

CD-1060 Transcription

The Vatican and the Jews, a dialogue with Father John T.

Pawlikowski and Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum [1]. 1991.

M:

Side One, JBI Lecture Series, Fall, 1991: The Vatican and the Jews, a dialogue with Father John T. Pawlikowski and Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum. Produced exclusively for the blind and visually impaired by the Jewish Braille Institute of America, Inc., 110 East 30th Street, New York, New York, 10016.

This recording has been produced through the great generosity of an anonymous donor in the finest spirit of *tzedakah*. It is a gift for your personal library and need not be returned. The author and [Carol Andeman?] lecture, *The Vatican and the Jews: A Dialogue* was recorded at Queens College, New York, on May 8th, 1991. Let us join Professor John Byrd, the lecture's moderator, as he introduces Father Powlikowski.

John Byrd:

The Anglo-Saxons have been saying it for 700 years, so I will say it once again: it is well [01:00] that you have come, and we are happy to see you here. The Queens College Jewish Lecture Series has established itself in the borough and the city as one

of the major forums for discussion of issues important to the Jewish community. Under the leadership of Dean Ernest Schwarz and this year under the guidance of Dean Hratch Zadoyan, the series consistently presents figures of eminence, prominence, and significance to share their experiences, their reflections, and their wisdom with us. This evening's program is a culmination for this season of that splendid tradition. We have been honored and enriched by historians, Talmudic scholars, anthropologists, sociologists, and survivors. Tonight we move to yet another dramatic arena: that of interfaith dialogue. [02:00] The history of Jewish-Catholic relations has been neither smooth nor happy. Nor would any serious person here present deny that there have been and are many issues outstanding between the Jewish community and the Catholic community -- some historical, some of recent date, some of very current vintage. A number of these are, truth to tell, deeply painful, which makes this evening's encounter all the more pertinent, relevant, and real. Our presenters are two distinguished scholars who have not been satisfied to sit behind the comfort and safety of their desks, but rather have spent their lives on the barricades, before audiences both supportive and hostile, and have themselves been writers, planners, motors, movers, [03:00] policymakers, and healers.

It is a special treat for me to be able to welcome to Queens College two very dear friends of many years' standing. Father John Pawlikowski is a doctor of philosophy and professor of social ethics at the Catholic Theological Union, a constituent school of a cluster at the University of Chicago. He has served as president of that Catholic theological union. President Carter appointed him in 1980 to the US Holocaust Memorial Council, and President Bush reappointed him to that post last year. He has held myriad responsible positions in the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in Washington, DC. He is a founding member of the Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry and a member of the Executive Committee of the National Christian Leadership Conference for Israel. He has received the Righteous Among the Nations [04:00] Award and the Raoul Wallenberg Humanitarian Award for his work. A distinguished Roman Catholic priest, academician and mensch, the Reverend Doctor John Pawlikowski. (applause)

John Pawlikowski:

Well, thank you very much. I'm very grateful to have had the opportunity to be invited to Queens College here and to be in the presence of two very dear friends, Professor Byrd and Rabbi Tanenbaum, with whom I have worked to collaboration on many projects, probably too long than I care to remember or they care

to remember at this point. But they've been very fruitful years, and I think they've been years that have seen considerable progress in the relationship between Christians and Jews and in particular between Catholics and Jews.

The title of the presentation, the topic for this evening, is The Vatican and the Jews. [05:00] And I would like to divide my own presentation basically into two parts. One part will be how the Vatican has approached the question religiously and theologically in the 25 years -- little more than 25 years now since the issuance of the historic declaration, *Nostra Aetate*, Chapter Four of which completely revamped the Church's understanding of its relationship to the Jewish people. And the second part will deal more on the political level, how the Vatican has related particularly to the state of Israel and to the question of Zionism.

Let me begin with an overview of the religious developments. The Vatican, in the last 25 years, has basically issued three major statements concerning Catholic-Jewish relations. In addition, there have been a remarkable set of statements [06:00] issued during the pontificate of Pope John Paul II, the present pope. The three statements are, of course, the original document, *Nostra Aetate*, the fourth chapter of which is devoted to the

issue of Catholic-Jewish relations; a document in 1975 celebrating the tenth anniversary of the original Vatican document; and a document in 1985 celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the original Vatican document. Each of these two documents shows a progressive development in the understanding and deepening of Catholic appreciation of Judaism and the Jewish people. The original Vatican II declaration, *Nostra Aetate*, *Nostra Aetate*, is in fact a very short declaration of several paragraphs. But its fundamental success, I would say, [07:00] -- and I might add here that the success of this document and really the very issuance of this document was due in large measure to the important work that people like Rabbi Tanenbaum did as a representative of the American Jewish Committee -- through their offices and through his own work in Rome during the Council. And that was very important. But it was basically putting to rest a legacy that had persisted for centuries in Roman Catholicism, which essentially was a fundamentally negative legacy of viewing Jews as excluded from God's covenantal relationship, by and large -- of viewing Jews as the rejected people for having murdered the Messiah. It is true, and there was some criticism of the final draft of the Vatican II declaration on this point, that *Nostra Aetate* does not use the term "deicide," [08:00] which was the historic charge against the Jewish people, but in effect, Vatican II repudiates the

charge of deicide. But let me make it very clear, because -- what Vatican II did, because it has been frequently misinterpreted in the popular press. Vatican II did not exonerate Jews, as some in the press reported, for murdering the Messiah. Vatican II says there was never a basis for the charge in the first place. It was a false, trumped-up charge, at least in terms of the Jewish people in totality -- that there may have been some in the Jewish leadership that collaborated; even Jewish scholars will acknowledge this. But Jewish scholars equally acknowledge that not all in the Jewish leadership at that time were highly regarded among their compatriots. So in saying that they may have collaborated in the death of Jesus [09:00] doesn't necessarily denigrate people who regarded (inaudible) characters among all the Jews of that period.

But Vatican II really put to rest this deicide charge. And in doing this, it fundamentally undercut the whole basis of the relationship as it has existed literally since the second and third century of Christianity. It also began to build a new relationship. But it only began to do that. It did affirm -- in simple language, in a few words -- that there was a continuing bond between the original covenant with Abraham and the covenant in Jesus Christ. And this would become a persistent theme developed much more deeply and more profoundly in the subsequent

Catholic statements. [10:00] But the original document pretty much stopped there. But its effect was tremendous, I think, because it validated the efforts, the fledgling efforts that had begun after World War II, particularly in Europe, to rethink the Catholic-Jewish relationship. And it gave impetus to a drive in North America to view positively the relationship between Catholics and Jews, and now to extend that positive feeling towards Jews beyond the level of social relationships and cooperation on social matters to religious and theological matters.

It has to be said that Chapter Four of *Nostra Aetate* is certainly one of the primal contributions of American Catholicism to the second Vatican Council. It was in many ways a document that probably [11:00] would not have passed if it had not been for the strong, unified support of the American bishops at the Council. And I think the reason the American bishops had given it such strong support is because the American Catholic Church, during the '30s and '40s, had experienced a very positive working relationships with Jews and also with Protestants in confronting the social problems of this nation. This is a remarkable history that's little-known, but I think this [tri-parthide?] relationship had a tremendous effect on transforming the economic and even political life of America in

the '30s and '40s. But strangely enough, it had very little effect on the religious and theological relationship. [12:00] People cooperated marvelously in this country in the '30s and '40s in a common pursuit [of? a?] social objective. But when they went to their individual religious institutions, they tended to speak about each other as they had spoken for the past three, four, five, six, seven hundred years. Now, Vatican II, building upon in part that experience of positive social interaction in America, began to change the religious discourse. And it legitimated -- it legitimated the complete transformation of religious education materials and even theological thinking about the Catholic-Jewish relationship.

But that was all Vatican II did. It's not a modest accomplishment. It changed the entire milieu. It changed the entire atmosphere from one of confrontation, I think, to a sense of collaboration, [13:00], to a sense of mutual dependence and interaction.

In 1975, the Vatican issued a set of guidelines -- what they called a set of guidelines for the implementation of *Nostra Aetate*. In effect, it was a set of guidelines for the implementation of the section on Catholic-Jewish relationships. And this document went even further, became even more specific

in terms of some of the concrete issues in Catholic-Jewish relations that had to be confronted: for example, the image of the Pharisees. Probably its most important single statement -- again, because this statement changed fundamental attitudes -- is the statement in the 1975 document which says that Catholics must come to understand Jews as they define themselves. Now, I don't know what percentage of the audience here [14:00] is Jewish, but those of you who are Jewish, and I trust that there are at least a few Jews here, (laughter) will recognize that Jews do not define themselves in a nice neat fashion. There are many ways that Jews define themselves, religiously and in other ways. But the point that the Vatican II document was making, and making very strongly in 1975, was that Catholics had to cease the practice that was very common of trying to define Jews as they saw them, rather than as Jews saw themselves. A very important change. It means that they had to begin to listen to Jews to find out how Jews thought about themselves. Now, as they began to listen, they also would begin to realize that the problem of defining Jews and even defining the Jewish-Christian relationship would become more complex [15:00] because of the multiple ways in which Jews define themselves. But it's not up to Catholics to create the definition of what is a Jew. Because in the past, what Catholics did very often would create what I would call "straw Jews." And of course, when you create a straw

Jew, when you create a straw person, it's very easy to knock that person down, to demolish that person. Because a straw Jew is a caricature of an authentic Jew. The heart and the soul are missing.

And I think this is probably the greatest single accomplishment of that 1975 document -- that it further reoriented the basic attitude of Catholics regarding their relationship with Jews: how they would think about Jews. And it's said that you have to engage in dialogue. It isn't enough to just study about Jews, to study about Judaism. You really have to learn [16:00] to hear and listen before you make pronouncements about what Jews and Judaism think or who they are or how they relate to Catholics or Christianity. You have to begin to listen to how Jews explain their own identity, even though that may become somewhat confusing at times.

In 1985, the process, I think, continued even further. The Vatican issued a document called "Notes on the Correct Presentation of Jews and Judaism in Catholic Preaching and Education." Now, this was a very thorough document which picked up on many of the individual topics in preaching, in education, that had to be confronted. Again, how Jews are presented in terms of the gospel teaching; how Jews are presented during Holy

Week; how the relationship between the covenant is presented; how the Pharisees are presented. [17:00] And this document -- one of the most remarkable statements, I think, in this document contains the sense of how Jewish Jesus was.

There was for a long time, I would say a period of several decades, in which many Scripture scholars in the Christian community more and more de-Judaized Jesus. They tried to turn him more and more into a kind of universal person. And they looked upon his Jewishness as an obstacle, as a detriment to the emergence of Jesus as a truly universal figure. And they truly downplayed and even obfuscated his Jewishness. There's been a gradual turnabout in that thinking amongst Biblical scholars, and that turnabout has now been reflected [18:00], particularly in the 1985 document and the great emphasis in the section of that document of how profoundly Jesus imbued the Jewish teaching, spirituality, and ethics of the period. In fact, the document at one point, in one paragraph, says that Jesus was closer to the Pharisaic movement in Judaism than to any Jewish movement at the time. That's a remarkable turnabout. When, at the suggestion of Rabbi Tanenbaum in my very young days, my very early days, I agreed to undertake the editing and kind of editorializing upon textbook studies that were coordinated by the American Jewish Committee -- there were textbook studies

done on Jewish textbooks, on Protestant textbooks, and on Catholic textbooks, and I agreed to coordinate and eventually publish the results [19:00] of the Catholic studies done at St. Louis University... I mean, one of the results of those studies at St. Louis University was that the image of the Pharisees was one of the most negative image of any Jewish group found in Catholic teaching materials. And this was not material from the Middle Ages. This was material that was still in wide use in Catholic school systems in the '50s and '60s, early '60s. And I daresay there's hardly a Catholic, probably, who hasn't read or heard in a sermon the denunciation of the Pharisees as the archenemies of Jesus, as the people who represented everything Jesus was against. And yet in 1985, this Vatican document said that was totally false, that was a total misunderstanding of where the Pharisees stood [20:00] in terms of the Jewish tradition and their relationship to Jesus, and now the 1985 Vatican document affirms that indeed Jesus was closer to the Pharisees than any other Jewish movement of his day -- a remarkable turnabout.

The fourth set of documents I would briefly allude to are the writings of Pope John Paul II. Now, I know that Pope John XXIII carries a very special image in the hearts and minds of many Jews -- and rightly so. He broke ground; he had the courage to

finally make the decision to place the idea of a statement on the Church and the Jewish people on the agenda of the Second Vatican Council. His own charismatic personal style broke down barriers [21:00] between Catholics and Jews as it broke down barriers between Catholics and Protestants, and Catholics and atheists, and many other people. John Paul II does not have that kind of charismatic personality. Of course, there are a number of controversial actions on the political level that John Paul has involved himself with, which have tended to, I suppose, cloud his image among many in the Jewish committee. Nonetheless, I think when one looks objective at the picture, one has to say that John Paul II has written more and more constructive material about the basic religious/theological relationship between the Church and the Jewish people than any other pope in history.

Now, in saying that, I am praising him, but not too strongly. Only in this sense: I'm not praising him too strongly because he didn't have to run very fast to get to the head of the line.

[22:00] There aren't an awful lot of popes who said a whole lot positively theologically about the Christian-Jewish relationship. In fact, this is one of the special features, I think, of the Christian-Jewish relationship. My colleague, Dr. Eugene Fisher, who has the Catholic Bishop's Office on Catholic-

Jewish relations in Washington, in a major paper delivered at a Vatican-Jewish dialogue some years ago made the very important part that the document *Nostra Aetate*, Chapter Four in particular, "On the Church and the Jewish People," really is a kind of unique document in the terms of the nature of Catholic documents from a council or from a pope. Any of you who have ever been acquainted at all with Catholic documents of this source know that these documents are laden with footnotes, to quotations from past popes, past councils, [23:00] and so on. Any of the many other documents issued by the Second Vatican Council follow this model. Look at them. There are all sorts of footnotes to past decrees of the church. One does not find this in *Nostra Aetate*. And why? Because there's nothing worth citing. They do cite a few passages from Scripture, particularly some of the Pauline teachings in Romans 9-11. But except for those sections, I think the bishops of Vatican II, without saying it so directly, recognize that the Church was now beginning a process of theologically rebuilding the relationship between Christians and Jews, a process that I would say was really in a sense short-circuited since the time of Paul the Apostle.

And so it's a historic -- it's a very historic [24:00] turnabout. And I think John Paul II has made some important contributions. And there has been a persistent theme -- a

persistent theme in the many, many speeches that John Paul has given on this topic, which have now been collected in several volumes: in an English volume edited by Rabbi Leon Klenicki and Dr. Eugene Fisher and published jointly by the Catholic Bishops' Conference and the Anti-Defamation League, and a new volume -- a much larger volume of the collection of the pope's comments on Jews and Judaism, which was recently published by the Polish Bishops' Conference. But the theme that remains consistent throughout John Paul's writing is this: and he says it here in one speech given in 1982 in Rome -- he says, "Jews and Christians are linked together at the very level of their identity, relationships founded [25:00] on the design of the God of the covenant. As a result, Jews and Judaism should not occupy an occasional and marginal place in catechesis. Their presence there is essential and should be organically integrated." But this theme of an essential bonding, at the very deepest level of identity, between Catholics and Jews, is probably the single most persistent theme in the theological writings of Pope John Paul II on the question of the Christian-Jewish relationship.

Well, those are some of the highlights, I think. We've made a lot of progress, both in eliminating the old deicide charge, in eliminating the idea that the coming of Jesus Christ already meant the simple replacement of Jews by Christians in the

covenantal relationship, and we've come a long way in seeing that Jesus didn't oppose the totality of the Jewish community [26:00] of his own time. On the contrary, he deeply identified with a good part of it with what I would say the most progressive and healthy part of the Jewish community of his day -- that he drank very deeply of the well of Judaism of his period, particularly Pharisaic Judaism. That's a remarkable turnabout.

In the time remaining to me, let me turn my attention to, you might say, more practical matters. What about the question of the Vatican and the state of Israel and Zionism? For many of you, this may be a far more nitty-gritty and up-front kind of issue. It is true that up to this point, the Vatican has not formally established full diplomatic relationships with the state of Israel. But it's equally true to say that the Vatican has upgraded its relationship to the state of Israel [27:00] considerably, particularly since around -- since the time of the Yom Kippur war. I can't say for sure -- I'm not sure the Yom Kippur war had any direct involvement with that upgrading, but it's just sort of the period of time when we began to notice a change. But let me step back in history a bit to the beginning of this century, just to locate the problem a bit more.

At the turn of the century, those of you who know something about the history of Zionism, you know that Theodor Herzl, who's certainly one of the early fathers of Zionism -- in 1903, Theodor Herzl paid a visit to the Vatican, met with the pope, and asked that the papacy endorse the idea of a Jewish national homeland. The official response of the Vatican at that time was no. And the reason given was not political; the reason given was theological. [28:00] The reason was that because Jews had not accepted Jesus Christ, the Vatican could not accept the right of the Jewish people to return or support the idea of the Jewish people returning to Israel. Now, they did qualify that by saying they did [not?] necessarily have political objections and so on. But from a strictly religious point of view, they couldn't support it. And that's basically where it was. Now, in 1948, when the state of Israel actually came into existence, the Vatican position had evolved somewhat. I think a great deal of that theology, which is normally called -- I think a lot of that is rooted in a very historic theological position in the Catholic Church called "the theology of the Jew as perpetual wanderer." Now, this was not just a theological position. I think this was a theological position that had infiltrated popular culture. [29:00] And if you want an example of this, think of a plant. There's a plant called the Wandering Jew. That's not an accident. I mean, the name of that plant really

comes from a theological position. OK? Jews were deemed to have the fate of being perpetual wanderers on the face of the -- not to be -- it wasn't genocide. It wasn't the idea that they were to be eliminated, but they were to be perpetual wanderers. They were to live in a less than wholesome state. They were to endure suffering and banishment -- for two reasons, kind of interrelated: both as a punishment for the failure to recognize the Messiah, but also as a warning to others of what happens to people when they refuse to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah. And that was a view. And that's why the Vatican II declaration, [30:00] *Nostra Aetate*, in removing any validity to the notion of deicide from the Catholic Church, not only changed the whole theological spectrum in terms of the Catholic-Jewish relationship, but it also changed the basis for the way the Vatican and Catholics [are/out?] to view Jews and Jewish political aspirations. I think that's a very important point, because Jews were not meant automatically from a theological point of view to be perpetual wanderers -- because the whole basis of that theology, namely, deicide, had been declared without fundamental basis by Second Vatican II.

OK. I think that theology of perpetual wandering is basically gone. I think the Vatican's theological objections to the state of Israel have largely disappeared. I know there are still some

people who claim that; a recent book [31:00] by an Israeli diplomat and professor, Professor Minerbi, still makes that argument. I happen to disagree with that position, but I'm not going to go into the arguments right here. I think basically, the reasons for not reaching the point of full diplomatic relationships is primarily political, and it's due to a combination of circumstances. Sometimes it's put forward as a totally legal sort of point of view, namely that Israel still exists, not in permanent state boundaries but in temporary boundaries, and the Vatican has traditionally not recognized states with temporary boundaries -- the example given is it doesn't recognize Jordan either for the same reason. But I'm not sure that's the real reason. I think it's a combination of circumstances, both the fact that there's a substantial Palestinian population which has impact on the Vatican; number two, the Vatican has a genuine concern for the rights of the Palestinian people; [32:00] and thirdly, the Vatican has a great sensitivity, as a small minority community in the Arab world, for the future of Catholics in the Arab world and fears doing anything that would further threaten the situation of the small Arab Catholic communities in many of the countries where they're already under harassment. But it has to be said, despite the fact that there hasn't been this upgrading to the full diplomatic status, nonetheless there has been an enhancement of

genuine communication since the end of the Yom Kippur war. For example, the state of Israel has had a person in its embassy in Rome -- at times part-time, at times full-time -- whose responsibilities have been to relate to the Holy See. And this person has not had to bang down the doors to gain admittance to talk. And likewise, the Vatican has appointed full-time diplomats to a desk in its [33:00] secretary of state charged with Israeli affairs. So Israeli political leaders are given full diplomatic courtesy equivalent to their political rank if and when they visit the Vatican and so on. So these are some indications, but there also have been statements, both about the state of Israel and about Jerusalem in particular and also about Zionism, that if you're not acquainted with them, you should at least have some idea about them. Probably the most thorough statement of John Paul II on the question was actually issued in 1984, on April 20, 1984. And he makes this statement: he says, "For the Jewish people who live in the state of Israel and who preserve in that land such precious testimonies of their history and their faith, we must ask for the desired security and the due tranquility that is the prerogative of every nation [34:00] and condition of life and the progress of every society." Well, my friends, I think that is full political recognition of Israeli statehood without perhaps the final step of the diplomatic relationships. I mean, you cannot say that the

Vatican does not represent the state of Israel as a legitimate and viable state that has a right to all the rights that any political states should have.

On the question of Jerusalem, the Vatican position -- it's not completely possible even for myself and others to say for certain what it is. I'm not sure that the Vatican has clearly laid its cards on the line here. I think, though, it's really wrong, as some have said, to continue to insist that the Vatican is holding out for the internationalization of the city. I think the Vatican did certainly put that forward as a solution in 1948, but the Vatican has since become quite aware that that's not acceptable either [35:00] to Jews or Muslims or to the other Christian communities in the area, particularly the Orthodox. Indeed, what I think the Vatican is looking for is a -- and this is the actual statement that the Vatican has issued: "There should be found with good will and farsightedness a concrete and just solution by which different interests and aspirations can be provided for in harmonious and stable form and be safeguarded in an adequate and efficacious manner by a special statute internationally guaranteed so that no party could jeopardize it." I think what the Vatican is aiming at is an international statute that could be the basis, if there was a violation of a court case, say, at the International Court of Justice in

(inaudible), which would protect certain of the holy places -- and believe me, the Vatican here is not thinking only of Jewish hegemony in the area, but also the possibility of Muslim hegemony. [36:00] But that's what I think is probably the position now, more of a kind of international statute that could be used as the basis of international appeal if there was some gross violations. But over and above that, Pope John Paul has also indicated his awareness of how deeply attached, how meaningful Jerusalem is to the Jewish community. He writes, for example: "Jews ardently love her and in every age venerate her memory. Abundant as she is in many remains and monuments from the time of David, who chose her as the capital, and of Solomon, who built the temple there. Therefore, Jews turn their minds to her daily when they say -- and point to her as the sign of their nation." Unquote.

Finally, I'd like to say just a word about Zionism. Several years ago, the Vatican Justice and Peace Commission issued a very important document on racism. [37:00] Very interesting. It dealt with racism in the United States, it dealt with apartheid, but it also dealt with the problem of anti-Zionism. Now, remember -- I think this is extremely important, because in an era when we are still living under the shadow of the horrors of the Jewish Holocaust, it has unfortunately yet not entirely

disappeared. "As if some had nothing to learn from the crimes of the past, certain organizations with branches in many countries keep alive the anti-Semite racist myth, with the support of networks of publication. Terrorist organizations which have Jewish persons or symbols as their targets have multiplied in recent years and show the radicalism of such groups. Anti-Zionism serves at times as a screen for anti-Semitism, feeding on it and leading to it. Furthermore, some countries impose undue harassments [38:00] and restrictions on the free immigration of Jews." That's a sample of what the Vatican has said both on the religious and theological level as well as on the political level. I think it represents a substantial turnabout in the Catholic-Jewish relationship. It doesn't mean that everyone in the Catholic Church worldwide has accepted all these statements and incorporated them.

We have many, many things to do yet. I'd be the first to say that while we've made tremendous progress, I think, in religious education, especially in North America, even here we have some work to do, but in many parts of the world the process has barely begun. I think on the theological level and the level of how theologians think the kind of statements that I just indicated that John Paul has made still need to be incorporated into the everyday life of the Church's teaching. Up to this point they're very fine statements, in my judgment, [39:00], but

they are statements that remain somewhat peripheral and have not yet been integrated to the main body of Catholic teaching -- to those moments when Catholics are not speaking to Jews, but when they're speaking about themselves to themselves. And I think that will be the final and ultimate test of the success of this effort.

I should say that on the other side, Jews have to recognize that some of this new theology is the kind of theology which in a way also challenges Jews. The Jews may not simply stand back and applaud some of this theology as a new progressive feature, but if one really proclaims a bonding, for example, from the Catholic side, that says something that I think sets the context for some Jewish reflection about what that bonding might mean from the Jewish side, which perhaps provides a challenge for Jews as well. I think there have been intentions on the political issue particularly but also on some of the theological issues. [40:00] On the political side, I think that just as the 1975 Vatican document insisted that Catholics must understand Jews how they define themselves -- so I think Jews will have to have a little deeper appreciation of the complexity of the Catholic community, and that in fact, Catholic-Jewish relations are not made by a single group or a single voice. And even within the Vatican, you have essentially two different groups,

with different interests and different responsibilities. The theological statements come from those who are largely committed and whose responsibilities entail what I would call the ecumenical area. However, the political statements tend to come from the secretary of state, whose responsibilities fundamentally are the preservation of the Catholic community. And when they look at the situation of Catholics in these Arab countries, it may not be totally justifiable, but it's understandable, [41:00] at least, why the reaction is to go very slow, because their first instinct is to say, How will this play out in terms of the difficulties, the increased difficulties faced by many of the Catholic communities in many of the Arab lands? And you know yourself as Jews, I think, how difficult some of these choices are at times.

Thirdly and finally, I would say -- if we are to proceed in dialogue, I think we need to do dialogue in a somewhat quieter tone, more in educational centers such as Queens College and elsewhere and less in some of the public media and in the pages of the *New York Times*. I think there is a danger that we can too easily fall into the trap of exchanging comments about one another in the popular press, and these things tend to, I think, pollute and harm a slowly budding and evolving relationship which still needs a lot of nurturing but also needs a lot of

education and understanding, without which it will fail. So once again, I thank you for the invitation. [42:00] I hope this has been helpful in helping you understand both the progress we've made, but maybe also realizing that we have homework to do as well. Thank you. (applause)

M:

End of Side One.

END OF AUDIO FILE