



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Preserving American Jewish History

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

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 48, Folder 10, Vatican - Palestine Liberation Organization,
1981.

On the PLO-Vatican meeting, each of the Jewish delegates spoke forcefully of their sense of outrage over Cassaroli's official meeting with the PLO, thereby appearing to throw a mantle of sanctity and legitimation over this foremost terrorist group. There were no indications publicly that the Holy See ever confronted the PLO group with the moral duty of giving up its designs to try to destroy Israel and its commitment to violence and terrorism.

Zach Shuster and I pointed out that on March 19th, Khaddoumi called a press conference on Vatican City premises during which he claimed that not only the Vatican but Pope John Paul II himself "expressed solidarity" with the PLO's policies and views on Jerusalem, a Palestinian state, Israel's return to 1967 borders. We distributed a copy of a UPI story sent around the world in which these claims of Khaddoumi are quoted extensively - under a photo showing Capucci and Khaddoumi kissing each other (clipping enclosed.)

The failure of the Vatican to issue any clarifying statement of what actually transpired has left the impression throughout the world that the Khaddoumi version is the true statement of the present views of the Vatican and the Pope.

We also pointed out forcefully that continued silence over the Vatican-PLO meeting would inevitably create a situation in which any future pronouncements by the Vatican and the Pope criticizing violence and terrorism will lose their credibility.

The reaction of the Vatican delegation was generally positive and supportive of the Jewish views. Several of the Vatican delegates said they regarded the Vatican-PLO meeting as "a scandal" and urged the leaders of their delegation to seek to bring about some public clarification of the Vatican's views. One U.S. Catholic delegate declared with vehemence that he "doesn't care what the Vatican thinks," he will write and speak out criticizing the PLO meeting and will see to influence American Catholic bishops to do the same. He added that he regarded Capucci to be "a thug" and "an embarrassment to the Church." and he could not understand why he could not be disciplined, particularly since other priests involved in politics have been disciplined (i.e., Rev. Robert Drinan, etc.)

Prof. Talmon underscored the outrage of Capucci's behavior, indicating that he, as IJCIC's chairman, was involved in helping negotiate Capucci's release following the written agreements arrived at between Pope Paul VI and the Israeli Government.

It became clear that the three Vatican officials - Bishop Torella, Msgr. Mejia, and Msgr. Rossano - were under explicit Curia instruction not to discuss in any way the PLO-Capucci event. As the joint communique was being prepared, there was a long hassle as to whether the fact that the PLO discussion had taken place during this London dialogue could be included.

After strong pleadings from the Vatican officials - who claimed that such statements would undermine their authority in Rome - the IJCIC group agreed to the following understandings and commitments:

- 1) No reference to the Vatican-PLO discussion would be included in the joint communiqués;

- 2) IJCIC would be free to issue its own communique as an independent action, criticizing the Vatican-PLO-Capucci meeting, and indicating that the IJCIC statement was being sent to Vatican authorities;

3) An IJCIC letter signed by Prof. Talmon would be sent to Bishop Torella, as vice-president of the Vatican Secretariat on Catholic-Jewish Relations, requesting an official meeting with the Vatican Secretariat of State for the purpose of discussing the March 18th PLO meeting, Capucci, Jerusalem, and related issues. Bishop Torella and the other Vatican officials pledged that they would do everything they could to help arrange that meeting.

(During a private walk with Msgr. Rossano, Secretary of the Vatican Secretariat for Relations with Non-Christians - i.e., Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, etc. - he told me he was deeply upset over the PLO meeting and he would personally intervene to try to bring about a clarifying Vatican statement on the PLO audience as well as to encourage the meeting between IJCIC and the Secretariat of State. Inter alia, and in strict confidence, he told me that dialogues with Muslims are virtually dead. Since the rise of Ayatollah Khomeini, he said, Muslims come to Vatican-Islamic sessions only with threats of blackmail, reprisals against Arab Christians, intimidations, and demands for support of all Islamic positions.

By contrast, he said, repeating a statement he made during our joint deliberations "the dialogue between the Vatican and the Jews is the most advanced in the Church today; it is true dialogue...There is an ontological density in our shared views that the rights of man are inherent in human nature. The Muslims do not have that.")

On Friday, April 3, 4 p.m., a meeting was held with the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Pio Laghi, at his New York residence. Representatives from the American Jewish Congress, (Henry Siegman, Phil Baum), the ADL (Abe Foxman, Ted Freedman); and AJC (Bert Gold and myself) participated.

Our delegation set forth our concerns over the recent Casaroli-PLO meeting, the Khaddoumi press statement, and the role of Archbishop Capucci. Laghi, an elegant and skilled diplomat, said he anticipated our concerns. He then informed us confidentially that Casaroli's office had sent an aide-memoire to all Papal Nuncios informing them that the purpose of the meeting with the PLO was not that as reflected in the the press communiques. Rather, Laghi informed us, Casaroli sought to inform the PLO that the Vatican was deeply concerned about what was happening in Lebanon, the destruction of the Christian community and suggested that the PLO must modify its destructive role.

He also said that Casaroli informed the PLO that the Vatican's view on Jerusalem is not the same as the PLO's or the Arab states; namely, that the Vatican was only interested in the adoption of an international statute to assure the security and freedom of the "old City" of Jerusalem and its holy places, and not West Jerusalem.

We indicated that in light of Khaddoumi's press statement which gave the contrary impression it was all the more essential that the Vatican clarify in its own terms exactly where it stands.

Archbishop Laghi then asked us to submit a letter stating our concerns and that he would forward that to Cardinal Casaroli with his personal note encouraging such an action.

April 9, 1981

I also informed him about our Vatican-IJCIC meeting, and our request for a meeting with the Secretariat of State. Laghi said he would write and urge that such a meeting take place.

The letter was sent this week - a copy of which is enclosed.

We agreed at IJCIC and in New York to follow-up in two weeks on both these fronts.

MHT:RPR

Enclosures



The International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultations has met in London for the ninth consultation of the Liaison Committee with representatives of the Vatican. The Jewish delegates 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 appearance with representatives of the PLO after the meeting with the Vatican authorities constitutes a flagrant breach of that understanding.

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.

INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE
BETWEEN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND JUDAISM

London, March 31 - April 2, 1981

Jewish Delegation

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



April 8, 1981

RECEIVED

APR 10 1981

E. J. GORD

His Excellency
The Most Reverend Pio Laghi
The Apostolic Delegation
3339 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

Your Excellency:

On behalf of the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, we wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity to meet with you last Friday.

As we sought to make clear, we are deeply distressed that the Holy See's Secretary of State granted an official audience to the representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization, given the PLO's unalterable dedication to terrorism and its infamous record of murder and violence inflicted indiscriminately over a period of years against men, women, and children, both Christians and Jews. Our dismay over this meeting is intensified in the face of the extremely significant series of compelling moral pronouncements of His Holiness Pope John Paul II categorically condemning all manifestations of terrorism, violence, and murder as a sin against God and man. The seriousness of our shared concern is underscored by the fact that on March 19, the day following the meeting between Cardinal Casaroli and the PLO, Farouk Kaddoumi called a press conference on the premises of Vatican City during which he proclaimed that Pope John Paul II and Vatican authorities identified themselves almost entirely with the PLO's extremist positions on the key issues in the Middle-East conflict.

As can be noted from the enclosed news dispatch sent throughout the world by the United Press International, in connection with a photograph showing Archbishop Capucci embracing Kaddoumi at Vatican City, the impression has been communicated throughout the world that the PLO's claim of Vatican solidarity with their terrorist program is an authentic reflection of what supposedly took place during that March 18 audience.

The failure of any Vatican spokesman thus far to contradict those PLO assertions has clearly left the impression that the PLO statement is a reflection of actual attitudes of the Holy See toward the issues of Jerusalem, Palestinian rights, and toward Israel.

April 8, 1981

We respectfully submit that while the damage done by such a meeting will prove difficult to remedy, we would urge that a statement from the Vatican issued at an early date, openly rejecting the terrorism of the PLO and placing the discussions of that meeting in proper perspective is very much in order.

We understand that Cardinal Casaroli may be visiting the United States in May and our organizations which are national and international in outreach would welcome an opportunity to discuss this subject in greater detail with him.

Respectfully yours,

For The American Jewish Committee:

Bertram H. Gold

Bertram H. Gold

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum

For The American Jewish Congress:

Henry Siegmán

Henry Siegmán

Philip Baum

Philip Baum

For The Anti-Defamation League of
B'nai B'rith:

Abraham Foxman

Abraham Foxman

Theodore Freedman

Theodore Freedman

[start]

Original documents
faded and/or illegible





Archbishop Enrico Cepedji (left) greets PLO political director Farouk Kaddoumi during a Rome press conference.

PLO chief claims support of Vatican

ROME (UPI)—Farouk Kaddoumi, diplomatic chief of the Palestine Liberation Organization, said Friday the Vatican has taken a position of solidarity with the Palestinian people and their struggle for a homeland.

Kaddoumi, who met with Vatican secretary of state Cardinal Agostino Casaroli and other Vatican officials Wednesday to discuss the Palestinian question and the Israeli annexation of Jerusalem, ranks second to PLO leader Yassir Arafat in the PLO hierarchy.

"There is no doubt that the position of the Vatican and of the Holy See toward the Palestinian question is a position of solidarity with the Palestinian people and the struggle for their land," Kaddoumi said during a news conference.

The differences between the Vatican and Israel have become sharper since Pope John Paul II's election in 1978 but Kaddoumi's statement about Vatican solidarity with the Palestinian's was the most explicit ever from the Pa-

lestinians about the Vatican viewpoint.

Kaddoumi's meeting in the Vatican took place 23 days after Israeli Foreign Minister Yitzhak Shamir canceled an audience with the pope that was expected to deal with the delicate issues of Jerusalem and the Palestinians.

Shamir canceled the meeting because he could not arrive at the Vatican before the beginning of the Jewish Sabbath. But before ending a visit to the United States he said there were tendencies in the Vatican's position on Jerusalem that were not good for Israel.

The Vatican protested the annexation of Jerusalem last year when the Israeli's declared the city their "united and eternal capital."

The clear position of the Vatican on the annexation of Jerusalem holds great importance not only for the people of the Christian faith, but those of all faiths," Kaddoumi said. "As Cardinal Casaroli confirmed to me, the Vatican is opposed to the annexation of Jerusalem."

The Vatican made its position on Je-

rusalem clear in a policy statement last June that said Israel's declaration of "free access for all to the holy places" in the city considered sacred by the world's three largest religions as insufficient.

The statement said international guarantees were necessary, including an "appropriate juridical safeguard that does not derive from the will of only one of the parties interested."

The most explicit statement on the Palestinian issue made by the pope came last October, when he said "a sad condition was created for the Palestinian people, who were in conspicuous part excluded from their homeland" when the state of Israel was created in 1948.

The most explicit statement on the Palestinian issue made by the pope came last October, when he said "a sad condition was created for the Palestinian people, who were in conspicuous part excluded from their homeland" when the state of Israel was created in 1948.

[end]

Original documents
faded and/or illegible



MAYNARD I. WISHNER
105 WEST ADAMS STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60603

April 20, 1981

Father John T. Pawlikowski, OSM
Catholic Theological Union
5401 South Cornell Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60615

Dear John:

Thank you very much for the copy of your letter to Archbishop Laghi. You caught me unawares last Sunday. I somehow confused the subject matter. I do indeed recall the statement that I issued expressing AJC's concern.

The substance of your comments were very much appreciated. I value your friendship on the issues which I couple with much personal affection.

Sincerely,



MIW/ep
bcc: Bert Gold
→ Rabbi Marc Tannenbaum

APR 16 1981

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION

5401 SOUTH CORNELL AVE., CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60615

TELEPHONE (312) 324-8000



Office of the M.A. Director

13 April 1981

Archbishop Pio Laghi
Apostolic Delegate
3339 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20008

Dear Archbishop Laghi:

I write to express my deep concern about the recent meeting of the Vatican and the PLO. It is certainly my view that our church needs to be attentive to the rights of the Palestinian people. But in light of the numerous public calls for Israel's annihilation by the PLO I fear that our church leadership is acting in an irresponsible fashion towards the survivors of Auschwitz and the other Jews who have built the State by giving such public recognition to the PLO for whom terrorism has been a central tool.

I am especially disturbed by two aspects surrounding this recent meeting. The first is the press conference held by Mr. Farouk Kadoumi of the PLO immediately following the session. While I recognize that this was not an officially sanctioned session in which the Vatican took part, Mr. Kadoumi's remarks about a coalescence between PLO and Vatican views on the Middle East will remain open to misinterpretation unless the Vatican publicly disassociates itself from this position which runs counter to previous Vatican statements. I would urge you to press Rome for such a declaration.

Secondly, I would ask that you communicate to Rome the growing revulsion of those of us in the interreligious dialogue about the increasingly public role of Archbishop Hilarion Capucci. First Iran, now the Vatican-PLO meeting. His participation in these activities appears a direct violation of the conditions



Office of the N.A. Director

-2-

13 April 1981

attached to his release from prison. The Vatican will suffer significant erosion of its status if it allows Archbishop Capucci to continue to break the terms the Vatican formally accepted for his freedom in negotiations with the Israeli government. In addition, his continuing activity will injure the developing, productive relationships which Catholics and Jews have established since the II Vatican Council.

I thank you for your kind consideration of my views. I trust you will share them with the competent persons at the Vatican.

Warmest greetings for the Easter season.

Sincerely yours,

John T. Pawlikowski
(Rev.) John T. Pawlikowski, OSM, Ph.D.
Professor

Member, Advisory Committee, Secretariat
for Catholic-Jewish Relations, NCCB

cc. Fr. Jorge Mejia, Vatican Commission on Religious Relations with Jews

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

OF B'NAI B'RITH

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

FEB 18 1981

MEMORANDUM

To: Nathan Perlmutter
From: Rabbi Leon Klenicki
Date: January 12, 1981
Subject: Pope John Paul II, Israel and Jerusalem

The Vatican and Zionism: A Historical Background

The creation and establishment of the State of Israel is an event of political consequence that has touched significantly the political scene of the Middle East and the geo-politics of the big powers. Israel is also a special reality for Christianity. The Jewish state as Edward Flannery has pointed out, "came as a shock, even a scandal" to some Christians whose consideration of Judaism was and is rooted in the traditional Church Fathers' teaching of contempt.

This teaching, the anti-Judaism of Christian classical theology, upholds that the coming of Jesus, the Christ or Messiah, implies the abrogation of the Sinai Covenant, God, the people of Israel, and the promises given to the chosen people, especially the Promised Land as stated in Genesis XII. The non-recognition of the Messiah brought along the destruction of Jerusalem, year 70 of the common era, and the dispersion of the Jewish people, an eternal galut. Any attempt to return entails a negation of Christian purpose in history, and the situation will be changed when Israel recognizes the true Messiah.

This thinking is still, under different tones, prevalent in many Christian circles. The evangelical support of Israel, for instance, entails the hope that the reunion of the Jewish people in the land will speed up the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah awaited by Israel. The social oriented theologies, rooted in neo-Marxism, consider the state and the Jewish people in general as part of the forces that oppress humanity, the working class, and a people in search of a home, the Palestinians. The new Israel, Christianity, however, is free of this nationalism that brings political and economic injustice.

The Catholic Church's position towards Israel as a state, and especially the Holy See, has shown an ambivalence rooted in the teaching of contempt and political reasons related to the special Middle East situation. This situation entails the consideration of the Church in the area, the economic power of oil-producing countries, and the "liberating" ideology of the PLO of appeal to certain pro-Third World tendencies in the Vatican. The Vatican II Council reckoning process vis-a-vis Judaism created, however, a new mood. Prominent Catholic personalities, and even members of the hierarchy, express their solidarity to Judaism and Israel and participate in activities in support of Israel. But many, especially related to the Curia Romana express similar concepts on a personal basis and not for the record. This has created some illusions in the Jewish community though the public record of the Holy See has not been as clear and determined concerning Israel and especially Jerusalem.

January 12, 1981

The Zionist movement was criticized from the very beginning. In 1897, the year of the first Zionist Congress the semi-official periodical La Civiltà Cattolica published an article under a significant title: "The Dispersion of Israel in the Modern World." It began by saying:

1897 years have past since the prediction of Jesus of Nazareth was fulfilled, namely, that Jerusalem would be destroyed. . . that the Jews would be led away to be slaves among all the nations and that they would remain in the dispersion until the end of the world.

The very idea of the creation of a state is rejected with scorn by the magazine:

✓ According to the sacred Scriptures the Jewish people must always live dispersed and vagrant (vagabondo) among the other nations so that they render witness to Christ not only by the Scriptures. . . but by their very existence.

And the article continues in no uncertain terms:

As for a rebuilt Jerusalem which might become the center of a reconstituted State of Israel, we must add that this is contrary to the predictions of Christ Himself who foretold that "Jerusalem would be trodden-down by the gentiles until the time of the gentiles is fulfilled." (Luke 25:24) that is. . . until the end of the world.

Pope Pius X and Theodore Herzl

On January 25, 1904, Theodore Herzl had his well-known interview with Pius X who, to Herzl's pleading for a sympathetic understanding of the Zionist's cause, opposed an unyielding Non Possumus:

We are unable to favor this movement. We cannot prevent the Jews from going to Jerusalem -- but we could never sanction it. The ground of Jerusalem has been sanctified by the life of Jesus Christ. As the head of the Church I cannot answer you otherwise. The Jews have not recognized our Lord, therefore, we cannot recognize the Jewish people.

The Pope added that:

The Jewish faith was the foundation of our own, but it has been superseded by the teachings of Christ, and we cannot admit that it still enjoys any validity.

This understanding of Zionism has been current until the creation of the State of Israel. There was one exception and that was the favorable view of Zionism expressed by Benedict XV in his interview with Nahum Sokolov in May, 1917. There is reason to believe, however, that the Pope's attitude on this occasion was at least partially due to the political situation then existing in the Middle East.

The Holy See has not recognized the State of Israel although it maintains a relationship through the Israeli Embassy in Rome. The main reason advocated by the Vatican representatives is that it is the Vatican policy not to recognize any country in a state of war or one whose political frontiers are not yet recognized by international agreement. This lack of diplomatic relationship is reflected in a careful diplomatic avoidance to name the state, exemplified in Paul VI's statements when he visited Israel and in many documents of John Paul II on peace in the Middle East.

The Opinion of World Catholicism: The Statements of the American and French Bishops Conferences

Statements by American and European Bishops' conferences, however, are not concerned with diplomatic fears and state the close relationship of Judaism to the Promised Land for the information and understanding of their communities. The American document of November, 1975 points out:

In dialogue with Christians, Jews have explained that they do not consider themselves as a church, a sect, or a denomination, as is the case among Christian communities, but rather as a peoplehood that is not solely racial, ethnic or religious, but in a sense a composite of all these. It is for such reasons that an overwhelming majority of Jews see themselves bound in one way or another to the land of Israel. Most Jews see this tie to the land as essential to their Jewishness. Whatever difficulties Christians may experience in sharing this view they should strive to understand this link between land and people which Jews have expressed in their writings and worship throughout two millenia as a longing for the homeland, holy Zion. Appreciation of this link is not to give assent to any particular religious interpretation of this bond. Nor is this affirmation meant to deny the legitimate rights of other parties in the region, or to adopt any political stance in the controversies over the Middle East, which lie beyond the purview of this statement..

The document of the French Bishops takes a broader dimension discussing theological and political implications:

The dispersion of the Jewish people should be understood in the light of its history. Though Jewish tradition considers the trials and exile of the people as a punishment for infidelities (Jer 13:17; 20:21-23), it is nonetheless true that, since the time when Jeremiah addressed his letter to the exiles in Babylon (29:1-23), the life of the Jewish people in the diaspora has also held a positive meaning. Throughout its trials, the Jewish people have been called to "Sanctify the Name," amidst the nations of the world. Christians must constantly combat the anti-Jewish and Manichean temptations to regard the Jewish people as accursed, under the pretext of its constant persecutions. According to the testimony of Scripture (Is 53:2-4), being subjected to persecution is often an effect and reminder of the prophetic vocation.

✓ — Today more than ever, it is difficult to pronounce a well-considered theological opinion on the return of the Jewish people to "its" land. In this context, we Christians must first of all not forget the gift once made by God to the people of Israel, of a land where it was called to be reunited (cf Gn 12:7; 26:3-4; 28:13; Is 43:5-7; Jer 16:15; Soph 3:20).

Throughout history, Jewish existence has always been divided between life among the nations and the wish for national existence on that land. This aspiration poses numerous problems even to Jews. To understand it, as well as all dimensions of the resulting discussion, Christians must not be carried away by interpretations that would ignore the forms of Jewish communal and religious life, or by political positions that, though generous, are nonetheless hastily arrived at. Christians must take into account the interpretation given by Jews to their ingathering around Jerusalem which, according to their faith, is considered a blessing. Justice is put to the test by this return and its repercussions. On the political level, it has caused confrontations between various claims for justice. Beyond the legitimate divergence of political options, the conscience of the world community cannot refuse the Jewish people, who had to submit to so many vicissitudes in the course of its history, the right and means for a political existence among the nations. At the same time, this right and the opportunities for existence cannot be refused to those who, in the course of local conflicts resulting from this return, are now victims of grave injustice.

Let us, then, turn our eyes toward this land visited by God and let us actively hope that it may become a place where one day all its inhabitants, Jews and non-Jews, can live together in peace. It is an essential question, faced by Christians as well as Jews, whether or not the ingathering of the dispersed Jewish people — which took place under pressure of persecution and by the play of political forces -- will despite so many tragic events prove to be one of the final ways of God's justice for the Jewish people and at the same time for all the nations of the earth.

— How could Christians remain indifferent to what is now being decided in that land?

John Paul II, Israel and Judaism

The election of the new Pope brought a change in the criteria followed by the cardinal electors for centuries. A non-Italian was chosen, but a person coming from a country, Poland, deeply related to the Church and traditional Catholicism. Many hopes for change and development were placed on Cardinal Wojtyla's election. One of them was the hope that Vatican II would be implemented in Rome itself at the Curia Romana as a reality and a ground for the Church's reckoning of the present world and its problems. The Pope's philosophical background, phenomenology, the creation and thought of the German-Jewish philosopher Edmund Husserl, his courageous

confrontation with Communist domination, his defense of Jewish intellectuals under Gomulka were positive signs greeted enthusiastically by Catholics and Church observers. Disillusion and concern followed the early expectations. John Paul II presents an active, dynamic ministry, mixing trips, populist attitudes and a traditional thinking practically, at times, a reactionary ideology, that confronts the very spirit of the West at this moment of history and human experience.

John Paul's references to Israel and Jerusalem do not represent a new position. They restate Vatican opinions already expressed in documents and official statements. What has changed is its presentation and frequency. The general tendency under Paul VI was to remain silent and to avoid any expression that might be taken by any part involved in Middle East politics. John Paul II speaks freely, and refers often to the situation. At times he is careful in his language or conveys a vagueness that is essentially a diplomatic way or method, typical of Vatican circles, to allow for changes in complicated political situations. Some expressions are erroneous, as the Otranto reference to Israel's creation, allowing to confusion or political distortion by interested parties, mainly the PLO.

The stand taken by John Paul II in projecting the Vatican position on the Middle East is troublesome because of the timing of the speeches and the figure and influence of the Pope as an international religious leader. His references become, by disparate impact, harmful of Israel in its confrontation with the Arab world.

Pope John Paul II's Specific References on Judaism and Catholic-Jewish Relations

In his first encyclical, Redemptor Hominis (The Redeemer of Man, 1979), John Paul II referred to inter-religious dialogue, its importance and the special attention given to Jewish religion. His first encyclical was a friendly consideration of dialogue and its close relationship to the testimony of the Church. The document said the following:

The Fathers of the Church rightly saw in the various religions, as it were, so many reflections of the one truth, "Seeds of the Word," attesting that, "though the routes taken may be different, there is but a single goal to which is directed the deepest aspiration of the human spirit as expressed in its quest for God and also in its quest, through its tending towards God, for the full dimension of its humanity, or in other words, for the full meaning of human life." The Council gave particular attention to the Jewish religion, recalling the great spiritual heritage common to Christians and Jews. It also expressed its esteem for the believers of Islam, whose faith also looks to Abraham.

The second encyclical, Divis in Misericordia (Rich in Mercy) issued on December 2, 1980 contained a reference to the Lex Talionis, retaliation, written in the spirit of anti-Judaism which pervaded Christian thought for centuries. The text points out that:

Not in vain did Christ challenge His listeners, faithful to the doctrine of the Old Testament, for their attitude which was manifested in the words: "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth."

This was the form of distortion of justice at that time; and today's forms continue to be modelled on it.

This disturbing affirmation attributes to the very faith of the Hebrew Bible, a concept that belongs to an earlier stage of Biblical law, it is not the doctrine of the Bible. Later Biblical thought, especially Deuteronomy 24:6 and the Pharisaic interpretation, contemporary of Jesus, strongly denied retaliation. Jesus in his criticism followed the thought of the rabbis and evidenced once again his relationship to one of the seven Pharisaic groups of his days.

The simplification of the presentation and explanation of the Lex Talionis is of concern for it brings back in a papal document a concept familiar in anti-Jewish polemics and widely used by anti-Semites through the centuries.

Auschwitz

John Paul referred several times to Auschwitz and the Holocaust. On June 7, 1979, he paid an official visit to Oswiecim, known during World War II by its German name, Auschwitz, which is situated in his former diocese before being elected Pope. He recalled Maximilian Kolbe, a Polish priest, who gave his life for a fellow-prisoner and Edith Stein, a convert, a Carmelite nun and one of the most brilliant disciples of Edmund Husserl, the Pope's greatest philosophical influence. Miss Stein was taken from her monastery in Holland to Auschwitz. He described her also in his speech to the German-Jewish leadership on November 17, 1980, when he said that "there were also others who, as Christians, went to the end in their affirmation of adherence to the Jewish people along the road, suffering with their brothers and sisters. Such was the great Edith Stein, in religion, Theresa Benedicta of the Cross, whose memory is held justly in high honor."

The Pope, however, didn't clarify that Edith Stein was taken to Auschwitz, not as a Christian, but only because she was considered a Jewish person by the Nazis.

The Pope referred to Jewish martyrdom:

In particular I pause with you, dear participants in this encounter, before the inscription in Hebrew. This inscription awakens the memory of the people whose sons and daughters were intended for total extermination. This people derived its origin from Abraham, our father in faith (cf. Romans, IV:12) as was expressed by Paul of Tarsus. The very people who received from God the Commandment: "Thou shalt not kill" itself experienced in a special measure what is meant by killing. It is not permissible for anyone to pass by, this inscription with indifference.

In his speech to the U.N. on October 9, 1979, he referred to Auschwitz but did not specify that the Jews were the main victims of the gas chambers and Nazi tortures:

Today, forty years after the outbreak of the Second World War, I wish to recall the whole of experiences by individuals and nations that were sustained by a generation that is still alive. I had occasion not long ago to reflect again on some of those experiences,

in one of the places that is most distressing and overflowing with contempt for man and his fundamental rights -- the extermination camp of Oswiecim (Auschwitz) -- which I visited in my pilgrimage to Poland last June. This infamous place is unfortunately only one of the many scattered over the continent of Europe. But the memory of even one should be a warning sign on the path of humanity today, in order that every kind of concentration camp anywhere on earth may once and for all be done away with. And everything that recalls those horrible experiences should also disappear forever from the lives of nations and states; everything that is a continuation of those experiences under different forms, namely the various kinds of torture and oppression, either physical or moral, carried out under any system, in any land; this phenomenon is all the more distressing if it occurs under the pretext of internal security or the need to preserve an apparent peace.

You will forgive me ladies and gentlemen for evoking this memory but I would be untrue to the history of this century, I would be dishonest with regard to the great cause of man which we all wish to serve if I should keep silent, I who come from the country on whose living body, Oswiecim was at one time constructed.

He did, however, refer directly to Jewish suffering in his address on October 10, 1979 to the Jewish leadership in New York where he said that "a special word of greeting to the leaders of the Jewish community. . . ." "as one who in my homeland has shared the suffering of your brethren."

References to Israel and the Middle East

On October 5, 1980, John Paul II offered a homily at the Hill of the Martyrs at Otranto commemorating the 500th anniversary of the death of Blessed Antonio Primoldo and his 800 companions. At one point in his homily the Pope said the following:

The terms of the Middle East drama are well known: the Jewish people, after tragic experiences connected with extermination of so many sons and daughters driven by the desire for security, set up the State of Israel. At the same time the painful condition of the Palestinian people was created, a large part of whom are excluded from their land. These are facts which are before everyone's eyes. And other countries, such as Lebanon, are suffering as a result of a crisis which threatens to be a chronic one. In these days, finally, a bitter conflict is in progress in a neighboring region, between Iraq and Iran.

The concept that the State of Israel created a painful condition for the Palestinian people echoes a terminology usually used by the PLO in its propaganda. The Pope seems to forget or overlook that, at the time of the creation of the State of Israel, another state was created, an Arab state. The word Palestinian was not used at that moment. The Arab state created by the U.N. was taken over by Egypt and Jordania. The refugee question was created by the Arabs themselves rather than by

the Israeli government which has integrated its Arab population into the structure of Israel itself.

At a private conversation with a high representative of the Vatican in New York, ADL pointed out the negative impact of this expression for Israel. The only response was that readers might project personal or political feelings into the words of the Pope. It was pointed out, however, that the Pope has been extremely careful in his speeches in Germany because of the Augsburg Declaration and the delicate situation of East Germany and Poland concerning the dioceses on the borders of both nations. A document issued before his trip created some uproar in Germany and the Pope was extremely careful in every declaration during his visit and in any written statement.

The Pope's speech was criticized by Catholics. One example is Father John Pawlikowski's correspondence with Monsignor Jorge Mejia, Secretary of the Vatican's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews concerning the Otranto homily:

I wish to report to you the very deep uneasiness in the Jewish community regarding the recent statement of Pope John Paul II which seemed to support the discredited thesis that Jews expelled Palestinians en masse at the time of Israel's foundation. The statement received widespread coverage in the American press. As a result I received any number of calls, not simply from Jews in organizational positions, but from common, ordinary people. I'm afraid that this statement has had a significantly negative impact on Catholic-Jewish relations especially at the grass-roots level. Except for Arab historians, very few other scholars will accept the thesis of massive Arab expulsion from Israel by the Jewish leadership in the simplistic way the Pope seemed to present it. I would hope that some proper representation would be made by your office about this matter to the appropriate Vatican sources.

On November 17, 1980, in Germany, the Pope met with Jewish leadership and referred to Israel in a different way. John Paul II expounded the theological dimensions of Abraham's Covenant and referred, to the surprise of everybody, to the "land," a central concept in Jewish religious thought and related to God's promise to Abraham, Genesis XII:1, the very beginning of Zionism. He said the following:

In the light of this promise and this Abraham-like call I look with you toward the destiny and the role of your people among the peoples. I gladly pray with you for the fullness of shalom for all your brethren of the same faith and the same people and also for the land to which all Jews look with special reverence.

In the speech to the U.N. the Pope referred to the Middle East crisis and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty, but didn't name the Camp David accord. He called it a "concrete step" and a "first stone," a real foundation "of a general overall peace in the area." This diffused, general terminology contrasts with the clear, strong support of the Pope to the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty the day before it was signed. John Paul II called it "an event formalizing peace between two countries after decades of war and tension and giving a decisive impulse to the peace process to the entire region of the Middle East."

January 12, 1981

The Pope had the following to say:

It is my fervent hope that a solution also to the Middle East crisis may draw nearer. While being prepared to recognize the value of any concrete step or attempt to settle the conflict, I want to recall that it would have no value if it did not truly represent the "first stone" of a general overall peace in the area, a peace that, being necessarily based on equitable recognition of the rights of all, cannot fail to include the consideration and just settlement of the Palestinian question.

The Jewish listener might quarrel not with what the Pope expressed but rather with what he doesn't say. Referring to the rights of all, we can ask if this reference includes Israel's rights and needs. His expression is so vague that it is open to all sort of interpretations. It is of no comfort to think that the Pope was here being consistent with the Vatican policy of non-recognition of Israel and that one can hardly expect the Pope to alter this attitude, especially in the U.N. context. John Paul II, it should be pointed out, makes no reference to any particular grouping such as the PLO or any other Palestinian body that he prefers as interlocutor.

On November 10, 1980, the Pope received the new Egyptian Ambassador to the Holy See, Moustafa Kamal el-Diwani and during the presentation of the Ambassador's credentials he said the following:

I have followed closely the efforts to build a lasting peace which have been made by President Sadat and the Egyptian government. And I'm happy to receive from you the confirmation that these efforts will continue despite all difficulties. In fact, precisely because the tension and dangers have increased in recent times, the work of peace as you have said, must go on. Indeed, it must be intensified until a comprehensive peace is achieved, a peace which provides for an equitable solution to all aspects of the Middle East crisis, including the Palestinian problem and the question of Jerusalem. Any so-called peace, which would not take into account all the elements of divergency and which would not ultimately include all the parties who are directly concerned would risk being ineffective and could spark an even-more bitter conflict.

The Pope in his reference to the Camp David agreement made no reference to the State of Israel that was the counterpart of the peace treaty. He did not refer to the discussion on the Palestinians that are focusing in the meetings of both countries.

Jerusalem

Jerusalem occupied the attention of John Paul II in different speeches. At the U.N. he said:

I also hope for a special statute that under international guarantees, as my predecessor Paul VI indicates, would respect the particular nature of Jerusalem, a heritage sacred to the veneration of millions of believers of the great monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

He did not call for the internationalization of the city but for a special statute re: Jerusalem. It is this statute, or treaty that would be the subject of international guarantees not the city, nor its status.

In his speech to King Hassan II ben Mohammed of Morocco, April 2, 1980, he spoke of Jerusalem in this manner:

In the same spirit of dialogue, your majesty comes to talk to me today about a very delicate question, to which so many peoples of the earth are sensitive. You are here the spokesman of a large number of Islamic countries, which wish to make known the sentiment with regard to the problem of Jerusalem. This tells you with what attention I listen to you develop those views and your reflections on the same subject which you had already outlined to me in a personal letter.

I considered this talk very useful. It seems to me that the Holy City represents a really sacred heritage for all the faithful of the three great monotheistic religions and for the whole world, and in the first place for the populations living on its territory. A new impetus, a new approach would need to be found which would make it possible, far from accentuating division, to express in actions a far more fundamental brotherhood, and to teach, with the help of God, a solution, which may perhaps be an original one, but close at hand and definite, guaranteed and respectful of the rights of all.

If only we could see this wish realized at last. For this purpose, I venture to hope that believers of the three religions will be capable of raising their prayers at the same time towards the one God, for the future of the country so dear to their hearts.

These generalities were not followed in the Vatican document on Jerusalem distributed by the Vatican permanent observer to the U.N. on June 30, at the time of the discussion of Jerusalem in the Security Council.

The document outlines the Vatican position asking for international guarantees for the Holy Places and the city. He points out the central significance of the city to the three monotheistic religions and the special Christian commitment to Jerusalem. Nothing is said about the present administration of the Holy Places, an administration lauded by the main religious groups and organizations, and no reference is made concerning the previous state of the religious situation under Jordanian-Arab rule. The timing of the document and its distribution are questionable considering the international ideological assault on Israel at the United Nations. The document has the following phrase concerning the future of Jerusalem:

In short, the Jerusalem question cannot be reduced to mere "free access for all to the Holy Places." Concretely it is also required: (1) that the overall character of Jerusalem as sacred heritage by all three monotheistic religions be guaranteed by appropriate measures; (2) that the religious freedom in all its

aspects be safeguarded for them; (3) that the complex of rights acquired by the various communities over the shrine and the centers for spirituality, study and welfare be protected; (4) that the continuance and development of religious, educational and social activity by each community be insured; (5) that this be actuated with equality of treatment for all three religions; and (6) that this be achieved through an appropriate juridical safeguard that does not derive from the will of only one of the party's interested.

The document also refers to UNESCO's criticism of Jerusalem usage of the landscape as a sign of international concern over the city. The Vatican disregards the political orientation of the educational organization and its anti-Israeli policies. The document distributed at the U.N. was widely used by the PLO observer, too, and became part of the ideological arsenal for an assault on Israel and the Jewish people.

The Vatican never specified any details concerning an international statute of guarantees for the Holy Places and religious communities. ADL has pointed out to Vatican authorities that such a statute would not only not improve upon the present reality of free access, but would lead to a more deleterious situation. In this regard it is important to note that among the proposed signatories of such guarantees are powers that promote atheism and prohibit religious sancta. Others are already in a "holy war" against Christianity, as in the Middle Ages. They cannot be expected to improve or even maintain the current level of adherence to free access and freedom of faith.

On December 20, John Paul II met with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Saudi Arabia, Saud Al Faisal, and the Vatican issued a communique outlining the discussions on the Middle East, the Palestinians and Jerusalem. Saud informed the Pope of his government's concern "about the illegal action by which Israel annexed the Holy City." The Pope repeated the Holy See's position contrary to "any unilateral change in the political status of Jerusalem" and its proposal for the city to become "a meeting point of the three monotheistic religions -- Christianity, Islam and Judaism." John Paul II also "urged action to resolve, on the basis of equity, the problem of the Palestinian people and to maintain the independence, territorial integrity and unity of Lebanon."

The Archbishop Hilarion Capucci Affair

Archbishop Capucci received in 1974 a sentence of 12 years for smuggling arms for terrorists that were hidden in door panels and under the seats of his car. He was released three years later at the request of Pope Paul VI on the condition that he would refrain from further involvement in Middle East politics.

In 1978, he travelled to South America and propagandized against Israel. Later he assisted in setting up a PLO office in Venezuela, much to the embarrassment of the Holy See. The Archbishop denounced the Camp David accords and in January, 1979 he showed up in Syria to address a group of Palestinian guerrillas forcing the Vatican to state that he was there without its permission. In September of 1979, he appeared in Spain and later visited Teheran several times. In one of those visits he took along a letter of the Pope to the Islamic authorities which caused wide publicity.

The Archbishop was recently in Argentina at the commemoration of Palestinian Day and had harsh expressions concerning Israel and the Camp David treaty.

The arrangement of Capucci's freedom from Israel was considered a gentleman's agreement by which the Vatican would put an end to the terrorist-political activities of the Archbishop. This has not been the situation and despite the criticism and denunciations of Jewish leadership and the State of Israel, the Vatican has not put an end to the Archbishop's political activities. It is said that at a meeting with Pope John Paul II, the Archbishop was harshly recriminated for his activities, but this may be a gratifying legend rather than a reality. The activities of the Archbishop have shown that any recrimination by the Pope had no influence in his conduct.

LK:bl

cc: Ted Freedman



THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
611 Olive Street-Suite 1923
St. Louis, MO. 63101
(314) 621-2519

DATE

2/9/81

TO:

M. Rosenbaum

FROM:

Lee Cohen

☒ FOR YOUR INFORMATION

☐ PLEASE HANDLE

☐ READ AND RETURN

☐ FOR APPROVAL

☐ YOUR COMMENTS, PLEASE

Remarks :

'Jews question pope's Israel policy' — rabbi

By PAM BAUER
Staff Writer
Kansas City, Mo.

A U.S. RABBI said here last week that U.S. Jews fear the Vatican under Pope John Paul II is developing an increasingly pro-Palestinian foreign policy.

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, interreligious affairs director of the American Jew-

ish Committee, said U.S. Jews are "appalled" that a Palestinian representative has been received at the Vatican with dignity and honor. Whatever its intent, such a reception appears to condone violence and terror, he said.

Tanenbaum said that in the past, Catholics have been strongly pro-Israel, adding, however, that John Paul appears to be making subtle but important shifts in his dealings with the Jewish nation.

The pope appears to be "waffling" on the issue of Jerusalem, Tanenbaum said. The pope is emphasizing the city's spiritual element as a haven where all can live and worship.

One would expect the pope, being Polish and having lived under the Nazis and the Soviet influence, to be "more sympathetic" to the Jewish situation, Tanenbaum said, referring to the Jewish need for a homeland.

The rabbi also said U.S. Jews must seek alliances within the conservative fundamentalist movement despite fears such

AMERICAN JEWISH
A R C H I V E S



TANENBAUM

fundamentalists want the United States to become a "Christian" republic.

It is a mistake to ignore the fundamentalists' political, social and economic power, Tanenbaum said, but added the coalition of conservative political organizers with the electronic evangelist groups was a marriage of convenience.

Southern Baptists and other fundamentalist groups suffered when the United States was young and sometimes died for religious liberty and a pluralistic society, said Tanenbaum. It was ironic, he said, that conservative religious people were now insisting the United States was in a moral decline and must return to earlier times.

Last year former Southern Baptist Convention president Jimmy Allen held a press conference criticizing the political/religious actions of fundamentalists during the election. Tanenbaum, Monsignor George Higgins and a Lutheran leader stood with him at the press meeting.

The next day the Rev. Jerry Falwell, Moral Majority founder and Baptist minister, called Tanenbaum and arranged to come and see him, Tanenbaum said. Falwell spent an hour and a half with Tanenbaum, during which Falwell denied he wanted a Christian republic, but supported religious pluralism and insisted his followers must sign a pledge to support a strong defense for Israel. Tanenbaum said he persuaded Falwell to write down these views, telling Falwell he had never made them public before.

"Both Carter's and Reagan's offices warned me not to meet with him. I was told he was shifty. Was I had?" asked Tanenbaum. "I believe it was the longest time he had ever spent with a Jew. I think he learned something," Tanenbaum said.