

Preserving American Jewish History

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

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 53, Folder 2, World Council of Churches & Jewish Leaders Consultation [Geneva], 11-14 December 1972.

WCC / Jewish Leaders Consultation, Geneva, 11 - 14 December 1972

Christian Participants

The Most Rev. George Appleton

Prof. André Dumas

Dr. E. Flesseman-van Leer

Prof. R. Martin-Achard

Dr. Kurtis Friend Naylor

Rev. W. W. Simpson

Prof. Krister Stendahl

Dr. Olivia Pearl Stokes

Dr. John B. Taylor

Archbishop in Jerusalem Chairman of the WCC's Committee on the Church and the Jewish People Church of England British

Faculty of Protestant Theology, Paris Reformed Church of France French

Member of the WCC's Working Group and Commission on Faith and Order Netherlands Reformed Church Dutch

Faculty of Protestant Theology, Geneva National Protestant Church of Geneva Swiss

Ass. Ex. Director, Department of International Affairs, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, New York United Presbyterian Church in the USA American

General Secretary, Council of Christians and Jews Secretary, International Consultative Committee of Organisation for Jewish-Christian Cooperation Methodist Church British

Dean, Harvard Divinity School Lutheran Church of America Swedish

Staff Associate, Department of Educational Development, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, New York American Baptist Church American

Reader in Islamics, Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham Assistant Director, Sub-Unit on Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies, World Council of Churches from May 1st, 1973 Methodist Church British Dr. Aaron Toolen

Rev. Rudolf Weckerling

World Student Christian Federation, Co-Secretary for Africa and Madagascar Presbyterian Church of East Cameroun Camerounian

Okumenisch-Missionarisches Institut, West Berlin Evangelical Church Berlin-Brandenburg (West) German

The Venerable Carlyle Wittin-Davies Archdeacon of Oxford

Executive Chairman of the Council of Christians and Jews, Great Britain Church of England British

WCC Staff Members

Rev. Clement Barbey

Archpriest Vitaly Borovoy

Dr. Elfan Rees

Dr. Staley J. Samartha

Rev. Johan M. Snoek

Dr. Lukas Vischer

Part-time

Rev. David Gill

Assistant to the General Secretary, World Council of Churches Swiss Reformed Church Swiss

Associate Director, Faith and Order, World Council of Churches Russian Orthodox Church Russian

Consultant of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, World Council of Churches Congregational Union of England and Wales British

Director, Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies, World Council of Churches Church of South India Indian

Executive Secretary, Committee on the Churches and the Jewish People, World Council of Churches Reformed Church of the Netherlands Dutch

Director, Faith and Order, World Council of Churches Swiss Reformed Church Swiss

Secretary, Church and Society, World Council of Churches Congregational Church of Astralia Australian Mr. Leopoldo J. Miilus

Dr. Philip A. Potter

Dr. Baldwin Sjollema

Director of the Commisssion of the Churches on International Affairs, World Council of Churches Evangelical Lutheran Church Argentinian

General Secretary, World Council of Churches Methodist Church West Indian

Director, Ecumenical Programme to Combat Racism, World Council of Churches Netherlands Reformed Church Dutch WCC / Jewish Leaders Consultation, Geneva, 11 - 14 December 1972

# Christian Participants

Name	Arrival	Departure
Dr. Aaron Tolen	Saturday 9.12.	Tuesday 12.12.
Dr. Krister Stendahl	Saturday 9.12.	Wednesday 13.12.
Dr. R. Martin-Achard	Saturday 9.12.	Thursday 14.12.
Dr. A. Dumas	Saturday 9.12.	Thursday 14.12.
Archbishop G. Appleton	Monday 11.12.	Friday 15.12.
Ms Olivia Stokes	Sunday 10.12.	Friday 15.12.
Dr. K.F. Naylor	Sunday 10.12.	Friday 15.12.
Mrs. E. Flesseman-van Leer	Monday 11.12.	Thursday 14.12.
Rev. W.W. Simpson	Monday 11.12.	Thursday 14.12.
Archdeacon C. Witton-Davis	Monday 11.12.	Thursday 14.12.
Kev. Weckerling	Monday 11.12.	Thursday 14.12.
Dr. John Taylor	Monday 11.12.	Thursday 14.12
20		

# WCC Staff members

Dr. Stanley Samartha Rev. Clement Barbey Archpriest Vitaly Borovoy Dr. Elfan Rees Dr. Lukas Vischer Rev. Johan M. Snoek Miss Uta Hobrecht (office secretary)

# Part-time

Dr. Philip A. Potter Rev. David Gill Mr. Leopoldo J. Niilus Dr. Baldwin Sjollema

Press Release Intraction - Jenit

The Joint Liaison Committee of the Roman Catholic Church and the International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultations met from December 18th-20th, 1972, in Marseilles, France.

The purposes of the Liaison Committee are the improvement of mutual understanding between the two religions communities, exchange of information, and cooperation in areas of common concern and responsibility.

The meeting was presided over by His Excellency Mgr Roger ETCHEGARAY, Arehbishop of Marseilles, and Chairman of the Council of Episcopal Conferences of Europe, and by Prof. R.J.Zwi WERBLOWSKY of Jerusalem, Chairman of the Jewish Council for Interreligious contacts in Israel.

The Committee discussed preliminary papers on "Land and People in the Jewish and Christian Traditions" prepared by Catholic and Jewish scholars. It was agreed that their work be continued and that their completed findings and recommendations be submitted to the next meeting of theLiaison Committeee.

An important part of the three-daymeeting consisted of an exchange of information and views, from a religious perspective, on issues of concern to both communities, including:

1. activities on the area of Justice, Peamce and Development undertaken by the Jewish Community and the Catholic Church respectively;

- 2. the situation of Catholics and Jews in the USSR and Inter- Lange
- 3. the recrudescence of antisemitism in various parts of the world;
- 4. the problem of terrorism;
- 5. the possible implication of certain forms of evangelisation , particularly in the USA.

6. religious developments in the start Israel and to hope of Christianity, 7L (Jewish scholarly research on the historic araphy of Christianity, and the phanel for the filling to the first of the discussions took place in an atmosphere of frankness and cordia-

lity and owere seen by both delegations as an important contribution to better wasker mutual understanding.

The Catholie Jewish Liaison Com ittee consists of the follo ing representatives :

The Lissin Committee expressed it deep concern over the growing manifestitions of anti-Semithem in voursus parts of the world and acpeed to the effective there to cope with the problems. (peek oppropriate ways

On the Catholic side:

H.E. Francis F. Mugaveno

Revd. Jérôme HAMER

**Revd. Bernard DUPUY** 

Revd. Cornelius RIJK

Auguno On the Jewish side:

Rabbi Balfour BRICKNER,

Dr. Gerhart RIEGNER

Dr. Joseph LICHTEN

Rabbi Henry SIEGMAN

Rabbi Marc TANENBAUM

Prof. Zwi WERBLOWSKY

H.E. Msgr.Roger ETCHEGARY, Archbishop of Marseille, Chariman of the Council of Episcopal Conferences of Europe;

> Secretary General of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, Rome. Secretary of the Episcopal Commission for the Relations with Judaism in France, Paris;

> In charge of the Office for Catholicy Jewish Relations, attached to the Secretariat for Unity, ROME.

Director of Interfaith Activities, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York: Secretary General of the World Jewish Congress, Geneva; Consultant B'nai B'rith - Anti Deflamation League, Rome. Executive Vice President of the Synagogue Council of America, New York; National Director of Interreligious Affairs of the American Jewish Committee New York.

Chairman of the Jewish Council for Interreligious Contacts in Israel, Jerusalem.

lithe members, appointer with mappione of the face to by Carenip Jun Willehands: Jenst members. Cypres. IT cic;

IK Future minutes will consist of a summary of approximately 10-15 pages which will contain the main lines of the discussions.

Summary of Conclusions

Memorandum of Understanding

II. With regard to the various study-papers the follwowing procedure was agreed upon: a) The study-papers on "People and Land in the Christian and Jewish

- 1. tradition"will' be sent back to bhe scholars with the view of revising and improving them in the light of the discussion and con--frontation which took place at the meeting in Marseille; their
  - b) The scholars of each side will communicate to each other comments on the papers of the other side;
  - c) The papers will then be communicated to the organisations and institutions represented on the Liaison Com ittee for study and comment;
  - d) The committee of scholars Will then be called together and will meet not later than, the end of May, in the presence of one representative of the Steering Committee from each side with the view of discussing the papers, improving them and clarifying certain points in the light of the discussions and of the comments received. The scholars' committee will prepare a summary of the papers setting out notably the convergences and divergencies in the positions held hy the Christian/Jewish scholars and make such recommendations to
- If here has the Liaison Committee as it sees fit in the light of its discussions e) The Liaison Committee will discuss the summary and the recommendat tions at its next meeting.
  - f) The possible publication of the summary and of the study papers will be examined in the light of these discussions.
  - With regard to the study on "Promotion of human rights and religious 2. freedom" Examination of our spiritual sources and formulation of principles of action, The Committee agrees to maintain this item on its agenda. It is further agreed :
    - a) That the two sides will formulate in the newr future in a most precise way the description of the subject in order to give guidance to the makakaaxaax scholars on the questions which have arisen in the course of the study;

general

- by that the preliminary studies by each side should be completed during the coming year;
- c) that after the completion of the preliminary studies & procedure similar to that under III,1 be implemented during the year 1974.
- III. The Catholic delegation agreed to facilitate contacts and possible cooperation between the International Jewish Committee and the Pontifical Commission Justice and Peace.
- It was agreed by the two sides to keep each other informed concerning

   a) the situation of Catholics and Jews in the USSR;

b) the Evangelisation movement particularly in the USA. whe c) Jewish scholarly research on Christianity and developments on the subject in the Jewish curriculum of funch education with the the particular of the terreturn of the Mederal of funch education with the particular on the project of studies on the role of religion in text books of history and of efforts directed at the revision of text books, the Jewish delegation was invited to submit a written communication to the Catholic participants expressing Jewish interest in this quarter.

VI. It was agreed to hold the next meeting .... in ....

V.

The **Lates** or major points of the agenda will be fixed by common agreement not later than two months before the meeting; leaving room for adjustments in the light of developments.

Currocula of Christian education withit

It The Comin discussed the remaining of anti-S. It is the Comin discussed the remaining of the the second that the is transfer parts of the words. It was agreed that the description of the typology are documentry office the maining their description of the typology are documentry office the maining the of the particle worder to have the big and to the the typo parts of the particle worder to have the boot the the Episcopate of the oppropriate action.

## WCC-IJCIC COMMUNIQUE

A joint consultation devoted to an examination of Jewish-Christian relations [in global perspectives]was held from December 11-14, 1972 (at the Hotel Méditerranée) in Geneva. The fifth of its kind, the consultation was co-sponsored by the World Council of Churches and the International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations. The Jewish body 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 Council for Interreligious Contacts. The co-chairmen of the plenary sessions were His Grace George Appleton, Archbishop of Jerusalem, and Professor Zwi Werblowsky of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

The main theme of the meeting was "The Quest for World Community: Jewish and Christian Perspectives." Through the presentation of a series of papers by Christian and Jewish scholars and extensive discussion in a spirit of candor and friendship, an effort was made to clarify common as well as divergent conceptions and approaches to the organization of world community as "a community of communities."

The consultation also provided an opportunity for the exchange of information and for the sharing of concerns about a number of current issues facing both groups and their respective constituencies. These included the problems of terrorism; social change through violent and  $(\alpha_{C(SM} + South + A_{V}, \alpha_{V}))$ non-violent movements; human rights in the Soviet Union; the Arab-Israel conflict and possibilities for reconciliation between Jews, Christians, and M<sub>u</sub>slims in the Middle East; the Bible and social justice; evangelism, mission, and proselytization; and Christian and Jewish cooperation in relation to international organizations for the advancement of human rights.

The papers presented dealt with the following themes : "The Concept of Community : Between Identity and Solidarity," by Aaron Tolen of Yaounde, the Cameroons; "Structures of Fellowship and Community in Judaism," by Prof. Uri Tal of Tel-Aviv University, Israel; "The Dialectic of Particularity and Universality from the Standpoint of Christian Theology," by Prof. Rudolf Weth of the University of Tubingen, Germany; "Particularity and Universality - A Jewish View," by Prof. Shemaryahu Talmon of Hebrew

Galried (fahle

University, Jerusalem; "Working Together with Peoples of Other Religions," by Dean Kristar Stendahl of Harvard Divinity School, Cambrudge, Mass.; "The Quest for World Community Based on the Resources of Other Groups," by Dr. Norman Lamm of Yeshiva University, New York City; "The Biblical Doctrine of Social Justice," by Prof. Robert Martin-Achard of the University of Geneva; and "The Biblical Matrix and Our Present Bocial Responsibilities," by Prof. André Dumas of Paris.

At the opening session, Dr. Philipp Potter, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, addressed the gathering.

Elo

A report of the Joint Scholars' Working Group was presented to the closing session of the plenary. It emphasized the following major points :

The joint steering committee of the World Council and the International Jewish Committee consists of the following representatives : World Council - Archbishop Appleton; the Rev. Clément Barbey, Assistant to the General Secretary; Dr. Stanley J. Samartha, Director of the Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies; Rev. Johan M. Snoek, Executive Secretary of the Committee on the Churches and the Jewish People; Dr. Lukas Vischer, Director of Faith and Order, and Dr. Elfan Rees, Consultant of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.

International Jewish Committee : Rabbi Balfour Brickner, Director of Interfaith Activities of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Dr. Joseph L. Lichten of Rome, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Dr. Gerhart M. Riegner, Secretary General of the World Jewish Congress; Rabbi Henry Siegman, Executive Vice-President of the Synagogue Council of America; Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, National Interreligious Affairs Director of the American Jewish Conmittee; and Dr. R. Zwi Werblowsky.

The consultation agreed to continue its contacts and to plan for further collaboration. It also agreed to share the findings of the consultation with wider audiencess:

-2-

# AGENDA (Tentative)

Joint Consultation of the International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations and the World Council of Churches

Monday, December 11, 1972 (Mont Blanc Room)

Co-Chairmen: Stanley Samartha and Marc Tanenbaum

9.30 a.m.

- I. Presentation by Lou Silberman of Precis Jewish Papers
  - a) Particularity and Universality by Shmaryahu Talmon
  - b) Fellowship and Community by Uri Tal
- II. Presentation of WCC Precis
  - a) The Concept of Community by Aaron Tolen
  - b) Particularity and Universality by Rudolph Weth
- III. Presentation of Precis of
  - a) The Quest for World Community by Norman Lamm
  - b) Working Together with Other Religions by Kristar Stendahl
- 12.30 2.30 p.m. Luncheon
- 2.30 5.00 p.m.
- Precis of WCC Papers
- a) The Biblical Doctrine of Social Justice by R. Martin-Achard
- b) The Biblical Matrix and Social Responsibility by André Dumas
- 6.00 p.m.

8.30 p.m.

PLENARY SESSION

Opening by two Chairmen: Archbishop Appleton Zwi Werblowsky

## Roll Call

Welcome by Philip Potter, General Secretary of WCC

PARTICULARITY AND UNIVERSALITY

JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Paper by Shmaryahu Talmon Paper by Rudolph Weth Discussion

	-2-
Tuesday, December	12, 1972
9.30 a.m.	SECOND SESSION - THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY
	Paper by Uri Tal Paper by Aaron Tolen Discussion
12.30 p.m.	Luncheon
2.30 p.m.	THIRD SESSION - THE QUEST FOR WORLD COMMUNITY WITH OTHER RELIGIONS
3,45 - 5.30 p.m.	Paper by Kristar Stendahl Paper by Norman Lamm Discussion
6.00 p.m.	Dinner
8.30 p.m.	FOURTH SESSION - SOCIAL JUSTICE
6.30 p.m.	Paper by Robert Martin-Achard Paper by André Dumas Discussion
Wednesday, Decembe	r 13, 1972
9.30 a.m.	FIFTH SESSION - CURRENT ISSUES AND INFORMATION
`	Presentation by Gerhart M. Riegner Presentation by Johan Snoek
	FUTURN PLANS FOR STUDY
12.30 p.m.	Luncheon
2.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m.	SIX SESSION - CURRENT ISSUES AND INFORMATION Discussion
6.00 p.m.	Dinner
8.30 p.m.	SEVENTH SESSION - CURRENT ISSUES AND INFORMATION Discussion
Thursday, December	14, 1972
	EIGHTH SESSION - JOINT CONCENSUS DOCUMENT
	Further discussion of current issues (if necessary)
9.30 a.m.	
9.30 a.m. 12.00 noon	Luncheon
	Luncheon JOINT CONCENSUS DOCUMENT

# JOINT PROPOSALS

In accordance with a decision made by the Jewish-Christian Consultation held in Lugano in October 1970, whose major theme was "The quest for a world community - Jewish and Christian perspectives", Jewish and Christian Study Groups have been established and met jointly in Geneva in April 1972. They have agreed upon the following proposals and present them as agenda for the plenary meeting in the autumn of 1972.

Ι.

The present world situation is characterized by increasing interdependence. Mass communication from continent to continent bring close to us the concerns of millions of people of whose existence we were hardly aware before. Mass travel helps us to become acquainted first hand with ways of life and thinking which in the past were hardly known to us. Economic, technological and political developments draw the people of this world more closely to one another. This development raises acutely the question whether mankind will be able to create a world community which allows for life in justice and peace. The realization of such a new order is not optional. It is decisive for the future of the human race. "One world..., or none" is more than a slogan. However, the concept of interdependence of mankind is ambivalent. It may hold out the promise of new community but we also know from bitter experience that human institutions are not always unmixed blessings, no matter how noble the intentions of their founders, and may even lead to new conflicts of unprecedented dimensions. Groups can overreach themselves and destroy others. Nations can and do make war,

and one world may be dictatorial or soulless.

When speaking of world community we do not think of an imposed uniformity throughout the world - ideological, cultural, political and religious. We feel that world community needs to be understood as community of communities. The identity of each group must not be extinguished, but each must find its place in the wider community of communities. Only such a concept provides the hope for the development of a human future in which individuals and groups will have their rights respected and their dignity inviolate.

The way to the realization of world community is barred by many obstacles. We mention only a few factors which need realistically be taken into account :

1. The abdication of social responsibility by individuals.

ntvi butin

5

Christian

- 2. The loss of a sense of history and continuity by contemporary man.
- 3. The traumatic diminution of the sense of human dignity man's meaning and worth - in this technological era, with the resultant breakdown in interpersonal and intercommunal relationships.
- 4. The division of the world by racism, competing power blocs and antagonistic classes of the advantaged and the disadvantaged, such that the latter are permanently frozen in their deprivation with the only recourse being revolution and social upheaval.

It is imperative that our two faith communities apply themselves in common to devising the ways and means of remedying these problems. The Jewish and Christian communities both are aware of this challenge. They have in the past not been sufficiently sensitive and open to those outside their own circles. Yet we feel that our world-views are such that our communities have to respond sympathetically and creatively at this moment of history if they are to be true to their respective heritage.

These traditions are specific for each faith community. Judaism reverences the Hebrew Bible, but it is by no means restricted to it. In its long history, it drew upon the Bible and creatively applied its teachings to each generation and its problems within a developing (tradition. The matrix of Christianity is the Christ event, which is witnessed in the New Testament and cannot be understood without the Old Testament. In the course of time, each tradition has learned to reinterpret itself and reformulate its world view in critical response to new phenomena, conditions and challenges.

Starting from different points of origin, the two heritages have yielded certain understandings and insights that are of the most crucial significance for human history. These concepts, not adequately realized heretofore, include the dignity of man and his freedom, which issue from his creation in the divine image, and his responsibility for his fellow-man under God. It is our conviction that such ideals which our communities share are deserving of renewed commitment and implementation over respective peopled by the two of us as part of the human family for the betterment of all mankind. It is up to us to create an atmosphere in our communities conducive to the implementation of these principles in concert with other faith communities. - 3 -

The two study groups agreed that the following are some of the subjects requiring further investigation by the constituent groups and the plenary conference. The first, third and fourth subjects have not been considered in depth because of lack of time. The second has been discussed but the groups have not been able to reach agreement on a common statement.

. .

- We have used the terms "world community" and "community of communities" in this paper. These terms must be properly defined and conceptually analyzed before they are used in a final statement.
- 2. The dialectic relation of universality and particularity is differently conceived by the two groups. These differences must be spelled out and clarified.
- 3. How can we understand and work together with communities of other religions and ideologies in their quest for a world community based on their own resources ?
- 4. How can we contribute to the actualizing of the biblical teaching of social justice in cooperation with communities of other religions and ideologies, and in addition to, or in conjunction with, governmental and international agencies ?

Geneva, May 1972.

your brace Amberrador Shahetai escine of Israel who is Geneva ashed me to inquisie of you whether be might be able to Pay a Cowrteny call on you formorrow for a few moments, of that is convenient? Ture ) queubein Phere thank him very much I am rather presed tomorrow as I have to Ge in the chevir all day, House The sely time 6 pm. Wilnesday I could be sur of a. 4 pm. Thursday 2. 30 pm Surge a 2

The International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee met from December 10th to 20th, 1972, in Marseilles, France.

This was the second annual meeting of the Joint Committee which was established to implement a recommendation that was made at a Catholic-Jewish consultation held in Rome in December 1970.

The purposes of the Liaison Committee are:the improvement of mutual understanding between the two religious communities, exchange of information and cooperation in areas of common concern and responsibility.

The meeting was presided over by His Excellency Msgr. Roger ETCHEGARAY, Archbishop of Marseilles and Chairman of the Council of Episcopal Conferences of Europe, and by Prof. R.J. Zwi WERBLOWSKY of Jerusalem, Chairman of the Jewish Council for Interreligious Contacts in Israel.

The Committee discussed preliminary papers on "Religious Community, People and Land in the Jewish and Christian Traditions", prepared by Catholic and Jewish scholars. It was agreed that their work be continued and that their completed findings and recommendations be submitted to the next meeting of the Liaison Committee.

An important part of the three-day meeting consisted of an exchange of information and views, from a religious perspective, on issues of concern to both communities, including :

l. activities in the area of Justice, Peace and Development undertaken by the Jewish Community and the Catholic Church respectively;

2. the situation of Catholics and Jews in the USSR;

3. the recrudescence of antisemitism in various parts of the world;

4. the problem of terrorism;

5. the possible implication of certain forms of evangelisation, particularly in the USA;

6. religious developments in Israel, and

7. Jewish scholarly research on the historiography of Christianity.

The Liaison Committee expressed its deep concern over the growing manifestations of antisemitism in various parts of the world and agreed to seek appropriate ways to cope with this problem.

The discussions took place in an atmosphere of frankness and cordiality and were seen by both delegations as an important contribution to better mutual understanding. The Liaison Committee consists of the following representatives :

Catholic members, appointed with the approval of Pope Paul VI by Cardinal J.Willebrands .

H.E. Msgr. Roger ETCHEGARAY, Archbishop of Marseilles, Chairman of the Council of Episcopal Conferences of Europe;

Revd. Jérôme HAMER

Revd. Cornelius RIJK

**Revd.Bernard DUPUY** 

H.B. Msgr. Francis MUGAVERO, Bishop of Brooklyn, Chairman of the Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations in the U.S.A Secretary General of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, Rome; In charge of the Office for Catholic-Jewish Relations, attached to the Secretariat for Unity, Rome;

> Secretary of the Episcopal Commission for the Relations with Judaism in France, Paris;

Jewish members, representing the International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultation,

Rabbi Balfour BRICKNER

Dr. Gerhart RIEGNER

Dr.Joseph LICHTEN

Rabbi Henry SIEGMAN

Rabbi Marc TANENBAUM

Prof. Zwi WERBLOWSKY

Director of Interfaith Activities, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York; Secretary General of the World Jewish Congress, Geneva;

Consultant B'nai B'rith - Anti Defamation League, Rome;

Executive Vice-President of the Synagogue Council of America, New York;

National Director of Interreligious Affairs of the American Jewish Committee, New York; Chairman of the Jewish Council for Interreligious Contacts in Israel, Jerusalem.

## Summary of Conclusions

I. Future minutes will consist of a summary of approximately 10-15 pages which will contain the main lines of the discussions.

II. With regard to the various study-papers the following procedure was agreed upon:

- 1. a) The study-papers on "Religious Community, People and Land in the Christian and Jewish Tradition" will be sent back to the scholars with a view of revising and improving them in the light of the discussion which took place at the meeting in Marseilles;
  - b) the scholars of each side will communicate to each other comments on the papers of the other side;
  - c) the papers will then be communicated to the organisations and institutions represented on the Liaison Committee for study and comment;
  - d) the committee of scholars will then be called together and will meet not later than at the end of May, in the presence of one representative of the Liaison Committee from each side, with the view of discussing the papers, improving them and clarifying certain points in the light of the discussions and of the comments received. The scholars' committee will prepare a summary of the papers setting out notably the convergencies and divergencies in the positions held by the Christian and Jewish scholars and make such recommendations to the Liaison Committee as it sees fit in the light of its discussions. If necessary a second meeting of the scholars' committee.
  - e) the Liaison Committee will discuss the summary and the recommendations at its next meeting.
  - f) the possible publication of the summary and of the study papers will be examined in the light of these discussions.

- 2. With regard to the study on "Promotion of human rights and religious freedom. Examination of our spiritual sources and formulation of general principles of action" the Committee agreed to maintain this item on its agenda. It was further agreed
  - a) That the following guidance be given to the scholars: The studies should concern themselves with the following 3 points:
    - Which are the human rights that Jews and Christians consider should be promoted by them at the present time? (civil and political rights; economic, social and cultural rights; equality and non discrimination ...)
    - ii. What are the sources of these rights in our respective spiritual traditions?
    - iii. The methods by which these sources may be brought into relation with the specific rights whose promotion is intended;
  - b) that the preliminary studies by each side should be completed during the coming year;
  - c) that after the completion of the preliminary studies a procedure similar to that under II, 1 be implemented during the year 1974.

III. The Catholic delegation agreed to facilitate contacts and possible cooperation between the International Jewish Committee and the Pontifical Commission Justice and Peace.

IV. It was agreed by the two sides to keep each other informed concerning

- a) the situation of Catholics and Jews in the USSR;
- b) the evangelisation movement particularly in the USA;
- c) Jewish scholarly research on Christianity and developments in the portrayal of Christianity in the curricula of Jewish educational institutions, similarly Christian scholarly research on Judaism and developments in the portrayal of Judaism in the curricula of Christian educational institutions.

-2-

V. On the project of studies on the role of religion in European text books of history and of efforts directed at the revision of such text books, the Jewish delegation was invited to submit a written communication to the Catholic participants expressing Jewish interest in this matter.

VI. The Committee discussed the recrudescence of anti-Semitism in various parts of the world. It was agreed that the Jewish Committee would submit a detailed memorandum describing the typology and documenting specific manifestations of this problem in order to have this information transmitted to other offices of the Holy See as well as to national Episcopates for appropriate action.

VII. It was agreed to hold the next meeting on December 4, 5 and 6, 1973 in Belgium. The major points of the agenda will be fixed by common agreement not later than two months before the meeting, leaving room for adjustments in the light of developments.

Marseilles, 20 December 1972

-2 -2 🎽

-3-

# The American Friends of the WORLD COUNCILCLARENCE H. LINDER, Chairmanof CHURCHES

CLARENCE H. LINDER, Chairman REV. EUGENE L. SMITH, Ph.D., Vice Chairman Executive Secretary of the World Council in the U.S. GEORGE W. YOUNG, Treasurer Vice President, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company

475 RIVERSIDE DRIVE, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10027

December 29, 1972

Dear Friend:

"Friends of the World Council of Churches" came from St. Louis, Chicago, Indianapolis, Washington, Albany, Boston and in-between places for the November 21st dinner honoring Dr. Eugene Carson Blake and Dr. Philip A. Potter.

The dinner gave many of us a chance to renew friendships, as well as to welcome Dr. Blake back home, and to welcome Dr. Potter to his new position as General Secretary.

We were asked to invite some to the dinner who were not already "Friends." You were among them.

"Friends of the WCC" are those who express their commitment to the world-wide ecumenical movement through an annual contribution to the World Council of Churches through the U.S. Conference for the World Council of Churches. Each is aided in keeping alert to global ecumenical developments by receiving a quarterly report in "The Ecumenical Courier."

We invite you to become a "Friend." An envelope is enclosed for your convenience. We look forward to keeping in touch with you, and to your participation in WCC events in the United States.

Very truly, Eugene &

Eugene L. Smith Executive Secretary

ELS:j

Enclosure

# REPORT WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES FALL, 1972

The Central Committee meeting in August in Utrecht, Holland, moves the Council into a period which may be extraordinarily hopeful and difficult.

. . . . . . .

2 and 1 and 12 a

The Rev. Dr. Philip A. Potter was elected General Secretary with a unanimity which is tribute both to him and to the sense of direction in the Council.

A black, from a people once enslaved, Dr. Potter knows the movement of the oppressed toward identity and independence. A Methodist pastor with graduate work in theology at the University of London, he is in wide demand for leadership in Biblical studies. Former Chairman of the World Student Christian Federation, he has had long years of global exposure and of contact with the student world. His churchmanship and administrative competence have been demonstrated as an executive of the Methodist Missionary Society in London and later as Director of the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism of the W.C.C.

Eight new member churches bring the total to 261. The new churches are Asian, European, African and Latin American; and in Confession are Pentecostal, United Methodist, Reformed and Lutheran.

An extensive exchange of resources on "The Spiritual Life of the Churches" has developed through W.C.C. channels around the conviction that "Spiritual life is man's everyday life and work lived within the dimension of faith, hope, love and fellowship in Christ."

Dialogue with persons of living faiths and idealogies gathers momentum with a March 1972 meeting with Buddhists and Cao Daists on contributions to the renewal of society in Vietnam; a July 1972 meeting in Beirut with Muslims; and Christian-Jewish plans for a joint consultation at the end of the year on world community.

The ongoing ministry of the Council to human need includes:

- a \$13 million program for Bangladesh
- a \$2.5 million program for the Sudan
- development programs in Mindinao, Malawi, North Africa,
- West Irian, Zambia and Sicily.

- an increasing shift of refugee service toward the Third World.
  supplementation of the ongoing relief program in Indochina a
- supplementation of the ongoing relief program in Indochina a new body, largely national, for focus on reconstruction and reconciliation.

The Special Fund to Combat Racism, having met its original goal of \$½ million, has been continued with a \$1 million minimum goal, part of which has already been pledged. Considering the furor over the first grants, it is notable that this extension was unanimously voted.

dan na Sa

Out of deepening commitment to take whatever constructive action may be possible to combat racism, the Central Committee voted that none of the reserve funds of the Council should in any way be invested in companies having direct investment or trade with southern Africa, and that none of its funds should be deposited in banks maintaining operations directly in those countries, and called upon member churches and other Christian agencies to press corporations to withdraw from those countries.

A major consultation on Human Rights, with particular attention to religious liberty, will be initiated by the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.

The W.C.C. was praised by Maurice Strong, head of the U.N. Conference on Human Environment, held in Stockholm, for its "significant contribution" to that meeting.

The W.C.C. studies on the future in a technological age continue. A new thrust has been added on "Human Settlements and Social Justice." In less than 30 years, more than 1½ billion new dwellers will be added to the cities of the world - 85% in the poorer nations. Immediate decisions must be made in almost every nation if explosive suffering is to be avoided, and the nature of those decisions demands priority study.

Church union negotiations are not diminishing: thirty-six are now underway on all 6 continents and at least 22 have vigorous momentum.

Meanwhile, work continues on many other areas: "Salvation Today," Urban and Industrial Evangelism, "Violence, Non-Violence and the Struggle for Social Justice." Family Life, Biblical Studies, the Humanum Studies, Development, and others.

An enormously hopeful development is an increase, largely European, of support for the Central Budget sufficient to maintain programs at present levels until 1975.

Perhaps the most significant current development is the growing sense of unity the Council finds as it tests its convictions in critical areas. The New Testament gives no sign that the ecumenical road is easy. Said Dr. Potter, at the close of his acceptance speech:

"Fellowship is not cheap. I have learned this as one who comes from a people who experienced slavery... The cost of fellowship is the Cross .... As St. Paul put it so well, one must give up all things in order that one might know Christ in the power of his resurrection and in the fellowship of his sufferings .... I stand with you in the knowledge that we will not only stay together, grow together, go forward together and act together - but also suffer together under the sign of the Cross, and in the power of the Risen Lord."

The New York Office

AGENDA (Tentative)

Joint Consultation of the International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations and the World Council of Churches

Monday, December 11, 1972 (Mont Blanc Room)

Co-Chairmen: Stanley Samartha and Marc Tanenbaum

9.30 a.m.

· ·· Š

- I. Presentation by Lou Silberman of Precis Jewish Papers
  - a) Particularity and Universality by Shmaryahu Talmon
  - b) Fellowship and Community by Uri Tal

II. Presentation of WCC Precis

- a) The Concept of Community by Aaron Tolen
- b) Particularity and Universality by Rudolph Weth
- III. Presentation of Precis of
  - a) The Quest for World Community by Norman Lamm
  - b) Working Together with Other Religions by Kristar Stendahl
- 12.30 2.30 p.m.
- 2.30 5.00 p.m.

Precis of WCC Papers

- Luncheon

- a) The Biblical Doctrine of Social Justice by R. Martin-Achard
- b) The Biblical Matrix and Social Responsibility by André Dumas

6.00 p.m.

8.30 p.m.

# PLENARY SESSION

Opening by two Chairmen: Archbishop Appleton Zwi Werblowsky

Roll Call

Welcome by Philip Potter, General Secretary of WCC

PARTICULARITY AND UNIVERSALITY

JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Paper by Shmaryahu Talmon Paper by Rudolph Weth Discussion

	4	×	
	Tuesday, December	12, 1972	
	9.30 a.m.	SECOND SUSSION - THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY	
	3 2	Paper by Uri Tal Paper by Aaron Tolen Discussion	
	12.30 p.m.	Luncheon	
	2.30 p.m.	THIRD SESSION - THE QUEST FOR WORLD COMMUNITY WITH OTHER RELIGIONS	
	3,45 - 5.30 p.m.	Paper by Kristar Stendahl Paper by Norman Lamm Discussion	
	6.00 p.m.	Dinner	
it.	8.30 p.m.	FOURTH SESSION - SOCIAL JUSTICE	
1		Paper by Robert Martin-Achard Paper by André Dumas Discussion	
	Wednesday, Decembo	er 13, 1972	
	9.30 a.m.	FIFTH SESSION - CURRENT ISSUES AND INFORMATION	
		Presentation by Gerhart M. Riegner Presentation by Johan Snock	
		FUTURE PLANS FOR STUDY	
	12.30 p.m.	Luncheon	
	2.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m.	SIX SESSION - CURRENT ISSUES AND INFORMATION Discussion	
	6.00 p.m.	Dinner	
	8.30 p.m.	SEVENTH SESSION - CURRENT ISSUES AND INFORMATION Discussion	5 25
	Thursday, December	<u>14, 1972</u>	
		EIGHTH SESSION - JOINT CONCENSUS DOCUMENT	
	9.30 a.m.	Further discussion of current issues (if necessary)	
,	12.00 noon	Luncheon	
	2.30 - 4.00 p.m.	JOINT CONCENSUS DOCUMENT	
	4.00 p.m.	Adjournment	
3			
		* *	

\* \*

# AG AGENDA/(Tentative)

Joint Consultation of the International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultations and the World Council of Churches

MON., DEC; 11, 1972 (Mont Blanc Room) Co-Chairmen' Stanley Samartha and Marc Tanenbaum 9:38# A. M. - Presentation by Low Sillecture Precis of Jewish Papers a) Particularity and Unigersality - by Shmaryahus Talmon b) Fellowship and Community - by Uri Tal II-Presentation of WCC precis by Johan Snock a) The Concept of Community by Aaron Tolan - Yeoundeb) Particularity and Usiversalitz by Rudolph Weth- Tulmiger apper ment /III - Presentation of Precis of a) The Quest for World Community by Norman Lamm b) Working Together with Other Religions by Kristar Stendahl 12:30 - 2:30 p.m. - Luncheon 2:30 - 5:00 p.m. - Precis of WCC Papers a) The Biblical Doctrine of Social Justice by R. Martin-Achard b) The Biblical Matrix and Social Responsibilitz bz Andre Dumas 6:00 p.m. - JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING 8: 30 p.m. - I PLENARZ SESSION Opening by two chairmen! Archbishop Appleton Zwi Werblowsky Roll Call Welcome by Philip Potter, General Secretary of NCCC ) K. Sten dabl presentation UNIVERSALITY Paper by Shmaryahu Talmon Paper by Axer Rudolph Weth Discussion TUESEAXX, DEC: 12 - SECOND SESSION 9:30 a.m. - THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY my Paper by Uri Tal Paper by Aaron Tolen Discussion 12: 30 p.m. - LUNCHEON 2:30 p.m. - THIRD SESSION - THE QUEST FOR WORLD COMMUNITY WITH OTHER RELIGIONS TH Paper by Kristar Mant Stendahl Paper by Norman Lamm 3:45 - 5:30 p.m. - Discussion 6: 00 P; M; - DINNER - Steering Committee

AGENDA (TENTATIVE) - 2 -

TUES; DEC; 12 -

8: 30 p.m. - FOURTH SESSION - social JUSTICE Paper bz Robert Martin-Achard Paper by Andre Dumas 815 a.m. -Discussion AND INFORMATION WED; DEC; 13 - FIFTH SESSION - CURRENT ISSUES 9: 30 a.m. 1) do ument Presentation by Gerhardt Riegner Pressntation by Jan Snoek 3) FUTURE PLANS FOR HUTURE STUDE 12:30 P.M: - LUNCHEON 2:30 P.M; - SIXTH SESSION - CURRENT ISSUES AND INFORMATION to 5:30 p.m. DISCUSSION -JE p.m. -; document 6: 00 P:M: - DINNER SEVENTH SESSION ? CURRENT ISSUES AND INFORMATION 8:30 P.M. -DISCUSSION THURS., DEC; 14 - EIGHTH SESSION :- JOINT DONCENSUS DOCUMENT. 9: 30 a.m. - Further discussion of current issues (if ne cessarz) 12:00 noon - LUNCHEON 2:30 - 4:00 p.m. - JOINT CONCENSUS DOCUMENT 4:00 P:M: - ADJOURNMENT

2

## JOINT PROPOSALS

I.

1

In accordance with a decision made by the Jewish-Christian Consultation held in Lugano in October 1970, whose major theme was "The quest for a world community - Jewish and Christian perspectives", Jewish and Christian Study Groups have been established and met jointly in Geneva in April 1972. They have agreed upon the following proposals and present them as agenda for the plenary meeting in the autumn of 1972.

The present world situation is characterized by increasing interdependence. Mass communication from continent to continent bring close to us the concerns of millions of people of whose existence we were hardly aware before. Mass travel helps us to become acquainted first hand with ways of life and thinking which in the past were hardly known to us. Economic, technological and political developments draw the people of this world more closely to one another. This development raises acutely the question whether mankind will be able to create a world community which allows for life in justice and peace. The realization of such a new order is not optional. It is decisive for the future of the human race. "One world ..., or none" is more than a slogan. However, the concept of interdependence of mankind is ambivalent. It may hold out the promise of new community but we also know from bitter experience that human institutions are not always unmixed blessings, no matter how noble the intentions of their founders, and may even lead to new conflicts of unprecedented dimensions. Groups can overreach themselves and destroy others. Nations can and do make war, and one world may be dictatorial or soulless.

When speaking of world community we do not think of an imposed uniformity throughout the world - ideological, cultural, political and religious. We feel that world community needs to be understood as community of communities. The identity of each group must not be extinguished, but each must find its place in the wider community of communities. Only such a concept provides the hope for the development of a human future in which individuals and groups will have their rights respected and their dignity inviolate.

The way to the realization of world community is barred by many obstacles. We mention only a few factors which need realistically be taken into account :

- 1. The abdication of social responsibility by individuals.
- 2. The loss of a sense of history and continuity by contemporary man.
- 3. The traumatic diminution of the sense of human dignity man's meaning and worth - in this technological cra, with the resultant breakdown in interpersonal and intercommunal relationships.
- 4. The division of the world by racism, competing power blocs and antagonistic classes of the advantaged and the disadvantaged, such that the latter are permanently frozen in their deprivation with the only recourse being revolution and social upheaval.

It is imperativo that our two faith communities apply themselves in common to devising the ways and means of remedying these problems. The Jewish and Christian communities both are aware of this challenge. They have in the past not been sufficiently sensitive and open to those outside their own circles. Yet we feel that our world-views are such that our communities have to respond sympathetically and creatively at this moment of history if they are to be true to their respective heritage.

These traditions are specific for each faith community. Judaism reverences the Hebrew Bible, but it is by no means restricted to it. In its long history, it drew upon the Bible and creatively applied its teachings to each generation and its problems within a developing tradition. The matrix of Christianity is the Christ event, which is witnessed in the New Testament and cannot be understood without the Old Testament. In the course of time, each tradition has learned to reinterpret itself and reformulate its world view in critical response to new phenomena, conditions and challenges.

Starting from different points of origin, the two heritages have yielded certain understandings and insights that are of the most crucial significance for human history. These concepts, not adequately realized heretofore, include the dignity of man and his freedom, which issue from his creation in the divine image, and his responsibility for his fellow-man under God. It is our conviction that such ideals which our communities share are deserving of renewed commitment and implementation by the two of us as part of the human family for the betterment of all mankind. It is up to us to create an atmosphere in our communities conducive to the implementation of these principles in concert with other faith communities.

- 2 -

The two study groups agreed that the following are some of the subjects requiring further investigation by the constituent groups and the plenary conference. The first, third and fourth subjects have not been considered in depth because of lack of time. The second has been discussed but the groups have not been able to reach agreement on a common statement.

- We have used the terms "world community" and "community of communities" in this paper. These terms must be properly defined and conceptually analyzed before they are used in a final statement.
- The dialectic relation of universality and particularity is differently conceived by the two groups. These differences must be spelled out and clarified.
- 3. How can we understand and work together with communities of other religions and ideologies in their quest for a world community based on their own resources ?
- 4. How can we contribute to the actualizing of the biblical teaching of social justice in cooperation with communities of other religions and ideologies, and in addition to, or in conjunction with, governmental and international agencies ?

Geneva, May 1972.

- 3 -

Geneva, April 26th, 1972.

### PROPOSAL OF THE JEWISH STUDY GROUP

Our group formulates the problems which can fruitfully be discussed in the following manner :

- 1) The abdication of social responsibility by individuals.
- 2) The tendency to an imposed uniformity throughout the world ideological, cultural and political.
- 3) The loss of a sense of history and continuity by contemporary man.
- 4) The traumatic diminution of the sense of human dignity man's meaning and worth - in this technological era, with the resultant breakdown in interpersonal and intercommunal relationships.
- 5) The organization of the world into antagonistic classes of the advantaged and the disadvantaged, such that the latter are permanently frozen in their deprivation with the only recourse being bloody and blind revolution and social chaos.

It is suggested that the two faith communities apply themselves in common to the execution of ways and means of remedying these problems.

#### II.

Τ.

Before pointing out some of the tentative directions that we wish to propose, it is important to mention briefly the religious overview that informs our approach.

Judaism reverences the Hebrew Bible, but it is by no means restricted to it. In its long history, it drew upon the Bible and creatively applied its teachings to each generation and its problems within a developing tradition. In the course of this time it has learnt to reinterpret itself and reformulate its world view in critical response to new phenomena, conditions and challenges.

This is the matrix from which we speak. It is our hope that this treasury of interpretation and experience will serve us in meeting the very challenges of our time. We regard our spiritual heritage as normative for ourselves; for others, as a possible source of illumination.

#### III.

1) Modern Western man tends to view the individual as ontologically primary while regarding the collectivity as derivative.

Judaism's view is more complex. It asserts two foci of reality, the individual and the community, though it tends to place a premium on the latter. Thus Judaism validates human collectivities. It grants worth and authenticity to groups such as the family, ethnic entities, nation, people, credal associations, and other social organisms, including these that defy precise definition by present standards. Hence, Judaism looks askance at two phenomena that presently bedevil the contemporary world. The first is the progressive atomisation of society, resulting in a glaring individualism and a lack of concern for others. The second is the tendency towards a homogenized uniformity which demands that all men be alike, whether they like it or not.

The Jewish conception of world structure is pluralistic.

Implicit in this conception is an affirmative attitude toward the specific historic consciousness of diverse groups and the continuity of the cultural identity.

- 2) As a consequence, Judaism never deemed it necessary or desirable to proselytise other peoples. It does not subscribe to an imposed "universalism" which may easily become a form of national, cultural or religious imperialism.
- 3) Judaism affirms that dignity is a property of all men by virtue of their creation in the image of God. This is understood as obligating us to promote the welfare of our fellow men.
- 4) Just as with our community, these responsibilities are institutionalized as obligations laid upon individuals to share their goods with the disadvantaged, so must the same principle prevail in the community of communities.

It is nowup to us to create an atmosphere in our community conducive to the implementation of these principles in concert with other faith communities.

WCC/JEWISH LEADERS CONSULTATION Geneva, December 11 - 14, 1972.

## THE CONCEPT OF 'COMMUNITY': BETWEEN IDENTITY AND SOLIDARITY

## by Aaron Tolen

In our day the concept of 'identity' has been a driving force and an influence in the life both of individuals and of groups to a degree unprecedented in the history of mankind. This fact must undoubtedly be set down to the account of that great movement of national liberation which began by canonising the principles enunciated by the Allies in ~ the conflict with the Axis forces. Their concern was basically to assert the right of peoples to self-determination and to inscribe into the history of mankind the equality of all men before the law, without distinction of race, religion, or colour. But, above all, it was the right of every individual and every group to choose its mode of life which underlay these principles.

These principles have often been urged by the upholders of every sort of intense nationalism. In the African countries, they are among the familiar commonplaces deployed in every speech aimed at defending and promoting particularisms of all kinds. This is the language of tribalism; the language of the regionalists; the Credo of the sectarians.

Colonialism, foreign domination, in short, the claim of certain national groups to hold the monopoly of deciding how things should be done, has often in fact provided adequate justification for a swing of the pendulum to the other extreme, in the form of movements of national liberation. The mass media have made us aware of the unity of our world, of the global village with all its cultural, economic, physical and even theological conflicts. This has caused the concept of identity to explode so that it no longer applies only to communities but also to individuals as well. Identity comes to mean an individual, personal identity. No longer is it a question of defending the 'culture' of a group; it is a question of developing in complete liberty the culture of a community which is still to be constructed. In the urban concentrations of industrialized regions, and already even in the townvillages of regions which are in process of organization, efforts to organize human life, whether industrially, artistically, emotionally or religiously, tend to reduce the individual to an anonymous cipher, so much so that the notion of identity has come to the fore. The relentless pressure of an international order which is basically ruled by the law of the jungle forces the small national communities to assert their particularisms in order to survive.

It is conceivable that this development of things may one day result in a new concept of 'community'. In any case, I suggest, it has already drawn our attention to the relations existing between identity and solidarity. I have no intention of reopening here the (to my mind, futile) debate about which comes first, the individual or the community. I content myself with the commonplace fact that we all, individualists or communitarians, are men and women 'in society'. The fact is that, in spite of the existence of Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Animist, Breton, Buddhist, black, white communities etc., our world is still organized basically into national communities. What relationship can there be then between loyalty to the community I call the community of sentiment and loyalty to the organic community?

The Robert Dictionary's article on 'communauté' defines the term thus: 'Social group characterised by the fact of living together, possessing common property, having common interests and a common goal'. This definition covers the two levels of the concept which I have labelled 'community of sentiment' and 'organic community'. In the biblical concept of community, the people of Israel is a people which lives together. possesses common property, has common interests and a common goal. This is particularly striking in the period from the Exodus from Egypt down to the entry into the 'promised land'. So, too, in the modern world every nation is defined by a common life, the common possession of property, common interests and common goals. We know, however, from experience and from sociology that the national community is always made up of a number of 'communities of sentiment'. These communities can be small numerically and in range, and like the Christian and Jewish communities, they can extend between and beyond nations. In every case, they will be factors making for social cohesion or factors weakening social cohesion, to the extent that they give priority to national solidarity or to their own individual identity.

Some sociologists believe in the objective approach to the phenomenon of community, one which leaves aside all ideological or political concerns. But once we accept the fact that the basic instrument available to the enquirer is the method which combines observation and participation, how can such a project possibly succeed, engaging as it does the enquirer's whole personality? I believe that if we are to have a useful and genuine discussion about the concept of community, we must put our cards on the table. Each one of us must declare his preferences. In the debate with which we in particular are concerned, we need to know to what extent and in which areas a community which has a religious basis can make concessions to a national or world community which does not necessarily share this basis. In other words, to what extent can particular cultures continue to exist and to what extent should they give place to global world views as national or international life demands? What are the limits to 'integration' and what are the limits to the right of self-determination?

I suggest that particular views of the world only have an inherent right to exist to the extent that they advance or strengthen man's universal quest.

Take two examples: the 'black' indentity and the Jewish identity. For centuries right down to the present day, historical circumstances and technological differences have meant that black communities have been sub-groups whose identity has not been acknowledged. Dismissed as 'savages', 'heathens', 'uncivilized', etc., they have been the victims of slavery and colonialism. 'Assimilation' and all forms of cultural imperialism were believed to be justifiable in relation to them. The movement towards the independence of the former colonies brought no real solution to the problem. The situation of the American blacks and those living in South Africa shows clearly enough that full civic rights are still not accorded to the black man and the 'black community'. The independent countries of black Africa continue to struggle against cultural alienation, so much so indeed that they themselves are adamant in their insistence that they live in an increasingly cosmopolitan world. This situation fathers such radical movements as Black Power which tend to reject any 'integration' in the wider society once it is clear that

- 2 ----
this is controlled by cultural groups which refuse them recognition.

Some have called this 'anti-racist racism'. This charge cannot be lightly dismissed. There is a danger of something of this kind. Let us not forget, however, that the attitude of extremist radical groups is itself the end-product of a whole series of painful experiences, missed opportunities, broken promises. This 'anti-racist racism' (why not say it?) is the revolt of those who believed in humanist ideals and now find themselves in a parlous situation because of the very people who invented these oft-proclaimed principles but never practised them.

But we have learned increasingly from both experience and sociology and this is fundamental - that the notion of identity takes second place after the notion of 'solidarity of interests'. Moses Tshombe found it possible to accept the racists of South Africa and Rhodesia as allies without the problem of race arising for either side. There are bourgeois elements in the black community of the United States which do not identify themselves with the black majority claiming black rights but with the interest groups close to them, whether these interest groups are white, yellow or brown. Our twelve years of independence in Africa have taught us that the lines of division and of solidarity cut right across the races, religious groupings, cultural options, and nationalities. The ally of the black is not always the black. 'Community' should therefore be defined primarily as the 'community of interests' and not necessarily as a 'cultural community'. How could it be otherwise in a world which is dominated by economic interests and by forces which never think of culture except as an a posteriori justification?

Turning now to the Jewish community, I have first of all to confess my incompetence. The sources of my information are the Bible, the Old Testament in particular, historical studies, especially of the contemporary period, and the excellent analyses provided in the collective work entitled <u>Racism in the Light of Science</u>, published by UNESCO. It is in no sense an inside view which I am offering. I have recently been privileged to conduct study groups on education for international peace, cooperation and understanding. In the course of these exercises I was made very much aware of all that is involved in the search for authenticity. I was also made aware, alas, of the injuries which can be inflicted by claims which at first sight seem to be legitimate once these claims are turned into absolutes.

As I said at the beginning, the Jewish people claim to be a 'people chosen by God'. They believe that this God has given them their religion, their social patterns, and that it is He who prescribed for them what sort of relationships they were to have with other communities. On this basis the Israelite community has always claimed the right to an autonomous culture in the midst of all the national communities into which it has been led by the Diaspora. Recent facts and happenings confirm the continuity of this claim. It is also on these same principles that the State of Israel desires to be an essentially and exclusively Jewish State in accordance with the Mosaic law. Is an Israelite who lives in a non-Jewish country a citizen of that country? What are the limits and the extent of his loyalty to national institutions on the one hand, and to the basic principles of the Israelite community on the other? In other words, is the Israelite first and foremost an Israelite and a Jew and only secondarily a citizen of his country? To whom does he owe allegiance? To the State of Israel or to the State of which he is a national?

I do not raise these questions in any polemical spirit. What I am looking for is patterns of explanation. It seems to me that the Jewish communities should provide the many who are genuinely perplexed with clear and comprehensive explanations.

A second set of questions concerns the organization of the State of Israel itself in accordance with 'biblical' principles, and the status of all those who live within the territory of the State of Israel but are not themselves Israelites. Does insistence on the 'purity' of the Jewish community justify the disregard of fundamental principles giving all inhabitants of a country the right to obtain citizenship? In other words, can there be any basis for the position that only a certain class of citizens, practising a certain religion and having adopted this religion, can be full citizens of the country?

I hope that our consultation will discover the appropriate procedure for the elaboration of these explanations. The world is entremely sensitive to all that concerns the 'Jewish community', whether because of the links between it and Christianity, or because of anti-semitism which has so wantonly destroyed so many innocent people, or, finally, because of the mass media which so swiftly spread news of these two communities. The world needs help in understanding the bases and principles underlying the attitude of the Jewish communities in general and of the State of Israel in particular. What are the specific interests guiding these communities? Are they, too, communities which have a unifying mission or must they be considered as the only ones that 'will never mix with the others'?

In our world today it is not enough to have reasons which we alone understand. We have to communicate our reasons and be sure that they are understood. Already there is really only a single community: the world community. It cannot be a homogenous community, which is why it does not accept imperialism. Nor can it be merely a juxtaposition of mutually exclusive communities, which is why it rejects sectarianism and racism. It is a 'unity in diversity' made up of communities which have and which keep their own identities but which realize and opt for relations of solidarity and complementarity. In the last analysis, the world community is no stranger to conflicts and it is held together because of solidarity.

It is not a 'faceless community', therefore, nor a community without problems, but it would cease to be a community if its ultimate goal were not a common life.

Suggestions for Bibliography C.M. Arensbergy, 'The Community as Object and as Sample', in R. König, <u>Handbook of Empirical Sociology</u>, Cologne, 1961; R. Boudon and P. Lazarsfeld, <u>Le Vocabulaire des Sciences Sociales</u>, Paris -The Hague, 1967; G.A. Hillery, 'Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement', in <u>Rural</u> <u>Sociology</u>, Lexington, Mass. Vol. XX, 1955.

Translated from the French Language Service WCC

# GENISTIAN/JEWISH LEADERS CONSULTATION Geneva, December 11 - 14, 1972

How can we understand and work together with communities of other religions and ideologies in their quest for a world community based on their own resources?

# by K. Stendahl

1) To what extent is there a "quest for a world contaunity" in various religious communities? Now high priority does such a quest have in various communities? To what extent is such a quest intrinsic to our communities? The answer to these questions are not obvious to me.

2) Contrary to the views, hopes and expectations of many believers and non-believers, religion has actually been more devisive than unifying as far as "world community" is concerned. Religion seems to be a complicating rather than a helpful factor. And it is well known that human and political and economic conflicts become more vicious when wedded to religious diversifications. Religious wars are the most ferocious ones.

3) Yet I cannot imagine human beings apart from their religiourness. In their faith they find their identity, their full humanity, their place in the universe, their calling. Communities of faith are a necessity. Even if such communities create tensions, let us <u>first</u> affirm the indispensible character of the communities of faith and <u>then</u> ask for how they may fit together in a larger whole.

4) The Christian and the Muslim communities have tended to think of world community by conquest be it by military or missionary means. The Jewish community has had a different model. They have accepted the calling to obedient service to God and to the Torah in a manner which in God's plan has global meaning as they become "the light unto the mations." Their witness to the One God and the Moral Order remains a witness, not an urge of making all men Jews.

5) In a pluralistic society and a shrinking world this "jewish Nodel" of witnessing rather than conversion may well deserve serious consideration by all religious communities. It could be argued that early Christianity was closer to it than than we now bolieve. The "universalism" of the Christian Church did imply a community across the line between Jews and Gentiles, but it did not envisage a christianized world. On the contrary, it envisaged a distinct minority drawn from many nations and peoples, but still a minority that served God as the salt of the earth and as light to the world.

6) Thus we may approach the "world community" as distinct, nonimperialist, witnessing communities. The result of our witness must retain its dimensions of mystery. Only God knows the plan and the consummation. To us belongs "only" the faithful witness. 7) What are the "resources" of our communities referred to in our assignment? They are, of course, our Scriptures, our traditions, cur histories, our inherited wisdom. Eut if our faith is a living faith and God is a living God, then the greatest resource is our present experience of God and the present promptings of the Spirit.

- 2 -

8) It could be argued that religious tradition without God - without a present relation to God, without prayer, meditation, listening for the Word here and now - is not only dead but positively dangerous, destructive and demonic.

9) Contemporary religious experience must include a new seriousness about "world community". In many ways this is a new question or at least a question with new urgency and possibilities in a shrinking world, a world of hold bened inter-dependence.

10) It could be argued that a search for the role of religious communities witnessing to the will of God for the world must lift up the issues of <u>power</u>. And it may be that especially Jews and Christians together should consider whether their Scriptures and their traditions have a special insight and perspective, somewhat like this:

In the drama of history God chows his grace, his power, his election on the side of the oppressed, repressed, depressed - so as to overcome the inbalance of power. Hence there is never comfort for the comfortables. Hence grace reans justice, mercy means judgment. The first become the last and those who hunger and thirst after justice are called blessed for they shall be vindicated. This is the criterion of biblical ethics. Strength and Chosen-mose do not mix well. In times of strength the Day of the Lord is darkness rather than light.

This "resource" is one that overcomes the triumphalism of religious communities. And the triumphalism of religious communities is the main read block on the way toward a community of communities.

11) But the only resource worth the name is and remains the living God and the living faith. We who says God knows that God transcends everything, including  $h_{1,3}$  statements about God, and including his community. The world somehow expects men and women of faith to be an asset toward world community. And in spite of all the signs to the contrary the true believer knows that that expectation is correct.

# REPORT OF THE JOINT SCHOLARS' WORKING GROUP

At the Jewish-Christian Consultation held in Geneva in April 1972, the major theme was "The Quest for World Community - Jewish and Christian Perspectives." That meeting resulted in Joint Proposals which concluded with the recommendation that further deliberations be held by the two Study Groups to discuss outstanding questions of major significance which are in need of clarification.

In December 1972, the two groups reconvened in Geneva and studied the questions assigned to them, as specified in Part 2 of the Joint Proposals of April 1972.

The Study Groups presented their papers to the plenary session. The following represents the major points that were made at this conference.

In speaking of "World Community" we did not mean merely an interdependence of men and nations. We intend rather an order that enables communities to live together. It is not a perfect community but a viable way of human co-existence. Thus, we did not speak of World Community as an ultimate but as a proximate goal. To be sure, both Jews and Christians - as well as other religious and ideological communities - have ultimate hopes for the future. There is the Messianic Age and the Kingdom of God. God will one day rule over the whole world. <u>He</u> will bring about the reign of love and justice. Such hopes inspire our life and action.

By World Community we mean a viable order for today's world; it is pre-eschatological.) We think of it as a community of communities. World Community is not only the sum of individual human beings; it is composed of communities of various kinds. Each individual expresses his individuality as a member of various communities, such as his membership in a family, groups, a nation, etc. Thus, World Community must recognize the value of such communities which provide human identity and physiognomy.

As each individual belongs to several communities at the same time, these communities work towards overcoming the threats of loneliness, anonymity, and uniformity.

./..

However, no community should be absolutized in the name of ultimate values. The role of the State as impartial protector of all communities, as it has emerged in modern times, was welcome and affirmed.

We found helpful a distinction between particularity and particularism. By particularity we mean the commendable concern of the community for its own self-interest without at the same time ignoring or encroaching upon the vital interests of others. By particularism we mean the self-interest of a community which is exclusive in that it ignores the concerns of other communities and disregards the interests of World Community. Particularism, because it does not contribute to solidarity with the larger community, is not helpful in the quest for World Community. Each community must be open to and responsible for other communities and the whole of mankind.

It was agreed that mutual respect and concern are the basis of a World Community. We must strive together for the empowerment of the now powerless and hopeless, for those whose voice has not yet been heard and identity not yet recognized.

-----

Geneva, December 1972.

WCC/JEWISH LEADERS CONSULTATION Geneva, December 11 - 14, 1972.

# THE DIALECTIC OF PARTICULARITY AND UNIVERSALITY

#### FROM THE STANDPOINT OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

by Dr. Rudolf Weth Hist to Neo I turn - Tubrigen Vair,

The 'dialectic of particularity and universality' is a category extensively used in human thought. As an aesthetic category it seeks to define the harmony of a unity in diversity; as a sociological category, the coexistence of society and individuals; as a term used in political economy, the competition between particular interests and those of the whole; in political science, the desirable fellowship between a community of nations - to mention just a few examples. From these examples, it is clear that both concepts, 'particularity' and 'universality', are ambivalent and can be taken in a bad sense as well as in a good sense. Universality can mean deadly uniformity and not necessarily a vital diversity. Particularity does not necessarily imply the egoism of the particular but can also mean particularity in a justified and desirable form.

When used in theology, this thought pattern acquires a peculiar significance. Both the Jewish and the Christian traditions use it to express their own identity in relation to contemporary humanity and its future, on the basis of divine election. The fact that they both employ it shows a certain identity of content but at the same time raises the question of the characteristically different ways in which they understand it and apply it. Judaism and Christianity, synagogue and Church, understand themselves in terms of a universality which reaches out beyond themselves and, both protologically and eschatologically, embraces men of every kind of world view and nationality. Both of them maintain that in their historical particularity they already participate in this universality. But it is precisely in the way in which they understand and apply this participation, however, that the differences begin. The most striking difference is that whereas in the one case we have a non-missionary particularity, in the other we have a missionary particularity. It is impossible to evade this difference, since it also determines all the other differences in their respective views of particularity and universality. More especially, however, relations between Jews and Christians have been impeded by Christian practice in the past. Whenever Christian theology and the Christian Church regarded Judaism as a false particularism which was no longer justified after the coming of Christ and is therefore 'obdurate', it has been guilty of an aggressive universalism from which a particularistic Anti-Semitism was and still is inseparable. If Christian theology is to achieve a responsible Christian view of the dialectic of particularity and universality, it is absolutely essential that it should resolutely retrace its steps from such longtrodden paths. For precisely this relation to 'Israel' will provide this Christian view with its boundary and its touchstone.

1. The Unity of Particularity and Universality in the Fellowship with God in Jesus Christ

Particularity and universality coincide for Christian faith in the person of Jesus Christ. The particularity of the communion with God that is given in Jesus Christ means the contingent and <u>exclusive</u> self-identification of God with Jesus of Nazareth in the cross and the resurrection. Its universality, however, consists in the fact that thereby at the same time God's self-determination towards communion with all men and glorification in all things is definitively and conclusively brought to a decision.

This unity of particularity and universality cannot be understood apart from the Old Testament covenant history, of which Christian faith confesses Jesus Christ to be the fulfilment. The particularism of ancient Israel is not to be reckoned as an instance of the particularity of the nations. Its particularism is of a dialectical kind. Superficially it might appear to be the negation of a world of nations constituting a threat to its existence and a danger to its faith. Basically, however, it is to be understood as the mystery of salvationhistory at work in the history of the world.

The particularity of Israel passes over into the particularity of the one Jew Jesus. Not the church, but this Jesus of Nazareth takes the place of the chosen people. He is the Chosen One, the Righteous One of God, the Man with whom alone God identified himself on Good Friday, while everywhere else on that day dorkness prevailed among Jews and Gentiles. Election thus becomes more particular: it is restricted to the One who lived in perfect communion with God, in the unity of Father and Son. Election becomes at the same time, however, more universal. For Jesus did not regard communion with God "as a prize" to be kept to hinself, but sought to share it with the many and remained true to this purpose even to his death on the cross (Phil. 2,5-11), that is, even anid the universal opposition which mankind in its sin maintains against communion with God. There is accordingly no longer any such thing as election and salvation apart from this One: "No one comes to the Father except by me" (Jn. 14,6). Election and salvation are now, in virtue of his substitution, valid unconditionally for all: "In making all mankind prisioners to disobedience, God's purpose was to show mercy to all mankind" (Rom. 11, 32).

2. Particularity and Proleptic Universality on the Part of the Christian Church

The Christian Church has its being not in itself, but outwith itself. Its being and measure is Jesus Christ, the Crucified and the Firstfruits of the coming world. In him alone it has therefore also that universality of which Col. 3,11 speaks: "There is no question here of Greek: and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, freeman, slave; but Christ is all, and is in all." Exclusive and universal reality exists, however, solely in the Crucified, and, one day, in the messianic future of Christ.

The church in its existence and activity corresponds to the exclusive and universal reality of Jesus Christ, but is not this reality itself. Only with this limitation can it be called the "first International (cf. Gal. 5,28), the ecclesic surmoned from all nations and states. It is the pilgrim people of God (Heb.) in between the cross and the

parousia of Christ. It lives in faith in the reconciliation of the world in the setting up of God's gracious justice in the cross of Christ, and in hope of the consummation of this justice in eternal righteousness and joy at the parousia of Christ.

The universality of the new Jerusalen no longer knows anything of a church (Rev. 21,22). There is accordingly only a proleptic universality of the church, which coincides with its historical particularity. For it is particular, distinct from all other human fellowships, in its sense of divine-human fellowship in the name of Jesus Christ. And it is particular in the form of its discipleship of the cross. When the church really participates in the universal mission of Jesus Christ, then it finds itself in the particularity of the discipleship of the cross. What is one day to be an all-comprehending and all-pervading community in the presence of God, begins as a separation among men, as mustard seed and minority. The word of the cross arouses opposition. The universal eschaton is concealed beneath the particular form of the cross. The very universalism of Christian mission leads to particularity. Proleptic universality is therefore enbodied in Christendon only when the latter proclaims the justification of the godless and follows Jesus' party-spirited identification of himself with the least of his brethren, the hungry, the oppressed, and the imprisoned: ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia!

3. The Particularity of National, Speculative and Political Systems, and the Utopia of a Universal World Community

The history of Christendom and its present state are at variance with the ideal form of the church as thus far outlined. Christendom, as an element in this world and its history, bears in its own body all the marks of human division. The dialectic of particularity and universality in the national, cultural and political realm is in the first instance its own problem. This applies also to the <u>Oikoumene</u>. The latter can only be understood as a movement of repentance resulting from the consciousness of our sacramental unity and eschatological universality in Christ.

This leads at once to criticism of our own disunity. False particularity in the national, cultural and political realm is, together with all its related separations in the body of the Church, a sin against the Church's own being. Christendon, however, is called to provide already in its own form, for all its brokenness, a proleptic representation of that community which undermines all national and other divisions (cf. Acts 2 and the ecumenical reflections on the eucharist). The particularity of national and cultural factors is, of course, ambivalent, and for that reason this task is not an easy one. It calls for constant critical distinction: what, on the one hand, is intolerable repristination and reproduction of national, racial and cultural barriers, and what, on the other hand, is national, racial, cultural diversity which is not only permissible, but also necessary and desirable for the life of the oikoumene <u>in loco</u>?

3.1 The Particularity of the Nations and the Utopia of a Universal World Community

# (a) Biblical Perspectives

Christian faith is one with Judaism in regarding the division of mankind into a multitude of peoples as a historical fact in the context of the

one chosen people of God, but not as a genuine order of creation. The biblical account of primeval history testifies, on the contrary, to the fact that in terms of their creation all men are destined to be a single humanity (Adam as man and humanity). And this destiny finds its eschatological fulfilment in the new Adam, Jesus Christ, in whom the "dividing walls" of national, racial and religious antitheses are broken down and a new, undivided humanity comes to light (cf. Eph. 2, 14ff and Col. 3,9ff). In harmony with this is the Old Testament promise of the pilgrimage of the peoples to Zion at the end of time: "They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks" (Is. 2.4). The element of hostile separation in the difference between the nations will disappear. The distinction between the people of God and the nations will be done away in the universal presence of God in all men and all things: "Now at last God has his dwelling among men! He will dwell among them and they shall be h's people, and God himself will be with them" (Rev. 21,3 = Ez. 37,27). This divine presence, however, means the abolition of absolutely every division, of all that keeps men from communion with God in their relationship to each other and to nature: "There shall be an end to death, and to mourning and crying and pain; for the old order has passed away!" (v. 4). Abolition of the hostile separation is not necessarily, however, abolition of the difference between the nations altogether, as this difference has developed in history, but rather makes room for unimaginable diversity: "The wealth and splendor of the nations shall be brought into it (the heavenly city)" (Rev. 21,26).

The "particularity of the nations" is accordingly - from the biblical point of view - ambivalent:

(1) The nations are not separate creations or historical manifestations of an eternal creative idea in the mind of God. This forbids all myths about national origins, and all religious glorification of national features. As products of history nd as factors within history, the nations stand, on the contrary, under the judgment of God. Their particularity in the pejorative sense of their aggressive relation to each other and more especially towards Israel is the expression of pagan aloofness from God (cf. Gen. 11 amongst other passages).

(2) Certain as it is that national particularity has all along been infested with sin, it is equally certain that it also contains a positive element in view of God's goal of salvation for the nations. The Old Testament is not egalitarian, but recognizes the specific character of the different nations, such as Egypt, Assyria, Phoenicia, etc. Through the midst of judgment they will be accepted by God in their peculiarity, fitted into his plan of salvation and finally brought to that messianic dominion of instruction and righteousness which abolishes all dominion of nations over nations and men over men: "No longer need they teach one another to know the Lord; all of them, high and low alike, shall know me, says the Lord, for I will forgive their wrongdoing and remember their sin no more" (Jer. 31,34).

#### (b) Historico-political Perspectives

The ambivalence of national particularity is evidenced also in the more recent and most recent history of the nations. Constructive national consciousness and nationalistic egoism permeate each other from the start. The European nations arose in the process of emancipation from the supranational Empire of the Latin-Christian Middle Ages and gave shape to the modern concept of the nation as the identity of national language, national culture and national body politic - which, to be sure, is only seldom realised in its pure form. At the same time the "sacro egoismo" (Machiavelli) of the national state entered into the concept of the nation, often also a belief in election and, bound up with this, the sense of a political and cultural mission to other nations. Rousseau with his modern "civic", or "national", religion repristinates to a certain extent the primitive religion of closed tribal societies which functioned as the strongest expression of their self-assertion against foreigners and enemies. Nationalistic particularism in the negative sense culminated in National Socialism with its concept of Germano-Teutonic supremacy and its murderous consequences for six million Jews, to say nothing of other victims.

National egoism and imperialism is to this day one of the strongest historical factors in the aggressive division of mankind. Today, however, it is necessary to bring out also the positive element in the particularity of the nations - and this, too, at various levels and in various situations:

(1) Nationalism has often served an integrative and constructive function in helping new political groups and historical subjects in Asia and Africa to discover their identity and consolidate their position. To be sure, it leads at once to new internal and external barriers when partial historical, religious and cultural traditions are expected to serve as a national ferment, especially when they are combined with ethnic and racial characteristics. Yet precisely in the many cases in which various peoples, tribes, languages and cultures grow together into a new nation, the dominant element in their nationalism is the political factor that in Europe derived from the French Revolution: the struggle for political and economic independence, for the realisation of human rights, for bread and peace, social justice and tolerance.

(2) Already today it is no longer from individual nations but rather from supra-national political, ideological, economic and military blocs that the danger of an agressive division of mankind threatens. The interest of such blocs in the rest of the world is particular and therefore provokes particular reactions which have their temporary justification; for example, the reactions of the developing countries to the cartel of industrial nations. But even internally, these blocs frequently display the hegemony of the stronger nations, if not indeed of one strongest nation, over the weaker nations. It is precisely here that the particularity of the nations acquire a new and positive significance by functioning as political guardians of minorities and promoting human selfdetermination at the regional and local levels. It is true that if mankind is to survive today the nations must surrender substantial sovereign rights. But can they do so unless they are certain that their rights will be safeguarded within a supra-national community and not abused by bloc or individual interests?

(3) Whereas in the previous two paragraphs we spoke of a particularity of the nation which is positive in a <u>transitory</u> sense, i.e. a particularity which can disappear when the negative particularity has been overcome or, as may happen, can be taken up into a world wide community in which human rights at the local level are secured, in this third paragraph we must speak of an abiding positive character attaching to national particularity. It is conceivable that, along with a uniform world culture in the technological field, a world society politically united and with a common law may become a reality. But this unity could mean the universal dispersion of the human factor into the alienation of a totally planned, 'one-dimensional', meaningless and soulless world. It is here that the particularity of the national element is already beginning to acquire new importance, as the diverse historical, religious, cultural and aesthetic traditions which, freed from the burden of the roles forced on them by nationalistic self-seeking and competition, can contribute to the manifold richness and to the opportunities open to the whole of mankind.

#### 3.2. The Particularity of Religions and Ideologies and the Utopia of a Universal World Community

As already in 3.1., so here we must distinguish strictly between the eschatological promise of the universal kingdom of God and the utopia of a world community to be achieved by men. The additional point that must be made here, however, in respect of the plurality of religions and ideologies, is that only at the expense of its own identity could Christianity abandon its fundamental, but also exclusive and particular, experience of fellowship between Good and man in Christ. This does not mean it must be blind to the many convictions held by others around it but rather be open to them - whether they affirm a different awareness of God and man, or, adopting a different ideology altogether, repudiate all such awareness as either illusion or deception. So far as these convictions are concerned it will be resolutely in favour of pluralism, in view of a coming world community, but without falling a prey to a pluralistic ideology. For it can only be faithful to its commission if it is constantly engaged in a spiritual struggle to establish the possibility that one particular-awareness of God and man represents the truth. This struggle is manifestly a spiritual one, a non-violent one, using the vehicle of language, the methods of reason and love, and with respect for the convictions of the other and for his human dignity. The Christian Church is therefore in favour of the neutrality of the political constitution towards any positive world view or ideology.

At the same time, the very character of the Christian Church involves a decisive option in favour of a non-religious State. For, confessing the sovereignty of God in Jesus Christ, the Christian Church is a 'brotherhood free from all domination', one in which none exercises sovereignty over another (individual autonomy), but also one in which none stands outside the 'we' of the Church (universal solidarity). But since the State, whatever be its constitution, means a relationship in which men exercise sovereignty over other men, then, from (the) Christian standpoint, it is impossible for awareness of God to form part of tis constitution. The opposition of the Christian Church must here be directed not merely against the 'Christian' State but against the 'religious' State in any form, as also against the State with a decidedly anti-religious ideology.

# 3.3. Overcoming false Particularity in the Political and Social Fields with a view to the Coming World Community

Because the Christian Church is a brotherhood free from all domination, its members are led to struggle politically against every form of false.

particularity in the political and social fields and makes them champions of a radically democratic constitution for the world. A brotherly Christian Church and a democratic civil community have a common interest in promoting maximum justice for all citizens. Close as the relations may have been and may still be between Christianity and the liberal state, what is disturbing today is the actual dominance of society by the category of 'property' and the principle of 'production' which are allowed to control other freedoms instead of being controlled by them. Moreover, economic expansion and the increase of the Gross National Product, the basic principle of world society in its late bourgeois stage and, at the same time, the dubious and, in face of the Third World, imperialistic standard by which a society is measured, is beginning to reach its ecological and human limits. As we look towards a universal world society which will turn its back on false particularity in the political, social and ecological fields, it becomes increasingly urgent to establish new values and priorities for the life of society.

4. The Christian View of Particularity and Universality in Relation to Judaism and the State of Israel

There is no single Christian conception of particularity and universality in respect of Judaism, still less in respect of the State of Israel. Some believe that the special dealings of God with Israel came to an end with the coming of Christ. For these, Judaism is a religion like any other religion and the State of Israel a secular state like any other. Others believe that the mystery of divine election still continues to surround the Jewish people. Some even regard the establishment of the State of Israel as the beginning of the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies of the last days.

In my view, the Christian faith would cease if it failed to hold to the belief that the unity of exclusive particularity and universality in Jesus Christ applies also to 'Israel'. But this means no less than that in Israel the universalism of the Church and its mission discovers its boundary. Jesus was a Jew and the Church of Jesus Christ began in Jerusalem as a revival movement within Judaism and symbolized the messianic Israel by the number of the twelve apostles. This is precisely why there can be no Gentile Christian mission to Israel; there can only be a dialogue between Christians and Jews and as well as the dialogue between Gentile Christians and Jews there should perhaps also be an inner Jewish dialogue between Jewish Christians and Jews. The Christian Church became an ekklesia of the nations in the first place only because of the twofold experience: on the one hand that the Spirit of the Crucified embraced also Gentiles who lacked the Law and circumcision and, on the other hand, that the synagogue rejected this way taken by the exalted Jesus. According to Romans (cc. 9-11), this meant that the traditional order of redemption - first the Jews, then the Gentiles - has been reversed by God Himself and that the gathering together of the nations which belongs to the time of the end is already a reality now in mission and Church. But this way is at the same time God's roundabout way of fulfilling His promises to Israel. In rejecting the Gospel of Jesus the Messiah, Israel goes its own self-chosen way. Yet this way is, after all, in a hidden fashion, the special way along which God is leading His people to the universal divine community. The particularism of Israel does not fall by the board; on the contrary, it acquires new meaning.

- 7 -

For the Church's understanding of itself and, above all, its universality, it matters supremely whether or not it recognizes Israel's peculiar road. Certainly Israel's particularism is no longer the signal exclusiveness of its election, for in Jesus Christ all are elect. But in continuing to hope for the coming of Messiah, Israel reminds the Church of the still outstanding messianic future of Jesus Christ. Extra Christum nulla salus applies to all men, and therefore to Israel, too. But the very particularity of Israel is a warning to the Church not to falsify this statement to read <u>extra ecclesiam nulla salus</u>. Ultimately only the messianic future of Jesus Christ and his kingdom, which will embrace Israel too, is catholic and universal. The Church's catholicity and universality is therefore provisional; within history it is bounded by the particularity of Israel.

When the Church has forgotten this, it has arrogated to itself the catholicity and universality of the kingdom. The tendency on the Church's part to <u>turn Israel into the Church - dividing the Christ who has come</u> from the Christ who is still to come! - has often enough gone hand in hand with the Church's own paganization. Whenever the Church has lost the sense of its own provisional and pilgrim character, whenever it has failed to distinguish between reconciliation and redemption, and believed itself already to be the filfilment, it has served as the religious endorsement of an empire (that of Constantine, for example), or of an ideology (that of the 'Christian' West, for example), or of a nation.

In my view, therefore, the Christian Church should pay heed to the mysterious role of Judaism in God's history of salvation, of a Judaism which in two thousand years has never assimilated itself to the peoples who have been its hosts but has clung to its religious peculiarity and its eschatological hope. For this precise reason, the Church cannot accept an identification of Judaism and the State of Israel. For example, is the eschatological hope of 'next year in Jerusalem' no longer valid after 1948? Would the complete absorption of Judaism into the State of Israel not inevitably mean the end of its identity and a paganizing of it into the 'political religion' of a State? These can only be raised as questions, with due respect to the Jews' own understanding of their role and their various and divergent views. Yet the Christian Church, considering its peculiar relationships with Judaism, should measure the <u>State</u> of Israel and its politics by the same standards which it uses to measure all States and all political activity.

Translated from the German Language Service WCC

# CURISTIAN/JENISH LEADERS CONSULTATION Geneva, December 11 - 14, 1972

How can we understand and work together with communities of other religions and ideologies in their quest for a world community based on their own resources?

#### by K. Stendahl

1) To what extent is there a "quest for a world community" in various religious communities? Now high priority does such a quest have in various communities? To what extent is such a quest intrinsic to our communities? The answer to these questions are not obvious to me.

2) Contrary to the views, hopes and expectations of many believers and non-believers, religion has actually been more devisive than unifying as far as "world community" is concerned. Religion seems to be a complicating rather than a helpful factor. And it is well known that human and political and economic conflicts become more vicious when wedded to religious diversifications. Religious wars are the most ferocious ones.

3) Yet I cannot imagine human beings apart from their religiousness. In their faith they find their identity, their full humanity, their place in the universe, their calling. Communities of faith are a necessity. Even if such communities create tensions, let us <u>first</u> affirm the indispensible character of the communities of faith and <u>then</u> ask for how they may fit together in a larger whole.

4) The Christian and the Muslim communities have tended to think of world community by conquest be it by military or missionary means. The Jewish community has had a different model. They have accepted the calling to obedient service to God and to the Torah in a manner which in God's plan has global meaning as they become "the light unto the nations." Their witness to the One God and the Moral Order remains a witness, not an urge of making all men jews.

5) In a pluralistic society and a shrinking world this "Jewish Hodel" of witnessing rather than conversion may well deserve serious consideration by all religious communities. It could be argued that early Christianity was closer to it than than we now believe. The "universalism" of the Christian Church did imply a community across the line between Jews and Gentiles, but it did not envisage a christianized world. On the contrary, it envisaged a distinct minority drawn from many nations and peoples, but still a minority that served God as the salt of the earth and as light to the world.

6) Thus we may approach the "world community" as distinct, nonimperialist, witnessing communities. The result of our witness must retain its dimensions of mystery. Only God knows the plan and the consummation. To us belongs "only" the faithful witness. 7) What are the "resources" of our communities referred to in our assignment? They are, of course, our Scriptures, our traditions, our histories, our inherited wisdom. Fut if our faith is a living faith and God is a living God, then the greatest resource is our present experience of God and the present promptings of the Spirit.

8) It could be argued that religious tradition without God - without a present relation to God, without prayer, meditation, listening for the Word here and now - is not only dead but positively dangerous, destructive and demonic.

9) Contemporary religious experience must include a new seriousness about "world community". In many ways this is a new question or at least a question with new urgency and possibilities in a shrinking world, a world of heightened inter-dependence.

10) It could be argued that a search for the role of religious communities witnessing to the will of God for the world must lift up the issues of <u>power</u>. And it may be that especially Jews and Christians together should consider whether their Scriptures and their traditions have a special insight and perspective, somewhat like this:

In the drama of history God shows his grace, his power, his election on the side of the oppressed, repressed, depressed - so as to overcome the inbalance of power. Hence there is never comfort for the comfortables. Hence grace means justice, mercy means judgment. The first become the last and those who hunger and thirst after justice are called blessed for they shall be vindicated. This is <u>the criterion of biblical ethics</u>. Strength and Chosen-ness do not mix well. In times of strength the Day of the Lord is darkness rather than light.

This "resource" is one that overcomes the triumphalism of religious communities. And the triumphalism of religious communities is the main road block on the way toward a community of communities.

11) But the only resource worth the name is and remains the living God and the living faith. He who says God knows that God transcends everything, including  $h_{1S}$  statements about God, and including his community. The world somehow expects men and women of faith to be an asset toward world community. And in spite of all the signs to the contrary the true believer knows that that expectation is correct.

- 2. -

#### Shemaryahu Telmon

# PARTICULARITY AND UNIVERSALITY - A JEWISH VIEW

3

The twin concepts of particularity and universality have been 1. differently interpreted throughout history not only by Judaism and Christianity, but also by diverse social and political ideologies. It is inevitable that the religious interpretation of these concepts which do not pertain exclusively to the domain of religion, always have been and still are affected by moods, modes and attitudes which prevail in the sociopolitical dimension. In our own generation, although not exclusively, the dichotomy of the two concepts has hardened into full-fledged opposition: More often than not, particularity and universality are viewed as two mutually exclusive frames of mind and ideological pursuits. 2. Whereas Judaism emphatically rejects the presentation of particularity and universality as mutually contradictive, Christianity on the whole is prepared to subscribe to this definition. The expectation of a future perfect equality of men in the kingdom to come creates in believing Christians a consciousness of mutual obligation and a sense of solidarity within the framework of a constituted community - the Church as Corpus Christi. The individual and the community are called upon to prepare the way for the realisation of the all-embracing future society by progressively foreshadowing it in actual history.

The ideal picture implicitly and explicitly presupposes the ultimate conversion of all mankind to the one and only faith, the universal religion of humanity, Hegel's "absolute religion". No other social affiliations and configurations are required, may permitted to mediate between the individual and the ultimate unity which is the Church. The community of the Church is World Community.

This universalist ideology, based upon the concept of election, is pregnant with the hybris of self-righteousness to no lesser degree than a particularistic conception of chosenness. Being grounded in the lofty vision of a united mankind, direct universalism easily can generate contempt for individuals and groups that have not seen the light. Since this type of universalism is conceived of as the only legitimate way leading to salvation of mankind - nulla salus extra ecclesiam, its proponents may feel entitled, even enjoined to use not only missionary persuasion but also crass coercion to impose this universalism on the recalcitrant.

Rev.

Any opposition which hinders the realisation of what is taken to be "objective" universalism must be vanquished, since, almost by definition it surely emanates from stubborn "subjetive" egotism. Individuals and groups who insist on remaining outside the structure of this "particularistic universalism" may again have to face, as they did face in the past, the danger of annihilation.

A prevalent ideological tendency, voiced preponderantly by Western 3. liberals, whi h advocates the abrogation of any sort of institutionalised borders and limitations in the realm of socio-political organisation, coalesces with the above universalist persuasion of Christianity, notwithstanding the guite different underlying motivations. The resulting universalism, self styled "progressive", instinctively rejects and actively militates against insistence of collectivities on the right to cling to their particular identities. Judaism presents an altogether different ideology, perpetuating as it does, its historically specific beliefs and customs, underscored by the reconstitution of Israel as a separate political entity. This actual particularity is decried by universalists as the expression of objectionable religio-political parochialism. The confusion of "particularity" as an actuality with "particularism" as a normative concept in respect to Judaism, necessitates a renewed analysis of these issues and their respective roles in the system of ideas of Judaism 4. It must be stated from the outset that the presentation of the matter is beset by severe limitations: Judaism is not monolithic in the interpretation of its own heritage. In the present context, it would be impossible to do justice to the diverse nurnees, some varying even on principles, which can be discerned in the discussion of the issue un er review within Jewry. What is more, the interpretation of particularity and universality and of the relative roles which they are assigned in the overall framework of Jewish thought, to a large degree is directly dependent on specific historic situations. The variations in emphasis by successive generations of Jewish thinkers often is the direct result of external politico-religious conditions to which Jews reacted. These reformulations of the concepts of particularism and universalism determine, to a great measure, the Jewish attitude towards the surrounding world. It follows, that in an attempt to present the essence of Jewish particularity and universality, selection is imperative. One can only hope to recapture the essential aspects which should guide Jewish thinking in this matter, although historical reality may

. .

- 2 -

diverge from them, as indeed it sometimes did and still does, and even flagrantly flout the principles distilled from basic normative Jewish sources. "Between the idea And the reality Between the motion And the act Falls the shadow" (T.S. Elliott, The Hollow Man, Collected Poems New York 1936, P. 104).

5. Both Jewish particularity and the universalist thrust of Judaism are grounded in the biblical world of ideas. It is from there that any discussion of these two aspects within the orbit of Judaism must take its departure.

From its very inception, biblical thinking affirms "particularity" as a universal empirical fact, and "universalism" as a value, the particular goal of Israel's singular monotheism. The particularity of the individual expresses itself not in solitude or in "oneness" - God alone is "one" - but rather in diverse crystallisations of collective specificity: family, clan tribe, credal community, people, nation, and freely contracted fellowship. Judaism strives to give validity to the fragmentary life of the individual vis the projection of social structures, thus saving him from direct unmitigated confrontation with an impersonal universal society. The self is thus the touchstone by which to measure altruistic relationships: Love for thy neighbor should equal love for thyelf. Raised to the societal level, and applied to intergroup relationships, this precept makes collective specifities and particular identities the cornerstones of all general and universal structures: "The ideal of the religion of Israel was society in which the relations of men to their fellows was governed by the principle 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself'." (George Fcote Moore, Judaism vol. II, p.156), 6. 'Farticularity' and 'universalism' are complementary, not mutually exclusive. This almost axiomatic statement obviously causes difficulties when it is applied to actual life situations. Here, the problem of relating the principle to the specific arises in full force. There is, on the one hand, the danger of judging actualities in their relativity by visionary absolute standards. On the other hand, expendiency often causes the ideal to become subjected to short-range considerations of practicability. "It is true", says Martin Buber, "that we are not able to live in perfect justice (let alone, inperfect love, S.T.), and in order to preserve the community of men, we are often compelled to accept wrongs in decisions concerning the community. But what matters is that in every hour of decision we are aware of our responsibility and summon our conscience to weigh exactly how much is necessary to preserve the community, and accept just so much and no more (Hebrew Humanism, in: Israel and the World, p. 246). Practical morality, as understood in

- 3 -

Judaism, grasps both these complementary aspects of social-reality, and works at relieving the inevitable tension between them. Fully recognising the deficiency of our historical world, Judaism acquiesces in the knowledge that an ideal structure of human society can be achieved only at the 'end of days'. However, the ewareness of the limitations of collective life on all levels in the historical world, is not an attitude that breeds inertia. From its inception in biblical days to the present day, Judaism has grappled with internal and external problems arising from the tension between different collectivities, adjusting the ways and means of dealing with them to the particular needs of the specific historic situations. The validation of history generates in Jews a readiness to reinterpret their heritage and to respond self-critically to new con itions and new challenges. This stance can be fruitfully utilised in the redefinition of basic Jewish concepts in the context of the present deliberations: the search for a better world-order.

7. In this context it would appear that a redefinition of the idea of 'election' becomes imperative. Notwithstanding the centrality of the idea of 'the chosen people', a concept which was assimilated by Christianity to itself, the underlying persuasion that distinctiveness necessarily equals 'distinction' clashes with the basic convictions of equality inherent in the projected world-order. As a concept of superiority, rather than differentness and service, the doctrine of chosenness must be rejected by Jewry since it implies the unacceptable notion of automatically preferential status of the Jewish collectivity before the Creator vis-à-vis other credal and ethnical collectivities. In a world society founded on the inherent equality of all men, the term 'chosen' as implying moral superiority, can only be legitimately conferred upon a collective by others, if this group has shown itself to be worthy of such distinction by its exemplary mode of life.

8. The sychronic extension of the individual into the collective, is complemented by the diachronic extension. Man in his collectivity spans the gap between proceeding and future generations. The collective thus affords to the individual the security of continuity beyond his own circumscribed life-span. Historical consciousness arises from collectivity, and at the same time undergirds and strengthens collectivity. It helps overcome the fragmentariness of mankind which may lead to forlornness, and ultimately to destructiveness.

- 4 -

3

The certainty of being a link in the chain of generations encourages the perpetuation of transmitted values. The knowledge that one is enjoined to transmit these values in ever-changing circumstances to generations to come, makes for a readiness to reinterpret them in the light of new experiences. The ongoing reshaping of inherited values opens up in Judaism a readiness to apply these values to wider collectivities.

9. In summarising the basic tenets of Judaism with respect to the 'particularity' - ' universalism' dichotomy, it may be said that Judaism recognises particularity as an undeniable principle of human existence. Judaism further confers a spiritual dimension upon actual particularity, as experienced in all life situations, by conceiving of it as divinely decreed: it is a basic phenomenon of the human condition since the days of creation neturally, anthropologically, ethnically, socially and politically. Particularity implies diversity and, to a certain degree, separateness of men, under the unifying overlordship of the Creator who reigns supreme over all mankind. Judaism affirms the resulting diversity in the retum of the human spirit. It recognises the multiformity of the religious experience, and of its expression in various and varied cultic practices, a reality of human history. Freedom of choice in matters spiritual is considered the unalienable right of all men as individuals, and as members of specific collectivities, i.e. of socio-religious communities.

10. In actual history, as a result of man's sins, positively viewed specificity degenerated into divisiveness. The processes by which the separateness of individuals and of species and the particularity of groups deteriorated into inimical competition and hatred, is portrayed in the Bible in a series of enisodes set in the antedeluvian and the pre-Hebrewseras. The Adam/Eve-Snake enmity (Gen. 3:14-15) typifies man's separation from other species; Cain's fratricidal killing of Abel symbolyses the erosion of individuality into egotistic rivalry anthropologically (ib. 4:3 ff.). Not only does human divisivaness result from particularity gone awry but according to the biblical marrative also from a wrongly conceived universality. This is exemplified in the episode of the Tower of Bable. Until then "all the world spoke one language and used the same words" (or possibly "had common purposes"). Excessive 'oneness' generated hybris towards the only 'one', God the Creator, and was punished by the divisive scattering of mankind which characterises the human condition until the 'end of days'. Historical divisive particularity is viewed as the hiatus between the divinely established concerted diversity at the time of creation, and the reconstituted composite unitedness of man and beast, of nation and mation, at the time of the 'latter days'.

- 5 -

-

11. Judaism has set up 'universalism' as the ultimate goal towards the achievement of which mankind should direct its efforts. All men and all peoples are exhorted to place their hopes in the vision of 'the latter days' -- a cosmic situation when the historical-existential tension between particularlity and universality finally will be allayed: The universe again will be beacefully shared by all under the just guidance of the Creator to whom all peoples will pay homege. As in the initial, i.e. pre-historical era, so in the latter stages of human history, universality will be realised in the accord of species and specificities, and not in the abolition of particularities - anthropological, credal and socio-political. Israel's universalist vision expresses itself in the unisons of particular men and particular people who worship the 'one most high' in the manifold hypostisations of the Deity. Israel will remain, indeed, God's 'am segulah, His 'particular' (AV:pecular) people (Ex.19:5; Deut- 7:6; 14-2; 26-18 and Mal. 3:17). But by the same token such a special position and relationship is granted to each and every meople in the context of its own faith: "Each man shall dwell under his own vine, under his own fig tree undisturbed, for the Lord of Hosts himself has spoken. All peoples will (or: may) walk, each in the name of his god, but we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever" (Micah 4:4-5). Judaism holds out to the nations salus extra synagogem.

12. In this context, the Jewish perception of life in society as being based upon a definite code of legal prescriptions and injunctions gains special importance. The interaction of individuals and of social bodies must be regulated by divinely proclaimed and normatively expounded statutes which affect all mankind, although to varying degrees. Jewish universalism is grounded in a legal basis which is shared by all humanity: the seven Noshide laws which are the seven pillars of human coexistence. Jewish particularity is revealed in the superstruct re of commandments and laws which define the specificity of Judaism. In the ideal "Commonwealth of Nations", peoples will voluntarily subject their sovereign will to the persuasive power of the Divine Judge (Isaia: 2:1-4; Micah 4:1-4). Divine justice will become manifest in the Isrzelite religio-cultural body politic under the just leadership of the Israelite king (Is. 11: 1-5). The regulative force of the Divine and the human-royal adjudication will overcome all divisiveness which arose from improperly understood particularities internally between Judah and Ephraim (ib. 11:12); externally, between Israel and the nations (ib. 19:24-25) and between nation and nation their -- specifically unimpaired.

- 6 -

In this biblical vision unfolds, in the purest and most concentrated form, Israel's conception of 'world community' as a 'community of communities'. Between the particular subjective level of individual human exustence and the universal-objective realm of world-community, Judaism posits the non-universal but trans-subjective character of the group, irrespective of its nature of definition.



Rev.

Prof. Uriel Tal November, 1972

> STRUCTURES OF FELLOWSHIP AND COMMUNITY IN JUDAISM

(A religio-anthropological definition of the concepts: Community and World Community)

Α.

On the Method:

The purpose of this paper is to describe and to define, according to Jewish tradition, the terms to be discussed by this consultation: "Community", "Community of Communities" and "World Community". As Salo W. Baron points out: "... Only through a deeper penetration of the essential trends in the millenial history of the Jewish Community will we be able to comprehend the chaotic variations of the contemporary community, all of which go back to the same original structure and still reveal its indelible imprint. Interest in Jewish communal history, true enough, is fairly universal in Jewish circles. Reformers and Zionists, orthodox Jews and Socialists, indeed, all wings of Jewish public opinion have for decades expressed intense interest in the past as well as the present of the Jewish Community. An enormous monographic literature has grown  $v_p$  in recent decades, making available primary sources of information for many areas and centuries ... and subjecting then to close juridical, sociological and historics l scrutiny ..." (Salo W. Baron, <u>The Jewish Community</u>, Phil. 1948, (J.P.S.), Vol. I, p. 29).

Our attempt to describe and define the concepts of Jewish Fellowship and Community is based on, and derived from, this historical research, including the vast number of studies produced since the appearance of Baron's work (1948) by Baron himself as well as by other scholars of contemporary "Wissenschaft des Judentums" (Louis Finkelstein, Jewish Self-<u>Government in the Middle Ages</u>, New York (1924), 1964 . Israel Halpern, <u>Acta</u> <u>Congressus Generalis Judaeorum Regni Poloniae</u> (1580-1764), Jerusalem, 1945, (Bialik Inst.), 635 pp. (LXXXVIII). - cf. Ben Zion Dinur, <u>Historical & Fritings</u>, Vol. I, Jerusalem, 1955, (Bialik Inst.), pp. 19-68.)

However, the context of our present consultation is one of applied scholarship rather than of חורה לשמה (Torah Leshma) of learning

for its own sake. Such an application of historical study for a contemporary concern requires the adoption of an additional method, which might help us find the common denominator that unites (although by no means unifies), or that connects (although by no means fuses) the diversified forms of Jewish fellowship and community.

The Torah around which Jewish communal life developed takes for its scope the whole of human life, its physical conditions, its personal conscious and subconscious motivations, its forms of thought and articulation and its social and political relations. The true object of the Torah, and consequently of Judaism as a Community, is the sanctification of life, rather than the salvation of the soul: "... I call heaven and earth to witness: against You this day that I have set before You life and death, blessing and curse, therefore choose life, that You may live, You and Your descendants ..." (Deut. 30:19. cf. Maimonides, <u>Hilchot Teshuva</u>, V:2).

Therefore, the method most suited to our task - that is the description and definition of those communal and inter-communal forms through which Judaism tries to realise the commandment: "Choose life" "that you may live" would be the religio-anthropological approach (cf. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky, "Judaism" in: <u>Historia Religionum Handbook for the History of Religions</u>, ed. by C. Jeuco Bleeken and Geo Widengren, Vol. II. Leiden, (B.J. Brill), 1971, pp 1-3). It is through anthropological structures, developed amidst many diverse historical situations, that this intentionalist form of the Torah and consequently of Jewish tradition, has been realized. The carthliness of the Torah indicates that man is able to unfold in community both his essence, which is his metaphysical status as <u>bian</u> (Nivra Betzelem), as "created in His image", and his existence, which is his natural status as a rational being.

The framework in which this process of growth, of unfolding, takes place is the one we called "Fellowship and Community", starting with man as a partner in God's covenant, proceeding through the family, the community, the congregation, the people or ethnic group or perhaps nation, and culminating in the World Community.

It is this sequence of cycles in Judaism that provides sharp contrasts which often makes the study of Jewish self-understanding

-2-

unconducive to impartial judgment. On the one hand, the entire life-cycle of the Jew is rooted in forms which originally intended to preserve the Jewish people in its priestly sanctity, hence also separateness, so that its religious truths should remain pure and free from encreachments. On the other hand, especially in modern times, this life-cycle has manifested a mighty impulse to intergrate among the nations; whether in order to disseminate the age-old Jewish longing for redemption as exemplified by the Jewish Reform Movement in its early days or, in a different way, as non-religious Jewish revolutionaries would have it; whether in order to absorb world culture and participate in it as equal, though dissimilar, partners, frequently in terms of "ARTH 20 FIG. ARTH 20 FIG. The method of the detech eretz.

1 donthy 1 donthy Ctocher

One aspect of the Jewish life-cycle requires separation from the world, from the nations; the other requires participation; one intends to lead to identity, the other to cooperation; one emphasizes Jewish particularism, the other Jewish universalism; one reflects a strong, nearly biological group desire to preserve Jewish distinctiveness, the other reflects the urge towards human commonality.

Β.

Man and Fellowship:

The pillar on which the entire community structure rests is Man. It is man who is the keystone of all creation, who is God's partner acting as the administrator of His works, as the agent called upon to take his full share in the completion of God's Creation, in the process of the redemption of the world, in progress. Hence, Man is a-priori created as an Individual. As the Mishnahsays when teaching how witnesses should be admonished in capital cases: "... for man casts many coins with one die and they are all alike; while the King of kings, the Holy One praised be He, patterns every man after Adam and (yet) every man is unique. Therefore every man is obliged to say: For my sake was the world created" (Mishnah, Sanhedrin, IV:5).

Yet at the same time, Jewish tradition indicates that Adam, the individual, is also Ben-Adam, a son of mankind. This is not to say that man is only a social or political being; he is an individual. But it is society, or more exactly, the world, Creation, that serves as the medium through which

-3-

Man's religious calling is realised. It is Man, collectively, who in the first chapter of Genesis is commanded to subject the earth and all its creatures to the purpose of cultivation. As we learn from the prophets and then from the sages: "... He who formed the earth created it not a waste; - He formed it to be inhabited ... " (Isajah 5:18. cf. T.B. Yebamoth, 62/a). Therefore in creating Man, our sages continue, God took dust from every part of the world, so that he would be everywhere at home (Genesis Rabbah, VITI-: P). Once Man's universality has been established, according to the his way of life is subsequently consecrated to the Halachic pattern. realization of the Torah in the world, in society, amidst mankind. The Midrash tells that when Ben-Zoma saw great crowds of people together he exclaimed: "Praised be Thou who has created all these to serve me". In the explanation to this blessing he said: "how hard the first man in his loneliness must have toiled until he could eat a morsel of bread or wear a garment, but I find everything prepared. The various workmen, from the farmer to the miller and the baker, from the weaver to the tailor, all labor for me. Can I then be ungrateful and be oblivious to my duty?" (Tos. Berachoth, VII:2. cf. T.B. Berachoth, 58/a).

It is, therefore, in the world and among its inhabitants and its communities that man finds release from his initial loneliness. Hence, as Rabbi Soloveitchik in his essay on "The lonely man of Faith" said: "The prayerful community must not ... remain a twofold affair: a transient I addressing himself to the eternal He. The inclusion of others is indispensable. Man should avoid praying for himself alone. The plural form of prayer is of central Halakhic significance" (Joseph B. Soloveitchik, "The lonely Man of Faith" in: Tradition, Vol. VII, No. 2, N.Y. Summer 1965, p. 37).

C.

The Covenant:

The first step out of Man's loneliness and towards the world is taken through the structure of the Covenant. The covenant with Noah is of course one which relates God and mankind. According to Jewish tradition, the subsequent covenant is structured in two forms of socio-religious life (or as we put it of Fellowship and Community): the family and the people. God's covenant with Abraham was as the head of a family, while the Jewish people was conceived as a group, unique though not exclusive, from among his descendants: "... You and Your seed after You throughout their generations for an everlasting Covenant to be God to You and to Your seed after you ... " (<u>Genesis XVII</u>; 7; 1-8).

It is here, at this primary cycle of Man's religious history that the family emerges as the root of both Jewish separateness and Jewish universalism. True humanity, according to the sages, has its seat not in the life of a recluse but in the family circle. It is the family which generates the essential moral values such as mutual love, physical interrelationship, personal integrity and socio-economic responsibility. According to the Midrash of Genesis it is Man and Wife together who first receive the name "Man" because only mutual helpfulness, care and toil for one another draw forth the inner, human resources of Man. (<u>Genesis Rabbah</u> XVII:2). Hence the family is the first type of communal interdependence where we have the merging of body and mind, matter and spirit, reason and emotion, as indeed reflected in the two pillars of Jewish tradition: Halacha and Aggada.

Hence, Judaism regards the establishment of family life both as a joy and a duty; joy to the individual and duty to mankind, to the world. The Hebrew Bible commands man to procreate. According to the sages, only in the married state can happiness, blessing and peace be attained (<u>T.B. Yebamoth</u>, 62/a, b). Therefore only a person who himself has founded a family, a household, in which moral and social values such as faithfulness, responsibility and love are practised, is preferred by tradition to plead for the people, for the house of Israel, before God. This is one of the reasons why the High Priest must be married, in order to observe the solemn rites of the Day of Atonement (<u>Mishnah Yomah</u>, I:1).

Against this background a Jew is one who is born, or is adopted into the family of Israel, not as often claimed, into the Jewish "race". He becomes a legitimate Jew by becoming a child of Abraham, a (Ben B'rith), a party to the Covenant.

The initial step into the Covenant is birth in terms of (literally speaking) "existence", from ex-sisto ex-sistere, that is of "coming out into standing", "into Being". It is symbolized by circumcision and actualized in

-5-

the first community or - the family.

The second step towards Jewish Fellowship and Community is likewise structured as a covenant, this time the covenant with Moses and through him with the people. According to Exodus (6:2-8), God, after having heard the groaning of the children of Israel whom the Egyptians held in bondage, remember his covenant with Abraham, with Isaac and Jacob, and promised: "... And I will take you to Myself for a people and will be your God... I am the Lord". At this point the dichotomy inherent in Fellowship and Community between separateness and participation, between identity and integration comes into focus.

The covenant with God binds Israel, as the Jewish People, to the task of being a hely nation, separate and distinct. This separateness obliges them to fulfill the divine Commandments. These commandments, however, are related not to Heaven only, but to Earth, to the world and its community, to every part of reality, physical as well as spiritual, to (Maasse Habriah), to the world as Creation.

The very purpose of Israel's separateness therefore, is to live in the world, bostowing form, order and meaning upon it. In order to be faithful to his calling, the Jew has to work in and through society, in and through his own as well as the world's community. Physical labor is not simply to be pursued for individual economic benefit alone but imposes socio-moral responsibility as well: "Idleness, even amid great wealth, leads to the wasting of the intellect (of God's gift) (<u>Mishnah Kethubeth</u> V:5). Intellectual endeavor too possesses a social dimension: "Learning does not thrive in solitude" (<u>T.B. Taanith:</u> 7/a). The seal of the Torah is meant to be imprinted upon the world, its inhabitants and its communities, even upon the satisfaction of Man's most earthly desires.

This intentionalist structure of the covenant has been reconfirmed in one of the most interesting forms of Jewish Community in our days, in the Religious Kibbutz. In it, "... the communal bent of the Torah" is demonstrated, among other ways, by the fulfillment of the laws of the Sabbatical Year and the Jubilee. From the Torah, the religious Kibbutz teaches, "... we learn that the individual does not possess absolute control over the main instruments of production in an agricultural economy. There are restrictions

-6-

on the ownership of the land: "For the land is Mine, for You are sojourners and residents with Me" (Lov. 25:23), on labour: "For they are My servants ... they shall not be sold as bondsmon" (Ibid, 42), and on money necessary for the upkaep of the economy: "And whatsoover of thine is with thy brother thy hand shall release" (Deuteronomy 15:3). These commandments involve a social structure in which the means of production, land, labour and capital - arc regulated, thereby removing the cause of poverty which degrades man and leads to sin, and ... ensuring that "there will not be amongst you a pauper.." (Tsuriel Admanit, "On the Religious Significance of the Community", in: <u>The Réligious Kibbutz Movement - The Revival of the Jewish Réligious</u> <u>Community</u>, ed. by Aryei Fishman, Jerusalem 1957, p. 33; publ. by the Religious Section of the Y.H. Dept.).

D.

The Community

The community is the medium for the actualization of the covenant. The community is the nucleus of Jewish social cohesion, the indispensible structure that enables man to survive so that he can serve God. Without this necessary condition, without surviving in his own, unique community, the Jew can not fulfill the commandments in respect to the relations between Man and God, nor those between Man and Man. The key term for the concept "community" is probably that of Deuteronomy 33:4 "קהילח יעקב" (Kehilat Yaacov) "the Congregation of Jacob". Semantically the Hebrew expressions for "community" are various: Kahal (Ecclesia) as in I King 8:65; Joel 2:16; Psalm 40:10; " 'ח סהל ה' (The Congregation of the Lord) as in Deuteronomy 23:1 (later, the term Kahal referred to the leadership of the "קהילה" ) 8 "עדת ישרצל" (The Congregation of Israel), as in Exodus 12:3 and גול as in as in The Assembly of the Congregation of Exodus 16:1. Finally Israel) as in Exodus 12:6, Num. 14:5.

It is the particularistic community which enables man to practice universalistic ideas such as justice or the pursuit of peace. Maimonides said in his Introduction to the Mishnah:"... A man will not search truth nor seek to do what is good when he goes off into exile or is hungry or is

-7-

fleeing from his enemies..." Because of this vital function, the community is often denoted as קהילה קדרשה" Holy Community", and indeed, the adjective "holy" is applied mainly to communal forms, rarely to persons.

While the pattern of Jewish Communal life has its origins in the Biblical and Graeco-Roman period, its history becomes porhaps more significant for the context of our consultation - for the study of the dichotomy between separatness and participation (or identity and integration, or particularism and universalism) - with the emergence of Medicval Jewish different.

Throughout all this period of history - during the autonomy enjoyed in the Byzantine Empire, in the days of the Arab conquest of Persia in the first half of the seventh century, in Christian Spain where Jewish selfgovernment reached its peak in the 13th century, in Western Europe and Germany chiefly from the 11th century on, in Central Europe, in Italy, and then until the abolition of the Councils of the Lands in Ashkenaz, Poland, Lithuania and Moravia in the second half of the 18th century - throughout all these centuries and in all these countries it was the that functioned as the main form in which that dualism of Jewish particularism and universalism was maintained.

> The privileges granted to the Jewish minority by Muslim and Christian authorities enabled the Jews to take an active part in the corporate structure of Medieval societies and states. Many of the socio-political functions exercised by the state were left in the hands of Jewish selfgovernment. All the components of life, education, worship, philantropy, vocational organization, taxation, financial transactions, social welfare, commerce, moral guidance and regulation, the maintenance of public order, surveillance over buildings, streets, bridges, walls and gates, sanitary control, the care of the sick and of peupers, and disposition of the dead - all these were part of what Rabbi Soloveitchik has called the "Halachic community" which included "... the prayerful life ... consocrated to the realization of the divine imperative" (Soloveitchik, ibid).

Thus Jewish law became a decisive factor, rathor than a petrified fossil in the history of the Jewish Community. Organized like little commonwealths within the bodies of large nations and exercising more or

-8-

less full judicial, fiscal and ecclesiastical authority, the Jewish communities were called upon to regulate the entire life of their members. To satisfy the religious-ethical domands of a highly activist and socially oriented creed, leaders had to pay special attention to moral conduct even in domains today considered strictly secular in nature. The Jewish judiciary was resorted to/only by litigants in economic or domestic disputes, but also by agencies seeking protection for the underprivileged or raising similar issues of social importance (Baron, Vol. I, p. 85; Vol. II, p. 291).

With the disappearance of the medieval communal forms from Western society there was little scope left for autonomous Jewish corporate body. With the omancipation of modern society, the Jew too integrated into the open-class stratified structure of modern life. As the principlos of liberty of conscience and of equality of rights were realized, the Jew too tried to reshape his communal tradition. However, since the Christian denominations, especially in Protestant countries, had abandoned many political features characteristic of the medieval Church, many partisans of emancipation expected the Jewish religion too to be purified of secular ingredients, and confine its activities to worship, religious education and charity (Idem, Vol. I. pp 4, 8).

However, much of Diaspora Jewry since, and the Jewry in the State of Israel today, both refuse, although in different ways, to accept the interpretation of equality in terms of uniformity, with a stubborness or stiffneckedness which is not always admired by the Christian world. Equality, in the Jewish interpretation, means the equal right to maintain socio-religious selfhood amidst human unity, in other words, the principle of separateness and participation.

E.

#### World Community

At first sight, since the fulfillment of the seven Noahite commandments opens the gate to God for "wheever wants to enter" (Exodus Rabbah, XIX:4), it would appear that the attitude of Judaism to the nations should be a simple and open one, as is claimed by Jewish apologeticists. Indeed, many sayings of the sages, of philosophers or theologians would sustain this

-9-

interpretation. An old rabbinic legend, which is reflected in the New Testament miracle of Pentecost, relates that the decalogue was uttered in seventy tongues of fire, to reach the known seventy nations of the earth (<u>T.B. Shabbath</u> 88/b., <u>Excdus Rabbah</u> V:9, <u>Tanchmuah Shmoth</u> XXII, <u>Midrash</u> <u>Tehillim</u>, Psalm LXVIII:6, cf. Acts II:6). Simirarly we learn that when the people entered Canaan the words of the Law were engraved in seventy \_languages on the stones of the altar at Mount Ebal (<u>T.B. Sotah 35/6</u>).

Yet it seems that an objective, truthful definition of the relationship of Judaism to the nations reflects a much more complex attitude. The very duality we called "separateness and participation" or "identity and intergration" or "particularism and universalism", comes to a head here, in the relationship of Judaism to the World and its communities.

On the one hand, since earliest Biblical times, a tendency to relentlessness, to harshness had emerged especially when the pure worship of Israel's one and holy God was endangered. The Bock of the Covenant forbade any alliance with idelatrous nations (Exedus XXIII:32), and the Deuterenomic Code made this more stringent by prohibiting intermarriage and even the teleration of idelators in the land, lest they seduce the people of God to turn away from him (Deuterenomy VII:2; XX:16 ff). In the eyes of the prophets too the heathen nations were looked upon as the embediment of evil, of idelatry, violence, impurity, as a world of arrogance and pride denying God and doomed to perdition because they opposed the sovereignty of God preclaimed by Israel (<u>Is</u>. LX/12; LXIII:6; LXVI:14 f; <u>Zoeh</u>. XIV:2 f; Joel IV, 9-19; <u>Jer</u>. X:25; <u>Ps</u>. IX:16, 18, 20; X:17).

The Pharisces went still further by placing an interdict upon cating with the heathen or using food or wine prepared by them, thus hoping to achieve separation from the non-Jowish world (T.B. Shabbath 27/b). The law in principle did not tolerate those heathen who engaged in idolatrous practices and refused to observe the Seven Noahite Laws, the laws of humanity: "Thou shalt show them no mercy" was the phrase of the law for the seven tribes of Canaan as for all other idolators (<u>Deuteronomy</u> VII:3; cf. <u>T.B. Sanhedrin</u>: 57/a - 59/b). Hence Maimonides lays down the rule that "wherever and whenever the Mesaic law is in force the people must be compelled to abjure heathenism and accept the seven laws of Noah or else they are doomed to die" (Maimonides, Hilchoth Melachim, VIII: 9-10).

-10-

These ancient roots, together with the historical experience of Judaism under both Christian and Muslim regimes, coupled with the recent memory of the Holocaust and reinforced by the ever-present warfare in the Near East - will all perhaps help to explain the hardening of attitude that has lately emerged by quite a number of Jews and Israelis.

On the other hand, however, in the code just cited, Maimonides also says: "... Not only the Jewish tribe is sanctified by the highest degree of human holiness, but every human being, without difference of birth, in whom is the spirit of love and the power of knowledge to devote his life exclusively to the service of God, and the dissemination of this knowledge, and who, walking upright before Him, has cast off the yoke of the many earthly desires ... God is his portion and his eternal inheritance..." (Idem. <u>Hilchoth Shmittah Veyowel</u>, XIII:13). Just as the exclusive attitude to the nations is rooted in the teachings of prophets and sages, so is this opposite, peaceful and universalist attitude to the nations, an integral part of Jewish tradition and an obligating heritage for contemporary Jewry.

The book of Jonah testifies that Israel's God sent His prophet to the Heathen of Nineveh to exhort them to repentance, that they might obtain forgiveness and salvation (Jonah III:IV). Similarly, according to our sages, a non-Jew who studies and practices the Torah is equal to the High Priest, for when the Scripture says: "The laws which a man fulfills, he shall live by them" it implies, that pure humanity is the one essential required by God (Midrash Tehillim, Ps. I:1-2).

Just as the tradition of exclusiveness contributed to hard feelings and harsh attitudes towards the nations, the tradition of inclusiveness contribute to a growing openness, to an increasing pursuit of peace so that justice can be practiced between Israel and Nations.

### F.

#### Conclusion

The Torah, beginning with Creation, teaches that there is no aspect of human life, of Being, which can be regarded as irrelevant to religion. Hence Judaism is realized throughout the entire life-cycle of Man by his

-11-

physical and spiritual growth through the Covenant, the family, the congregation, the community, voluntary associations, peoplehood, ethnicity (or, for some, nationality and statehood) into the world and its communities, into mankind.

Thus, Jewish existence requires adequate conditions for the unfolding of this religio-anthropological structure. Indeed, it seems that much of the history of the Jews among the nations can be understood as attempts at safeguarding these conditions. Since a pluralistic structure of society offers more chances for the free unfolding of the potential of a person or a people, Judaism supports pluralism and opposes imposed uniformity.

This pluralistic structure, since it is derived from understanding the totality of Creation, is not confined to safeguarding Jewish separate existence only, but rather comprises the world and its communities. According to the Jewish creed, redemption has not yet come; no attempt is made to reconcile the diversity of religions. Judaism does not accept Christianity or Islam, nor does it demand of other religions that they embrace Judaism. It is precisely this "stiffnecked" insistence upon being itself, that makes Judaism aware of the universal equal right to be different.

-12-

CERISTIAN/JEMISH LEADERS CONSULTATION Geneva, December 11 - 14, 1972

How can we understand and work together with communities of other religions and ideologies in their quest for a world community based on their own resources?

#### ty K. Stendahl

1) To what extent is there a "quest for a world containity" in various religious communities? Now high priority does such a quest have in various communities? To what extent is such a quest intrinsic to our communities? The answer to these questions are not obvious to me.

2) Contrary to the views, hopes and expectations of many believers and non-believers, religion has actually been more devisive than unifying as far as "world community" is concerned. Religion seems to be a complicating rather than a helpful factor. And it is well known that human and political and economic conflicts become more vicious when wedded to religious diversifications. Religious wars are the most ferocious ones.

3) Yet I cannot imagine human beings apart from their religiourness. In their faith they find their identity, their full humanity, their place in the universe, their calling. Communities of faith are a necessity. Even if such communities create tensions, let us <u>first</u> affirm the indispensible character of the communities of faith and <u>then</u> ask for how they may fit together in a larger whole.

4) The Christian and the Muslin communities have tended to think of world community by conquest be it by military or missionary means. The Jewish community has had a different model. They have accepted the calling to obedient service to God and to the Torah in a manner which in God's plan has global meaning as they become "the "light unto the nations." Their witness to the One God and the Mora). Order remains a witness, not an urge of making all men Jews.

5) In a pluralistic society and a shrinking world this "Jewish Nodel" of witnessing rather than conversion may well deserve serious consideration by all religious communities. It could be argued that early Christianity was closer to it than than we now believe. The "universalism" of the Christian Church did imply a community across the line between Jews and Gentiles, but it <u>did not</u> envisage a christianized world. On the contrary, it envisaged a distinct minority drawn from many nations and peoples, but still a minority that served God as salt of the earth and as light to the world.

6) Thus we may approach the "world community" as distinct, nonimperialist, witnessing communities. The result of our witness must retain its dimensions of mystery. Chly God knows the plan and the consummation. To us belongs "only" the faithful witness.
7) What are the "resources" of our communities referred to in our assignment? They are, of course, our Scriptures, our traditions, our histories, our inherited wisdom. Eut if our faith is a living faith and God is a living God, then the greatest resource is our present experience of God and the present promptings of the Spirit.

8) It could be argued that religious tradition without God - without a present relation to God, without prayer, meditation, listening for the Word here and now - is not only dead but positively dangerous, destructive and demonic.

9) Contemporary religious experience must include a new seriousness about "world community". In many ways this is a new question or at least a question with new urgency and possibilities in a shrinking world, a world of heightened inter-dependence.

10) It could be argued that a search for the role of religious communities witnessing to the will of God for the world must lift up the issues of <u>power</u>. And it may be that especially Jews and Christians together should consider whether their Scriptures and their traditions have a special insight and perspective, somewhat like this:

In the drama of history God shows his grace, his power, his election on the side of the oppressed, repressed, depressed - so as to overcome the inbalance of power. Hence there is never comfort for the comfortables. Hence grace means justice, mercy means judgment. The first become the last and those who hunger and thirst after justice are called blessed for they shall be vindicated. This is the criterion of biblical ethics. Strength and Chosen-ness do not mix well. In times of strength the Day of the Lord is darkness rather than light.

This "resource" is one that overcomes the triumphalism of religious communities. And the triumphalism of religious communities is the main road block on the way toward a community of communities.

11) Eut the only resource worth the name is and remains the living God and the living faith. He who says God knows that God transcends everything, including  $h_{is}$  statements about God, and including his community. The world somehow expects men and women of faith to be an asset toward world community. And in spite of all the signs to the contrary the true believer knows that that expectation is correct.



Geneva, December 1972

Professor Lou Silberman

## Precis of PARTICULARITY AND UNIVERSALISM

### by Prof. S. Talmon

The complementary concepts of particularity and universalism have in modern times been transformed into the theoretical polarities of particularism and universalism. It has seemed to us that a theology, appropriating the Hegelian dialectic of the history of religion, has in large measure been ready to accept these as contradictories and to assert that the Church as the expression of universalism, <u>i.e.</u> the "absolute religion" represents in the present the reality of that unity that is ultimately to prevail. In practical terms this position has meant the overcoming by whatever means available of particularity, condemned as recalcitrant "particularism".

In this the Church, it **again** appears to us, has in recent years been supported or even been taken over by the secular ideology of a deracine humanity composed of singular individuals. Judaism has in largest measure rejected the polarization of particularism - as a theory - and universalism, insisting rather on the historical complementarity of particularity and universalism.

Having insisted upon this generalization, it must be admitted that there is within Judaism both in its historical development and its present state a variety of emphases and nuances. Nonetheless a more or less general tendency may be pointed to, granting divergencies within the historical nexus. Both Jewish particularity and the universalist thrust of Judaism are grounded in the biblical world of ideas. There particularity is affirmed as a <u>universal empirical fact</u> and "universalism" as a <u>value</u>, the particular goal of Israel's singular monotheism. Judaism strives to give validity to the fragmentary life of the individual by means of social structures, guarding him from unmitigated confrontation by an impersonal universal society. The scriptural equation of love of self and love of neighbor provides a role for specific collectivities within the most general and universal structure.

This insistence upon the complementary status of these ideas does not, unfortunately, prevent problems in their application in life situations. An absolutized standard of universalism may be invoked to judge the relativity of the actual. Expediency may subject the ideal to shortranged considerations of practicality. Only when these two are seen within an eschatological framework is the destructive tension between them reduced.

Such a vision, however, does not give rise within Judaism to inertia. Rather are ways and means sought to meet and to deal with specific historical situations. In other words, the ultimate solution does not invalidate the proximate search for a better world-order.

In this context of a tension between particularity and universalism it is important to define the idea of "chosenness". Judaism claims for itself distinctiveness but not distinction in the sense of superiority, <u>i.e.</u> automatic preferential status. Nor can it accept the term in such a sense, even if conferred by others except as it has shown itself worthy of such distinction by its exemplary mode of life. Existence within collectivity bestows upon the individual historical continuity that encourages the perpetuation of transmitted values, makes for a readiness to reinterpret them in the light of new experiences and provides a basis for applying them within the framework of larger collectivities.

In sum, Judaism recognizes particularity as a natural state of man, but bestows upon it a spiritual dimension, affirming its divine origin. Yet this diversity exists under the unifying overlordship of the Creator of mankind. Thus it is led to affirm the multiparity of religious experiences and the varied forms in which that is expressed. Freedom of choice in matters spiritual is considered an inalienable right of men as individuals and as members of specific collectivities.

The biblical narrative is concerned both with the way in which particularity deteriorates into inimical competition and hatred, and corrupt commonality (i.e. the Tower of Babel episode) results in divisiveness. The "latter days" serves as the symbol of the restoration of that divinely established concerted diversity explicit in the creation story.

It is this restored situation that is the ultimate goal enunciated in Judaism understanding of universalism. Here the historical existential tension will be resolved and the world will be shared by all under the just guidance of the Creator. Until such times the life of man is regulated by divinely ordained statutes that are the obligation of all men (the seven Noahide commandments) and the further structure of commandments and laws that govern the people of Israel in its particularity. The ultimate biblical vision sees mankind as a "community of communities" in which the particularity of the singular community and the universality of a world-community are mutually affirmed.

The twin concepts of particularity and universality have been 1. differently interpreted throughout history not only by Judaism and Christianity, but also by diverse social and political ideologies. It is inevitable that the religious interpretation of these concepts which do not pertain exclusively to the domain of religion, always have been and still are affected by moods, modes and attitudes which prevail in the sociopolitical dimension. In our own generation, although not exclusively, the dichotomy of the two concepts has hardened into full-fledged opposition: More often than not, particularity and universality are viewed as two mutually exclusive frames of mind and ideological pursuits. Whereas Judaism emphatically rejects the presentation of particularian 2. and universality as mutually contradictive. Christianity on the whole i prepared to subscribe to this definition. The expectation of a future perfect equality of men in the kingdom to come creates in believing Christians a consciousness of mutual obligation and a sense of solidarity within the framework of a constituted community - the Church as Corpus Christi. The individual and the community are called upon to prepare the way for the realisation of the all-embracing future society by progressively foreshadowing it in actual history.

The ideal picture implicitly and explicitly presupposes the ultimate conversion of all mankind to the one and only faith, the universal religion of humanity, Hegel's "absolute religion". No other social affiliations and configurations are required, may permitted to mediate between the individual and the ultimate unity which is the Church. The community of the Church is World Community.

This universalist ideology, based upon the concept of election, is pregnant with the hybris of self-righteousness to no lesser degree than a particularistic conception of chosenness. Being grounded in the lofty vision of a united mankind, direct universalism easily can generate conterpt for individuals and groups that have not seen the light. Since this type cf universalism is conceived of as the only legitimate way leading to salvation of mankind - nulla salus extra ecclesiam, its proponent: feel entitled, even enjoined to use not only missionary persuasion but also crass coercion to impose this universalism on the recalcitrant.

Any opposition which hinders the realisation of what is taken to be "objective" universalism must be vanquished, since, almost by definition it surely emanates from stubborn "subjetive" egotism. Individuals and groups who insist on remaining outside the structure of this "particularistic universalism" may again have to face, as they did face in the past, the danger of annihilation.

3. A prevalent ideological tendency, voiced preponderantly by Western liberals, whi h advocates the abrogation of any sort of institutionalised borders and limitations in the realm of socio-political organisation, coalesces with the above universalist persuasion of Christianity, notwithstanding the quite different underlying motivations. The resulting universalism, self styled "progressive", instinctively rejects and actively militates against insistence of collectivities on the right to cling to their particular identities. Judaism presents an altogether different ideology, perpetuating as it does, its historically specific beliefs and customs, underscored by the reconstitution of Israel as a separate political entity. This actual particularity is decried by universalists as the expression of objectionable religio-political parochialism. The confusion of "particularity" as an actuality with "particularism" as a normative concept in respect to Judaism, necessitates a renewed analysis of these issues and their respective roles in the system of ideas of Judaism 4. It must be stated from the outset that the presentation of the matter is beset by severe limitations: Judaism is not monolithic in the interpretation of its own heritage. In the present context, it would be impossible to do justice to the diverse nurnces, some varying even on principles, which can be discerned in the discussion of the issue under review within Jewry. What is more, the interpretation of particularity and universality and of the relative roles which they are assigned in the overall framework of Jewish thought, to a large degree is directly dependent on specific historic situations. The variations in emphasis by successive generations of Jewish thinkers often is the direct result of external politico-religious conditions to which Jews reacted. These reformulations of the concepts of particularism and universalism determine, to a great measure, the Jewish attitude towards the surrounding world. It follows, that in an attempt to present the essence of Jewish particularity and universality, selection is imperative. One can only hope to recapture the essential aspects which should guide Jewish thinking in this matter, although historical reality may

diverge from them, as indeed it sometimes did and still does, and even flagrantly flout the principles distilled from basic normative Jewish sources. "Between the idea And the reality Between the motion And the act Falls the shedow" (T.S. Elliott, The Hollow Man, Collected Poems New York 1936, P. 104).

- 3 -

5. Both Jewish particularity and the universalist thrust of Judaism are grounded in the biblical world of ideas. It is from there that any discussion of these two aspects within the orbit of Judaism must take its departure.

From its very inception, biblical thinking affirms "particularity" as a universal empirical fact, and "universalism" as a value, the particular goal of Israel's singular monotheism. The particularity of the individual expresses itself not in solitude or in "oneness" - God alone is "one" - but rather in diverse crystallisations of collective specificity: family, clan tribe, credal community, people, nation, and freely contracted fellowship. Judaism strives to give validity to the fragmentary life of the individual viz the projection of social structures, thus savi- i him from diract unmitigated confrontation with an impersonal universal society. The .... i thus the touchstone by which to measure altruistic relationships: Love for thy neighbor should equal love for thyelf. Raised to the societal level, and applied to intergroup relationships, this precept makes collective specifities and particular identities the cornerstones of all general and universal structures: "The ideal of the religion of Israel was society in which the relations of men to their fellows was governed by the principle 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"." (George Fcote Moore, Judaism vol. II, p.155). 'Particularity' and 'universalism' are complementary, not mutually exclu-6. sive. This almost axiomatic statement obviously causes difficulties when it is applied to actual life situations. Here, the problem of relating the principle to the specific arises in full force. There is, on the one hand, the danger of judging actualities in their relativity by visionary absolute standards. On the other hand, expendiency often causes the ideal to become subjected to short-range considerations of practicability. "It is true", says Martin Buber, "that we are not able to live in perfect justice (let alone, in perfect love, S.T.), and in order to preserve the community of men, we are often compelled to accept wrongs in decisions concerning the community. But what matters is that in every hour of decision we are aware of our responsibility and summon our conscience to weigh exactly how much is necessary to preserve the community, and accept just so much and no more (Hebrew Hur .... in: Israel and the World, p. 246). Practical morality, as understood in

Judaism, grasps both these complementary aspects of social-reality, and works at relieving the inevitable tension between them. Fully recognising the deficiency of our historical world, Judaism acquiesces in the knowledge that an ideal structure of human society can be achieved only at the 'end of days'. However, the awareness of the limitations of collective life on all levels in the historical world, is not an attitude that breeds inortia. From its inception in biblical days to the present day, Judaism has grappled with internal and external problems arising from the tension between different collectivities, adjusting the ways and means of dealing with them to the particular needs of the specific historic situations. The validation of history generates in Jews a readiness to reinterpret their heritage and to respond self-critically to new con itions and new challenges. This stance can be fruitfully utilised in the redefinition of basic Jewish concepts in the context of the present deliberations: the search for a better world-crder.

7. In this context it would appear that a redefinition of the idea of 'election' becomes imperative. Notwithstanding the centrality of the idea of 'the chosen people', a concept which was assimilated by Christianity to itself, the underlying persuasion that distinctiveness necessarily equals 'distinction' clashes with the basic convictions of equality inherent in the projected world-order. As a concept of superiority, rather than differentness and service, the doctrine of chosenness must be rejected by Jewry since it implies the unacceptable notion of automatically preferential status of the Jewish collectivity before the Creator vis-à-vis other credal and ethnical collectivities. In a world society founded on the inherent equality of all men, the term 'chosen' as implying moral superiority, can only be legitimately conferred upon a collective by others, if this group has shown itself to be worthy of such distinction by its exemplary mode of life.

Ascribed

VS.

status

8. The sychronic extension of the individual into the collective, is complemented by the diachronic extension. Man in his collectivity spans the gap between proceeding and future generations. The collective thus affords to the individual the security of continuity beyond his own circumscribed life-span. Historical consciousness arises from collectivity, and at the same time undergirds and strengthens collectivity. It helps overcome the fragmentariness of mankind which may lead to forlornness, and ultimately to destructiveness.

- 4 -

The certainty of being a link in the chain of generations encourages the perpetuation of transmitted values. The knowledge that one is enjoined to transmit these values in ever-changing circumstances to generations to come, makes for a readiness to reinterpret them in the light of new experiences. The ongoing reshaping of inherited values opens up in Judaism a readiness to apply these values to wider collectivities.

In summarising the basic tenets of Judaism with respect to the 9. 'particularity' - ' universalism' dichotomy, it may be said that Judaism recognises particularity as an undeniable principle of human existence. Judaism further confers a spiritual dimension upon actual particularity, as experienced in all life situations, by conceiving of it as divinely decreed: it is a basic phenomenon of the human condition since the days of creation naturally, anthropologically, ethnically, socially and politically. Particularity implies diversity and, to a certain degree, separateness of men, under the unifying overlordship of the Creator who reigns supreme over all mankind. Judaism affirms the resulting diversity in the realm of the human spirit. It recognises the multiformity of the religious experience, and of its expression in various and varied cultic practices, a reality of human history. Freedom of choice in matters spiritual is considered the unalienable right of all men as individuals, and as members of specific collectivities, i.e. of socio-religious communities.

Stysten Stecres Jumpus Jumpus Soliteus

> 10. In actual history, as a result of man's sins, positively viewed specificity degenerated into divisiveness. The processes by which the separateness of individuals and of species and the particularity of groups deteriorated into inimical competition and hatred, is portrayed in the Bible in a series of episodes set in the antedeluvian and the pre-Hebrewseras. The Adam/Eve-Snake enmity (Gen. 3:14-15) typifies man's separation from other species; Cain's fratricidal killing of Abel symbolyses the erosion of individuality into egotistic rivalry anthropologically (ib. 4:3 ff.). Not only does human divisiveness result from particularity gone ewry but according to the biblical narrative also from a wrongly conceived universality. This is exemplified in the episode of the Tower of Bable. Until then "all the world spoke one language and used the same words" (or passibly "had common purposes"). Excessive 'oneness' generated hybris towards the only 'one', God the Creator, and was punished by the divisive scattering of mankind which characterises the human condition until the 'end of days'. Historical divisive particularity is viewed as the hiatus between the divinely established concerted diversity at the time of creation, and the reconstituted composite unitedness of man and beast, of nation and nation, at the time of the 'latter days'.

- 5 -

11. Judaism has set up 'universalism' as the ultimate goal towards the achievement of which mankind should direct its efforts. All men and all peoples are exhorted to place their hopes in the vision of 'the latter days' -- a cosmic situation when the historical-existential tension between particularlity and universality finally will be allayed: The universe again will be meacefully shared by all under the just guidance of the Creator to whom all peoples will pay homege. As in the initial, i.e. pre-historical era, so in the latter stages of human history, universality will be realised in the accord of species and specificities, and not in the abolition of particularities - anthropological, credal and socio-political. Israel's universalist vision expresses itself in the unisono of particular men and particular people who worship the 'one most high' in the manifold hypostisations of the Daity. Israel will remain, indeed, God's 'am segulah, His 'particular' (AV:pecular) people (Ex.19:5; Deut- 7:6; 14-2; 26-18 and Mal. 3:17). But by the same token such a special position and relationship is granted to each and every reople in the context of its own faith: "Each man shall dwell under his own vine, under his own fig tree undisturbed, for the Lord of Hosts himself has spoken. All peoples will (or: may) walk, each in the name of his god, but we will welk in the same of the Lord our God for ever and ever" (Micah 4:4-5). Judaism holds out to the nations salus extra synagogem.

In this context, the Jewish perception of life in society as being based 12. upon a definite code of legal prescriptions and injunctions gains special importance. The interaction of individuals and of social bodies must be regulated by divinely proclaimed and normatively expounded statutes which affect all mankind, although to varying degrees. Jewish universalism is grounded in a legal basis which is shared by all humanity: the seven Noshide laws which are the seven pillars of human coexistence. Jewish particularity is revealed in the superstruct re of commandments and laws thich define the specificity of Judaism. In the ideal "Commonwealth of Nations", peoples will voluntarily subject their sovereign will to the persuasive power of the Divine Judge (Isaia: 2:1-4; Micah 4:1-4). Divine justice will become manifest in the Israelite religio-cultural body politic under the just leadership of the Israelite king (Is. 11: 1-5). The regulative force of the Divine and the human-royal adjudication will overcome all divisiveness which arose from improperly understood particularities internally between Judah and Ephraim (ib. 11:12); externally, between Israel and the nations (ib. 19:24-25) and between nation and nation their # specifically unimpaired.

Sprei ficty

- 6 -

In this biblical vision unfolds, in the purest and most concentrated form, Israel's conception of 'world community' as a 'community of communities'. Between the particular subjective level of individual human exustence and the universal-objective realm of world-community, Judaism posits the non-universal but trans-subjective character of the group, irrespective of its nature of definition.

m1

### Geneva, December 1972.

Lou H. Silberman

## Precis of STRUJTURES OF FELLOWSHIP AND COMMUNITY IN JUDAISM by Professor U. TAL

## The Method:

In addition to an historical perspective that delineates the diverse forms in which the Jewish community has appeared in its millenial existence, it is necessary to examine them as well from a religio-anthropological approach that concerns itself with the way in which those structures express the intention of Torah: "I call upon heaven and earth to witness against you this day that I have set before you life and death, blessing and curse, therefore choose life, that you may live, you and your descendants (Deut. 30:19). Thus within Judaism these communal forms, developed amidst diverse historical situations, are understood to be the loci in which man unfolds his essence - his metaphysical status as created **DYX1**, and his existence - his natural status as a rational being.

Man's growth thus understood begins as he becomes a partner in God's covenant, proceeds through the family, the community, the congregation, the people or ethnic group or perhaps the nation, culminating in the world community. This process requires separation from the world but as well participation in its life; it calls for emphasis on identity yet seeks to cooperate; underscores particularity but looks toward universalism; reflects both the desire to preserve destructiveness and the urge toward human communality.

Man and Fellowship:

The Jewish tradition recognizes that man is both Adam, individual, and ben-Adam, social or political being, for it is through society or more generally through creation that man's calling is realized. The loneliness of the individual is overcome in the world with its inhabitants.

#### Covenant:

Man's movement out of loneliness and toward the world found its structure according to Jewish tradition/God's covenant with Noah. Subsequent structures in which covenant was embodied were family (fellowship) and community (people). The first of these covenants, established with Abraham, points to the family as the first type of communal interdependence. Hence Judaism regards the establishment of family life as both joy and duty. The initial stepinto the covenant is birth - coming into being - and is symbolized by circumcision and actualized in the first community-family. The second of these two covenants is that made with the people through Moses. At this point the dichotomy between separateness and 'participation, between identity and integration - that is inherent in fellowship/community comes into focus; for now there is imposed upon the people the task of being or becoming a holy nation, separate and distinct. The purpose of this separateness is living in the world, bestowing form, order and meaning through faithfully laboring in and through society - in the Jewish and in the world community.

### The Community:

For Judaism the community is the medium for the actualization of the covenant; it is the indispensible structure that enables man to survive so that he can serve God. But it is not its own end but enables the Jew as well to practice universalistic ideas, such as justice or the pursuit of peace. The history of Jewish communal life over the course of centuries and in the widespread dispersion shows that law, far from being a petrified fossil, was a decisive factor in the continuing life of the people in wide areas of public existence. With the end of the medieval structure of society, little scope was left for an autonomous corporate body. Indeed, the expectation was that, following the lead of Western Christianity, the Jewish religion, too, would divest itself of worldy aspects and confine itself to worship, religious education and charity. Though some parts of the community moved in this direction, much of Diaspora Jewry since and Jews in the State of Israel today have refused to equate equality with uniformity and have insisted upon maintaining socio-religious selfhood amidst human unity - option for separateness and participation.

### World Community:

While there is much in the Jewish tradition that exhibits an unequivocally open attitude towards the nations, nonetheless it is, at further inspection, more complex. It cannot be gainsaid that often the nations were at best held at arms length and wore frequently - albeit theoretically the object of hestility. One must, therefore, speak of a tradition of exclusiveness contributing to hard feelings and harsh attitudes toward the nations; and of a tradition of inclusiveness contributing to a growing openness, to an increasing pursuit of peace so that justice may prevail between Israel and the Nations.

### Conclusion:

The Torah teaches that there is no aspect of human life irrelevant to religion. Judaism is to be realized throughout man's life: by his physical and spiritual growth - through covenant, the family, the congregation, the community, voluntary associations, peoplehood, ethnicity (or for some nationality and statehood) - into the world and its communities, into mankind,

Judaism's support of a pluralistic structure of society reflects its understanding that its realization requires the safeguarding of the condittions in which this is to take place; but this structure derived as it is from an understanding of the totality of Greation, is not confined to safeguarding separate Jewish existence alone but it includes whe world with its communities and religions. In an unredeemed world Judaism, through its stiff-necked insistence on being itself, understands as well the universal right to be different. Norman Lamm

Rev.

# "THE QUEST FOR WORLD COMMUNITY BASED ON THE RESOURCES OF OTHER GROUPS"

1. The effort to achieve world community, as a voluntary pluralistic entity rather than as an imposed uniformity, raises a particularly sensitive question - one amongst many - to which each participant in the endeavor must essay its own answer. That question is: How can we understand and work together with communities of other religions and ideologies in their quest for a world community based on their own resources? This paper is an effort to formulate a Jewish response to this challenge.

2. It is a truism that Judaism has often interacted with contemporary civilizations, and cultural borrowing is a fact of history which requires no documentation. Yet with Judaism, such borrowing as did occur was largly unconscious. Deliberate imitation was explicitly proscribed. "Neither shall ye walk in their statutes" (Lev. 18:3) was taken as a general prohibition of pagan practices and became a major source of Judaism's strictures against non-Jewish ritual and mores. To speak, therefore, of cooperation with other faith communities on the basis of their own resources, poses an immediate dilemma.

3. There is an inherent danger in the whole enterprise that we have labeled "the quest for world community." It may, if we are not on our guard, result in commiting one of three fundamental errors.

The first of these is the possibility that "world community" will become a suphemism for what can only be called religious and ideological imperialism, whether conscious or unconscious. If our goals are largly identical, why not adopt my methods?

The second is the imposition of a kind of apologetic strait-jacket on individual philosophies, frequently distorting them in the course of striving for preconceived conclusions acceptable to others. Jewish thought has too often suffered from this willful if well-intentioned distortion.

Third, one must beware of falling into the trap of a theological indifferentism which regards theological and cultic exclusiveness as

retrograde and reactionary. If, according to this doctrine, all that counts is the ultimate desideratum - whether that be a moral principle or ethical conduct or belief in a supernatural god or religious experience - and all the various methods of reaching that goal are of little impact, then our problem is no problem; but then too, our Judaism is no Judaism, and we have no right to speak in its name.

4. However, the Biblical prohibition against cultic promiscuity, especially as it was expanded by the Rabbis, cannot and need not be taken as an assertion of the total self-containment of Jewish teaching and a denial of validity to any and all non-Jewish wisdom. That there have been such introversionist, centripetal, and exclusivist tendencies in the history of Jewish religious thought and life cannot be denied; but the tradition speaks with other voices as well.

One finds, in general, a more open attitude in the earlier sources of the Rabbinic tradition than in the later ones. We may accept as normative, I believe, the Midrashic dictum, "if someone tells you that the nations of the world possess wisdom, you may believe him; that they possess Torah (read: religious truth), do not believe him" (Lam. R. 2:13).

One can cite a whole roster of examples from the medieval Sephardic authorities to illustrate the receptivity of Judaism to the insights of others when such insights are not in conflict with basic Jewish thought. Maimonides, whose name is the first to come to mind in this respect, explicitly taught, "accept the truth, no matter what its source" (Introduction to his "Eight Chapters"). And Don Isaac Abravanel, somewhat later, was not averse to quoting Christian exegetes and sometimes preferring their interpretations of Scripture over those of the Jewish commentaries.

5. One must, of course, make a clear distinction between cultic practices and intellectual insights. Whatever else the terms <u>hokhmah</u> (wisdom) and <u>Torah</u> may mean (in the Midrashic passage cited above), they do differentiate between the realm of particularistic cult and universal knowledge. Jewish ritual practice is "private," normative, and specific, and hence should be guarded against infusion of non-Jewish religious forms. But cult and culture are by no means identical. Human culture and civili-

-2-

zation have broad universal aspects in which all human beings share by virtue of their very humanity; hence, the Noahide laws as the common heritage of all mankind. The Sages of the Talmud were not averse to holding up certain contemporary pagan nations as exemplars of particular moral behavior which they considered worthy of imitation (See BT, <u>Ber</u>. 8b).

6. Judaism imposes on its members a normative code of conduct, yet it cannot be considered monolithic in its insights and values. It exhibits paradoxes, and, often, opposing principles. The Halakhah itself, the very expression of Judaism's quest for essential uniformity in moral and ritual behavior, is often arrived at as a result of the clash of and interplay between conflicting rules, principles, and values. One may thus find elements in Judaism which articulate well with insights of other faiths or secular ideologies. To cite but one example, Judaism knows of both quietistic and activistic streams in its tradition. It may find resonance for its quietistic dimensions in certain Eastern religions, and its activism certainly corresponds to that of modern, secular technological culture. The presence of such polarities and ambivalences within the Jewish tradition allows us, as committed Jews, to work cooperatively towards world community with others who espouse any one side of such views and are seized of one aspect of such polarities, without our necessarily adopting the whole context of these insights or subscribing even to that one particular view for ourselves.

7. One further caveat is in order in formulating a Jewish response to this challenge of working towards world community with others on the basis of their own particular resources. The attempt to assign to other religions an anticipatory messianic role in the redemptive conception of history, (e.g. Jewish versions of the concept of <u>preparatic evangelica</u>) should not serve as a legitimation of our goals. Judaism can no more use Christianity than Christianity can use Judaism by virtue of this argument. Furthermore, this argument is confined to one or two historical religions -Christianity and Islam - and says nothing about all others, especially non-Western religions.

8. In view of what has been said thus far, we must now formulate the modus operandi for such a cooperative quest for world community, and here

-3-

two points need to be made.

First, a guiding principle should be that while every religion and ideology draws upon its own indigenous resources in order to formulate its insights, attitudes, and doctrines on world community; and while these resources should be respected and peculiar modes of hermeneutics and exegesis accepted as valid for that group; the other religions and ideologies joining in the quest for world community should consider only the conclusions, and not the resources and methods, in devising means for working cooperatively towards world community.

An example of the above may be cited from the resources of Judaism. A law or a generally sanctioned approach to nonçJews may be a basic <u>halakhah</u> with pronounced universalistic and humanistic emphasis, or it may turn out to be of sufficiently broad scope only as a result of certain correctives that the halakhic method supplies, such as the principle of <u>kiddush hashem</u> or <u>darkei shalom</u>. How we arrive at such conclusions is irrelevant to other groups; <u>which</u> resources we use is only of academic interest to them. Of real and effective significance is only the specific <u>conclusions</u> at which we arrive.

9. The second point is far more difficult to attain, because it obligates all participants to a form of collective self-restraint. Many religions, especially Western religions and certain ideologies possess, to varying degrees, dreams of universal acceptance, whether by force or by conviction. The utopian views of Christianity and Islam have traditionally envisioned the ideal state of mankind as the embracing by all human of their respective prophets or dogma. Judaism, at the very least, looks forward to the oblitoration of idelatry, and the universal acceptance of the One God. Marxism strives for domination by the proletariat and the establishment of a classless society based on its dialectical materialism. If such ultimate aims are denied, we are false to these individual outlooks.

How, then, can Christianity achieve genuine world community with Jews, when it desires all Jews eventually to accept Jesus? How shall Moslems work with Christians when the goal of Islam is the universal acknowledgment of Mohammed? How shall Jews cooperate in world community with religions which they traditionally consider idolatrous? And how shall

-4-

the materialistic Marxist achieve genuine cooperation with any of the above, when he sees them as obstacles to the realization of his utopian vision?

It is here, perhaps, that all religions and ideologies may have to be called upon to make a clear decision, in common, in order to proceed both honestly and honorably on the quest for world community. That is, that having openly acknowledged its eschatological goals, each group must affirm that our contemporary mutual quest for world community is non-eschatological or, at worse, pre-eschatological. Allied with this must come a resolve that even if world community represents, according to one's insights and orientation, a pre-eschatological state, such world community must never become the instrumentality for activistic eschatological realization, and the proselytization that it implies.

That is admittedly asking a great deal from those communities for whom the achievement of the <u>eschaton</u> is an essential doctrine and effective motivation of conduct. But unless such self-restraint is forthcoming, and unless it is forthcoming in a manner that will inspire trust by others, the quest for world community will be bedeviled by mutual suspicion and will die aborning. WCC/JEWISE LEADERS CONSULTATION Geneva, December 11 - 14, 1972.

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

How It Can Be Made Relevant Today

### by Prof. Robert Martin-Achard

1. Present-day biblical studies tend to underline the fact that Sacred Scripture is not a code of laws which could be automatically applied by our contemporaries. Neither is it the repository of an unchangeable and definitive Word of God, universally and perpetually valid, leaving us nothing to do except submit to it. Sacred Scripture is the precipitate of a long historical process which lasted for many centuries, the fruit of a slow growth, a living tradition reflecting the diverse experiences of the people of God as it moves with its Lord towards the fulfilment of the divine promises.

A static view of Scripture saw it rigidly defined, as it were, by its wording. This is being succeeded by a dynamic view which regards it as having developed like a living organism. The Bible is not primarily the presentation of doctrine and indeed shows itself rather as resistant to all dogmatic synthesis. It is, as has been said, a tradition worked cut in the midst of a people, a tradition embodying that people's life while at the same time influencing it.

This is true in particular of the Old Testament. But it is undoubtedly also true of the New.

Students of the Bible are confronted in fact not by one single tradition but by a group of traditions more or less closely linked to each other. Without doing violence to them, it is difficult to discern what is central to them. (The central message of the Old Testament, like that of the New, is at present the subject of debate, and remains an open question). These traditions are in a constant flux, reflecting the course of history as it affects the people of God. This people, as Gerhard von Rad in particular has shown for the writings of Israel, is constantly obliged to re-think its faith, to formulate it anew in terms of its own actual life and to give it a meaning that holds good for that moment. The books of the Bible reflect the successive formulations of the faith held by the people of God. Israel - and the Church after it - has to believe anew with each passing year, that is, it must express its faith on the basis of what former generations proclaimed, while also taking into account the particular situation in which it lives.

This re-reading of tradition, which went on throughout the whole canonical period and continues today in post-canonical times, is based on the two principles of fidelity and freedom. Re-reading does not mean that a given situation may be invoked to justify any or every assertion. It is a matter of being faithful to the testimony of the ancients. The people of God cannot ignore the faith of its Fathers, but must re-affirm it for its own time without merely repeating it. Hence also there is no question of just taking up once more the formulas of long ago, of cementing, as it were, the proclamation of biblical faith to the words and formulas used in the past to suit a cultural setting which no longer exists today. In affirming what it means to belong to the people of the Bible what matters is to have the courage to use new terms, addressing oneself to problems unknown perhaps to earlier generations.

Hence the re-reading of tradition, both within Scripture and after it, presupposes respect for what was announced in the past and openness for what is suggested by the present. The haphazard pursuit of the merely topical is excluded, as is the rigid devotion to the letter of the law which fails to recognize that it is and always has been God's will to converse with adults, that is, with free and responsible people.

Finally, in re-reading the Bible one has to remember that its message is always remarkably concrete. It is given in a definite situation and points one way only. It "becomes incarnate" here and now and cannot be separated from the context of civilization, politics, literature, religion and so on which forms its flesh and without which it cannot exist, or exist for long - just as from the biblical point of view the <u>nephesh</u> is in a sense nothing without the <u>basar</u> - unless it is given flesh once more, that is, a new context. This means that the Bible eschews general, changeless truths which are applicable in all places and at all times. It only speaks with reference to a particular and concrete situation for which it caters. Starting from the concrete it rejoins, supposes and demands the concrete.

The views now current in Protestant theology and especially in biblical studies tend to rejoin in a certain measure the perspectives of Catholicism and those of Judaism. In this respect they would not be very far from the Propositions of a Jewish study-group of April 1972 (pp. lf.), which insist on the creative approach of every generation of Judaism to the application of the teaching of the Hebrew Bible, an approach which was nonetheless determined to be faithful to its spiritual inheritance.

2. The prophets provide a perfect illustration of what we have just said. Highly divergent judgments have been passed upon them, in view of their attitude to tradition. For some, they continued the work of Moses; for others, they inaugurated new eras. They have been called in turn conservatives, reformers or even revolutionaries. In fact, the prophets chose deliberately to be both faithful and free, faithful to their God and free with regard to those around them whom they saw as betraying God. They did not aim at teaching a particular doctrine or at inventing a new religion, as has sometimes been said. They tried to utter, at the precise moment of their intervention, and for that moment, the then relevant word of their Lord.

They spoke therefore in the name of a known God, whose revelation could not or should not have been unknown to their fellows. So they took their stand on this, but they did not hesitate to break with the past or with the interpretation given it in their own times when they were trying to lead their people back to God and confront it once more with the reality of the demands and the true nature of the promises emanating from him. They give their message in full awareness of the tradition which it supposes and by turns contests, rectifies and prolongs. The prophets have a very special, though not unique contribution to make to any consideration of the biblical teaching on social justice. For they are not the only ones who spoke out on this matter. The problem is already being grappled with in the earliest parts of the Law, and it is taken up again and again throughout the Pentateuch. It is signalled by the wisdom literature, from Proverbs to Job and then Ecclesiastes, as also by the Book of Psalms. It can be said without exaggeration that the theme of social justice runs through the whole Scripture of Israel and that it is not passed over in the New Testament writings. It is undoubtedly linked to the theme of the justice of God, which is envisaged in its relationship to the justice of man. And this theme serves as its theological basis.

But it was undoubtedly high-lighted by the intervention of the prophets, not only because nearly all of them spoke out on social justice, from Amos to Jeremiah, from Micah to Malachi, but still more because of the way in which they took up the defence of the right in Israel as they succeeded each other with their indictments of their contemporaries, with their appeals, menaces and sometimes also their promises.

The prophets did not hesitate, in fact to challenge the most solidly established values of their times, speaking in the name of the God of Israel to demand justice for the <u>anawim</u> who were his poor. They were then free men, because indentured to their God. They were free with regard to the government and the authorities, whether civil or religious. They were free with regard to even the most sacred institutions, not for the pleasure of contradicting, but for the sake of fidelity towards the God who was also the Lord of their fellows and of the world.

3. To justify these remarks, two examples will suffice, that of Jeremiah in the last years of the kingdom of Judah and that of Amos under the prosperous reign of Jeroboam II in Israel.

(a) The key to the attitude adopted by Jeremiah during the Babylonian crisis may be found in what is termed his "temple discourse" (Jeremiah 7; see also 26), delivered perhaps at the very beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim (about 608). It constituted a sort of declaration of war against this king. We may omit detailed consideration of this text - and of the critical problems which it poses - and simply note that the prophet is here attacking what was the most sacred symbol of the Yahwistic tradition, the temple of God at Jerusalem.

At a period of grave crises, when king after king had come to the throne in Judah and the euphoria of King Josiah's days had had to give way to the grim reality of Egyptian occupation and then to the threat from Babylon, Jeremiah denounced as deluded all those who drew from the temple, the pledge of God's presence among his people, the comforting certainty that no misfortune could overtake them. He attacked, as André Neher puts it, the "God-with-us" party who claimed to have a monopoly of divine protection for the defence of their interests. And he had the audacity to compare the sanctuary of the Most Holy God to a gangsters enterprise, and to suggest that it might meet the fate of the sanctuary at Shiloh, once the shrine of the ark, but then given over to destruction.

ŝ

To justify his intervention, Jeremiah recalled the crimes of his contemporaries. He denounced their double-dealing, listed their misdemeanours and especially, though not uniquely, their disregard for the rights of the feeblest among them. There was to be no magic protection for Jerusalem. Nothing but respect for the divine will could safeguard Jeremiah's generation. Salvation could only be channelled, then as in the past, through obedience to the divine will.

The prophet's appeal went unheard, and the night closed in on Judah. The Babylonians camped at the gates of the Holy City. Though part of the people rallied to King Zedekiah, determined to carry on the struggle at all costs, Jeremiah, at the risk of his life, pleaded for the surrender of Jerusalem and submission to Nebuchadnezzar. He was threatened with death and spent the last days of the Kingdom of Judah in captivity. Efforts have been made to explain this "policy of capitulation" (M. Weber) by suggesting that Jeremiah was in the pay of the enemy or again by speaking of the prophet's pacifism or opportunism. In reality, Jeremiah's stand is to be explained by his vocation, and not by his character, his political genius or his origin.

The prophet intervened as God's witness in the midst of his age and noted Judah's long-standing infidelity towards its Lord. The cup was full to the brim, the time of punishment had come and could not but come. From the moment that Jehoiakim came upon the scene, Jeremiah knew the line he must take: the only possible policy for Judah was to acknowledge the divine judgment and to submit to its instrument, the King of Babylon. To prolong the struggle against Nebuchadnezzar was to delay the hour of conversion and the possibility of a new start.

Jeremiah therefore took up a position which was diametrically opposed, it would seem, to that of Isaiah. Isaiah had figured as a spiritual freedom-fighter who had announced the failure of the siege of Jerusalem (Isiah 7), but Jeremiah preached submission to Babylon. Thus he was bold enough to disavow his predecessor, as it would seem, and as his contemporaries saw it, his position was untenable.

The point is that in Jeremiah's time the relations between God and his people were not longer the same as in Isaiah's time. The prophet sensed that something had changed, and changed so much that he could no longer repeat what his illustrious forerunner had said. The statutory force of the berith by which God was bound to Israel had altered between the time of the eight-century prophet and that of the man from Anathoth.

 $\tau \to (-1)$ In Isaiah's time, the people of God had a future before it, based on the berith to which God remained faithful and to which Israel ought to have been faithful. So Isaiah urged his contemporaries to live up to the covenant. But this appeal went unheard. Judah continued to reject its Master's law, sinning so permintently that the hour of judgment sounded. By the time of Jeremiah, the covenant had been repudiated. The prophet was the first to see this, and he tried in vain to convince his contemporaries of this fact. There was only one course open to Judah, to his mind: to accept the calamity which its God was bringing down on it. • .•

2<sup>88</sup> ....

Hence in the time of Jeremiah it was no longer possible to live as if in the time of Isaiah. It was even dangerous to repeat the latter's message, as the prophet Hananiah did (Jeremiah 28) - Isaiah's parrot, as Martin Buber has termed him. Hananiah imagined that he was being faithful to Isaiah, whereas he was in fact betraying him. By repeating his words, or rather, as much of them as the Judaen tradition had retained, he transformed yesterday's truth into today's falsehood and destroyed all who hailed him as God's spokesman.

The true successor of Isaiah was Jeremiah, because he refused to keep on repeating outmoded formulas and because when assessing the actual situation, a new one compared to that of Isaiah, he took both tradition into account and the real relationship then existing between God and his people. Though he seemed to be contradicting the eighth-century prophet, he was in fact continuing to relay his message.

As the example of Jeremiah and Hananiah shows, there is an ostensible loyalty which is deceptive and leads to disaster, while there is also a genuine attachment to tradition which consists in discovering, for the present moment, the right way of re-stating it and of making it once more the guide of life.

(b) Isaiah and Jeremiah are again at one in the interest they take in the problem of social justice. They are in agreement in condemning their people for their offences against it, or rather, in denouncing the attitude of certain circles in Judaea who exploited their privileges to the detriment of other elements of the population, those who were gravely deprived. In the name of their God, they took up the defence of these "little ones", that is, of those most destitute of resources, importance and power within the community. Here they were anticipated by the prophet Amos.

Amos came forward in the northern kingdom, which was not his place of origin, at a time of great economic prosperity but one in which the differences between rich and poor were being polarized. He attacked the elite of the country, or rather, the property-owning class which was showing complete disdain for the rights of the <u>anawim</u>. He used precise and forcible language to denounce their dubious practices and seeing how far the evil had spread, declared that Ephraim would soon be stricken by disaster, though at the time the subjects of Jeroboam II were living in peaceful times (Amos 3; 4; 5; 6; etc.).

Thus Amos' preaching is particularly concerned with this problem of people's rights. And so he has been termed a "herald of justice", and sometimes hailed as a precursor of socialism. He went so far as to say, as some of his readers have interpreted him, Let justice be done though the State perish! In any case, the prophet firmly condems all political and economic oppression and is ready to blame all abuse of power or influence. He shows that God is particularly interested in what befalls the poorest among his people, and that the people's future is closely linked to the attitude adopted by Israel with regard to the "little ones". In this matter, Amos was not the first to link the service of God with the service of the neighbour, and he was not to be the last to insist on this point. But he was particularly keen-sighted in indicating that dealing with the "poor" meant dealing with the Lord himself (Matthew 25).

Amos displays a marked severity towards the Israelites of the northern kingdom because of the crimes of which they were guilty. This leads him to take an expressly negative attitude on certain points with regard to the State of Ephraim and the traditions which it lives by, as has been noted (R. Smend). He denounces the property-owning classes who use their wealth only to provide themselves with pleasures and whose one thought is to extend their privileges at the expense of the most elementary justice. He rejects religious practices and a liturgy, lavish though it is, which merely serves an an alibi for people who care nothing for the Lord, as their dealings with their fellow-men show, but cover up their nonchalance with sacrifices and prayers (Amos 6). He contradicts notions widely-held in his day, especially the belief in election from which his contemporaries drew reassurance to carry out their petty transactions (Amos 3), and the expectation of the splendid day which would enable them to enjoy an unparalleled prosperity (Amos 3-5). He decries the notion of a future for Jeroboam's kingdom and proclaims its end. He already intones its dirge, and sees death penetrating the country everywhere (Amos 5-6). Famines, natural calamities, military disasters and epidemics are according to Amos the signs which show that his fellows are about to meet the living God (Amos 4). The time for repentance seems to be already past. The rebellious nation is ripe for the final harvest (Amos 5).

It should be noted that the prophet's interventions, for all their brevity, are clear and precise. Amos does not indulge in generalities. He avoids the vague formulas which do not mean anything or enable one to avoid saying anything. He goes straight for his objective and does not hesitate to grapple with burning questions. In his concern for the right, to have it respected among the people of God, there is no taboo from which he recoils. He names things as he sees them, firmly and distinctly. He knows what he is talking about; he has weighed the terms used in his statements. His brief is well-prepared.

He is in fact remarkably well-informed and his knowledge covers a wide field. He has sometimes been made out to be - wrongly - an uneducated person, up from his country home in the back of beyond to protest against the big city, a world which he did not understand. In reality, Amos! information is exact. He is as familiar with the religious traditions by which his contemporaries lived, the essential elements of Sacred .History in its traditional form, as with the intimate and general history of the Near East. His interests take in the nations as well as his own people, incidents of limited scope as well as major movements of populations, the life of the Judaean shepherd as well as the manners of the towns-people of Samaria. His outlook is world-wide, taking in historical and geographical details. With exact and verified information to guide him, he can give a correct diagnosis and speak with authority. If he is exacting in his demands on others, he is equally so with regard to his own procedures, intervening in the real and not the imaginary problems of his time.

4. After the foregoing considerations, our conclusions may be stated briefly. Today as in earlier times, we have to try to be faithful to the biblical tradition while taking cognizance of the problems of our own times. We therefore need information of two kinds, which have constantly to be revised and completed: first on the message of Scripture, which is not disclosed to us automatically and which demands repeated study if it is to be deciphered; and then on the state of the world, which we have to examine realistically and lucidly, being mindful of all the various elements which have to be taken into account here. The prophets put us on our guard against a tendency to take refuge in ready-made solutions, where we confine ourselves to repeating yesterday's truths, blind to the fact that history - including that of the relations between God and his people - is on the move. The same Scripture which tells us that there is a time for everything also demands that we should be abreast of our times.

Finally, the prophets emphasize the importance of social justice in the eyes of the God upon whom we call. It is a problem that we cannot avoid. We are obliged by our faith to attack it with frankness, precision and courage. It shows itself under many different aspects, none of which we should treat from the start as taboo. It calls for something more from us than generous but vague formulas. We are not asked for our pious wishes, but for clear-sighted and responsible declarations. It is on these terms that we can hope that our discussion will make a modest contribution to one of the most burning questions of the present day.

Translated from the French Language Service, WCC

WCC/JEWISH LEADERS CONSULTATION Geneva, December 11 - 14, 1972.

## THE BIBLICAL MATRIX AND OUR PRESENT SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES

by André Dumas

## I. Is the Bible anachronistic?

Our present time is characterised by its concern with the future, by its awareness of rapid changes in technology and economic life which have repercussions on moral behaviour. The traditional societies live by faithfully observing myths and rites which ensure communication with divine truth, that truth being situated in a past whose value and whose secret must not be lost. The classic societies live by conforming the eternal, immutable orders derived increasingly from elsewhere, and identified with human conscience and human reason. They are societies based on principles, whereas the traditional societies are characterised by initiations. On the other hand the contemporary societies are societies of invention and innovation. The situations in which they live, and the problems presented by those situations, are entirely different from the situations and the problems of the past. To give just a few striking examples: should man continue to multiply on the face of the earth? Should the resources of nature be exploited more and more? Should man live through (divine) providence, or through planning?

Many of our contemporaries imagine that the Bible, with its descriptions of the origin and the end of the world, might be consonant with a traditional society. Or that with its immutable principles, like the Ten Commandments or the Sermon on the Mount, it might still be suitable for a classic society. But in their view the Bible is definitely anachronistic in a contemporary society which is constantly being challenged to face the impact of the future instead of dwelling on the memory of the past, and which is constantly endangered by the perpetuation of principles which have become inapplicable and are no longer observed.

This general feeling that the Bible may be anachronistic, especially in the social sphere, seems to me to be strengthened by the four following observations:

a) The Bible may be valid only in very special circumstances, when everyone living in one area shares the same faith and obeys the same norms. The theocentrism and theocratism of the Bible are diametrically opposed to the humanistic pluralism of all contemporary societies.

b) The Bible was lived and written within the framework of an agricultural, patriarchal, conservative society completely different from the industrial, democratic, revolutionary environment in which we live today.

c) As our knowledge of biblical archaeology becomes more detailed and complete, we perceive the divergence between the past (described in the Bible) and the present; consequently the Bible is coming to be regarded as a cultural museum, a collection of archives and records, and ceasing to be a message, a witness and signs. d) Lastly, if the Jews seem to be in danger of literalism (confusing a modern interpretation of the Bible with betrayal and disloyalty), Christians seem to be in danger of "spiritualising" the Bible, making it 'relevant' by arbitrary procedures lacking norms and historical memory.

For all these reasons, the Bible today is in danger of ceasing to inspire the social ethic, which is based on sociology and on ideology far more than on convincing and effective theology.

### II. The social justice of our time

Following an inductive method, I shall begin by tracing some of the main contemporary themes, and then try to cast light on them from the Bible. In adopting this approach I do not think I am being disloyal to the way in which witness was borne by the patriarchs, judges, priests, kings, prophets, men of wisdom, psalmists, apostles and visionaries, for they too were expressing a message received from God directed against, and for, the people of their own time.

1. The present time is an age of groups and masses. Rational calm and foresight, the growth of population and its concentration, the ideologies which have superseded personal philosophies of life, all these things give the individual the feeling that he is of less importance than the collective structures on which he is dependent, which inform him and determine his lot. However, these structures are not real communities. They are rather groups or institutions. As a result, people have a strong sense of being alone and forgotten, frustrated and abandoned. Today there is no convincing collectivism, nor any positive individualism.

2. Economic expansion is evident; so is social security. A tremendous quantity of goods are being produced. No previous century has guaranteed such a high standard of welfare. Yet we realise that this affluence and security are limited to the group which benefits from industrial efficiency, while other groups are reduced to eating the crumbs which fall from the table of that efficiency which exiles and exploits them.

3. Work is becoming less arduous and working hours are not so long. Thanks to machinery, energy, the computer, human beings no longer have to work so hard. People dream of a week in which the seventh day (devoted to celebration, human relations, living, enjoyment and joy) would be extended, and the six days spent in the painful struggle for survival would be reduced. But leisure could never take the place of work, in which man would take less and less interest. Moreover, the danger exists that the gulf would widen between two classes of people: those whose education enables them to monopolise the interesting work, and those who have to do the boring jobs.

4. More and more is being done to protect life against illness and death. Health has become one of the great values, if not the greatest, desired by the people who benefit from industrial progress. But neither life as such, nor health as such, are normative truths; even less are they selfsufficient achievements. They may even go so far as to take the place of God Himself, which would reduce us to paganism. In saying this, I am not thinking in "spiritualistic" terms, as if God did not care what happened to the body. For God encounters us and loves us in our physical body. What I mean is that the worship of life must not supersede worship of the living God.

- 2 -

## III. The biblical matrix and social ethics today

In my view the Bible is not anachronistic; it is concrete, full of examples and analogies. The important point is not that the Bible speaks of what God did and said in the past, but that those acts and words really did take place here on earth; they are not the imaginary outcome of the longings of the human heart nor of the speculations of the human mind. The more we stress the <u>concrete</u> nature of what happened, the more chance we have that it will also be applicable to our situation today. For the facts related in the Bible are always <u>examples</u>. The unique event illustrates all events. Those events are examples which concern all men, all cultures, all ages. Thus the real task of biblical social ethics is to throw light on our present situation by <u>analogy</u> with the concrete examples recorded in the Bible (not by clinging to myths and ancient rites, nor by repeating archaic principles). I will apply this method to the four examples selected above.

1. The Bible describes certain persons whose vocation was to found communities (Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David, Jesus). It also speaks of communities which discover their own significance in personal vocations. Can this theological truth be applied as a means of healing the present antithesis in society between anonymous groups and solitary persons? What light does it cast on such penultimate realities as nations, languages, races, classes and economic patterns?

2. The Bible teaches constant solidarity with those who want to forget the difficulties of their origin. "Thou also hast been a stranger, a slave, with no homeland, no security, childless." What is the economic analogy to this theological solidarity in the sphere of social legislation today? What (in our view) is the contemporary equivalent of institutions such as the sabbatical year, the jubilee year, the collection for the community in Jerusalem (described in the New Testament)? How can we steer our course between idealism and legalism? How can solidarity be expressed and enforced?

3. The Bible speaks of work both as arduous toil and as achievement, both for man and for God. It speaks of the working week and of the Sabbath rest, of the onerous task on the one hand, and of praise and thanksgiving on the other. The Bible is thereforce not cynical but realistic about work, and it regards leisure as containing promise but not as a Utopia. On analogy with this biblical view, how can we restore a sound attitude to work and to leisure today?

4. Lastly, the Bible speaks of life as being blessed, but not to be worshipped. How can we find an ethic for today which will be both merciful and disciplinary, on analogy with the Bible, at a time when these problems have become burning issues (legislation concerning contraception, abortion, health, old age)?

I have merely outlined these examples here. I will develop them later.

Translated from French

# WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

## CONGRÈS JUIF MONDIAL

## CONGRESO JUDIO MUNDIAL

1211 GENÈVE 20	NEW-YORK N.Y.	LONDON W. 1	PARIS 80	TEL-AVIV
DUE DE VAREMRÉ	15 FAST 84th STREET	55. NEW CAVENDISH STREET	78, AV. CHAMPS-ELYSEES	128, YEHUDA HALEVI STR.
TELEPH. 34 13 25	TEL. TRAFALGAR 9-4800	TELEPH. WELBECK 0335	TELEPH. ÉLYSÉES 9463	TELEPH. 29139

Geneva, December 8, 1972.

MEMO

To : Rabbi Siegman, Rabbi Tanenbaum, Rabbi Brickner, Professor Werblowsky, Mr. Lichten, Mr. Shuster, Mr. Becker

From : Gerhart M. Riegner

### This is to confirm the following arrangements :

1. The meetings with the Catholic group will take place on December 18 and 19 and in the morning of December 20, 1972 in the administrative building of the Archbishop's Palace, 4, Place du Colonel Edon, Marseilles.

2. Arrangements have been made for two Kasher luncheons to be taken jointly at the Centre communautaire juif.

3. I understand that one evening has been reserved for a reception to which local Catholic and Jewish personalities will be invited.

4. Rooms have been reserved for the whole Jewish delegation at the Rôtel de Noailles in Marseilles, from Sunday December 17, on. The Hotel de Noailles is situated at La Canebière, which is the main street of Marseilles.

Time

I have a problem with the paraqueth repretug on the fourt Solislars - since we proversed voul our people we w it public before garing Here a chance to bet ap Otherwise it is free He

We Mined try for hoth - and veed de, settle for it in this communitie. Auch mer light both, we onghit to to work on thes very Shatly-Set .... have ..... 100 • **b**::

# Memozandum

# WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL

1. RUE DE VAREMBÉ - 1211 GENÈVE 20 (SUISSE)

Ø 34 13 25 # WORLDGRESS GENÈVE

To : Rabbi Siegman, Rabbi Tanenbaum, Dr. Lichten, Prof. Werblowsky Mr. Shuster, Rabbi Brickner, Mr. Karlikow, Mr. Becker From : Dr. Riegner

I wish to inform you that an informal meeting of the IJCIC delegation to Marseilles with Ambassador Najar will take place on Thursday, December 14, at 5 p.m. in the Geneva Office of the WJC, 1, rue de Varembé. The meeting will last probably until 8 p.m. You are cordially invited to attend.

Geneva, December 12, 1972.

# CCJP/72/7

# REPORT ABOUT THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN STUDY GROUP

At the Jewish-Christian consultation at Lugano, two main themes were recommended for further study:

1. The Quest for World Community: Jewish and Christian Perspectives 2. Jewish and Christian Perspectives on the Relationship to each

other and the Relation with Men of Other Faiths.

Obviously, this programme was too ambitious. It will not be possible to deal with both themes. Priority needs to be given to the first. It has a great advantage in that it directs our attention to the present situation of the world. It does not start from an analysis of our traditions, but rather looks at a problem mankind is facing today. This theme may provide the possibility and opportunity for cooperation.

The following six points will need to be developed in the paper we plan to work out together:

#### 1. World Community

What do we understand by this term?

We are faced with the phenomenom of an increasing inter-dependence. This constitutes a challenge to Jews and Christians alike. We need to remember that this growing inter-dependence is ambivalent. It presents us with new possibilities of relationships but also with new conflicts and threats; there is the danger of selfdestruction of humanity. Therefore, this ambivalence of the growing inter-dependence should be stated.

The meaning of the different terms should be made clear. Should we distinguish between "world order" or "-society" as a maximum to be hoped for in this world and thus reserve the word 'community' for the eschatological fulfilment? Discussion of the terms would be required.

### 2. The Common Specificity of the Jewish-Christian Tradition

Jews and Christians share a common tradition. Is it correct to say that we share an understanding of man and his role in history - of man created in the image of God? Freedom and dignity, justice, etc. are important factors for a world community. These concepts must be spelled out. On the one hand our situation is the result of human activity; on the other hand we experience today all the limitations which characterize the human responsibility in history, and the dangers of an over-emphasis of the activities of homo faber. Thus there is a need to recognize other elements in human existence. Do we not need to stress anew the communal aspect of human existence?

### 3. Universality and Particularity

Basic differences must be faced here between the two groups as well as within them. There is a common conviction about the oneness of mankind. How on the basis of biblical evidence do we understand this oneness?

4. We feel that it would be important to discuss the subject of <u>'People of God and the Nations'</u>. How do we understand nationhood? From our side we would stress the ambivalence of nations. They play a positive role, but if they do not transcend their limitation they become an obstacle to world community.

- 5. There is the wider context which needs to be taken into account. Jews and Christians are not alone in their concern for world community. <u>Religions and ideologies</u> all have their own way of understanding the oneness of mankind, Especially Islam should be kept in mind in this respect.
- 6. The Contribution Jows and Christians can make to Building a World Society

Here the question of a common struggle for justice, the struggle of the oppressed and the struggle for human rights needs to be dealt with.

ga a conta

. . . . . . . .

Geneva, May 1972.

• •

### REPORT OF THE JOINT SCHOLARS' WORKING GROUP

-----

At the Jewish-Christian Consultation held in Geneva in April 1972, the major theme was "The Quest for World Community - Jewish and Christian Perspectives." That meeting resulted in Joint Proposals which concluded with the recommendation that further deliberations be held by the two Study Groups to discuss outstanding questions of major significance which are in need of clarification.

In December 1972, the two groups reconvened in Geneva and studied the questions assigned to them, as specified in Part 2 of the Joint Proposals of April 1972.

The Study Groups presented their papers to the plenary session. The following represents the major points that were made at this conference.

In speaking of "World Community" we did not mean merely an interdependence of men and nations. We intend rather an order that enables communities to live together. It is not a perfect community but a viable way of human co-existence. Thus, we did not speak of World Community as an ultimate but as a proximate goal. To be sure, both Jews and Christians - as well as other religious and ideological communities - have ultimate hopes for the future. There is the Messianic Age and the Kingdom of God. God will one day rule over the whole world. <u>He</u> will bring about the reign of love and justice. Such hopes inspire our life and action.

By World Community we mean a viable order for today's world; it is pre-eschatological. We think of it as a community of communities. World Community is not only the sum of individual human beings; it is composed of communities of various kinds. Each individual expresses his individuality as a member of various communities, such as his membership in a family, groups, a nation, etc. Thus, World Community must recognize the value of such communities which provide human identity and physiognomy.

As each individual belongs to several communities at the same time, these communities work towards overcoming the threats of loneliness, anonymity, and uniformity.

./..

However, no community should be absolutized in the name of ultimate values. The role of the State as impartial protector of all communities, as it has emerged in modern times, was welcome and affirmed.

We found helpful a distinction between particularity and particularism. By particularity we mean the commendable concern of the community for its own self-interest without at the same time ignoring or encroaching upon the vital interests of others. By particularism we mean the self-interest of a community which is exclusive in that it ignores the concerns of other communities and disregards the interests of World Community. Particularism, because it does not contribute to solidarity with the larger community, is not helpful in the quest for World Community. Each community must be open to and responsible for other communities and the whole of mankind.

It was agreed that mutual respect and concern are the basis of a World Community. We must strive together for the empowerment of the now powerless and hopeless, for those whose voice has not yet been heard and identity not yet recognized.

Geneva, December 1972.

- 2 -

## WCC-IJCIC COMMUNIQUE

A jognt consultation devoted to an examination of Jewish-Christian relations in global perspective was held from Dec. 11-14 (at the Hotel Mediterranee) in Geneva. The third of its kind, the consultation was co-sponsored by the Comission of the Church and the Jewish Peopleof (the World Council of Churches and the International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Constitutions. The Jewish body is composed of the World Jewish Congress, the Synagogue Council of America, the American Jewish Congress, the Synagogue Council of America, the American Jewish Conmittee, the American Defamation/of <u>Jenei Derith</u>, interfaith Contacts. The co-chairmen of the plenary sessions were His Grace George Appleton, Archbishop of Jerusalem, and Prof. Zwi Werblowsky of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

TRAFT

The main theme of the meeting was "The Quest for World Community: Jewish and Christian Perspectives." Through the presentation of a series of papers by Christian and Jewish scholars and extensive discussion in a spirit of candor and friendship, an effort was made to clarify common as well as divergent conceptions and approaches to the organization of world community as "a community of communities."

The consultation also provided an opportunity for the exchange of information and for the sharing of concerns about a number of current issues facing both groups and their respective constituencies. -These included the problems of terrorism; social change through violent and non-violent movements; human rights in the Soviet Union; the Arab-Israel conflict and possibilities for reconciliation bētween Jews, Christians, and Muslim§ in the Middle East; the Bible and social justice; evangelism, mission, and proselytization; and Christian and Jewish cooperation in relation to international organizations for the advancement of human rights.

The papers presented dealt with the following themes: "The Concept of Community: Between Identify and Solidarity,"by Aaron Tolen of Yaounde, the Cameroons; "Structures of Fellowship and Community in Judaism," by Prof. Uri Tal of Tel Aviv University, Israel; "The Dialectic of Particularity and Universality from the Reint Standpoint of Christian Theology," by Prof. Rudolf Weth of the University of Tubingen, Germany;"Particularity and Universality -A Jewish View," by Prof. Shmaryahu Talmon of Hebrew University, Jerusalem; "Working Together with Peoples of Other Religions," by Dean Kristar Stendahl of Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass.; RakkixKormanzkamaxxx "The Quest for World Community Baed on the Resources of Other Groups," by Dr. Norman Lamm of Yeshiva University
New York City;"The Biblical Doctrine of Social Justice," by Prof. Robert Martin-Achard of the University of Geneva; and"The Biblical Matrix and Our Present Social Responsibilities," by Prof. Andre Dumas of Paris.

At the opening session, Dr. Philip Potter, General Secretary of the World Council, addressed the gathering.

A report of the Joint Scholars' Working Group was presented to the closing session of the plenary. It emphasized the following major points:

The joint steering committee of the World Council and the International Jewish Committee consists of the following representatives: World Council - Archbishop Appleton; the Rev. Clement Barbery, Assistant to he General Secretary; Dr. Stanley J. Samartha, Director of the Dialogye with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies; Rev. Johan M. Snoek, Executive Secretary of the Committee on the Churches and the Jewish People; and Dr. Lukas Vischer, Director of Faith and Order., and Dr. Elfan Rees, consultant toxx of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.

International Jewish Committee: Rabbi Balfour Brickner, Director of thexadox Interfaith Activities of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Dr. Joseph/Lichten of Rome, of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Dr. Gerhart M. Riegner, General Secretary of the World Jewish Congress; Rabbi Henry Siegman, Executive Mice-President of the Synagogue Council of America; Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, national interreligious affairs director of the American Jewish Committee; and Dr. Werblowsky.

The consut/lation agreed to continue its contacts and to plan for further collaboration. It also agreed to share the findings of the consultation is wider audiences.

- 2 -

#### Norman Lamm

# "THE QUEST FOR WORLD COMMUNITY BASED ON THE RESOURCES OF OTHER GROUPS"

1. The effort to achieve world community, as a voluntary pluralistic entity rather than as an imposed uniformity, raises a particularly sensitive question - one amongst many - to which each participant in the endeavor must essay its own answer. That question is: How can we understand and work together with communities of other religions and ideologies in their quest for a world community based on their own resources? This paper is an effort to formulate a Jewish response to this challenge.

2. It is a truism that Judaism has often interacted with contemporary civilizations, and cultural borrowing is a fact of history which requires no documentation. Yet with Judaism, such borrowing as did occur was largly unconscious. Deliberate imitation was explicitly proscribed. "Neither shall ye walk in their statutes" (Lev. 18:3) was taken as a general prohibition of pagan practices and became a major source of Judaism's strictures against non-Jewish ritual and mores. To speak, therefore, of cooperation with other faith communities on the basis of their own resources, poses an immediate dilemma.

3. There is an inherent danger in the whole enterprise that we have labeled "the quest for world community." It may, if we are not on our guard, result in commiting one of three fundamental errors.

The first of these is the possibility that "world community" will become a suphemism for what can only be called religious and ideological imperialism, whether conscious or unconscious. If our goals are largly identical, why not adopt my methods?

The second is the imposition of a kind of apologetic strait-jacket on individual philosophies, frequently distorting them in the course of striving for preconceived conclusions acceptable to others. Jewish thought has too often suffered from this willful if well-intentioned distortion.

Third, one must beware of falling into the trap of a theological indifferentism which regards theological and cultic exclusiveness as

Rev.

retrograde and reactionary. If, according to this doctrine, all that counts is the ultimate desideratum - whether that be a moral principle or ethical conduct or belief in a supernatural god or religious experience - and all the various methods of reaching that goal are of little impact, then our problem is no problem; but then too, our Judaism is no Judaism, and we have no right to speak in its name.

4. However, the Biblical prohibition against cultic promiscuity, especially as it was expanded by the Rabbis, cannot and need not be taken as an assertion of the total self-containment of Jewish teaching and a denial of validity to any and all non-Jewish wisdom. That there have been such introversionist, centripetal, and exclusivist tendencies in the history of Jewish religious thought and life cannot be denied; but the tradition speaks with other voices as well.

One finds, in general, a more open attitude in the earlier sources of the Rabbinic tradition than in the later ones. We may accept as normative, I believe, the Midrashic dictum, "if someone tells you that the nations of the world possess wisdom, you may believe him; that they possess Torah (read: religious truth), do not believe him" (Lam. R. 2:13).

One can cite a whole roster of examples from the medieval Sephardic authorities to illustrate the receptivity of Judaism to the insights of others when such insights are not in conflict with basic Jewish thought. Maimonides, whose name is the first to come to mind in this respect, explicitly taught, "accept the truth, no matter what its source" (Introduction to his "Eight Chapters"). And Don Isaac Abravanel, somewhat later, was not averse to quoting Christian exegetes and sometimes preferring their interpretations of Scripture over those of the Jewish commentaries.

5. One must, of course, make a clear distinction between cultic practices and intellectual insights. Whatever else the terms <u>hokhmah</u> (wisdom) and <u>Torah</u> may mean (in the Midrashic passage cited above), they do differentiate between the realm of particularistic cult and universal knowledge. Jewish ritual practice is "private," normative, and specific, and hence should be guarded against infusion of non-Jewish religious forms. But cult and culture are by no means identical. Human culture and civili-

-2-

zation have broad universal aspects in which all human beings share by virtue of their very humanity; hence, the Noahide laws as the common heritage of all mankind. The Sages of the Talmud were not averse to holding up certain contemporary pagan nations as exemplars of particular moral behavior which they considered worthy of imitation (See BT, <u>Ber</u>. 8b).

6. Judaism imposes on its members a normative code of conduct, yet it cannot be considered monolithic in its insights and values. It exhibits paradoxes, and, often, opposing principles. The Halakhah itself, the very expression of Judaism's quest for essential uniformity in moral and ritual behavior, is often arrived at as a result of the clash of and interplay between conflicting rules, principles, and values. One may thus find elements in Judaism which articulate well with insights of other faiths or secular ideologies. To cite but one example, Judaism knows of both quietistic and activistic streams in its tradition. It may find resonance for its quietistic dimensions in certain Eastern religions, and its activism certainly corresponds to that of modern, secular technological culture. The presence of such polarities and ambivalences within the Jewish tradition allows us, as committed Jews, to work cooperatively towards world community with others who espouse any one side of such views and are seized of one aspect of such polarities, without our necessarily adopting the whole context of these insights or subscribing even to that one particular view for ourselves.

7. One further caveat is in order in formulating a Jewish response to this challenge of working towards world community with others on the basis of their own particular resources. The attempt to assign to other religions an anticipatory messianic role in the redemptive conception of history, (e.g. Jewish versions of the concept of <u>preparatic evangelica</u>) should not serve as a legitimation of our goals. Judaism can no more use Christianity than Christianity can use Judaism by virtue of this argument. Furthermore, this argument is confined to one or two historical religions -Christianity and Islam - and says nothing about all others, especially non-Western religions.

8. In view of what has been said thus far, we must now formulate the modus operandi for such a cooperative quest for world community, and here

-3-

two points need to be made.

First, a guiding principle should be that while every religion and ideology draws upon its own indigenous resources in order to formulate its insights, attitudes, and doctrines on world community; and while these resources should be respected and peculiar modes of hermeneutics and exegesis accepted as valid for that group; the other religions and ideologies joining in the quest for world community should consider only the conclusions, and not the resources and methods, in devising means for working cooperatively towards world community.

An example of the above may be cited from the resources of Judaism. A law or a generally sanctioned approach to nonçJews may be a basic <u>halakhah</u> with pronounced universalistic and humanistic emphasis, or it may turn out to be of sufficiently broad scope only as a result of certain correctives that the halakhic method supplies, such as the principle of <u>kiddush hashem</u> or <u>darkei shalom</u>. How we arrive at such conclusions is irrelevant to other groups; <u>which</u> resources we use is only of academic interest to them. Of real and effective significance is only the specific <u>conclusions</u> at which we arrive.

9. The second point is far more difficult to attain, because it obligates all participants to a form of collective self-restraint. Many religions, especially Western religions and certain ideologies possess, to varying degrees, dreams of universal acceptance, whether by force or by conviction. The utopian views of Christianity and Islam have traditionally envisioned the ideal state of mankind as the embracing by all human of their respective prophets or dogma. Judaism, at the very least, looks forward to the obliteration of idelatry, and the universal acceptance of the One God. Marxism strives for domination by the proletariat and the establishment of a classless society based on its dialectical materialism. If such ultimate aims are denied, we are false to these individual outlooks.

How, then, can Christianity achieve genuine world community with Jews, when it desires all Jews eventually to accept Jesus? How shall Moslems work with Christians when the goal of Islam is the univorsal acknowledgment of Mohammed? How shall Jews cooperate in world community with religions which they traditionally consider idolatrous? And how shall

-4-

the materialistic Marxist achieve genuine cooperation with any of the above, when he sees them as obstacles to the realization of his utopian vision?

It is here, perhaps, that all religions and ideologies may have to be called upon to make a clear decision, in common, in order to proceed both honestly and honorably on the quest for world community. That is, that having openly acknowledged its eschatological goals, each group must affirm that our contemporary mutual quest for world community is non-eschatological or, at worse, pre-eschatological. Allied with this must come a resolve that even if world community represents, according to one's insights and orientation, a pre-eschatological state, such world community must never become the instrumentality for activistic eschatological realization, and the proselytization that it implies.

That is admittedly asking a great deal from those communities for whom the achievement of the <u>eschaton</u> is an essential doctrine and effective motivation of conduct. But unless such self-restraint is forthcoming, and unless it is forthcoming in a manner that will inspire trust by others, the quest for world community will be bedeviled by mutual suspicion and will die aborning.

-5-

## WCC/JEWISH LEADERS CONSULTATION Geneva, December 11 - 14, 1972.

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

How It Can Be Made Relevant Today

by Prof. Robert Martin-Achard

1. Present-day biblical studies tend to underline the fact that Sacred Scripture is not a code of laws which could be automatically applied by our contemporaries. Neither is it the repository of an unchangeable and definitive Word of God, universally and perpetually valid, leaving us nothing to do except submit to it. Sacred Scripture is the precipitate of a long historical process which lasted for many centuries, the fruit of a slow growth, a living tradition reflecting the diverse experiences of the people of God as it moves with its Lord towards the fulfilment of the divine promises.

A static view of Scripture saw it rigidly defined, as it were, by its wording. This is being succeeded by a dynamic view which regards it as having developed like a living organism. The Bible is not primarily the presentation of doctrine and indeed shows itself rather as resistant to all dogmatic synthesis. It is, as has been said, a tradition worked out in the midst of a people, a tradition embodying that people's life while at the same time influencing it.

This is true in particular of the Old Testament. But it is undoubtedly also true of the New.

Students of the Bible are confronted in fact not by one single tradition but by a group of traditions more or less closely linked to each other. Without doing violence to them, it is difficult to discern what is central to them. (The central message of the Old Testament, like that of the New, is at present the subject of debate, and remains an open question). These traditions are in a constant flux, reflecting the course of history as it affects the people of God. This people, as Gerhard von Rad in particular has shown for the writings of Israel, is constantly obliged to re-think its faith, to formulate it anew in terms of its own actual life and to give it a meaning that holds good for that moment. The books of the Bible reflect the successive formulations of the faith held by the people of God. Israel - and the Church after it - has to believe anew with each passing year, that is, it must express its faith on the basis of what former generations proclaimed, while also taking into account the particular situation in which it lives.

This re-reading of tradition, which went on throughout the whole canonical period and continues today in post-canonical times, is based on the two principles of fidelity and freedom. Re-reading does not mean that a given situation may be invoked to justify any or every assertion. It is a matter of being faithful to the testimony of the ancients. The people of God cannot ignore the faith of its Fathers, but must re-affirm it for its own time without merely repeating it. Hence also there is no question of just taking up once more the formulas of long ago, of cementing, as it were, the proclamation of biblical faith to the words and formulas used in the past to suit a cultural setting which no longer exists today. In affirming what it means to belong to the people of the Bible what matters is to have the courage to use new terms, addressing oneself to problems unknown perhaps to earlier generations. !

Hence the re-reading of tradition, both within Scripture and after it, presupposes respect for what was announced in the past and openness for what is suggested by the present. The haphazard pursuit of the merely topical is excluded, as is the rigid devotion to the letter of the law which fails to recognize that it is and always has been God's will to converse with adults, that is, with free and responsible people.

Finally, in re-reading the Bible one has to remember that its message is always remarkably concrete. It is given in a definite situation and points one way only. It "becomes incarnate" here and now and cannot be separated from the context of civilization, politics, literature, religion and so on which forms its flesh and without which it cannot exist, or exist for long - just as from the biblical point of view the <u>nephesh</u> is in a sense nothing without the <u>basar</u> - unless it is given flesh once more, that is, a new context. This means that the Bible eschews general, changeless truths which are applicable in all places and at all times. It only speaks with reference to a particular and concrete situation for which it caters. Starting from the concrete it rejoins, supposes and demands the concrete.

The views now current in Protestant theology and especially in biblical studies tend to rejoin in a certain measure the perspectives of Catholicism and those of Judaism. In this respect they would not be very far from the Propositions of a Jewish study-group of April 1972 (pp. lf.), which insist on the creative approach of every generation of Judaism to the application of the teaching of the Hebrew Bible, an approach which was nonetheless determined to be faithful to its spiritual inheritance.

2. The prophets provide a perfect illustration of what we have just said. Highly divergent judgments have been passed upon them, in view of their attitude to tradition. For some, they continued the work of Moses; for others, they inaugurated new eras. They have been called in turn conservatives, reformers or even revolutionaries. In fact, the prophets chose deliberately to be both faithful and free, faithful to their God and free with regard to those around them whom they saw as betraying God. They did not aim at teaching a particular doctrine or at inventing a new religion, as has sometimes been said. They tried to utter, at the precise moment of their intervention, and for that moment, the then relevant word of their Lord.

They spoke therefore in the name of a known God, whose revelation could not or should not have been unknown to their fellows. So they took their stand on this, but they did not hesitate to break with the past or with the interpretation given it in their own times when they were trying to lead their people back to God and confront it once more with the reality of the demands and the true nature of the promises emanating from him. They give their message in full awareness of the tradition which it supposes and by turns contests, rectifies and prolongs.

The prophets have a very special, though not unique contribution to make to any consideration of the biblical teaching on social justice. For they are not the only ones who spoke out on this matter. The problem is already being grappled with in the earliest parts of the Law, and it is taken up again and again throughout the Pentateuch. It is signalled by the wisdom literature, from Proverbs to Job and then Ecclesiastes, as also by the Book of Psalms. It can be said without exaggeration that the theme of social justice runs through the whole Scripture of Israel and that it is not passed over in the New Testament writings. It is undoubtedly linked to the theme of the justice of God, which is envisaged in its relationship to the justice of man. And this theme serves as its theological basis.

But it was undoubtedly high-lighted by the intervention of the prophets, not only because nearly all of them spoke out on social justice, from Amos to Jeremiah, from Micah to Malachi, but still more because of the way in which they took up the defence of the right in Israel as they succeeded each other with their indictments of their contemporaries, with their appeals, menaces and sometimes also their promises.

The prophets did not hesitate, in fact to challenge the most solidly established values of their times, speaking in the name of the God of Israel to demand justice for the <u>anawim</u> who were his poor. They were then free men, because indentured to their God. They were free with regard to the government and the authorities, whether civil or religious. They were free with regard to even the most sacred institutions, not for the pleasure of contradicting, but for the sake of fidelity towards the God who was also the Lord of their fellows and of the world.

3. To justify these remarks, two examples will suffice, that of Jeremiah in the last years of the kingdom of Judah and that of Amos under the prosperous reign of Jeroboam II in Israel.

(a) The key to the attitude adopted by Jeremiah during the Babylonian crisis may be found in what is termed his "temple discourse" (Jeremiah 7; see also 26), delivered perhaps at the very beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim (about 608). It constituted a sort of declaration of war against this king. We may omit detailed consideration of this text - and of the critical problems which it poses - and simply note that the prophet is here attacking what was the most sacred symbol of the Yahwistic tradition, the temple of God at Jerusalem.

At a period of grave crises, when king after king had come to the throne in Judah and the euphoria of King Josiah's days had had to give way to the grim reality of Egyptian occupation and then to the threat from Babylon, Jeremiah denounced as deluded all those who drew from the temple, the pledge of God's presence among his people, the conforting certainty that no misfortune could overtake them. He attacked, as André Neher puts it, the "God-with-us" party who claimed to have a monopoly of divine protection for the defence of their interests. And he had the audacity to compare the sanctuary of the Most Holy God to a gangsters enterprise, and to suggest that it might meet the fate of the sanctuary at Shiloh, once the shrine of the ark, but then given over to destruction.

ž

 $q_{1} = 1$ 

To justify his intervention, Jeremiah recalled the crimes of his contemporaries. He denounced their double-dealing, listed their misdemeanours and especially, though not uniquely, their disregard for the rights of the feeblest among them. There was to be no magic protection for Jerusalem. Nothing but respect for the divine will could safeguard Jeremiah's generation. Salvation could only be channelled, then as in the past, through obedience to the divine will.

The prophet's appeal went unheard, and the night closed in on Judah. The Babylonians camped at the gates of the Holy City. Though part of the people rallied to King Zedekiah, determined to carry on the struggle at all costs, Jeremiah, at the risk of his life, pleaded for the surrender of Jerusalem and submission to Nebuchadnezzar. He was threatened with death and spent the last days of the Kingdom of Judah in captivity. Efforts have been made to explain this "policy of capitulation" (M. Weber) by suggesting that Jeremiah was in the pay of the enemy or again by speaking of the prophet's pacifism or opportunism. In reality, Jeremiah's stand is to be explained by his vocation, and not by his character, his political genius or his origin.

The prophet intervened as God's witness in the midst of his age and noted Judah's long-standing infidelity towards its Lord. The cup was full to the brim, the time of punishment had come and could not but come. From the moment that Jehoiakim came upon the scene, Jeremiah knew the line he must take: the only possible policy for Judah was to acknowledge the divine judgment and to submit to its instrument, the King of Babylon. To prolong the struggle against Nebuchadnezzar was to delay the hour of conversion and the possibility of a new start.

Jeremiah therefore took up a position which was diametrically opposed, it would seem, to that of Isaiah. Isaiah had figured as a spiritual freedom-fighter who had announced the failure of the siege of Jerusalem (Isiah 7), but Jeremiah preached submission to Babylon. Thus he was bold enough to disavow his predecessor, as it would seem, and as his contemporaries saw it, his position was untenable.

The point is that in Jeremiah's time the relations between God and his people were not longer the same as in Isaiah's time. The prophet sensed that something had changed, and changed so much that he could no longer repeat what his illustrious forerunner had said. The statutory force of the <u>berith</u> by which God was bound to Israel had altered between the time of the eight-century prophet and that of the man from Anathoth.

In Isaiah's time, the people of God had a future before it, based on the <u>berith</u> to which God remained faithful and to which Israel ought to have been faithful. So Isaiah urged his contemporaries to live up to the covenant. But this appeal went unheard. Judah continued to reject its Master's law, sinning so percistently that the hour of judgment sounded. By the time of Jeremiah, the covenant had been repudiated. The prophet was the first to see this, and he tried in vain to convince his contemporaries of this fact. There was only one course open to Judah, to his mind: to accept the calamity which its God was bringing down on it.

1. 1. 1

Hence in the time of Jeremiah it was no longer possible to live as if in the time of Isaiah. It was even dangerous to repeat the latter's message, as the prophet Hananiah did (Jeremiah 28) - Isaiah's parrot, as Martin Buber has termed him. Hananiah imagined that he was being faithful to Isaiah, whereas he was in fact betraying him. By repeating his words, or rather, as much of them as the Judaen tradition had retained, he transformed yesterday's truth into today's falsehood and destroyed all who hailed him as God's spokesman.

The true successor of Isaiah was Jeremiah, because he refused to keep on repeating outmoded formulas and because when assessing the actual situation, a new one compared to that of Isaiah, he took both tradition into account and the real relationship then existing between God and his people. Though he seemed to be contradicting the eighth-century prophet, he was in fact continuing to relay his message.

As the example of Jeremiah and Hananiah shows, there is an ostensible loyalty which is deceptive and leads to disaster, while there is also a genuine attachment to tradition which consists in discovering, for the present moment, the right way of re-stating it and of making it once more the guide of life.

(b) Isaiah and Jeremiah are again at one in the interest they take in the problem of social justice. They are in agreement in condemning their people for their offences against it, or rather, in denouncing the attitude of certain circles in Judaea who exploited their privileges to the detriment of other elements of the population, those who were gravely deprived. In the name of their God, they took up the defence of these "little ones", that is, of those most destitute of resources, importance and power within the community. Here they were anticipated by the prophet Amos.

Amos came forward in the northern kingdom, which was not his place of origin, at a time of great economic prosperity but one in which the differences between rich and poor were being polarized. He attacked the elite of the country, or rather, the property-owning class which was showing complete disdain for the rights of the <u>anawim</u>. He used precise and forcible language to denounce their dubious practices and seeing how far the evil had spread, declared that Ephraim would soon be stricken by disaster, though at the time the subjects of Jeroboam II were living in peaceful times (Amos 3; 4; 5; 6; etc.).

Thus Amos' preaching is particularly concerned with this problem of people's rights. And so he has been termed a "herald of justice", and sometimes hailed as a precursor of socialism. He went so far as to say, as some of his readers have interpreted him, Let justice be done though the State perish! In any case, the prophet firmly condems all political and economic oppression and is ready to blame all abuse of power or influence. He shows that God is particularly interested in what befalls the poorest among his people, and that the people's future is closely linked to the attitude adopted by Israel with regard to the "little ones". In this matter, Amos was not the first to link the service of God with the service of the neighbour, and he was not to be the last to insist on this point. But he was particularly keen-sighted in indicating that dealing with the "poor" meant dealing with the Lord himself (Matthew 25). Amos displays a marked severity towards the Israelites of the northern kingdom because of the crimes of which they were guilty. This leads him to take an expressly negative attitude on certain points with regard to the State of Ephraim and the traditions which it lives by, as has been noted (R. Smend). He denounces the property-owning classes who use their wealth only to provide themselves with pleasures and whose one thought is to extend their privileges at the expense of the most elementary justice. He rejects religious practices and a liturgy, lavish though it is, which merely serves an an alibi for people who care nothing for the Lord, as their dealings with their fellow-men show, but cover up their nonchalance with sacrifices and prayers (Amos 6). He contradicts notions widely-held in his day, especially the belief in election from which his contemporaries drew reassurance to carry out their petty transactions (Amos 3), and the expectation of the splendid day which would enable them to enjoy an unparalleled prosperity (Amos 3-5). He decries the notion of a future for Jeroboam's kingdom and proclaims its end. He already intones its dirge, and sees death penetrating the country everywhere (Amos 5-6). Famines, natural calamities, military disasters and epidemics are according to Amos the signs which show that his fellows are about to meet the living God (Amos 4). The time for repentance seems to be already past. The rebellious nation is ripe for the final harvest (Amos 5).

It should be noted that the prophet's interventions, for all their brevity, are clear and precise. Amos does not indulge in generalities. He avoids the vague formulas which do not mean anything or enable one to avoid saying anything. He goes straight for his objective and does not hesitate to grapple with burning questions. In his concern for the right, to have it respected among the people of God, there is no taboo from which he recoils. He names things as he sees them, firmly and distinctly. He knows what he is talking about; he has weighed the terms used in his statements. His brief is well-prepared.

He is in fact remarkably well-informed and his knowledge covers a wide field. He has sometimes been made out to be - wrongly - an uneducated person, up from his country home in the back of beyond to protest against the big city, a world which he did not understand. In reality, Amos' information is exact. He is as familiar with the religious traditions by which his contemporaries lived, the essential elements of Sacred History in its traditional form, as with the intimate and general history of the Near East. His interests take in the nations as well as his own people, incidents of limited scope as well as major movements of populations, the life of the Judaean shepherd as well as the manners of the towns-people of Samaria. His outlook is world-wide, taking in historical and geographical details. With exact and verified information to guide him, he can give a correct diagnosis and speak with authority. If he is exacting in his demands on others, he is equally so with regard to his own procedures, intervening in the real and not the imaginary problems of his time.

4. After the foregoing considerations, our conclusions may be stated briefly. Today as in earlier times, we have to try to be faithful to the biblical tradition while taking cognizance of the problems of our own times. We therefore need information of two kinds, which have constantly to be revised and completed: first on the message of Scripture, which is not disclosed to us automatically and which demands repeated study if it is to be deciphered; and then on the state of the world, which we have to examine realistically and lucidly, being mindful of all the various elements which have to be taken into account here. The prophets put us on our guard against a tendency to take refuge in ready-made solutions, where we confine ourselves to repeating yesterday's truths, blind to the fact that history - including that of the relations between God and his people - is on the move. The same Scripture which tells us that there is a time for everything also demands that we should be abreast of our times.

Finally, the prophets emphasize the importance of social justice in the eyes of the God upon whom we call. It is a problem that we cannot avoid. We are obliged by our faith to attack it with frankness, precision and courage. It shows itself under many different aspects, none of which we should treat from the start as taboo. It calls for something more from us than generous but vague formulas. We are not asked for our pious wishes, but for clear-sighted and responsible declarations. It is on these terms that we can hope that our discussion will make a modest contribution to one of the most burning questions of the present day.

Translated from the French Language Service, WCC

## WCC/JEWISH LEADERS CONSULTATION Geneva, December 11 - 14, 1972.

#### THE BIBLICAL MATRIX AND OUR PRESENT SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES

by André Dumas

# I. Is the Bible anachronistic?

Our present time is characterised by its concern with the future, by its awareness of rapid changes in technology and economic life which have repercussions on moral behaviour. The traditional societies live by faithfully observing myths and rites which ensure communication with divine truth, that truth being situated in a past whose value and whose secret must not be lost. The classic societies live by conforming the eternal, immutable orders derived increasingly from elsewhere, and identified with human conscience and human reason. They are societies based on principles, whereas the traditional societies are characterised by initiations. On the other hand the contemporary societies are societies of invention and innovation. The situations in which they live, and the problems presented by those situations, are entirely different from the situations and the problems of the past. To give just a few striking examples: should man continue to multiply on the face of the earth? Should the resources of nature be exploited more and more? Should man live through (divine) providence, or through planning?

Many of our contemporaries imagine that the Bible, with its descriptions of the origin and the end of the world, might be consonant with a traditional society. Or that with its immutable principles, like the Ten Commandments or the Sermon on the Mount, it might still be suitable for a classic society. But in their view the Bible is definitely anachronistic in a contemporary society which is constantly being challenged to face the impact of the future instead of dwelling on the memory of the past, and which is constantly endangered by the perpetuation of principles which have become inapplicable and are no longer observed.

This general feeling that the Bible may be anachronistic, especially in the social sphere, seems to me to be strengthened by the four following observations:

a) The Bible may be valid only in very special circumstances, when everyone living in one area shares the same faith and obeys the same norms. The theocentrism and theocratism of the Bible are diametrically opposed to the humanistic pluralism of all contemporary societies.

b) The Bible was lived and written within the framework of an agricultural, patriarchal, conservative society completely different from the industrial, democratic, revolutionary environment in which we live today.

c) As our knowledge of biblical archaeology becomes more detailed and complete, we perceive the divergence between the past (described in the Bible) and the present; consequently the Bible is coming to be regarded as a cultural museum, a collection of archives and records, and ceasing to be a message, a witness and signs. - 2 -

d) Lastly, if the Jews seem to be in danger of literalism (confusing a modern interpretation of the Bible with betrayal and disloyalty), Christians seem to be in danger of "spiritualising" the Bible, making it 'relevant' by arbitrary procedures lacking norms and historical memory.

1

For all these reasons, the Bible today is in danger of ceasing to inspire the social ethic, which is based on sociology and on ideology far more than on convincing and effective theology.

#### II. The social justice of our time

Following an inductive method, I shall begin by tracing some of the main contemporary thenes, and then try to cast light on them from the Bible. In adopting this approach I do not think I am being disloyal to the way in which witness was borne by the patriarchs, judges, priests, kings, prophets, men of wisdom, psalmists, apostles and visionaries, for they too were expressing a message received from God directed against, and for, the people of their own time.

1. The present time is an age of groups and masses. Rational calm and foresight, the growth of population and its concentration, the ideologies which have superseded personal philosophies of life, all these things give the individual the feeling that he is of less importance than the collective structures on which he is dependent, which inform him and determine his lot. However, these structures are not real communities. They are rather groups or institutions. As a result, people have a strong sense of being alone and forgotten, frustrated and abandoned. Today there is no convincing collectivism, nor any positive individualism.

2. Economic expansion is evident; so is social security. A tremendous quantity of goods are being produced. No previous century has guaranteed such a high standard of welfare. Yet we realise that this affluence and security are limited to the group which benefits from industrial efficiency, while other groups are reduced to eating the crumbs which fall from the table of that efficiency which exiles and exploits them.

3. Work is becoming less arduous and working hours are not so long. Thanks to machinery, energy, the computer, human beings no longer have to work so hard. People dream of a week in which the seventh day (devoted to celebration, human relations, living, enjoyment and joy) would be extended, and the six days spent in the painful struggle for survival would be reduced. But leisure could never take the place of work, in which man would take less and less interest. Moreover, the danger exists that the gulf would widen between two classes of people: those whose education enables then to monopolise the interesting work, and those who have to do the boring jobs.

4. More and more is being done to protect life against illness and death. Eealth has become one of the great values, if not the greatest, desired by the people who benefit from industrial progress. But neither life as such, nor health as such, are normative truths; even less are they selfsufficient achievements. They may even go so far as to take the place of God Himself, which would reduce us to paganism. In saying this, I am not thinking in "spiritualistic" terms, as if God did not care what happened to the body. For God encounters us and loves us in our physical body. What I mean is that the worship of life must not supersede worship of the living God.

### III. The biblical matrix , and social ethics today

In my view the Bible is not anachronistic; it is concrete, full of examples and analogies. The important point is not that the Bible speaks of what God did and said in the past, but that those acts and words really did take place here on earth; they are not the imaginary outcome of the longings of the human heart nor of the speculations of the human mind. The more we stress the <u>concrete</u> nature of what happened, the more chance we have that it will also be applicable to our situation today. For the facts related in the Bible are always <u>examples</u>. The unique event illustrates all events. Those events are examples which concern all men, all cultures, all ages. Thus the real task of biblical social ethics is to throw light on our present situation by <u>analogy</u> with the concrete examples recorded in the Bible (not by clinging to myths and ancient rites, nor by repeating archaic principles). I will apply this method to the four examples selected above.

1. The Bible describes certain persons whose vocation was to found communities (Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David, Jesus). It also speaks of communities which discover their own significance in personal vocations. Can this theological truth be applied as a means of healing the present antithesis in society between anonymous groups and solitary persons? What light does it cast on such penultimate realities as nations, languages, races, classes and economic patterns?

2. The Bible teaches constant solidarity with those who want to forget the difficulties of their origin. "Thou also hast been a stranger, a slave, with no homeland, no security, childless." What is the economic analogy to this theological solidarity in the sphere of social legislation today? What (in our view) is the contemporary equivalent of institutions such as the sabbatical year, the jubilee year, the collection for the community in Jerusalem (described in the New Testament)? How can we steer our course between idealism and legalism? How can solidarity be expressed and enforced?

3. The Bible speaks of work both as arduous toil and as achievement, both for man and for God. It speaks of the working week and of the Sabbath rest, of the onerous task on the one hand, and of praise and thanksgiving on the other. The Bible is thereforce not cynical but realistic about work, and it regards leisure as containing promise but not as a Utopia. On analogy with this biblical view, how can we restore a sound attitude to work and to leisure today?

4. Lastly, the Bible speaks of life as being blessed, but not to be worshipped. How can we find an ethic for today which will be both merciful and disciplinary, on analogy with the Bible, at a time when these problems have become burning issues (legislation concerning contraception, abortion, health, old age)?

I have merely outlined these examples here. I will develop them later.

Translated from French

## Christian-Jewish Consultation Geneva, December 10-14, 1972

At the request of the Jewish-Christian Consultation in Lugano (October 1970) a group of Jewish-Christian scholars met in Geneva in April 1972 to discuss the theme "The Quest for World Community -Jewish and Christian Perspectives". At the end of the meeting the following joint proposals were formulated:

(here follows the text of the April Memorandum)

Implementing the recommendation in the above mentioned proposals that further deliberations be held to clarify outstanding questions of major significance, the two groups reconvened in Geneva in December 1972 and presented papers on several of the questions assigned to them. The followings represents the major points that were made in the papers and the ensuing discussion:

1. In speaking of world community we do not mean mere interdependence of men and nations. We intend rather an order that enables communities to live together creatively in justice and peace and for our mutual enrichment. It is not a perfect community but a viable way of sharing the possibilities and responsibilities of human existence. Thus, we do not speak of world community as an ultimate goal but as a proximate goal to be sure. Both Jews and Christians - as well as other religious and ideological communities - have ultimate goals for the future which are not necessarily identical. There is the messianic age and the Kingdom of God. God will one day rule over the whole world - <u>He</u> will bring about the reign of love and justice. These hopes will inspire our lives and action and our modes of responsibilities with regard to our more proximate goals.

1

# . 1

2. World community as a viable order for today's world should be conceived as a community of communities. World community is not only the sum of individual human beings; it is composed of communities of diverse kind and of a variety of societal structures, some natural, some historically and culturally determined, some freely contracted (e.g. ethnic, linguistic, religious, political). Individuality can be expressed through membership in various communities. World community must recognize the value of such communities as they provide human life with identity and meaning and work towards overcoming the threats of lonliness, anonymity and uniformity.

3

3. The states, too, should regard themselves as the protectors of equal rights of all their component communities. This understanding of the attained as it has emerged in modern times is to be welcomed and affirmed. If the state is regarded as absolute in the name of an ultimate value it becomes a danger to rather than an instrument of world community.

4. We found helpful the distinction between particularity and particularism. Particularity does not exclude the legitimate concern of a community for its rights as long as it does not ignore the rights of others. By particularism we mean the self-interest of a community which is exclusive in that it ignores the rights of other communities and these duregards the interest of world community. Particularism because it does not contribute to solidarity with the larger community is detrimental to world community. World communities should be aware of the dynamics of historical developments and the emergence of legitimate demands which may effect their own rights. The distinction between particularity and particularism can not be drawn in a final static way. Each community must be open and responsible for the rights of other communities and the whole of mankind. 5. Both Jews and Christians are bound to emphasize the value of particularity in world community. We think that this emphasis needs to be understood as a contribution to world community because insistence on particularity emphasizes the insistence on the respect for the rights of other particularities. Mutual respect is the basis of world community. This emphasizes the access to power of the as yet powerless and a readiness to Wetter Watt structures which are impeding the access to power and the fulfilment of identity.

6. Religions have often been a hindrance rather than a contribution to the building of world community. Today's situation calls into question in a special way the exclusiveness which may have characterized the traditions in the past. Any form of triumphalism must be rejected. The contributions Jews and Christians are able to make to world community must be seen in the wider context of the contributions other religions and ideologies are striving to make. The dialogue between Jews and Christians is as yet still too restricted to the Western world. Therefore, they must be particularly sensitive to the wider context and make the effort to contribute to the mutual understanding between people of all persuasions.

7. Obviously many areas require further research and discussion. Some of the areas mentioned are:

- a. The understanding of election and its bearing on the life of the community
- b. The role of the state and its relation to its component communities
- c. The role of power in the mutual relation of communities in particular the biblical understanding of power

d. The actualisation of biblical teaching for social action.

DIALOGUE WITH JUDAISM -JEWISH/CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATIONS

Sue Jacobi New Jealens - Wee 92

### OF JESUS;

## BASIC PRESUPPOSITIONS ABOUT DIALOQUE:

Judaism is a living faith - once we recognise this we must also acknowledge that any so-called dialogue which has conversion to Christianity as a hidden or not so hidden aim is out. This leads from certain theological/ biblical presuppositions which I want to make clear from the outset: 1)the Bible arose out of a particular situation, or I should say that various books, gospels, letters etc. were written/edited in certain situations and, therefore, reflect the components which go to make up that situation -some or all of these factors may or may not be present in our own situation.

a) The Bible is not the "Word of God" in a vacuum - in fact, the idea of the Bible as the Word of God is extremely problematical.

b)Certain statements contained in the Bible may have no direct bearing on our situation.

c)The response of some Bibligal authors/editors to certain situations may not be the response we should make.

d)We must use the Biblical evidence critically taking into full consideration the historical situation.

e)Even within the Bible we find contradictory ways of doing theology i.e. on deciding on the relevance and meaning of certain ideas, sayings and even happenings.

2)Nevertheless, the Bible is important for us. Christianity arose from within Judaism, therefore - to a certain extent at any rate - we share a common history. (I realise that that statement is possibly an oversimplify ication) The New Testament is important because it provides u<sub>g</sub> with a witness to the Christ-event and early interpretations of what it could mean.

3) Theological terms such as openness, forgiveness, mutual understanding, acceptance, respect, have an important bearing on the whole topic of dialogue. We must, however, approach dialogue as theologians who have some idea of why they stand within a particular tradition - being committed to that tradition and all that that implies and while realising the problems of committment to have a prophetic role with regard to that tradition. Theologians are not to be confused with wet rags! If each party in the dialogue is unwilling to give account of their beliefs, hopes etc. of his/her faith then both are doing a great disservice to dialogue. to live in a fool's paradise is as bad as being involved in open conflict.

4) My position has implications for the mission of the Church and I hope that this will be brought out more clearly as I proceed with my presentation. For me mission involves giving an honest account of the hope that we hold -presenting our faith in the light of our committment and living according to it. It may of may not involve linguistic explanation. It certainly does not involve pressuring people into accepting the Christian faith by means of a high-powered, emotional everlasting fire insurance advertising campaign.

5)In the course of the lectures it has been pointed out that there are different levels of dialogue which is overlap at certain points. It seems to me that this dialogue must be carried on at what might be called an explicitly theological level. I would expect each partner in the dialogue to be "hard headed" (philosophically speaking), ready to listen but also ready to ask questions, to give account of their own beliefs and to openly disagree when necessary - making use of the histirical-critical methods at their disposal.

### INTRODUCTION TO THE TOPIC:

At the centre of Christianity lies what we refer to as the Christ-event. Different Christians have differing opinions of the mechanics of the Christ-event but all are agreed that Jesus is important, that he holds a central position in Christianity, that we have in some way been grasped by him and that for us to have a full life means to try to come to grips with all that being grasped by Jesus implies. In fact, we want to say that Jesus is unique. We express this belief in many different (and sometimes contradictory) ways and some of these ways are more problematic than others. Christianity bases itself on the premise that Jesus is the Messiah.

### ORIGINS OF JEWISH THINKING ABOUT JESUS:

There has been a considerable amount of interest shown in Jesus by Jewish scholars - this despite the amount of suffering and rejection Jews have undergone at the hands of Christians. Why is this so?

3

1) Christianity arose out of Judaism - or, perhaps, within Judaism would be more accurate. Jesus was a Jew who lived under the Jewish law circumcised on the eighth day and so on. His first followers were Jews and he exercised his ministry amongst Jews. Christianity and Judaism, however, parted company in the first century and since then there has been antagonism between the two religions.

2)Many Jewish scholars have been almost provoked into looking at the life and story of Jesus because to a large extent anti-semitism appears to have its roots in the W New Testament. Christians have called Jews the Christ-killers and accused them of deicide. Their sufferings from the time of the destruction of the second temple have been interpreted as the penalty they mist pay for their rejection of the Messiah. Hence, in much of the Jewish research there is an element of self-justification (e.g. in Jules Isaac's book "Jésus et Israël") This is not essentially good or bad but it must be openly acknowledged lest it should cloud the issued raised by biblical scholarship and encourage an interpretation which is more subjective and emotionally loaded than necessary. This is what I mean by the hardheadsdness which is necessary in our approach to dialogue (on this level at any rate).

# SULMARY OF JEWISH THINKING:

Jewish scholars have been mainly concerned with the so-called "Historical Jesus".(I use the term more as a means of convenient expression than anything else). They have established the Jewishness of Jesus and have even compared the teachings of Jesus with the the rabbinical teachings of that period. They arrive at the conclusion that Jesus was truly Jewish in outlook. Even his criticisms of the pharispes have been shown to be in line with the sorts of things the rabbis said. After all, as several Jewish scholars have pointed out - when you're a committed member of an organization quite often criticism is a responsible way of exercising your membership responsibly. And criticism from the inside is a lot diffement from outside criticism. The pharispes also come in for some criticism from other sources but this does not necessarily imply that they were all corrupt - as is the impression given by many Christian commentators is "

Klausner<sup>(1)</sup>however says that though Jesus' teaching may not have been deliberately directed against contemporary Judaism it had within it the germs from which there could and must develop - in the course of time - a non-Jewish and even an anti-Jewish teaching.

One problem which both Jewish and Christian scholars continually come up against is the fact that the Gospels are not history as such - they are not chronological records either of the life of Jesus or of his ministry. They simply do not set out to do such a thing. The gospels are proclamation - they proclaim, spread and confirm the new faith - the good news and therefore, the compilars of the Gospels have an ulterior motive for the Receivers way in which they organise and even edit their materials. There is also the problem that the gospels were compiled at relatively late dates, we do not have access to the sources of even to many of the most ancient manuscripts and so on. Another difficulty arises when we compare the Synoptics and the fourth gospel- on some points there are considerable divergences of opinion. Hence, the question arises - Which is to be considered as the most historically accurate? the Synoptic gospels or St John's Gospel? Most of the Jewish scholars tend to plump for the Synoptics and so, in the past, did most Christian scholars but later research tends to confirm the opinion that in many cases St John's gospel may well be more historically reliable that has hitherto been thought. This is a problem which is not easily solved and may be an area in which Christian and Jewish scholars may work together with a great deal of effectiveness. Both groups must also work on elucidating the background to the situations out of which the first editors compiled their materials. Klausner gives a very detailed picture of Palestine in the

> time of Jesus and considers the various messionic movements and the general scene of messionic expectations. The political situation was explosive and, at the same time, there were many hardships caused by natural causes.

1.1

"Consequently" says Klausner "there were around among the people of this time strong messionic longings which found expression in many apocryphal bocks filled with messionic fantasies and apocalyptic visions."(2)

There were malcontented people throughout Palestine. These who had any strengt and vitality joined the Zealots in order to work for the coming of the Kingdom. The half-hearted and moderates studied the Torah for its own sake and comforted themselves by spreading among the people "the knowledge of God" and a higher moral and ethical standard. The more weak and downtrodden among them cultivated secret mystic doctrines which had little to do with this world and were given up entirely to the heavenly life. TWO POINTS OF CONTROVERSY:

Two problems which appear to catch the imagination of Jewish scholars more than any others are:

1) Jesus' messianio-consciousness.

2) the trial and death of Jesus and the consequent teaching of the Church concarning the sin of the Jews (i.e. in rejecting the Messiah). 1) From the New Testament records it is evident that Jesus believed himself to be the Messiah (in some sense of that term). With few exceptions both Jewish and Christian scholars will come to this conclusion. They differ, however, on deciding upon the validity of his belief. There are certain problems - when did Jesus become aware of his messianic role? Why did he not proclaim openly his messiahship? Why was he keen to keep it a secret?(see the incident at Caesarea Philippi). What about the enigmatic "Son of Man" title? and so I could go on enumerating the problems which have been raised by New Testament research. These are problems for anyone who wants to do serious work in this field - whether Christian or Jewish.

The general concensus of opinion seems to be the following. (I am well aware of the dangers inherent in making any generalisations and realise that you may well disagree with me - I'm introducing this subject in order to provoke you, not to give any answers)

Jesus did, in fact, believe himself to be the Messiah and his belief was confirmed at the time of his baptism. However, his understanding of what Messiahship involved was so madically different from popular expectations that he realised the dangers of proclaiming himself to be messiah and so be expected to act in a certain way. Or, perhaps he wanted to convince his disciples first of his messianic destiny in order to be assured of their support

The use by Jesus of the title "Son of Man" presents some difficulties and provokes such questions as why did he use it and what did he mean by it. The most general Old Testament precedent is the Hebrew  $\Box \uparrow \lor - \uparrow \uparrow$  which simply means "man" (i.e. a member of the race of mankind) in the book of Daniel it has a more apocalyptic significance (see Daniel 7:13) - the Hebrew at this point is slightly different  $\Box \circ \lor - \uparrow \uparrow$  still literally "Son of man" but it is interesting to note in passing that wherever these two Hebrew phrases occur the New English Bible translates simply as "man". In the New Testament however the Greek  $\Box \circ \Box \to \Box \to \Box$  is rendered as "Son of Man". Some scholars have suggested that Jesus in his use of the title has been influenced more by Daniel and apocalyptic usage than by the ordinary Hebrew usage.

Three solutions so-called have been found to the Son of Man problem (or perhaps I should say at least three) Some sholars say that by "Son of Man" Jesus meant an apocalyptic Messiah and refers to himself. Others say that he was in fact referring to someone else. Others say that  $\beta$  "Son of Man" is simply a circumlocution for "man" (in good Hebrew tradition). In many cases it makes far more sense to translate  $D(\rho) = D(\rho) + D$ 

Of course, the real controversial area is the question of the messiahship of Jesus. Was Jesus really the Messiah? Yes, answer the Christians; No answer the Jews. The whole interpretation of messiahship comes in here. Within Judaism there ware many different ideas of what the Messiah would be like and what form his reign would take. The idea is one which has developed throughout the life of Judaism. The messianic idea , says Klausner

". . . absorbed into itself the most splendid national-humanitarian ideals of Israel".(3)

In judaism the coming of the Messiah is bound up with the coming of the Messianic age and, indeed, the idea of a personal Messiah is not always present. The Messianic age is to be a period of transition to the last judgement, the resurrection of the dead and the New World. It is to be something definite and something unmistakable. The Jewish messianic idea comes forth from an essentially politival aspiration - the longing of the nation to recover its lost political power and see the revival of the Davidic kingdom (a kingdom both of right and might). Therefore, the Messianic kingdom and the Messiah are both very much of THIS WORLD. The personality of the Messiah plays little or no part in Jewish messianic expectation.

The Jewish criticism is that when Christians call Jesus the Messiah they are wrong - where is the kingdom? Christianity, they say, is based wholly on the personality of the so-called Messiah. This is very unJewish. I refer again to Klausner(4) who says that the Christian messiah is, in essence, only a further development of the Jewish messiah. But the differences between the two are very great. The unity of God is not affected in any essential way by the Jewish messiah but in Christianity, however, monotheism is obscured by the Messiah. Perhaps it will be helpful if I enumerate some of the Jewish criticisms of Christian messianism: 1)They ask Where is the Kingdom?

2)They criticise the development from strict monotheism - or at least,
3)Jesus holds a unique place in Christianity - this they cannot accept.
4)Christian teaching about the Kingdom of God is a very airy-fairy, other - worldly affair and quite contrary to Jewish teaching.

#### COPING WITH CRITICISM:

Our first reaction may be one of justification - justifying our beliefs in the light of New Testament theology perhaps <u>but</u> it is too easy for this approach to degenerate into a polemic. What is necessary at this point is: (a)an honest description of Christian belief - a faithful presentation in the light of our personal committment.

(b)an assessment of the problems we are facing especially with regard to the criticism that Christian teaching is other-worldly.

(c)a scholarly comparison between the Jewish and the Christian approach endeavouring to draw out any implications for our community, our actions etc.

An article which I found very helpful at this point is one by someone called Reuter entitled "An Invitation to Jewish-Christian Dialogue - in what sense can we say Jesus was the Christ".(5) Christians enter dialogue with recognition of the fact that Christianity is based on the belief that Jesus id the Christ (the Messiah). We must recognise (says Reuter) that the Jew in rejecting the claim that Jesus was the Messiah is affirming the integrity of his own tradition about what this word means. The Jew must be-recognised-by-the reckoned with by the Christian as giving truthful witness to the negative side of the Christian faith. The Kingdom (in the Jewish sense of the word) has not come. He says:

"To come to terms with this <sup>j</sup>ewish negation of Christian faith is nothing less than to come to terms with the cross of human history

which has not yet turned into a messianic victory."(6) Reuter goes on to say that if we were to ask in what sense Jesus is the Christ we must say that he is not yet the Christ. Even for his disciples he was not fully the Christ - there remained always the sense in which these the content of this tiple was deferred and vested in a future that has not yet come. However, Reuter points out, it is illegitimate to turn this into a theology of progress - that is, to sum up our messionic expectations by saying that Jesus started something - gradually changing thimgs - in due time this will lead to the Kingdom. Such an approach would force the actual reality into a straightjacket and it cannot be sustained. Reuter suggests another model which seems to me to be more adequate although it raises a great multitude of problems for the linguistic philosopher in me. However, it is a useful jumping-off point. He says:

". . Jesus is our paradigm of hoping, aspiring man, venturing his life in expectation of the kingdom and Christ stands as the symbol of the fulfilment of that hope . . . (he) then stands for that unification of man with his destiny which has still not come, but in whose light we continue to hope and struggle. "(7)

Jesus is the Christ - not merely in the sense of absent destiny but also as a foretaste and presence of it as well.

Of course, this may be a totally unsatisfactory approach and we may well find that Jews cannot agree with our interpretation but the aim of dialogue is not necessarily that we should agree. The aim is mutual respect and understanding.

I think that we must openly confess that Christianity tends to be far too airy-fairy and heavenly and not concerned enough with this world and here dialogue with Judaism can become something of a corrective for us. There is still the criticism that Christianity has deviated from strict monothelam and here I think we need to look very closely at our doctrine of God. There is a distinction between Trinitarian belief and Trithelam and we have to admit that our categories are very misleading and even outmoded in our present world and perhaps we should be endeavouring to express our beliefs about God in language which is far less ambiguous and confusing than at present.

Our aim is not agreement on a set agends of items or the syncretism of Judaism and Christianity but rather mutual recognition and respect. This is something which has been lacking throughout the centuries and perhaps an open and honest discussion about messiabship in relation to Jesus Will help bring this about.

#### THE DEATH OF JESUS AND ANTI-SEMITICISM:

I will not deal with this problem at length apart from making a few observations and do perhaps elucidating the problem. As I have already mentioned one of the things which has provoked Jewish scholars into this area of research has been the fact that throughout the centuries' Jews have been labelled by Christians as being Christ-killers. This has been given Biblical justification and has led Jews to see the roots of anti-semitism lying within the New Testament.

Most Jewish scholars point out that only a few Jews could possibly we have been involved in the death of Jesus - that on many points Jesus' teaching and that of the Pharisees ran parallel - that Pilate was well known for his cruel regime and lack of hesitation in crucifying anyone whose ideas could possibly cause trouble. The text which has provoked a great deal of response from Jews is the one in which the Jews at the trial say of Jesus "his blood be on us and on our children". Jules Isaacs(8) points out that, in fact, the Jews living in Palestine were a minority and the Jews of the Dispersion were the majority. Hence, the majority of people in Jesus' time had not even known Jesus. Some Christianshave interpreted the dispersion of the Jewish people as their punishment for not accepting Jesus as Messiah but Isaacs points out that this is foolishness since the dispersion actually happened before the destruction of the Second Temple.

Here is a case in which we must approach the New Testament critically -taking note of the historical situation and openly acknowledging that some of the responses outlined in the text may well be wrong for us. (1) The New Testament was compiled at a time when the Christianity was having growing pains, the Church and synagogue were parting company and there was, consequently, friction between Christianity and Judaism especially since Christianity had taken on a more universalistic nature. This is reflected in the New Testament sources.

(2) The Gospels are not history as such but have a particular aim - that of encouraging people to acknowledge Jesus as Messiah. Put these two points together and it is evident that there is friction and tension displayed in the New Testament Sources. But for us - at our point in time- the friction and tension is not a valid response. And if we take seriously the fact that Judaism is a living faith and as such as valid an approach as our own then such questions as "Is God still faithful to the Jews?" Have they lost the right to be considered God's people and all the other naïve questions which arise are meaningless.

#### SOME CONCLUSIONS:

First, the question which must be asked is - Is this area a fruitful one as far as dialogue is concerned? It's certainly an area which has provoked a great deal of controversy and, therefore, has many difficulties. There is also a multitude of historical and textual problems which take up a great deal of painstaking research and which may have no answers in the final analysis.

Another difficulty which presents itself is that of the theological uncertainty within the Christian Church concerning Christology and the Trinitarian doctrines.

Perhaps this discussion with Jews will help-i- in elacdating the problems at any rate.

This dialogue necessarily involves an ability (and a willingness) to use the technical tools of biblical criticism and demands that theologians approach the problems in a hard headed manner and with a certain amount of detachment.

Of course, we may raise more questions than solutions but that's all to the good.

REFERENCES:

(1) J; Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth- his life, times and teaching.

(2)ibid p.152.

(3) J. Klausner, The Messionic Idea in Israel, p. 389.

(4)Ibid

(5) in the Ecumenist Vol.X No.2 Jan-Feb, 1972

(6)ibid p.20

(7) Ibi ap, 22

(8) Jules Isaacs Jésus et Israël

## Geneva, December 1972.

Lou H. Silberman

# Precis of STRUJURES OF FELLOWSHIP AND COMMUNITY IN JUDAISM by Professor U. TAL

#### The Method:

E 3

In addition to an historical perspective that delineates the diverse forms in which the Jewish community has appeared in its millenial existence, it is necessary to examine them as well from a religio-anthropological approach that concerns itself with the way in which those structures express the intention of Torah: "I call upon heaven and earth to witness against you this day that I have set before you life and death, blessing and curse, therefore choose life, that you may live, you and your descendants (Deut. 30:19). Thus within Judaism these communal forms, developed amidst diverse historical situations, are understood to be the loci in which man unfolds his essence - his metaphysical status as created **DYX1**, and his existence - his natural status as a rational being.

Man's growth thus understood begins as he becomes a partner in God's covenant, proceeds through the family, the community, the congregation, the people or ethnic group or perhaps the nation, culminating in the world community. This process requires separation from the world but as well participation in its life; it calls for emphasis on identity yet seeks to cooperate; underscores particularity but looks toward universalism; reflects both the desire to preserve destructiveness and the urge toward human communality.

Man and Fellowship:

The Jewish tradition recognizes that man is both Adam, individual, and ben-Adam, social or political being, for it is through society or more generally through creation that man's calling is realized. The loneliness of the individual is overcome in the world with its inhabitants.

### Covenant:

Man's movement out of loneliness and toward the world found its structure according to Jewish tradition/God's covenant with Noah. Subsequent structures in which covenant was embodied were family (fellowship) and community (people). The first of these covenants, established with Abraham, points to the family as the first type of communal interdependence. Hence Judaism regards the establishment of family life as both joy and duty. The initial stepinto the covenant is birth - coming into being - and is symbolized by circumcision and actualized in the first community-family. The second of these two covenants is that made with the people through Moses. At this point the dichotomy between separateness and participation, between identity and integration - that is inherent in fellowship/community comes into focus; for now there is imposed upon the people the task of being or becoming a holy nation, separate and distinct. The purpose of this separateness is living in the world, bestowing form, order and meaning through faithfully laboring in and through society - in the Jewish and in the world community.

#### The Community:

For Judaism the community is the medium for the actualization of the covenant; it is the indispensible structure that enables man to survive so that he can serve God. But it is not its own end but enables the Jew as well to practice universalistic ideas, such as justice or the pursuit of peace. The history of Jewish communal life over the course of centuries and in the widespread dispersion shows that law, far from being a petrified fossil, was a decisive factor in the continuing life of the people in wide areas of public existence. With the end of the medieval structure of society, little scope was left for an autonomous corporate body. Indeed, the expectation was that, following the lead of Western Christianity, the Jewish religion, too, would divest itself of worldy aspects and confine itself to worship, religious education and charity. Though some parts of the community moved in this direction, much of Diaspora Jewry since and Jews in the State of Israel today have refused to equate equality with uniformity and have insisted upon maintaining socio-religious selfhood amidst human unity - option for separateness and participation.

#### World Community:

While there is much in the Jewish tradition that exhibits an unequivocally open attitude towards the nations, nonetheless it is, at further inspection, more complex. It cannot be gainsaid that often the nations were at best held at arms length and were frequently - albeit theoretically the object of hestility. One must, therefore, speak of a tradition of exclusiveness contributing to hard feelings and harsh attitudes toward the nations; and of a tradition of inclusiveness contributing to a growing openness, to an increasing pursuit of peace so that justice may prevail between Israel and the Nations.

#### Conclusion:

The Torah teaches that there is no aspect of human life irrelevant to religion. Judaism is to be realized throughout man's life: by his physical and spiritual growth - through covenant, the family, the congregation, the community, voluntary associations, peoplehood, ethnicity (or for some nationality and statehood) - into the world and its communities, into mankind.

17:57

Judaism's support of a pluralistic structure of society reflects its understanding that its realization requires the safeguarding of the condittions in which this is to take place; but this structure derived as it is from an understanding of the totality of Greation, is not confined to safeguarding separate Jewish existence alone but it includes the world with its communities and religions. In an unredeemed world Judaism, through its stiff-necked insistence on being itself, understands as well the universal right to be different.

# Prof. Shemaryahu Talmon

# PARTICULARITY AND UNIVERSALITY - A JEWISH VIEW.

A. The twin concepts of particularity and universality, throughout history have been differently interpreted not only by Judaism and Christianity, but also by diverse social and political ideologies. It is inevitable that these concepts which do not pertain exclusively to the domain of religion, but permeate many aspects of hum, and especially of social life, in their religious interpretation always have been, and still are affected by moods, modes and attitudes which prevail in the socio-political dimension. In our own generation, although not exclusively, the dichotomy of the two concepts has hardened into full-fledged opposition: More often than not, particularity and universality are viewed as two mutually exclusive frames of mind and ideological pursuits.

2. Whereas Judaism emphatically rejects the presentation of particularity and universality as mutually contradictive, Christianity on the whole is prepared to subscribe to this definition. The expectation of a future perfect equality of men in the kingdom to come creates in believing Christians a consciousness of mutual obligation and a sense of solidarity within the framework of a constituted community - the Church as Corpus Christi. The individual and the community are called upon to prepare the way for the realization of the all-embracing future society by progressively foreshadowing it in actual history.

This ideal picture implicitly and explicitly presupposes the ultimateconversion of all mankind to the one and only faith, the universal religion of humanity, Hegel's 'absolute religion'. No other social affiliations and configurations are required, nay permitted to mediate between the individual and the ultimate unity which is the Church. The community of the Church is World Community.

This universalist ideology, based upon the concept of election, is pregnant with the danger of bringing forth the hubris of self-righteousness to no lesser degree than a particularistic conception of election. Being grounded in the lofty vision of a united mankind, direct universalism easily can generate contempt for individuals and groups that have not seen the light. Since this type of universalism is conceived of as the only legitimate way leading to salvation of mankind - nulla salus extra ecclesiam, its proponents may feel entitled, even enjoined to use not only missionary persuasion but also crass coercion to impose this universalism on the recalcitrant. Any opposition which hinders the realization of what is taken to be 'objective' universalism must be vanquished, since, almost by definition it surely emanates from stubborn 'subjective' egotism. Individuals and groups who insist on remaining outside the structure of this 'universalistic particularism' may again have to face, as they did face in the past, the danger of annihilation.

3. A prevalent ideological tendency, voiced preponderantly by Western Jiberals, which advocates the abrogation of any sort of institutionalized borders and limitations in the realm of socio-political organization, coalesces with the universalist persuasion of Christianity, notwithstanding the quite different underlying motivations. The resulting universalism, self-styled 'progressive', instinctively rejects and actively militates against insistence of collectivities on the right to cling to their particular identities. Judaism presents an altogether different ideology, perpetuating, as it does, its historic specific beliefs and customs, underpinned by the reconstitution of Israel as a separate political entity. This actual particularity is decried by universalists as the expression of objectionable religio-political parochialism. The confusion of 'particularity' as an actuality with 'particularism' as a normative concept, respective of Judaism, necessitates a renewed analysis of these issues and their respective roles in the world of ideas of Judaism.

4. It must be stated from the outset that the presentation of the matter perforce labors under severe limitations: Judaism is not monolithic in the interpretation of its own heritage. In the present context, it would be

impossible to do justice to the diverse nuances, some varying even on principles, which can be discerned in the discussion of the issue under review within Jewry. What is more, the interpretation of particularity and universality and of the relative role which they are assigned in the overall framework of Jewish thought, to a large degree is directly dependent on specific historical situations. The ups and downs in the stress laid upon one or the other by successive generations of Jewish thinkers often is the direct result of external politico-religious conditions to which Jews reacted in their reformulations of the concepts of particularism and universalism which determine, to a great measure, the Jewish attitude towards the surrounding world. It follows, that in an attempt to present the essence of Jewish particularity and universality, selection is peremptory. One can only hope to recapture the essential aspects which should guide Jewish thinking in this matter, although historical reality may diverge from them, as indeed it sometimes did and still does, and even flagrantly flout the principles distilled from basic normative Jewish sources. "Between the idea And the reality, Between the motion And the act Falls the shadow" (T.S. Elliott, The Hollow Man (Collected Poems New York 1936, P. 104).

5. Both Jewish particularity and the universalist thrust of Judaism are grounded in the biblical world of ideas. It is from there that any discussion of these two aspects within the orbit of Judaism must take its departure.

From its very inception, biblical thinking affirms 'particularity' as a <u>universal empirical fact</u>, and 'universalism' as a <u>value</u>, and as the <u>particular</u> <u>goal</u> of Israel's singular monotheism. The particularity of the individual expresses itself not in solitude or in 'oneness' - God alone is 'one' - but rather in diverse crystallizations of collective specifity: family, clan, tribe, credal community, people, nation, and freely contracted fellowship. Judaism strives to give validity to the fragmentary life of the individual via the

- 3 -

projection of social structures, thus saving him for direct unmitigated confrontation with an impersonal universal society. The self is the yardstick by which to measure altruistic relationships: Love for thy neighbor should equal love for thyself. Raised to the societal level, and applied to intergroup relationships, this precept makes collective specifities and particular identities the cornerstones of all general and unviersal structures: "The ideal of the religion of Israel was society in which the relations of men to their fellows was governed by the principle 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself'." (George Foote Moore, Judaism vol. II, p. 156).

'Particularity' and 'Universalism' are complementary, not mutually exclu-6. sive. This almost axiomatic statement obviously causes difficulties when it is applied to actual life situations. Here, the problem of relating the principle to the specific arises in full force. There is, on the one hand, the danger of subjecting actualities in their relativity to visionary absolute morals. On the other hand, immediacy and expediency often cause the ideal to become subjected to short-range deliberations of practicality. "It is true", says Martin Buber, "that we are not able to live in perfect justice (let alone, in perfect love, S.T.), and in order to preserve the community of men, we are often compelled to accept wrongs in decisions concerning the community. But what matters is that in every hour of decision we are aware of our responsibility and summon our conscience to weigh exactly how much is necessary to preserve the community, and accept just so much and no more" (Hebrew Humanism, in: Israel and the World, p. 246). Practical morality, as understood in Judaism, grasps both these complementary aspects of socio-religious reality, and works at relieving the inevitable tension between them. Fully recognizing the deficiency of our historical world, Judaism acquiesces in the knowledge that an ideal structure of human society can be achieved only at the 'end of days'. However, the

awareness of the limitations which are upon collective life on all levels in the historical world, is not an attitude that breeds inertia. From its inception in biblical times to the present day, Judaism has grappled with internal and external problems arising from the tension between different collectivities, adjusting the ways and means of dealing with them to the particular needs of the specific historical situations. The validation of life in this word generates in Judaism a readiness to reinterpret its heritage in a critical, and hopefully self-critical response to new conditions and new challenges. This basic stance can be fruitfully utilized in the redefinition of basic specific concepts in the context of the present deliberations: the search for a better world-order. In this context it would appear that a redefinition of the idea of . 7. 'election' becomes imperative. Notwith standing the credal-historical centrality of the self-conception of being 'the chosen people', a concept which was assimilated by Christianity to itself, the underlying persuasion that distinctiveness necessarily equals 'distinction' clashes with basic convictions of egality inherent in the projected world-order. In this form, the concept of election' is a burden too heavy to be borne by living Jewry since it implies. the notion of a preferential status of the Jewish collectivity before the Creator vis-a-vis other credal and ethnical collectivities. In a universe to be founded on the admitted inherent equality of all men, the term 'chosen' can be legitimately conferred by one collective on other, if the so designated group has shown itself to be worthy of such distinction by its exemplary mode of life, internally and externally. It cannot be legitimately appropriated by a collectivity for itself.

2. The synchronic extension of the individual into the collective, is complemented by the diachronic extension. Man in his collectivity spans the gap between preceding and future generations. The collective is two-dimensional, chronologically speaking, and thus presents to the included individual the
secureness of continuity beyond his own circumscribed life-span. Historical consciousness arises from collectivity, and at the same time underbuilds and strengthens collectivity. It helps overcome fragmentation of mankind which may lead to forlorness, and ultimately to destructiveness. The certainty of being a link in the chain of preceding generations encourages the perpetuation of transmitted values. The knowledge that one is enjoined to transmit these values in ever-changing circumstances to generations to come, makes for a readiness to reinterpret them in the light of new experiences. The perpetual reshaping of traditional values opens up in Judaism a readiness to apply these values to wider collectivities which transcend the specifity of the Jewish entity. IN summarizing the basic tenets of Judaism with respect to the 9. 'particularity' - 'universality' dichotomy, it may be said that Judaism recognizes particularity as an undeniable principle of human existence. Judaism further confers a spiritual dimension upon actual particularity, as experienced in all life situations, by conceiving of it as divinely decreed: it is a basic phenomenon of the human condition since the days of creation - anthropologically, ethnically, socially and politically. Particularity implies diversity and, to a certain degree, /of men, under the unifying overlordship of the Creator who reigns supremem over all mankind. Judaism affirms the resulting diversity in the realm of the human spirit. It considers multiformity of the religious experience, and of its expression in various and varied cultic practices, as a vital reality of human history. From here follows that the freedom of choice in matters spiritual is considered the unalienable right of all men as individuals, and as members of specific collectivities, i.e.of socioreligious communities.

In actual history, as a result of man's sinfulness and fall from grace, positively viewed specifity degenerated into divisiveness: To quote Will

Herberg: "The original perfection of Paradise is the perfection of the idea; the fall occurs in the transition to action" (Judaism and Modern Man, New York 1955, p.77). The processes by which the separateness of individuals and of species, and the particularity of groups deteriorated into inimical competition and hatred, is portrayed in the Bible, in a series of episodes set in the antes prediluvian and the pre-Hebrews eras respectively. The Adam/Eve-Snake enmity (Gen. 3:14-15) typifies man's separation from other species; Cain's fratricidal killing of Abel symbolyzes the erosion of individuality into egotistic rivalry on the anthropological plane (ib. 4:3 ff.); The Tower of Babel debacle illustrates the debasement of the commonality mankind. Untilthen "all the world spoke one language and used the same words" (or possibly "had common purposes"). Excessive 'oneness' generated hubris towards the only 'one', God the Creator, and was punished by the divisive scattering of mankind which characterizes the human condition until the 'end of days'. Historical divisive particularity is viewed as the hiatus between the divinely established concerted diversity at the time of creation, and the reconstitute composite unitedness of man and beast, of nation and nation at the time of the future 'new creation'.

11. Judaism has set up 'universalism' as the ultimate goal towards the achievement of which mankind should direct their efforts. All men and all peoples are exhorted to pin their hopes on the vision of a cosmic situation 'at the end of days' when the historical-existential tension between particularity and universality finally will be allayed: The universe again will be peacefully shared by all under the just guidance of the Ereator to whom all peoples commonly will pay homage. As in the initial, i.e. pre-historical era, so in the latter stages of human history, universality will be realized in the accord of species and specifities, and not in the abolition of particularities - anthropological, credal and socio-political. Israel's universalist vision expresses

- 1 -

itself in the unisono of particular men and particular people who worship the 'one most high' in the manifold hypostizations of specific deities. Israel will remain, indeed, God's <u>'am segulah</u>, His 'particular' (AV: peculiar) people (Ex. 19:5; Deut. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18 and Mal. 3: 17). But by the same token such a special position and relationship is granted to each and every people vis-à-vis its own deity: "Each man shall dwell under his own vine, under his own fig tree undisturbed, for the Lord of Hosts himself has spoken. All peoples will (or:may) walk, each in the name of his god, but we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever" (Micah 4:4-5). Judaism holds out to the nations salus extra synagogaum.

In this context, the Jewish perception of life in society as being based 12. upon and anchored in a definite code of legal prescriptions and injunctions gains special importance. The interaction of individuals and of social bodies, whatever their circumscription, must be regulated by divinely proclaimed and normatively expostulated statutes and directives which affect all mankind, although to varying degrees. Jewish universalism is grounded upon a legal basis which is shared by all humanity: the seven Noahide laws which are the seven pillars of human coexistence. Jewish particularity is revealed in the superstructure of commandments and laws which define the specifity of Judaism. In the ideal "Commonwealth of Nations", peoples will voluntarily subjugate their sovereign will, and their wilfulness to the persuasive power of the Divine Judge (Isaiah 2:1-4; Micah 4:1-4). Divine justice becomes manifest within the framework of the Israelite religio-cultural body politic in the just leadership of the Israelite king (Is. 11.1-5). The regulative force of the Divine and the human-royal adjudication will transcend all divisiveness which arose from improperly understood pecularities, internal, between Judah and Ephraim (ib. 11:12); external, between Israel and the nations (ib. 19:24-25) and between nation and nation, their specifity unimpaired.

In this biblical vision unfolds, in the purest and most concentrated form, Israel's conception of 'world community' as a 'community of communities'. Between the individual-subjective level of human existence and the universalobjective realm of world-community, Judaism posits the non-universal but trans-subjective particularity of the group, irrespective of its circumscription, definition or character.

AMERICAN JEWISH

Prof. Uriel Tal November, 1972

# STRUCTURES OF FELLOWSHIP AND COMMUNITY

### IN JUDAISM

( A religio-anthropological definition of the concepts: Cummunity and World Community)

On the Method:

The purpose of this paper is to describe and to define, according to Jewish tradition, the terms to be discussed by this consultation: "Community", "Community of Cummunities" and "World Community". As Salo W. Baron, one of the greatest Jewish historians points out: "... Only through a deeper penetration of the essential trends in the millenial history of the Jewish Community will we be able to comprehend the chaotic variations of the contemporary community, all of which go back to the same original structure and still reveal its indelible imprint. Interest in Jewish communal history, true enough, is fairly universal in Jewish circles. Reformers and Zionists, orthodox Jews and Socialists, indeed, all wings of Jewish public opinion have for decades expressed intense interest in the past as well as the present of the Jewish Community. An enormous monographic literature has grown up in recent decades, making available primary sources of information for many areas and centuries ... and subjecting then to close juridical, sociological and historical scrutiny ... "(1)

Our attempt to describe and define the concepts of Jewish Fellowship and Community is based on, and derived from, this historical research, including the vast number of studies produced since the appearance of Baron's work (1948) by Baron himself as well as by other scholars of contemporary "Wissenschaft des Judentums" <sup>(2)</sup>. However, the context of our present consultation is one of applied scholarship rather than of nit of learning for its own sake. Such an application of historical study for a contemporary concern requires the adoption of an additional method, which might help us find the common denominator that unites (although by no means unifies), or that connects (although by no means fuses) the diversified forms of Jewish fellowship and community.

The Torah around which Jewish communal life developed takes for its scope the whole of human life, its physical conditions, its personal conscious and subconscious motivations, its forms of thought and articulation and its social and political relations. The true object of the Torah, and consequently of Judaism as a Community, is the sanctification of life, rather than the salvation of the soul: "... I call heaven and earth to withness against You this day that I have set before You life and death, blessing and curse, therefore choose life, that You may live, You and Your descendants..."<sup>(3)</sup>.

Therefore, the method most suited to our task - that is the description and definition of those communal and inter-communal forms through which Judaism tries to realise the commandment: "Choose life""that you may live" - would be the religio-anthropoligical approach. It is through anthropological structures, developed amidst many diverse historical situations, that this intentionalist form of the Torah and consequently of Jewish tradition, has been realized. The constant substance in this diversity of historical situation is, as anthropologists as Helmut Plessner and Buitendyk showed<sup>(4)</sup>, the life-cycle of man, that is the process of growth through which man attains his self understanding, his self-realization and thus a commitment to society out of freedom. It is through his life-cycle, as indeed the earthliness of the Torah indicates that man is able to unfold both his essence, which is his metaphysical status as a rational being.

2

The framework in which this process of growth, of unfolding, takes place is the one we called "Fellowship and Cummunity", starting with man as a partner in God's covenant, proceeding through the family, the community, the congregation, the people or ethnic group or perhaps nation, and culminating in the World Community.

It is this sequence of cycles in Judaism that provides sharp contrasts which often makes the study of Jewish self-understanding unconducive to impartial judgment. On the one hand, the entire life-cycle of the Jew is rooted in forms which originally intended to preserve the Jewish people in its priestly sanctity, hence also separateness, so that its religious truths should remain pure and free from encroachments. On the other hand, especially in modern times, this life-cycle has manifested a mighty impulse to integrate among the nations; whether in order to disseminate the age-old Jewish longing for redemption as exemplified by the Jewish Reform Movement in its early days or, in a different way, as non-religious Jewish revolutionaries would have it; whether in order to absorb world culture and prticipate in it as equal, though dissimilar, partners, frequently in terms of "nor work".

One aspect of the Jewish life-cycle requires separation from the world, from the nations; the other requires participation; one intends to lead to identity, the other to integration; one emphasizes Jewish particularism, the other Jewish universalism; one reflects a strong, nearly biological group desire to preserve Jewish distinctiveness, the other reflects the urge to merge with nations. ...

· 3 · -

## Man and Fellowship:

The pillar on which the entire community structure rests is Man. It is man who is the keystone of all creation, who is God's partner acting as the administrator of His works, as the agent called upon to take his full share in the completion of God's Creation, in the process of the redemption of the world, in progress. Hence, Man is a-priori created as an Individual. As the Mishna says when teaching how witnesses should be admonished in capital cases: "... for man casts many coins with one die and they are all alike; while the King of kings, the Holy One praised be He, patterns every man after Adam and (yet) every man is unique. Therefore every man is obliged to say: For my sake was the world created"<sup>(5)</sup>.

Yet at the same time, Jewish tradition indicates that Adam, the individual, is also Ben-Adam, a son of man, that is, a segment of Mankind, This is not to say that man is just a social or political being; he is an individual, but it is society, cr more exactly, the world Creation, that serves as the medium through which Man's religious calling is realised. It is Man, collectively, who in the first chapter of Genesis is commanded to subject the earth and all its creatures to the purpose of cultivation. As we learn from the Prophetsand then from the sages: "... He who formed the earth created it not a waste; He formed it to be inhabited ... "(6). Therefore in creating Man, our sages continue, God took dust from every part of the world, so that he would be everywhere at home (7). Once Man's universality has been established, it follows, according to the Halachic pattern that his way of life is consecrated to the realization of the Torah in the world, in society, amidst mankind. The Midrash tells that when Ben-Zoma saw great crowds of people together he exclaimed: "Praised be Thou who has created all these to serve me". In the explanation to this blessing he said: "how hard the first man in his loneliness must have toiled until he could

**B**.

eat a morsel of bread or wear a garment, but I find everything prepared. The various workman, from the farmer to the miller and the baker, from the weaver to the tailor, all labor for me. Can I then be ungrateful and be oblivious to my duty ? "<sup>(8)</sup>.

It is, therefore, in the world and among its inhabitants and its communities that man finds release from his initial loneliness. Hence, as Rabbi Soloveitchik in his important essay on "The lonely man of Faith" said, even: "The prayeful community must not... remain a twofold affair: a transient "I" addressing himself to the eternal "He". The inclusion of others is indispensable. Man should avoid praying for himself alone. The plural form of prayer is of central Halakhic significance" <sup>(9)</sup>.

#### The Covenant:

The first step out of Man's loneliness towards the world is taken through the structure, of the Covenant. While, from the strict abstract theological point of view the covenant is of course one which relates God and Man, actually according to Jewish tradition, the covenant is structured in two of the forms of socioo-religious life (or as we put it. of Fellowship and Community): the family and the people.

God's initial covenant was with Abraham as the head of a family, while the Jewish people was conceived as a group, unique though not exclusive, from among his descendants: "... You and Your seed after You throughout their generations for an everlasting Covenant to be God to You and to Your seed after you..."<sup>(10)</sup>

It is here, at this primary cycle of Man's religious history that the family emerges as the fundamental cell of both Jewish separateness and Jewish Universalism. True humanity, according to the sages, has its seat not in the life of a recluse

5

but in the family circle. It is the family which generates the essential moral values such as mutual love, physical interrelationship, personal integity and socioeconomic responsibility. Hence the family is the first type of communal interdependence where we have the merge of body and mind, matter and spirit, reason and emotion, as indeed reflected in the two pillars of Jewish tradition: Halacha and Aggada. According to the Midrash of Genesis it is Man and Wife together who first receive the name "Man" because only mutual helpfulness, care and toil for one another draw forth the inner, human resources of Man.<sup>(11)</sup>

Hence, Judaism regards the establishment of family life both as a joy and a duty; joy to the individual and duty to mankind, to the world. According to the sages, only in the married state can happiness, blessing and peace be attained.<sup>(12)</sup> Therefore only a person who himself has founded a family, a household, in which moral and social values such as faithfulness, responsibility and love are practised, is entitled to plead for the people, for the house of Israel, before God. This is one of the reasons why the High Priest if unmarried, is not allowed to observe the solemn rites of the Day of Atonement<sup>(13)</sup>.

5

Against this background a Jew is one who is born, or ado ted, not into the Jewish "race" (as often claimed) but into the family. He becomes a legitimate Jew by becoming a child of Abraham, a cf-creater a party to the Covenant.

Birth, in terms of (literally speaking) "existence", of ex-sisto ex= sistere, that is of "coming out into standing", "into Being" is therefore the initial step into the Covenant, symbolized by circumcision and actualized in the first community or - the family.

The second step towards Jewish Fellowship and Community is likewise structured as a covenant, this time the covenant with Moses and through him with the people. According to Exodus (6:2-8), God, after having heard the groaning of the children of Israel whom the Egyptians held in bondage.

6 -

remembered his covenant with Abraham, with Isaac and Jacob, and promised: "...And I will take you to Myself for a people and will be your God... I am the Lord". At this point the dichotomy inherent in Fellowship and Community -- between separateness and participation, between identity and integration -- becomes even sharper.

On one hand the covenant with God binds Israel, as the Jewish People, to the task of being a holy nation, a separate corporate priesthood. On the other hand, this separateness obliges them to fulfill the divine Commandments. These commandments, however, are related not to Heaven only, but to Earth, to the world and its community, to every part of reality, physical as well as spiritual, to הבריאה, to the world as Creation.

The very purpose of Israel's separateness therefore, is to live in the world, bestowing form, order and meaning upon it. The seal of the Torah is meant to be imprinted upon "earthliness", upon the world, its inhabitants and its communities; even upon the satisfaction of Man's most sensuous desires. In order to be faithful to his calling, the Jew has to work in and through society, in and through his own as well as the world's community. As "learning does not thrive in solitude" <sup>(14)</sup>, so labor is not simply socio-economic necessity but a moral merit as well, since: "Idleness, even amid great wealth, leads to the wasting of the intellect (of God's gift)<sup>(15)</sup>.

This intentionalist structure of the covenant, a structure through which Judaism relates religion to the world, to creation, has been reconfirmed in one of the most interesting forms of Jewish Community in our days, in the Religious Kibbutz. There, "...the communal bend of the Torah "is demonstrated, among others, by the fulfillment of the laws of the Sabbatical Year and the Jubilee. From the Torah "...we learn that the individual does not possess absolute control over the main instruments of production in an agricultural economy. There are restrictions on the ownership of the land: 'For the land is Mine, for You are sojourners and residents with Me' (Lev.25:23) On labour: 'for they are My sevants... they shall not be sold as bonsmen' (Ibid, 42),

- 7

and on money necessary for the upkeep of the economy : 'And whatsoever of thine is with thy brother thy hand shall release' (Deuteronomy 15:3). These commandments involve a social structure in which the means of production, land, labour and cpital - are regulated, thereby removing the cause of poverty which degrades man and leads to sin, and ... ensuring that 'there will not be amongst you a pauper''..."<sup>(16)</sup>.

D.

### The Community

The link between the covenant and the people, and between both these and the world, is the Community. Symbolically the key term for the concept "community" is probably in Deuteronomy 33:4 " קהל ה "the Congregation of Jacob". Semantically the Hebrew expressions for "community" are various: Kahal (Ecclesia) as in I Kings 8:65; Joel 2:16; Psalm 40:10; "יקה לה" (The Congregation of the Lord) as in Deuteronomy 23:1 (later, the term Kahal referred to the leadership of the "קהל לה"); also "Eda" as in Num. 35:23 or "'a הזק" as in Num. 27:17, or "פדת-ישראל" (the Congregation of Israel), as in Exodus 12:3 and איז בני-ישראל (the Congregation of Israel), the Assembly of the Congregation of Israel) as in Exodus 12:6, Num. 14:5.

The Community is the nucleus of Jewish social cohesion, the indispensible structure that enables man to survive so that he can serve God. Without this necessary condition, without surviving in his own, unique community, the Jew can not fulfill the commandments in respect to the relations between Man and God, nor those between Man and Man.

8

Maimonides said in his Introduction to the Mishna: "... A man will not search truth nor seek to do what is good when he goes off into exile or is hungry or is fleeing from his enemies..."(17). Hence it is the particularistic community which enables man to practice universlistic ideas such as justice or the pursuit of peace.

Because of this vital function, the community is often denoted as קהילה קדושה "the Holy Community", and indeed, the adjective "holy" is applied mainly to communal forms, rarely to persons.

While the pattern of Jewish Communal life has its origins in the Biblical and Graeco-Roman period, its history becomes perhaps more significant for the context of our consultation — for the study of the dichotomy between separatness and participation ( or identify and integration, or particularism and universalism) — with the emergence of Medieval Jewish self-government.

During the Arab conquest of Persia in the first half of the seventh century, C.E., throughout the Autonomy enjoyed in the Byzantine Empire, in Christian Spain where Jewish self-government reached its peak in the 13th century, in Western Europe and Germany chiefly from the eleventh century on, in Central Europe, in Italy, and then until the abolition of the Councils of the Lands in Ashkenaz, Poland, Lithuania and Moravia in the second half of the 18th century -throughout all these centuries and in all these countries it was the approx that functioned as the main form in which that dualism of Jewish social paricularism and theological universalism was maintained.

The privileges granted to the Jewish minority by Muslim and Christian authorities enabled the Jews to take an active part in the corporate structure of Medieval societies and states. Many of the socio-political functions exercised by the state were left in the hands of Jewish self-government. All the components of life, education, worship, philantropy, vocational organization, taxation, financial transactions, social welfare, commerce, moral guidance and reglementation, the maintenance of public order, surveillance over buildings, streets, bridges, walls and gates, sanitary control, the care of the sick and of paupers, and disposition of the dead — all these were part of what the Rav Soloveitchik called the "Halachic community" which included "... the prayerful life... consecrated to the realization of the divine imperative" (17).

Thus Jewish law became a decisive factor, rather than a petrified fossil in the history of the Jewish Community. Organized like little commenwealths within the bodies of large nations and exercising more or less full judicial, fiscal and ecclesiastical authority, the Jewish communities were called upon to regulate the entire life of their members. To satisfy the religious-ethical demands of a highly activist and socially oriented creed, leaders had to pay special attention to moral conduct even in domains today considered strictly secular in nature. The Jewish judiciary was applied not only by litigants in economic or domestic disputes, but also by agencies seeking similar protection for the underprivileged or raising issues of social importance. (18)

With the disapparance of corporate forms from Western society there was little scope left for a segregated Jewish corporate body. With the emancipation of modern society the Jew too integrated into the open-class stratified structure of modern life. As the principles of liberty of conscience and of equality of rights were realized, the Jew too tried to reshape his communal tradition. However, since the Christian denominations, especially in Protestant countries, had abandoned many political features characteristic of the medieval Church, of many partisans/emancipation expected the Jewish religion too to be purified of secular ingredients, and confine its activities to worship, religious education and charity"<sup>(19)</sup>.

However, Diasyora Jewry and the Jewry in the State of Israel both refuse, although in different ways, to accept the interpretation of equality in terms of egalitarianism with a stubborness, or stiffneckedness which is not always admired by the Christian world. Equality, in the Jewish interpretation, means the equal right to maintain socio-religious diversity amidst human unity, in other words, separateness and participation.

10

World Community

At first sight, since the seven fulfillments of the Noahitic commandments opens the gate to God for "whoever wants to enter"  $^{(20)}$ , it would appear that the attitude of Judaism to the nations should be simply a welcoming one, as is claimed by Jewish apologeticists, and indeed, many sayings of the sages, of philosophers or theologians would sustain this interpretation. An old rabbinical legend, which is reflected in the New Testament miracle of Pentecost, relates that the Ten Words of Sinai were uttered in seventy tongues of fire, to reach the known seventy nations of the earth  $^{(21)}$ . Similarly we learn that when the people entered Canaan the words of the Law were engraved in seventy languages on the stones of the altar at Mount Ebal<sup>(22)</sup>

Yet it seems that an objective, truthful definition of the relationship of Judaism to the nations would have to reflect a much more complex attitude. The very duality between what we called "separateness and participation" or "identity and integration" or "particularism and universalism", comes to a head here, in the relationship of Judaism to the World and its communities.

On the one hand, since earliest Biblical times, a tendency to relentlessness, to harshness had emerged especially when the pure worship of Israel's one and holy God was endangered. The early Book of the Covenant forbade any alliance with idolatrous nations,  $^{(23)}$  and the Deuteronomic Code made this more stringent by prohibiting intermarriage and even the toleration of idolators in the land, lest they seduce the people of Bod to turn away from him.  $^{(24)}$  In the eyes of the prophets too the heathen nations were looked upon as the embodiment of evil, of idolatrous iniquity, violence, impurity, as a world of arrogance and pride denying God and doomed to perdition because they oppoed the kingdom of God proclaimed by Israel.

E.

The Pharisees went still further by placing an interdict upon eating with the heathen or using food or wine prepared by them, thus hoping to achieve separation from the non-Jewish world. <sup>(26)</sup> The law allowes for no teleration for those heathen who persisted in idolatrous practices and refused to observe the Seven Noahitic Laws, the laws of humanity: "Thou shalt show them no mercy" was the phrase of the law for the seven tribes of Canaan as for all other idolators <sup>(27)</sup>. Hence Maimonides lays down the rule that "wherever and whenever the Mosaic law is in force the people must be compelled to abjure heathenism and accept the seven laws of Noah in the name of God or else they are doomed to die" <sup>(28)</sup>.

These ancient roots, together with the historical experience of Judaism under both Christian and Muslim regimes, coupled with the recent memory of the Holocaust and reinforced by the ever-present warfare in the Near East - will all perhaps help to explain the more adamant feelings and stricter position lately developed by quite a number of Jews and Israelis.

On the other hand, however, in the code just cited, Maimonides also says: "... Not only the Jewish tribe is sanctified by the highest degree of human holiness, but every human being, without difference of birth, in whom is the spirit of love and the power of knowledge to devote his life exclusively to the service of God, and the dissemination of this knowledge, and who, walking upright before Him, has cast off the yoke of the many earthly desires... God is his portion and his eternal inheritance..."<sup>(29)</sup>. Just as the exclusive attitude to the nations is rooted in the teachings of prophets and sages, so is this oppsite, peaceful and universalist attitude to the nations, an integral part of Jewish tradition and an obligating heritage for contemporary Jewry.

The book of Jonah testifies that Israel's God sent His prophet to the Heathen of Nineveh to exhert them to repentance, that they might obtain forgiveness and salvation like repentant Israel.<sup>(30)</sup> Similarly, according to Rabbi Meir, a non-Jew who studies and practices the Torah is equal to the High Priest, for when the Scripture says: "The laws which a man fulfills, he shall live by them" it implies, that pure humanity is the one essential required by God".<sup>(31)</sup>

12

Just as the tradition of exclusiveness contributed to hard feelings and harsh attitudes towards the nations, the traditions of inclusiveness contribute to a growing openness, to an increasing pursuit of peace so that justice can be practiced between Israel and Nations.

F.

### Conclusion

The Torah, beginning with Creation, teaches that there is no aspect of human life, of Being, which can be regarded as irrelevant to religion. Hence Judaism as both, a religion and a people, is realized throughout the entire life-cycle of Man - - by his physical and spiritual growth through the Covenant, the family, the congregation, the community, voluntary associations, peoplehood, ethnicity (or, for some, nationality and statehood) into the world and its communities, into mankind.

AMERICAN JEWISI

<sup>Thus,</sup> for a Jew to live, physical conditions for the unfolding of this religioanthropological structure must be safeguarded. Indeed, it seems that much of the history of the Jews among the nations might be understood as attempts at safeguarding these conditions. Since a pluralistic structure of society offers more chances for the free unfolding of a person's life-cycle, or a people's, Judaism supports pluralism and opposes exalitarianism.

This pluralistic structure, since it is derived from a complete understanding of Creation, is not confined to safeguarding Jewish separate existence only, but rather comprises the world and its communities. Moreover, according to the Jewish greed, salvation has not yet come, hence no attempt is made to reconcile the diversity of religions. This does not mean that Judaism would agree with all the varieties of religious faiths and people, nor should the recognition of these varieties depend on such agreement, not to speach of acceptance. On the contrary, Judaism does not accept Christianity or Islam, and it is precisely this stiffnecked non-acceptance which makes Judaism aware of the universal equal right to be different.

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

1

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES Central Committee Meeting Utrecht, Netherlands 13-23 August, 1972

#### INVESTMENTS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

The following resolutions were adopted by the 120-member Central Committee (there were four votes against the action and several abstentions) :

The World Council of Churches, in accordance with its own commitment to combat racism, considering that the effect of foreign investments in Southern Africa is to strengthen the white minority regimes in their oppression of the majority of the peoples of this region, and implementing the policy as commended by the Uppsala Assembly (1968) that investments in "institutions that perpetuate racism" should be terminated:

- a) instructs its Finance Committee and its Director of Finance:
  - to sell forthwith existing holdings and to make no investments after this date in corporations which, according to information available to the Finance Committee and the Director of Finance, are directly involved in investment in or trade with any of the following countries: South Africa, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique and Guiné-Bissao; and
  - ii) to deposit none of its funds in banks which maintain direct banking operations in those countries.
- b) <u>urges</u> all member churches, Christian agencies and individual Christians outside Southern Africa to use all their influence including stockholder action and disinvestment, to press corporations to withdraw investments from and cease trading with these countries.

In the context of the multiple strategies recommended at Addis Ababa, the Central Committee is aware of and appreciates proposals to achieve racial justice in Southern Africa through reform (e.g. the preliminary statement by the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany). The Central Committee is nevertheless convinced that the policy of withdrawal already commended by the Uppsala Assembly needs to be implemented now.

#### -1-

### A. SOME RELATED WCC POLICY STATEMENTS

The situation of racial oppression in Southern Africa has been a major corcern for the WCC since its inception. Throughout the years various policy statements have emanated from the Assembly, the Central Committee and other constituent parts of the Council. The following are some of these statements directly related to the subject of foreign investments in Southern Africa.

Of historic importance was the statement of the Fourth Assembly of the VCC at Uppsala, Sweden in 1968:

Racism is linked with economic and political exploitation. The churches must be actively concerned for the economic and political well-being of exploited groups so that their statements and actions may be relevant. In order that victims of racism may regain a sense of their own worth and be enabled to determine their own future, the churches must make economic and educational resources available to under-privileged groups for their development to full participation in the social and economic life of their communities. <u>They should also withdraw investments from institutions that perpetuate racism</u>. (emphasis added)

The Central Committee in Addis Ababa, in 1971, decided to urge "the WCC Staff and Committees and Member churches to begin an immediate study and analysis of their involvement in the support and perpetuation of racism in the following areas:

- a) investment policies and practices
- b) employment training and promotion schedules
- c) the ownership, management and control of property .
- d) the ownership, management and control of church and church-
- related institutions

The Committee also urged "the member churches themselves or through their respective National Councils to:

- a) investigate and analyse the military, political, industrial and financial systems of their countries ...
- b) develop individually or in cooperation with other churches, strategies and action programmes to redirect these systems ...
- c) develop in cooperation with the PCR and between themselves joint strategy and planning ..."

The Central Committee in Addis Ababa on the more specific question of investment in schemes like Cabora Bassa said:

"The Central Committee calls upon Member Churches to discourage their Governments and industrial and commercial enterprises from supporting schemes like the Cabora Bassa Dam and other such projects which entrench racist and colonial minority regimes in Africa."

Earlier, the Central Committee at Heraklion, Crete in 1967 called attention to the following statement made by the 1966 World Conference on Church and Society in Geneva: "We urge Christians and churches everywhere to use the powers inherent in its administrative structure, such as those that come from the investment of its resources or from the influence of its means of communication, to correct racial malpractice in society as well as within the Church itself."

In February, 1969 the Finance Committee of the WCC approved the following directive to its investment managers:

"The desire of the WCC is that the portfolio shall be built of investments in concerns engaged in socially constructive activities and it is therefore required that no resources be invested in concerns which are primarily or wholly engaged in: (emphasis added)

a) production or handling of armaments; or

b) activities in or trade with South Africa or Rhodesia."

The Commission of the PCR in 1971 requested that:

and the second second second second

1.1

"...a thorough investigation be made of the portfolio of investments owned by the WCC in order to discover:

- i) any direct or indirect investment in companies operating in Southern Africa;
  - ii) any investment in subsidiary companies operating in Southern Africa;
  - iii) any investment in banks operating in Southern Africa;
  - iv) any investment in any other financial interests in Southern Africa."

"...that the WCC encourage member churches to investigate and analyse their investments and financial involvement in Southern Africa"and went on to say that "any profits accruing hereafter from such investments should be applied to the support of the oppressed."

A joint DICARWS/DWME Southern Africa document, adopted in November 1970 by the respective Commissions of the two sub-units, states, inter alia that "Special attention should be given to ... the ways in which investment policies of Mission and Service Agencies affect Southern Africa, and other areas of the world, including racial and deprived minorities within their own countries."

In the context of this past ecumenical history the Commission of the PCR in its policy statement of April 1972 under the caption of "the role of International Finance" stated:

" A special feature of the Southern Africa conflict is the extent of external support given to the racist system by international corporations and banks (through investment, loan, etc.). <u>Recommended</u> that PCR should publicise the extent and nature of this involvement and select targets for appropriate action by the WCC, its member churches and related bodies.

i ... ; ..

A major current controversy regarding investment links with Southern Africa is whether investment should be withdrawn or not. We reject the 'Polaroid experiment' approach, considering it as merely legitimising investment in oppression and urge that all investment should be withdrawn, though we recognize the value of shareholder action and confrontation as a stage prior to withdrawal."

#### B. I. INTRODUCTION

The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, whom Christ has sent to the world, is today convincing us of sin, justice, and judgement (John 15:7-11). Not only of individual sin, personal righteousness and judgement on the last day. The Holy Spirit convince us of sin regnant in the structures of our society, impels us to seek a just society, and not to be afraid of judging the powerful forces of evil in the world which God has already condemned in Christ.

None of our societies are free from sin, nor can any of our nations claim injustice in Southern Africa, where a white minority, many of them our brethren in Christ, is oppressing a black majority. The Holy Spirit convinces us of sin here, and impels us to seek justice.

Christians must not abdicate ethical responsibility for the outcome of economic policies. The impact of foreign economic involvement on racial discrimination and apartheid involves moral decisions which should not be avoided - or left to technicians alone.

Discussions of foreign economic involvement in South Africa sometimes become confused between policy and tactics. Loans by foreign governments and corporations to the South African Government, doing business with or changing business practises in South Africa, or withdrawing capital from South Africa, involve POLICY. On the other hand, individuals or organizations who invest in corporations which do business in South Africa may use TACTICS to influence corporation policies. This paper deals primarily with policy, examining the policy alternatives open to companies, urging that the WCC takes an stand in favouring the withdrawal of investments from South Africa.

Foreign economic involvement in Southern Africa, primarily by the U.S.A. and countries of Western Europe, takes three forms: TRADE, LOANS and INVESTMENTS. Some idea of the extent of this foreign involvement could be total outstanding foreign currency obligations (loans) of the Government and public corporations were as follows:

LOANS:

Pounds Sterling	14,788,276	
Florins	58, 337, 000	
Deutsche Mark	1,195,000,000	
Swiss francs	2,267,921,461	8
United States dollars	91,455,000	64
Units of accounts	62,550,000	3
European Currency Units	25,000,000	
Maltese Pounds	5,000,000	(1

#### INVESTMENTS:

The figures for foreign investment in South Africa reach the stuggering total of £ 2,984 million in 1970.

In 1965-67 foreign investment in South Africa averaged  $\pounds$  93 million a year: in 1968-70 it averaged  $\pounds$  235 million and in 1970 itself it reached a record of  $\pounds$  328 million. The total for 1971 will be even higher: in the first six months of 1971 foreign investment was  $\pounds$  226 million, over 50 per cent higher than the figure for the first six months of 1970.

Britain is by far the largest single investor in South Africa: in 1970 sterling investment (nearly all British) there amounted to 2 1,728 million, 58 per cent of total investment. Investment from Vestern Europe was £ 721 million, 24 per cent of total investment. Dollar investment (nearly all from the USA) was £ 438 million, 15 per cent of total investment.

1.1.1

In 1971 512 British companies and over 300 American corporations had subsidiary or associate companies in South Africa. (2)

The main inducement to British and US companies to invest in South Africa is the exceptionally high rate of profit, made possible by the system of cheap, forced labour. Between 1965 and 1968 the annual average rate of return on British investments in South Africa was 12 per cent. The annual rate of return on US capital invested in South Africa in the period 1960-70 was 18.6 per cent compared with an average for total US overseas direct investments of 11 per cent. (3)

The beneficiaries of the exploitation of the black South Africans are not only South African whites. That becomes clear in the following table:

TRADE :	SOUTH AFRICA:	DIRECTIONS OF (in millions of			NG PART	ners (4	1) 60-64%
		<u>1963</u>	1964	1965	1966	<u>1967</u>	1968
United King	gdom AM	ERICAN	JEW	ISH		- <sup>2</sup> -	
export import		R C 449.6	478.4 605.8	498.5 692.2	552.4 628.9	574•4 696•0	666.5 629.3
United Stat	tes						
export import		124.3 286.3	124.3	138.6 463.7	188.0 408.1	150.7 451.7	146.2 465.9
Federal Rep	public of Germany			1 a -			1
export import		69.5 181.6	81.4 231.5	77.0	90.3 246.5	113.2 324.3	141.8 355.2
Japan	\			- 7			•
export import		99.3 79.0	118.1 114.1	100.4	118.3 126.4	244.9 162.4	286.2 173.5
Italy	X.	la.	2				
export import		69.4 47.7	56.0	52.7 98.3	61.1 71.9	69.1 99.1	60.1 109.3
					E. A.		

These foreign investments are regarded by the South African Government as important to the life of the regime and to the continuation of its racist policies. Prof. W.F.J. Steenkamp of the University of South Africa has said:

"We have learnt that our large international economic relationships are our best shield in a world which has chosen us as scapegoats."(5)

II. POLICY ALTERNATIVES

There are three possible positions on foreign capital involvement in South Africa, available to those wishing to change the racist nature of the South African 1. THE ARGUMENT FOR INCREASED INVOLVEMENT regime.

To promote increased investment and accelerated infusions of technological expertise, in the belief that the economic growth thus stimulated will inevitably alter the economic conditions and social structure, and ultimately lead to the involvement of blacks (African, Coloured, and Indian South Africans) in the political process.

2. THE ARGUMENT FOR REFORM

To press business interests to raise black wages, offer training and better promotion opportunities for black workers, and plough back a portion of their profits into educational and other benefits for the black community.

3. THE ARGUMENT FOR WITEDRAWAL \*)

To stop providing direct economic and material support to the white minority regime and advocate the withdrawal of investment and the severing of economic links as the consistent moral alternative which at the same time offers solid support to Southern Africans committed to winning their freedom.

-- It is useful to analyse these alternatives in turn, examining the potential effects of each upon the South African situation. To do so in such a brief treatment entails simplifying matters of enormous complexity and deleting logical steps in a thorough process of investigation, but may, nevertheless, give some indications of the most appropriate response to the operations of multinational corporations and international capital in South Africa today.

### III. THE ARGUMENT FOR INCREASED INVOLVEMENT

The thesis that economic growth entails the breakdown of traditional economic and social structures has many articulate proponents. The <u>Financial Mail</u>, South Africa's influential business weekly which speaks for a large segment of the country's industrialists, argues that every new investment is "another ray of hope for those trapped on the dark side of apartheid", and postulates the "Economic development will bring change that will loosen chains, just as it did in the Middle Ages in Europe". (6)

These arguments are based on the undeniable fact that as the economy expands, pressures for a more efficient use of black labour will grow. The leap from this accepted premise to the proffered corollary that more rational utilization of the country's labour potential will lead to black political and social advancement is a large and unproven one.

It is important at the outset to distinguish between the structure of South African society where political power is in the hands of a minority to which the country's wealth also accrues, and the official government policy of separating black and white. The germ of truth in the "growth" theory is that economic development does tend to strain government credibility as more and more black workers stream to the urban areas where industry needs their labour. The countervailing tendency, however, is that an influx of blacks to the cities reinforces the electorates fears and brings on greater repression such as characterised the last decade. There is a great difference between alteration of the techniques of domination and abandonment of white supremacy.

\*) The term 'withdrawal' is used in this paper to denote the termination of investment links <u>by corporations</u> involved with Southern Africa. The term 'disinvestment' is used to mean the disposal of stocks and shares held by stockholders and shareholders in these corporations.

One response to this movement of African labour into "white" industry and "white" cities is the border industry policy, which seeks to divert industrial development to the borders of the African Reserves. The Reserves function as reservoirs of cheap labour within easy access of industry rather than to become the economically developed regions pictures in apartheid ideology. Through such measures as the Physical Planning and Utilisation of Resources Act of 1967 the government is encouraging the establishment of new industries and the relocation of urban industries in these border areas. Among the incentives offered by the government to companies to move into these areas has been the authorization of African wage rates lower than those in the cities.

As for developing the Bantustans through investments, the bluff was called by the Rand Daily Mail which stated: "We have at the moment 3.7 million Whites and 13.7 million Africans. The Bureau of Census and Statistics estimates that by the end of the century there will be 7 million Whites and 27.9 million Africans ("Die Beeld" recently published new estimates, which it said were authoritative, of 6 million Whites and 35 million Africans).

At the moment 4.1 million Africans live in the projected Bantustans. If these areas are developed to a quite unimaginable degree with the creation of 85,000 new jobs a year (the present average is 100), they will be able to accommodate at most 10 million Africans by the end of the century.

That means at least 17.9 million Africans will still be living in "White" South Africa - or 25 million if one works on "Die Beeld's" figure. Plus 5.8 million Coloureds and 1.1 million Asians.

In other words even if separate development is implemented with unimaginable success, "White" South Africa will still be more than three-quarters Non-White. Nothing will have been solved." (7)

This is in addition to the more obvious contradiction that apartheid is a system designed specifically to provide cheap labour by the use of force.

Sometimestheseforeign companies\*claim to oppose apartheid by circumventing the restrictions on the use of black labour and they may even consider violating regulations when the need arises. But, many of these violations are approved by the Government because of the shortage of white workers for "white" jobs.

In the meantime, they usually support the overall policy of the South African Government. For example, the Ford Motor Company, while seeking exemptions to their quota of African workers, also recruits skilled white workers from Britain and elsewhere to minimize the need for them.

Increasing dependence on black labour does not lead to political power or better living conditions for blacks. African, Asian and Coloured participatipation in the industrial work force has risen from 64% in 1946 to 77% in 1970. (8) Yet this period also saw the growth of a sophisticated network of discriminatory legislation to counter African nationalist aspirations. To cite some examples: Since the passage of the Group Areas Act in 1956, the government has removed more than half of the entire Indian population from their homes and placed them in specially designed townships; in 1970, parliamentary representation for Coloured people was finally ended;

investing in Scuth Africa.

the Terrorism Act of 1967 gives policemen above the rank of sergeant the right to detain indefinitely, without trial or appeal, any persons deemed in the <u>opinion</u> of the arresting officer - to be a threat to the established order; the Bantu Law Amendment Act 1970 gave the<u>Minister</u> power to prohibit any blacks doing any work, such as he may decide in white areas.

(a) <u>Economically</u>: The food price index has risen faster over the years than the general price index so that increased sales taxes, rail fares, etc., have borne hardest on the lower income groups.

(b) <u>Health</u>: The incidence of TB is rising steadily every year: 2500 new cases in 1969. The infant mortality rates increased from 1960 according to Dr. Hoffenberg of University of Cape Town. This is partly explained by the increase in the incidence of malnutrition over the years.

(c) <u>Education</u>: The cutback on money spent on black education has contributed to the deteriorating standard of education for blacks in South Africa. In fact, today only 0.1% of the black population have a matric or school leaving certificate. The percentage of net national income spent on black education had been declining steadily from 0.57% in 1953 (already very low) to 0.39% in 1964.

The hierarchical pattern of authority has therefore been preserved. If the "growth" argument were accurate, one would expect the boom years of the 60's to have produced concurrent prosperity for the entire population, but such is not the case. African miners' salaries were actually worth less in 1970 than they were in 1911; and between 1966 and 1971, the gap separating white and African pay in the mines widened from a ration of 17.5 : 1 to 20.3 : 1. South Africa's miners have always been notoriously exploited. In real terms (allowing for inflation) this leaves them about as badly off as they were before the first world war, a fate not shared, so far as is known, by any other group of workers anywhere in the world. (9)

But there is evidence that their fate of economic stagnation is shared by other South African workers.

The white-to-African manufacturing wage ratio grew from 5.1 : 1 in 1966 to 5.7 : 1 in 1971. (10) Including the rural sector (comprising over 50% of the African population), average African incomes have declined in recent years. John Sackur, writing in <u>The Times</u> (London, April 26, 1971) shows that a 61% rise in average African incomes between 1956 and 1970 was more than offset by a 20% growth in inflation and a greater-than-40% increase in population. Thus, per capita incomes actually dropped during that period of extensive economic growth.

"What evidence is there that the apartheid system has been changed as foreign investment (specifically American investment) has increased? In 1950, American investments in South Africa amounted to \$ 148 million. Today, they amount to more than \$ 800 million ..., during these same years non-whites lost their last representation in Parliament: black opposition parties, press and leadership were banned; and laws were enacted permitting arrest and punishment without charges, trial or appeal. A multitude of other laws passed in this period broke up families and forcibly removed thousands of Africans from areas designated "white" to tribal areas. In short, far from being challenged with the increase of foreign investment, the apartheid laws have been hardened." (11) South Africa's economic boom therefore, has enriched the coffers of the dominant whites, brought Africans no real gains and in fact in recent years, made the relative wages and conditions worse. The argument that the prosperity generated by investment accrues to blacks is not supported by any evidence and there is no reason to expect that future capital inflow would alter the pattern.

History is full of examples of economies that have rapidly grown without achieving distributive justice. Two clear examples which relate to this present position are the growth in the industrial development of Salazar's Portugal and the brief economic boom of the ill-fated Central African Federation.

In the case of South Africa there is an additional factor. The creation of new jobs will in all likelihood increase white immigration.

In the ten years 1961-1970, a total of 374,667 immigrants arrived in South Africa. The main countries of origin of the immigrants were as follows:

172,819	R	<u>Lainte de la composition de l</u>	
28,611			
13,423		(a.15) (2)a	
	- O		14
12.856	(Source: U	N Unit on	
	32,231 28,611 13,423 13,305	28,611 13,423 13,305	32,231 - S 28,611 - S 13,423

11

#### IV. THE ARGUMENT FOR .'REFORM

While it is possible to show historically that industrialization and progress for South Africa's blacks are not corollaries, one has also to consider the alleged <u>intentional</u> involvement by businesses in the process of promoting social change. What chance for success is offered by this line of action?

The Polaroid "experiment" offers a ready-made opportunity to examine the "reform" option in action, and it is this which had made the company's relatively small involvement in South Africa symbolically important.

In January 1971 the US Polaroid Corporation, under attack from black employees in the USA for its involvement in South Africa, announced that it would undertake a one year 'experiment' to try to improve wages and working conditions of the black workers employed by its distributor in South Africa.

Like the banks, Polaroid does not employ large numbers of black workers. It operates in South Africa through a distributor, Frank and Hirsch and its sunglasses assembly company, South African Sunglasses.

Polaroid's 'experiment' had three main planks. Polaroid said it would 'improve dramatically' wages and conditions of black workers: it would divert part of its South African profits to support African education: and it would stop selling ID equipment to the South African government.

As part of the 'experiment', Polaroid's South African distributor, Frank and Hirsch, increased its minimum wage for black employees to £ 30.77 a month: this was still below the subsistence minimum of £ 32.30 a month which the Johannesburg municipality calculated in 1969 was necessary for a family of six in Soweto. Top salaries for African employees at Frank and Hirsch were increased to £ 102.56 a month, which is about the salary paid to junior white typists.

Polaroid has made grants to help black students continue their education, but only within the South African apartheid education system.

3.

marget and the second

Polaroid has stated that it has discontinued sales of its equipment to the South African government. But a Polaroid advertising circular dated October 1971 states that the biggest user of Polaroid's ID3 Identification System is still the South African Defence Force.

Polaroid decided after a year's "experiment" that its policies had yielded results, and that it would continue its South African operations. An examination of the facts makes clear a primary difficulty of the "reform" argument: there is no method of policing improvements. Critics have difficulty gaining access to the facts with which to evaluate a company's policies. In the case of Polaroid, it took a respectable South African publication, the <u>Financial Mail</u>, which supports both continued investment and reformed labour policies, to expose the myth of progress at Polaroid. A Financial Mail investigation at the end of the 1971 experimental year revealed that there were at Polaroid's local distributor, workers who were still being paid the legal minimum. This is \$ 90 less per month than a minimum subsistence budget for an average African family, as calculated by Soweto's Urban Bantu Council. (12)

Throughout the South African economy, performance of previously whiteheld jobs by blacks is not a new development but merely a continuation of the pattern which has evolved throughout the country's history. In any case, all attempts to promote blacks are limited by the government, which has repeatedly made it clear that supervision of whites by blacks will not be tolerated.

The South African government cannot permit companies to take actions which are considered a threat to the <u>status quo</u>. A memorandum circulated by the U.S. consulate in Johannesbury cautioned American corporations: "the impression that the United States firms were engaged in a coordinated effort 'to change the South African way of life' would almost certainly engender harmful reactions". (13)

But the tensions caused by the racial policies are not a basis for demanding that companies should remain in South Africa and institute labour reforms. As profit making institutions, they can only carry out such programmes, and implement them in such ways as they feel will ensure their future security.

Moreover, as has been pointed out by Mr. Tim Smith of the U.C.C.'s Council for Christian Action, a close scrutiny of the statements of the most liberal industrialists shows that they "do not ask for an abolition of apartheid nor even the abrogation of the industrial color bar, but merely for the relaxation of some restrictions which would enable them to fit non-whites into jobs where whites are no longer available. The underclass would be allowed to move a small number of "representatives" up the pyramid, but the essential pyramidal power relationship, which makes the rules, would not have shifted one inch.

If our goal is to alter that power relationship so that political power is shared, the goal of all the Colored, African, and Asian political parties before they were banned, then the integration of a number of skilled Africans into the lower echelons of the white economy is hardly a cause for celebration. The political power remains firmly reoted in the hands of a government responsive only to a white constituency. The result is simply a nation of slightly better fed and clothed political and economic serfs ... ... In fact the theme of white control is the parcent\_of apartheid, allowing parts of the latter to be reshaped without touching the former." (14) He adds: "By pressing for certain limited economic reforms but not for deeprooted change liberal industralists will be able to achieve a number of economic objectives:

-- greater productivity than is possible with white workers; -- overcome the problem of not having a regular supply of cheap labour; -- produce at lower unit costs because of paying lower wages to nonwhites for doing the same jobs, thus increasing their profits; -- be able to compete in the export market, especially in the rest of Africa, and so hope to increase their political stranglehold on areas in that continent;

- -- at the same time maintain the artificially high standards of living of the white community;
  - put on a face to the rest of the world that their intentions are honorable."

In considering the reform argument it must be noted that the denial of trade union rights to African workers has been key to apartheid both in principle and in practice.

It is of interest to note that the Johannesburg based South African Institute of Race Relations in a report published in November 1971, after a full analysis of the Polaroid experiment states that "if it was intended to significantly improve the wages and working conditions of black South Africans in general it must be regarded as a failure. If the intention was to create greater social concern among businessmen, it appears to have been moderately successful." The former was the objective of the Polaroid Corporation's "experiment". 1. di B. , the second second second

 $X = \{x_i \in X_i\}$ 

8 9 8

d a lease a second de la

a de composition de c

en englennen hange betalt i 

-14 t 14 s

, mar the dept is

್ಷಾಣ್ಯೇ 1 ನಿರಿ

is arolood ar CT SAULT and the off e ndanto 184 i e produji i

\*1 a l

8. 7 ·\* ••••

0.00

#### V. THE ARGUMENT FOR WITHDRAWAL

The role of foreign investments in South Africa must be seen in the context of the supply and control of cheap African labour, which is embedded in the patterns of <u>apartheid</u> policy, notably in the system of <u>African Reserves</u>, which restricts African land ownership and occupation to <u>13 per cent</u> of the country's land area. This has meant that African <u>subsistence farming has been confined</u> to a land area too small to provide for the needs of the rural population. Land shortage and <u>land poverty</u>, together with <u>the imposition of a money economy</u> and of <u>compulsory taxes</u>, have ensured the flow of Africans into the labour market controlled by whites.

More than four million Africans live in the urban areas, but the basis of urban legislation was defined in 1921 by a Government Commission, which said:

"The native should only be allowed to enter the urban areas .... when he is willing to enter and to minister to the needs of the white man and should depart therefrom when he ceases to minister." (15)

The contribution of investments to the solution of the land distribution problem is nil, and to black poverty it is infinitesimal. What it does in actua-lity is strengthen the white economy. More money goes into white wages, from these recipients and the industry itself to the government in taxes, and from taxes into the military-control machine. The existence of investments results therefore inevitably in the process of strengthening the military machine in order both to protect the interests of the white minority and the foreign in-vestors. France has supplied jet fighters for ground attack operations, crucial helioopters, submarines and submarine warfare training; has developed the surface-to-air "cactus missle" in close collaboration with the South Africans, and allows armoured cars to be supplied and manufactured under license in South Africa. The Italian arms firm Oto Malara is planning to supply the South African Navy with surface-to-surface missiles. Macchi 326 jet trainers, known in South Africa as Impala trainers are built locally with British Bristol Viper jet engines imported from Italy where they are manufactured under license by the Piaggio aircraft concern. Belgian automatic rifles are manufactured under license. Britain is supplying the Wasp helicopters. The U.S. which has consistently sold several million dollars a year worth of equipment to South Africa has recently licensed the sale of "light jet aircraft" which are technically classified as "non-military" but which form a basic component of an anti-guerilla force. (16)

Even in less spectacular areas the political implications of investing and doing business in South Africa are very clear. Investment in the auto, oil, and rubber sectors of the economy assist in building South Africa's military potential. Trucks made by the U.S. firms sold to the South African army are but one example of the way in which a "neutral economic investment" helps South Africa. Oil explorations assist South Africa in her frantic search for petroleum, a key strategic product.

Such assistance srengthens the white minority's military power, ultimately assisting them not only in suppressing rebellion at home but also in fighting African Liberation Movements in Mozambique, Angola and Rhodesia.

Since control of land and economic power is in the hands of the whites, foreign investors in South Africa automatically develop a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. In Western capitals the most consistent pressures on the organs of Government for more sympathetic policies towards the South African regime comes from the business leaders and their organizations. With the conflict in Southern Africa getting sharper and the Africans posing a real challenge to power the outside groups with interests in the region will react to it as a threat to their investments and move even <u>closer</u> to supporting the status quo power. They will aslo demand that Western Governments should give support to these white regimes and thus we face the real danger of external intervention on the side of the white rulers and against the forces of African freedom. This is why withdrawal is the only correct policy - any form of engagement is likely to lead to providing continuous support for the apartheid system and when that system faces a crisis to come its aid, not necessarily because those outside agree with apartheid but because they look upon it as a way of safeguarding their investments and other interests. If this does happen the holocaust in Southern Africa will create a global war.

The economic benefits accruing to whites are only one aspect of the impact which foreign capital makes in South Africa. The country is heavily dependent on outside sources for both capital and advanced technology. Foreign capital, both loans and investments, have been essential for South Africa's perennial balance of payments problem.

Commenting on the record-high deficit in 1971, a government-supporting weekly, the South African <u>Financial Gazette</u>, pointed out that the "trade gap has very fortunately been covered by a substantial inflow of capital so that gold and foreign exchange reserves have emerged from the situation relatively unscathed" (17). Between 1946 and 1970, net inflow of foreign capital was large enough not only to completely offset the net trade imbalance, but also to increase reserves by \$330 million. It has been pointed out that the greatest danger to the country would be the loss of "one of our most valuable pipelines to advanced technology, innovation and know-how". (17a) The managing director of a U.S. computer firm subsidiary claims that without the computer technology of the West, based in the United States, the fabric of South Africa's economy would dissolve into chaos. (18) Pressure for withdrawal will not bring the sudden flight of all foreign capital from South Africa, but it is becoming a factor with which corporations must reckon. Some companies are more open to persuasion or more vulnerable to protest than others, and pressure will have varying effects:

- 1. A few companies may decide that the return on their South African investment does not offset the negative image they are receiving at home, and they may sell their South African operations.
- 2. Corporations contemplating new or additional investments will have to take this pressure into account, and some can be expected to abandon their plans rather than face criticism.
- 3. Many firms will have to take visible reform action in an attempt to justify their continued presence.

The first two are clearly most desirable since they deny foreign capital to South Africa. Yet even the third can have a positive effect if it <u>comes as</u> <u>a result of pressure for withdrawal</u>, since it offers proof to oppressed South Africans of outside support for their struggle. - 14 -

The argument that withdrawal of foreign capital is a morally and politically sound positon can be summarized in the following points:

- 1. Industrial growth and promotion of blacks to more skilled positions is a well-established tightly controlled pattern, which in itself does not alter the hierarchy of power.
- 2. Despite phenomenal economic growth in recent years, the economic and political situation of black South Africans has deteriorated; and with slower growth forecast for the future, there is little reason to believe their situation will be significantly altered by improved labour policies in some
- corporations.
- 3. The contribution of foreign capital and expertise to white South Africa's ability to consolidate its control is crucial and outweighs small gains, where they exist, to few blacks who may benefit from employment in foreignowned companies.

If indeed investment in South Africa assists in maintaining the overall system of white control then the only legitimate demand possible by those wishing to challenge that control is that the companies must withdraw from South Africa.

Section of the sectio

. . .

10 11 3

<u>1</u>2 - 11

## VI. RECOMMENDATION ON POLICY

In view of these arguments we can readily understand why, for more than a decade, voices of African resistance have called for the economic isolation of) that country until its racial policies are changed. Now, when internal oppositon is becoming more and more visible, it is a particularly important time for a response. In fact, action in the economic sphere seems to offer one of the last opportunities for the outside world to help and demonstrate that it takes seriously its own rhetoric about non-violence.

South Africa today is in a fluid situation. In neighbouring Angola and Mozambique the wars against Portuguese forces drag on. Zimbabwe remains tense after black rejection of the Anglo-Rhodesian settlement proposals. Labour unrest in South African controlled Namibia continues. Within South Africa itself protests accelerate as does the force which meets them. Though the government, fearing condemnation and the risk of capital outflow has tried to avoid another "Sharpeville", response to mounting opposition by both blacks and whites has been harsh. From other quarters also, the government faces reaction to the state of the economy, as spiralling prices and increasingly inefficient services cause unease among the middle class whites. In this situation of internal economic and political stresses, statements and actions from outside the country have an inflated importance. The criticism that economic sanctions will affect Africans first has been effectively answered by the late Chief Albert Luthuli who said:

"The economic boycott of South Africa will entail undoubted hardship for Africans. We do not doubt that. But it is a method which shortens the day of bloodshed, the suffering to us will be a price we are willing to pay. In any case, we suffer already, our children are often under-nourished, and on a small scale (so far) we die at the whim of a policeman." (19)

Now is an opportune time for the World Cauncil of Churches to take affirmative action in support of change in South Africa.

The extent of the economic impact which would result from a campaign for withdrawal of South African investments is to be seen, though it can safely be concluded that the thrust of my change would be positive. A certainty, however, is the political and moral importance of such a step. Both the South African government and the multinational companies would be pressured by serious opposition. As was the case with the earlier decision to support liberation movements' humanitarian needs, black South Africans would feel supported in their aspirations. .evri

A stand by the World Council of Churches against investments in South Africa is an expression of solidarity with oppressed people. Support of economic boycotts is labelled "Terrorism", and under South African law, is punishable by death. Black South African workers employed by foreign-owned firms have jeopardized not only thier livelihoods but also their lives, to advocate withdrawal of foreign capital.

The Coloured Labour Party, reversing an earlier more "prudent" position calling for reform, has publicly called for withdrawal, as has The South African Students Organization, a group of African, Indian and Coloured Students with a membership of over 4000 has said:

"SASO sees foreign investments as giving stability to South Africa's. exploitative regime and committing South Africa's trading partners to supporting this regime. For this reason SASO rejects foreign investments. Furthermore, SASO sees the ameliorative experiments like those of Polaroid as at worst, conscience-salving and best resulting in the creation of change resistent middle class amongst the few blacks employed by foreign firms."(20)

South African protests in the early sixties precipitated a governmental and economic crisis. It was averted by massive aid from foreign banks and industries, which was an expression of confidence in the country's stable future. Today, South Africans have again put themselves on the line. They can call for withdrawal of economic bolstering of the government, but it is only from outside that successful pressure against international companies can be mounted. Our support of their demands not only affords them protection, but makes possible further challenges.

### VII TACTICS TO SECURE WITHDRAWAL

62 - <u>8</u>6 -

It would be easy to end this paper with the recommendation that foreign investment in Southern Africa by governments and corporations be withdrawn and no further investments be made until South Africa achieves majority rule. We would have denounced what we regard as acts in support of evil and have left the implementation of our recommendation to others.

ZPY

But this time the churches cannot so readily escape by making a pronouncement, for the Churches themselves are directly involved. Church organizations and individual Christians in the West have literally tens of millions of dollars invested in banks and businesses which invest in Southern Africa. As silent. partners we have often consented to practices that are not Christian in their results. Disposing of such investments can scarecly be the only answer. However, where other tactics have been exhausted such disinvestment must be the only justifiable alternative.

Our share is not enough so that sale would outeratically affect change. The WCC Member Churches and individual Christians must in the first instance, use their position to bring pressure upon governments and corporations to withdraw their support from the racist regimes. Campaigns for withdrawal exert more pressure on corporations than any other type of protest, often forcing them to take some action to justify their presence in South Africa. The situation in various countries and corporations is different, the extent of the investment varies and the tactics to be used will depend on the individual situation. Special attention should be given to what positive investments could be recommended elsewhere in Africa. Churches will also have to look at their policies concerning programme support for sister churches in Southern Africa and how the foreign exchange thus provided is used. Illustrations of how this is already being initiated appear in an appendix to this document.

The WCC, Member Churches and individual Christians must commit themselves to effective action to secure withdrawal of investments by corporations and support by Governments for the racist regime in South Africa. Where it is felt that such pressures will not be effective, or have been tried and failed, disinvestment from corporations supporting the racist structures must be the answer. Where, however, it is felt that such pressures can effect the withdrawal of corporate or Government support the relevant tactics can be used and a time limit should be set so that the result of such efforts are objectively tested after a reasonable period. We can no longer be silent.

The case for withdrawal has been argued from the standpoint of South Africa for reasons of conciseness and space. The conclusions arrived at apply automatically to Namibia, Zimbabwe and equally, to /ngola, Mozanbique and Guiné Bissao t to which territories the Portuguese colonialist covernment has refused to grant independence despite universal condemnation of colonialism - the arguments in

their specific cases have been documented elsewhere. (21)

#### and the second se

\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### FOOTNOTES

The PCR wishes to acknowledge the help received from Tami Hultman and Reed Kramer in the first drafting of this paper.

- 1. UN Special Committee on Apartheid, May 1972. Working paper on foreign loans to the South African Government and Companies Registered in South Africa.
- 2. Anti-Apartheid Movement, London, Newsletter, July 1972.
- 3. ibid, note 2
- 4. Source: IMF Directions of Trade Annual 1963-67, and IMF Directions of Trade May 1969
- 5. W.J.F. Steenkamp, "Labour Policies for Growth during the Seventies",
- South African Journal of Economics, Vol. 39, 1971, p.99
- 6. Financial Mail, September 11, 1970
- 7. Rand Daily Mail, April 18, 1970
- 8. Computed from figures in South African Statistics 1968 and Bulletin of Statistics, March 1971, Government Printer, Pretoria. (Hultman & Kraner)
- 9. The Economist (UK) 1968.

 Computed from figures in an unpublished paper on wages by Prof. W.F.J. Steenkamp of the University of South Africa; South African Survey, <u>Financial Times</u>, London, June 14, 1971; and <u>Financial Mail</u>, March 26, 1971

17 -

- 11. Houser, Christian Century, February 24, 1971
- 12. Financial Mail, December 3, 1971
- 13. 'Apartheid and U.S. Firms in South Africa', unsigned memorandum circulated by the United States Department of State, cited by Hultman & Kramer, in 'A Brief Critique of U.S. Corporate Involvement in South Africa'
- 14. Tim Smith, American Corporations in Southern Africa
- 15. United Nations, Unit on Apartheid, No. 22/70
- 16. ACOA Facts Sheets, June 2, 1971
- 17. SAFG, June 18, 1971
- 17a. Stephen Mulholland, Sunday Times, Johannesburg, January 17, 1971
- 18. Tami Hultman and Reed Kramer, interview with Mr. C. Cotton, managing director of Burroughs (South Africa), Johannesburg, March 3, 1971
- 19. cited in Houser, above no. 11
- 20. SASO Policy Document, 1972
- 21. see for instance, <u>PCR Publication</u>, Namibia, U.S. Corporate Involvement, <u>Africa Today</u>, The U.S. and Portugal in Africa, Vol. 17, No. 4 see PCR Profiles on FRELIMO (Mozambique), PAIGC (Guiné Bissao), The Cunene Dam Scheme, Cabora Bassa and the Struggle for Southern Africa.

- .
- WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Central Committee Meeting

• Unit on Justice and Service

Utrecht, Netherlands

4 i.

· 52.14

Commission on the Programme to Combat Racism

APPENDIX 1

### A SUMMARY OF AMERICAN CHURCHES' ACTIONS AND POLICY STATEMENTS ON U.S. CORPORATIONS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA \*

### Church Actions on U.S. Investment in Southern Africa.

For almost a decade now, Protestant Churches in the United States have been active in analysis, interpretation and campaigns around the question of American corporate investment in Southern African countries. Concerned about the insufferable conditions under which millions of African, Coloured, and Asian people live, the oppresive rule of white minority regimes, and the strength these regimes have received from foreign investment, American churches have attempted to assess ways in which they could influence meaningful social change.

Such an assessment has led to a variety of actions, including pressure on U.S. corporations which conduct business in South Africa and other Southern African countries, legal and congressional actions, relief work and support for humanitarian programmes of liberation movements. A number of tactics have been used by churches in their efforts to express concern and influence U.S. companies on the issues.

In the early 1960's several Protestant denominations passed <u>resolutions</u> regarding the situation in South and Southern Africa. These resolutions often supported economic sanctions against South Africa as called for by the United Nations.

By the mid-1960's, the activity of these church bodies had escalated considerably. Attention was focused upon a floating credit arrangement of 540 million by ten U.S. banks to the South African government. A "Bank Campaign" was launched against the bank consortium demanding withdrawal of the credit arrangement. As several churches held accounts or investments in these banks, certain denominations became active participants in meeting with bank officials, making <u>public statements</u>, and passing resolutions condemning the financial arrangement. Some accounts held by churches were <u>publicly withdrawn</u>. The campaign both strengthened and was strengthened by a growing mood in the churches that social concerns and investment policies could not be separated. Finally, and partially due to Church pressure, the banks withdrew the credit arrangement.

\* Edited version of a summary outline of major Protestant denominational involvement in Southern Africa issues, prepared by the Corporate Information Centre, National Council of Churches, Room 846, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, 10027, Tel:(212) 870-2295, with the assistance of the Interfaith Committee on Social Responsibility in Investments. (July, 1972); information on investment policies and church stockownership available from C.I.C. During this period, the question of church stockholder actions with companies conducting business in Southern Africa became a major strategy for action. Churches, using their <u>stockholder powers</u>, began to communicate their views with companies such as Gulf Oil regarding its role in Angola, and General Motors with respect to its major investment in the South Africa auto industry. Attendance at stockholders' annual meetings increased where questions and presentations were delivered.

By 1969. Protestant denominations were engaged in planning and strategy sessions to <u>file resolutions</u> with specific companies that would be included in the corporation's proxy statements for voite by individual and institutional shareholders at annual meetings. In 1971, for example, the Episcopal Church filed a resolution with General Motors urging stockholders to vote on the withdrawal of the company from South Africa. The United Presbyterian Church filed a similar resolution urging Gulf Oil to withdraw from Angola. Conversations with corporate management also took place.

In 1972, a coalition of six major Protestant denominations was formed with a primary emphasis on filing disclosure resolutions asking corporations to reveal the full facts of their involvement in Southern Africa. Prior to these resolutions, an inter-racial task force of sixteen persons visited South Africa, interviewed company management, and witnessed the situation directly. Finally, disclosure resolutions were filed with eight companies; General Motors, General Electric, Gulf, Goodyear, American Metal Climax, Newmont Mining and Mobil Oil. This ecumenical challenge was an essential element in focusing public attention on the role of U.S. corporations in Southern Africa, alerting these and other companies to the fact that no longer would their business go unnoticed. In this way, the churches played an important role in public education and pressure on the role of U.S. companies in Southern Africa.

There is no blueprint for future action, but it is clear that American Protestant churches are committed to continuing their focus on U.S. corporations investing in Southern Africa, Many Catholic agencies as well, are beginning to address the issues with respect to their own investments, and American churches are also challenging corporations on a variety of other issues, such as the environment, military production, minorities and U.S. corporate activity in foreign areas other than Southern Africa.

## Church Statements on Southern Africa.

Over the last decade U.S. denominations have expressed their concern about minority rule in Southern Africa on a number of accasions.

In 1966 the Executive Committee of the National Council of Churches stated:

"The Executive Committee views with continuing concern the tragic and, in fact, deteriorating situation in those countries of Southern Africa where the principle of minority white rule is the basis of policy and is maintained by repression in various forms and degrees. It is disturbing to note that in spite of the demands both local and international for greater justice, governments have hardened their position in South Africa by the intensification of the policy of apartheid, inevitably accompanied by an ever-growing and increasingly ruthless system of repression; in Southern Rhodesia, by the search for escape from any limitation, present of future, on white political authority; in Angola and Mozambique, by the steps taken by the Portuguese Government to resist all demands to share any authority with the peoples of these countries."

"In the light of these and other expressions of the deepening concern of Christians, including the February 16, 1966 World Council of Churches Resolution on Southern Rhodesia, the General Board of the National Council of Churches hereby: ...6. Urges the Government of the United States to apply a firmness toward the Republic of South Africa corresponding to that which it has indicated it would apply to Southern Rhodesia, and to that end to explore and exercise such political and economic pressures as may lead to the effective dissociation of the United States and its citizens from implicit support of South Africa's denial of rights to nonwhites. This should include such measures as:

a. A policy of discouragement rather than the present policy of encouragement of trade with and investment in South Africa; such a shift would be in accord with the United Nations recommendations.

b. The implementation of non-discriminatory policies in employment and assignment of personnel in United States establishments in South Africa.

c. The granting of asylum in the United States to political refugees from South Africa."

The General Brotherhood Board of the Church of the Breth ren stated:

va ir Na

"THE PROBLEM .... The nations of western Europe and the United States carry some of the responsibility for conditions in South Africa because the status quo is supported through the high level of trade and investment controlled by these nations. Economic assistance and long range credit further implicated the United States and western Europe. Around 250 major American firms conduct about 700 million dollars worth of trade each year with South Africa, and individual American investment there continues to rise. A consortium of American banks headed by the Chase Manhattan and First National City Bank of New York extend liberal credit arrangements to the South African Government. Trade, investment, and loans all help stabilize the white government and bolster the internal social and political system."

"WE URGE THAT -- the United States Government contribute generously to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa to provide legal aid to those charged under aparthied laws, relief for dependents of persons persecuted by the laws, education of prisoners, their children and dependents, and relief for refugees from South Africa.

" - the United States Government support and join other nations in applying economic sanctions against South Africa as one means by which South Africa might be induced to modify its racial policies." " - the National Council of Churches and member denominations make significant withdrawals of their funds from any banks which do not cease providing such a revolving credit arrangement".

"Economically it will mean a rethinking of the Protestant concept of stewardship. It is accepted that all natural resources, and this includes economic power, should be used in accordance with the will of God and to His glory. It therefore should be an integral part of our stewardship responsibility to utilize our financial resources for constructive social change. This may involve withdrawing funds from enterprises supporting minority domination in Southern Africe. It will mean seeking changes in the policies of corporations that exploit the present situation for profit alone, with little or no regard for social betterment. Responsible stewardship of the Board's resources means investment in the correction of conditions of oppression in the U.S., as well as in overseas development projects."

In Octeber, 1971, an inter-faith team went to South Africa to see first hand the operations of U.S. firms there. The team of sixteen church persons produced a report on their findings. The report concluded that:

"Apartheid is wrong. It imposes inferior status on some of God's people solely on the basis of their race. It promoted the domination of a large number of these people by a much smaller number of white people. It is dehumanizing and it is undemocratic.

Based on our understanding of the Scriptures and our first-hand knowledge of the situation in South Africa, we are convinced that any cooperation with or strengthening of apartheid is contrary to the fundamentals of Christianity. Some of the participants in this Consultation believe that if American corporations adopted vigourous new policies they might, over a period of many years, make a contribution to improving the lot of the "non-white"worker. Most of us believe that American corporations should totally disengage from Southern Africa; that the presence of American corporations in which we are shareholders undergirds the system of racism colonialism and apartheid which prevails in Southern Africa.

And we are unanimous in our conviction that American companies in Southern Africa are not doing that which they are able to do and ought to be doing with regard to their non-white employees. But even progressive employment policies on the part of American companies will not bring the basic changes in society that we support because of our Christian commitment to freedom, justice and self-determination. We acknowledge that the church of Jesus Christ has failed in its own responsibilities in the U.S., South Africa, and around the world - to help bring about that change in systematic racism to which the Gospel commits us."

### SECR/DEC.72 : 225

## MEETING OF JEWISH-CATHOLIC LIAISON COMMITTEE

## Marseille, Dec. 18-20 1972

Sessions begin on Monday, December 18, at 9 A.M.

Place : 4 Place du Colonel Edon

13 MARSEILLE VII<sup>o</sup> (House of His Excellency Archbishop R. Etchegaray).

### Programme

- 1. Minutes of Paris meeting, Dec. 1971 (Discussion on form, length and contents of minutes).
  - 2. Study papers.
  - 3. Exchange of Information

Questions : from Jewish side :

- a) Situation in the Middle East, Jerusalem, terrorism.
  - b) Situation of Catholics in U.R.S.S.
  - c) Christian Evangelisation movement in U.S.A.
- >d) Reorganisation of Pontifical Commission Justice and Peace, SODEPAX.

from Catholic side :

- a) Activities concerning Justice, Peace and Development on Jewish side.
  - b) Developments concerning Christianity on the level of historiography and science in the Jewish World.
  - c) Religious development in Israel.
  - e) Information on project of the Council of Europe concerning text books of history.