1| *Materials for the historical chapter of this opening conference were prepared by Mariano Delgado. See also: Mariano Delgado, Konferenz des Internationalen Rates der Christen und Juden an der Universität Fribourg 60 Jahre nach dessen Gründung, in: Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft 93 (2009) no 1.*

2| *See the chronicle of the conference and other informations: Qu'est-ce que le Conseil international de chrétiens et de juifs?, in: L'Amitié judéo-chrétienne, no 1 (September 1948) 13; Le Congrès de l'association internationale des chrétiens et de juifs à Fribourg (21–28 Juillet 1948), in: L'Amitié judéo-chrétienne, no 2 (January 1949) 12–13; Die christlich-jüdische Konferenz von Freiburg, in: Neue Zürcher Zeitung (NZZ), 11 August 1948, 7; Christlich-jüdische Konferenz, in: Freiburger Nachrichten, no 171, 27 July 1948, 3; Fin du Congrès judéo-chrétien, in: Le Fribourgeois, no 114 (1948) 3; Le Conseil international de chrétiens et juifs, in : La Liberté [Fribourg], 30 July 1948, 4.*

3| *See: William W. Simpson – Ruth Weyl, The International Council of Christians and Jews. A Brief History. Heppenheim 1988, 28.*

4| *See ibidem 15.*

5| *See: Archiv für Zeitgeschichte (AfZ), NL Jean Nordmann, CJA, Ornstein an Nordmann, [24.] Juni 1948 (ohne Signatur: Dossier 294); see also Simpson – Weyl 24.*

6| *Jacques Maritain: Contre l'Antisémitisme, in: Nova et Vetera 22 (1946–47) 312–317 (Maritain wrote this text on 28 July 1947 at Rome), also published in: Jacques Maritain, Le mystère d'Israël et autres essais. Nouv. éd. augmentée. Ed. par le Cercle d'Études Jacques et Raïssa Maritain. Paris 1990, 221–231.*

7| *See: Christian M. Rutishauser, Jüdisch-christliche Arbeit von 1947–2007: was feiern – warum wir feiern!, in: 60 Jahre Seelisberger Thesen. Der Grundstein jüdisch-christlicher Begegnung ist gelegt! Bern – Fribourg – Zürich 2007, 14–19, here 17.*

8| *Die christlich-jüdische Konferenz von Freiburg, in: NZZ, 11 August 1948, 7.*

9| *See the opening speech in: AfZ [see above note 5].*

10| *The text is published in: Charles Journet: Chrétiens et juifs, in: Nova et Vetera 24 (1949) 238–244; La Liberté, 31 July 1948, 2.*

11| *See AfZ [see above note 5].*

12| *See: Universitas Friburgensis Helvetiorum, Bericht über das Studienjahr 1948–49. Erstattet vom derzeitigen Rektor Oskar Vasella. Freiburg/Schweiz 1949, 16–17.*

13| *See: Jacques Maritain, Correspondance, vol. 3, 1940–1949, ed. Fondation du Cardinal Journet. Fribourg 1998, 663–671, here 664.*

14| *Ibidem 669.*

15| *See: Benedict T. Viviano, L'histoire de „Nostra aetate", la Déclaration sur les relations de l'Eglise avec les religions non chrétiennes, in: Mariano Delgado – Benedict T. Viviano (edd.), Le dialogue interreligieux. Avec la collab. de Patrizia Conforti. Fribourg 2007, 11–20.*

16| *See: Simpson – Weyl 29.*

17| *See ibidem 63–64.*

BUMPS, FORKS AND DETOURS ON THE ROAD TO GOD'S KINGDOM

Marc Saperstein

During my rabbinical studies at the New York School of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion I once had a teacher who told us, "If you are ever asked months in advance to provide a title for a sermon, and you don't have the vaguest notion of what you will want to be speaking on so long before the actual date, you can always give the title, "For Such a Time as This". When asked for a title a month and a half ago, I was tempted to go along with his advice. Instead I came up with a somewhat more colourful one, without really knowing what I was going to say. You will need to judge its appropriateness for what follows.

My actual remit was to present what I consider to be the most pressing issues and theological challenges for Jewish-Christian dialogue today. My response to this will be a bit quirky, as I will not be speaking about such issues as Israel, intermarriage, or the beatification of Popes Pius IX or Pius XII. Rather, I would like to share my perspective as a non-professional in dialogue, as a historian and not a theologian, on three general issues concerning our approach to inter-religious communication.

MIND THOSE METAPHORS

A few months ago I heard a statement on the radio while I was concentrating on something else, so I confess I am unable to provide the source. But the point struck me as enormously perceptive and valid. The speaker, noting the common rhetorical image of marching into the future, pointed out that the metaphor of marching into the future is totally misguided. When you march forward, the assumption is that you can see clearly for a certain distance ahead. The appropriate metaphor – at least for those of us who are not Prophets – would be *walking backward* into the future. We see nothing ahead of us; all that we see is the landscape behind us, the path that brought us to where we are at present. Our progress into the future is blind; the only guidance is from our vision and memory of the past and the problems we encountered were we have been.

Now in addition to the insight about the problematic nature of this specific image of "marching into the future", this comment raises a larger issue that is the first point I would like to address. It is the seductiveness of allowing vivid metaphors to substitute for proper analytical thinking; the rhetorical strategy of using vivid metaphors to persuade and convince in the absence of adequate evidence; and the need to recognize a metaphor that comes in place of a true rational argument.[1] During the Second World War, Churchill spoke of "the soft under-belly of Europe" as a strategic target. Those who actually participated in the invasion of Sicily and Italy discovered that the metaphor did not at all reflect the reality.

Some chilling examples of the power of metaphor in pernicious discourse: First, from a work written by a German liberal intellectual, published in 1819 in the context of debates over the emancipation of Jews: The Jews are like "a rapidly growing parasitic plant that winds round the still healthy tree to suck up the life juice, until the trunk, emaciated and eaten up from within, falls moldering into decay."[2]

The second, from Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, describes the author's experience in Vienna during the years preceding the Great War: "Was there any form of filth or profligacy, particularly in cultural life, without at least one Jew involved in it? If you cut even cautiously into such an abscess, you found, like a maggot in a rotting body, often dazzled by the sudden light – a kike!"[3] The third is attributed to Fritz Klein, an SS physician assigned as camp doctor in Birkenau throughout most of 1944, by Ella Lingens-Reiner, a

Jewish physician, chosen to assist at the Auschwitz infirmary. One day they were standing together, watching black smoke coming out of the chimneys of the crematoria, and Lingens-Reiner asked Klein, "How can you reconcile this with your Hippocratic Oath?" The reply: "When there is a gangrenous appendix, we remove the appendix to save the patient. The Jew is the gangrenous appendix of mankind."[4]

In all of these cases, metaphorical language is used to create a vivid image in an appeal to emotion intended to short-circuit the process of rational analysis and critical thinking – with potentially catastrophic results. (Note that none of these metaphors of modern anti-semitism draws from traditional Christian discourse, but rather from entirely new realms.)

The problem is not only with such obviously malicious uses of metaphor. Image substitutes for analysis in less offensive contexts as well. Virtually every significant word of my title, "Bumps, Forks, and Detours on the Road to God's Kingdom", is a metaphor, and a problematic one at that. "Kingdom", implying the metaphor of God as King, central to our Biblical and liturgical traditions, but certainly not without problems in our contemporary context where kings are either relatively impotent figureheads or autocratic tyrants. And "road". Is this indeed the proper metaphor for our experience in history? It may work for the past (*The Twisted Road to Auschwitz*), but does it work for the future – as in "The Road Forward", a major heading in our draft document?[5] Is there indeed one destination of history, where the road ends? Is there a single road to that destination, or parallel roads? Detours away from the most direct root? Might an equally plausible metaphor for the complexities of history be a *labyrinth?* Or perhaps even – as many have thought – a large oval track, or a Möbius strip, circling back upon itself? Is there an infallible Sat-Nav that will always direct us, no matter where we are, to destination, so long as we follow instructions?

One of the most common road metaphors we use in Jewish-Christian dialogue is "the parting of the ways". This implies a picture of people walking on a path together, until they come to a fork, and then they split up. But are the two paths leading eventually to the same destination, or is one path – that taken by the Jewish people – meandering around in loops and circles, never arriving to the destination of the alternative? Or perhaps is there no destination at all, just a path, or two paths, and the

purpose is not to reach a destination but the journey itself? There is of course no demonstrable answer to these questions, which are essentially about images and pictures, not reality.

Perhaps the very metaphor of parting of the ways is misleading.[6] Daniel Boyarin has suggested a very different analogy, based on the languages of South-eastern France and North-western Italy. Today there are borders, with French spoken on one side and Italian on the other. But "on the ground", as one travels from one region to the next noting the local dialects of each village, one would find more and more elements identified with the other language gradual blending with the first, until the elements of the second language eventually began to predominate.[7] That is an engaging alternative metaphor to replace the parting of the ways – no sudden rupture, many individuals without a clearly demarcated identity of one religion or the other, only gradual differentiation.[8]

Let me mention in somewhat greater detail one other example of metaphorical thinking. In the summer of 2000, I prepared a paper for the Oxford Holocaust Conference called "Remembering for the Future" exploring the state of the scholarly question of continuity or discontinuity between Christian anti-Jewish doctrine and policies and the Nazi death camps.[9] Many scholars can be situated clearly on one side or the other of this divide, emphasizing elements of continuity with the Christian past, or emphasizing the novelty of Nazi policy. A popular compromise position, held by many whom I respect both in the Jewish and Christian communities, is represented by the image of "the fertile field" – the Christian teaching of contempt over many centuries provided a fertile field in which the Nazis' "venomous plant of hatred for the Jews was able to flourish" and produce the implementation of a policy of mass murder[10].

Let us remember that this is simply a metaphor that does not substitute for arguments that would demonstrate the validity of the claim asserting continuity between Christian doctrines and the death camps. In order to justify the metaphor, one would expect evidence documenting a correlation between the level of traditional religious piety and devotion of Christians within the general German population and the degree of their support for the Nazi anti-Jewish programme. To my knowledge, no evidence for such a correlation exists: the German Catholic Centre Party may have made an accommodation with Nazism, but it was by no means a base of support.

There is no need to appeal to traditional Christian doctrine about the Jews in order to explain why most Polish Catholics under Nazi occupation were unwilling to defy the German authorities by sheltering Jews, when all knew that the penalty for such defiance was summary execution. And the implication that had they not been imbued with traditional Christian anti-Jewish discourse, the masses in occupied Poland would have risen up to prevent the operation of Death Camps on their territory is an obvious absurdity.

Although I was of course a signatory to the "Dabru Emet" statement, I did not concur with the assertion that "Without the long history of Christian anti-Judaism and Christian violence against Jews, Nazi ideology could not have taken hold nor could it have been carried out", a counter-factual that is impossible to prove. The historical record and subsequent examples of genocide (for example in Cambodia) suggest to me the more pessimistic conclusion that an authoritarian government can demonize a minority group with lethal results in a frighteningly short period of time without a centuries-long tradition of negative attitudes. The Nazis did not need any "fertile field" to implement their programme, and it is not at all clear that the legacy of Christian anti-Judaism made their work easier. Their purpose was not to grow a plant, but to destroy a people. Let us indeed "mind those metaphors".

NO PRECONDITIONS OR ULTIMATUMS

One of the ground-rules of dialogue as I understand it is that we enter without pre-conditions. The purpose is to articulate our own understandings of our faith tradition in a manner that is intelligible to the Other, and to listen sympathetically to the articulations of the other tradition in their own integrity, so as to deepen our understanding both of commonalities and differences. It is certainly not to convince the Other that they are wrong, or pressure the Other to change. If change arises from within one tradition as a result of an internal dynamic stimulated by the communication of dialogue, that of course is welcome, but that is very different from the attitude "You must change x, y, z, or there is nothing to talk about."

An internal Jewish joke: A Jew and a Christian are sitting down to engage in dialogue for the first time. The Jew says to the Christian, "If we are going to have anything to talk about, you will need give up the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Virgin Birth, and Vicarious Atonement."

"That's a pretty serious request," says the Christian. "To be honest, it doesn't leave very much left of Christian theology. Tell me, what would you be willing to go up in return?" The Jew thinks for a moment and says, "I'll go back to my people; I think I can get them to agree to give up the second *"Yekum Purkan"* (by context, you can appreciate that this is one of the most minor paragraphs of traditional Jewish liturgy).

In general, dialogue is held between the representatives of the various religions who share an outlook of openness to new insight, to alternative assumptions, to a broadening of world-view, to the possibility of learning from those different from themselves. Fundamentalist, evangelical Christians and ultra-Orthodox Jews might indeed have something to learn from each other about facing common problems and challenges in a secular world, but they rarely feel any inclination to talk to each other. What about liberal Jews and evangelical Christians? Here it gets rather complicated.

I once participated in such a dialogue, and heard a leading American evangelical theologian articulate his position in totally uncompromising terms: "We evangelicals maintain that by the whole Christ-event Judaism *qua* religion has been superseded, its propaedeutic purpose accomplished. Since the Messiah has come and offered his culminating sacrifice, there is, as we see it, no temple, no priesthood, no altar, no atonement, no forgiveness, no salvation, and no eternal hope in Judaism as a religion. Harsh and grating expressions as to [Judaism's] salvific discontinuity are called for – abrogation, displacement, and negation. And these expressions are set down here, I assure you, with some realization of how harsh and grating they must indeed sound to Jewish ears."[11]

These words were said not with arrogant condescension, but with a measure of anguish. How do I as a believing Jew respond to them? Do I get up and walk out of the room? Do I dismiss the spokesman as a theological Neanderthal unworthy of serious attention? Do I say that if he wants to have talk to us, he is going to have to change his belief: abandon (if not Trinity and Incarnation) then at least supersessionism, accept God's continuing covenant with the Jewish people, concede that Jews can be saved without the Christ? I speak for no one but myself in saying that this would not be my approach. I would certainly confirm his intuition that the words sound harsh and grating to Jewish ears, but intellectually I can recognize the basis for these beliefs in classical Christian doctrine,

and emotionally I can appreciate the integrity of someone who affirms them today despite all the pressures to substitute a more pluralistic, tolerant, "open-minded" view. Ultimately, his view of Judaism tells me something not about Judaism but about the theologian and his own religion; my own sense of the value of Judaism is not dependent upon his recognition of my faith as a valid way of fulfilling what God expects and demands from a tiny minority of the human race.

In this context, allow me to revisit for a few moments the issue that aroused such strong feelings last spring: the permission extended by Pope Benedict XVI for Catholics who so chose to use the "extraordinary rite" version of the Good Friday prayer "For the Jews". As we all know, the text authorized by Pope Benedict prays (in the English translation) that "our Lord and God may enlighten their hearts, that they may acknowledge Jesus Christ as the Saviour of all men," and that God will "graciously grant that all Israel may be saved when the fullness of the nations enter into Your Church." This was perceived, in my judgment rightly, as a throwback from the version in Pope Paul VI's Roman Missal of 1970, which speaks of the fullness of redemption for the Jewish people, without reference to the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Saviour of all mankind.

Something of a firestorm of protest ensued from members of the Jewish community, especially in Europe. The official Jewish communities of Germany, Austria and Italy proclaimed that they would discontinue all programmes of dialogue with the Church as an expression of their dismay, after a "demand" with a deadline from the Central Council of German Jews that the prayer be changed was not met. Some 1600 rabbis throughout the world (myself not included) were said to have issued a formal protest. The Rector of our sister seminary, Abraham Geiger College, wrote that "the dismay of Jewish … officials is rooted in the more general observation that high-ranking Catholic Church representatives seem to be emphasising again that missionising the Jews is a natural mandate for the Church" – an assertion for which no evidence was provided, and I wonder whether such evidence exists. My understanding is that the position of the Catholic Church on this issue is still, and will remain, substantially different from that of the World Evangelical Alliance, which recently issued a document calling for its members to renew their "commitment to the task of Jewish evangelism".[12]

My own take on this was quite different:

a. Knowing the influence of traditionalist groups in the Jewish community who are opposed to all change, especially in the direction of liberalism, I recognize this decision of the Pope as driven essentially by internal considerations, a concession to the traditionalists that was deemed to be critical enough to risk ruffling some feathers in the Jewish community. I believe that in such circumstances, we Jews need to remind ourselves that the Church is an enormous and complex institution, and that maintaining the best possible relations with the Jewish community, though important, is not (and should not be expected to be) at the very top of the priority list.

b. I would suggest that we Jews have the same kind of problem in our own liturgy – a point that is acknowledged in general terms toward the end of the ICCJ draft document. One of the most important passages of Jewish liturgy is the *Aleynu* prayer, which comes near the end of every morning, afternoon and evening service. The beginning of it emphasizes a particularistic statement of Jewish identity and mission: We praise God, according to one translation, "for He has not made us like the nations of the lands, and has not emplaced us like the families of the earth... ." The original text of prayer then draws a clear contrast: "For they bow to vanity and emptiness and pray to a god who does not save, while we go on our knees and prostrate ourselves in acknowledging the King of kings of kings, the Holy One, blessed be He."

In the late middle ages, some genius who converted from Judaism to Christianity reported to Church authorities that the word "emptiness" in the phrase "they bow down to vanity and emptiness" (actually taken from Isa. 45:20, in a polemic against idolatry), was a code word for "Jesus", as the numerical equivalent of letters in the Hebrew word *va-rek* was identical to that for "Yeshu". The Jews were therefore guilty of blaspheming, which violated the ground-rules of toleration: Jews were permitted to say their own prayers but not to insult the sancta of Christianity.[17] As a result, various governments intervened to prohibit this passage, and the Ashkenazi communities removed it from their printed prayer books. The Sephardi and Eastern communities, retain it. Today, there is a tendency even among Ashkenazi Orthodox communities to restore the original wording.

This is in my judgment an internal Jewish problem. Even ignoring any association with Jesus, the controversial phrases assert that the Gentile nations at present have no access to the true God, who is worshipped by Jews alone. All Liberal and Reform prayer books eliminate the phrases, and most substitute a positive formulation for the preceding ones.

I wonder, however, how Jews would react if a group of Christians were to say to the Chief Rabbis of Israel, or of the United Synagogue in the UK, "You must prevent all Jews from saying those words that we find to be offensive in their prayers. Otherwise, we will discontinue our dialogue with you." Jews would resist acting on the basis of such outside pressure.

Actually, the continuation of the *Aleynu* prayer is more analogous to the problem raised by the Good Friday liturgy. While the first part is particularistic, asserting the uniqueness of Jewish identity, the second part is universalistic, expressing the hope that God will remove all idols from the earth and false gods will be utterly destroyed, that "all human beings will call upon Your name ..., that all who dwell on earth will recognize that to You every knee must bend and every tongue swear loyalty …" Growing up, I was taught that this universalism was a model of open-mindedness, praying to include everyone, without exception, in the worship of the one true God. It was not until much later that I began to wonder why this was so different from the universalism of the Church, praying that all (including the Jews) will recognize Jesus as the universal saviour.[14] And – appreciating of course the obvious historical differences – I wondered why Hindus should not be protesting the "universalism" of our prayer as offensive, if Jews protest the "universalism" of the "extraordinary rite" in the Good Friday liturgy.[15] Despite aspects of other traditions that perplex or even offend us, let us not set pre-conditions for dialogue, or issue ultimatums.

NO FALSE WITNESS

My mentor in Jewish-Christian dialogue, Krister Stendahl, of blessed memory, used to say that the first commandment of dialogue is "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour".

My teacher Eugene Borowitz once wrote a book called *Contemporary Christologies: A Jewish Response*. It was based on a careful reading of the work of leading Christian theologians, recommended to him by several Christian intellectuals whom he respected. I recall hearing Borowitz speak in public about the reception of this unusual book in the Jewish community. A distinguished traditionalist intellectual said to Borowitz, "My

problem with the book is that you don't take seriously the category of idolatry" – which is indeed an important category in Jewish law. Borowitz replied, "I read these writers very carefully, and I did not find in their discussion of Jesus or the Trinity anything that would fit my understanding of idolatry." To which the response was, "Well then, they're not really representative of Christianity."

This response recalls the old line, "Don't confuse me with the facts, my mind's already made up." That mindset, so antithetical to true dialogue, is familiar to us on both sides: highlighting the most problematic components of the other religion, oversimplifying, removing them from context, identifying them as the essence of the other faith, and contrasting them with the reasonable and politically correct components of one's one. I would like to exemplify this tendency with regard not so much to theology but to the issue of fanaticism and intolerance within our religious traditions.

A month or so ago I saw advertised a new book called *The Legacy of Islamic Antisemitism: From Sacred Texts to Solemn History*, edited by Andrew G. Bostom (Prometheus Books, 2008). Its 766 pages contain passages (in translation) from the Qur'an with an abundance of material from classical Muslim commentators, *The Life of the Prophet*, collections of *Hadith* or statements attributed to the Prophet and handed down in an authoritative tradition, and passages by legal experts. In addition, there are many essays by scholars on Islam, highly respected authorities. All of this material has a single focus: Islamic discourse about, policy toward, and behaviour regarding the *dhimmi* (tolerated religious minorities) in general, and Jews and Judaism in particular.

As far as I can tell, none of the material is fabricated. It is all there in the Islamic tradition and in the scholarship about the Islamic tradition. But all of the material in the book is negative. The purpose of the book is not to document a comprehensive picture of Muslim discourse, policy and behaviour regarding the Jewish minorities in Islamic lands, but rather to select the negatives and present them in English at exhaustive length. Reading this book, it would be impossible to imagine how Jewish communities living under Islamic rule – at one point (in the 10th century) comprising 90% of the Jews in the world – were tolerated, survived, and even flourished under Islamic rule, its culture immeasurably enriched by the stimulus of texts made available to Jews in the Arabic language, in turn producing a rich Jewish literature written in the Arabic language.

I cannot fathom the purpose of this book other than to convey the message that there is no possibility for peaceful co-existence between Jews and Muslims today. In its massive scholarship mobilized for what I consider to be a pernicious purpose, it reminds one of Eisenmenger's 2100-page *Entdecktes Judenthum*, published in 1699, which ransacked classical Jewish texts to present evidence of unmitigated hostility toward all Gentiles, especially Christians.[16]

And as we all know, there is a substantial literature of Jewish writing presenting a similarly one-sided view of Christianity and Christian policy and behaviour toward the Jews. Joshua Trachtenberg's *The Devil and the Jew* is of this nature, chronicling and documenting the negative images of the Jew from Christian sources.[17] Or Dagobert D. Runes' *The War Against the Jew,* the very last book by this prolific writer, organized not thematically but by brief entries in alphabetical order.[18] Or Simon Wiesenthal's, *Every Day Remembrance Day: A Chronicle of Jewish Martyrdom:* starting from January 1 and ending with December 31, each day of the year lists events in which Jews were persecuted, or murdered, as Wiesenthal puts it, in a manner always "directed by Christians: first of all by the Roman Catholic Church, then by the Orthodox Church."[19] And by a prolific scholar, Dan Cohn-Sherbok, *The Crucified Jews: Twenty Centuries of Christian Anti-Semitism.*[20]

As a result of such books, many reasonably knowledgeable Jews come to dialogue with a litany of persecutions in their repertoire: Crusades, ritual murder, host desecration, Inquisition, expulsions, pogroms. Ironically, the libel "Your ancestors killed our Saviour" has been replaced in the other direction with "Your ancestors killed our ancestors." I have spent a good part of my academic career trying to combat these overly simplistic presentations of the past, in teaching American undergraduates, in speaking to synagogue audiences (and now Limmud), and in published essays and reviews, because of a commitment to a far more balanced and nuanced historical picture, but also because I believe that this attitude is likely to foster smug self-righteousness among Jews and guilt among Christians, with neither emotion conducive to healthy dialogue.

Let us stop judging pre-modern doctrines and behaviours by the standards of contemporary multi-culturalism, pluralism, and political correctness. Let us recognize that both of our traditions – and the Islamic tradition as well – are multivalent, containing material that can be used to justify a

narrow-minded, prejudiced view of the other, the outsider, as well as the basis for toleration, understanding, and mutual respect. Enough of these works by (metaphorical) prosecuting attorneys and hostile witnesses. Let us cease bearing false witness against our neighbours, or the ancestors of our neighbours.

There are pressing challenges that require cooperation today between Jews and Christians and Muslims who take a Scriptural-based faith with utmost seriousness yet are open to the inspiration of the best of modern culture and appreciate the freedom of secular democracy. The threat of environmental degradation despoiling the home that all of us share and are entrusted to hand over to future generations, and the economic turbulence that seems to be shaking the ground of our assumptions like an earthquake have a common cause: the prioritizing of short-term material self-indulgence over long-term commitments. Faced with these challenges, the wording of a Good Friday prayer or a statement about Israeli government policy seems almost trivial. The ICCJ has shown that it can continue to strengthen an alliance based on knowledge and respect, an alliance that will bring us beyond the bumps, forks and detours as we continue our difficult backward walk into the future.

1| I was first stimulated to think about this issue by an address delivered in the 1980s, during the Reagan Administration, by Barney Frank, for many years a member of the US House of Representatives. At one point in his talk, Frank cited a phrase frequently used at the time to justify the policy of Reagan's economic policy: "A rising tide raises all boats", or in other words, when the general economy improves, everyone benefits. Frank said, "that may be true for the people in boats, but what about that rising tide if you are standing at the bottom of the water, just trying to keep your head above the surface?" The general point that Frank was making – which has remained with me ever since – was not merely a critique of specific economic policy, but a general point about allowing metaphors to substitute for analysis.

2| Christoph Henrich Pfaff, "Über das Verhältnis christlicher Regierungen und Staaten gegen die Juden in dem gegenwärtign Zeitpuncte", quoted in Jacob Katz, From Prejudice to Destruction, p. 150.

3| Mein Kampf, a selection readily accessible in The Jew in the Modern World, ed. Paul Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz, second edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 638.

4| Quoted by Robert Jay Lifton, The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide, p. 232.

5| Note also a chapter entitled "Antechamber to the Holocaust" reviewing policy of the Vatican in the 1920s and 1930s, the metaphor implying that being in the antechamber, people should have been aware of what would happen in the main hall: David I. Kertzer, The Popes Against the Jews (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001), pp. 264–91.

6| Note Philip Alexander's alternative suggestion of two circles, overlapping to various degrees in antiquity, eventually separated: The 'Parting of the Ways' from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism", in Jews and Christians: the Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991), p. 2.

7| Daniel Boyarin, Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism (Stanford: SDtanford University Press, 1999), p. 9.
Boyarin also discusses the problem of family metaphors for religions: is Christian a "daughter religion" or a "sister religion" of Judaism? (pp. 1–2).

8| Are languages indeed an appropriate analogy for religion. In his book The Dignity of Difference, British Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks suggested that different religions might indeed be conceived like different languages, each having certain strengths and beauties compatible with the peoples who learn them from early childhood, as well as certain weaknesses. That strikes me as a rather daring analogy for an Orthodox Jew, indeed for an Orthodox believer of any faith, and unfortunately Rabbi Sacks felt pressured or compelled by the ultra-orthodox Jewish religious court in the UK to remove formulations that suggested the possibility that Judaism does not have a monopoly on truth and that other religions may transmit truths as well.
My own suggestion for a metaphor of inter-religious relations is an orchestra. Large groupings or families of instruments: strings, woodwinds, brass, percussion. Within the families, separate instruments, reflecting the diversity within religious traditions. Most instruments are played by several musicians. Each individual has a part to play, a contribution to make; sometimes all are in unison, sometimes one family or one group of instruments has the melody while others are silent, or provide harmony, or a counter-melody, or the same melody in counterpoint. The performance is not complete unless each instrumentalist plays her role while listening to the others and watching the divine conductor, who is dependent on the musicians to create harmony rather than dissonance. But again, this is only a metaphor, not a substitute for analysis.

9| Marc Saperstein, "Christian Doctrine and the 'Final Solution': The State of the Question," in Remembering for the Future: The Holocaust in an Age of Genocide, edited by John K. Roth, 3 volumes (Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Publishers, 2001), pp. 814–41.

10| French Bishops 1997 Declaration of Repentance", cited by Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, A Moral Reckoning (New YorkL: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002), p. 226).
Cf. John Pawlikowski, "There is no question that Christian anti-Semitism provided an indispensable seedbed for Nazis"—"The Holocaust and Contemporary Christology", in Fiorenza and Tracy, editors, The Holocaust as Interruption, p. 44.

11| Vernon C. Grounds, in Evangelicals and Jews in an Age of Pluralism, ed. Marc Tanenbaum (Grand Rapids, 1984), p. 207.

12| Jewish Chronicle ,3 October 2008, p. 6.

13| Although the word "va-rek", and "emptiness" was of course not originally intended as a code word for Jesus, it is not inconceivable that some medieval and early modern Jews thought of Jesus when they said the word in their prayer, and some contemporary Jews may as well.

14| I also wondered (ironically) whether the Taliban were fulfilling the sentiments of this prayer when they literally destroyed the statues of the Buddha in Bamyan back in 2001.

15| *I would contrast the universalism of the Aleynu (praying that all human beings will recognize the truth that now we alone recognize) with an example of a more positive universalism in our liturgy, emphasizing those aspects of the human condition shared by all human beings. It is taken from a central prayer for the Days of Awe Unetaneh tokef, which has been shown by scholars to be originally based on a Byzantine Christian liturgical poem, and has strong affinities with the Dies irae of the Latin Requiem mass: see Eric Werner, The Sacred Bridge: Interdependence of Liturgy and Music in Synagogue and Church During the First Millennium (1959), pp. 252–55. "This day all who enter the world pass before You like a flock of sheep … You set a limit to the life of every creature and determine its destiny … Man comes from the dust and ends in the dust. He spends his life earning his living, but he is fragile like a cup so easily broken, like grass that withers, like flowers that fade, like passing shadows and dissolving clouds, a fleeting breeze and dust that scatters, like a dream that fades away, But You are the king, the living God, the everlasting."*

16| *A useful and accessible review of Eisenmenger can be found in the first chapter of Jacob Katz, From Prejudice to Destruction (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), pp. 13–22; Katz concedes the author's "tremendous erudition" and notes that "he does not falsify his sources", but presents a selection of Jewish texts that does not reflect the reality of Jewish attitudes and behaviour toward contemporary Christians.*

17| *Joshua Trachtenberg, The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Antisemitism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943; republished Philadelphia: JPS and Cleveland: World Publishing Company). See my new Foreword to the 1983 JPS republication.*

18| *Dagobert D. Runes, The War Against the Jew (New York: Philosophical Library, 1968. We are informed in the Preface, "From pulpit to pulpit, every Sunday and holy day, in every Church of Christ, cold hate was released against the hapless Jewish families. And this teaching of hate has not ceased to this very day [in 2968. Soon the cold hate turned into fiery action, and from one end of Europe to the other the almighty Catholic Church put the Jews to the pyre and sword. No child, no woman, no invalid was spared" (p. xvi). The book is truly an embarrassment for anyone with historical knowledge and a minimal sense of accuracy and fairness.*

19| *Wiesenthal, p. 9. One instance would be August 25, for which the first date is '1255 – A Jew in Lincoln, England, is victim of a blood libel.' The second date is '1941 – During a night raid, several thousand Jews are taken from the ghetto of Minsk, Belorussian S.S.R, and murdered,' as well as other atrocities committed in the wake of the Germany invasion of the USSR, followed by other Holocaust-related events of 1942, 1943, and 1944 (p. 191).' No connection between the blood libel and the murder of Minsk Jews is explicitly claimed, but the very juxtaposition on the page implies the continuity.*

20| *Dan Cohn-Sherbok, The Crucified Jew: Twenty Centuries of Christian Anti-Semitism (London: HarperCollins, 1992Grand Rapid, Mich., Eerdmans, 1997); see the review by Eugene Fisher in Missiology.*

REDISCOVERING: "AN IMMENSE PATRIMONY"

A CATHOLIC REFLECTION ON THE TWELVE BERLIN POINTS

Abstract of 2008 Statement held by Bishop Richard Sklba

Sklba's reflections begin with three parallels between Jewish and Christian communities in the first century of the common era and our own communities today in order to help set the stage for understanding the kinds of dialogue that are needed now. First: in their passionate search for truth the dialogic debates in the first century (CE) were usually characterized by differentiation without exclusion; second: Dialogue between Jewish Christians and Jews carried moral weight and the obligation to put into practice what the dialogue had discovered; third: Dialogues in the first century were fully aware of our "unknowing" state in interreligious dialogue.

One of the most pressing issues in Christian-Jewish dialogue today is the cultivation of memory within the minds and hearts of Christians. A memory which is more than a psychological recalling or the mere story as told in history text books, it is a spiritual act to be developed by following generations, until it has become an intricate part of Christian culture.