

Rec'd 4/73

CATHOLIC-JEWISH RELATIONS: 1945-1972

... an interpretative history

(Rev.) John T. Pawlikowski, O.S.M., Ph.D.
Catholic Theological Union
Chicago Cluster of Theological Schools
Chicago, Illinois 60615

Prepared for a Special Meeting of the Synagogue Council of America,
Carnegie Foundation Building, New York City, December 7, 1972

I. Introduction

Limits are the bane of creatureliness. And since the following pages are very much the work of one who considers himself clearly marked with this quality, let me immediately try to place my assigned task in proper perspective. In no sense is the following a comprehensive history of all that has gone on in the area of Catholic-Jewish relations since 1945. First of all, I have concentrated almost exclusively on the American scene, the only exception being some consideration of the Vatican's role in the dialogue. The European picture has been purposely left untouched, not because it is unimportant as such, but because it has not significantly to my mind affected interreligious relations in the United States in the Catholic-Jewish sphere. Secondly, it would have been impossible for me to list every important endeavor that has taken place in Catholic-Jewish relations during the last quarter century. So selectivity rather than comprehensiveness ruled this paper.

In view of the selective character of my presentation I would like at the outset to offer my apologies to any Jewish or Catholic groups who might legitimately feel I have by-passed significant programs for which they have been responsible. The developments I have highlighted are listed more as illustrations than as the sole or necessarily the most important programs or writings on a particular topic. I must also confess in all honesty that while I would admit to a fairly good grasp of the area of Catholic-Jewish relations I am certainly not aware of each and every development that has taken place. Hence omission may simply be due to ignorance. Another limiting factor in this paper was brought about by my original instructions for its preparation. I was told not to be concerned so much about compiling an exhaustive list of the developments in Catholic-Jewish relations but to concentrate on evaluating major trends and why they occurred. As a result, I have refrained from an excess of details and tried rather to focus on the meaning of certain events. And the meaning for which I have grasped is not merely an understanding of why certain things did or did not happen in the past, but what these occurrences or omissions portend for the future shape of Catholic-Jewish relations. "Where do we go from here," I am told, is the *raison d'être* for this meeting. My goal is to contribute to the answering of this question.

Finally, I have limited my remarks to the realm of the Catholic Church. I recognize that some of the ideas of American Protestants on the issue of Christianity's relationship to Judaism have found their way into Catholic circles. But developments in the Protestant communities are being treated in another paper.

Let me make one further point before proceeding to my analysis. I have tried in the following pages to give as honest an interpretation of the course of Catholic-Jewish relations as I could. In so doing I have pointed out what I consider to be serious deficiencies in my church's approach to the Jewish people and have indicated some of the fundamental changes that need to be made if we are to get off dead-center in the dialogue. In no sense, however, do I assume the situation to be a one-way street. As I have publicly stated, there are also movements that I feel to be essential from the Jewish side.¹ But their enumeration and discussion does not fall within the parameters set down for this paper.

II. The Major Issues in Catholic-Jewish Relations

A. The Holocaust

It is quite obvious that 1945 was not chosen simply as a convenient starting-point for this review. Certainly, as the end point of the Nazi Holocaust, one might expect that it would mark a significant turn in the history of Jewish-Catholic relationships. To be perfectly candid, while it no doubt was partially at the base of some of the postwar developments in this area, I do not judge it to have been a major stimulus for change. Nor have American Catholics grappled in any profound or extensive fashion with the implications of this monstrosity. We do find a few scattered attempts in this direction in such countries as France, Denmark, Austria and the Netherlands.² But they have had virtually no impact on the American Catholic consciousness and in fact very little even on that of their European brothers and sisters. The great names in European Catholic circles have generally ignored the Holocaust in their theological formulations.

The positive developments we have witnessed in the last twenty-five years or so have been largely the result of the general spirit of ecumenism and brotherhood which has marked the Catholic church's attitudes toward all non-Catholic groups rather than a response to its failures during the Nazi period. In point of fact I can only recall one serious exploration of the Holocaust by an American Catholic writer. That would be Gordon Zahn's *IN SOLITARY WITNESS*,³ the powerful biography of an Austrian Catholic peasant who resisted the Nazis till death. Another Catholic layman, the historian Edward Gargan, also confronted this issue head-on in his seminars at Loyola University in Chicago. But his views have not received wide dissemination in the print media.

Fr. Edward Flannery devotes a chapter to the "Final Solution" in his epic work *THE ANGUISH OF THE JEWS*.⁴ But Flannery's analysis, as important a contribution as it is, generally takes a historical perspective. He does not deal explicitly with the theological and ethical implications arising from the Holocaust, except to show how it is at least in part a continuation of the tragic history of religio-cultural anti-Semitism. By confining his treatment of the Holocaust to a single chapter, Flannery's book tends to leave the impression that it is no more significant than the anti-Semitism of the Middle Ages or of the current Communist regimes in Eastern Europe. I do not mean to be overly critical of Flannery with the above remarks, for his book had certain goals which dictated the somewhat abbreviated treatment of the Holocaust. It is merely to say that even in the best of contemporary literature in Catholic-Jewish relations the sufferings of the six million have not taken on the monumental dimensions that this tragedy demands. And this becomes doubly distressing when one considers that these few works really stand as an oasis in a desert of gigantic proportions.

The only other example of the Holocaust issue surfacing in Catholic circles was in the controversies surrounding the debut of the play *THE DEPUTY* by Rolf Hochhuth and the publication of Guenter Lewy's *THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND NAZI GERMANY*.⁵ The implied and overt criticism of Pope Pius XII was generally met with hostile reactions by American Catholics. Their posture was almost totally defensive in the face of the charges by Hochhuth and Lewy. In fact, looking at it in retrospect, the American Catholic community was generally successful in muffling the accusations made in these two works. Whatever one may think of the credibility of these accusations, the appearance of these two works could have occasioned a serious exploration of the Holocaust by American Catholics. It did not, as the overriding response was to bury rather than to probe.

With this background we are forced to ask the inevitable question, why have American Catholics been so reticent to face up to the Nazi period.⁶ The answer is a complex one. I would suggest the following as contributing factors to the silence. The first is the fact that the United States as a nation, and therefore the American Catholic church, was generally removed from the physical ravages of the II World War. We simply did not feel its effects in the same existential way as did the Europeans. And the American Catholic church was not faced with the same type of immediate and painful judgments about political allegiance or protest that confronted many European Catholics. But this is only a small part of the total explanation. A residual anti-Semitism that subconsciously still regards Jewish life as expendable because of the Jewish people's past "sins" and the general exterminations of human beings probably also accounts in part for the failure to confront the Holocaust.

In my view, however, the principal reason for silence about the Holocaust is to be found in a theological attitude that is deeply ingrained in Catholics. In essence this attitude looks upon the church as a holy and spotless institution incapable of any major moral defects. Specific application of this belief surfaces in such doctrines as papal infallibility and indefectibility. It is extremely difficult to suggest to a believing Catholic even the possibility that his or her church could have been guilty of serious moral irresponsibility in such an event as the Holocaust. The initial reaction is usually hostility and extreme defensiveness. I recall an institute on Judaism for Catholic teachers which I helped to organize a few years ago. In one of the classes a Catholic professor exposed the participants to concrete examples of anti-Jewish attitudes and teachings among some of the major church fathers such as John Chrysostom. The negative reaction that ensued was shocking, as most of the participants simply tried to dismiss the evidence the professor was presenting them. And this outburst came from a group of Catholics who were well-educated and on the whole quite open to ecumenism generally and Jewish-Christian relations in particular.

I cite the above example because I feel it well illustrates the problem. One could not ascribe the teachers' reaction to uninformed prejudice against Jews. Rather, I think it was a result of a serious shaking of the foundations of their faith commitment. After awhile some of them were able to take a more sober and mature look at the evidence presented in the class. But if such reactions can spring up among Catholics from a presentation of what would have to be called minor failings in the distant past, so much more will it be trying for Catholics to face an infinitely more serious and more recent challenge to the traditional Catholic notion of the church's basic moral integrity.

I am not for a moment suggesting that Catholics must not seriously confront the Holocaust and other past instances of the persecution of the Jewish people in the name of the gospel. But I do feel the Jewish community must understand how fundamental a challenge to traditional Catholic beliefs such confrontation involves. I will reaffirm this point again in this paper because of my firm conviction that further advancement in Catholic-Jewish relations demands very deep soul-searching on the part of the church regarding many of its basic beliefs. Such soul-searching will prove extremely painful and Jews must appreciate this even if they feel, as I certainly do, that Catholics cannot be let off the hook on these hard issues. Pressure must continue to be exerted, but it must be confined with a sensitivity that the changes required will seriously shake the pilings of Catholicism.

I should add two further comments at this point. First of all, among many liberal Catholics there has been a serious erosion of the belief in the absolute moral purity of the church. But such Catholics have generally omitted the Holocaust from their reflections for several reasons. One would be the fact that Jews are no longer classed by them as a persecuted minority and their attention has been rather on the church's failure with respect to Blacks, the Spanish-speaking, Native Americans and other minorities in this country and in the whole Third World. The second reason is allied to the first. It has to do with what I consider an overexaggerated concentration on the present in certain liberal Catholic circles with little interest in even the immediate past. The Holocaust is viewed by them as past history and hence discarded as not terribly relevant for present discussions. I consider this most unfortunate, but it is a fact that must be faced. As one who generally sympathizes with a great part of this group's viewpoint, I have tried personally to introduce the historical perspective into their reflections. But the resistance admittedly remains strong.

The neglect of the Holocaust by Catholics, both the traditional and the liberal, reveals one of the basic gaps that exists in the current Jewish-Catholic dialogue. I have read enough contemporary Jewish literature to recognize that the Holocaust is considered by the vast majority of present-day Jews as one of the central experiences in their history as a people. So if Catholics fail to delve into this question in any significant way, as has been the case up till now, there is bound to be a serious gap in the conversations between us.

B. The History of anti-Semitism

Our discussion of the Holocaust naturally leads to the whole history of anti-Semitism and its presentation to Catholics. In spite of the type of reaction to such history described above, the record here is somewhat better than on the Holocaust. It was undoubtedly Fr. Edward Flannery's *THE ANGUISH OF THE JEWS*⁷ which broke the ice in this regard within American Catholicism. This is not to say that Flannery's work has performed miracles, but it has significantly raised the general level of consciousness among American Catholics with regard to the church's past anti-Judaism. Other general works such as the Catholic historian Frederick M. Schweitzer's *A HISTORY OF THE JEWS SINCE THE FIRST CENTURY A.D.*⁸ and more specific studies such as Fr. Edward Synan's *THE POPES AND THE JEWS IN THE MIDDLE AGES*⁹ and my own article, "Roman Imperial Legislation on the Jews: 313-438 C.E.",¹⁰ have added to the impact of Flannery's groundbreaking efforts. The same may be said for the recent filmstrip created by Sister Suzanne Noffke, O.P. entitled "Christians & Jews. A Troubled Brotherhood."^{10A} The television series for Catholic teachers developed originally in New York by the Anti-Defamation League and the schoolboard of the Archdiocese of New York is another step in the right direction as is the filmstrip produced by the Interfaith department of the UAHC for classroom use by Catholic teachers. The ADL program in modified form has also been shown to teachers in Chicago under the sponsorship of the school board of the Archdiocese of Chicago. Two of my forthcoming books also take up this question.¹¹ The late Fr. Robert Reicher, in an article in the *BARAT REVIEW*,¹² and the many contributors to the symposium on anti-Semitism in the Catholic intellectual journal *CONTINUUM*¹³ (occasioned by the Glock-Stark report) also advanced Catholic thinking a few steps forward on issue of the church's historic condition of anti-Semitism.

When I say the situation here is better than it is on the Holocaust, I am making a comparative statement and not trying to paint an overly bright picture. Much remains to be done in disseminating the results of these studies to the Catholic population at large. But at least the materials are available whereas for the Holocaust we are not yet advanced to this stage. An increase of institutes such as those which have been sponsored by the Catholic Adult Education Center in Chicago and by the Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies at Seton Hall University is a major requirement for serious improvement in Catholic-Jewish relations. From my own experience in these institutes and in conversation with people like Sister Rose Thering of the Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies who has been responsible for organizing many programs in this area, I can testify to the good response they have elicited from the participants, both initially and after the completion of the institute. So I see a basis for cautious optimism in the area of the history of Christian anti-Semitism. We must continue to press for more programming in this vein and for the inclusion of this issue both in religion and social studies teaching materials.

C. The Image of the Jews in the Christian Scriptures

Since we concluded the previous section of this paper on a somewhat positive note, it might be well to continue in this line with a consideration of the image of the Jews in the New Testament. Looking at the scholarly and educational scene on this topic will result, I believe, in a considerable amount of hope although a problem of massive proportions remains for Catholic exegetes, theologians and liturgists. But hope before problems.

There exist good grounds for asserting that the advancements made in understanding this issue far outdistance the progress achieved in any other single area of the Jewish-Catholic agenda. An impressive number of Catholic scripture scholars and theologians in North America have addressed themselves to this issue. And the influence of European scripture scholars, both Catholic and Protestant, has been felt on important aspects of the problem of the portrayal of Jews by the New Testament authors. The most significant breakthrough has come with respect to the centuries-long tradition in Catholicism which saw the Jews as Christ-killers and which took from the New Testament a fundamentally anti-Judaic attitude. Catholic scripture scholars such as John Dominic Crossan,¹⁴ Joseph Fitzmyer,¹⁵ and Bruce Vawter,¹⁶ as well as a theologian such as Gregory Baum,¹⁷ have shattered the widely held and deeply imbedded Catholic belief.¹⁸ At this point it is fair to say that Catholic doctrine at both the theological and educational levels has been exhaustively cleansed of the deicide charge and that consensus has been attained that Jesus was put to death by the Romans on a political charge, however Christians may still wish to speculate about the ultimate theological significance of his death. The pioneering work of the Crossans and the Baums and of people like Msgr. John Oesterreicher of the Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies have definitely had an effect. And since the II Vatican Council was more strongly influenced by the Scripture scholars than by any other single group, their conclusions on the deicide issue were very important for the Council's eventual proclamation on the church's relationship to the Jewish people.

Our enthusiasm quickly modifies, however, once we turn to other aspects of the Catholic-Jewish question in the Scriptural realm. In several areas there is room for considerable improvement. And one issue constitutes a real dilemma for Catholic scholars.

The areas that reveal serious deficiencies as regards presentation to Christians include the relationship between the Jewish and Christian testaments and the positive influence of Pharisaism on the teachings and religious style adopted by Jesus. In short, while the work of Scripture scholars which culminated in the declaration of II Vatican removed the Scriptural basis for many of the negative stereotypes about Jews held by Christians for centuries, the Christian's appreciation of the positive influence that Judaism, especially the Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition that was contemporaneous with Jesus, had on the fundamentals of his message has been far from adequately developed.

Several Catholic Scripture scholars have addressed themselves to the issue of the connection between the Jewish and Christian covenants. The best of their answers certainly represent an improvement over previous replies to the question by Catholics which saw the New Testament as the fulfillment of the Old, thereby relegating the latter to an antiquated and inferior position. Confronted with this fundamental theological question, many Catholic exegetes have encouraged a positive appreciation of the religious values found in the Hebrew Scriptures, have lessened or totally downplayed the former emphasis on how Christ fulfilled the Messianic prophecies and, in a desperate search for a new model, have tended to fall back on St. Paul's "mystery" explanation of the relationship between Christians and Jews after the coming of Christ. While all these developments are welcome signs of hope, the real issue continues to be skirted. What is that issue? Simply put, it is the deep search within the Catholic soul whether it can continue to maintain that as the fulfillment of biblical and Second Temple Judaism Catholicism is the true and perfect religion. That has been the Roman Catholic church's contention throughout its history. In its best moments it did admit that there were authentic religious elements in other world religions including Judaism and that people who conscientiously practiced these religious traditions could attain salvation. At its worst the church engaged in forced conversion and even murder in order "to save people from themselves."

While Vatican II signalled a new appreciation of other world religions, the theological articulation of the relationship between Catholicism and other religious traditions is still in its infancy. With respect to Christianity's relationship to Judaism, the following North American theologians among others have made substantial contributions to the discussion: Gregory Baum,¹⁸ Peter Chirico,¹⁹ Rosemary Reuther,²⁰ and Monika Hellwig.^{20A} Of these, Dr. Reuther has gone the furthest in suggesting that Jesus may not have been the Messiah as Jews expected him, namely, that he did not inaugurate the "end of days," and that the Catholic's experience of Christ might be only one authentic form of Messianic experience. I believe that these theologians are on the right track, even though they have just pulled out of the station. My own sympathies lie with Dr. Reuther's approach even though I am not totally happy with her explanation of the significance of Christ. But here again Jews must understand that it is very difficult for Christian theologians to work creatively in this area. The charge of heresy

comes quickly because the new models being suggested involve the partial abandonment of a viewpoint that has been central to Catholic identity from the very beginning of the church's existence. One just does not throw overboard a central tradition of such long-standing duration overnight or without pain or struggle. Jews certainly have an experience of similar problems in confronting their own tradition. So there is no way Christian theological formulation is going to move along very quickly in this regard. Nor is it going to be easy to change what has been a fundamental part of the ordinary Catholic's self-understanding. The process must continue, however, and it should begin with a firm declaration that Catholicism is not the only true and complete religion,²¹ even though Catholic theologians at this point may not be able to fully articulate a new identity for Catholicism vis-à-vis other world religions including Judaism. The issue cannot continue to be skirted, nor can we escape by appealing to Romans 9-11 which, in spite of some positive assertions about Jews, still casts Judaism into an inferior position in relation to Christianity. Only if Catholics are willing to at least begin to seriously discuss this issue can there be any real significant advancement in the Catholic-Jewish dialogue. But Jews cannot expect miracles here. We need only look at how difficult it was to secure the declaration on the Jewish People at II Vatican. Yet its purpose was simply to eliminate the negative teachings about the Jews from Catholic doctrine. To assert that Jesus was not killed by the Jewish people, but by the Romans on a political charge, though it reverses a long-standing popular belief, represents but a minor challenge to Catholic identity in comparison to the issue we have just been discussing.

With regard to the second of the deficiencies to which I have alluded above, the portrayal of Pharisaism, there is a greater possibility for short-term improvement. I have espoused this as an area of personal concern in my publications.²² In addition, other Catholic scholars such as Dr. Josephine Massingberd Ford of Notre Dame University have highlighted the Christian debt to Pharisaism.²³ In fact, the fifth volume of THE BRIDGE which contains Dr. Ford's essay reveals a general recognition of the importance of Christian understanding of Pharisaism on the part of three other contributors (Kurt Shubert, Sofia Cavalletti and John Oesterreicher). Such understanding, if it increases, has a great potential for improving Catholic-Jewish relations for several reasons. Firstly, Pharisaism after all was responsible for the forms of Jewish religious expression such as the synagogue and the rabbinate that still survive today within the various Jewish denominations as diverse as these are. In the second place, while I welcome the greater appreciation among Catholics of the Hebrew Scriptures and the introduction of readings from these Scriptures at Sunday Mass, the Judaism that directly influenced the teachings of Jesus and his disciples differed in many significant ways from the Jewish values expressed in the written Torah. If Catholics today are to see clearly how thoroughly Judaism has influenced Jesus' ideas about ethics, the ministry, God, liturgy and the like and how significant a study of Judaism can be for current Catholic renewal, the understanding of Pharisaism is a must. Study of Pharisaism, I am convinced, can evoke a positive appreciation of Judaism among Catholics which will go a long way in counteracting possible negative images because of the continued existence and reading of certain anti-Judaic New Testament texts. The negative image

of the Pharisees must also be confronted in Catholic education, even though there are no simple solutions. I believe we can assert, however, that whatever the explanation for the portrayal of "the Pharisees" as the archenemies of Jesus in the synoptic gospels, these opponents certainly do not represent the genius or totality of the movement. Such a realization would do much to neutralize what studies of Catholic textbooks have shown to be perhaps the major source for negative stereotypes of Jews now that the deicide charge has faded away.

The discussion of Pharisaism leads us to something that remains as an intense headache for those trying to improve Catholic-Jewish relations. How does one use the New Testament texts that denounce the Pharisees or speak collectively of "the Jews" in a negative fashion. Professor Michael Zeik, a Roman Catholic who teaches history of religions at Marymount College in New York, suggested several years ago that provocative texts in the New Testament should be retranslated or eliminated.²⁴ Scripture scholars have generally balked at such a proposal except in cases where a retranslation is merited on the basis of widely accepted research. The problem is especially acute in my view when such objectionable texts are read in the context of the liturgy. In this setting they are susceptible to acquiring a sacred aura which enhances their credibility. Furthermore, it is usually not possible in the context of liturgical celebrations to provide the type of corrective background information which can be supplied in a more formal educational venue.

There is no simple solution to this very serious difficulty. I have some sympathy with the Scripture scholars who object to tampering with ancient texts. You cannot alter simply because you no longer agree with them or suspect they might have meant something different than their first impression would suggest. To engage in such efforts, I feel, would violate the canons of sound scholarship. On the other hand, the existential impact of such texts cannot be ignored. My suggestion would be to devise a set of readings for the Catholic liturgy which would simply omit the most offensive and objectionable texts. This approach, however, is rooted in the personal conviction that parts of the New Testament are not all that important or relevant for contemporary Catholic religious value formation and in some cases even represent outdated viewpoints which we have an obligation to discard today. Many of my Catholic colleagues would not agree with such a position, feeling that the entire New Testament should be read at the liturgy because all of it is revealed truth, and the type of selective text I am suggesting does violence to the sacred character of the New Testament. While I do not share this attitude, its widespread presence among many Catholic exegetes seriously hampers any positive action on the problem of offensive New Testament comments about the Jewish people. I firmly believe this dilemma will remain with us for the foreseeable future, even though those of us sensitive to Catholic-Jewish relations must continue to press for a constructive solution. The Bishops' Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations, under the director of Fr. Edward Flannery, is very interested in promoting further study of this question and is planning to sponsor in the near future a series of workshops in which scholars will turn their attention to the question of the Jewish people in the Christian Scriptures.

D. Judaism in the Catholic Curriculum

Substantial efforts have been undertaken to tackle the presentation of Judaism at the various levels of the Catholic educational enterprise from primary school to the seminary. This endeavor has involved both scientific research to determine how Jews have in fact been portrayed in Catholic teaching materials and the sponsorship of institutes and publications which bring out the new appreciation of Judaism that is emerging within Catholicism.

One of the most important scientific analysis of Catholic textbooks was the project sponsored by the American Jewish Committee and coordinated by the sociology department of St. Louis University, a Jesuit-run institution. Another important analysis has been produced more recently under the auspices of the ADL.

Inaugurated in the late fifties and continuing into the early sixties, the AJC study involved a three-member Catholic research team consisting of Sisters Linus Gleason, Rita Mudd and Rose Thering who conducted a detailed analysis of all the major textbooks used in Catholic educational programs in the fields of literature, social studies and religion. Overall director of the project was Fr. Trafford P. Maher, S.J. Their research utilized the most advanced instruments and techniques for attitudinal surveys available at that time. Concurrent with the Catholic study, the AJC sponsored self-analysis of teaching materials by Protestants and Jews. It is interesting to note that the study of religious textbooks was the last to be undertaken. This was deliberate. The project directors were afraid at the time that criticism of religious texts which in Sister Thering's words had achieved a kind of "sanctity" by association might outrage many Catholics. Hence the decision was made to concentrate first on the literature and social studies units. That such fears sound strange to us in 1972 is a clear indication of how much Vatican II has done to open up the Catholic mind and how far we have advanced through the courageous work of such people as Sisters Mudd, Gleason and Thering.

The St. Louis textbook studies did not examine only the picture of Jewish groups in Catholic materials, but all "outgroups" including Native Americans, Blacks, Spanish-Speaking, Orientals, etc.²⁵ While the results attained for all the groups forced Catholics to revise their textbooks, the findings with regard to Jews were especially enlightening.

There is very little to report from the literature study with respect to the image of the Jews. Sister Gleason did not designate the Jewish group as a separate category but tabulated references to Jews in a general non-Christian category. But the vast majority of visibility scores for the non-Christian group in the four sets of textbooks that were examined stood below three per cent. Hence it is evident students had little or no exposure to characters clearly identifiable as Jews. Whether this is due to the textbook compiler or simply reflects the literary scene from which the compiler had to select material is open to question. Whatever the reason, however, the results are far from encouraging.

The social studies findings revealed only a minimal presence of materials dealing with Judaism. Jewish exposure ranked lowest among the seven ethnic-racial groups. What materials were used generally provided a favorable

presentation of Judaism. Yet scores for the Jewish group stood considerably below those achieved by the racial-ethnic groups. In addition, most references to Judaism in the social studies units pertained primarily to Jews of the ancient period. This represents another manifestation of a clear tendency in Catholicism to focus almost exclusively on ancient forms of Judaism. Even if such presentations are largely positive in tone, they leave the impression that there is not much worthwhile talking about in present forms of Judaism. Yet the Jews with whom Catholics must live in harmony today are not the Jews of ancient times. Could this phenomenon be due at least in part to the "fulfillment" theology of Catholicism. I personally suspect it is, but I have no concrete means of proving this hypothesis.

Also of significance in the results from the social studies analysis is the total exclusion of any material on the development of Zionism and the modern State of Israel which have become so central to Jewish existence today even in the diaspora. This omission is probably due in great part to the excessive preoccupation in this country with American and Western European history. But the situation severely cripples the ability of the Catholic student to relate to his Jewish brother and sister in a meaningful way since Israel has become so pivotal in the self-identity of the American Jew.

The religion texts reversed the trend with regard to the appearance of Jews in the content of the units under examination. For in all of the textbook series without exception the Jewish group predominated in visibility among outgroups. This is not a totally unexpected finding since it is virtually impossible to treat Christianity without significant reference to the Jews.

The majority of the positive textual references to Jews deal with the Jewish heritage of Christianity. But a disturbing implication is sometimes evident even in the seemingly positive passages. While stressing on the one hand the spiritual and cultural wealth of Judaism and its rich contribution to early Christianity, the inference is that its riches were absorbed by Christianity (and hence modern Judaism is shallow when compared to Christianity) and the textbooks' praise is reserved chiefly for those Jews who found it in their hearts to accept the teachings of Jesus.

The overwhelming majority of negative references concerning Jews focused around the following themes: (1) the Jewish rejection of Christianity and the consequent divine curse inflicted on the people; (2) the Jewish role in the crucifixion; and (3) comments regarding the Pharisees. In their treatment of the death of Jesus the textbook authors often made references to the responsibility that all men and women including Christians shared for this act. Nonetheless this universalistic outlook seldom appeared in considerations of the specific events which led up to the crucifixion. Thus, even though the Catholic student may be told that the "sins of all men" were responsible for Christ's sufferings, this theological principle will remain an abstract notion unless it is meaningfully applied to the description of the specific historical events. In representative excerpts from the religion materials we find the accusation of unique and collective Jewish culpability for the sufferings and death of Christ rather than the incorporation of a more universalistic notion of responsibility. Such accusations become even more serious when the term "the Jews" is used to denote the enemies of Jesus without the corrective information that a limited number of individuals and not the entire Jewish populace of Palestine is in question.

The third negative theme in the materials concerned with Judaism is in many ways the worst of all. Passages referring to the Pharisees were among the most vile encountered in the textbooks. One basic series depicted the Pharisees in such a distorted fashion that the student would find it virtually impossible to sense any human identification with them or to believe that they acted out of human motivation.

It is necessary at this point to stress that the textbook series that provided the data for the St. Louis studies are no longer in general use. Improvement has generally taken place. In fact, Sister Rose Thering who worked on the religion study during the days of the Council already noticed an improvement in the textbooks which were appearing at that time. Most Catholic textbook publishers now have members of the Jewish community read through manuscripts prior to publication. Rabbi Edward Zerlin, for example, served in such a capacity for some five years. He has recorded his impressions in an article in the CCAR JOURNAL.²⁶ He has discovered much unevenness among Catholic ecumenical endeavors in this regard, some being positive, creative efforts which in his opinion should be welcomed and "both complimented and complemented." He cites as an example the following statement which now forms part of a chapter on pluralism in the TO LIVE IS CHRIST series (Vol. I)

But you must realize that being Catholic does not necessarily make you better than anyone else....There are many Protestants, Jewish persons and non-believers who are more faithful to their consciences than some Catholics are to theirs.... We must beware of a Catholic superiority complex, not only as private individuals, but as a group.... While we believe our doctrines are true, we must admit that our customs may not always be the best way to express our doctrines.... (pp. 97-98). So we live today in what is called a pluralistic society, that is, one which is based on many ("plural") beliefs, rather than just one way of thinking. (p. 95)

Nonetheless other texts have been prepared (but not published) by Catholic authors which, according to Rabbi Zerlin, "still exhibit the hand of the medieval artisan." He offers the following example:

We differ in this: We Catholics believe that 'a partial blindness only has befallen Israel' (Rom. 11:25). We believe that, because most Jews do not accept Jesus as the Messiah, we who are wild olive branches have been grafted into the cultivated tree of God's choice. We believe that, because they do not believe in Jesus as the Messiah, the Jewish people are temporarily cut off from the tree to which they belong by a right prior to ours.

The process of textbook analysis by Catholics to try to root out vestiges of prejudicial teaching did not end with the St. Louis effort. The archdiocese of Atlanta, for example, commissioned such an investigation in 1969.²⁷ A joint Catholic-Jewish study team there discovered considerable improvement in post-Vatican II textbooks in comparison to pre-conciliar materials. But even in these improved materials some anti-Jewish passages were found to remain.

To summarize the textbook situation I would make the following assertions: (1) overt denigration of Judaism and the Jewish people has virtually disappeared from all major Catholic textbook series; (2) the accusation of collective Jewish guilt for the death of Jesus has been eliminated; (3) while the worst denunciations of the Pharisees found in the texts analyzed by Sister Thering have generally vanished (though not to the same degree as the deicide accusation), little positive has been added to neutralize the highly negative picture of "the Pharisees" that emerges from the pages of the New Testament; and (4) some attempts have been made to introduce Catholic students to the positive values inherent in contemporary forms of Judaism. But virtually nothing has been included about Zionism, the State of Israel or the Holocaust, three core elements of the modern Jewish soul. In short, the principal result of the textbook studies thus far has been the elimination of denigrating portraits of Judaism. Inclusion of new material which would lead to a positive appreciation and understanding of the Jew as she or he exists today has lagged far behind. And I have some uneasiness at this moment that even the limited influence of these pioneering ventures could be undermined by the new drive on the part of the Vatican and, to a lesser extent, by the American hierarchy to "tighten up" religious teachings materials. In a desire to bring Catholic education back on course, many of the gains made in interreligious dialogue thus far could be lost. I make this comment with a heavy heart and with the firm assurance to you that I will do everything in my power to fight against it. As I indicated earlier on in this paper, what we need now if the Catholic-Jewish dialogue is to make any significant advance is some bold new theological thinking, not a regression to past Catholic claims of the type I have described above. Let me make it clear that I am not yet pushing the panic button. But since I said at the outset that I wanted to be honest in my assessment of the situation, I felt it imperative to alert you to what to my mind is a very disturbing trend.

There is another trend in the educational area that further complicates the problem of improving the image of Jews and Judaism among Catholic students. This is the movement away from the reliance on standardized textbooks in the teaching of religion. Now I generally applaud this trend, but it does create a new set of problems. To begin with, merely changing textbooks becomes a lot less significant than it would have been a decade ago. There are so many different texts in use and no one can be sure to what extent a teacher will utilize a particular text even if it has been selected for his or her class. This means that the proper training of teachers is becoming more and more crucial. Many of the teachers, depending on their age, were presented with a more or less distorted picture of Judaism in their own training program. With the new classroom freedom teachers now enjoy, they tend to fall back more and more on their personal resources. In addition, with the burden of choosing classroom materials more squarely on their shoulders, the positive presentation of Judaism will probably not find a place in their program unless they have been sensitized to the problems in this regard. Even those teachers with good will have expressed puzzlement on some occasions as to what they should do in this line. A few years ago a questionnaire was distributed to participants in Catholic teachers' institute on Judaism which Sister Rose Thering and I helped to direct for the Catholic Adult Education Center in Chicago. The replies indicated a serious confusion on one important point: On the one

hand the teachers were aware of II Vatican's declaration on the church's relationship to the Jewish people and were in sympathy with it; but they simply did not know how to square the conciliar statement with the negative comments about Jews contained in the New Testament. This dilemma illustrates the amount of spadework that is required in teacher training in Judaism throughout the country. Chicago has had several such institutes under the sponsorship of the Catholic Adult Education Center, the ADL, and AJC and the Catholic archdiocese. The Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies in collaboration with the ADL has organized intensive institutes for the past few summers, including one in Israel last June. There has been an intensive Summer program at Wheeling College, a Jesuit-run institution in West Virginia. Furthermore, the ADL television series has been shown to teachers in New York and Chicago. All these programs have been good, but so far they have touched only a handful of teachers. The only answer is to continue to increase the number of such institutes. They are a must to my mind because of the recent changes in classroom methodology.

A word or two should be said at this point about the problem of Judaism and the Catholic seminary curriculum. This issue was first brought to a head when the ADL, in cooperation with Loyola University and the University of Chicago, sponsored a two-day consultation on the subject in 1965. The discussions held during this consultation certainly opened the eyes of many Christian seminary professors and administrators to the horrible neglect and stereotyping of Judaism in Christian seminaries. Follow-up programs tried to rectify this situation. The ADL in collaboration with the Chicago area seminaries set up a program in Judaism for Christian seminary students. Secondly, many seminaries, both Catholic and Protestant, added rabbis to their teaching staffs. But in spite of such advances the surface has barely been scratched so far in this area. The basic problem is that whatever positive input on Judaism there has been so far into the Catholic seminary curriculum has remained on the periphery with little or no effect on the core curriculum (with the exception that the worst accusations against the Jews from the past have been eliminated). Until the core curriculum of the seminary is infused with the new attitudes towards Judaism, there is little hope for any substantial change. Such infusion will not come easily, however, and the reasons are not rooted entirely in any form of anti-Judaism. There is simply the problem that in a theological seminary, which is after all a graduate institution, professors are very conscious of their academic freedom. They do not like to be told what they should and should not teach nor are they easily convinced that they are seriously deficient in some area. All this makes the necessary professional re-training very difficult to pull off. The national office of the ADL has been particularly interested in this problem of late. But as they will testify, trying to get a school to alter its core curriculum and individual teachers to change their syllabi is indeed a formidable task. But further attempts must be made along this line. If it is to be successful at all, however, the impetus must come from the seminary professors' own peers and not directly from agencies whether Catholic or Jewish.

A further problem on the seminary level has been occasioned by the loss of interest in "formal ecumenism" of the Vatican Council type among many of the more liberal professors. They have tended to turn to issues of the church's role and responsibility in the Third World and its dealings with

minorities in this country. In such a perspective Jews are usually included within the "haves" and therefore specifically Jewish questions are met with indifference and in a few cases even with open hostility. On the strictly theological-liturgical level these professors tend to focus on other world religions. And for one reason or another Judaism is usually not included in this category. Could this be due to a lingering belief that Christianity has really subsumed anything of value in Judaism? Perhaps.

One part of the Christian seminary program that illustrates how far we have to go is the teaching of Scripture. While there undeniably has been an intensification of interest in, and appreciation of, the Hebrew Bible, the vast majority of Catholic scripture professors utilize none of the Jewish interpretations of individual books of the Hebrew Bible as resource material. They tend to rely exclusively on Christian interpreters. I cannot scientifically pinpoint the cause of this phenomenon. But it would seem to be that a residue of the traditional Catholic viewpoint which insisted that the true meaning of the Hebrew Bible could only be found through the eyes of the New Testament is at least partially the basis of this neglect. This is one area where improvement could be made without excessively altering the curriculum. The same might be said for at least a consideration of Jewish commentators on the New Testament such as Samuel Sandmel and David Flusser. Such inclusion of Jewish resource material, both primary and secondary, could have a significant impact on core Catholic teachings.

To close off this section of the paper, it would be well to summarize the findings of a recent survey of the presentation of Judaism in Catholic educational programs.²⁹ This survey was prepared jointly by the staffs of the national office of the American Jewish Committee and the Institute of Judaean-Christian Studies for presentation to the participants in the convocation marking the fifth anniversary of the conciliar statement on the Jews held at Seton Hall University in October 1970. For the Catholic portion of this study, surveys were sent to a representative nationwide sampling of four key groups: Catholic seminaries (100 with 31 replies), Catholic colleges and universities (227 with 149 replies), Catholic high schools (500 with 170 replies) and offices of superintendents of diocesan schools (152 and 46 replies). The conclusions from the survey ran as follows: Very few of the Catholic institutions (zero per cent of the seminaries) have department of Jewish studies. Nearly half of the institutions provide separate courses in Judaism. Roughly 70 per cent of the responding Catholic colleges indicated they have scripture and/or theology offerings which specifically deal with the relationship of Christianity to Judaism. About 15 per cent of these colleges also list courses covering the intertestamental period, while close to 50 per cent of the Catholic seminaries handle this subject. 55.3 per cent of the Catholic high schools teach the rabbinic background of the New Testament in religion classes.

On the question of the Nazi Holocaust and the history and theological significance of Israel the figures drop markedly. The responses to the question as to whether the Holocaust was dealt with ranged as follows: Catholic colleges = 1.3 per cent; Catholic high schools = 23.2 per cent in religion courses, 13.6 per cent in church history courses; Catholic

seminaries = 6.8 per cent. 10.3 per cent of the Catholic seminaries, 5.4 per cent of the Catholic colleges and 19.6 per cent of the Catholic high schools said yes to the question of courses on the history of Israel. Courses dealing with the theological significance of the state of Israel were presented in 1.3 per cent of the Catholic colleges, 10.3 per cent of the seminaries and 25.5 per cent of the Catholic high schools. On the question of whether Jewish scholars are teaching courses in their institutions, the Catholic response produced these figures: 7 per cent for the Catholic seminaries, 42.5 per cent for the Catholic colleges, 5.3 per cent for the Catholic high schools (although almost 70 per cent responded that they invite a local rabbi to join their classes when specifically Jewish subjects are being discussed. Over 50 per cent of the high schools said their students visit neighboring synagogues for added lectures or Sabbath services. The high school response appears to be supported by the responses from the diocesan school superintendents. 50 per cent of them responded that the treatment of present-day Judaism is covered in their schools; 56.5 per cent indicated their belief that their religion textbooks carried an adequate and positive treatment of Judaism and its relationship to Christianity; 49 per cent said that the theology of Judaism was part of the curriculum of their secondary schools, and 18 per cent said the schools dealt with the theological significance of the State of Israel.

From one point of view, the above results seem rather meager. Yet placed over against the situation a decade ago there is room for guarded optimism. I would concur with the conclusion put forward by the compilers of this report that

one possible conclusion is that the two most decisive events which forged the consciousness of contemporary Jews - the Nazi Holocaust and the rebirth of Israel - are relatively ignored in...Catholic...seminaries and colleges. It can also be surmised from the responses that Judaism is taught essentially as a "religion"... and probably most specifically as background for, or prelude to, Christianity. Of course this does not mean that Judaism must necessarily be presented in a negative light. But it does seem appropriate to question whether certain aspects of Judaism which are critical to Jews as they understand themselves receive full exploration, such as Jewish historical continuity, the strong sense of Jewish peoplehood, and Jewish religious development in the post-biblical period as reflected in the oral law and the opinions and decisions of the Talmudic and rabbinic scholars and teachers. In other words, even a sympathetic treatment of "Old Testament" Judaism in Christian educational institutions will not likely prepare students for an adequate understanding of contemporary Jews and Judaism.

E. The Vatican Council's Declaration on the Jews

The statement on the church's relationship to the Jewish people emanating from II Vatican produced a great deal of negative reaction from those Catholics and Jews who felt it did not get to the roots of the problem.

of a Catholic understanding of the Jewish attachment to Israel. In general, the report laid emphasis on the need to advance the dialogue beyond the boundaries of II Vatican. While this was in no sense a formal declaration by the bishops, the official acceptance of the report gave a certain approbation to its forward-looking ideas.

Among projects that seem to me have the potential for knocking down some of the barriers referred to above, I would list the following:

(1) THE BRIDGE, edited by Msgr. John Oesterreicher of the Institute of Judaean-Christian Studies. Its fifth and latest volume opened its pages to Jews for the first time and indicates a sensitivity to the issues that remain real obstacles to a genuine new advance in Catholic-Jewish relations.³¹ (2) For several years now a group of Catholic and Protestant scholars have been meeting under the aegis of the National Council of Churches' Faith and Order Commission with the support of the Catholic Bishops' Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish relations. This group which has as its general aim the consideration of Israel as Land, People and State has been working on a statement to the churches for over a year. When completed, it will no doubt take us somewhat beyond II Vatican. How far still is uncertain. Part of the difficulty in formulating such a statement has to do with the current methodological tensions that exist within religious studies generally. How important are biblical categories in such a statement? How important is tradition? So on and so forth. The methodological question transcends the Christian-Jewish dialogue and yet directly affects it. There are occasions when some Jews would find themselves much closer to Catholic theologians, and vice-versa, on basic issues of how one interprets a religious tradition that is both living and historical than they would to members of their own faith group. The wide range of theological vocabularies and methodologies, as well as styles of religious living, within both the Catholic and Jewish communities today severely complicate the problem of new joint formulations from either side. We are both part of the current tensions in the world of religious studies and religious expression. (3) In Chicago negotiations are currently under way to try to develop an Institute of Interreligious Research with the cooperation of the American Jewish Committee. The goal of this institute would be to explore Christian-Jewish relations within the context of the value crisis that is affecting contemporary culture. The motivation for this institute comes from the belief that the barriers to further advancement in Christian-Jewish dialogue are such that only an ongoing and planned examination of the issues will get us anywhere (the scatter-shot approach has outlived its usefulness) and that such research must be set within the context of American pluralism and the present process of value reconstruction that is currently at work within it. If it gets off the ground, the institute would be modeled somewhat after the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, California. Something of this sort is a sine qua non from my perspective for any future concrete developments.

As a final point in this section, I would mention that several Catholic dioceses in the United States have issued guidelines on relations with the Jewish community which reflect the spirit of Vatican II and in many areas move slightly beyond it. In this connection I would refer you to the guidelines published by the diocese of New York-Brooklyn-Queens, Albany, Cincinnati, Allentown and Chicago-Rockford-Gary. As for possible developments

from the Vatican itself along these lines, I frankly do not except anything in the near future. In all honesty there has been a serious retrenchment within Vatican circles with the office of the Secretariat of State putting a rather tight lid on the activities of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity under whose jurisdiction the Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish relations operates. The proposed new statement of two years ago that was prematurely released by Cardinal Shehan of Baltimore has been buried. The rather dismal prospect of positive advances in Catholic-Jewish relations from the Vatican side is due in part in my judgment to the political tensions in the Middle East. But an even more important cause is the internal conflict that now exists within the Vatican itself on the whole issue of ecumenism. We are now witnessing somewhat of a conservative-liberal power struggle in Rome for control of church policy. This may sound very forbidding for the status of Catholic-Jewish relations. While I would admit it does cast somewhat of a dark shadow, the Jewish community should be aware that Vatican control and initiative are not as important as they once were. Hence many theologians and educators will continue in their efforts to improve Catholic-Jewish relations no matter what the situation might be in Rome itself.

F. The State of Israel and Catholic-Jewish Dialogue

The issue of a Jewish national homeland has constituted a source of tension between Catholics and Jews for the better part of this century. When the first suggestions for the re-establishment of a Jewish homeland were put forward at the end of the nineteenth century, the official Catholic reaction repeated the church's centuries-old view that such a homeland was impossible because of the act of deicide committed by the Jewish people. When the father of modern Zionism Theodore Herzl approached the Vatican about support for a Jewish national homeland, he received a negative response which sought its justification in the traditional Catholic viewpoint. In an address to the 1970 Seton Hall Convocation mentioned above Dr. Charlotte Klein of Frankfurt University quotes from several articles which appeared in the authoritative semi-official Roman periodical CIVILTA CATTOLICA.³² Let me give only two of the examples cited by Dr. Klein:

1827 years have passed since the prediction of Jesus of Nazareth was fulfilled, namely, that Jerusalem would be destroyed...that the Jews would be led away to be slaves among all the nations, and that they would remain in the dispersion until the end of the world. (article written in 1897, the year of the first Zionist Congress)

(Quoting from Pope Pius X's reply to Theodore Herzl on his visit to the Vatican, January 25, 1904, in which Herzl pleaded for a sympathetic understanding of the Zionist cause) We are unable to favour this movement. We cannot prevent the Jews from going to Jerusalem - but we could never sanction it. The ground of Jerusalem... has been sanctified by the life of Jesus Christ. As the head of the Church I cannot answer you otherwise. The Jews have not recognized our Lord. Therefore we cannot recognize the Jewish people:

It was not until the II Vatican Council that the grounds for this traditional Catholic attitude toward a Jewish national homeland were destroyed. In making it clear that the Jewish people were not responsible for the death of Jesus, the conciliar statement on the Jews removed all justification for the idea that the people Israel were destined to perpetually wander among the peoples of the earth without a national entity of their own.

The "perpetual wandering" theology, though in the process of modification, made itself felt in 1948 in the Vatican decision not to recognize the new State of Israel. The unofficial organ of the Vatican *OSSERVATORE ROMANO*, for example, wrote the following:

Modern Zionism is not the authentic heir of biblical Israel, but constitutes a lay state...This is why the Holy Land and its sacred places belong to Christianity, the veritable Israel.³³

I cannot go into this question at any great length in this paper. Suffice it to say that in my view it was a combination of this theology with a firm conviction on the part of Pope Pius XII that the creation of the state seriously violated Arab rights that brought about the Vatican's stance.

With respect to the continuing diplomatic non-recognition of Israel by the Vatican I would offer the following comments. I have written in *WORLDVIEW*³⁴ and in an essay inserted in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*³⁵ of the basic injustice involved in this non-recognition. In all honesty I do not believe the Catholic theological legacy vis-à-vis Israel of which I have just spoken is the principal force withholding recognition today (although it may still play a small part). Basically the Pope fears repression of the Catholic minorities in Arab lands and a possible break with Rome by certain Eastern patriarchs and bishops. I realize these are rather narrow internal concerns, but such things hamper the actions of all groups at times. Ideally I would still urge the Vatican to step beyond these concerns. Practically I am not sure that such an act would be in the best interests of Israel at the present moment. In conversations with Mr. Michael Pragai who heads the desk in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Israel charged with relations with the Christian churches, he expressed the opinion that the Vatican could be of most help to Israel in the present situation if it remains somewhat outwardly detached in its relations with Israel. He felt that on the practical level relations with the Vatican through the Israeli diplomatic mission in Rome had improved considerably and he even expressed general satisfaction with Israel's recent dealings with the World Council of Churches. While not all Israelis would share his optimistic outlook, his position makes it necessary to treat his viewpoint with respect. So in approaching this sensitive issue we must be careful to balance the ideal with what would be most beneficial for Israel in the present circumstances. In no way do I foresee Vatican recognition of Israel until the political situation in the Middle East is better clarified. In fact, such recognition at this time could possibly dilute any constructive mediating role the Vatican might be able to play in this situation. The possibility of such a mediating role has been suggested by several Jewish spokesmen, including Rabbi Jacob Agus. Writing in the *JOURNAL OF ECUMENICAL STUDIES*, he speaks as follows:

I feel that the Christian community is truly called upon to assume the blessed task of 'peacemakers', serving through non-governmental channels as an agency of conciliation, allaying the fears of both Arabs and Israelis, and helping to heal the bleeding sores of mankind in the holy land.³⁶

A pivotal moment in Catholic-Jewish relations occurred with the events surrounding the Six-Day War in 1967. Soon after the immediate crisis had subsided some Jewish spokesmen such as Rabbi Balfour Brickner raised the issue as to whether the churches had again remained silent in the face of possible Jewish annihilation. There were charges and counter-charges made in both the religious and secular press. Most of you are familiar with that discussion so there is no need to dwell upon it. My own personal opinion of the controversy is that the truth lies somewhere between the silence charge and the Christian counteroffensive. The institutional Catholic church as a body did almost nothing. I am not defending this silence completely, but in all fairness it must be said that institutional church bodies rarely respond to a situation very quickly. Many individual Catholics and a few Catholic bishops did speak out in support of Israel. Polls have shown that the Catholic policy strongly sympathized with Israel. In addition, one did not find in the Catholic community the same type of bitter criticism of Israeli policy that surfaced in some sectors of American Protestantism. Certainly many liberal Catholics were caught off guard. Fresh off Vatican II's declaration on religious liberty which destroyed so much of Catholicism's previous views on church-state relations and mindful of the anti-war stance many of them had previously taken on Vietnam, they were simply in a quandry how to respond to the crisis of the Six-Day War. Finally, and I know that this is a controversial statement, I believe that at least part of the attack against Christians on the silence was the result of deep soul-searching and frustration within American Judaism about the role Israel is to play in American Jewish self-identity.

But I do not wish to enter into any lengthy debate about how silent the Catholic church was in 1967. Far more important is what we have learned from this confrontation that developed over the issue. Many had predicted that Catholic-Jewish dialogue had come to an end. In retrospect I would say that the controversy marked a new beginning of the dialogue. Previous to 1967 there had been a tendency to stress similarities in the dialogue and to avoid points of conflict and difference. 1967 made us realize that such an approach is bound to fail eventually. In any dialogue each partner must come to understand and appreciate the self-identity of the other. Increasingly American Jews had come to understand Israel as a part of their own self-identity. This movement crested at the time of the Six-Day War. Yet Jews had been reluctant prior to 1967 to place Israel on the dialogue agenda. All that has changed since 1967. And this is healthy, for we are coming to recognize that the dialogue cannot advance in any significant way unless Catholics and Jews really come to know each other as they really are in the deepest part of their being. Some conflict is to be expected at times in such an open dialogue, but the potential good that can result is well worth it. 1967 also helped us to see that the greatest contribution each partner can make to the dialogue is precisely in those areas where they most differ from their co-religionists.

Finally, the 1967 crisis destroyed the image of the Jews as simply another "religious group." From now on in the dialogue Catholics would have to come to understand the multi-dimensional nature of Jewish peoplehood, one dimension of which was the attachment to the land tradition. Hence dialogue with Jews would have to take on a somewhat different tone than would ecumenical contact with the various Protestant denominations. The title of the National Council of Churches' Faith and Order Commission I referred to above "Israel: Land, People, State" indicates that this point has come across to at least a segment of both the Catholic and Protestant theological fraternity.

Now I do not wish for a moment to exaggerate the developments since 1967. The dialogue, true, has not ended and the potential for real growth remains. Some positive starts have been made. But as the various textbook studies have shown, there is still very little about the State of Israel and its religio-cultural dimensions included in Catholic teaching materials. This is obviously a serious lack given the centrality Israel has assumed in contemporary Jewish self-identity. This certainly constitutes an area where an all-out effort is needed.

One interesting area of investigation for a fuller picture of American Catholicism's attitudes toward Israel can be found in the Catholic press in this country. In this vein I would recommend a study recently published by Eugene Rothman entitled "Rome and Jerusalem: The Uncertain Voice of the American Catholic Press."³⁷ After a survey of the editorial stands taken in AMERICA, COMMONWEAL, THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC REPORTER and THE CATHOLIC WORLD, Mr. Rothman says that:

the first and most striking conclusion...is that there is no general consensus on the Middle East conflict. Although almost all segments of Catholic opinion began with support for Israel in the face of Arab threats, the four journals reviewed soon diverged and their views evolved in different, sometimes diametrically opposed, directions. There was an overall decline in the level of support for Israel. Yet it must be asked whether this was a phenomenon confined to the Catholic press in America. It appears that this erosion of support for Israel was a widespread manifestation and could be found in much of both the secular and denomination press.

Rothman goes on to say that the two aspects of the situation American Catholics found most puzzling were the deep theological connection between Judaism and Jewish nationhood in the land of Israel and Zionist insistence on the preservation of the Jewish character of Israel as a national ethos and not as an individual creed. Thus when Catholics were faced with Jewish appeals for political support of Israel on religious grounds the response ranged from surprise to hostility and they tended to brand Israel as an exclusivist society in comparison to the pluralistic approach in America.

What Rothman concludes specifically about the American Catholic press, namely, that it has been an "uncertain voice" on the Middle East conflict, aptly describes the general American Catholic scene. After general initial

support of Israel in 1967 critical voices have been heard, although others have arisen to counteract some of these negative voices. From my observations the ordinary parochial Catholic is still generally pro-Israel. The opposition has come mostly from religious leaders and the academic world. Archbishop Ryan of Anchorage, Alaska, circulated a statement last Spring to the American Bishops meeting in Atlanta which strongly criticized Israeli actions in and around Jerusalem. This paper received some coverage in the American Catholic press, most notably in Chicago where THE NEW WORLD, the local archdiocesan paper, reprinted it in full in a special section. But generally the Archbishop's statement did not find overly receptive ears. The Coalition of American Nuns, whose executive director is Sister Margaret Traxler, issued a strong rebuttal to the Archbishop's charges. The writings and speeches of Fr. Joseph Ryan, S.J., a Jesuit formerly connected with the Jesuit university in Bagdad, and Msgr. Nolan of the United States Catholic Conference have been strongly anti-Israel. On the other side, Fr. Edward Flannery, head of the Bishops' Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations, has raised his voice time and time again in support of Israel on specific issues in the Middle East, in reply to Archbishop Ryan, and in uncovering the anti-Semitism that lurks behind so much of what is paraded as mere "anti-Zionism."³⁷ And Msgr. John Oesterreicher of the Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies has spoken out strongly against unjustified criticism of Israel and has tried to engender among Catholics an understanding of the Jewish people's profound attachment to the Land.

At this point it is difficult to say whether the anti-Israel activities of some Catholics have made any headway in eroding Catholic support for the Israeli position. My assessment would be that they have had only a very limited effect. But let me be very frank at this moment. The situation will deteriorate further, I believe, unless the Jewish community also modifies its attitude to some degree. By this I mean that on some occasions members of the Jewish community have branded almost any questioning of current Israeli policy by Christians as anti-Semitic. They seem to be demanding a total acceptance of Israeli actions by Catholics. Perhaps they do not mean this, but that is the impression they have left even on one who considers himself sympathetic to the general Israeli position. Imagine the effect on the neutral, lukewarm and hostile. Quite honestly I find it much easier to engage in a frank discussion of certain Israeli policies with Israelis than with most American Jews. Some American Jewish leaders have expressed reservations about certain Israeli policies to me in private, and on occasion have even made their feelings known to Israeli officials. So I know that they do not automatically subscribe to everything the Meir government says or does. But Jews must allow Catholics the right to challenge Israel on certain military and social policies without immediately calling such criticism anti-Semitic. Certainly such criticism and discussion is rather widespread in Israel itself. Unless such challenges by Christians are discussed and answered rationally, and not dismissed out of hand, it will prove very difficult for those of us with generally pro-Israeli views (though we are also sympathetic to the just claims of the Palestinians) to retain any credibility within the Catholic community. If this tendency in American Judaism to regard any and all criticisms of Israel with immediate contempt and hostility, rather than to subject them to sober evaluation, continues to predominate, I fear the pro-Arab factions may gain the upper hand.

G. The Tragedy of Soviet Jewry and Catholic-Jewish Relations

The newest issue in Catholic-Jewish relations is the cultural genocide being perpetuated against Jews in the Soviet Union. On the whole, Catholics have responded well in the face of this tragedy. Support for the Soviet Jewish struggle has been considerable. Certainly one must admit that this situation does not carry with it the controversial dimensions of the Middle East conflict. Catholics such as Sister Margaret Traxler of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice were responsible for convening the national interreligious meeting on the Soviet Jewish question held at the University of Chicago last March. This consultation issued a strong statement in support of Soviet Jews and established a permanent office on Soviet Jewry. This office has now begun operations in Chicago under the direction of Sister Ann Gillen. Catholics have been especially sympathetic to this issue for many reasons. First of all, conservative-leaning Catholics have always been concerned about the persecution of religious groups within the Soviet bloc of nations. And Soviet Catholics have begun to initiate the Soviet Jews in protesting against religio-cultural repression by their government. This has intensified Catholic support for the overall protest movement in Russia of which the Soviet Jewry struggle is a core element. Catholics in the Soviet Union are becoming increasingly vocal and increasingly imprisoned. At a rally in honor of Ruth Alexandrovich last Spring in Chicago, Ruth and her husband asked me to do something to try to help the Catholic protestors they had met in Soviet prisons. The liberal Catholic community has generally supported the Soviet Jewish struggle on the grounds of civil rights and the U.N. Charter.

The Soviet Jewry question has elicited one of the most favorable and widespread responses coming from Catholics on any Jewish question in this century. While I certainly am pleased with this response, I am not sure it will contribute much to ultimate Catholic-Jewish understanding. From the strong desire of Soviet Jews to restore their Jewishness by settling in Israel Catholics may gain some idea of the dimensions of Jewish peoplehood. But most Catholics have not really supported this struggle on the basis of Jewish self-identity, but out of anti-Communist or civil rights motives. So this issue probably will not lead us to the type of understanding of Jewish self-identity called for so often in the previous pages.

III. A Brief Conclusion

As a summary statement I would say that I remain cautiously optimistic about future positive developments in the area of Catholic-Jewish relations. Some very important steps have been made since 1945, even if they generally fall into the category of the elimination of the negative. There is a solid core of Catholic leaders and theologians who are exploring the question with great seriousness and commitment. From their efforts will be born some important new formulations. In addition, there is a much larger group of educators, sensitive to the history of Jewish-Catholic relations, who are bringing their appreciation and sensitivity to a growing number of Catholic students at all levels of education. There will not be dramatic change overnight. Much of the euphoria that surrounded Catholic-Jewish relations

right after the Council has evaporated, and that is probably a good thing. If you get easily discouraged and impatient, Catholic-Jewish relations is not the place for you. For those with some stamina, I believe there is genuine hope for slow but steady progress. This will require concerted and well-planned strategy. Too much of Catholic-Jewish programming in the past has been scatter-shot.

If you were to finally ask, in the long run is all the effort worth it, I would respond in the words of a dear friend, Rabbi Irving Greenberg:

There are indeed men who are willing to live side by side until the end of days who do so because they are fully confident that the Messiah, when he comes, will confirm their rightness all along. Of course, it is a step forward to live together until that time. But even here, we may underrate the love and wonder of the Lord. I have often thought of this as a kind of nice truism. Let us wait until the Messiah comes. Then we can ask him if this is his first coming or his second. Each of us could look forward to a final confirmation. A friend, Zalman Schachter, taught me that perhaps I was a bit too narrow in my trust in God with this conception. He wrote a short story in which the Messiah comes at the end of days. Jews and Christians march out to greet him and establish his reign. Finally they ask if this is his first or second coming. To which the Messiah smiles and replies: "no comment"....Perhaps we will then truly realize that it was worth it all along for the kind of life we lived along the way.³⁹

.....

References

1. cf. my review of BROTHERS IN HOPE, THE BRIDGE, Vol. V, in THE ECUMENIST, Vol. 9, No. 6 (September-October 1971), pp. 85-86. Also cf. my review essay in the JOURNAL OF RELIGION, Vol. 51, No. 3 (July 1971) pp. 222-226.
2. One example would be Friedrich Heer's somewhat disjointed but tremendously provocative and challenging work GOD'S FIRST LOVE which devotes considerable space to the Holocaust. New York, Weybright and Talley, 1970.
3. New York, Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1965. Also cf. Zahn's earlier sociological study, GERMAN CATHOLICS AND HITLER'S WARS: A STUDY IN SOCIAL CONTROL. New York, Sheed & Ward, 1962.
4. New York, Macmillan, 1965.
5. Guenter Lewy. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND NAZI GERMANY, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967. Rolf Hochhuth's THE DEPUTY is available in printed form: New York, Grove Press, 1964.
6. This is ably demonstrated by Saul S. Friedman in his recent study of the treatment of the Holocaust in textbooks dealing with modern world history: "Teaching the Holocaust," JEWISH FRONTIER. Vol. 39, No. 6 (July-August, 1972), pp. 8-15. And the general reaction of the American public to a book such as Morse's WHILE SIX MILLION DIED parallels in many ways the specifically Catholic reaction to Hochhuth and Lewy.
7. Friedman, op. cit.
8. New York, Macmillan, 1971.
9. New York, Macmillan, 1970.
10. CCAR JOURNAL, Vol. 17, No. 1 (January 1970), pp. 35-51.
- 10A. Canfield, Ohio, Alba House Communications, 1972.
11. OURSELVES AND OTHERS to be published by the Paulist Press under the sponsorship of the American Jewish Committee and SINAI AND CALVARY: THE MEETING OF TWO PEOPLES, a publication of the Benzinger division of Macmillan.
12. BARAT REVIEW, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Fall 1966).
13. Vol. 4, No. 3 (Autumn 1966).
14. "Anti-Semitism and the Gospel," THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, Vol. 26, (June 1965), pp. 189-214.
15. "Anti-Semitism and the Cry of all the People," THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, Vol. 26 (December 1965), pp. 667-671.

16. "Are the Gospels anti-Semitic?", JOURNAL OF ECUMENICAL STUDIES, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Summer 1968), pp. 473-487.
17. "The Doctrinal Basis for Jewish-Christian Dialogue," THE MONTH, Vol. 38, No. 5 (November 1967), pp. 232-245.
18. This belief, as far as current scholarship can determine, was never officially proclaimed as dogma by a Pope or Council. But in many respects that is a theoretical question since its grip on Catholic popular consciousness was extremely deep.
19. "Christians and Jews Today from a Christian Theological Perspective," JOURNAL OF ECUMENICAL STUDIES, Vol. 7, No. 4 (Fall 1970), pp. 747-762.
20. "An Invitation to Jewish-Christian Dialogue. In what sense can we say that Jesus was 'the Christ'?", THE ECUMENIST, Vol. 10, No. 2 (January-February, 1972), pp. 17-24.
- 20A. "Christian Theology and the Covenant of Israel," JOURNAL OF ECUMENICAL STUDIES, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Winter 1970), pp. 37-51.
21. I have stated this clearly in several places. cf. "The Church and Judaism: The Thought of James Parkes," JOURNAL OF ECUMENICAL STUDIES, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Fall 1969), pp. 573-597.; "Across a Canyon," COMMONWEAL, Vol. 40, No. 11 (May 30, 1969), pp. 313-318; also my two forthcoming books mentioned above.
22. "The Minister as Pharisee," COMMONWEAL, Vol. 45, No. 16 (January 21, 1972), pp. 369-373; "On Renewing the Revolution of the Pharisees," CROSS CURRENTS, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Fall 1970), pp. 415-434; "The Pharisees and Christianity," THE BIBLE TODAY, October 1970, pp. 47-53.
23. "The Christian Debt to Pharisaism," in John M. Oesterreicher (ed. BROTHERS IN HOPE: THE BRIDGE, Vol. V. New York, Herder & Herder, 1970, pp. 218-230.
24. COMMONWEAL, Vol. 21, No. 11.
25. An interpretative summary of the St. Louis studies appears in my forthcoming book OURSELVES AND OTHERS mentioned above.
26. June, 1969, p. 80.
27. cf. Sister Mary Alice Muir, S.N.D. de N., "Catholic-Jewish Team Reviews Textbooks," THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY, January 15, 1969, p. 99.
28. Bruce Long (ed.), JUDAISM AND THE CHRISTIAN SEMINARY CURRICULUM, New York, ADL, 1967.
29. "A Survey and Evaluation of Christian-Jewish Relationships Since Vatican Council II." A paper presented by Rabbi Marc H. Tannenbaum, national interreligious affairs director of the American Jewish Committee, in cooperation with Sister Rose Albert Thering of the Seton Hall Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies; Mrs. Judith Banki, Rabbi James Rudin and Dr. Gerald Strober, Interreligious Affairs Department, American Jewish Committee.

30. THE VATICAN COUNCIL AND THE JEWS. Cleveland, World Publishing Co., 1968.
31. John M. Oesterreicher (ed.) BROTHERS IN HOPE: THE BRIDGE, Vol. V. New York, Herder & Herder, 1970. cf. reviews in THE ECUMENIST, Vol. 9, No. 6 (September-October, 1971).
32. "The Theological Dimensions of the State of Israel," also cf. Yitzhak Minerbi, "The Vatican & Zionism: The Vatican's Attitude to Zionism up to the end of World War I," IMMANUEL, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Summer 1972), pp. 59-61.
33. cf. Jean Paul Lichtenberg, O.P., FROM THE FIRST TO THE LAST OF THE LAST, Jerusalem, Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity, 1972, p. 43.
34. "The Middle East Conflict: A Christian Perspective," WORLDVIEW, Vol. 12, No. 7-8 (July/August 1969), pp. 12-14.
35. April 14, 1969.
36. Summer 1970, p. 558.
37. MIDSTREAM (April 1971), pp. 33-42.
38. "Anti-Zionism and the Christian Psyche," JOURNAL OF ECUMENIAL STUDIES, Vol. 6, No. 2 (Spring 1969), pp. 173-184.
39. BARAT REVIEW, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Spring 1966).