust is OK. [02:24:00]

REPORTER: Do you think this is a watershed, Father O'Keefe?

O'KEEFE: No, I frankly don't. Maybe that's because, all the time I was in Rome, there were so many of these visits. I

think, as the rabbi said in the beginning, the record of John Paul II is clear on this. He's condemned this. He's been a victim too. He suffered badly from it. I think relations have improved between the two communities, the Jewish communities -- community, rather, and the Roman Catholic community, during his -- on...

TANENBAUM: No question about...

REPORTER: Well, wha--

O'KEEFE: There's no question about it.

REPORTER: -- well, what is this --

TANENBAUM: No question about tha--

REPORTER: -- going to do? I mean, the pope will be here for his first extended visit in eight years in just a few weeks. And --

TANENBAUM: In September.

REPORTER: -- yes -- and Archbishop O'Connor has said that, you know, Jews are on the top of the list for this meeting. But I see in the wires this afternoon that a lot of them are reconsidering this meeting. Is that going to happen now?

TANENBAUM: Well, two major Jewish groups have already made a decision they will not take part in the meeting with Pope John Paul in Miami in September, the American Jewish Congress and also the Synagogue Council of America.

[02:25:00] My own group, the American Jewish Committee,

and, as I understand, the Anti-Defamation League are still considering what our decisions ought to be. We're going to have a meeting next week at which we're going to think about it. You see, one of the problems that emerges for us -- and I hope we're not overreacting to it -- but just looking at the reality of it... We've been involved, for example, working in Germany for 18 years with, especially, young German Catholics, young German Christians. And recently, this past year, we began working in Austria, with Austrian Christians -- o-- It's overwhelmingly a Christian country. Young people, finally, have begun to say, in both of those countries, "We are tired of the silence about the Holocaust that our parents have inflicted on us -- keep evading that issue. We are determined to learn the truth about what happened in Nazism, how our country and our churches were involved in that. And we want to face that and learn from that." And now it is quite possible that, as a result of today's meeting, one of the messages that comes out to them -- "Look, the Nazi Holocaust, it means nothing," is not even discussed with a Nazi Army officer, [02:26:00] who's now being presented as an architect of peace.

REPORTER: Father O'Keefe, how do you think the pope is going to handle this when he comes here, given this building resentment in the Jewish community?

O'KEEFE: I would disagree seriously with Rabbi Tanenbaum that this was not even discussed with Mr. Waldheim. There's no evidence for that. All we have is a very brief report. And this is the protocol.

REPORTER: But what people are responding to, here in this country, as far as I've been able to determine, is, you know, the appearances of it --

TANENBAUM: In the press, the media.

REPORTER: -- in the press.

TANENBAUM: Yeah.

REPORTER: How do you think the pope can overcome this, when he gets to this country? Is that going to...?

O'KEEFE: I think he should do it before he comes, and I think in the ongoing conversations. Israeli leaders have open and easy access to the Holy Father. This goes on continually, all the time.

TANENBAUM: We have a relationship with --

O'KEEFE: And...

TANENBAUM: -- the Vatican Secretariat --

O'KEEFE: Surely.

TANENBAUM: -- on Catholic-Jewish Relations.

REPORTER: Cardinal O'Connor -- Archbishop O'Connor... I keep calling him different things. But anyway...

TANENBAUM: [Father?]....

REPORTER: Sorry. (laughs)

O'KEEFE: No, that's quite all right.

REPORTER: But he said earlier today that time is going to heal this rift. [02:27:00] I mean, do you think...? You said this was a watershed. Do you think that time will heal it, especially by the time the pope gets to the United States?

TANENBAUM: Well, I think there's a real strain in Vatican international Jewish relations. And it will not heal by itself. To say it colloquially, the ball is really in the - - and the pope's part and the Vatican Secretariat of State's part. They created this problem. They're going to have to help resolve it.

REPORTER: All right. Well...

TANENBAUM: But the relationship with the American Catholic Church and American Catholic community is very strong and very solid. And I think that will withstand this, in any case.

REPORTER: All right. Well, on that note, Rabbi Tanenbaum and Father O'Keefe, thank you, very much, for being with --

(break in video file)

(*Today*)

GUMBEL: The fact that the Vatican still does not officially recognize the state of Israel was also expected to be a focal point of the meeting, which the Vatican hopes will smooth the way for the pope's arrival in the United States next week. The interfaith meeting at the Vatican is among our top stories today, Tuesday, the first day of September, 1987.

REPORTER: [02:28:00] The Jewish delegation came to *Castel Gandolfo* for the meeting with the pope and they prayed. It was a meeting that was demanded by American Jewish organizations to set aside what some had described as a roadblock in 20 years of progress in Catholic-Jewish relations. The meeting with the pope was seen as necessary, as well, by the Vatican and the American bishops, to set a better mood for the upcoming papal trip to the United States. This visit by Austrian President Kurt Waldheim to the Vatican is what shocked Jews everywhere. Waldheim has been accused of involvement in Nazi war crimes, a charge he denies. Today the meeting with the pope was not expected to result in any apology for the Waldheim meeting nor is it expected to move the Vatican any closer to formal

recognition of Israel. But some sources say the meeting with the pope will bring some unusual steps by the Vatican on anti-Semitism and perhaps even setting up a mechanism within the Vatican State Department to insure information is passed to Jewish leaders so they are not surprised by Vatican activities affecting relations with Jews.

STAN BERNARD: Whatever the result, the meeting itself is historic. [02:29:00] It is more than ceremonial. It is covering substance. And there are some who suggest that, without the Waldheim visit and the timing of the pope's trip to the United States, this meeting never would have taken place. Stan Bernard, *NBC News* --

(break in video file)

(*Today*)

JANE PAULEY: --heim, an accused Nazi. Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, Director of International Relations for the American Jewish Committee, attended the session in *Castel Gandolfo*, the pope's summer residence outside of Rome, and he joins us from there this morning. And thank you, Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, for joining us this morning. How would you --

TANENBAUM: Good morning, Jane.

PAULEY: -- how would you characterize the meeting?

TANENBAUM: Well, it was a remarkably warm and friendly meeting, very sympathetic. The pope sat informally with a group of us around a circle, invited us to present our concerns to him, and then responded to them in general terms. We did have an opportunity, as we had requested, to speak forthrightly, [02:30:00] with great respect and civility, about the issues of the audience with Kurt Waldheim, the matter of diplomatic relations with Israel, problems of the Nazi Holocaust and anti-Semitism, so that our full agenda was placed before him and for members of the Vatican Curia.

PAULEY: About the meeting with Kurt Waldheim, would you say that the damage done to relations between Catholics and Jews, the damage done by that meeting is now undone?

TANENBAUM: Well, I'm not sure it's undone. I think that's a closed chapter, though. We've dealt with the issue. And now we need to go on to what is really central before us. Catholic-Jewish relations in the United States and in other parts of the world is far too important, has made far too much progress in the past 20 years to allow it to be jeopardized by this one event, however unfortunate that event has been. And I think what we've done, and these two days, not only with the visit with the pope but with an earlier visit today with Cardinal Casaroli, [02:31:00] the



number two man in the Vatican, with whom we've had an excellent visit -- all of these meetings, the meetings all day yesterday with Vatican authorities, have literally helped us put Catholic-Jewish relations throughout the world back on the main track, a very constructive understanding.

PAULEY: What progress of substance can you report, if any?

TANENBAUM: Well, I think we're going to hear, before this week is out, about a commitment on the part of the Vatican to prepare a very serious document, on the highest official level of the church, to examine in very great detail the Nazi Holocaust, what were the forces that made possible this demonic chapter, which was so traumatic for our people, to look at the manifestations of anti-Semitism on the deepest levels, all over the world, and then to propose specific, concrete ways in which to counter anti-Semitism and prejudice. That'll be one of the achievements. Another major achievement is that we're talking with Vatican [02:32:00] authorities about creating a whole new structure to keep the Vatican in touch with trends and developments in the world Jewish community, all over the world, so that surprises like the Waldheim surprise, the Arafat surprise will not happen again, or at least possibilities of them will be reduced.

PAULEY: Would you have...?

TANENBAUM: Those are two... I'm sorry.

PAULEY: My apologies. And just getting ahead of myself. But you must count as a disappointment no progress, that I understand, on the subject of recognition by the Vatican of the state of Israel.

TANENBAUM: Well, I think none of us came here with any illusions. You know, this was not a magical meeting. We do not expect one audience with the pope to transform everything. But we did begin a process of consultation, especially with Cardinal Casaroli, who is, after all, the head of the Vatican Secretariat of State, to look together at this question, to see what ways we can help remove obstacles -- that, in time, lead to the full normalization [02:33:00] of diplomatic ties between the Vatican and Israel. We did make it clear that we think the Vatican needs diplomatic relations with Israel, at least as much as Israel wants diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

PAULEY: Do you anticipate any Jewish protest during the pope's upcoming visit to the States?

TANENBAUM: Oh, I'm sure of it. There are marginal people in our community, as there are in the Catholic and other communities, who simply are going to exploit these meetings with their demonstrations, for their own purposes,

institutional purposes and private purposes. There are people who are even going to try to raise funds on the basis of their protesting the pope's visit. But those are appeals of hate. And we came here to appeal to hopes and love and mutual respect. And we represent the mainstream sentiment of the American Jewish people and, I think, of the world Jewish community.

PAULEY: Well, Rabbi Tanenbaum, once again, we thank you, well, on -- well, on a historic day.

TANENBAUM: Thank --

PAULEY: And we'll be back in a moment. This is *Today*, on NBC.

(break in video file)

REPORTER: -- [02:34:00] remarkable meeting between the two faiths.

PRESSMAN: The cars bearing the Jewish leaders entered the gates of *Castel Gandolfo* for a meeting the Jewish leaders said was unprecedented. For the first time, a conversation with the pope, not an audience, on issues of great concern to Catholics and Jews. The Jewish leaders would tell us later they were almost overwhelmed by the pope's warmth, his intensity. For an hour and 12 minutes, they would air their concerns about the Waldheim visit, the Holocaust, anti-

Semitism, other matters. And the pope would talk emotionally about his own memories of World War II, of the Jewish friends he lost in his native Krakow, of the horrors of yesterday. Outside, after the meeting...

SEIGMAN: We felt that this encounter was a historic one.

REPORTER: Why?

REPORTER: In what sense?

REPORTER: In a good way or bad way?

SEIGMAN: In a very positive way. Because it was the first time that the head of the Roman Catholic Church engaged in conversation, in genuine conversation, representatives of the Jewish community.

REPORTER: First time in history?

SEIGMAN: First time in history. [02:35:00]

PRESSMAN: -- feelings about the meeting?

SCHINDLER: [Must have heard?], really. Every way open and free, no holds barred, as we would say in America, and the friendliest of spirits.

PRESSMAN: You think that it was important?

ALEXANDER SCHINDLER: It was very important. It lifted our dialogue to a much higher level.

REPORTER: Later a communiqué was issued at a news conference at the Vatican, the pope pledging to put out a new document on the evils of the Holocaust and anti-Semitism and its

historic origins, a new Vatican mechanism to be created to hear Jewish concerns, anti-Catholicism deplored by all the delegates, both Catholics and Jews pledging to fight prejudice together.

PRESSMAN: The pope has called the Jewish people "our elder brothers." And the closeness and warmth here today on both sides seemed an affirmation of that idea. In St. Peter's Square, Rome, Gabe Pressman, *News 4 New York*.

REPORTER: Well, because of the pope's meeting with Waldheim, Jewish leaders had threatened to boycott the pope during his visit to the United States, which begins next week. But after -

(break in video file)

REPORTER: -- trying to work out tensions [02:36:00] stirred up by months of dissension and long-distance confrontation.

REPORTER: The historic meeting opened with prayers, in Hebrew and Latin, and the quickly turned to controversial issues, the major topic of discussion, the Jewish leaders' anger over the pope's meeting earlier this summer with Austrian President Kurt Waldheim, who's been accused of involvement in Nazi war crimes.

TANENBAUM: He responded in a generalized way. He did not respond concretely to the Waldheim question.

KLAPERMAN: He knows exactly how we feel about it. And I think that that was important for us to convey.

REPORTER: Another sensitive point raised by the group was the pope's meeting with PLO leader Yasser Arafat in 1982.

TANENBAUM: I was told, after the Arafat visit, that, contrary to popular impression, that Pope John Paul II read the Riot Act to Arafat, told him to stop killing Christians in Lebanon, told him to stop terrorism, to make peace and coexistence in the Middle East. And none of that got out publicly.

REPORTER: Overall, [02:37:00] the Jewish leaders seemed please with the results of today's meeting with the pope, especially the pledge for a papal letter on anti-Semitism and the Holocaust.

KLAPERMAN: The church will issue a document dealing with the Holocaust, reflecting on anti-Semitism throughout the ages, which, again, is a very progressive stand for the church to take.

REPORTER: The meeting ended with one issue unsettled, and that's the Vatican's refusal to formally recognize Israel. But that's not expected to stand in the way of another get-

together with Jewish leaders when the pope begins a visit to the United States next week in Miami.

REPORTER: You know, those talks today were between the leaders, those who speak for the Catholic Church and the Jewish community. But what about the people they represent? How much do they think fences need to be mended? Channel 2's Randall Pinkston went out tonight, looking for some answers.

RANDALL PINKSTON: Many Catholics and Jews here in New York kept up with reports of the meeting at Castle Gandolfo and reaction tonight is generally favorable.

STAN GETZLER: I think it's wonderful that it's happening.

[02:38:00] I think we'll have to see what the results are.

LOURDES WALLEN: Well, I think it's a good idea, you know, like, since, no matter what kind of religion you belong to, it's all together, one god, you know.

PINKSTON: But not everyone is applauding today's historic meeting. Here at Lincoln Square Synagogue, the assistant rabbi says he doesn't think the meeting should have taken place. While many Jewish leaders hailed the pope's promise to issue a major statement on the Holocaust and anti-Semitism here -- meeting is a dead end or a new beginning.

LEGUM: I'm sort of cynical.

PINKSTON: Why?

LEGUM: Well, unfortunately, the history of the church has proven that it's not likely to improve to any significant extent.

MCLAUGHLIN: Well, I think it was positive that a meeting took place between the pope -- that he sat down and met with these people.

STERN: And I believe, if he would recognize Israel, that would be the right step to take.

PINKSTON: While there's still some skepticism about the ultimate outcomes of today's meeting, it is hoped that it could be one more step on a long and bumpy road to resolving old differences, healing [02:39:00] old wounds.

(break in video file)

(*Nightwatch*)

ANNOUNCER: Now, sitting in for Charlie Rose, here is CBS news correspondent Eric Engberg.

ERIC ENGBERG: Good morning. The pope is scheduled to meet with Jewish leaders in Miami during his trip to the US which begins next week. There had been concerns that the meeting would be a tense one, because of Jewish anger over the pope's meeting with Austrian President Kurt Waldheim last June. But some of those tensions were diffused earlier this



week, when the pontiff met with Jewish leaders at the Vatican. Are they satisfied that the pope heard their message? One man involved in that meeting is Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, of the American Jewish Committee. He joins us from New York. Welcome, rabbi.

TANENBAUM: Thank you.

ENGBERG: And your reasons for asking for a meeting with the pope, were you merely trying to explain your position or were you hoping to get some kind of promise from him?

TANENBAUM: Well, we have felt for a long time that we have made tremendous progress in Catholic-Jewish relations, especially in the United States. [02:40:00] Then the audience with Kurt Waldheim seemed to throw a pall of doubt over the whole movement forward. So it was essential for us to clarify where does Pope John Paul II stand on the core of Catholic-Jewish relationships. Our purpose was to clarify a number of these issues with him. I think the meeting with him, as well as with members of the Vatican Curia with whom we met that morning and the day before, contributed substantially to the clarification of a number of basic questions.

ENGBERG: For the benefit of those who have not been following the issue, your major objections to the meeting with Waldheim were what?

TANENBAUM: Well, there were really two major objections. First was the fact that the pope had agreed to receive Waldheim in the first place. Here is a man who has been charged with complicity in Nazi war crimes that led to the deportation and the death of some 40,000 Jews from Greece [02:41:00] and the massacre of thousands of Christians who were Yugoslav partisans during World War II. Then, having agreed to receive him, for reasons of state, the crucial issue became how is it possible for the pope, the international conscience of mankind, as he's been referred to, to receive an unrepentant Nazi and not say a single word about his Nazi past. The message that came out of that avoiding of talking about Nazism and anti-Semitism altogether, with Waldheim, was a message to million of young Catholics that perhaps the Nazi Holocaust is not very important. It isn't even worth a mention. That was the most dreadful message that could go out to millions of young German Catholics, Austrian Catholics, Polish Catholics, who want to face the past. It's as if the pope were saying to them, unintendedly, that the Nazi Holocaust is really not very important.

ENGBERG: Now when you raised the issue with the pope, do you recall his exact response?

TANENBAUM: Well, in fact, I think [02:42:00] the pope anticipated that response in the very first words he said to us. When we came into the reception room in *Castel Gandolfo*, he started off by saying, "Today is September the 1<sup>st</sup>, 1987. This is the 48<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Nazi invasion of Poland. I saw what the Nazis did to the Polish people. I saw what the Nazis did to the Jewish people. It was a terrible lesson for us to learn." That, I think, was his way of saying that he understood the magnitude of the suffering that the Nazis had inflicted, not only on Polish Christians but also on Polish Jews and European Jews generally. After that he repudiated anti-Semitism and talked about the very powerful bonds, affirmative bonds that exist between Christianity and Judaism. Once he made that brief statement at the outset, he then asked us for our views about the issues that are of concern to us. And we went around the room and [02:43:00] each one of us made our statement, about a number of crucial issues.

ENGBERG: Was Waldheim's name mentioned specifically by the people on your side?

TANENBAUM: Oh, yes! Three of us, in fact, explicitly referred to Waldheim. We indicated to him that we came there not simply as individuals but we came there as emissaries of our people. And few issues have caused us --

great pain and dismay, among Jewish people throughout the world, as has that audience between the pope and Waldheim on June 25<sup>th</sup>. He sat and listened very carefully, stoically. Our feeling was that he understood the magnitude of the error that was involved in receiving Waldheim.

ENGBERG: But what did he say?

TANENBAUM: He did not respond to it specifically. Toward the end of our meeting, a few of us were gathered with him as we were saying goodbye and he said, in a kind of symbolic language, [02:44:00] "You know, there is very great evil in the world. We have to find a way together, under God's grace, of overcoming that evil with good." And I think that essentially has been his position.

ENGBERG: Were you satisfied with that, especially in view of the fact that he apparently did not respond directly to your criticisms of the Waldheim meeting?

TANENBAUM: Well, my own view is that the meeting with the pope, in a sense, was a symbolic climax of very important things that went on before we met with him --

ENGBERG: G--

TANENBAUM: -- more important than Waldheim. He is, after all, an incidental figure, in some ways. Waldheim was a lieutenant. More important is what Waldheim represented, namely the magnitude of the evil, the demonic evil that the

Nazi Holocaust represented to Western mankind and particularly to the Jews. In response to putting that issue before Cardinal Willebrands and the other members of the Secretariat, we got an extraordinary response. Cardinal Willebrands [02:45:00] reported to us that the church was now prepared to publish a major document, an official Catholic document, he said, on the highest authority of the church, not inconceivable a papal encyclical, on the history of anti-Semitism over the past 1,900 years, on the Nazi Holocaust, on the role of the church during the Nazi Holocaust, and what lessons need to be learned today to combat that evil wherever it manifests itself throughout the world. That is probably the most important outcome of that meeting. And when we met with the pope and Cardinal Willebrands reported on that intended project, the pope gave it his blessing, said, "I support that and I want that to happen."

ENGBERG: Uh...

TANENBAUM: That may --

ENGBERG: Go ahead --

TANENBAUM: -- I'm sorry --

ENGBERG: -- rabbi.

TANENBAUM: -- no, I just say I think that may be the most important result that came out of our meeting.

ENGBERG: Rabbi Tanenbaum, we'll be talking with you in just a few minutes about some of the other issues that were raised at that meeting with the pope, when *Nightwatch* continues.

[02:46:00]

ENGBERG: Rabbi Tanenbaum, returning from Italy, where he and other American Jewish leaders met with the pope to discuss concerns that have grown up in the last several months between American Jews and the Catholic Church. Now prior to this meeting with the pope, there had been some indications that, when the pope comes to the United States, he might face a boycott in Miami of American Jews. To what extent do you think the possibility or, if you will, the threat of that boycott influenced the church in agreeing to see you?

TANENBAUM: Well, I think it was very important. There was very great anxiety on the part of many people in the Vatican, as we came in there on Monday, about the consequences of our meeting there for the reaction of the Jewish community and many others to the pope's visit, beginning in Miami with his meeting with Jewish leaders. My own sense [02:47:00] is that the quality of the discussion that took place, the results that emerged from it have eased the atmosphere and that probably the overwhelming majority of Jewish leadership will be participating with

him on September the 11<sup>th</sup>. There will be some marginal groups demonstrating. There may be one or another group carrying out a boycott. But my own sense is that the major Jewish organizations, the major Jewish religious bodies recognize that there are signs of genuine good faith, feel that Catholic-Jewish relations are far too important in the United States to allow it to be jeopardized by the Waldheim episode. And therefore, when the pope comes here, almost all of us will be present in Miami to greet him and to move forward.

ENGBERG: But if the pope visits Waldheim again in June in Austria, as is now planned, isn't there a likelihood that there will be further calls for action by American Jews?

TANENBAUM: Well, I think we have to wait and see how that turns out. [02:48:00] The pope is going there in June of 1988. There has been conversation about his being received by Waldheim, as head of state. Our own government, the United States government, will more than likely ask that the American ambassador, the next American ambassador, hand his credential to Waldheim, but making it very clear that they will not be involved in any personal social relationships with him. That's a judgment that the moral character of Waldheim remains under question but they're responding to Austria, of whom Waldheim happens to be the

ceremonial head, they are not responding to Waldheim, the personality. My own sense is that this pope will be responding in those terms, as well.

ENGBERG: Why did you feel the need to go to Italy for the meeting? Why couldn't you have just waited until he got here?

TANENBAUM: Would have been too late. The resentment over the Waldheim visit was so profound and so widespread that more than likely there would have been a substantial number of Jewish organizations [02:49:00] that simply would have voted with their feet in protest against the pope's receiving Waldheim, without any clarification from the Vatican. We believed that it was essential to clear the air before then. We had met, four of us, and met with Cardinal Casaroli in New York, at the suggestion of the American Catholic hierarchy, on July 9<sup>th</sup>. And we indicated it was essential to have a meeting with the pope before he comes to the United States, in order to make sure that we understand exactly what was involved in receiving Waldheim. We think we received the clarification we needed, we received a commitment to assure that that sort of thing does not happen again in the same way. And that cleared the way for us now to have a constructive meeting in Miami.



ENGBERG: Are you convinced in your own mind that your delegation represented accurately the majority of Jewish opinion in this country?

TANENBAUM: Well, I don't think there's any question about that. We had representatives of the Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform movements in this country, of every major Jewish body [02:50:00] that represents the largest constituencies in the United States. There... We want the American people and American Catholics to know that the people who are carrying out demonstrations, who are making a lot of noise, who are publishing ads in newspapers represent only themselves. They are very small and marginal. They're making an awful lot of noise. They do not represent the overwhelming sentiment of responsible Jewish leadership and, I would say, the masses of the American Jewish people.

ENGBERG: Are not some conflicts inevitable when we deal with religious questions that have -- that have divided men for centuries?

TANENBAUM: Well, there's no question that the conflict between religious groups, not just Christians and Jews -- Catholics and Protestants in Europe, have been responsible for massive destruction all over Europe. You look at the consequences of the Protestant Reformation, [02:51:00] the struggle between the Catholic Church and the Protestant

church, you still see relics of that destruction all over Europe, countries that were divided, massacres that took place. We're determined to learn lessons from that past, especially the Jewish people. It was 1,900 years of Christian teachings of contempt, the Christ-killer charge, the notion that Jews are a wandering people punished by God that led to the destruction of millions of Jews, across the centuries. This is not symbolic stuff we're playing with. We are talking with the church about uprooting the poisonous weeds of anti-Semitism, that have resulted in rivers of Jewish blood being spread across every country in Europe and other parts of the world. We are determined to make sure that that poison does not contaminate the human bloodstream again in our lifetime.

ENGBERG: We have just a couple of seconds here but how did the pope react when you broached with him the question of Vatican recognition of the state of Israel? [02:52:00]

TANENBAUM: Well, he said the word *Israel* with warmth, and several times. He then said that he understood the centrality of Israel in Jewish historic and religious consciousness and the life of the Jewish people. He did not go beyond that. But as I said, I think the practical business of discussing that, in fact, took place in the morning, with Cardinal Casaroli. We have an agreement with

him, something which we've not had before, that we will now have regular meetings with Cardinal Casaroli and the Vatican Secretary of State, which is responsible for the possibility of establishing full diplomatic relations with Israel. And we hope that, out of those conversations, we will be able to face the obstacles which inhibit full diplomatic relations and move toward helping build peace and coexistence between Jews and Christians and Arabs in the Middle East. And that's an important opening, for us.

ENGBERG: Thank you, very mu--

(break in video file)

(*Today*)

PAULEY: -- refrained from deporting those [02:53:00] nine Palestinians. Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum is the Director of International Relations for the American Jewish Committee and Rita Hauser is a lawyer and founder of the International Center for Peace in the Middle East and join us this morning, to talk about divisions in the Jewish community. The Jewish community has, in the past, had so much solidarity for Israel. The two of you are uncomfortable with me putting you in the position of being on one side and Rabbi Tanenbaum on the other. But you are

not entirely in support of the Israeli handling of this situation, are you?

RITA HAUSER: I don't think that that's the real issue, how they handle the specifics. It's important but it's not the crucial issue. The crucial issue is where does Israel go from here and what should the United States' policy be. Many of us who would be lumped in the peace camp, if you like, have been strongly in favor of Shimon Peres's initiative for an international peace conference, with all the problems that are involved, but the [02:54:00] commencement of negotiation, looking to an autonomy in the area, giving the Palestinians some civic and political rights, and a phased out activity for the Israelis. We have been fearful, for a long time, that these built up resentments would blow over and erupt, as they have. And it is imperative, it seems to me, that the United States government put it shoulder, now, to the wheel to help facilitate an international conference.

PAULEY: The pictures you've seen on television have to have cause you great anguish.

HAUSER: It's caused everybody anguish, not just the Jewish community. There are many people interested in the Middle East, beyond the Jews. It's an anguishing situation.

PAULEY: Prime Minister Shamir says, unequivocally, Israel will never leave the West Bank. Does he give any room for negotiating anything but quelling this particular round of violence only to see it boil up and over some other time soon, perhaps.

TANENBAUM: Jane, I think one must make a distinction between [02:55:00] the propaganda warfare that goes on and the possibilities of political solution. I think we recall that former prime minister Menachem Begin, who was regarded as a hard-liner and would not yield anything, the moment in which President Sadat of Egypt made his dramatic visit to Jerusalem, suddenly everything changed. Begin, who had talked about not yielding an inch of territory, who was even more hard-line than even Prime Minister Shamir is, ended up giving away the Suez airfields, oilfields, exchanging territory for peace. I think the real issue is who in the Arab world is prepared to become another Sadat, to take that dramatic step forward to sit at the table. I think the Arabs would be amazed at the flexibility and the responsiveness of the Israelis, including Shamir.

PAULEY: I know both of you are anxious to discuss the broad picture. But in the meantime, in the last [02:56:00] 30 days or so, pictures that the world has seen on their

television have done more for the Palestinian cause -- would you agree? -- than anything in the last 20 years.

HAUSER: I think there's no question about it. The rioting has brought to the forefront the dilemma of an occupation that seemingly is without end and without solution. And quite clearly, the million and a half-plus Arabs in the West Bank, and their compatriots who are citizens of Israel, are saying that they want a resolved solution. It is a very complicated political problem. And I cannot agree with Marc in his analysis. The situation is not the same as Sadat's Egypt. The West Bank is holy territory for a very large number of more traditional, nationalist, religious Jews. Hussein is not in the same position as Sadat. And that's been made clear at least two dozen times. He cannot, he is unwilling, he's unable to go to Israel [02:57:00] and negotiate face-to-face. He's met with Shimon Peres at least a dozen times. They have reached an accord, last April, which was reduced to writing. The problem is to organize a conference with an appropriate representation of the Palestinians. The question of where the Americans will be, where the Soviets will be, where the broader Arab world will be... It is not an easy problem. But because it's a difficult problem doesn't give you the liberty of doing nothing. And we have, for the last year or so, watched a

terrible drift of nothing, as Israel is divided in two on the question and as the American government has not been willing to really put its shoulder to the wheel. I think these events now show that something must be done.

TANENBAUM: I think the missing piece and probably the issue on which I would differ with Rita, for whom I have great respect and affection, is that what emerges generally out of her analysis of the situation is somehow that Israel is held [02:58:00] primarily responsible for everything that seems to be going wrong there. You dismiss the fact of Arab responsibility. I think that you have got to talk directly to the Arab world, as well, and talk to them about their recognizing the complexity and what the costs will be to the Palestinians unless, until they move in. Let me just make one point. You know, the Palestinians may have won a propaganda victory. I don't see anything, any political formulation coming out of it. Also, I think we ought to keep in mind the question that there is something wrong in the treatment of this crisis. You know, during the past seven years, a quarter of a million people have been killed, many of them young children, in the Iran-Iraq war. There's almost no passion about that, no concern about that.

PAULEY: I'll have to leave it at that, looking at the clock. I ask you if we were just to eavesdrop on a discussion that I know American Jews are having all over the country. Twenty-two after the hour. This is *Today*, on NBC.

(break in video file)

RATHER: -- rights accord of the 1980s. This agreement [02:59:00] is supposed to pave the way for a crucial new round of bargaining on reducing conventional military forces in Europe. Wyatt Andrews has our report.

WYATT ANDREWS: East and West celebrated in Vienna with the waltzes of old. But the diplomatic dance here was brand new. In a sweeping document, 35 countries, including the Communist Iron Curtain nations, have agreed on a new set of specific human rights: freedom of religion; the freedom to teach religion; an end to the jamming of all radio broadcasts; and the biggest achievement, an East Bloc agreement that any person has the right to leave his or her country: free emigration.

JAMES MCCLURE: These words are more precise than we have had before.

ANDREWS: Jewish leaders in America are skeptical.



TANENBAUM: We ought not to have any delusions or fantasies that the sheer signing of this agreement magically is going to produce human rights in the Soviet Union.

ANDREWS: Those doubts seem justified. For example, [03:00:00] if everyone has the right to leave his country, does that mean the Berlin Wall is coming down? The East Germans celebrating here said, "Absolutely not," quite different from what the Americans said.

WARREN ZIMMERMANN: Tearing down the Berlin Wall would be a very appropriate response to the commitments taken in this document.

ANDREWS: Another question is who enforces this agreement. Czechoslovakia agreed to the new guidelines this weekend and then violently broke up human rights demonstrations with water cannons and nightsticks.

GERALD NAGLER: (inaudible). No, there are no (inaudible) -- but international pressure and public opinion, which is not so bad.

ANDREWS: One strength of the accord is that both sides have agreed to begin conventional-arms reduction talks in March. This is still an agreement that seems to overwhelmingly favor the West. It does set a new worldwide standard for human rights behavior, and it launches a new set of arms talks to reduce the threat of conventional war. If it all

sounds too good to be true, come experts say it is. It is Gorbachev, they say, [03:01:00] in a courtship of Europe, trying to weaken American influence, a long-term effort to appear less threatening and to woo the Europeans away from the United Sta--

(break in video file)

BRINKLEY: Bert Quint reports.

BERT QUINT: It was to be a massive display of religious unity, with representatives of the world's major faiths praying that never again would there be war. Instead, there were the old acquisitions of Polish anti-Semitism and a boycott by Jewish organizations. The issue raising dread memories of the Nazi death camps in Poland was Auschwitz. Here, during the war, four million people, perhaps 2-1/2 million of the Jews, were killed. The controversy today is the presence near Auschwitz of a handful of cloistered Carmelite nuns. They established a convent there in 1984 to pray for all of the camp's victims. This offended Jewish sensibilities.

M: [*D'habitude?*]...

QUINT: "We cannot pray there, in the presence of the cross," Jews said. In 1987 the Polish church agreed to remove the

convent. But it never did. And recently Jewish groups began demonstrating [03:02:00] there. The dispute escalated a week ago, when Poland's Roman Catholic primate, Cardinal Glemp, criticized the harassment of the nuns as offending all Poles. Glemp went on to formulate an old stereotype, saying that Jews control the mass media. Since then, there have been charges of anti-Semitism made in Poland and the United States.

TANENBAUM: It was an absolutely demagogic speech, now rejected by Solidarity and, thank God, rejected by virtually every cardinal and archbishop in the United States.

QUINT: At the same time, many Poles, who are not thought to be anti-Semites, complained about what they call Jewish intolerance. Solidarity leader Lech Walesa expressed sympathy for the Jews but summed up the feelings of many Poles when he remarked, "People, including the nuns, have a right to pray anywhere. Poland's Jewish community, once a major force in Polish life, was all but wiped out during the war. Most of those who survived it left Poland in 1968, when anti-Semitism was used as a political ploy. Today there are few practicing Jews in Poland. [03:03:00] Their representative said they were refusing to take part in the

ecumenical service because, "There is no sense joining in prayers with those who do not allow us to pray."

(break in video file)

F1: -- world wars. Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, of the American Jewish Committee, joins us to discuss those concerns. Rabbi, we have, for a couple of days, several days now, been watching this magnificent display of jubilation, dancing on the wall. You have worries. Can you tell us what they are?

TANENBAUM: Well, first, I think we exult with all Americans, I think all Westerners, in the rise of democracy and the collapse of the Communist regime. It was a terribly repressive regime. But I think there are concerns about the possibility of a regressive turn, possibly to some form of jingoism, patriotism, which could then issue forth in imperial militarism, which has been a good part of German history. I think one has to be careful not to be paranoid about that. Needs to be watched very carefully. I think the question of rearmament [03:04:00] has to be watched very carefully. But I think the overall sense of the Jewish community is that this is a remarkable achievement, which ought to be celebrated, as it is now.

M1: Rabbi, when you look at these emotional pictures of the breaking down of the wall, it's very hard to be negative. I

would ask you, however, to consider that West Germany is the most important and most powerful economic entity in Europe, right at this minute. Is it a concern, do you think, in the Jewish community, that with the addition of East Germany it could become a formidable nation?

TANENBAUM: The first thing that has to be said, and I say this based on 30 years of experience of working in Germany -- we have exchanges programs in Germany -- is that Germany today is a constitutional democracy. It is committed to anti-Nazism. And it's committed to the upholding of religious freedom or freedom of conscience. The question is what impact East Germany's possible reunification might have on Germany. [03:05:00]

M1: Do you want to see a flat declaration that Germany cannot rearm?

TANENBAUM: I think that has to be explored with NATO. I think certainly a sense of limits. One ought not to become paranoid about it. But I think one ought to have a realistic anxiety about the resurgence of jingoistic elements. There are some right wing groups in Germany headed by former Nazi storm troopers, who are winning elections in Germany today. And that has to be a source of concern to us, as it is to the government of --

(break in video file)

(Channel 2 News)

REPORTER: -- [whose?] Jane Velez-Mitchell found out today potential reunification has many Jews in New York thinking about a pain that is now etched in memories and the history books.

JANE VELEZ-MITCHELL: They are stirring images, East Germans feeling the power of liberty, as the brick and mortar boundary separating the two Germanys crumbles. Watching along with the rest of the world, Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum. As an acknowledged pioneer in Jewish-Christian relations, who has served on the President's Commission on the Holocaust, he tracks [03:06:00] the situation with a special focus.

TANENBAUM: I think the majority of the Jewish people welcome the collapse of Communist regime in East Germany and the movement toward democracy and freedom.

VELEZ-MITCHELL: But while Jews in New York share the joys of East Germans discovering new freedoms, there's also apprehension about how the situation is going to affect Jews around the world. For example, all the speculation now that a reunified Germany has become a real possibility has Jewish leaders pointing out that, while West Germany is one

of Israel's largest trading partners, East Germany has a history of anti-Israeli propaganda and terrorism.

TANENBAUM: East Germany has been the fiercest anti-Israel, pro-PLO, pro-Arab country in the Warsaw Pact alliance. And the question is that, if they reunify with West Germany, what kind of impact will they have on West Germany's extremely friendly policy toward Israel?

VELEZ-MITCHELL: Rabbi Tanenbaum also worries, [03:07:00] with East German refugees taxing West Germany's economy, history may repeat itself, noting that Hitler used Jews as scapegoats for economic problems, preceding World War II.

TANENBAUM: There's going to be the problem of jobs and housing and schools and social welfare. And in that economic turmoil which would follow, the right-wing neo-Nazi party, the Republican Party, could well try to exploit that and make Jews scapegoats.

GRUEN: I was persecuted, because I was underground.

VELEZ-MITCHELL: Ruth Gruen, born in Berlin 86 years ago, still gets reparation checks from the West German government for the agony she endured under the Nazis. The East German government refuses to pay reparations. Still, the idea of a united Germany does not worry Gruen.

RUTH GRUEN: It's very good that the wall came down.

VELEZ-MITCHELL: Gruen sees hope in East and West Germany, in  
the form of a new generation. Jane Velez-Mitchell,  
*Channel 2 News*.

END OF VIDEO FILE