Preserving American Jewish History

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

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 24, Folder 8, International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee meeting [London], March-April 1981.

The American

Jewish Committee

European Office · 4, rue de la Bienfaisance, 75008 Paris · Tel. 522-9243 and 387-3839

April 7, 1981

Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum AJCommittee 165 E 56 Street New York, N.Y. 10022

Dear Marc,

I am sending you herewith the final text of the separate statement by the Jewish group after the conference in London. As I told you on the phone there was much wrangling both among ourselves and among our group and the Catholic side before reaching an agreement about the wording of the statement.

Our Catholic friends insisted on two things: First, that no reference be made in the joint statement to issues raised by us on matters concerning Israel; Second, that even in our own statement no mention should be made that these issues have been raised at the joint meeting.

The Catholics told us in clear terms that they came with definite instructions to this effect and that any inclusion of these issues, either in the joint or in the separate statement, will cause serious embarrassement to them vis-a-vis their superiors in Rome. After many hours of intense discussions I finally proposed a compromise formula, namely that our statement should not say that our position was declared at the joint conference, but simply state our views towards the subjects in question are being communicated to the Vatican. This formula was adopted by both sides, and the conflict was thus concluded.

It is interesting to note that the sensitivity on this matter was so great that even the timing of issuing the statements was arranged on the following way:

MAYNARD I. WISHNER, President

BERTRAM H. GOLD, Executive Vice-President
HOWARD I. FRIEDMAN, Chairman, Board of Governors
THEODORE ELLENOFF, Chairman, National Executive Council
GERARD WEINSTOCK, Chairman, Board of Trustees
ROBERT L. PELZ, Treasurer
MERVIN H. RISEMAN, Secretary
ELAINE PETSCHEK, Associate Treasurer
Honorary Presidents: MORRIS B. ABRAM, ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, PHILIP E. HOFFMAN, RICHARD MAASS, ELMER L. WINTER
HONORARY Vice-Presidents: NATHAN APPLEMAN, RUTH R. GODDARD, ANDREW GOODMAN, JAMES MARSHALL, WILLIAM ROSENWALD
MAX M. FISHER, Honorary Chairman, National Executive Council
MAURICE GLINERT, Honorary Treasurer
JOHN SLAWSON, Executive Vice-President Emeritus
Vice-Presidents: STANFORD M. ADELSTEIN, Rapid City, S.D.; MORTON K. BLAUSTEIN, Baltimore; ROBERT D. GRIES, Cleveland; DAVID HIRSCHHORN, Baltimore; MILES JAFFE, Detroit; HARRIS L. KEMPNER, JR., Galveston; HAMILTON M. LOEB, JR., Chicago; JOHN H. STEINHART, San Francisco; EMILY W. SUNSTEIN, Philadelphia; GEORGE M. SZABAD, Westchester; ELISE D. WATERMAN, New York

The joint statement was to be released on Friday, and our separate statement on the following Sunday.

I explained today to Dr. Riegner the circumstances in which you made your announcement on the radio and that this was due to the fact that you had to leave before the meeting was terminated. He accepted this explanation in a friendly and cooperative spirit.

The lesson of this development is that when one of us is compelled to leave before the end of a meeting, he should check with the other before making anything public.

I appreciate your information about the meeting with the Apostolic Nuncio. This certainly shows that the Vatican does take into account Jewish reactions to their diplomatic steps involving our interests.

Finally, I am glad to tell you that I feel that our participation in the London meeting was most useful and made a real contribution to the proceedings of this important event.

I do hope that we shall be in touch with each other as often as possible before my arrival in New York for the Amual Meeting.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely yours,

Zachariah Shuster

P.S. I shall send you the joint statement shortly.

IJCIC declaration in London

The International Jewish Committee for Interreligious consultations issued the following statement:

We are profoundly dismayed over the recent official meeting between the Secretary of State of the Vatican with representatives of the PLO. The Vatican-PLO meeting cannot in any way be reconcilied with Pope John Paul's repeated forthright condemnations of terrorism and violence. The declared aim of the PLO is the destruction of the State of Israel to be achieved through terrorist activities and violence directed against Israel and Jews elsewhere.

We strongly protest the political activities of Archbishop Capucci acting on behalf of the Vatican in various capacities in the Middle-East, in Rome and in Latin America. We are especially concerned that Archbishop Capucci was permitted to act as an intermediary in bringing about the meeting between the Vatican authorities and the PLO representative. This contradicts the undertaking given at the time of his release from prison in Israel, after serving only part of his sentence for gunrunning, that he would be assigned to pastoral work and not be allowed to engage in anti-Israel activities and Middle-East affairs. His emergence on the political scene, including his public appearance with representatives of the PLO after the meeting with the Vatican authorities constitutes a flagrant breach of that undertaking.

We are apprehensive that these developments - the meeting with the PLO and the activities of Archbishop Capucci - could adversely affect the encouraging progress that has been made in recent years in the Jewish-Catholic relationship.

These views are being communicated to the Vatican.

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

UNITED KINGDOM OFFICE

11 Hertford Street, London W1Y 7DX

TELEPHONE: 01-491 3517.
TELEGRAMS: WORLDGRESS, LONDON.
TELEX: 21633.

AMERICAN JEWISH

Enclosed are the lists of the Catholic and Jewish participants in the meeting of the International Liaison committee.

His Eminance Cardinal Basil Hume, Archbishop of Westminister, the Most Revd. Bruno Heim, the Apostolic Delegate, and the Very Rev. the Chief Rabbi, Dr. Immanuel Jakobovits will attend the Reception.

INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE BETWEEN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND JUDAISM

London, March 31 - April 2, 1981

Catholic Delegation

Most Rev. Mgr. Ramon Torrella Cascante Tit. Bishop of Minervino Murge;

Tit. Bishop of Minervino Murge; Vice-Fresident of the Secretariat for Fromoting Christian Unity, Rome

Mgr. Jorge Mejia

Secretary, Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with Judaism, Rome

Most Rev. Mgr. Karl Flügel

Auxiliary Bishop of Regensburg; in charge of relations with Judaism in the Catholic Bishops Conference in the Federal Republic of Germany, Regensburg

Mgr. Erich Salzmann

Secretariat for Fromoting Christian Unity, Rome

R.P. Bernard Dupuy, OP

Secretary, Commission for Relations with the Jews of the French Eishops Conference, Paris

Dr. Eugene J. Fisher

Secretary, Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations, US Bishops Conference, Washington

Mgr. George Higgins

Catholic Bishops Conference of the US, Washington

R.P. Roger Le Deaut

Professor at the Biblical Institute, Rome; Consultant, Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with Judaism

Mgr. Pietro Rossano

Secretary, Vatican Secretariat for non-Christians, Rome

Rt. Rev. Geoffrey Burke

Auxiliary Bishop of Salford; Chairman, Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations of the Bishops Conference of England and Wales, Salford

Rev. Deacon Graham Jenkins

Secretary, Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations of the Bishops Conference of England and Wales, London

INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE BETWEEN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND JUDAISM

London, March 31 - April 2, 1981

Jewish Delegation

the state of the s	
Prof. Shemaryahu Talmon	Chairman, International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations; Hebrew University, Jerusalem
Dr. Geoffrey Wigoder	Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University; former Chairman, Jerusalem Rainbow Group, Jerusalem
Dr. Gerhart M. Riegner	Secretary-General, World Jewish Congress, Geneva
Mr. Fritz Becker	Representative, World Jewish Congress, Rome
Dr. Paul Warszawski	Assistant Director, Latin American Jewish Congress, Buenos Aires
Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum	National Interreligious Affairs Director, American Jewish Committee, New York
Mr. Zachariah Shuster	European Consultant, Interreligious Affairs American Jewish Committee, Paris
Rabbi Bernard Mandelbaum	Executive Vice-President, Synagogue Council of America, New York
Dr. Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich	European Director, B'nai B'rith, Basle
Dr. Joseph L. Lichten	Representative, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Rome
Rabbi Leon Klenicki	Co-Director, Interfaith Affairs Committee, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith,
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	New York
Dr. Nachum L. Rabinovitch	Principal, Jews' College, London
Sir Sigmund Sternberg, JP	Representative, Board of Deputies of British Jews, London

Rabbi Dr. Norman Solomon

Rabbi, Hampstead Synagogue, London

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

CONGRÈS JUIF MONDIAL

CONGRESO JUDIO MUNDIAL

1211 GENÈVE 20 NEW YORK, N.Y. 10016 LONDON W1Y 7DX 75008 PARIS JERUSALEM

1, RUE DE VAREMBÉ ONE PARK AVENUE 11, HERTFORD STREET 78, AV. CHAMPS-ÉLYSÉES P.O.B. 4 2 9 3

CASE POSTALE 191 TELEPH. 679-0600 TELEPH. 491-3517 TELEPH. 359,94.63 4, ROTENBERG STREET

TELEPH. 341325 TELEX 23 6 1 2 9 TELEX 2 1 6 3 3 TELEX 6 5 0 3 2 0 TELEPH. 635546-635544

TELEX 28 98 76 GMR/rg

Geneva, April 10, 1981

To: Rabbi Marc A. Tanenbaum

From: Gerhart M. Riegner

AMERICAN JEWISH

Please find enclosed:

- 1. The joint press release on our meeting in London.
- 2. The Jewish press release.
- 3. Copy of the letter to Mgr. Torrella.

I understand that the joint press release has been published in the Osservatore Romano.

Vatican Commission For Religious Relations With Judaism

International Jewish Committee
On Interreligious Consultations

c/o World Jewish Congress 11 Hertford Street London W1Y 7DX

Tel: 01-491 - 3517

London April 3, 1981

PRESS RELEASE

The 9th meeting of the International Liaison Committee between the International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultations and the Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with Judaism took place in London, England, March 31st - April 2nd, 1981.

The major points on the agenda included the presentation and discussion of two papers on "The Challenge of Secularism to our Religious Commitments", delivered by Msgr. Pietro Rossano, Secretary of the Secretarist for Non-Christian Religions and consultant of the Vatican Commission, and Rabbi Dr. Nachum Rabinovitch, Principal of Jews' College, London.

Msgr. Roseano underlined the following points: Secularization is a historic process of western origin which tends to remove from society sacredness and the sense of the religious. There are several patterns of secularization and different ways of reacting to and interpreting the same phenomena. The effects of secularization should not be assessed in a negative way only: it offers in fact, more freedom towards an authentic expression of one's own religious identity. It can also be conducive to an atmosphere of dialogue and mutual cooperation, in which religious traditions, particularly Judaism and Christianity, can and should cooperate for the promotion of common values. Msgr. Rossano pointed out that the speech by the Chief Rabbi of Rome, Dr. Elio Toaff, on the occasion of his meeting with the Pope, deserves serious consideration.

Rabbi Rabinovitch said in his paper that "religion needs to cultivate not only love of God but also love of kindness. Religion needs to speak not with authority but with humility. Then it will be heard - surely in all these areas, all believers can cooperate, why not join research into social, economic and ethical problem:? ...Why not united efforts to deal with food distribution and famine? Why not a combined campaign to promote peace studies? To quote David's words:

"In the uprightness of my heart I have freely offered all these things, and I have seen thy people offering freely and Joyously Thee. If we set the example, it will be followed."

The discussion which followed engaged the participants in an analysis of both papers clarifying the understanding of major concepts in Judaism and Christianity. The delegates pointed out common problems facing both faith communities in today's world. The discussion centered on the crisis of traditional values, impact on family life and the transmission of spiritual tradition to the new generations.

The agenda considered an exchange of information on educational initiatives being taken in both communities to further mutual understanding, and on anti-semitism and its present resurgence in different parts of the world; its causes and possible counteraction. Special attention was given to the meaning of the destruction of European Jewry during the Second World War and its proper presentation in education. The meeting warned against pernicious revisions of the history of the Holocaust. The meeting discussed developments in the field of religious freedom focusing on the draft declaration on this subject recently adopted by the UN Commission on Human Rights. The delegates pointed out similar perspectives in Jewish and Christian approaches to the question. Finally, an exchange of views and opinions followed on misrepresentations of Judaism and of Christianity in some Christian and Jewish writings.

Receptions in honour of the delegations were given by the World Jewish Congress and the International Council of Christian and Jews. Many of England's Jewish and Christian religious leaders participated, among them His Eminence Cardinal George Basil Hume, Archbishop of Westminster and the Chief Rabbi of Great Britain, Dr.Immanuel Jakobovits.

The group experienced a gratifying spirit of frankness and trust on both sides in confronting together the sensitive issues raised.

The lists of participants follow.

The International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations is composed of the World Jewish Congress, the Synagogue Council of America, the American Jewish Committee, the B'nai B'rith - Anti Defamation League and the Israel Jewish Council on Interreligious Consultations.

International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

c/o World Jewish Congress 11 Hertford Street London WIY 7DX

Tel: 01-491 - 3517

London, April 6 1981

PRESS RELEASE

The International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations has met in London and issued the following statement:

We are profoundly dismayed over the recent official meeting between the Secretary of State of the Vatican with representatives of the PLO. The Vatican-PLO meeting cannot in any way be reconciled with Pope John Paul's repeated forthright condemnations of terrorism and violence. The declared aim of the PLO is the destruction of the State of Israel to be achieved through terrorist activities and violence directed against Israelis and Jews elsewhere.

We strongly protest the political activities of Archbishop Capucci acting on behalf of the Vatican in various capacities in the Middle East, in Rome and in Latin America. We are especially concerned that Archbishop Capucci was permitted to act as an intermediary in bringing about the meeting between the Vatican authorities and the PLO representative. This contradicts the undertaking given at the time of his release from prison in Israel, after serving only part of his sentence for gunrunning, that he would be assigned to pastoral work and not be allowed to engage in anti-Israel activities and Middle Eastern affairs. His emergence on the political scene, including his public appearance with representatives of the PLO after the meeting with the Vatican authorities constitutes a flagrant breach of that undertaking.

We are apprehensive that these developments - the meeting with the PLO and the activities of Archbishop Capucci - could undermine the encouraging progress that has been made in recent years in the Jewish-Catholic relationship. These views are being communicated to the Vatican.

The International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations is composed of the World Jewish Congress, the Synagogue Council of America, the American Jewish Committee, the B'nai B'rith - Anti Defamation League and the Israel Jewish Council on Interreligious Consultations.

Secretariat in Europe: c/o World Jewish Congress, l, Rue de Varembe, Geneva, Switzerland

> London, 6th April, 1981.

Secretariat in USA:

c/o Synagogue Council of America, 10 East 40th Street, New York 10016.



His Excellency Monsignor Ramon Torella Cascante, Vice-President of the Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with Judaism, Vatican City.

Your Excellency, FR CAN FW SH

The International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations has taken note with deep concern of the published reports on a recent official meeting between the Secretary of State of the Vatican with representatives of the Palestinian Liberation Organisation. It is difficult to reconcile this meeting with Pope John Paul II's forthright condemnations of terrorism and violence. It is well known that the declared aim of the PLO is the destruction of the State of Israel through terrorist activities and violence directed against Israelis and Jews elsewhere.

We also strongly protest against the political activities of Archbishop Capucci who was apparently permitted to act as an intermediary between the Vatican authorities and the PLO representatives, and who continuously acts in various capacities in political matters concerning the Middle East in Rome, in Latin America and several European capitals. This is in contradiction to the understanding, before he was released from prison in Israel, that he would be assigned to pastoral work and not be allowed to engage in anti-Israel activities and Middle East affairs.

We are apprehensive that these developments - the meeting with the FLO and the activities of Archbishop Capucci - could adversely affect the encouraging progress which has been made in recent years in the Jewish-Catholic relationship.

We ask Your Excellency kindly to transmit these views to the appropriate authorities of the Vatican. We should be grateful if, at the same time, you would convey to these authorities our desire that they meet with a delegation of the International Jewish Committee on Interneligious Consultations to discuss this matter in greater depth at an early and convenient date.

Yours respectfully,

Professor Shemaryahu Talmon, Chairman, International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations

CONGRÈS JUIF MONDIAL

CONGRESO JUDIO MUNDIAL

1211 GENEVE 20 NEW YORK, N.Y. 10016 LONDON W1M 8BT CASE POSTALE 191 TELEPH. 341325 TELEX 28 98 76

TELEPH. 679-0600 GMR/ra

1, RUE DE VAREMBÉ ONE PARK AVENUE 55, NEW CAVENDISH STREET 78, AV. CHAMPS-ÉLYSÉES TELEPH. 935-03.35 TELEX 236129 TELEX 21633 TELEX 650320

75008 PARIS TEL-AVIV 123, YEHUDA HALEVI ST. TELEPH. 359.94.63 P. O. B. 14177 TELEPH. 22.91.39

Geneva, February 16, 1981

Members of IJCIC

From: Gerhart M. Riegner

Further to my memo of December 9 and the minutes of the meeting of the Steering Committee of December 4, I wish to inform you that in agreement with the Catholic side the following technical arrangements have been made concerning the forthcoming meeting of the International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee, which will take place in London from March 31 to April 2.

- The meeting will take place in the Walden room at the Clifton Ford 1. Hotel, Welbeck Street, London W.1. (Telephone No. 486-660; Telex No. 22569).
- The Catholic participants have expressed the desire to be housed at the same place as the Jewish delegation and we have therefore reserved a sufficient number of rooms for both delegations at the Clifton Ford Hotel from March 30 to April 2 inclusive. I would be grateful if you therefore also chose to stay at the Clifton Ford Hotel. The price will be £24.72 per day, including breakfast and VAT.
- Arrangements have been made for joint kosher lunch meals at the hotel for all participants.
- I suggest that the Jewish delegation meet on March 30 in the evening for a preparatory meeting. I propose that we meet at 8 p.m. in the hotel.
- Please let me know during the next two weeks who will attend from your organization and how many rooms you will require, indicating also the days of arrival and departure. I would be grateful if you sent copy of this information to my colleague, Dr. Elizabeth Eppler, c/o Institute of Jewish Affairs, 11 Hertford Street, London W1Y 7DX, who has kindly agreed to make the necessary arrangements with the hotel.

The Kirami

NATL CONFERENCE CHRISTIAN AND JE 43 WEST 57 ST NEW YORK NY 10019



4-0390475079 03/20/81 ICS IPMMTZZ CSP NYBB 2126887530 MGM TDMT NEW YORK NY 127 03-20 0308P EST

RABBI MARC TANENBAUM AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE 165 EAST 56 ST NEW YORK NY 10022

DEAR MARC

BECAUSE THIS IS SHORT NOTICE I AM WIRING YOU IN BEHALF OF SIR SIGMUND STERNBERG, CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS. AT HIS REQUEST. HE, LIKE YOU, IS A DELEGATE TO THE FORTHCOMING MEETING IN LONDON MARCH 31-APRIL 2 OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS. SIR SIGMUND INVITES YOU TO A DINNER UNDER AUSPICES OF THE ICCJ ON APRIL 1 AT HILLEL HOUSE, 1-2 ENDSLEIGH STREET LONDON WC1. IF YOU CAN LET ME KNOW IF YOUR SCHEDULE WILL PERMIT YOUR ATTENDANCE APRIL 1, I WILL CALL SIR SIGMUND AND SO INFORM HIM.

WARMEST REGARDS
DAVID HYATT PRESIDENT NCCJ, PRESIDENT ICCJ

15:08 EST

MGMCOMP

International Jewish Committee Interreligious Consultations

AMERICAN SECRETARIAT:

Synagogue Council of America

TO FAST 40th STREES 2932 Park Ava

New York, N.Y. 10016 -Tel.: (212) 686-8670

EUROPEAN SECRETARIAT:

World Jewish Congress . 1 Rue de Varembe

1211 Geneve 20, Switzerland Tel.: (022) 34 13 25

CONSTITUENT AGENCIES:

American Jewish Committee 165 East 56th Street New York, N.Y. 10022

Anti-Defamation League-B'nai B'rith

823 United Nations Plaza New York, N.Y. 10017

Israel Jewish Council for Interreligious Consultations 12A Koresh Street, P.O.B. 2028 Jerusalem, Israel 91020

ynagogue Council of America

New York, N.Y. 10016

World Jewish Congress 1 Park Avenue New York, N.Y. 10016

TO:

· All Members of IJCIC

FROM:

Rabbi Bernard J. Mandelbaum

February 27, 1981

SUBJECT:

Attached Correspondence

I did not want to wait until our next meeting to

respond to the important invitation which is

enclosed.

If each of you will send me recommendations, I will

then clear the final list with you.

BJM/fiu attachments

RABBI ARTHUR J. LELYVELD RABBI SAUL L TEPLITZ Honorary President RABBI WALTER S. WURZBURGER First Vice-President RABBI MORDECALI, WAXMAN Second Vice-President NORMA LI LEVITT PETER I. FEINBERG HERBERT BERMAN Viole Presidents WINTH MISCHEL Recording Secretary RICHARD W. JOSELIT Cortesponding Secretary JEFF SHOR Treasurer RABBI IRVING LEHRMAN Chairman, National Society of Patrons PHILIP GREENE

Chairman, National Advisory Council

RABBI BERNARD J. MANDELBAUM

Associate Executive Vice-President

Chairman, Executive Committee

STEPHEN R. COHEN

Executive Vice-President

RABBI DANIEL F. POLISH

Director, Washington Office

INSTITUTE FOR JEWISH POLICY
PLANNING AND RESEARCH
NATHAN S. ANCELL
Cheirman, Board of Trustees
RITA E. HAUSER
Vice Cheirman
RABBI BERNARD J. MANDELBAUM
Drantor of Research

COMMITTÉE CHAIRMEN HERBERT BEAMAN Administration and Budget E DAVID ROSEN Communications RABBI ROBERT J MARX Domestic Affairs RABBI ABRAHAM KELMAN Task Force on the Family RABBI RONALD B. SOBEL Task Force on International Affairs RABBI MORDECALL WAXMAN Interreligious Affairs RABBI FABIAN SCHONFELD Israel Affairs SAMUEL S. BROCHSTEIN ROR Call of Synagogues SEYMOUR L. KA1Z Task Force on Soviet Jawry

CONSTITUENT ORGANIZATIONS

Central Gonference of American Rabbis RABBI JEROME R. MALINO, President Rabbinical Assembly RABBI SEYMOUR J. COMEN, President Rabbinical Council of America RABBI SOL ROTH, President Union of American Hebrew Congregations RABBI ALEXANDER M SCHINDLER, President Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America Julius BERMAN, President United Synagogue of America SIMON SCHWARTZ President

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA

10 EAST 40th STREET NEW YORK, N.Y. 10016 • (212) 686-8670



February 24, 1981

Mr. Jefferson N. Eastmond, President INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF RELIGIONS 2315 Stringham Avenue Salt Lake City, Utah 84109

Dear Mr. Eastmond:

This is in response to your letter of February 13th to our president, Rabbi Arthur Lelyveld. I hasten to respond to your communication because of the importance of the World Conference of Religions which you are projecting. However, I want to make the recommendation for Jewish participation with a great responsibility.

The Synagogue Council of America is the American Secretariat of IJCIC (International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations) which consists of the following constituent agencies: American Jewish Congress, Anti-Defamation League-B'nai B'rith, Israel Jewish Council for Interreligious Consultations and World Jewish Congress (European Secretariat).

I will take up your invitation with the executive board of IJCIC and then get back to you.

If you have any other information about the conference, it would be helpful, and I would also appreciate word about the deadline for submitting the list of recommendations.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours

Bernard J. Mandelbaum

BJM: 1r

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF RELIGIONS

13 February 1981

Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld, President Synasosus Council of America 432 Park Avenue, South New York, NY 10016

Office of the Vice President, Board of Trustees 2315 Stringhum Ave. Salt Lake City, Ut. 84109 Telephane (801) 486-5066

Dear Rabbi Lelyveld;

In approximately ten months from now the International Council of Relisions together with the Sikh relisious leadership are sponsoring a World Conference of Relisions. The Conference will be held in Amritsar, India and we expect to have more than 100 official delegates representing nearly all of the relisions of the world. There will also be a large number of official observers, conference participants, and staff members, friends, etc. The theme of the conference will be "Relision and Peace" and we anticipate a series of keynote speakers, work groups, and planning sessions that will indeed make a significant improvement in the conditions for peace throughout the world. The aim is to emphasize the spiritual elements, to better acquaint relisious leaders with one another, to strengthen the various relisions and enhance the possibilities of cooperation among them to achieve some agreed upon soals.

We would like to invite at least six official delegates and several official observers from the Jewish faith. Preferably these would be world spiritual leaders or their designates and others they might choose.

This letter is an inquiry as to the specific persons to whom an invitation can be addressed. Could you please send me the names and addresss of the World Spiritual Leaders of the Jewish religion which you would nominate for such a conference? These may include different sects or branches of the religion. Any other suggestions you could send in connection with our invitation would be appreciated.

As a seneral policy, we are hopins that a number of delegates can provide their own international travel to New Delhi. The International Council of Religions is prepared to assist partially or fully in meeting this expense if it is a problem to the religious leader. The Sikhs will provide local transportation between New Delhi and Amritsar and will furnish meals and lodsing in Amritsar. The conference is expected to last for three days.

May I hear from you in the near future as to whom I should extend the conference invitations?

Most sincerely yours,

fferson N. Eastmond

President

Rev. J. Stuart Wetmore, D.D. Chrmn of Exec. Comm. Suffragan Bishop, The Diocese of New York 1047 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10025

Telephone (212) 678-6984

Frary von Blomberg, President 111 Exeter Rd. Hampton, NH 03942 Telephone (602) 926-6027

International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations

AMERICAN SECRETARIAT:

Synagogue Council of America

New York, N.Y. 10016 Tel.: (212) 686-8670 - US. S. REWAY

EUROPEAN SECRETARIAT:

World Jewish Congress 1 Rue de Varembe 1211 Geneve 20, Switzerland

Tel.: (022) 34 13 25

CONSTITUENT AGENCIES:

American Jewish Committee 165 East 56th Street New York, N.Y. 10022

Anti-Defamation League— B'nai B'rith 823 United Nations Plaza New York, N.Y. 10017

Israel Jewish Council for Interreligious Consultations 12A Koresh Street, P.O.B. 2028 Jerusalem, Israel 91020

Synagogue Council of America 832 Park Avenue South New York, N.Y. 10016

World Jewish Congress 1 Park Avenue New York, N.Y. 10016 March 23, 1981

TO:

IJCIC Members

FROM:

Bernard J. Mandelbaum

AMERICAN JEWISH

You will find the enclosed of interest. This is of special importance for those who will be participating in the London conference at the end of this month.

BJM/fiu enclosure

MINUTES

of the eight meeting of the International Liaison Committee between the Roman Catholic Church (Vatican Commission for religious relations with Judaism) and the International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultations (Regensburg, West Germany, Oct. 22-25, 1979)

The meeting was held in Heupert Haus, a medieval building of the diocese of Regensburg. The participants appreciated constantly the warm hospitality and friendliness of its diocesan and auxiliary bishops, Dr. Rudolf Graber and Dr. Karl Flügel.

On the Catholic side, the chairman was Msgr. Charles Moeller, Vice-President of the Commission for religious relations with Judai, and, on the Jewish side, Prof. Shemaryahu Talmon, of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The two chairmen alternated as usually.

Oct. 22, 1979: morning session.

The first session opened on October 22nd, around 9 o'clock, with greetings from Msgr. Moeller, Bishop Flügel and Prof. Talmon, who also referred to the decision of the Jewish side to meet in Germany as "heavy and crucial", particularly in the city of Regensburg.

<u>Prof. Gordis</u> then read the text of Ps. 123. <u>Msgr. Mejia</u> presented to the group the greetings of Bishop Torrella, then recalled the recent passing away of Prof. Rijk and the anniversaries, falling in those days, of the Declaration "Nostra Aetate" and of the "Guidelines and Suggestions".

After the presentation of the participants one by one, <u>Prof. Gordis</u> presented his paper on Religious Freedom from the Jewish point of view. (Religious Liberty. A Jewish Perspective, 29 pp.). The reading was followed by a series of questions.

Dr. Fisher mentioned the so-called noachic laws. Dr. Brickner referred to the problem of herem.

<u>Prof. Talmon</u> underlined the problem (for Judaism) of the absence of a central authority and its consequences.

<u>Levinson</u> came back to the question of idolatry (in the Noachic Laws) and then asked if paganism does not of itself require a certain measure of intolerance.

Prof. Gordis answered briefly to each question, stating clearly that the herem question had to be seen in its own perspective, that the

absence of a central authority favoured pluralism and religious liberty but that paradoxically (in Israel) there is no religious freedom for conservative and Reform Jews. Referring to the noachic laws he said that two of them are openly theological, the others have/theological foundation. It was better, however, not to use the word intolerance (not even regarding paganism).

this is a line of the second of

Msgr. Biffi then read his text "Le droit à la liberté religieuse". Clarifying questions were asked at the end.

Dr. Riegner:

- a) is religious freedom the source of all human rights? Theoretically perhaps, but in actual fact?
- b) there is a question of terminology: democratic state. Is democracy a guarantee of religious freedom?

<u>Biffi</u> answers first the <u>second</u> question: a question of substance, not of terminology. Is common good best served by democracy or by some other system? One man or one party? The state should not tell me which God I should worship but leave me worship my own God.

To the <u>first</u> question: he does not offer a universal definition. Religious freedom would be the ultimate foundation of all liberties, from the practical point of view. Case of Great Britain.

<u>P. Dubois</u>: is everything self-coherent? No metaphysical or moral questions, but only juridical. However, p. 3 the relation of the person with God is mentioned.

<u>Biffi</u>: relation between God and myself falls under religious freedom as far as it is the act of faith. But he has spoken about the social enactment of such right. We thus remain in the field of rights and duties. In the totalitarian state the limitations of religious freedom affect the dignity of the human person. Juridically, however, the contents are not judged.

Lichten:

- a) is separation between Church and State accepted in principle, theologically or philosophically? or is it only a question of fact?
- b) regarding the problem of land for building a church: how far does the obligation of the State go?

<u>Biffi</u>: he has made an affirmation in the field of sociology. If he has to go deeper, then: <u>Pacem in Terris</u> (John XXIII's Encyclical letter) accepts the separation as part of a moral conduct. Cf. also <u>Gaudium et Spes</u>, in Vatican Council II (ch. 4 of Part Two): both institutions have essential but different aims. However they are

not opposed, but should collaborate according to the circumstances. And the state should create the conditions for the development of religion, taking into account the will of the citizens.

To the <u>second</u> question: it is not that the State should give out the land, but that it should provide for it in planning the urban development. If not, religious freedom is limited.

Lichten (insists): how far should this go?

 $\underline{\text{Biffi}}$: difficult to say. Consider the circumstances. The decision belongs to the citizens.

Levinson: about the use of the word "élan" (p.3).

<u>Biffi</u>: the reference is to the <u>public</u> character of religion. The state organizes everything.

Brickner: Biffi's text asks for thoughtful reflection. One feels a change. Affirm the importance of the search for truth. Applies the text to the USA: State does not interfere with religion nor religions among themselves. The neutrality of the state: no religion will make any effort to impose its convictions through the State. Attitude of the State in matters of sexuality and education?

<u>Biffi</u>: two problems: content of religion and political action. The distinction should be clear by now.

Oct. 23: afternoon session.

<u>Talmon</u> refers to the Trento agenda to focus the discussion: we should speak about relation between religions not about religion and state.

<u>Chouraqui</u>: thankful to Biffi for having used the French language. An hommage to a minority culture.

- 1) Both papers have avoided apologetics in relation to past mistakes.
- 2) Biffi says that religion is the heart of the human person. True, but consider real limitations. Not loose sight of the dynamic dimension: the final things and ends. The ILC should pass to everybody the essentials of the biblical message: victory upon death.

Mussner: the normative value of the judaeo-christian tradition.

<u>Warszawski</u>: an important subject in both papers: majority and minorities. Touches the situation of Jewish communities in Latin America in the context of the affirmation of the local Catholic tradition. Reads out a text from Argentina. A special relation

seem to exist between Church and State. Things have turned worst in the last 10/12 years, at least from the side of the Catholic people, not the Church officially, but she should speak out more clearly. A case in point: "Formaciòn moral y civica" in Argentina's/education and different reactions from Catholics (including the hierarchy). Not satisfactory.

Gordis (to Talmon):

- a) he never saw the Trento agenda;
- b) he is not interested in past history. His main point is relations between religions, not between Church and State (as Biffi). The question is: can one maintain commitment to one's own religion and religious vitality with religious freedom.

<u>Biffi</u> (to Chouraqui): he has not official technical solutions but principles. Collaboration between religious communities should be a matter for citizens. It is possible to write in a Constitution that such religion is the religion of the state. But it is said now rather: religion of the majority. Citizens are called to solve this question.

Three observations:

- a) better not to speak about State religion. Distinguish between Society and State.
- b) the State should acknowledge social reality: promote the religion of the majority and the rights of minorities.
- c) there is a dialectic between freedom and obligation (cf. <u>Dignitatis Humanae</u> 1, 9, 11). But the act of faith is free and every person should be free (regarding religion) of outside coercion.

<u>Mejia</u> reaffirms distinction between Society and State. Refers to the Israeli situation and prefers not to speak to the Argentine situation now.

Wyschogrod: let us face realities. The age of religious fanaticism is not over. Societies are transformed in States. Besides, there is not distinction between Church and State in the Bible. The concept itself is objectionable: the State always inspires a religion, even if it is a secularist one. Mejia has well posed the problem when mentioning the rights of minorities (in Israel). It is a real question, even for Jews.

<u>Talmon</u>: let's keep to the subject of the discussion. What the Bible says or not is irrelevant.

<u>Higgins</u>: avoid local situations (USA, Argentina). Goes back to the history of <u>Dignitatis Humanae</u> and the work of Fr John Courtney Murray.

The path opened by this document should be followed: how could we work together to foster religious influence in the world of today.

<u>Ehrlich</u>: a democratic state which allows religious freedom but does not allow social action is a democratic state? Some religions (Christianism and Judaism) promote social values. And the relation of Judaism with the land should be a matter also of religious freedom.

Tanenbaum agrees with Higgins. Let us not look back. Both papers have expressed real changes. Importance of Pope's speech in the UN. We are confronted with a series of dilemmas: State and society, v.gr. There are different situations: the USSR (here Catholics and Jews come together). In the USA, the Conservative Evangelicals tend to dominate society by dominating the State, hurting both Christians and Jews.

Talmon asks whether the discussion should follow after supper. It was agreed.

Gordis: distinction between Society and State is a crucial one. Religion should influence society but not dominate it. It forgets its role when it tries to translate its principles into laws. The problem should be faced as it is posed today: what is lawful and what is unlawful?

Biffi (agreeing with Gordis): adds two observations:

- a) human civilization has made a real progress: each one is and should be free before God. Avoid linking State and religion: it would mean a step backward.
- b) Besides, something else has been clarified: the lay character of the State, its secularity. But beware of secularism. This State cannot avoid all relation to religion and here comes in the question of collaboration between one and the other for the benefit of the human person. Religion should not be pushed into the place of worship. A State which would attempt to do so would not be a democratic one.

Mejia explains further Biffi's position by clarifying the relation of religion with the State on one side and with Society on the other.

Talmon: two observations:

- a) no opposition between religious engagement and religious freedom;
- b) a question still open: only tolerate other religions? or promote and encourage them?

<u>Dupuy</u> (to Gordis' text): we have religious freedom very much in common in the world of today. In former times the question did not exist. Our tradition was rather opposed. Now we are coming together. Would it be easier now for Judaism to speak of religious freedom and human rights? The halaka would acknowledge rights and freedom for secularists? There is another question: do we use the same principles? In Biffi's text it is the conscience of the human person. In Judaism rather the conscience of Israel.

And a third point: the right of dissenters. The last criterion is peace and justice and the unity of the community. What is the position of orthodoxy?

Gordis: Jews need to be educated in this matters. If Catholicism is not monolithic, much less Judaism. It is not concerned by Soloveitchik's affirmations. A case in point was the recent problem between the two great Rabbis (in Israel) on the Shofar. The point of view expressed is "modernistic" but authentic. And it provides a basis for the acceptance of secularism. Note that a sinning Jew is always a Jew, if he does not change his religion, and even if he does not have any. Retain the difference between secularization and secularism. For what regards the foundations of religious freedom, they are to be found in the human person (Cf. Mishna, Sanhedrin). The same is true of the Noachic laws and natural law in Catholic teaching.

Shuster: we need further clarification of the concepts we use in relation with the world we live in. It is a fact that nobody would have expected to have in this meeting studies based v.gr. in Islam. Consider the question of minorities, religious education and the State. India is case to study. Perhaps a small commission or study group to review such matters?

Heinz:

- 1) According to the Holy Father, religious freedom is in danger in East and West. It is true that "integralism" is tantamount to non-separation between religion and the State. Thus, who has another religion is a second class citizen. But there is also a "dogmatism of pluralism" in modern society.
- Jews and Christians should be very critical of all absolute ideology. And this is necessary for the survival of freedom.
- 3) Engage in the defence of human rights. An example: impending publication of a text on the Decalogue. There is real contribution of religion to society. Secularism is really more intolerant than religion.
- 4) For what regards minorities, promote their equality of rights.

Riegner tries to offer a synthesis. An important affirmation: both traditions accept the same basis of religious freedom, especially in this pontificate. A great step forward. We can still have problems with details and applications. And we should be frank about it. Our

problem is: religious freedom as the source of all rights. It is not the best approach. We fight for human rights even where there is no religious freedom. If we insist on this, we would not make any progress. Then, the question of "public order". The States could do anything on such principle. The concept of the separation of religion and state flows from religious freedom. Certain local situations (like Spain) have been influenced by the Council Declaration. A special problem is the Islamic world. It is advisable to give more consideration to the practical consequences of theoretical affirmations. For what regards the distinction, there does not seem to be such distinction when one starts from natural Law, to which also the State must submit. In the field of applications, Argentina and Israel cannot be brought together. There are security problems. And the school system is quite different. It is important to understand the consciousness the Jew has of himself. We have some concrete problems: the Islamic States and Eastern Europe. "Public order" sounds a bit like "limitations of Islamic Law". Draws a consequence: we together in the face of such problems. Let's not forget the project of UN Declaration on Intolerance. And the UNESCO meeting in December. A common front is required. Perhaps a working group to study the open questions.

<u>Talmon</u>: how translate things into practical terms? Let's propose ideas about collaboration in such fields.

<u>Biffi</u> - regarding strategy: one should always start from the truth. This is what the Church has done in the Council. If one is to defend the dignity of the human person, its religious dimension should also be defended. Repeats the distinction between religious and civil society.

Gordis: a certain consensus on the fundamentals:

 a) loyalty to one's own religion and religious freedom are quite compatible;

b) Founding principle for religious freedom is the same for both religions. Take good notice of the four fundamental principles from the history of creation: value of men, equality, legitimate differences, and centrality of men. Equally valid for both religions. And a careful monitoring of the situations.

Tanenbaum: a word of caution - the position is not the same in the Vatican and in the Jewish organisations.

October 23: morning session

Exchange of information.

Prof. Willehad Eckert makes a brief presentation about antisemitism in both German States. Gives some historical references about accusations of ritual murder (the Trento affair). Quite apart the lack of foundations for the accusation, there were also juridical defects. Regarding the explanation of antisemitism: it would be the anguish of a majority community in front of a non absorbed minority, a community not recognizing Christ. Thus, the Jews promote an unlawful form of worship, requiring innocent victims (children). Antisemitism has a psychological element, as in other cases (like the witches' hunt). Three years ago a study was made in Germany about antisemitism (disguised or dormant). One third of the people sounded believe that Jews have enormous influence, quite disproportionate to their actual number (thought to be about 200 thousand). Some stereotypes persist: the exhibition in Walberberg shows inter alia a Last Supper with Judas dressed as a Jew (the only one). The only Jews really known are Nathan der Weise (Lessing) and Shyllock. A tourist discovers as late as the 16th century that Jews were not like he believed. Unfortunately, Jews in Germany are still not known. In this context, Prof. Mussner's book is very important. Regarding Oberammergau: should it contain only what is found in the New Testament or also "Nostra Aetate" and the "Guidelines". There is a need for theological renewal: the Church does not understand herself as the People of God outside Judaism. Besides, there is a certain unconfessed sense of guilt regarding Judaism. And among the stereotypes some are projected over Israel (like the economic ones). The TV-film "Holocaust" had a positive impact, but the young say their elders were responsible for it. It is true that after the film, things began to change. In the DDR the community grows old, they feel besieged and most of the leaders are members of the Communist Party. There is a beginning of Jewish/Christian dialogue. Partially, all the negative elements come from a distorted interpretation of the Bible.

Moeller: Be careful and attentive. Retains psychological aspects of antisemitism. The Trento affair is closed, since the suppression of the cult. Same is true of the profanation of the Blessed Sacrament in Brussels.

<u>Levinson</u>: Several examples of antisemitism in Germany. There is an unconscious attitude. The Holocaust is denied. The Nazi-party is not important but its ideology is spread. On the other hand, when the anniversary of the Kristallnacht was held, it found great interest in the local communities, including the young. Same with the TV-film. We face now a good opportunity. A new period begins. He is optimistic.

Brickner: a comment: are they soundings on the feelings of people about 50/60. The argument about the innocence of the young was already being heard in 1966. What about the Ernst-report: 50% knew nothing about the Nazi-crimes. Is there any (positive) influence from the side of the favourable groups? Has Israel any influence on antisemitism? What can the non-German do? What sort of programs? Approach the German government? Work through private foundations? through the Churches?

Eckert: The study referred to (by Brickner) is not serious. Impossible to confirm. However, after "Holocaust" great upsurge of interest and everybody is duly informed. Many books on the subject. Very few deny Nazi-crimes. There are several groups of study, including some with generation-conflicts. Recently, for a meeting in Cologne on theology after Auschwitz 100 were invited, 300 came. Excellent sign. Distinguish between people about 50/60 and the 20 year group. Many things can be done: training weeks (to one during summer 30 teachers came). Recent meeting in Arnoldshain (120 people). Another weekend on Jews in the Middle Ages. To Walberberg and the exhibition: 10 thousand people have come. Great hopes are placed in the collaboration of non-Germans. Israel is not the source of much anti-semitism. The young are not very happy with the present politics but know how to distinguish. The influence of Church and education is limited. However, the Church can do something with those outside.

Flügel: a word about the German Synod. A special responsibility of the Church regarding Judaism. On antisemitism: the Arbeitsgruppe (some of its members are present) proposes suggestions to the German bishops. Other work is done in the Zentralkomitee der Deutschen Katholiken. The same happens on the side of the Evangel. Kirche Deutschlands, where the same themes are discussed and diffused. It is also important that both "Tage" (Kirchentag and Katholikentag) had meetings and common worship and the Jewish part should be thanked for it. There was youth participation. In academic circles, influence of the Freiburger Rundbrief (15 thousand copies). Expenses covered by the German episcopate. A text is now being prepared by the Arbeitsgruppe to be published by the Episcopal Conference in 1980. The draft will be read by some Jews (Ehrlich). The Conference also sponsors reserarch and religious study projects. The Conference is engaged in the fight against anti-semitism. Several bishops published declarations on the Kristallnacht: Ratzinger, Hemmerle, Stimpfle. Bishop Graber himself has concerned himself with the shrine of Deggendorf: anti-Jewish elements have been suppressed or placed where they can make no harm. The engagement is to put "Nostra Aetate" into practice in the German Synod. On religious education the Conference plans to spend half a million DM. The Evangelische Kirche Deutschlands has collected a whole documentation on the subject and plans to have it published.

Mussner: Six points:

- renewal of Christian theology: not very great reaction to the present moment from the Systematic theologians on the various aspects (eschatology; ecclesiology, marked by Auschwitz, etc.)
- 2) regarding existential anguish: its source would be the existence of the Jewish people as a people. How does this fit in the Hegelian pattern? difficult question. It disturbs the logical development of history (cf. F. Dostoievsky, Karamazov Brothers).
- 3) the stereotyped question: masonry and Judaism as world-poisoners (with some relation with Archbishop Lefebvre). There was a meeting on Oberammergau in the Theologische Akademie (München): Mussner's contribution "disgusts" a reader;
- 4) there is also great ignorance of biblical history: v.gr. the importance of Psalms for prayer;
- 5) a new Bible is being prepared for the schools: Prof. Gross could say something about it. According to the report of a Hungarian bishop, there is much anti-semitism in the USA: if a Nazi-party had the government, it would be worst than Auschwitz.
- 6) he is grateful for the help of the Bavarian bishops towards the publication of his book (<u>Traktat über die Juden</u>), given as a gift to all participants.

Heinz:

- the change in attitude was seen already before the TV-film. There
 is a religious renewal and a sense of transcendence. But it has
 ambiguous aspects. For spiritualism and against the Church. Thus,
 the recent book of Prof. Blank;
- 2) another point, already underlined, is the ignorance of the Bible;
- 3) important discussions in the "Zentralkomitee": reductionist Christology with danger of anti-Jewish consequences, because of a humanistic reinterpretation of religion. This anti-semitism is still worst than the other. The Bible is meaningful to Catholics because of their faith.
- 4) action towards Judaism should be positive, not merely negative. Refers to Prof. Biemer's project of religious education (cf. infra).

<u>Warszawski</u>: the situation in Latin America. Some references to history: take away the anti-semitic list from the airport to avoid a bad impression. Anti-semitism has a religious origin, although those who support it do not represent any official Church position. Diffusion of anti-semitic books. Some new elements: some Jews responsible for supporting the status quo. Different political situations important for Jews. There are anti-Israeli overtones and pro-Arab action, not only anti-Israeli but anti-Semitic (those elements can be distinguished but are related). Influence of this attitude in Brasil. There is still

some influence of the old prejudices. There was a book against the reality of the Holocaust in the bookshop in the Puebla Conference. The text of the Puebla Conference does not mention anti-Semitism. Underlines the influence of the Church in Latin America. The Jewish question should be posed theologically, without forgetting its political position.

Eckert believes that the renewed interest in Judaism goes back to the TV-film (against Heinz).

October 23: afternoon session.

Education for dialogue.

<u>Prof. Fisher, Biemer and Silverman</u> read their papers on the above mentioned subject. Prof. Silverman's text was distributed after the meeting.

The discussion is opened.

<u>Talmon</u>: there is convergency in practical conclusions, but Prof. Silverman has dealt also with the philosophical problems.

<u>Tanenbaum</u>: a common concern. As a comment: a concern for self-identity may put into question the welfare society.

Gordis: Prof. Silverman is the president of the Society for interreligious education in the USA (interconfessional). On his four options regarding pluralism: they are not adequately distinguished: one and two taken together equal four.

<u>Moeller</u>: Paul Valéry wrote a book about this subject: "Le cerveau de chacun est devenu une exposition universelle de la pensée". His point of reference was Hamlet.

Fisher expresses his agreement with Silverman.

The afternoon session is suspended.

Participants are invited to the reception which the Major of Regensburg, Dr. Friedrich Viehbacher, extended to them in the historical "Rathaus" of the city. Greetings were offered by the Major himself, with responses from Prof. Talmon and Msgr. Moeller on behalf of each side. Bishop Graber then expressed his welcome to the audience and

Bishop Flügel read out the cable from the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. Helmut Schmidt, published in the Press Release (here attached).

A concert ensued with the Choir of the Regensburg Academy for Church Music.

October 23: evening session.

Freedman reads out a communication on the problems of violence in the world.

Tanenbaum reads a communication on the plight of South East Asian refugees (text transmitted to the proper authorities on the Catholic side).

The discussion continues on "Education for dialogue".

Mejia refers to the specific character of the American scene.

Higgins takes up from Mejia's intervention. The world is not all like that. But we are making more progress than we are able to assess. Murray's (John Courtney) book is from the fifties. Things have changed. Silverman's text could not have been read if a decisive change had not taken place. We are not supposed to discuss some specific American problems, but to dialogue as we do now. Refers to his experience, after 36 years in the American Episcopal Conference.

<u>Dubois</u> refers to the importance of common witness regarding the vertical dimension of human life.

 $\underline{\text{Fisher}}$: pluralism does not necessarily drive to indifferentism. Keep the perspective proper to Judaeo-Christian dialogue. In this context the question of education should be posed.

Biemer: Some observations:

- a) roles have changed among Germans and Americans: they were pragmatic before, they have become theorizers;
- b) a hypothesis: secularization is a generalization of theologies (cf. P. Berger). Religion is transformed in Sociology. A real danger. Religious might survive like mythical leftovers (cf. B.Welte).
- c) a common concern for both Covenants: Sinai/Golgota. (Referring to the text on South East Asia:) Such action is our responsibility and the meaning itself of our religions.

Silverman (to Higgins) thanks for putting Murray in a proper perspective.

Silverman (to Biemer:) disagrees on the interpretation of secularization. In Berger's opinion: great meaning of change. There are secular facts and values which are there to stay, as far as they point to transcendance.

(to Dubois:) the vertical dimension of our religions is impossible to express. There is debate on the relation between communication and presence: which comes first?

Two practical points:

- a) a Catholic program in Boston initiated by A.G. Heschel; something similar on the Jewish side, with Catholic textbooks;
- exchange of professors at the academic level. Also consider the many possibilities of informal education.

Higgins: a brief reference to the Pope's visit in the USA.

October 24: morning session.

Exchange of information

1. Prof. Federici's paper

<u>Brickner</u>: awakens great interest in the USA. It has been translated into four languages. An informal Symposium on "Mission and Witness" is in program in New York. Would like to know what happens elsewhere: acceptance, discussions, etc.

Mugavero: only small groups dedicated to such study.

Dupuy: only Jews read it in France.

<u>Fisher</u>: various levels of study in different institutions. Remarks on diverging mission terminology with Protestants. The document in question has been published many times.

<u>Higgins</u>: the situation in the USA is not what is is in France. The document has been of great use to Catholics in order to answer to UAHC's program on witness. It is not, however, a canonical text.

<u>Dubois</u>: the Latin Patriarchate (in Jerusalem) considers it a marginal text. He has to defend it in the meetings of the diocesis. Should it be given a certain official character? Protestants do accept it as a text for study. He has prepared a translation in Hebrew, but has no money to publish it.

<u>Levinson</u>: the text creates more problems with Protestants in the USA than with Catholics.

Talmon: has it been published in the KNA?

Levinson: No. In the Freiburger Rundbrief?

Ehrlich assents.

<u>Riegner</u> continues about the diffusion of the text. (to Mejia:) Is it possible to have it sent to the Episcopal Conferences? Would it be a good procedure?

<u>Dupuy</u> has frequently presented the text. No reactions. It is still very general. Catholic do not follow the line of argument. He is against Riegner's proposal. A further step, a shorter, clearer text on the special relation with Judaism.

Mugavero: If it were sent to the Bishops, it would go to a committee.

<u>Higgins</u>: the problem in the USA is that theologians are not yet concerned with this problem. We could discuss, informally, in some future meeting on the problem of methodology and how to prepare declarations.

<u>Mejia</u>: there is a need for further information on the subject. There is already intense study at the academic level.

<u>Brickner</u>: Higgin's proposal is positive. Our concern is that the momentum of the Federici text be lost because of the revival of fundamentalism. But such momentum is necessary for dialogue and useful to the Catholic community. It is important that the commitment to such position does not loose ground.

<u>Le Déaut</u>: my impression is that the text is not the last word on the subject. We should prepare a carefully drafted document to avoid difficulties.

<u>Talmon</u>: it is all right to go on studying and clarifying. But defend Federici's text.

Le Déaut: I have not said anything against.

Dubois: two points:

- a) Systematic theologians are not interested in the Old Testament as permanently valid;
- b) this is a special type of encounter and Federici's paper does not entirely respond to the situation.

2. Publications

Riegner: a long discussion has taken place in Rome. Possibilities are not the same on each side regarding a common publication. We must be more selective. Perhaps, start with a small publication on religious freedom, as a first step. There seems to be some sort of contradiction: a real good will and the decision not to go public.

Fisher: some texts could be published: the Madrid meeting.

<u>Le Déaut</u>: there could be a publication in SIDIC, in the religious freedom issue.

<u>Chouraqui</u>: a pluralistic solution: official and non-official publications to get the message going. Refers to the publication of the Bible in Brepols, with which he is concerned. A real importance in the message of both religions to the world.

Moeller (going back to the Federici text): keep to the text its study character and avoid a formal declaration.

<u>Ehrlich</u>: a practical proposal: publish the texts in a private editorial house with a prologue.

Mejia: a possible solution.

Riegner: not enough - Somebody should back the publication.

<u>Talmon</u>: draw attention to what is being done. The two secretaries could work as editors. This would give to the publication a certain official status. - Discussion with a German publisher should begin in two weeks.

Shuster: texts are not enough. Publication of the discussions in a private way. Participation of individual Catholics.

<u>Talmon</u>: if done like this, it would not reach the proposed goal. Need of an institutional frame.

Gordis asks if he can publish his own text.

Talmon: have patience till we arrive at a decision.

<u>Higgins</u>: we cannot solve the problem here. Perhaps a solution should be found in the USA.

Fisher asks the same question as Gordis.

Mussner: Herder could do it in Germany.

<u>Talmon</u>: a proposal: publish a selection of the Madrid and Regensburg texts under the sponsorship of the chairmen or secretaries of each side and an appropriate introduction. We should arrive to some conclusion in six weeks' time.

3. Jewish presentations of Christianity

A . 1 25

Mejia introduces the question referring to the book "Ocho preguntas sobre Judaismo" (D.Prager and J. Telushkin).

<u>Wyschogorod</u> insists on the difference of the Jewish situation. But he could contact the writers and try to inform them. Other times it has been tried to remedy this situation.

Talmon: perhaps introduce changes in a second edition.

Warszawski: something is being done in Argentina along these lines.

Talmon: something should be done on our side. It is our duty.

4. Other matters

<u>Levinson</u> presents material distributed by the German Council for Christians and Jews.

Mejia informs about the official celebration in the Vatican of Einstein's centenary, on November 10, 1979.

<u>Fisher</u> informs about cultural cooperation in Temple University (Philadelphia, USA).

Riegner: we did not finish our debate on anti-semitism. Refers to France. A series of violent attacks, which are growing. The situation differs from the thirties. The government seems indifferent. Some approach perhaps to the French Episcopal Conference? Or should the Nuncio approach the French authorities?

<u>Dupuy</u> agrees with Riegner. One way could be found to involve the Bishops. Although he is not sure that it is a question of typical antisemitism. A kind of mentality, penetrating everywhere, not only in the government. Those responsible are not anti-semitic. The question is to find some solution for the Middle East problem, apart from the American one. This idea is common to all political parties. Catholics could do something more. But the abortion and the school problem have poisoned the relations with the government. And there is a trend towards socialism. Consider the influence of the mass-media.

Ehrlich refers to the Nouvelle Droite movement, expressed in Le Figaro. They fight against Christians and Jews simultaneously, in relation with some circles in Germany. It could become dangerous for Catholics.

Moeller: The Nouvelle Droite is completely atheistic. Refers to Blier's "Le Testament de Dieu".

<u>Dubois</u> is doubtful. The philosophical problem should be considered: Glucksmann, Levi, Clavel, etc.

Mussner: was the TV-film "Holocaust" played in France?

<u>Dupuy</u>: yes, without major results. It was done for Germany. This is not the moment for splitting the majority.

Mejia: we shall refer to the Secretariat of State.

<u>Higgins</u>: the press-release should be given for revision to a professional journalist.

Flügel thanks the group. Reads the answer to Chancellor Schmidt. The motto on Bishop Graber's coat of arms ("Love in service") has inspired whatever they did. Bavarian hospitality and warmth has been behind the whole meeting.

Other greetings follow.

The meeting is closed.

During the afternoon, the participants made a trip to the former concentration camp in Flossenburg, where prayers were offered for the victims, especially for the Jews.

Jorge MEJIA

Rome, March 1981

INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE

BETWEEN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND JUDAISM

Meeting of Regensburg, October 22 - 25, 1979

AMERICAN FWISH Press Release ARC FILVES

The eighth annual meeting of the International Liaison Committee between the Roman Catholic Church and Judaism took place in Regensburg. Bavaria, Federal Republic of Germany from October 22nd to 25th, 1979. The Liaison Committee is composed of representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and of the International Jewish Committee for Interneligious Consultations (IJCIC).

The significance of the meeting being held in Germany was underlined in a telegram sent to the Auxiliary Bishop Karl Flügel from Chancellor Helmut Schmidt:

"As you are meeting for the first time in a German city we are reminded not only how serious are the consequences of estrangement and lack of understanding between religious communities, but also how important is the task to seek dialogue, against the background of a burdensome common experience. I believe that in the course of your proceedings you will gain insights which will promote readiness for tolerance and dialogue not only on the religious plane. What Jews had to suffer in the painful

years of national socialist dictatorship is a burden which also concerns your deliberations in Regensburg. It is for this reason that I wish to express to you my gratitude that your encounter is taking place in the Federal Republic of Germany."

The working sessions of the conference took place in the House Heuport of the Diocese of Regensburg.

Two main subjects were discussed at this meeting: "Religious Freedom" and "Education for Dialogue in a Pluralistic Society". On the first subject, two papers were presented: "The Right to Religious Liberty" by Msgr. Franco Biffi, President of Lateran University (Rome), and "Religious Liberty in the Jewish Perspective" by Dr. Robert Gordis, Professor of Bible, Jewish Theological Seminary of America (New York).

Msgr. Biffi's paper outlined the teachings of the Catholic Church on religious liberty as stated in the Second Vatican Council's document on this subject and in subsequent papal statements. He analyzed the implications of the church's position regarding relations between religions and between Church, Society and the State.

Professor Gordis outlined the position of Judaism on religious liberty from a biblical, historical and philosophical perspective. He presented the concept of religious freedom as found in Jewish tradition. The discussion of the two papers revealed convergences of basic conceptions and similarities of problems which the two religious communities face in the area of religious freedom.

On the second subject, papers were presented by Dr. Eugene Fisher, Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations, National Conference of Catholic Bishops (USA), by Dr. Günter Bicmer, Professor of Religious Education, University of Freiburg i. Br., and by Dr. David Silverman, Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York.

The papers on the Catholic side dealt with the need for developing new teaching methods and curricula in the area of Catholic-Jewish dialogue at all levels of education. Professor Silverman analyzed the phenomenon of pluralism in contemporary society and its implications in the field of education for dialogue. He discussed the problems and opportunities for dealing creatively with pluralism.

In addition to the two main subjects, current trends of antisemitism were discussed by P. Dr. Willehad Eckert, O. P., Prior of the monastery of Walberberg. Following his presentation, Bishop Flügel presented a detailed outline of the work of the German Conference of Catholic Bishops, of the Central Committee of German Catholics, and the Council of the Protestant Church in Germany to counteract antisemitism, to promote Christian-Jewish dialogue in Germany and to foster scholarly research.

The joint committee took note of the recently published "Tractate on the Jews" by the Regensburg scholar, Prof. Franz Mussner. The work ist an outstanding contribution to the study of the significance of Judaism for Christianity.

Both delegations recognized the progress made in collaboration and mutual under-

standing since the Committee began its work in 1971.

The Jewish community tendered a reception to both delegations at the Regensburg Jewish Community Center.

The Lord Mayor of Regensburg received the conference participants at the hictorical Rathaus. Greetings were delivered by Lord Mayor Dr. Friedrich Viehbacher and addresses given by the two co-charmen of the conference, Professor Shemaryahu Talmon (Jerusalem) and Msgr. Charles Moeller (Vatican). Bishop Dr. Rudolf Graber welcomed the delegates cordially and Bishop Flügel read to the assembly the above mentioned telegram from Chancellor Helmut Schmidt. The participants expressed their appreciation to the choir of the Academy for Catholic Church Music for its inspiring performance.

At the end of the session the delegates visited the former concentration camp in Flossenbürg. Prayers were said for the Jewish and Christian victims who died there, and Bishop Flügel laid a wreath in their memory.

INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE

BETWEEN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND JUDAISM

Meeting of Regensburg, October 22 - 25, 1979

LIST OF CATHOLIC PARTICIPANTS

Prof. Dr. Günter BIEMER, University of Freiburg i.Br. D-78 FREIBURG

Monsignor Franco BIFFI, President, Lateran University 00120 CITTA' DEL VATICANO

R. P. Jacques-Marcel DUBOIS, OP

B.P. 1332, JERUSALEM

R.P. Bernard DUPUY, OP

45, rue de la Glacière, F-75013 PARIS

Hochw Pater Dr. Willehad ECKERT, OP Dominikanerkonvent St. Albert

Postfach D-5303 BORNHEIM-WALBERBERG

Dr. Eugene J. FISHER, Secretary, Secretariat for Catholic/Jewish Relations, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., WASHINGTON, DC 20005, USA

Most Rev. Karl B. FLÜGEL. Aux. Bishop of Regensburg Postfach 142, D-8400 REGENSBURG

Hochw. Herrn Prälat Dr. Heinrich GROSS, Universitätsprofessor Agnesstraße 13, D-8400 REGENSBURG

Dr. Hanspeter HEINZ, Direktor des Generalsekretariates des Zentralkomitees der Deutschen Katholiken Hochkreuzallee 246, D-5300 BONN - BAD GODESBERG

The Rt. Rev. Monsignor George HIGGINS, Social Action Department, NCCB 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., WASHINGTON, DC 20005, USA

Rev. P. Roger LE DEAUT, CSSP Via Santa Chiara 42, 00186 ROMA

Monsignor Jorge MEJIA, Secretary to the Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, 00120 CITTA' DEL VATICANO

Monsignor Charles MOELLER, Vice-President of the same Commission and Secretary of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, 00120 CITTA' DEL VATICANO

Most Rev. Francis J. MUGAVERO, Bishop of Brooklyn 75 Greene Avenue, BROOKLYN NY 11238, USA

Hochw. Herrn Prälat Dr. Franz MUSSNER, Universitätsprofessor Domplatz 8, D-5390 PASSAU

Monsignor Erich SALZMANN, Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity 00120 CITTA' DEL VATICANO

INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE

BETWEEN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND JUDAISM

Meeting of Regensburg, October 22 - 25, 1979

LIST OF JEWISH PARTICIPANTS

Mr. Fritz Becker	Representative - World Jewish Congress- Rome
Rabbi Balfour Brickner	Director of Department of Interreligious Affairs, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York
Mr. Andre' Chouraqui	Jewish Council in Israel for Interreligious Consultations - Jerusalem
Dr. Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich	European Director - Brai Brith - Basle
Mr. Theodore Freedman	National Program Director - Anti-Pfamation League of B'nai Brith - New York
Dr. Joseph L. Lichten	Representative Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith - Rome
Dr. Gerhart M. Riegner	Secretary General - World Jewish Congress Geneva
Mr. Zachariah Shuster	Europan Consultant- Interreligious Affairs - American Jewish Committee : - Paris
Prof. Shemaryahu Talmon	Chairman International Jewish Committee: for Interreligious Consultations - Hebrew University - Jerusalem
Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum	National Director, Interreligious Affairs Committee - American Jewish Committee - New York
Dr. Paul Warszawski	Assistant Director - Latin American Jewish Congress-Buenos Aires
Prof. Michael Wyschogrod	Senior Consultant - Synagogue Council of America - New York
Prof. Rabbi Robert Gordis	Professor - Jewish Theological Seminary New York
Prof. David Silverman	Professor - Jewish Thedogical Seminary New York
Rabbi N. Peter Levinson	Landesrabbiner von Baden - Heidelberg

Mr. Juan Rosengold

President - Jewish Community - Regensburg

On the eve of the Madrid Conference on European Security and Cooperation,

1 September 1980, His Holiness Pope John
Paul II sent a personal letter to the
Heads of State of the nations who signed the Helsinki Final Act (1975), enclosing the following document wherein he submits for their consideration and that of their respective Governments an extensive reflection on the value and content of freedom of conscience and of religion with special reference to the implementation of the Final Act.

ARCHIVES

Because of her religious mission, which is universal in nature, the Catholic Church feels deeply committed to assisting today's men and women in advancing the great cause of justice and peace so as to make our world ever more hospitable and human. These are noble ideals to which people eagerly aspire and for which governments carry a special responsibility. At the same time, because of the changing historical and social situation, their coming into effect - in order to be ever more adequately adapted - needs the continued contribution of new reflections and initiatives, the value of which will depend on the extent to which they proceed from multilateral and constructive dialogue.

If one considers the many factors contributing to peace and justice in the world, one is struck by the ever increasing importance, under their particular aspect, of the widespread aspiration that all men and women be guaranteed equal dignity in sharing material goods, in effectively enjoying spiritual goods, and consequently in enjoying the corresponding inalienable rights.

During these last decades the Catholic Church has reflected deeply on the theme of human rights, especially on freedom of conscience and of religion; in so doing, she has been stimulated by the daily life experience of the Church herself and of the faithful of all areas and social groups. The Church would like to submit a few special considerations on this theme to the distinguished Authorities of the Helsinki Final Act's signatory countries, with a view to encouraging a serious examination of the present situation of this liberty so as to ensure that it is effectively guaranteed everywhere. In doing so, the Church feels she is acting in full accord with the joint commitment contained in the Final Act, namely "to promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural, and other liberties and rights, all deriving from the dignity inherent in the human person, and essential for his free and integral development;" she thus intends to make use of the criterion acknowledging "the universal importance of human rights and fundamental liberties, the respect of which is an essential factor of peace, justice, and welfare necessary to the development of friendly relationships and cooperation among them and among all States."

- 2. It is noted with satisfaction that during the last decades the international Community has shown interest in the safeguarding of human rights and fundamental liberties and has carefully concerned itself with respect for freedom of conscience and of religion in well-known documents such as:
 - a) the UN Universal Declaration on Human Rights of 10 December 1948 (article 18);
 - b) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights approved by the United Nations on 16 December 1966 (article 18);
 - c) the Final Act of the Conference on European Security and Cooperation, signed on 1 August 1975 ("Questions related to security in Europe, 1, a). Declaration on the principles governing

mutual relationships among participating States: VII. Respect for human rights and fundamental liberties, including freedom of thought, conscience, religion or conviction").

Furthermore, the Final Act's section on cooperation regarding "contacts among persons" has a paragraph wherein the participating States "confirm that religious cults, and religious institutions and organizations acting within the constitutional framework of a particular State, and their representatives, may, within the field of activity, have contacts among themselves, hold meetings and exchange information."

Moreover, these international documents reflect an ever growing worldwide conviction resulting from a progressive evolution of the question of human rights in the legal doctrine and public opinion of various countries. Thus today most State Constitutions recognize the principle of respect for freedom of conscience and religion in its fundamental formulation as well as the principle of equality among citizens.

On the basis of all the formulations found in the foregoing national and international legal instruments, it is possible to point out the elements providing a framework and dimension suitable for the full exercise of religious freedom.

First, it is clear that the starting-point for acknowledging and respecting that freedom is the dignity of the human person, who experiences the inner and indestructible exigency of acting freely "according to the imperatives of his own conscience" (cf. text of the Final Act under (c) above). On the basis of his personal convictions, man is led to recognize and follow a religious or metaphysical concept involving his whole life with regard to fundamental choices and attitudes. This inner reflection, even if it does not result in an explicit and positive assertion

of faith in God, cannot but be respected in the name of the dignity of each one's conscience, whose hidden searching may not be judged by others. Thus, on the one hand, each individual has the right and duty to seek the truth, and, on the other hand, other persons as well as civil society have the corresponding duty to respect the free spiritual development of each person.

This concrete liberty has its foundation in man's very nature, the characteristic of which is to be free, and it continues to exist - as stated in the Second Vatican Council's Declaration - "even in those who do not live up to their obligation of seeking the truth and adhering to it; the exercise of this right is not to be impeded, provided that the just requirements of public order are observed" (Dignitatis Humanae, 2).

A second and no less fundamental element is the fact that religious freedom is expressed not only by internal and exclusively individual acts, since human beings think, act and communicate in relationship with others; "professing" and "practising" a religious faith is expressed through a series of visible acts, whether individual or collective, private or public, producing communion with persons of the same faith, and establishing a bond through which the believer belongs to an organic religious community; that bond may have different degrees or intensities according to the nature and the precepts of the faith or conviction one holds.

The Catholic Church has synthesized her thinking on this subject in the Second Vatican Council's Declaration, <u>Dignitatis Humanae</u>, promulgated on 7 December 1965, a document which places the Apostolic See under a special obligation.

This Declaration had been preceded by Pope John XXIII's Encyclical Pacem in Terris, dated 11 April 1963, which solemnly emphasized the fact that everyone has "the right

to be able to worship God in accordance with the right dictates of his conscience."

The same Declaration of the Second Vatican Council was then taken up again in various documents of Pope Paul VI, in the 1974 Synod of Bishops' message, and more recently in the message to the United Nations Organization during the papal visit on 2 October 1979, which repeats it essentially: "In accordance with their dignity, all human beings, because they are persons, that is, beings endowed with reason and free will and therefore bearing a personal responsibility, are both impelled by their nature and bound by a moral obligation to seek the truth, especially religious truth. They are also bound to adhere to the truth once they come to know it and to direct their whole lives in accordance with its demands" (Dignitatis Humanae, 2). "The practice of religion by its very nature consists primarily of those voluntary and free internal acts by which a human being directly sets his course towards God. No merely human power can either command or prohibit acts of this kind. But man's social nature itself requires that he give external expression to his internal acts of religion, that he communicate with others in religious matters and that he profess his religion in community" (Dignitatis Humanae, 3).

"These words" the UN address added "touch the very substance of the question. They also show how even the confrontation between the religious view and the agnostic or even atheistic view of the world, which is one of the 'signs of the times' of the present age, could preserve honest and respectful human dimensions without violating the essential rights of conscience of any man or woman living on earth" (Address to the 34th General Assembly of the United Nations, no. 20).

On the same occasion, the conviction was expressed that "respect for the dignity of the human person would seem to demand that, when the exact tenor of the exercise of religious freedom is being discussed or determined with a view to national laws or international conventions, the institutions that are by their nature at the service of religion should also be brought in." This is because, when religious freedom is to be given substance, if the participation of those most concerned in it and who have special experience of it and responsibility for it is omitted, there is a danger of setting arbitrary norms of application and of "imposing, in so intimate a field of man's life, rules or restrictions that are opposed to his true religious needs" (Address to the UN 34th General Assembly, no.20).

- the Holy See sees it as its right and duty to envisage an analysis of the specific elements corresponding to the concept of "religious freedom" and of which they are the application insofar as they follow from the requirements of individuals and communities, or insofar as they are necessary for enabling them to carry out their concrete activities. In fact, in the expression and practice of religious freedom one notices the presence of closely interrelated individual and community aspects, private and public, so that enjoying religious freedom includes connected and complimentary dimensions:
 - (a) at the personal level, the following have to be taken into account:
 - freedom to hold or not to hold a particular faith
 and to join the corresponding confessional community;
 - freedom to perform acts of prayer and worship, individually and collectively, in private or in public, and to have churches or places of worship according to the needs of the believers;

- freedom for parents to educate their children in the religious convictions that inspire their own life, and to have them attend catechetical and religious instruction as provided by their faith community;
- freedom for families to choose the schools or other means which provide this sort of education for their children, without having to sustain directly or indirectly extra charges which would in fact deny them this freedom;
- freedom for individuals to receive religious assistance wherever they are, especially in public health institutions (clinics and hospitals), in military establishments, during compulsory public service, and in places of detention;
- freedom, at personal, civic or social levels, from any form of coercion to perform acts contrary to one's faith, or to receive an education or to join groups or associations with principles opposed to one's religious convictions;
- freedom not to be subjected, on religious grounds, to forms of restriction and discrimination, vis-à-vis one's fellow-citizens, in all aspects of life (in all matters concerning one's career, including study, employment or profession; one's participation in civic and social responsibilities, etc.).
- b) at the community level, account has to be taken of the fact that religious denominations, in bringing together believers of a given faith, exist and act as social bodies organized according to their own doctrinal principles and institutional purposes.

The Church as such, and confessional communities in general, need to enjoy specific liberties in order to conduct their life and to pursue their purposes;

among such liberties the following are to be mentioned especially:

- freedom to have their own internal hierarchy or equivalent ministers freely chosen by the communities according to their constitutional norms;
 - freedom for religious authorities (notably, in the Catholic Church, for bishops and other ecclesiastical superiors) to exercise their ministry freely, ordain priests or ministers, appoint to ecclesiastical offices, communicate and have contacts with those belonging to their religious denomination;
 - freedom to have their own institutions for religious training and theological studies, where candidates for priesthood and religious consecration can be freely admitted;
 - freedom to receive and publish religious books related to faith and worship, and to have free use of them;
 - freedom to proclaim and communicate the teaching of the faith, whether by the spoken or the written word, inside as well as outside places of worship, and to make known their moral teaching on human activities and on the organization of society: this being in accordance with the commitment, included in the Helsinki Final Act, to facilitate the spreading of information, of culture, of exchange of knowledge and experiences in the field of education; which corresponds moreover in the religious field to the Church's mission of evangelization;
 - freedom to use the media of social communication (press, radio, television) for the same purpose;

- freedom to carry out educational, charitable, and social activities so as to put into practice the religious precept of love for neighbour, particularly for those most in need.

Furthermore:

- With regard to religious communities which, like
 the Catholic Church, have a supreme Authority responsible at world level (in line with the directives
 of their faith) for the unity of communion that binds
 together all pastors and believers in the same confession (a responsibility exercised through magisterium
 and jurisdiction): freedom to maintain mutual relations of communication between that authority and
 the local pastors and religious communities; freedom
 to make known the documents and texts of the magisterium (encyclicals, instructions, etc.);
 - at the international level: freedom of free exchange in the field of communication, cooperation, religious solidarity, and more particularly the possibility of holding multinational or international meetings;
 - also at the international level, freedom for religious communities to exchange information and other contributions of a theological or religious nature.
 - As was said earlier, freedom of conscience and of religion, including the aforementioned elements, is a primary and inalienable right of the human person; what is more, insofar as it touches the innermost sphere of the spirit, one can even say that it upholds the justification, deeply rooted in each individual, of all other liberties. Of course, such freedom can only be exercised in a responsible way, that is in accordance with ethical

principles and by respecting equality and justice, which
in turn can be strengthened, as mentioned before, through
dialogue with those institutions whose nature is to serve
religion.

territory and she has no geographical borders; here members are men and women of all regions of the world. She knows, from many centuries of experience, that suppression, violation or restriction of religious freedom have caused suffering and bitterness, moral and material hardship, and that even today there are millions of people enduring these evils. By contrast, the recognition, guarantee and respect of religious freedom bring serenity to individuals and peace to the social community; they also represent an important factor in strengthening a nation's moral cohesion, in improving people's common welfare, and in enriching the cooperation among nations in an atmoshere of mutual trust.

In addition, the wholesome implementation of the principle of religious freedom will contribute to the formation of citizens who, in full recognition of the moral order, "will be obedient to lawful authority and be lovers of true freedom; people, in other words, who will come to decisions on their own judgment, and, in the light of truth, govern their activities with a sense of responsibility, and strive after what is true and right, willing always to join with others in cooperative effort" (Dignitatis Humanae, 8).

Moreover, if it is properly understood, religious freedom will help to ensure the order and common welfare of each nation, of each society, for, when individuals know that their fundamental rights are protected, they are better prepared to work for the common welfare.

Respect for this principle of religious freedom will also contribute to strengthening international peace which, on the contrary, is threatened by any violation of human rights, as pointed out in the aforementioned UN address, and especially by unjust distribution of material goods and violation of the objective rights of the spirit, of human conscience and creativity, including man's relation to God. Only the effective protection of the fullness of rights for every individual without discrimination can guarantee peace down to its very foundations.

7. In this perspective, through the above presentation
the Holy See intends to serve the cause of peace, in the
hope it may contribute to the improvement of such an
important sector of human and social life, and thus of
international life also.

It goes without saying that the Apostolic See has no thought or intention of failing to give due respect to the sovereign prerogatives of any State. On the contrary, the Church has a deep concern for the dignity and rights of every nation; she has the desire to contribute to the welfare of each one and she commits herself to do so.

Thus the Holy See wishes to stimulate reflection, so that the civil authorities of the various countries may see to what extent the above considerations deserve thorough examination. If such reflection can lead to recognizing the possibility of improving the present situation, the Holy See declares itself fully available to open a fruitful dialogue to that end, in a spirit of sincerity and openness.

From the Vatican, 1 September 1980

(0903) 882948

CCJP CONSULTANTS

EUROPE

Telephone France Rev. B.P. Chavannes, Federation of Protestant Churches 0033 -(89) 41.57.70 8, rue Henry Lebert, F-68000 Colmar Germany 05361 / 51041 Pastor Arnulf Baumann, Evangelical Church in Germany Am Wiesengrund 49, D-3180 Wolfsburg OKR Christfried Berger, Am Dom 2, DDR-301 Magdeburg 3.18.81 Ms. Ulrike Berger, Johann-Georg-Str. 3, D-1000 Berlin 31 Dr. Franz von Hammerstein, Evangelische Akademie, Goethestrasse 27-30, D-1 Berlin 12 004930 / 319.12.67 Prof. Herbert Schmid, Sprangerstrasse 9, D-675 Kaiserslautern 0631 / 68449 Dr. Martin Stohr, Evangelische Akademie Arnoldshain, D-6384 Schmitten/Ts. 1. 06084 / 515 + 516 Dr. Coos Schoneveld, International Council of Christians and Jews, Postfach 305, D-6148 Heppenheim 06252 / 50 41 Great Britain Prof. George W. Anderson, Methodist Church, 51 Fountainhall Road, Edinburgh, EH9 2LH (Scotland) Rev. W.F. Barker, The Church's Ministry among the Jews, Vincent House, Vincent Square, London SWIP 2PX 01 - 834 4527/8 Rev. Peter Jennings, British Council of Christians and Jews, 48 Onslow Gardens, London SW7 3PX 01 - 589 8854/5 Rev. Ron Lewis, Hebrew Christian Alliance, 96 West Dyke Road, Redcar, Cleveland TS10 1HT (England) Redcar 4008

Canon Peter Schneider, Church of England,

Burpham Vicarage, Arundel, West Sussex BN18 9RR (England)

CCJP CONSULTANTS

EUROPE

Netherlands

Telephone

Dr. Ellen Flesseman-van Leer, Amstelhoven 10, Amstelveen

020 - 41.37.36

Rev. S. Gerssen, Eykmanlaan 46, Utrecht

030 - 71.23.01

Denmark

Rev. Anker Gjerding, Church of Denmark, Torup Bygade 5, DK-3390 Hundested

Office: 01-35.59.11 Copenhagen

Norway

AMERICAN JEWISH

... .:

Prof. Magne Saebø, Church of Norway, Lars Muhles vei 34, N-1346, Gjettum

Sweden

Dr. Biörn Fjärstedt, Church of Sweden Mission, Postbox 297, S-75105 Uppsala 1. 018 / 12 02 40

. Switzerland

Dr. John Mbiti, Bahnhofstrasse 96, CH-3400 Burgdorf

USSR

Bishop Vitaly Borovoy, Russian Orthodox Church c/o W.C.C. P.O. Box 66, 1211 Geneva 20

98.94.00

CCJP CONSULTANTS

NORTH AMERICA

Telephone

U.S.A.

Dr. Gerald H. Anderson, Overseas Ministries Study Center, 6315 Ocean Avenue, P.O. Box 2057, Ventnor, N.J. 08406

Prof. Paul van Buren, 134 Chestnut St., Boston, MA. 02108

Rev. Joan Campbell, NCC, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10115

(212) 870-2229

Prof. A.R. Eckhardt, Maginnes Hall, 9, Dept. of Religion Studies, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. 18015

Rev. William Harter, Presbyterian Church, 221 N. Main St. Chambersburg, Pa. 17201

Rev. Frances Manson, United Methodist Church, Indian Heights, (649) 9040 10211 Nall Avenue, Overland Park, Kansas 66207

Prof. Krister Stendahl, Harvard Divinity School, 45 Francis Ave, Cambridge, Mass. 02138 (617) 495.2927

Dr. R. Turnipseed, NCC, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10115

Dr. William L. Weiler, The Episcopal Church, 110 Maryland Ave, Washington D.C. 20002

Canada

Rev. J.B. Boyles, 600 Jarvis Street, Toronto, Ontario M4Y 2J6 (416) 924.9192

CCJP CONSULTANTS

ASIA

Telephone

Israel

Rev. Na'em Ateek, 2340 Le Conte No. 306, Berkeley, California, 94709

Rev. Ake Skoog, The Ecumenical Research Fraternity in Israel, POB 249, Jerusalem. (Tel. home: 69 00 17) 24 68 16

Rev. Ibrahim Sim'an, Relief and Social Ministries, 38 Haganim Street, Haifa

(04) 522-433

India

Rev.Dr. Victor Premasagar, Church of South India, The Synod Secretariat, P.B. No. 4906, Cathedral, Madras-600086. 81 12 66

Indonesia

Rev. Odeh Suardi, Jalan Cipinang Jaya LL nr. 17, Jakarta-Timur, Jakarta.

AFRICA

Nigeria

The Rt. Rev. J. Adetiloye, Anglican Church, Bishopscourt, P.O. Box 12, Ado-Ekiti, W. State.



OX No. 66 . 150, ROUTE DE FERNEY . 1211 GENEVA 20 . TELEPHONE: (022) 98 94 00 . TELEX: 23 423 OIK CH . CABLE: C:KOUMENE-GENEVA

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

PROGRAMME UNIT ON FAITH AND WITNESS
Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies
Geneva, February 24, 1981. (AB/LM)

To: Consultation on the Church and the Jewish People Re: 1981 Meeting, London-Colney.

Dear Colleagues,

I have just returned from inspecting All Saints Pastoral Centre, which we will utilize, 22-26 June, and found it to be most adequate. We will be housed in comfortable single rooms, meeting rooms are in ample number, and dining facilities appear to be superb. Every one must, however, bring soap and towels.

The best and easiest way to reach All Saints Pastoral Centre from London airports is by public transport, as follows:

From Heathrow Airport (most international flights) take the Piccadilly Line (Underground) to "Kings Cross and St. Pancras", change to British Rail for "Radlett" at Radlett take a taxi to All Saints Pastoral Centre. Total cost: £5.24.

From Gattwick Airport (Laker Airlines, British Caledonian, etc) take Eritish Rail to Victoria Station, then the Underground to "Kings Cross and St. Pancras", change to British Rail for "Radlett", at Radlett take a taxi to All Saints Pastoral Centre. Total cost: £6.54.

If at all possible, plan to arrive at All Saints on Monday morning, 22 June. Should your schedule require you to arrive on Sunday, let me know as soon as possible in order that I may make special arrangements for lodging close to the Pastoral Centre (it will not be possible for any of us to stay there before Monday). It would be most helpful, incidently, if you could inform me of your flight numbers, arrival and departure times.

Agenda

The agenda enclosed with this memorandum should be considered preliminary because a few details have yet to be worked out. You can see, however, that we will have a full and, indeed, concentrated week of work -- in order to complete the Guidelines and shape the course of the CCJP for the next years.

Let me call your attention to two high-lights of the week:

- 1) the discussion by Dr. David Hartman of Jerusalem of Dr. Paul van Buren's book,
 Discerning the Way (don't give up hope; a copy should reach you in time to
 study it before coming to London) and
- 2) the special session in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey, at which the Chief Rabbi of Britain will offer his reflections on the Guidelines.

As other preparatory materials become available, I'll be sending them on to you.

May God's peace be your peace.

Allan R. Brockway

Encl. : Agenda

AGENDA - LONDON CCJP MEETING

```
Monday, 22 June
       Opening Luncheon
13.00
            Introductory Remarks
            Invocation
            Greetings
            Introduction of Guests
            Presentation of Moderator's and Secretary's Reports
       Tea
16.00
16.30
       Plenary Session
            Regional Reports
18.30
       Dinner
       Small Group consideration of Guidelines
19.30
Tuesday, 23 June
        Morning Prayers
 8.15
 8.30
       Breakfast
 9.00
       Plenary Session
            Reports from small groups on Guidelines
            General Discussion
11.00
       Coffee
11.30
       Plenary Session (continued)
13.00
       Lunch
14.45
      Plenary Session
            Preparation for 1983 WCC Assembly
            CCJP relation to other aspects of DFI Work (Dr. Dick Mulder)
            Finance Report (Dr. John: Taylor)
16.00
       Tea
16.30
       Committee Meetings
18.30
       Dinner
19.30
       Committee Meetings
Wednesday, 24 June
 8.15
       Morning Prayers
 8.30
       Breakfast
 9.00
       Plenary Session
            Report of Guidelines Drafting Committee
li.00 Coffee
11.30
       Plenary Session (continued)
13.00
       Lunch
15.00
       Plenary Session
            Report of Relations to Other Faiths Committee
            Report of 1983 Assembly Committee
            First Report of Finance Committee
16.00
       Tea
16.30
       Plenary Session
            Report of Guidelines Implementation Committee
            First Report of Conference Statement Committee
18.30
       Dinner
19.30
       Committee meetings (as required)
Thursday, 25 June
 8.15
       Morning Prayers
 8.30
       Breakfast
 9.00
       Plenary Session
            Paper by Dr. David Hartman on Discerning the Way
            Response by Dr. Paul van Buren
11.00
       Coffee
11.30
       Plenary Session (continued)
            Questions and Discussion
13.00
       Lunch
       Board bus for Westminster Abbey
14.30
       Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey (Host: London Rainbow Group.
15.45
18.00
       Optional evening in London
```

14.30 Adjournment

Friday, 26 June

8.15 Morning Prayers

8.30 Breakfast

9.00 Plenary Session

Report of Nominating Committee

Final Report of Finance Committee

Final Report of Conference Statement Committee

13.00 Lunch



WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

CONGRÈS JUIF MONDIAL

CONGRESO JUDIO MUNDIAL

1211 GENÉVE 20 NEW YORK, N.Y. 10016 LONDON W1Y 7DX 75008 PARIS JERUSALEM

1, RUE DE VAREMBÉ ONE PARK AVENUE 11, HERTFORD STREET 78, AV. CHAMPS-ÉLYSÉES P. O. B. 4 2 9 3

CASE POSTALE 191 TELEPH. 679-0600 TELEPH. 491-3517 TELEPH. 359.04.63 4, ROTENBERG STREET

TELEPH. 341325 TELEX 23 61 29 TELEX 21 6 3 3 TELEX 6 5 0 3 2 0 TELEPH. 635546-635544

Geneva, March 27, 1981

To: The members of IJCIC From: Gerhart M. Riegner

Re.: Meeting with WCC

I had on March 9 a long discussion with Allan Brockway on the forthcoming meetings with the WCC.

1. The meeting of the Consultation on the Church and the Jewish People will take place from June 22 to 26, at the All Saints Pastoral Center, London-Colney (near St. Albans). The WCC expects from us that two or three people attend as observers, amongst them they would like to have one European.

It will be sufficient for our observers to arrive by Monday (June 22) in the evening. The presence of our observers is particularly requested in the plenary session on Tuesday morning (June 23), at 9 a.m., when the reports from several small groups on the Guidelines will come up for discussion.

On Tuesday late afternoon and evening there will be meetings of the Drafting Committee on the Guidelines. It would be desirable that our observers who will not be members of the Drafting Committee be available for consultations. The report of the Drafting Committee to the plenum will be made on Wednesday, June 24, in the morning (9 a.m.) and the presence of our observers would obviously be required.

There will be another discussion on the implementation of the Guidelines (report of Guidelines Implementation Committee) on Wednesday afternoon (4:30 p.m.). At this meeting the presence of our observers is equally desired and here particularly the presence of one European has been asked for. The purpose of the discussion is to examine how to involve the individual churches in the support of the Guidelines and what strategy generally is to be pursued.

I was also informed that there will be a meeting under the auspices of the London Rainbow Group at the Jerusalem Chamber at the Westminster Abbey, to which the Chief Rabbi has been invited. I also understand that

Rabbi Green of the Liberal Synagogue has been invited to the opening luncheon.

On Thursday morning (June 25), there will be a discussion on the book by Prof. van Buren, to which Dr. David Hartman has been invited. (When I expressed some surprise about this, I was told that this was an invitation only to one session and only to give a response to the van Buren book).

I enclose the circular letter of the WCC to their own members, the draft agenda, and the list of the CCJP consultants.

2. Meeting of the Liaison and Planning Committee WCC-IJCIC. This meeting will take place on June 28, at the offices of the World Jewish Congress, 11 Hertford Street, London W1Y 7DX, Telephone: 01-491 3517. The meeting will start at 10 a.m. and will end not later than 5 p.m.. We will see to it that a cold kosher buffet lunch be served.

I understand that Mr. Brockway expects the following persons from the WCC to attend: Prof. Stendahl, Mr. Taylor, Dr. Niilus, Mr. Brockway, Dr. Raiser (deputy secretary general, WCC), and possibly Dr. Potter (who by then will be back from his leave of absence). There will be one more member from the CCJP who has not yet been designated (it seems that they would like to replace Mrs. Flesseman van Leer).

We have agreed that the following points will be on the agenda:

- I. A report on the follow up of our meetings in Toronto and Geneva and particularly a report on the WCC Executive Committee in Geneva.
- II. A report on the CCJP meeting in June in London, and particularly a report on the adopted text on the Guidelines.
- III. A report on the WJC Assembly in Jerusalem (on WCC request).
- IV. A report on the Catholic Church IJCIC meeting in London.
- V. A discussion on the "new anti-Semitism" around the world.
- VI. A discussion on the US new administration and the religious communities.
- VII. A discussion on the situation in Israel and the Israel elections.
- VIII. A discussion on future plans, notably:
 - a) the next meeting of the Liaison and Planning Committee; place and agenda
 - b) next joint consultation 1983/84
 - c) the possibility of a mini consultation as part of the next LPC meeting and the selection of a subject.
- 3. I was informed that Dr. Niilus will be leaving the WCC in the summer. His attending our June meeting will be one of his last assignments. Dr. Niilus will be replaced as Director of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs by Mr. Koshi (India).

AGENDA - IJCIC Meeting

London, March 30, 1981

- 1. Preliminary discussion of arrangements for the 9th Annual meeting of the International Liaison Committee between the Roman Catholic Church and Judaism
- 2. Follow-up of political meetings with the Vatican
 - 3. CCJP meeting in London (June 1981)
 - 4. Preparations for Liaison and Planning Committee meeting with the WCC (June 1981)
 - 5. Preparations for consultation with the Lutheran World Federation (July 1981)
 - 6. Invitation by International Council of Religions
 - 7. Invitation by World Conference on Religions and Man

The Jewish delegation to the International Liaison Committee between the Catholic Church and Judaism convening in London have expressed its profound dismay over the recent official meeting between the Secretary of State of the Vatican with representatives of the F.L.O. The declared aim of the P.L.O., the Jewish delegates underscored, is the destruction of the State of Israel to be achieved through terrorist activities and violence directed against Israelis and Jews. The Vatican - P.L.C. meeting cannot in any way be reconciled with Pope John Paulôs repeated forthright condemnations of terrorism and violence.

Strong protest was expressed over the political activities of Archbishop Capucci acting on behalf of the Vatican in various capacities in the Middle East, in Rome and elsewhere. This contradicts the undertaking given at the time of his release from prison in Israel after serving only part of his sentence for gunrunning, that he would be assigned to pastoral work and not be allowed to engage in anti-Israel activities in Middle Eastern affairs. His emergence on the political scene represents a flagrant breach of that undertaking.

The Jewish participants voiced their apprehension that these developments - the meeting with the P.L.O. and the activities of Archbishop Capucci - could affect adversely the progress made in the Jewish-Catholic relationship, and would constitute a significant set-back to the cause of peace and reconsilitation in the Middle East.

of trust and solidarity that has developing between The Corne Church and The Just people. It would also constitute a set-back

The ITCIC met in honder this week for its runte amount commentation with the Vation delegation responsible for appearing from various parts of the world werest the following statement:

A the world werest the following statement:

3 Iscic sequences its profound drawing

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

CONGRÈS JUIF MONDIAL

CONGRESO JUDIO MUNDIAL

1211 GENÈVE 20 NEW YORK, N.Y. 10016 LONDON W1M 8BT 75008 PARIS TEL - AVIV

1, RUE DE VAREMBÉ ONE PARK AVENUE 55, NEW CAVENDISH STREET 76, AV. CHAMPS-ÉLYSÉES 123, YEHUDA HALEVI ST,

CASE POSTALE 101 TEL EP H. 679-0600 TEL EP H. 935-03.35 TEL EP H. 359, 94.63 P. O. B. 14177

TEL EP H. 341325 TEL EX 236129 TEL EX 21633 TEL EX 650320 TEL EP H. 22.91.39

TEL EX 289876

Geneva, March 5, 1981

To: The Jewish participants in the 9th annual meeting of the International Liaison Committee Between the Roman Catholic Church and Judaism

From: Gerhart M. Riegner

I wish to summarize hereunder the arrangements which have been made with regard to the forthcoming meeting of the International Liaison Committee.

- 1. The meeting of the International Liaison Committee will take place on March 31, April 1st and April 2nd, in London, at the Clifton Ford Hotel, Welbeck Street (Telephone: 486-6600), in the Walden room. The Jewish and Catholic participants from outside London will all stay at this hotel. Arrangements have been made for joint kosher lunch meals at the hotel for all participants.
- 2. The tentative list of the Catholic and Jewish participants is enclosed. I have also invited the French Jewish community to send a representative but I have not yet received a reply.
- 3. The major subject this year is: "The Challenge of Secularism to Religious Commitments". The Jewish presentation will be made by Rabbi Nachum Rabinovitch, Principal of Jews' College, and the Catholic presentation will be made by Mgr. Rossano, Secretary of the Vatican Secretariat for Non-Christians.
- 4. Following up the discussions at last year's meeting, which dealt with "Education for Dialogue in a Pluralistic Society", the following point was included in the agenda: "What educational initiatives are being taken or should be taken to further understanding, mutual respect, and cooperation in society?". The subject will be introduced on the Jewish side by Rabbi Tanenbaum.

- 5. Under the general rubric "Exchange of information" the following items will be discussed:
- a) Information on the recent resurgence of anti-Semitism, an analysis of its deeper reasons and what should be done to prevent it. Introduction on the Jewish side by Rabbi Klenicki.
- b) Misinterpretation of Christianity in some current Jewish Literature. Meyra?
- c) Misinterpretation of Judaism in some current Christian Literature (during which we want to raise some points of the recent Papal Encyclical). Introduction by Rabbi Mandelbaum.
- d) Developments in the field of Religious Liberty. Introduction on the Jewish side by Dr. Riegner.
- 6. The Jewish delegation will meet on March 30 in the evening, at 8 p.m., for a preparatory meeting at the Clifton Ford Hotel. We count on your presence at this meeting.
- 7. The meetings of the Liaison Committee will begin on March 31, at 10 a.m. (unless you hear otherwise).
- 8. There will be a reception for all participants on March 31, at 6 p.m., at the offices of the World Jewish Congress, 11 Hertford Street. Cardinal Hume and Chief Rabbi Jakobovits have agreed to attend.

The R.

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE

BETWEEN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND JUDIASM

Ninth Meeting, London, March 31 - April 2, 1981

Morning Session, March 31, 1981

Chairman: Most Rev. Msgr. Ramon Torrella (Rabbi B. Mandelbaum recites prayer)

MSGR. TORRELLA: Greets old friends from previous meetings in Jerusalem and Madrid. Fortunately, Msgr. Moeller's health has improved but he felt that he had to hand in his resignation to the Pope who accepted it in a very warm and personal letter, and appointed him Apostolic Pronotary.

MSGR. ROSSANO: Reads his paper on "THE CHALLENGE OF SECULARISM TO RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT" - a Catholic view.

(Appendix a).

DR. LICHTEN: asks for an interpretation of the term "control" used in Rossano's paper.

MSGR. ROSSANO: "Control" means the capacity of judging and checking, to impose by the means of social pressure.

RABBI MANDELBAUM: enquires as to the meaning of "innumerable substitute religions".

MSGR. ROSSANO: I mean Eastern Sects like Hare Krishna, etc., not Buddhism.

<u>RABBI TANENBAUM</u>: refers to the challenge to secular and pluralistic societies coming not only from Muslim but also from Western Christian fundamentalism.

MSGR. ROSSANO: agrees that the problem in our secularised society in which everything is permitted, in which the "law of the 50 + 1" applies, is to find the absolute, and it would be the aim of dialogue to make the major religions find some kind of platform of absolute values as the basis of the setting of life. In dialogue with Muslims there is a trend of their absolutising everything, in the West we are too

liberal, we have to reconsider our pluralism, our secularism. We have to study together to find the absolute for society. The Toaff document contains a good platform for the monotheistic religions to agree on basic values. If this consensus can be broadened through dialogue, we could perhaps arrive at a codified opinion.

DR. NACHUM L/ RABINOVITCH: reads his paper on "THE CHALLENGE OF SECULARISM TO RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT", a Jewish view.

(Appendix b).

A discussion ensued in which <u>Dr. E. Fisher, Rabbi L. Klenicki</u>, <u>Msgr. P. Rossano</u>, <u>Dr. N.L. Rabinovitch</u> and <u>Fr. M. Dubois</u> spoke. (No transcript could be made owing to extremly poor quality of the electronic recording).

Afternoon Session, March 31, 1981. Chairman: Prof. Shemaryahu Talmon

DR. EHRLICH: finds in Rabbi Rabinovitch's paper a statement which is important for the future of our relationship, namely that many Jews welcome the spread of secularism. This is a fact, but just because Jews welcome secularism, this has led to a rise of anti-Semitism in the Catholic world. While secularism and emancipation have paved the way for Jews to enter general society, it has created, in Christian society, the opinion that the Jews as such are the promoters of secularism and hence the destroyers of Christian religion and society.

PROF. TALMON: (First part omitted due to poor quality of recording).

Speaking of youth he suggests that they destroy old establishments and are building up an establishment of their own, and there is nothing more dangerous than to be different in their sub-culture. They are less liberal and less tolerant to anyone who deviates even in the slightest way than any sort of religious conviction ever was. Behind that is a new search for force, a new search for directives, which may lead to: on one hand, to the new cults, cults in the Eastern sense, or to some forms of socialization which are oppressive. People want again some sort of inner and outward form. The question is can we put forward suggestions which are applicable also for them. This leads to the last point, and that is the question of absolute values. Do we stop at theology in the abstract sense of the word, or can we offer a way of life.

Because this is what Judaism stands for; it is a way of life. Can we go further than just talk about absolute values? Can we try to point to practicable values not absolute ones? What is necessary for us is to recapture some of our religious ideas, beliefs in actual life. And if we could come to some sort of understanding, and also try to outline what can be done in order to bring about a practice in life that goes along these convictions, then we would have done something positive in our deliberations also for others.

RABBI MANDELBAUM: There is something you just said about "what do you do about it?" Prof. Talmon was right when he said that the Jewish notion of halachah is how does it affect life. But one of the most important mitzvoth is study, which is the Jewish way of saying that ideas are very powerful. Therefore, I think the first thing that we must not do is give up our most powerful credentials.

Rabbi Rabinovitch indicated this morning that certainly in the Jewish tradition the concept of the seven commandments of Noah is the framework of ethics within which, or beyond which, each religious tradition should express itself in its own tradition. I think it is terribly wrong to even suggest to the world that pluralism is a secular product but rather it is deeply rooted from the Bible onwards, certainly for the Jewish tradition.

In other words, in this illustration I am underscoring the fact that the first thing that we got to do is to reassert the religious roots of many of the basic ideas which are taken to be sort of modern and secularistic, but they are really very religious, and we have got to insist upon that and then the action will more easily follow and our image will change.

MSGR. RCSSANO: Just some comments on the observations of Talmon. Among the many interpretations that we can give to prophetic criticism is also the following one: It is a reaction against the sacralization of nature, against the divinization of nature. We can see this aspect also in prophetic teaching. This is the sense of my affirmation. My intention was to say that in the Psalms, in Job, in Quohelet, we say things are going as God was not seeing, but leaving them, the world is going according to its law, its internal law, prayer and justice are not transforming the law. The unjust people triumph, the right people are subjugated and suffering, the laws of nature are going and we are here, but the fact remains. This was the sense of my affirmation. Of course, there are distinctions between the things of Caesar and the things of God. This affirmation is repeated in the letter of St. Peter, of St. Paul and becomes one of the principles of the Christian conscience of the first centuries. In the first centuries, Christians and Jews suffered and protested against the emperor because Caesar is a man, Caesar is the emperor but Caesar is not God. This is the profound sense of these distinctions. I think that this distinction

alone helps to keep apart secular reality and sacral reality. Of course I realize every day that the Jewish approach to the reality according to the Law is nearer to the Islamic approach. This is evident to me, even though it is deeply different to dialogue with Jews or with Moslems. But the Jewish tradition has the same problem as Islam. Instead of the Shariah there is the Torah, but in a different form and in a different interpretation. Of course the Bible is a source of pluralism, and we are stimulated by this living example of your tradition. But there remains the problem of the quest for the absolute values. Today in reaction to the secularistic society we see the insurgence of fundamentalism. And the problem is, how to find in a secularistic, pluralistic society solid bases, common values, acknowledged absolutes which make possible a human coexistence, a peaceful development, the respect for rights of people who are different from us. This is my problem concerning the quest for the absolute. What concerns the word pluralism, I am ready to drop it. I understand pluralism always, or almost always, in the positive sense. The Bible is the source of pluralism, the world is rich, it is full of variety, but nevertheless there is also unity and my critique of pluralism is directed against radical pluralism in which there is no longer a basis, a unity. Pluralism which destroys every kind of unity is a dangerous risk.

FR. DUPUY: I wish to say to Rabbi Rabinovitch how much I agree with what he said and it is not because he spoke as a Jew but because we, as Christians, agree with what he said as a Jew.

I should like to say some words on the assymetry, the historical and theological assymetry between Judaism and Christianity in the problem of secularism. Is secularism really a Jewish problem? If it is not a Jewish problem there is a Jewish answer. We certainly know that for a Jew, God has no

, place in the world because the world has its place in God. In the time of secularization man is conscious that the world has its bases in God, but it is not the same thing. Secularism, therefore, is not a problem for the Jewish mind, but is there an answer to this question? In the time of secularization, the answer is identity. In modern times, in this time of secularization, we find that the Jew has a new consciousness. And this is what is new in our times. True; there was a Jewish identity in the past, in the times of the Pharisees. But the identity of the Jew in the world of today is given to us by this new consciousness of identity. And for us Christians this is also true, this is also fundamental and essential. It seems to me that the answer to our questions, Jews and Christians together, is that when we take into account that there is a Jewish identity, facing the problems of the modern world, we have to devise a theology of this new consciousness. There should be a reference to the Pirkeh Avoth, to the first consciousness I was referring to, because the sense of the Pirkeh Avoth is also for us the background of the New Testament. And that is what is really common to us and we have to discover that, not in the texts only but in the sense of our identity of today. What is really essential for us today in a world of secularism, in a world of anonymous man, is that Jews and Christians have an identity, an identity founded in the same roots. This is what we have to discover again. At the basis of the problem of nihilism is terrorism, and we have no answer to terrorism because alas terrorism has its reasons. The answer to terrorism is a question of existential attitude. We can only together give a testimony on the problem of terrorism. This is an essential problem for us today.

<u>DR. LICHTEN</u>: From a Jewish point of view, we use the word secularism, but we want to say something else. We rather mean emancipation, assimilation, integration, but not secularism. Secularism from our point of view practically does not exist. If somebody is born a Jew, he will stay a Jew. Some Jewish elements are still in him. Therefore, it is very difficult for us to speak about secularism. Now what can we do about it? Mandelbaum stressed the most important point: he said, our credentials are to study. I would like to add and say "study together". We should and we have a responsibility to study, to study together. This discussion is also studying together. In this way we will explain to ourselves certain elements which we have in common and some which divide us. Therefore let us understand each other very well. When we Jews use the word secularism, we mean something different than the Christians.

DR. RIEGNER: It is certainly true that we have not exactly the same concept of secularism. Talmon has put his finger on the reasons for it, especially the peoplehood concept. What strikes me in the presentation of today is, when you say that you Catholics have been frightened by secularism, I feel that when it comes to the present time we are much less frightened. There is a certain rapprochement to the Jewish concept. What I have been impressed with by the two presentations is that they both ended with a kind of a social action call. Very similar by the way. And Rossano defined this partly in his own words and partly in the words of Rabbi Toaff. But when you compare what Rabbi Rabinovitch, at the end of his paper, as a conclusion said we should do, and what Msgr. Rossano said, quoting Toaff, you will find an astonishing similarity. It is in fact the first time in the many sessions which we had that we come to such a conclusion. I have been one of those who, from time to time, have pushed in this direction in saying that it is not enough to discuss, that we should come to certain conclusions, some action or common concept or common perspectives. And I must say I was extremely impressed that

4:

the two papers, for the first time end up in such a conclusion. Now this is a very important and positive trend. But what is really the purpose of this discussion? How do we react to a phenomenon which makes religion less and less credible, or let us say meaningful to a great part of society. Then how can we revitalize religious sentiments, religious motivations, so that it becomes more meaningful. I believe that we have to come back to a certain kind of reaffirmation of a certain number of common values, the basic values which we share. In this world which is so full of despair and of abandonment of ideals, values, we have the task to proclaim together a certain number of basic common values. It is not only study, it is also the "doing together" after the study or even before it. We have to come back to some kind of new concept of natural law, to a real program of basic social action which has been completely forgotten. I believe that we have to come back in the challenge of secularism, in the challenge of a society which refuses to take religion seriously and does not believe in the credibility of the religious people. Therefore the younger people are not following. But we have to come back to some very simple fundamental affirmations which more or less are in the Decalogue which we have together to affirm. That is what I call the reformation of natural law, of some principles of natural law which I believe must come fore in the basic principles of the law of our society. It is the question of life, it is the question of torture, it is the question of freedom, it is the question of religious freedom, it is a certain number of basic principles which those who adhere to the monotheistic religions have to affirm together in a much more dramatic manner.

In my opinion this is the real answer to some of these problems. And only if we do so in a very dramatić form, will

we be able to impress. And only if we live up to them and not only proclaim them, but are looking for occasions for common action, and not waiting for the secular society to proclaim, but taking the lead in this matter, then, in my opinion, we can bring about a certain shift in the conscience of people.

MSGR. TORELLA: In our society of today, simultaneously with the industrial problem there is another new phenomenon. For the first time, youth achieved a collective dimension, a collective reality. Youth as such can be seen as a social class. Certainly it is a social group or a collective reality within society. In our secular society marked by science and technology, by pluralism, by ideology, young people are very weak. Practically they feel they are without points of reference. Many years ago, the educational system offered some framework, some concrete principles and some doctrine.

Technology produced a new sensitivity, practically a new mentality. And this kind of new sensitivity, the technological sensitivity is wary of spiritual values and of ideals. And youth does not accept, as in the past, principles, doctrinal orientations, guide-lines and norms of life. Society of today doesn't offer tradition and memory. And youth is without roots, and this seems to be the kind of disillusion underlined by Rabinovitch. In young people today there is certainly deep disillusion about religion, about faith, about spiritual values and church values. Perhaps we can offer a new quality in education itself.

DR. WIGODER: A secular Jew adheres to his Jewishness even though he doesn't subscribe to Judaism. Whereas a secular Christian - although one has heard of secular Christianity in some modern period - is a contradiction in terms. But to go to the secular Jew, there is something, and I would say there is a certain almost atavistic God intoxication among the Jews. The Jewish secularist is still bound to Jewish tradition even if he is not bound by it. And he may say that the world has

no judge, but he will still say that the world has a judgement. Hence the sort of belief and the strong tradition of social justice. And so we have this strong tradition in modern times of Jewish secularism. It is something that we should recognize as the positive values of secularism. If we look back on Jewish history of the past two hundred years, its creativity is derived from the secular sources of Judaism. What has creatively emerged over the past two centuries in Judaism is essentially a secular creation. Be it in Jewish socialism, in the revival of the Hebrew language, in much of Jewish education, in Zionism, which was largely a secular creation, because the major bodies of religious Jews both opted out. On the one hand the orthodox Jews because it was not God-inspired and on the other the reform Jews because it was too particularistic.

What happened in Soviet Russia? The Soviet Russian Jew has survived and has taken a Jewish identity without any possibility of a religious identification. A secularistic Jew is based on on Jewish tradition. The founder of one great ideology of of Labour Zionism developed a whole philosophy of labour which focussed on the realm of the holy, and the whole concept of holiness is never absent. Rabbi Cook, the first Chief Rabbi of Israel, recognized that it was the Holy Spirit that was at work in these so called secularist Jews. We see it in the meaning of Jerusalem, which to all Jews, whether they call themselves secular or religious, is a traditional symbol. The Kibbutz was also founded by Jews who called themselves secular.

The message that we have in this world which we would call secularistic, in this Jewish context, is that we can sacralize the secular, and the charge is for religious people not how they stand up against the secular world, but how they can redeem the holy.

MR. SHUSTER: (Extremely poor recording).

MSGR. MEJIA: Most interventions give the impression that there is no problem of secularism on the Jewish side, while there should be and there is one on the Christian side. There is in the Bible, in the Old Testament, a clear tendency to underline what we would call now the autonomy of creative reality, and to that extent I agree fully with Msgr. Rossano, that in certain texts of Deuteronomy I personally say that the whole Deuteronomy is a way of what we would call now, in an appropriate word, a kind of sacralized issue of life. Rabbi Mandelbaum has stressed it that it is extremely important not to believe that all creation is a kind of evolving divinity, that there is a deep relation, but at the same time a distance. There is a constant interplay in the Hebrew Bible between what you would call on one side, the proximity of God to this world, and on the other side, the distance of God to the world. God is at the same time very near but God is at the same time very distant. We, as Christians, may have not taken up completely this message. We chose, during a long time in history, a certain way of putting together the secular and the sacred, trying to dominate the secular with the sacred, and this had different consequences and at different levels which has been pointed out also by Rabbi Rabinovitch and Msgr. Rossano. The solution was imperfect, it was limited and it had several unwanted consequences. In this sense, the reaction against this solution was normally called in Catholic circles the Constantinian solution. The reaction against this Constantinian solution has its merits, its values and its positive sides, and in this direction, I think, one has to accept the result of what is called, with a very delicate distinction, secularization or secularism. There is also a distinction between pluralization and pluralism. But the whole question is now, I think, for Christians, but I believe also for Jews,

the present situation of the Western world, and not only in the Western world, a kind of breakdown of everything and everybody, to the extent that there is no exact frame of reference for anything, neither for God, nor worship, nor for what we would call normal humanistic values, values of human life, the problems of terrorism, of war, or simply how to live humanly love and sex, and other problems which concern youth and for which it has no frames of reference to solve.

One could perhaps object that in the situation we are in, one can say perhaps that it is not all the responsibility of secularism or radical pluralism, but there is certainly a connection. In this situation we who are responsible, each in his own way, and according to his own religious perspective or religious structure, how do we answer this situation? How do we come together, having the same deep roots and undeniable common values, how do we go along in this situation? Are we first going to look aside or are we going to find some kind of common ground on which to stand and respond to what I think is, in Jewish tradition, and we use exactly the same expression in Catholic tradition, sanctifying the Name in this world. And sanctifying the Name means in the Jewish tradition, to be witness to what the Name means. We Christians should live exactly on the same basis; to give witness to the Name. It means in the present world to defend some values. There is one problem which stands immediately out, a problem raised by Riegner also, raised in the context of the prophets. And it is how far are we credible witnesses in this world. There is a problem of credibility of religion. There is also the lack to compromise in our internal dissensions, our mutual criticism, our differences and our inability to come together. Even if we have to dissent in different fields, in different situations, the whole question is, what we do have in common, should not

prevail over what we do not have in common? I think we could stand on what Fr. Dubois has said before, not because those are exactly values in the modern sense of the word, but because they are what I would call "pre-values". Something that comes before those common values which the world needs, but which help us to come together because they come from the Jewish tradition and we Christians either have or should have them exactly in the same way. We probably are hearing the internal voice of God, in witness of God, memory, tradition, community, and hope. I think one point on which we could agree here is the centrality of these pre- or previous values which, almost gradually, pass into real values. Then we should try to define what our common values are, and here I am particularly grateful to Msgr. Rossano and Dr. Rabinovitch, because they both have underlined, not only practical ways, but also analyzed practical ways of setting together. The quotation of Rabbi Toaff is particularly relevant. It is very important what Rabbi Toaff said to the Pope: "We have all this in common". In the present Italian situation, let's do this together, and let us not only do, but let us be conscious that we can do this because we believe in the same values. This is not to deny that there is a certain assymetry but then again I go back to the question of credibility, whether this assymetry does not become less meaningful, when we consider, on the one side, the fullness of our common division, and on the other side, the need of a world which moves towards destruction. We all remember the story in Genesis 5, 7 or 6-9, and wonder if we are not exactly in the same situation. And, as a last point, what we cannot do still, at the higher universal level, should be done in local situations. People get together in London, in Brooklyn, wherever in the world, also, hopefully, on the other side of Europe, to become conscious and try to bear witness practically, really, daily,

sufferingly and prayerfully.

RABBI TANENBAUM: Burocratization of society which is dominant in every Western scientific technological society, presupposes that burocracy has no allowance for passion, feeling, any irrational emotion. Burocracy is constructive, ought to deal with objective reality as we perceive it, and all human purpose ought to be subservient to that. I want to get to the core of the issue which I think Msgr. Rossano and Rabbi Rabinovitch have pointed to. The crisis of modernity has to do with the fact of the impact of burocratization, which has led to a crisis of identity, a crisis in human freedom, a crisis in meaning, a collapse of a whole moral framework of the Middle Ages. It is a society in which human beings are partial, are caught in a wheel, have lost their sense of wholeness and integrity, in the burocratic process because of the impact of technology and industrialization. And the great pursuit - and I think that this is the real factor in the rise of cults and sects - is the effort to create a human-size community where people can realize they are humanity, in more intimate relations between persons, because they cannot find that in large burocratic systems. But I think the process of burocratization and depersonalization has, over a period of recent decades, reached the stage of an epidemic of dehumanization in the world. The human community today confronts a massive crisis of dehumanization, of devaluation of the dignity of human life. One can look around the world today and will find that there is not a continent on earth in which the massacre of human life is not almost without limits. And the nature of human response to that in itself is a judgement on the degree to which this kind of dehumanization has become so massive and overwhelming. And this says something about the degree to which the core value of the Torah and the Gospel is being destroyed before our eyes.

The notion that every human life has sanctity, is of infinite value, is being undermined. I don't know how much longer the human family can go on in that kind of massive destruction of human life and the almost casual response to it. In the U.S. there has been an extraordinary response cooperatively, of Roman Catholics, Jews, Protestants, Evangelicals, in trying to reduce human suffering, and that incidentally without getting involved in philosophical or theological discussions. The coming together of literally hundreds of thousands of Christians and Jews, in bringing refugees in, in restoring them to some human dignity, has been a demonstration that deep common values are operative, that these values have been overwhelming in binding us together.

I think Pope John Paul II has made a fundamental contribution to lifting up this central moral and spiritual issue in terms of how crucial the value of human life is. We can perform a very great service in terms of the objectives that we set for ourselves. If we can bring together some kind of Congress in Rome or elsewhere, of major religious leadership to deal with this fundamental challenge, to the central values of human life, that kind of proposition would not be unrelated to the powerful message that came out of Hiroshima and of Auschwitz. One of the things I find among young people is that what Auschwitz and Hiroshima has become to them, and as they look around the world with nuclear proliferation, toxic waste, they are the first generation to be told that they may be the last. The traumatic impact of that on the consciousness, the futility of hoping, among many young people has to be dealt with. And I think we have to think in more than conventional terms, to bring about a reversal of this callousness to the value of life. And religious leadership in America is in the forefront of anything that is humanizing.

FR. DUBOIS: I agree with people who said that there is no problem of secularism in Judaism, I think we have to be very clear. Secularism, in the meaning we gave the word in this meeting is for a Jew emancipation or assimilation, but we can ask the question nevertheless: is there an interest of pagan sort, or pagan attitude to Judaism? There is a pagan influence on Christianity inside Christian thinking. In other words, is there an impact of non-religious attitudes on Judaism? For instance, just to be more concrete, we could have a meeting about the impact of the birth or the death of God in both Judaism and Christianity. That is a residue of secularism, or the technological mentality. As a word, secularism has nothing to do with religious matters, but it has got an impact on both sides, Jewish and Christian.

I mentioned this morning the positivistic attitude. Is that also secularistic? And I think the right way to ask this question, by the Christian side, is how can we consider the divine dimension, the chosenness of the Jewish people in our time? There is Jewishness without religiousity. As a Christian I am convinced that even in Jewishness there is a divine dimension. I think that for Christians looking at Jewish existence, that is a problem. Just a brief answer to Dr. Riegner, I think that you emphasized the fact that both lecturers in their conclusion invited us to be practical, to reach some practical efficiency. I agree with you. But in which light, in which spirit, as witnesses of what should we act? It is not social welfare. Both sides should look at each other, respect the value of the other, and see what is the singularity and exemplarity of Jewish tradition for a Christian and for the world. We must keep in mind the fact that as Christians we have to look at your experience, at your history, as something very singular, absolutely specific. It is your history, your book,

your tradition, but it has got a central and exemplary value for me. But being together and discussing these problems together, has also a specific value, absolutely singular, but it has a universal meaning for the whole world. And I think that we have to keep that in mind when we speak, when we think of the urgent and central problems of secularism in the world.

MSGR. HIGGINS: I understand that it is difficult for Jews to speak of secularism. I can speak only from my own experience, and Jews do speak of secularism, and I have no doubt that Mejia is reporting accurately when he said that, to a large extent, the fact that this subject is on the agenda, is due to the initiative of some of the Jewish participants in the Steering Committee. But, aside from that, in the United States at least, I would say if Jews would not speak of secularism, I would be very concerned. It would mean that they were throwing this back only to the Catholics, or only to the Christians, that there was no problem in U.S. culture which required a reaction from the religious point of view, of the Jewish community. But it is a metter of cold fact that Jews do speak of secularism, they use the term regularly, they are concerned about it, perhaps from a different angle, a different perspective, a different historical perspective, than Christians of Roman Catholics, but in fact they do.

I will take only three writers and try to tie them with something Ehrlich said earlier. One was a Christian, not a Christian, a Unitarian, well known to anyone who has followed American cultural affairs; he died at the age of 90, Paul Blanchard; the other is Sidney Hook, I believe born as a Jew, what his religious affiliation is at the moment I don't know, I am sure he would call himself a secularist. I know he does

because I have read most of his writings; and from the English context, Harold Lasky. I had the occasion to read what all three of those writers said about religion, specifically on that subject. All three - but I suppose it was Blanchard to a greater extent - were thought of, by many Jews in the United States, as being concerned only about abuses in the Catholic Church. Therefore, what specifically Blanchard said about religion, as a secularist, was not considered, in my experience, to be of any great importance to the Jewish community, because his was an attack on the alleged or real abuses of Christianity and more specifically of Roman Catholicism. But I discovered in rereading them, which I had known before, that all three of them ended up by saying that Judaism is as much an evil in the world as Christianity, that any form of religion, the Judeo-Christian tradition, must be completely ignored, not abolished by law, but completely ignored, because it has nothing to contribute in a pluralistic society such as our own, meaning England and the United States. I think Jews were very late in discovering that this was the problem they were referring to. The reason I bring it up is that I would be very concerned if I thought the Jews were not concerned, about prominent, very influential writers in their day, who were saying that not only was Roman Catholicism a curse on modern society, but that Judaism was as well. But for a long time none of those writers was thought of in those terms. Now the reason I mentioned this, now this is a delicate point, but since Ehrlich raised it, I will raise it frankly, and I think that at least my American friends know that the frankness is done in the spirit of conciliation and dialogue. I think Ehrlich put his finger on a point which requires some frank discussion. It is true that some Christians, some for some very bad reasons, some for very innocent reasons, some not having thought it through, do look upon the Jewish community as not being concerned about secularism. One reason I think is

the same reason that Lichten himself gave, that secularism very properly was understood by the Jews as a necessity for them if they were ever going to be emancipated in the modern world. Therefore, quite understandably, they accepted it much more quickly and much more readily than Roman Catholics did. That, I think, led many Jews in the United States, and I stand subject to correction from anyone in the room, but it's my experience, after forty years of substantial reading in the field, and substantial meeting with the people in the United States that many Jews have been afraid to raise the question of secularism, because it would be interpreted as giving up, as it were, on the emancipation, on the freedom that came with what, rightly or wrongly, the world calls secularism. I don't believe that, but I would be less than honest if I didn't report that that is a lingering feeling, the feeling that many Jews are afraid to address questions from a religious point of view, in any kind of aggressive way - aggressive in a good sense of the word for fear that that would be interpreted as giving up on separation of Church and State. This is a completely dead issue in the United States, not all of the modalities are, but certainly the issue itself is. For fear of becoming involved even in such a thing as the educational crisis in the United States, for fear that the public school which was the symbol of emancipation for American Jews, one of the symbols, would be weakened at the expense of the Jewish community. I think it goes to another number of cultural factors. But to sum some of that up, however you want to define secularism - some other word might do - I am not concerned with the word, but I do feel that there is more ground-work to be done, at least in my own experience, before we can have a really frank and open agreement among Jews and Catholics in the United States on things they already agree on. As Tanenbaum said, on almost all the

social problems he is concerned about, of which he talked about so eloquently, there is substantial, almost total agreement among Christians and Jews in the United States. There is, I think, some lack, as of now, in doing what Father Dubois twice has asked us to do, and that is to determine how we will approach these problems, as Christians and Jews. What is the modality we bring to them, we are not simply secular social reformers, we have something we bring to it that comes out of our tradition, and that is the gap. It seems to me, it is not at all difficult to get Christians and Jews in the United States to work on social problems. I repeat again that I would be concerned, however we define the word secularism, if we thought it were only a Catholic problem. The crisis that Tanenbaum has referred to, which is wolrdwide, but, in my own experience the crisis we refer to is as much my problem as it is yours, and viceversa. This is a very deep religious and cultural problem in our society and in the United States, and I assume in most countries in the world. It cannot be thought of as one that is specific only to one group. To the question of separation between Church and State, which my good friend Shuster raised, I will only add this one point. John Courtney Murray is generally thought of as being the principal architect of the decree on that subject of the Council, at least one of the architects. I knew him very well and saw him many times before he died, he died tragically too young. His grave concern at the end of his life was to get on to the important matter of how we bring into society the biblical symbols of our common faith. Granted the separation of Church and State, the separation between Church and State nearly prepared the way belatedly for the Catholic tradition, far too belatedly in our tradition. The problem that should have been resolved long before it was - and he had to give it his entire life as a Catholic - to help to resolve it from the

Catholic side. He did it fully conscious of the fact that that was not his most important work, what he wanted to do was how Christians and Jews and all believers, in a system of separation of Church and State, can bring the biblical symbols that they share to bear upon our common problem. And it is a common problem, it will not be done by Jews alone and cannot be done by Christians alone ore Catholics alone.

RABBI KLENICKI: I feel that one very crucial point that we have to face in our dialogue and relationship is the question why are we talking to each other now? And why are we directing our attention to the world that is surrounding us? We can see that we are doing it because of social concern, because of crisis, refugees, hunger; persecution or torture. But that would be very simplicistic because we could do that through the political parties, to which we might belong or not, or through social groups. But essentially the fact is that we are in a human situation in "une situation humaine", we are religious people, we have a Covenant with God, one way or another:, according with our tradition, and we act and react towards the world in that way. And this is something which I think we should examine very carefully, and it is difficult on our side, because, I think, any discussion that might touch upon our vocation or mission in the world reminds us of the disputation at Tortosa, or the one in Paris. We cannot avoid that. I am going to use a Freudian term: we are castrated by two thousand years of memories. But there will come the moment when we are going to overcome that, and we will have to face that aspect: why, we Jews and Catholics and Jews and Christians are talking to each other and are going to the word? And then the question of secularism will go over the definition that we might have, as Jews or Catholics, but it is going to be an ever-present reality in relation to the transmission of our heritage to our children, in relation to social problems

and to persecution. But when we will realize that we are together, children of the Covenant and children of God, then
the prophetic witnessing will come out of our inside, of our
past, and then we will respond, not because of social problems,
but because we have to respond according to our experience
and to the word of God.

RABBI RABINOVITCH: Much has been spoken to clarify and amplify the problems. Very briefly, I would like to point to what seems to me occurred: a kind of semantic confusion on the definition of the term secularism. Since it was my duty to give my paper with the statement that secularism certainly implies a rejection of every form of religious faith or worship, I want to justify this. If secularism is after all, as was pointed out very properly here before, not a Jewish word, not a Hebrew word, and therefore we do not have the right to appropriate it for something which is not intended to be used for by those who made it, or invented it, and Msgr. Rossano has already pointed to the historical precedents of the use of the word. It is clear that the dictionary definition, and the accepted definition by all who write about the history of the last several centuries, is that secularism does not mean the attitude to the world. It means a particular attitude to the world, a particular attitude which implies a rejection of every form of religious faith or worship. Now, it is true that the Jewish attitude to the world differs radically perhaps from the Christian attitude to the world at a certain point, I see that today. There is a revalutation, and that therefore one can have questions about what is the proper attitude to the world, what is our traditional attitude or what is our changed attitude. But clearly secularism as such cannot be redefined to suit our prejudices, and in fact I am glad that we were reminded of that at the end. Secularism does pose a great danger to all believers, and to Judaism and to Jews as well. It is true that we welcome secularism because of some

phenomena, and these were mentioned. It is also true that in history one never finds, certainly not across the board, pure, unadultered, ideological movements, completely true to their consistent definition. And of course there is a wide spectrum of attitudes which varies into that of secularism, which carries the definition which I spoke of. And, clearly, when we welcome phenomena which were brought up by secularist development, I don't think anyone had in mind to welcome the extreme forms which were to imply rejection of every form of religious faith. So much for semantic clarification.

I should like to mention briefly one or two other things which seem to be problematic. The issue of Church and State, the separation of Church and State; here too we Jews have a long tradition, we share this biblical tradition. The Bible always knew of a separate civil and separate religious authority. The model of Jewish kingship, David, King of Israel, is one who was not the religious head of society of his time. And therefore the separation of Church and State is something we can take for granted. And I think this leads us also to the matter of distinct pluralism, as undermining unity. It is understandable, that after many centuries of a monolithic, hierarchical type of structure in which were molded together both civil and religious authorities, that is difficult to conceive of a pluralistic system which will not become a victim of its own centrifugal tendencies, will not be blown apart, will not become atomized. I think that there too it is important to understand, both for us, both for Jews, to understand our own tradition, and to present it to our Christian friends. That we have a long history of dissent and pluralism, not only in terms of our relations to others, but also in terms of our internal life, on very basic issues, differences about fundamental laws of marriage and yet they never needed to separate.

from each other. Of course we had our cleavages and our sectarian tendencies. This deserves a considerable amount of study to understand how it was possible to maintain radical disagreements not only in theory but also in practice, over many centuries, and to retain these disagreements while yet maintaining a common bond of loyalty which enabled the body politics somehow to be sustained.

And one other point that I should like to mention is, I think it is very important to mention this issue of youth that feels so rootless, feels a stranger in the world. Some people pointed out that this is a phenomenon of, we see the symptoms of this in the phenomenon of sex, and so on. I think we see this also in the very interesting phenomenon that wherever you go in the world, certainly this is true in the Western world, but I saw it even in Moscow: Young people want to wear jeans, or cut their hair in the same way, and so on. Someone mentioned these phenomena as deprecating. I think these are profound expressions of a need to feel at home, to identify with others, of a need for a substitute for the family, which provided the sense of security for the individual. To the extent that Jews have retained the ability to provide a sense of supportive family atmosphere, to that degree do we succeed in retaining the loyalty of our young people. And those whom we lose, it is precisely because the sense of community of "Klal Israel" has been eroded by secularism. Now, I think this is an area which requires a great deal of study. In my own experience with young people and with Christian young people, some of them have told me that they find it strange. They will end up in an airport in a strange city, on a plane with several Jewish young people and some non-Jewish young people, and the Jewish young people don't know anybody there, and the Christians don't know anybody there. Six or seven times out of ten, the Jewish young people will arrive

at the airport, not knowing anybody, will meet some Jews and will find a family or families to take them in, if it's for overnight, or two nights, or whatever it is. I don't know that it really isn't so, that the Christians could not find the same, but I have had young people tell me that. I think this is an important area in which our religious values have to find expression to make the world a more familiar place where young people can find themselves. Now, it is true that this will not solve all the problems of rootlessness of young people. But these problems are very deeply connected with the structure of the family, and the attitude to what families are supposed to do. And I would like to wind up with just this one word. A number of speakers have mentioned that, well, we have to make sure that, in the final analysis, while we are concerned with practical things, it is not just social welfare, or just social justice we are concerned with. Now, I must confess that I find myself extremely puzzled by what is meant by just, or mere social welfare or social justice. Does not the prophet say: "Let justice roll like water and righteousness like a mighty stream"? How dare we denigrate the significance of social welfare and social justice? "Anyone who saves one life it is as if he saved the whole world". Regardless of how we conceive of our relationship to God, certainly the realization of whatever is our faith commitment in terms of actually saving a life, or easing a life, or making someone feel at home in the world, is itself the ultimate achievement of which one is capable in this world. And, insofar as pure spirituality is concerned, that after all is to be reserved for the world to come.

PROF. TALMON: Thanks to our two speakers and all who participated in the discussion. For what we have learned today is as usually only just a beginning, we have to come back to the matter. I would only say at the end that I believe that the development

of what we call secularism has something to do with the fact that religion has more than necessary pinned its hope on the ultimate. For too long a time the so-called religious establishments were concerned with things which will come at the very end. While the secular man asks, what are we doing about the pen-ultimate? Judaism has always been especially concerned with the "here and now", not only with the "then", and the "year after". We did not say that we did not have a problem of secularism in Judaism. What I wanted to show is that it expresses itself quite differently. The fact that Amos can say "the good in the world and God are the same". Therefore, while it is "here and now", and how to apply our religious values to the "here and now", one way or another, this is something which I think comes, comparatively speaking, easily to the Jewish mind. It is not something we have to learn: but we have now only to learn how to abide by it.

Morning Session, April 1, 1981

Chairman: Msgr. Torrella

(prayer said by Dr. Wigoder)

RABBI MANDELBAUM: I do want to question Ehrlich's strong statement, that the attribution of Jewish acceptance of secularism is a cause of anti-Semitism. The deeper and perennial source of anti-Semitism is the dislike of the unlike and the cultivation of human hatred. Many Catholic thinkers like in the United States John Courtney Murrey and others praised Jews for their identification with liberal secularism. I really think that it is especially important for groups such as ours, religious leaders, always to focus on the central cause of anti-Semitism, which is the cultivation of human hatred, no matter what the excuse may be. Our basic message is to cultivate love of our fellowman, whether he is a Jew, a Christian or Mohammedan or Hindu, or even a secularist.

DR. EHRLICH: I did not say that the whole 19th century, 20th century's discussion of secularism is the source of anti-Semitism. But I said that this could be true especially in Catholic circles, for whom Jews were the liberals and the promoters of secularism for their own sake, for emancipation and integration into the general society. They were attacked by the Catholics, because the Catholics were themselves, at the end of the 19th century, in the so-called Kulturkampf, in a very difficult position, and they singled out as always the Jews and not the many other factors which date back to the old situation of liberalism of the 19th century. And what I mentioned is that even in times at the beginning of the 20th century, until the Nazi era, when those problems were no more important, when there was no more Kulturkampf whatsoever, these arguments of Jews as the leaders in the fight for secularism were always mentioned. This argument can be found in German Catholic literature until this very day. And as to the argument of Msgr. Mejia, I should say, we, in our inner-Jewish situation, are not confronted with secularism first hand but second hand: Our problem is secondhand secularism and I mean that the idea of what is behind is assimilation. What Jews are concerned with until this very moment is not so much the philosophical idea of secularism and liberalism, but assimilation and losing Jewish identity to a secularized world. And this is a much more complicated phenomenon than secularism, because the losing of Jewish identity does not mean to fight integration into the general society, but it means assimilation and losing Jewish identity.

DR. FISHER: A very good Jewish friend of mine at one fime defined himself an atheist then an agnostic, until it became clear that he considered himself a secularist and what he meant by secularism was what we meant by pluralism and that he did not

mean secularism in any of the sense that Msgr. Rossano so carefully defined in terms of the absolute secularism as a militant force against religion. He meant it simply as a way in which different meligions can work together. And then shortly after that, he invited me to his home for Passover. I was sitting there, looking at my wife and saying, this was the guy I was arguing with whether he was an atheist and now he is teaching his children the historical responding to questions and digging into the biblical tradition of God's liberation of his people. And yet he would go off and tell people he was an atheist. Now, from a Catholic point of view, those two types of statements that he made in his life with his religious observance, and the "anti-credo" formulation of that, would not be possible. I think within Judaism it is possible, and we as Christians really have to see the kind of peoplehood that is behind that, and the kind of the tradition behind that. So I don't think these things are incompatible but I think it is something we really need to talk about in the context of our discussion. We are only at the beginning of that. We, as Catholics, have always had an intense sense of community ourselves. Roman Catholicism has never been an individualistic religion, one of the things I think many Jews misunderstand. And they view us as if we were 19th century Berlin, German Protestants. That I think is something the Jews need to understand about Catholics. We have never had an individualistic tradition, so we have a basis of understanding peoplehood. We cannot define the difference, but I think there is much we need to talk about. We as Catholics, especially in the Vatican Council, really defined ourselves essentially as people of God, and therefore we need to know from the Jews what peoplehood means in this deeply historical sense of an historical tradition. That was one point.

The second point which I wanted to raise concerns the term secularity, which in Jewish understanding, I think, had an anti-semitic undertone. Thus, I would agree very strongly here and say that one cannot simply presume that the Jewish community can be very comfortable with secularism in the sense of Msgr. Rossano's absolute secularism attacking religion. In that sense I think Judaism will have to stand against it, because it is inimical to the survival of Jewish people. But I would link that also with thoughts I have seen expressed by commentators on the Holocaust, who raised the point in response to Rosemary Reuther, namely that, if one were to say that the seeds of the Holocaust were directly in Christian teaching, it would have been most likely that this would have been expressed by attempted genocide against the Jews somewhere in Christian tradition, when Christianity had absolute political power, real might, in the sense of putting its ideas into practice, somewhere during the Middle Ages, when the Church had political power and the means to implement its ideas rather directly. It was militant secularism that allowed the State to absolutize itself, in a way that was never possible under any religious approach because the State is always under God, and to dehumanize other human beings to the point of not only making them peripheral to society, but absolutely unnecessary, and reducing them to a level of not being human at all. This I think is a factor in our discussion that should be taken up in terms of the dark underbelly, if you will, of secularism, in that deep sense, so that also I would kind of question the radical sense of assymetry between our traditions. I think there is a lot of common basis for questioning secularity in that rather absolute sense.

MSGR. MEJIA: I have heard several times that the main problem of the Jewish people is assimilation and loss of identity, which is very true. I am afraid the Christians have exactly

the same problem, if not exactly with the same evidence. Does not all this directly lead to the loss of identity, to assimilation, against which we all want to stand? It we lose the Jewish identity in this world, we will have a terrible loss. This problem is not in the background, it is happening to both of us. As the Jews were moving away from religion, also the Christians and the Catholics were tempted to become less religious.

Now a second point: We Christians had a synthesis, and now this synthesis is going to pieces through secularism, or through scientific or industrial revolution. The problem is that we are all conscious that this situation we are now in is not acceptable any more, not only for the religiously minded Christian and Jew, but also for the world at large, because it does not give any real sense or meaning to human life, to human history and to the world. We need a new synthesis. I think this new synthesis has one essential element. It is a synthesis which cannot be made any more on the basis of Christianity alone, nor for that matter of Judaism alone, or Buddhism alone, but it has to be made on the basis of an encounter of the main religions, it has to be built on the basis of an encounter of the great two mother and daughter religions, Judaism and Christianity, perhaps as a nucleus around which other religions might also find a way to come in. But I see very clearly that this is at the basis of the new synthesis. The new synthesis, from the point of view of the Church, of the Catholic Church, and I think of the other Christian churches as well, implies that we recognize in the Christian tradition this intense relation to Judaism which belongs to our identity. The Jewish side frequently says that this does not apply to them. But however that may be, the other reason of it remains: we have a common heritage, we believe in God and the Decalogue, and in a way of life which reflects both, privately and publicly,

individually and socially. We respond in this way, to this terrible need of today. We are going towards a new synthesis, and I think that Jews and Christians finally have come together with all the problems and difficulties which this entails.

RABBI TANENBAUM: There is another dimension to this discussion. There is a very large and impressive volume of work on the "sacred and profane" by great scholars . These studies, after examining the phenomenology of the secular, not only in the Western religions but also in the Oriental, come to a variety of conclusions, one of which is that in phenomenological reality there is no such existential reality as pure secular man. And they use an extraordinary amount of evidence, historical, theological and sociological, to the effect that every human being, by virtue of his or her nature, has profound experiences, whether he or she prefers to identify that as religious or not, has profound experiences of holy places, of holy time, that even persons who identify themselves as pure secularists have moments when they encounter something of the transcendent, experiences of love, of caring and compassion which in reality are indistinguishable from those experiences of the transcendent which are encountered by essentially religious people. And one has to look at that phenomenological reality. And that search for personal and corporate immortality says something to us as an area in which so-called secularists do in fact find a point to converge with traditional religious people. I would suggest that as an area for our examination in any systematic approach. A recent study undertaken after a series of studies on catecetical materials, on the religious experiences of various Catholic populations found that in the present day, the most affirmative possibility in terms of facing above the problems of anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism, the affirmative possibility of change, renewal and reform was found in people

who were religiously committed, that is to say with committed Catholics and committed Jews it was possible to find an area of common agreement, there was a common vocabulary that one could share and use as the basis for self-examination and selfrenewal. The greatest problem that was found in that study were lapsed Christians or lapsed Jews, lapsed Catholics and lapsed Jews, with whom there was no common vocabulary, with whom there was no commitment; to any of the values of tradition, and therefore the possibilities of dealing with problems of anti-Semitism became almost non-existent. They took all of their cues from a common culture, and from traditions which were alien to the whole body of the biblical tradition. Therefore my own sense is that the future possibilities of improved relationships lie in our searching together, in communities where there is this commitment to our respective traditions and finding common ground within those traditions. In a deeper sense, authentic Christians, authentic Jews, have the basis of a kind of mutuality at their best in which the possibility of building this common future together is more apparent to us than in those who have rebelled against their traditions, have rejected their traditions.

PROF. TALMON: I feel that we have added many valuable insights this morning to the discussion of yesterday. And I think that especially Msgr. Mejia has made some remarks which are of decisive importance, but again I feel that we have to deal more with the definition of what secularism means to each of us and what means religious commitment. Because here, despite all that has been said, there are basic differences. But we get caught in the quandary we are all in. We are living in a world that cannot be completely adjusted to what we call religious commitments. And our own Jewish tradition cannot deal a 100% with the situation we are in, especially if you come, as I do, from Israel, where a revolution has taken place which

is possibly, with regard to Judaism, even more important than the emancipation or the industrial revolution. Because suddenly we were swept in a completely new arena, and you have now to try to find your ways with your tradition, your religious commitment in a setting which was altogether new. Now, here comes my problem: When we say, or you say, "People have become less religious", what does it mean? Their beliefs, their expressions, the fact that they go only once a year to the synagogue, the Yom Kippur Jews, or only to commemorate their parents, or if they go for the high holidays, or for all holidays, or three times a day? What is religious commitment? Or is it the fact that you try to work more with the spiritual values, or is it more that you try to define as our two speakers did yesterday, what I would again call a lifestyle, which is imbued with values coming from our religious tradition. Whether the Jew wants it or not, because of his Hebraic background, his history, he expresses whatever he does or not in religious terminology and symbols. When you come to think of the Hebrew language and the Jewish tradition, it is so imbued with religious terms and symbols that you cannot get away from it. We come to such a term as "secular messianism", which in fact affected Israel, especially after the Six-days War, and we were all perturbed about it. Somebody told us yesterday that everybody went to the Western Wall and I was perturbed first of all because I don't like the Western Wall altogether, and that is my own problem, these are modern symbols that for me have no great appeal, but in any case I knew they went there not for religious, spiritual reasons, but for other reasons, and therefore the term secular messianism was tied to the phenomenon about which I was not very happy. But on the other hand, instead of the term secular humanism you find with Buber "Hebrew humanism". And for him Hebrew humanism expresses itself most vividly in the life of the kibbutz. The ideal expression

of Hebrew humanism is for Buber in the non-religious, the a-religious and antireligious kibbutz of Israel. This is hard to explain. Why did he says so? Because in those kibbutzim they discovered the value system about which we talked. First of all, it is or was a non-consumer somety, it was a producer society, it was a society of complete equality, of justice, of love, although the kibbutz would not define itself in any way as religious or antireligious. By the way, when the anti- or non-religious kibbutz tried to find its own expression of its own social life, it had to fall back on traditional Jewish values. It is unbelievable, suddenly you had again the celebration of the Sabbath, not only in the religious kibbutz, but also in non-religious kibbutz. At Passover you will find the same. They will alter sometimes the wording of the Haggadah, but when you go through it, you see that from year to year, more and more traditional prayers come back into the text. . Msgr. Mejia is right: we have to go for a new synthesis, because just fighting secularism won't help us. I think we have, at least on the Jewish side, to say that we have gotten to a state where we cannot solve all problems of modern society with the tools that are given us by our own tradition as it stands; it has not evolved enough, it has left open questions and what is more, modernman who has access much more than medioeval man had to non-religious, non-traditional sources of information, of learning, of study, will not be any more content to go back to a life in Mea Shearim. This is not an acceptable solution for most people. So how do we go about it? This remains an open question. Can there be more synthesis? I believe there can. And here I think, as Tanenbaum just said, and this goes along 'with what our lecturers said, here is ground for working together. There will be different solutions. We cannot come up with one solution, but I believe we can come up with a workable, livable synthesis of values, which combines both

what we learn from secularism and secular life, and from our own tradition. Let me finish by saying: We view, I believe, our sources in a non-objective way. Namely, when we go back to the Bible, we quote the prophets, and we leave out the historical books. I have never heard here anybody quoting the Book of Judges, or the Book of Kings, and I am quite sure that the problem of what we now call secularism, and religious commitment, was existant then as well. The problem is more distinct in the Old Testament than the New, because the Old Testament portrays a situation which is much more comparable with our own, of a society in political settings. By picking on the prophets or getting nice verses out of a source; we make our lives too easy. We sweep under the carpet a great part of biblical reports and traditions, which show involvement in what we would call seculum which may not have been always inspired by religious commitment, as we would see it today. I believe as I said before that Buber was right when he presented biblical society as a united, a unified society, in which the divisions between seculum and religion or belief was not as sharp as in our days. But I am sure that if we would sit down and ask ourselves, what happened in Israel over a thousand, or twelve hundred years, from the beginning of the recorded biblical period to its end, and possibly we would find also in the New Testament that the basic problem was there too, that the solutions we have are eclectic, that we recorded only those solutions which were worthwhile and to which we can't now go back. But I think that this idea of a new synthesis, if I understood it correctly, should be the guiding light for any further discussion, and I think here we could work together.

<u>DR. LICHTEN</u>: Yesterday in my short remark I said that instead of secularism, one should rather think about assimilation, emancipation, integration. Now, although we lack the time, we should look at the definition of the word assimilation. What do we mean

by assimilation? Assimilation to what, and from what? We know that assimilation in a certain way, historically speaking, is a daughter of emancipation. Emancipation did many wonderful things for the future of the Jewish people, facilitated certain ideologies, even the Zionist. Therefore we have to think about assimilation from what? Somebody can be anti-secular, or nonsecular, or religious, and be at the same time integrated, or assimilated, or emancipated to certain cultures of the countries in which he lives. And I don't have in mind now the 19th century German situation. I mean even in a contemporary situation. It is possible to reverse the thing, and to retain religious values and to be involved in religious commitment and at the same time to be assimilated, culturally assimilated. I think that the wordsemancipation, assimilation, integration, are integral parts of what we call secularism, and deserve further discussion.

My last point is, we are doing a disservice to the Church in some of our presentations. In my youth I was told that the people who would understand the Jewish community, would understand us Jews, were either secularists, which means people who do not go often to church, or so-called liberal Catholics. And there were not too many at that time. We are facing a revolution in the Catholic Church, and we have to understand that the Church of my youth and the Church of today are not the same. Vatican II was a revolutionary movement. Vatican II made our dialogue possible. But it was not always that way. By not realizing that revolution, we are doing a disservice to the Church and to the Christian-Jewish relations. The teaching of religious commitments now is totally different. Vatican II is a milestone in our relationship. Therefore my intention was to stress the fact that in a great contrast to what I lived through in my first decades of life, we are now facing a much happier and much more hopeful future than I could have hoped for fifty years ago.

MSGR. ROSSANO: It is difficult to add some more things to what I have heard. Let me say that it was an example of a true dialogue, an example of mutual enrichment. I am accustomed to have such meetings with Moslems, Buddhists, Hindus, Shintoists, and generally they are a kind of monologue. Now this is a rare case that I really experienced that I got the happy experience of a true dialogue. This is the most advanced position of dialogue in our Church today. And for me it was a pleasure, and also a kind of encouragement because I confess that in many cases I feel rather disillusioned. But, nevertheless, we will work with this instrument of dialogue. Secularization, it has been repeated, is a Western phenomenon which started in the Christian world but spread all over the world, touched almost every culture and religion and took different models. And it was evident that the model of Jewish secularization is in some way common and different from the model of Christian secularization. So the word secularization, as a process, evokes some things in common to our tradition, to your tradition, and evokes some different things. We have to keep in mind this assymetry, as Fr. Dubois said. We have to be careful and to clarify the vocabulary, as Talmon, Tanenbaum and Klenicki suggested. Among the common evocations, some evocations of secularization are definitely, decisively good. We work on the process of seculariization because it gives one the chance of affirming our identity, freedom, the acknowledging of the intrinsic values of reality, of being, of the pen-ultimate God, the respect for the other, the affirmation of equality, of plurality in the world. Hence, many evocations, many results of this process are welcome. Some other aspects are judged in a different way, are considered negative. So we consider negative the phenomenon of total agnosticism, of amoralism, of consumerism, or aestheticism, or atheism, and so on. But while we are discussing good and bad evocations of secularization, we are facing now, in these years,

in these days, a new phenomenon of a rampant, or creeping neofundamentalism. Today there was a big headline in the newspaper, a condemnation of the Moon sect here in Europe. But we have not only this phenomenon of fundamentalism. Ten years ago, the last word was secularization, now we have to stand for good results of secularization. Because now the last word is neo-fundamentalism, sects, Islam. We are no more in the free atmosphere of ten years ago, twenty years ago. We and our youth are menaced by these attacks against reason. We have to stand together for the positive evocations of the process of secularization. And I quoted in my text the offer of collaboration which che Chief Rabbi of Rome, Dr. Elio Toaff, made to the Pope, and I think, on the basis of what I have heard from Talmon and yesterday from Riegner, Tanenbaum, also from Rabinovitch, and Dubois and Mejia, and all the others, we can find the possibility of enlarging our platform of consensus and to find the ground for working together, to use the expression of Prof. Talmon, and have also a kind of list, a catalogue of the elements on which we basically agree, given our spiritual heritage. And I think in the void of the world of today it is extremely important to enter the field, Christians and Jews united, for this humanism. When working with Moslems and other religions, I am always quoting and affirming the necessity to work, as religionists, in favor of man. Every religion has something to bring for the building up, for the education of man, for the defence of man. And our tradition of monotheistic religions have essential things to bring into this field, and especially we Christians and Jews have a vision of man of an ontological density which is not present in Islam for instance. In Islam, man is Abdallah, the servant, he does not have this ontological density, no human rights are inherent in man in Islam, as it is in the Christian and Jewish tradition. I heard many times that the nature of man received from God is complete,

total and pure only in Islam. If you are not a Moslem you are not realized, and you are not right. The words have different meanings, freedom, rights, all these things have different meanings. But with the Jews, thanks God, we have the same and I hope we can enlarge our platform to join our hands with Moslems, because they too have the Abramitic tradition and they can, looking at their history, at their culture, enlarge the platform and they can overcome the moment of neo-fundamentalism they are passing through. I think we have to stand together for the positive evocation of secular culture, of secular humanism, of the positive evocation of the affirmations of our own identities, of dialogues as a truly enriching, human encounter with the others and collaboration on ethical, social and humanistic fields of common concern . Yesterday Fr. Dubois and also Msgr. Mejia spoke about pre-values and previous values, and also Dr. Riegner talked about many other problems. I think we could also assert in a dramatic way, as it was thought, this collaboration, and also the urgency to affirm some absolute values in the emptyness of the world today. In this way we will face the risk of the void provoked through secularism as a bad ideology and we will also avoid the risk and the dangers of neo-fundamentalism in the world of today, affirming reason, affirming true humanity. I think at least for me, this sharing was extremely useful and to discover how large our common humanism is.

DR. RIEGNER: (point of order)

I would like to make a suggestion for the Steering Committee. I believe this is one of the best dialogues that we have had and I am very glad Msgr. Rossano said the same. It seems to me, Mejia, that this is an occasion to perhaps come out with some publication. Maybe we should consider the publication of this discussion as a separate thing, but it is obvious that this is the basic problem with which we are both concerned.

MSGR. TORRELLA: It would seem to me that the Executive Committee should select some concrete topics for future consideration. We should emphasize common religious values, together with common religious attitudes. Both is very important. We should also underline the importance of credibility, of bearing witness, of religious commitment. We should explore the possibilities of concrete collaboration on the local level. Finally, we should give concrete thought to a Christian-Jewish vocabulary as an aid in promoting dialogue.



Education for Dialogue in a Pluralistic Society
Tanenbaum: Traces the history of Church-andState relationship in colonial America from a
Puritan theocratic society and the total alliance
between Church and State to today's pluralistic,
multiracial democratic society and the separatation of Church and State. He quotes the First
Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and its art.6
assuring religious freedom which led to the churches'
and synagogues' becoming wholly voluntary institutions. The doctrine of religion liberty is regarded as being central for the whole pattern of liberties in the U.S.. Religious liberty was prior
to freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and freedom of the press.

In the U.S. after world war II, a cultural trend has developed in which diversity is understood as the given reality of American life. We owe it to the most advanced minds of both Christianity and Judaism in the U.S. who gave theological substance as well as laid the foundations for the institutionalization of both humanism and interreligious dialogue which are the content of a religious and cultural pluralism in America.

On the middle level of American society many of these ideas shaped the attitudes of the religious leadership: of religious communities and of the clergy (Catholic, Protestant, Evangelical and Jewish). The religious communities in America have 145 million members out of a total population of 220 million. They represent an extraordinary resource for building communal efforts for collaboration for the common welfare. Widespread efforts were made after the war to revise religious teaching materials of all major religious denominations. As a result, today the revised Christian teaching materials contain no anti-Semitic reference and the Jewish material no anti-Christian references of any kind. There is, morever, a gap on the level of mass culture since educators and the clergy of all denominations have so far failed to master the use of the mass media, particularly television, in the educational effort. However in the last few years the rise of fundamentalism has become a significant counter-pluralistic force in American life. There is a regression to the earliest level of American fundamentalism, there is now the task of educationg a large evangelical and fundamentalist Christian community, which is moving into the mainstream of American

politics, economics, culture, education and religious life - in the fundamentals of what it means to live in a pluralistic society.

Fisher: Follows-up on the detailed reports given by him to the Liaison Committee meetings in Madrid and London. He deals in detail with the efforts made in the United States by the Catholic community—on a nation-wide scale—towards the implementation of the "Guidelines" in the field of Catholic education, which consists in text-book revision, programming educational material for Catholic schools of all grades, the training of Catholic religious teachers, programming for preachers(particularly at Easter), giving special emphasis to the use of liturgy as a means of education for dialogue.

Afternoon Session: April 1, 1981.

(Chairman: Msgr. R. Torrella)

Exchange of Information

a) Recent PLO Approaches to the Vatican

<u>Talmon:</u> Expresses the deep shock felt in the Jewish world when on March 18, 1981, Cardinal Casaroli and Archbishop Silvestrini received in

the Vatican Faruk Kaddumi, head of the Political Department of the PLO, even more so as the meeting was arranged by Archbishop Hilarion Cappucci. The agenda of the meeting with the PLO officials appears the very same that this group wished to discuss with the highest authorities of the Holy See, but was refused. Talmon declares that the Jewish world failed to understand how the Holy See could deal with a terrorist group, but expresses the hope that similar incidents will not adversely affect the trust, understanding and progress which characterize this Liaison Committee.

Lichten: Was shocked when he read the communique' issued by the Vatican press office. This shock was even stronger the next morning when he saw in all newspapers pictures of a kissing embrace between Mr. Kaddumi and Archbishop Cappucci.

<u>Higgins:</u> Feels very strongly about Cappucci's activities and regards them as most unfortunate, and all the Catholics who work in Catholic-Jewish relations feel the same way. The question is what our particular group can do about the Vatican meeting with the PLO. He fully understands the indignation in the Jewish

community about the incident but lacks the expertise to recommend what this group could do.

Rabbi N. Solomon: Feels that the present situation taxes the very foundation of our meeting because it implies that there has been a breach of trust, somewhere along the line.

Fisher: Agrees with the previous speakers. We need to assess what this group can do about it.

To handle the issue we have to know how Jews and Catholics respectively interpret the distinction between "religious" and "political".

Tanenbaum: Takes issue with the press state = ments. made by Kaddumi after the meeting with the holy See and asks why clarification was not issued by the Vatican, to counteract the brazen exploitation of Vatican by Kaddumi.

Klenicki: Reports on the political activities in Latin America of Cappucci. Voices deep concern that not even the Pope can control him, fears that this may endanger the very meaning of our relationship.

<u>Dubois:</u> Agrees with Higgins and Fisher. We have to be aware of our limitations, as the Liaison Committee, in intervening in this case. We should distinguish between a public reaction and a more private approach to the Holy See. We have to express our reaction with regard to the PLO in a low-key manner.

<u>Higgins</u>: Has no hesitancy whatsoever, as an individual Catholic, to disagree with the Secretariat of State in this issue. The problem is how this particular group handles the issue at this particular moment.

Dupuy: Negative Christian reactions should be passed on to the higher Authorities in Rome by the Commission for Religious Relations. While it is unclear as to whether the Holy See should or should not have contacts with the PLO, it is a fact that the statements made by Kaddumi in Rome after his audience with Card. Casaroli went unchallenged by the Holy See.

<u>Wigoder:</u> Emphasizes the negative impact of these events and Cappucci's activities which is bound

to harm the credibility of our interfaith activities.

Le Déaut: Agrees with Dupuy to convey our concern to the Vatican authorities, but not publically.

Rabinovitch: Thinks the Catholic side must devise the strategy it considers appropriate.

Torrella: First, the discussion was positive. Vatican diplomacy never refuses to receive groups or organizations. It is devoted to act in matters of humanitarian concern and to promote peace and justice throughout the world. It is therefore committed to listen to all voices. In the Middle East, the Vatican strives for a global solution. It is also gravely concerned with the situation in Lebanon. At the Holy See the major diplomatic decisions are exclusively made by the Secretariat of State. Personally speaking, I can see some new light. As Vatican Commission we have been very keenly listening to the information that has been forthcoming from our discussions of today which we will pass on to our higher authorities. Suggests that the Steering Committee study the concrete modalities of how to proceed.

Riegner: (extremely poor quality of recording)
...Expresses appreciation that both sides are coming nearer in the understanding that the distinction between the political and the religious is not so clear-cut. Some of our Catholic partners accept the fact that there is some kind of "grey area" between the political and the religious. In a dialogue Jews cannot impose on the Catholics their concept of what is political and what is religious, nor can the Catholics impose their concept on the Jews either...Let us discuss in a small group how we do it. This is for the Jewish side an absolute necessity....

Fisher: On the national level, local churches are completely unaware of what the Vatican or the Vatican diplomats have in mind. Our Church certainly does not shape Vatican policy, but we must be able to explain it. We in the Church should be a little bit more sharing if we are to work for common goals.

Higgins: The Vatican has received all kinds of people whom other people consider just as dangerous as Kaddumi. As an individual Catholic, however

objects strongly that the Vatican did not issue a press release counteracting Kaddumi's disinformation.

Tanenbaum: There was no hint from the Vatican that it disapproved of the Palestinian Covenant calling for the destruction of Israel.

Talmon: Why was Kaddumi, with the help of Cappucci, permitted to acquaint the Holy See with his
views on Jerusalem when this group, a few months
ago, asked for a similar opportunity which was
rejected. We are going to that Steering Committee
meeting with clear notions and a clear mandate
from our colleagues and friends here, to achieve
certain aims in this specific matter.

Mejia: We are all in the corner. We should not make things more difficult than they already are.

Morning Session, April 2, 1982

Chairman: Prof. Sh. Talmon

b) Recent Resurgence of anti-Semitism
(Prayer read by Prof. Wigoder)

Klenicki: Reports on anti-Semitic activities in the United States and in other parts of the world. Concern about the sharp increase in the U.S. of anti-Semitic incidents - especially in the northeastern part of the country- There seems to be no ideological force behind these attacks. The perpetrators are youngsters in what the police calls an ecstatic crises of late adolescence. They come from families who suffer the impact of the economic transition experienced in American society. There is great concern in Christian circles. Courses on racism are being organized in Christian religious schools. Also in Latin America there is an ideological growth that causes great concern. It is closely related to economic change in those countries. This trend has repercussions not only on minorities but also on the Church's position on social change and human development. Unfortunately, in most books on "liberation theology", with the exception of Msgr. Mejia's work, there is no reference to the Jews after the Exodus. Thus, the Jews and Judaism in Lain America are still depicted in the medieval pattern. Ideologically speaking, the Jews are not anymore the children of the devile, but of the "establishment" that is exploiting the poor. Great concern is also caused in Argentina by the ideology of "national security", based on the notion of the "Christian concept of life and the fraction of national culture", with obvious danger for religions and ethnic minorities: The Church at Puebla and the Latin American Bishops' Conference has been critical of the theory of national security.

Tanenbaum: Major Catholic, Protestant, Jewish and Black leaders in the U.S. will together take a position, on sound moral grounds, against all manifestations of violence.

Lichten: Reports on events in present-day Poland. It is a case of "anti-Semitism without Jews". After the remnants of the Polish Jewish community were driven out of the country in 1968 by the Polish regime, in 1981, the remaining 4/5.000 Jews were made the scape-goats for the Polish upheavals. The only defence of the Jews came from the circles

of liberal and democratic Catholics in the Solidarnosc Movement.

Riegner:

The situation is very complicated. Jewish organizations have made representations with Polish ambassadors in the West. The question is whether the Polish Church should also come out in support of a clear condemnation of anti-Semitism. Perhaps this should be discussed in Rome in conversations with the Polish Church. I asked a year before the Rue Copernic bomb attack that the French Bishops' Conference express their concern about the rise of anti-Semitism . What has happened since indicated the assumption that the situation was more serious than many of us believed. I want to convey to you today the extremely serious concern of the world Jewish community- particularly since the Copernic incidentabout the rise of neo-Nazism, neo-Fascism, and neo-anti-Semitism in many parts of the world. But we need a clear picture of what is really going on and we have to refrain from easy comparisons to other recent periods of history. Some of us ask them selves, are we again the thirties, are we again approaching cathastrophy. I want to warn

of statistics in general, we need a deeper analysis e,specially in America, nor is protesting against incidents alone the only way. The 'Eighties" are not the "Thirties". There are sharp differences and some similarities and we have to analyze them . Most of the anti-Semitic movements and incidents happened in Europe. In the "thirties" there was a practically anti-Semitic Europe composed of officially anti-Semitic countries, supported by mass movements. There were anti-Semitic governments in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, the Baltic countries. The whole of Eastern and central Europe was anti-Semitic and Nazi-Germany was the key-stone in this development and from there anti-Semitism spread over the whole of Western Europe and even to other parts of the world. Today, we have no anti-Semitic government, no mass-movements supporting such policies but we have hundreds of small groups that have mastered the technique of violence and terrorism. They have learned that a bomb thrown by two or three people can kill 80 people in Bologna, Munich or Antwerp. But no government condones this violence, on the contrary, the deliberations of the Parliament of the Council of Europe most strongly condemn this kind of developments and

instruct member governments to counteract them . This was unthinkable in the "Thirties", so were the mass-demonstrations after Rue Copernic. Our Holocaust generation cannot take such events easily. What are the similarities? In Europe we witness the beginnings of a new racist ideology. In France there are groups like Grece which have succeeded in penetrating into government administrations and the big press, proclaiming the ideology of the inequality of races and of man, based on biological myths and attacking the Jewish inference on the Judec-Christian civilization of today. This is new, but this is also how it starts. Why are there only small groups and no mass movements? The real danger is the following: we are in the midst of a great social and economic crisis in most parts of the world. There is hopelessness facing the youth, unemployment in the millions. The young generation cannot find jobs, we have rising inflation. These are the factors that create situations in which anti-Semitic, neo-Nazi movements become possible. This is the real danger. The nazis would never have come to power in Germany without the seven million unemployed. This is the lesson from the past. What is important is that

today these small groups, more and more, are in contact with each other. You should all view a recent French TV film which clearly shows the interconnections of all these groups, ceptering in Spain, their small size, their stress of violence and military training and a great variety of anti-Semitic propaganda material. There are claims that these groups maintain relations with the PLO and Kheddafi, but in the latter case there is no evidence. What is essential is to devise a real program to combat these groups. One of the main duties of all of us is to see to it that unemployment is at the root of violence and criminality. It is on the social and economic level that the greatest efforts have to be made. These movements are not specifically directed against the Jews, they are set on destabilizing democratic society, but he Jews are the declared central target in this fight. We seem to understand what is really going on. The problem has to be dealt with on the social and economic level.

<u>Talmon:</u> Expresses his doubts as to what could be done by this group on the level of economics.

Feels that many of the young people "opt out" they

do not want to find jobs. There is a new situation.

The possibility in democratic countries of living without working, has created a new attitude.

Higgins: Basically agrees with Riegner. There is a need all over the world for really basic social and economic reform. The wide-spread vandalism in the New York area will not be stopped by public ecumenical statements. Young vandals don't read ecumenical statements. If the U.S. Government thinks that the central problem of today is terrorism, when the poor people of the world think that the central problem is to get enough to eat, we are heading for a very serious crisis. The Church has been accused widely in the past of underestimating the importance of economic and social reform.

Wigoder: Agrees with Riegner that many antiSemitic incidents are needlessly blown up in the media. There are some major sources of antiSemitism today in the world that have not been mentioned here, the Soviet Union, the attempt, all over the world, to deny the legitimacy of the State of Israel, and the denial of the Holocaust.

Ehrlich: According to the latest German Government research on right-wing extremism, 13% of the German population is anti-democratic, authoritarian, anti-Semitic but the majority of this 13% are over 55 years of age. There are 22 small neo-nazi groups in Western Germany.

AMERICAN IEWISH

Bishop K. Flügel: Sees the necessity to counteract anti-Semitic tendencies in Germany with well-written basic pamphlets, explaining that the Jews are not the cause of the economic crisis, unemployment and immorality.

Mejia: Anti-Semitism deeply worries Catholics; particular concern is felt at the Holy See. Adds another dimension to anti-Semitic phenomena: a kind of general break-down of moral and religious values. Suggests Jewish-Catholic joint reaction not only to the social and economic causes of anti-Semitism, of terrorism, and other evils. Perhaps until 20 years ago the Churches were at least partially responsible because of their "teaching of contempt". In the present situation, we are all in the same boat and it represents a great challenge to both of us together.

Jenkins: Reports on the wide-spread anti-Israeli attitudes in England and the upsurge of attempts to deny the Holocaust. Denounces wide-spread ignorance and lack of interest in Jewish-Christian issues.

Dupuy: Maintains that there is a link between terrorism and anti-Semitism. We tend to overemphasize the ideological dimension, and to play down the economical and political angle. As far as France is concerned, today the Communist party is the primary source of anti-Semitism. In the wake of the Copernic synagogue bombing there was an amazing confusion in the analyses of the facts.

Shuster: There is no political movement or government now in Western Europe advocating anti-Semitism. But the fragility of democratic institutions in Europe is becoming more and more visible and the young generation is becoming depoliticized. The Churches in France, after Rue Copernic, have come out unhesitatingly, sincerely, spectacularly against anti-Semitism. We ignore who is really responsible for major and minor manifestations of anti-Semitism, what are the international connections of those groups. Expresses pessimism as to the efficacy of educational methods to combat anti-

Semitism in the young generation. Israel is used both by the extreme Right and Left as a pretext to spread prejudice. We have to set up a process of clarification for educational purposes.

Tanenbaum: Emphasizes that anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism are being used to destabilize Western democratic society. Thus, it is a broad human problem, it is also a problem for the Catholic Church in its self-interest.

<u>Fisher:</u> Agrees with Tanenbaum and stresses the importance of the educational effort in the Catholic community.

Riegner: The Jews are not the center in this struggle, they are one of the targets, the principal target is the destabilization of the Democratic order. Makes a formal appeal: I believe that one of the major tasks today is the fight against unemployment. The Catholic Church has links to great political parties in Europe which can play a major role in changing the policies of European governments.

I also believe that together we can create a coordination of education. Mentions the recent

Conference of Youth leaders sponsored by the Council of Europe. We have to concentrate our action on those who are the multiplyers among the younger generation. Together with the competent Church bodies, we could perhaps develop this kind of contacts between young people to combat these dangers to democratic society, to stress the necessity of defending human rights.

Talmon: We should not lose sight of the effects of the world-wide campaign for the de-legitimazation of the State of Israel and the simultaneous one for the legitimization of the PLO.

Afternoon Session, April 2, 1982

Chairman: Msgr. R. Torrella

c) Developments in the Field of Religious Liberty

Riegner: When one reads the document by the Pope on freedom of conscience and of religion which was sent to the Heads of States, signatories of the Helsinki Final Act, you will find on the last three pages a catalogue of definitions of religious liberty rights. If one compares it with the document which the World Jewish Congress has submitted a year ago to the United Nations, one will be struck by the

similarities sometimes even by the identity of the formulations of a good number of principles; calls attention to the Draft Declaration as now adopted by the Human Rights Commission. It took 19 years to get this text approved due to sabotage and obstructionism from the Soviet and Muslim block. This year it was completed, thanks also to the very close cooperation between the Vatican representatives and our own people. A number of formulations were drafted together and written together. The Declaration was finally unanimously accepted, with the abstention of the Eastern and Muslim Block. With all its shortcomings, the Declaration means a big step forward in the struggle for religious liberty. Believes there should be Catholic-Jewish cooperation in this field also in the future and see to it that this Declaration be transformed finally into a legally binding international instrument. Expresses Jewish appreciation for the letter by the Pope.

d) Misinterpratation of Judaism in some Current Christian Teaching:

No discussion took place owing to the absence of Rabbi Mandelbaum.

e) Misinterpretation of Christianity in some Current Jewish Teaching

Mejia: Catholics are well aware that the Jews do not have a central authority, as Catholics have, that can control or take notice of misinterpretations of Christianity. Nor have the Jews anything like the Christian "teaching of contempt". Gives as an example Shalom Ben Chorin's book "Unser Bruder Jesus", which, apart from being far from scientific, offends Christian sensibilities in many ways. Jewish modern writings in general also contain other topics which may be offensive to Christian readers such as the "doctrine of faith and works" which represents a major distortion of Christian thought, because it claims that the Christian commitment rests on faith alone.

Ehrlich: Shalom Ben Chorin is a non-scholarly writer who caters for a group of Protestants in Germany.

Mejia: Wonders if the general Jewish reader does have access to books like Ben Chorin's. Another book in this class is a volume by Abraham Livni.

<u>Dupuy:</u> The author is a Catholic convert to Judaism, the book has not yet appeared. It is a typical work of a convert and hence rather disturbing.

<u>Fisher:</u> Lists a number of Jewish books and articles in the United States which contain typical misunderstandings of Christianity.

<u>Talmon:</u> The only way to counteract this trend is to write to the author and the publisher, or writing scathing reviews.

Le Deaut: Both Jews and Christians, also on the scholarly level, repeat notions about each other which go back to the Middle Ages.

Msgr. Torrella's closing remarks

Torrella: Thanks to all of you. We share an experience of the commitment to a true and sincere dialogue. In my opinion our London meeting was one of the best, but certainly some tensions remain. Hopefully these tensions can be transformed into new hope for the future.

THE CHALLFIGE OF SECULARISM TO RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT

Much has been written in the last twenty years about secularisation and its effects on religions and on the Churches. These notes are intended only to offer an introduction to the problem and to provide a basis for comparison of our respective religious experiences.

Secularisation is commonly understood as that progressive emancipation of society and culture from the control of institutional religions which has marked western civilisation in recent centuries. The term 'secularism' seems to have appeared for the first time in the programme of the 'London Secular Society' founded by Holyoake in 1846, where it meant a life interpreted and regulated wholly without reference to God and religion. Here is a typically western phenomenon, made up of two forms of historical experience: the Church, the depositary of a magisterium and an authority "from above", becomes marginal to life and the coming of the industrial revolution transforms the economic and cultural forms of the old, agrarian society.

But from western Europe the phenomenon has spread almost throughout the planet taking on forms and features which vary more or less according to the religious forms and the types of society it met with.

It is proper then to speak of different 'models' of secularisation existing today. Take for example the notion, fairly common today, of a 'secular state'. This is one thing in Italy, another in Great Britain where the queen is crowned by the archbishop of Canterbury, another still in U.S.A, in U.S.S.R, in Turkey, in Israel, in Indonesia, in India, in Mali and Nigeria, these last two being states which, though secular, form part of the Conference of Islamic States. (2)

There are then different models of secularization according to the point of departure and of arrival, or if you like according to the types of religious structures which have been done away with in the secular state. Together with this variety of models of secularization there is also a variety of linguistic patterns which express it, patterns and meanings which throw light on this or that particular aspect in the spectrum of secularization: thus we talk of rationalism, of laicism, of scientism, of agnostocism, of atheism, of positivism, of desacralizatic etc., according to which element stands out in this or that model of secularism. For really secularism signifies many things. It stands in opposition to a sacral world, and invites us to look at things no longer sub specie aeternitatis, or ratione peccati, but to consider them only in their ontological make-up and what they can yield from a temporal standpoint.

According to John E.Smith their are five characteristic marks of the secular attitude - autonomy, technology, voluntarism (and individualism), temporalism and aestheticism (3). We may add pluarlism, permissiveness, consumism and other things according to the levels of local cultures, their variety and the choices they offer. It is certain that the secular outlook sets a profane autonomy in opposition to a heteronomy rooted in the sacred, and instead of a subordination of all life and culture to religion it insists on the distinction, the separation, the emancipation of the temporal and the pushing aside, the radical exclusion of religion and of God.

"Dwarf either you or I: Zwerg, Du oder Ich" cries Zarathustra, putting

in the most drastic way the alternatives which will be repeated by all the pundits of secularism. (4)

Historians have analysed closely the steps which have led 2. progressively to the elimination of the dominant and unifying role of religions in the west. The "naissance de I'esprit laique" (5) is assigned to the 13th century as taking shape in the conflict between the state or the commune, both anxious to assert their own 'lay' authority, and the Church which claimed to have 'religious' authority even over political life. It is enough to think of the bull Unam Sanctam (1302) of Boniface VIII: "Oportet temporalem auctoritatem spirituali subici potestati". In succeeding centuries secularization progresses in all fields of thought and life. Secularization of the state and of politics, begun by Marsiglio of Padua who, with the Defensor pacis (1324) lays the foundations of the modern 'lay' state, is continued by Macchiavelli who proclaims the autonomy of politics from all moral law, and by Hobbes who makes the state the source and depositary of all human rights. Secularization of law begins with the renascence of Roman law and continues both with the assertion of Huig de Groot (Grotius) that natural law would be valid "etiamsi daremus non esse Deum" and with the view that the only law that exists is "positive" law of which the state is the origin and guarantee. The secularization of culture and of art of which the first signs are already there in the Roman de la Rose (1260-1280) is completed in the period of humanism and the Renaissance. The secularization of science begins with Nicholas of Cusa, Copernicus and Galileo, who claim autonomy for

scientific knowledge in the face of theology. Finally there is 'the secularization of philosophy, which detaches itself from theology of which it had been considered the 'handmaid', and makes an independent place for itself, even to the point of setting itself up in opposition to theology. (6)

Such a process of secularization did not happen, obviously, without shocks or without opposition from the Church and in general from religious institutions rooted in 'tradition'. But the movement was irreversible and took fire in the great revolutions of the end of the 18th century, when the whole Atlantic area was shaken by a revolutionary fever (America 1770-83, England and Irelan 1780-83, the Low Countries, Switzerland, Sweden, Poland, France etc.) If until then euro-atlantic societies were outwardly and officially ' christian; if institutions, the calendar, feast-days were inspired by christianity; if man, held to be weak and liable to error, lived in the framework of a community, subject to prohibitions, bound to observances which were upheld also by civil legislation (the secular arm) for fear he should fall into heresy, schism, libertinage, sin; if religious differences, for examples those of the Jewish communitie were barely tolerated and under social pressures and discrimination; after the revolutions the lay state, pluralistic, secularised, separated from the Church, came to birth. In many societies of former believers the Church even began to be felt as an alien thing Enlightenment culture recalled man to maturity and to be attacked. and to the critical task of sifting every acquisition by subjecting ' it to the test of reason, and reason became allergic to everything that savoured of the supra-rational, like divine intervention in history, miracles, revelation, metaphysics and so on. Kant, while he declared reason impotent in metaphysics, called for its mastery over the ethical and the religious; before him, G.E. Lessing reduced revelation to a "pädagogisches Kunstgriff" of reason, which is expressed in 'natural religion'.

In the 19th century the process of secularization passed steadily from the bourgeois élite to the masses, finding a powerful ally in industrialisation primed by technological progress. The same century saw the rise of fiercely anti-religious teachers whose influence is still strong in our generation: Feuerbach, Nietzsche and Freud: expressions like "God is dead", "this old God no longer lives, he is utterly dead", "the god of gaps" (Lückenbüsser) and "I teach you about superman" belong to Nietzsche's "Also Sprach Zarathustra", which for me is the summa of modern secularism and its contradictions. They represent the end of an age-long process, and everything that has been said since, from the "nausea" of J.P. Sartre to the lack of rationality and sense heralded by Foucault finds its roots in this work. According to it man, his reason, his liberty, his activity should not only be freed from the control of religion and from christian or Jewish morality but should proclaim themselves autonomous and free in determining what is good or evil, if indeed it is still possible to speak of evil.

What are the social and psychological consequences of this process which has led to the removal of the sacred, of God of the Church from the fabric of society? I will confine myself to a few pointers. Above all the secularisation process, by declaring faith, religion, the Church "irrelevant", i.e. without meaning, has led whole masses to lose taste for and abandon religion, carrying them easily towards indifferentism, agnosticism and practical atheism. In place of absolute Truth and Good to be sought wholeheartedly, mundane and earthly values have been pushed to the fore and absolutized in accordance with capricious scales of value which give privileged status to "consumer goods". At the same time man, freed from a transcendental moral code, wishes more and more to be fre and autonomous, rejecting every imposition which could hinder his freedom of choice. Thus is born the ideology of libertarian and anarchical radicalism. At the same time however the secularized world has witnessed the rise and spread of innumerable substitute religions which can be variously identified today in individual and social phenomena which hold the stage such as the cult of stardom, eastern religions, naturism, occultism, astrology, to say nothing of para-religions, utopian or revolutionary ideologies which have captured the imagination of many young people. It seems too that we must put down to the great religious vaccum that creeping disquiet written of by Nietzsche as "grosse Sehnsucht" towards another shore, towards another man

which, not by accident is one of the main themes of "Also Sprach Zarathustra"

How has the Church reacted to the process of secularization ? I refer in the first place to the Catholic Church which has taken up a position with condemnations and reproofs which teem in the ecclesiastical documents of the last century, continuing we may say until the middle of the present century. I say so because on this point too the pontificate of John XXIII marks a turn to a more serene and constructive attitude rooted in profound reasons belonging to the faith itself. Another spontaneous reaction of the Church, at least in some of its parts, was to transform religion, expelled by society, into an inward experience, individual and pietistic, practically dissociating it from any connection with the realities of life and history. A recent work, Parler du salut by Elizabeth Germain, studies the effects in France of the "preaching of salvation" during the period of the Restoration (1815-1830), analysing the sermons preached at missions to the people, the texts of catechisms and the courses of spiritual exercises given to specialised groups. The general impressions is one of a decided divorce of religion from the world. A typical hymn entitled "Le Salut" by St Louis Grignon de Montfort (1817) says -

Nous n'avons a faire Que notre salut. C'est là notre but. C'est la notre unique affaire. That is our only business.

We have nothing to work at But our salvation. That is our purpose.

Another celebrated preacher Fr. Croiset asserted in a meditation for the 6th October: "L'esprit de recuillement et de retraite est nécessaire pour faire son salut dans toutes d'états.... tout est piège dans le monde" (7)* All that, as Fr. Yves Congar observed, resulted in a "religion without the world" to which corresponded a world without religion. You could observe, the distinguished theologian goes on, the absence or inadequacy of the following articles in the enormous (yet how useful) Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique, 41,338 columns in 15 huge volumes published between under the word Profession there is an article "Professions of faith"; under metier (trade) nothing; under work nothing; under profene(lay) nothing; under family nothing; under woman nothing; under paternity nothing, under maternity nothing; under love, a third of a column divided thus: "love of God cf. charity; love of neighbour cf. charity; self-love, some lines with a cross reference to ambition; pure love cf. charity; but on human love as such, nothing; under the word friendship, nothing. Under happiness, a third of a column with a reference to the article "beatitude"; under the word life and article 'eternal life'; under body an article on glorified bodies; under sex, nothing; under pleasure nothing; under joy, nothing; under suffering, nothing; under illness an article which begins like this "under this word we group various cases of exemption from the law which the sick enjoy because of the bad state of their health".

^{*} A spirit of recollection and retreat is necessary in all circumstances to achieve salvation. Everything in the world is a snare.

Under evil there are twenty-five columns; under economy, nothing; under politics, nothing, under power a long article of 103 columns (four times as much as there is on evil) on 'the temporal power of the pope'! Under Technology, nothing; under Science another long article divided into four sections: sacred science, the science of God, the science of angels and of souls separated from their bodies, the science of Christ....but on what we call science, nothing. Under art a long article on primitive Christian art; under beauty, nothing; under value nothing; under person one line; "see hypostasis"; under history, nothing; under earth, nothing; under world, nothing; under layman and laity nothing except an article on laicism stigmatised as a heresy. (8)

5. But that is not the full story of the Church's reaction to secularism. This was much deeper and healther and began to be expressed in concrete and positive ways from the middle of the 20th century. This was thanks to the biblical, patristic and liturgical studies which were already decisively in train at the end of the 19th century and in the first years of the 20th. Because of these studies the christian faith breathed more freely and not only did not resign itself to secularism but confronted it positively, re-establishing connection with the mainstream of its origins and traditions. In this way it was discovered that the Bible already contains surprising pointers on the theme of secularisation, that is on the intrinsic character of cosmic and human realities, on their relation with the divine and sacred and on the inherent meaning of history which is moving towards an end. According to the Bible, all created reality, from the protological to the eschatological, has a meaning and is in movement towards and end and so is buoyed up by a hope which is not

only individual bu social and cosmic.

The first pages of Genesis already demolish the mythological and sacral conceptions of the environment: the struggles, the marriages, the generations, the jealousies, artistic invention, the founding of cities, all these things in the bible are removed from the world of the divine and regarded as part of the human creative patrimony, just as the stars, the animals, the plants, minerals are creatures. They are at man's disposal and form part of his history. There is no need then to regall, here the epic struggle of the prophets against the cult of the high places (Bamoth and asherah) bound up with a sacral view of the cosmic forces mythologised under the names of Baal, Astarte, etc., prophets too who protest against the ritualisation of faith and of relationship with God: "I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hates; Wash yourselves, make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression; defend the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Isaiah I,11,14, 16-18)

The reflection of wisdom literature went even farther, with the Psalms, Job, Qohelet (Ecclesiastes), to the point of agreeing on the practical uselessness of worship, of prayer even of pledges to observe God's law.....without however abjuring faith!

Deuteronomy (XII, 15-20) makes no difficulty about allowing the killing of animals for domestic use, departing from the more archaic rules of Leviticus (XVII, 2-6) which made all butchery a sacrificial action requiring the intervention of a priest. In the Gospel the process of secularisation continues: Jesus distinguishes clearly between the things of Caesar and the things of God (Natt. XXII, 21)

St Mark notes that Jesus "declared all foods clean (VII, 19)

St Paul exhorts the christians of Rome "to present your bodies as a living sacrifice holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship" (Pom. XII,1) and in St John's Gospel Jesus tells the woman of Samaria that the time is past for discussing which temple to worship in, because "the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth" (John IV, 23). It is known that Christians, like Jews, often paid in blood for their refusal to give divine honours to the deified genius of Rome and of the Empire present in the emperor; similarly Christians and Jews were accused of atheism because they shunned the sacral and mythical emblems with which the society and culture of the time abounded. Both of them claimed, and after much suffering obtained the freedom to act in public and in private in accordance with their own religious conscience. Today there is agreement in recognising in those pages of Christian-Jewish history the first vindication of the secular conscience in the West: they stand at the foundation of western civilisation.

The process of secularisation in this way gave rise to effects which were beneficial to the Church's understanding of herself.

She was driven to concentrate on essentials, that is on the proclamation of the religious message, without temporal compromises. At the same time she was helped to recognise the ontological density of cosmic and human realities and to respect their internal laws and their autonomy in their own order. The temptation to find in the bible the answer to everything receded, and the realisation hardened that there were a series of twin principles for the building of culture and of the moral order itself - i.e. faith and reason, revelation and conscience, the religious and the lay sphere. It was thus that Vatican II was able to speak openly of the rightful autonomy of earthly realities

"If by this autonomy we understand that created things and society itself have their own laws and values which man must gradually learn, use and control, it is perfectly right to insist on it. It is not only the concern of our contemporaries — it is in harmony with the Creator's will. It is a feature of creation that all things have their own stability, truth goodness; their inner law and coherence which man should respect, recognizing the methods proper to each of the sciences and artsIt is right then to regret that habit of mind which has sometimes existed among Christians who failed to appreciate the proper autonomy of science." (Gaudium et Spes 36)

On this point the Church stands apart from Islamic fundamentalism which subjects every expression of life and culture to the binding dictate of the Shariat, whether for the individual of in the social, political and economic order. It is known in fact that the Shariat represents a complete code, of divine origin, and embraces in binding fashion the whole of reality.

Because of all this the distinction has become current in Christian language between secularism and secularity, between laicism and lay status (or the lay condition) a distinction which suggest that judgement on the vexed process of secularization should not be simply negative. Secularity like lay status "point to the autonomy of earthly realities as against ecclesiastical institutions, and the affirming of their value in themselves apart from any reference to religious or supernatural values.... They have meaning and value in themselves and can be ends worth pursuing for themselves,

even though they must always be subordinate to the final end which is God.... Secularism by contrast (parallel with laicism) indicates a kind of immanentist and atheist ideology totally closed to transcendence and to religious values...; it indicates the absolutising of worldly and earthly values, the exclusion of God from the world and from life, the rejection of religious values not only as "irrelevant" but as estranging man and the world". (9)

We rule out secularism then and welcome secularity as the serene and positive acceptance of values developed by history and by modern culture, even in controversy with religion, and we do not dream of putting the clock back. Vatican II declared honestly that the Church should listen to the voices of the modern world, from which it can and should draw lessons - even from the voices of those in conflict with it. (Gaudium et Spes No.44)

"In our opinion", we read in a 'Civiltà Cattolica' editorial, "it is necessary to distinguish in modern culture between the values it has gained and its improper absolutising of those values.

There are values in modern culture which constitute a genuine advance for man's freedom, respect for man's dignity and rights, the thirst for equality and justice and hence the rejection of all forms of inequality and discrimination whether political, economic, cultural or religious, the spirit of tolerance, pluralism, the spirit of dialogue, secularity, lay status and the autonomy of earthly realities, the sense of history, the value of historical engagement, the value of the body and earthly realities, the feeling that humanity has a historical

plan to work out to create a more just and peaceful world. the danger is that these values in modern culture will become absolute and in a certain sense divinised. Man then becomes, as Marx says, the 'supreme being', freedom becomes impatience of every moral principle, reason becomes rationalism, secularity becomes secularism, the historical sense becomes historicism, lay*status becomes laicism. respect for the body and for earthly things becomes materialism." (10) We thus touch the real point at which secularism is overcome, the tangent of faith and secular realities. of "just autonomy", or of an autonomy which is not absolute but relative. Relative, not , in the sense of being imaginary or counterfeit or curtailed, but in that it finds its laws written in the fibres of a being which, since it is of the created order, is referable ultimately to God from whom it derives. In this sense we speak of true but 'relative' autonomy, that is recognising an ultimate relation to the Creator and to his purposes for history. Hence it is a matter of finding by the light of faith the ultimate meaning of human and cosmic realities, starting from man and his culture (noosphere) to reach out to the whole ambit of life (biosphere) and, beyond that, to the realm of cosmic matter itself. Nothing that exists in the created universe is of itself sacred and divine, but everything can and should be referred and ordained by man to the Author of creation and redemption Nothing is sacred, nothing divine in itself, but everything can be 'consecrated'. For man, christian tradition in harmony with biblical data announces the great end of theosis or divinisation which is geared to his transcendental dimension and vocation, manifest in an

unquenchable thirst for the infinite which urges him on and makes him an untiring "searcher after God". For all realities outside and below the human, relationship to God is written into their situation as creatures.

It might be said that secularization, in trying to eliminate religious outreach from things and from history, has really only brought about the collapse of external structures which could be seen to be superstructures or to divide reality into compartments, and has stimulated believers to rediscover the pofound and eschatological relation which every being and the whole of history has to God the Beginning and End. This is why for thirty years we have seen a rush of theologies of historical and earthly realities, theologies which someone has drily called "theologies of the genitive". It is enough to cite such enterprises as 'theology' of liberation, of work, of history, of pain, of love, of death, of marriage, of the family, of politics, of economics and so on. These are explorations and essays still partial and sometimes faltering, but there seems no doubt that they are destined to prepare the way for a new and great theological vision - the cogitatio, the expressio fidei in the secularized world.

It is all an effort to give religious belief contemporary expression and to bring it into the spirit of our age which is marked by the by Sciences, by technology, pluralism, ideologies. Believers should find, in faithfulness to their own religious consciousness and to the appeals of contemporary humanity, answers to problems which preceding generations solved by consulting the bible, often in an over-literal

and uncritical fashion; above all, they are called to live, pray and celebrate their own faith in the setting of those realities of life and history in which they find themselves.

One other aspect before we finish. Secular society, which no longer numbers faith among its binding demands, has led the Church to examine more closely the existential status of faith, forcing it to point to freedom of choice and complete absence of all external compulsion as the normal and necessary premisses of faith. This was solemnly expressed, though not without much discussion given the many question marks connected with it, in the decree Dignitatis Humanae published by the Second Vatican Council an October 28, 1965.

In secular society the Church asks for nothing more than liberty of religious profession - which is not simply the same as freedom of worship. Indeed it is clear that

"the faith is lived in a religious community, and so requires education in faith. Hence a society which would hinder the Church or religious community, or place obstacles in the way of this its essential task, would be not merely a secular or lay society but secularist and laicist and to that extent a denier of the values of freedom". (11)

But there is more to it than that. It is legitimate to ask the believer who calls for liberty of faith; "liberty for what?" The answer will be; to give social witness to the values implicit in faith itself and to permeate human society and culture with its flavour. Vatican II's decree on religious freedom affirms that

"it comes within the meaning of religious freedom that religious bodies should not be prohibited from freely

undertaking to show the special value of their doctrine in what concerns the organisation of society and the inspiration of the whole of human activity."

But here the question arises: how can this be realised in a secularised and pluralist society without yielding to the temptation to seek to destroy the very foundations of this society and go back to social integralism of a religious mould? The words which count here are dialogue and balance. As V. Miano wisely puts it:

"In a secularised society it is more difficult for the christian to achieve a just balance between wanting to impose, in the name of faith, solutions which emerge rather from specialised knowledge and analysis(integralism) and sacrificing, through a misconceived respect for the liberty of others, indispensable points of his own vision of man and society, as though the faith had nothing to say in this regard. Secularised society is a pluralistic society, which takes for granted respect for the freedom of others (which has its proper limits in fundamental human rights and in the general welfare) and dialogue between the various elements making up society, but for the christian this dialogue cannot mean losing his own identity; rather it should be a motive for affirming that identity in a spirit of collaboration". (12)

Essential points are touched on here: affirmation of our own identity, respect for the identity of others, dialogue, collaboration, a right balance in coexistence with those who differ from us, search for the common welfare, lucidity about fundamental human rights. But the theme which the Church has put forward with most fervour is dialogue, on which the contribution of M. Buber is undisputed.

Thanks to dialogue the christian and every other religious man can reach agreements and become along with others a promoter of personal and social values for the whole community. I am happy on such an occasion as this to be able to cite as in every way exemplary the offer of collaboration which the Chief Rabbi of Rome, Dr. E. Toaff made to Pope John Paul II on February 8th this gear: "There are too many things which we have in common in the struggle which we are forced to carry on in the world around us: a struggle to affirm the dignity of man seen, as a mirror of the divine image; a struggle for the right to life from the moment when it first manifests itself recognising as we do that God alone has the right to give it or take it away; a struggle to assert the rights of the family, its cohesion and its morality; a struggle against drugs which kill the weak and the outcasts and for the realisation of a more just society where all can have access to those good things which the Lord has granted to mankind; a struggle finally for human rights and for religious freedom. I am confident that faith in the Lord and in our common ideals will make for an advance in collaboration and understanding between the Jews of Rome and the Church". (13)

Before concluding I would like to allude again to a series of challenges for the expression of the faith in the midst of a secular society: first and foremost it is a question of channelling this expression into more flexible and functional structures; of renewing the language in which we present the faith and its values; of studying ways and contexts for transmitting it in a society less

attached to socially expressed religious signs (a point on which christians can certainly learn from Jews); of presenting the religious message as an enhancement, a fulfilment of life, liberation and human welfare instead of as opposition, as shackling and alienating; of looking for space for freedom in totalitarian and coercive societies (search for a modus vivendi, for social agreements, for concordats); and last but not least of stimulating a new creativity in celebration and in worship itself so that it may find a true setting (be "contextualised" in the jargon of the moment) in the life and culture of every society. This creativity should be woven of beauty, truth and goodness, and promote devotion, knowledge and action. Here is a call to manifest the profound vitality of religious faith in the broad setting of the secular city. Alongside worship, often celebrated in the varied forms of association which are dotted about in the secular city, we must bear in mind the phenomenon of voluntary activity . for social service, in which young people and whole communities under religious inspiration offer themselves to help those who suffer or who find themselves for any reason in emergencies (the old, the handicapped, drug addicts, victims of natural disaster etc.,). In these innumerable groups of volunteers who offer themselves disinterestedly in the name of their own faith, I would not hesitate to see one of the noblest expressions of religious faith in the framework of the secular city.

P. Possano.

HOTES

- 1) Cfr. J.Brown, Men and Gods in a changing World,
 London, SCM Press, 1980, p.11
- The western pattern of the secular state and the condemnations of it can be seen in the recommendations of the 5th meeting of the Human Rights Seminar in Islam (Kuwait, Dec. 9-14,1980)

 "As there is no such religious establishment (like the Church) in Islam, and as all authority is delegated by God, the Conference draws the attention of Muslim states who have opted for secularism to the fact that in doing so they have misinterpreted Islam and wrongly regarded it as similar to the Churches in the West".
- J.E.Smith, Experience and God, New York, Oxford University Press. 1968, p.480 ss.
- 4) F. Nietzsche. Also Sprach Zarathustra, III, I, Augsburg Goldmann Verlag 1980, p.127
- 5) Cfr. G.de Lagarde, La naissance de l'esprit laique au déclin du Moyen Age, Louvain-Paris 1956
- 6) G. de Rosa, Indifferenza religiosa e secolarizzazione, in <u>L'Indifferenza religiosa</u>, as edited by the Secretariat for non-believers, Rome, 1978, p.131
- 7) E.Germain, Parler du salut? aux origines d'une mentalité religieuse, Paris, Beauchesne, 1968, p.14-15
- 8) Y.Congar, "Situation Ecclesiologique au moment de "Ecclesiam Suam" Seminaire sull' encyclique "Ecclesiam suam" organized by the Paul VI foundation, Rome 1980
- 9) G.de Rosa, Lc. cit. p.132
- 10) Civiltà Cattolica, Fede cristiana e mondo moderno, 15 marzo 1980, p.529-30
- V.Miano, Missione della Chiesa in un mondo secolarizzato, in
 Evangelizzazione e cultura. Atti del Congresso Int.
 scientifico di Missiologia, 1975, Vol. II, Rome
 Pont. Univ. Urbaniana, 1976, p.490

MOTES

- 12) V.Miano, Ic, cit. p. 491
- 13) Osservatore Romano, 9 February 1981

TRANSLATOR'S NOTES

- 1) p.6 six lines from the end:

 the cult of stardom. This stands for the useful but not easily translatable Italian divismo which designates the kind of quasi-religious adulation accorded (usually popularly) to leading figures in the cinema, television, sport, etc., but also sometimes to political and religious personalities.
- 2) passim

lay status. This stands for the Italian laicità, which disignates not a theory or doctrine so much as the condition of a society in which the laity and lay concerns are given a proper autonomy and independence. It entails no opposition to religion, whereas laicismo laicism, is a doctrinaire attitude which in its extreme form opposes and rejects religion as 'irrelevant', etc.,

Dr. Nachum L. Rabinovitch:

The Challenge of Secularism to Religious Commitment

(a Jewish view)

"Secularism" certainly implies a rejection of every form of religious faith or worship. But we should be historically extrelemy naive to suppose that this rejection is all there is to secularism. In the great ages of religion, religious doctrines and religious institutions played a dominant role. Organized religion determined much of the structure of society, while religious teachings articulated the meaningfulness of these structures as well as the significance of the lives of the believers. David said, "For we are strangers before Thee and sojourners as all our fathers were; our days on earth are like a shadow and there is no hope". - Such is the human condition and to that religion bravely addresses itself. The religious approach may perhaps be schematically summed up thereby. By making sense of the world, man can discover familiar landmarks to lessen his fear of the strangeness of it all. By groping for eternity, the fleetingness and transience of life is transcended. By reaching out for God, man can find hope. In the western world, it seems that the decline of

religion and the spectacular rise of secularism came about at least partly because the religious approach lost its credibility.

Paradoxically, it ceased to be acceptable because it offered too much.

In the closed relatively small medieval world the model of a hierarchically ordained, providentially determined universe provided genuine understanding. All of nature's secrets could be known, and between them revelation and "the philosopher" had taught all that needs to be known. Man could be throughly at home at the centre of the universe. Eternity was there for the taking and redemption was already assured.

The scientific revolution shattered the almost comfortable familiarity of the world. Suddenly man
found him self again a stranger astride a small planet, wandering aimlessly in space. Religion could
no longer cope, but more importantly it could no
longer be trusted, for it refused to acknowledge
the validity of what had been discovered. Triumphalist religion could admit only a situation in which
it knew all the answers. But more and more people
became convinced that it did not. What is more,
the progress of scientific inquiry indicated that

truth could be discovered a little bit at a time, and that hope too could be of this world as well as the next. Another look at Sacred Scripture with its emphasis on the dignity and worth of the individual human soul, together with a new sense of confidence bred of great explorations and technological advance gave birth to a belief in the possibility of progress brought about by human effort. An immediate consequence was the acceptance of the worth whileness of material progress, and thus the character of the social and political structure of society became a major concern. Here too, a re-examination of the religious heritage provided a powerful inspiration to seek to build a just society. Triumphalist religion, though, persisted in its exclusivist stance. It saw itself not only as a repository of truth and hope, but refused to acknowledge that either might also be found elsewhere. This claim was backed up by ruthless oppression, pitiless persecution and bloody wars.

Out of such ingredients — on the one hand, a bright new optimistic vision of human capacity for progress, and, on the other, profound disillusionment, with the exaggerated triumphalism of religious institutions — secularism grew to become a major force.

Secularism gave us much to be grateful for. A new openness to reason swept away much crippling superstition, a new awareness of pluralism recognized the worth of differing points of view and extended personal liberty. A new strong self-image encouraged progress, upward social and economic mobility and the development of democratic political institutions.

Many Jews welcomed the spread of secularism.

Most often the victims of triumphalism, we stood to benefit from the new freedoms.

But as so often happens in the history of culture and human affairs, success and power corrupt. Secularism developed all the trappings of institutionalized religion and became triumphalist on its own. The justified emphasis on the discovery of nature's truth was wildly extrapolated to become a crushing materialism. The great unknown, the abiding mystery of existence, these came to be denied altogether. Out poured the pagan lust to manipulate the world and its gods that lurks never far beneath the level of human consciousness. As eternity became irrelevant, the ego became insatiable. Man sought to become God and in the process became thoroughly dehumanized and brutalized.

The bright morning of universal liberation became a hideously terrifying darkness of rampant evil. Auschwitz and Gulag became the parameters the crazed chaos which seized humanity. And then ominously overhanging the globe the great mushroom cloud of nuclear annihilation. Since the second world war, the secularist has lost his selfconfidence and there has been a steady rise in all kinds of religious and pseudo-religious phenomena. The position of religion has acquired heightened prestige in society. The Journeys of the Pope attract world-wide attention, far greater than heads of state. Yet, it is clear that religious teaching is not taken seriously. And for increasing millions religion has little of consequence to say on the important decisions of their lives. There is a widespread feeling that we are strangers in a hostile and dangerous environment, that our days are numbered under the shadow of nuclear holocaust, that we have lost control of our destiny, if we ever had it, and there is no hope. Can religion light up the darkness? It seems to me that there is now a great need and a great opportunity for the religious message to be heard. Perhaps we should take an object lesson from the events in Iran.

Although the history I spoke of is not theirs, the confrontation with a form of secularism and especially with modern technology is their problem too. The resurgence of a triumphalist exclusivist religion is clearly not going to be a satisfactory solution. It is already wallowing in pools of blood and no end is in sight. In the west, the process of secularization went on until religion was virtually pushed aside to the periphery of civilization. Can it make a comeback? Ought it to? Obviously, as believers ourselves, we have the conviction of our faith. Clearly, we should not be here if we did not trust in the truth that is ours. Yet the possession of truth is not sufficient. Truth can be prostituted by falsehood. The essential challenge of secularism is that in some forms of religion the dress of hubris, of presumption, and even sheer humbug, disguises the truth beyond recognition. The words of David we began with perhaps sum it up best. After describing man's predicament: "For we are strangers before Thee and sojourners... our days on the earth are like a shadow, and there is no hope", he continues: "I know, my God, that Thou triest the heart and Thou desirest uprightness".

Before we can speak to man about God, each according to our own faith's commitment, we must be sure that our hearts are clean, that our actions are upright.

We must renounce false claims to knowledge that we do not have. We must acknowledge the inviolable rights of all men to use their God-given souls to serve their Maker as He has taught them. In setting our sights for eternity we dare not overlook or brook injustice or oppression in this transient world. In reaching out to God we must not forsake suffering man.

A religion which equivocates on pluralism will not earn nor deserve the confidence of thinking men.

Man is indeed in search of God but we can only show the way if we honestly admit that we too are in search.

Are there then no certainties of faith? Indeed there are, but these are matters of the heart. What can be shown for all to see? It is written. He has showed you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you, but to do justice and to love kindness and to walk humbly with your God. Religion needs to act decisively not only to alleviate pain but to do justice. Religion needs to cultivate

not only love of God but love of kindness. Religion needs to speak not with authority but with humility. Then it will be heard.

Surely in all these areas, all believers can co-operate, why not joint research into social, economic and ethical problems? Why not co-operative study of political questions and matters of international law? Why not a combined campaign to promote peace studies?

To get back to David who said: In the uprightness of my heart I have freely offered all these things, and I have seen thy people offering freely and joyously to Thee. If we set the example, it will be followed.