Remembering the Past, Living the Present,

Shaping the Future:

Catholic-Jewish Dialogue in Australia

Submitted by

Lorraine Victorsen B.A., M.A.

A Thesis Submitted in total Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Philosophy

School of Theology

Faculty of Theology and Philosophy

Australian Catholic University

Graduate Research
PO Box 968

North Sydney New South Wales   2059

Date of Submission

30th March, 2017

Statement of Authorship and Sources

This thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma.

No parts of this thesis have been submitted towards the award of any other degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgement in the main text of the thesis.

Signed:_____

All quotations from the Holy Bible

are according to the *New Revised Standard Version (NRSV)*

unless otherwise stipulated.

Except for direct quotations

Australian spelling is used throughout this thesis.

Statement of Appreciation

It is with gratitude that I acknowledge the interest, support and patience of many people who provided me with the assistance I needed to complete this research.

Firstly, I recognise with sincere appreciation The Sisters of the Good Samaritan of the Order of St Benedict who generously provided the opportunity, encouragement and support enabling me to undertake this research into Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia. I also acknowledge their ongoing commitment to interreligious dialogue through the international body *Dialogue Interreligieux Monastique*/Monastic Interreligious Dialogue (DIMMID).

I am sincerely grateful to three Supervisors for their guidance and direction: to Rev. Dr. Gerard Hall SM, my principal Supervisor, for encouraging me to explore, in depth, the theology of Johann Baptist Metz and to investigate its connection to Catholic-Jewish dialogue. His insightful advice, encouragement, Marist hospitality, patience and perseverance are all greatly appreciated; to Dr. Edmund Kee-Fook Chia, for challenging me, in the early stages of this research, to see and do things differently; and to Dr. Terry Veling, for his always perceptive and sharp observations and advice.

To Rabbi Fred Morgan (Melbourne) I owe my sincere thanks for his interest and encouragement, and especially for his invaluable comments and advice from a Jewish perspective. I am particularly grateful to members of the Brisbane Jewish community who have welcomed me into their lives, their families and their homes and, as a result, have enriched my life both personally and spiritually.

Finally, with deep gratitude, I acknowledge my parents, Arnold and Betty Victorsen. By example they taught their children the positive principles and benefits of religious and cultural dialogue and instilled in me, from an early age, "a lifelong love of learning."

Abstract

There is no doubt that the positive relationship that exists today between Catholic and Jewish individuals and communities is due in large part to *Nostra Aetate* and to the Catholic Church's commitment to ongoing Catholic-Jewish dialogue.[1]

This research focuses on relevant key issues suggested by the practical, political theology of Johann Baptist Metz and on the significance of his key categories of *memory, narrative* and *solidarity* as they relate to both Catholic and Jewish theology.

While Receptive Ecumenism is directly concerned with developing more contemporary ways of engaging *ecumenically* with other *Christian* groups, the premise of this study is that the transfer of the principles of Receptive Ecumenism to *inter-religious dialogue*, particularly Catholic-Jewish dialogue, is a possibility.[2]

The thesis argues that the principles of *Receptive Ecumenism* have the ability to enhance existing Jewish-Catholic relations and to provide systematic and improved dialogue opportunities in the future.

---

[1] Vatican II Council, *Nostra Aetate* (hereafter *NA), Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions,* in *The Documents of Vatican II, with Notes and Comments by Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Authorities,* ed Walter Abbott, S.J., (London and Dublin: Chapman, 1966), 660-668.
[2] Paul Murray, ed. With the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri, *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

As a result of reflecting on the past, the present and the possible future of Australian Catholic-Jewish dialogue, this study is better positioned to suggest options for more positive, productive dialogue for the future.

The findings of this research have validated the conviction that the security and advancement of the existing Catholic-Jewish inter-religious relationship in Australia is contingent on the development of contemporary, appropriate, effective and vigorous inter-religious education and collaboration.

Explanation and Significance of the Title

The title of this paper, *"Remembering the Past, Living the Present, Shaping the Future"*, has particular significance for Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia.

The inspiration for the title emanates from the mission statement of *Yad Vashem*, the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Jerusalem, which states:

> As the Jewish people's living memorial to the Holocaust, *Yad Vashem* safeguards the memory of the past and imparts its meaning to future generations.[3]

The scriptural basis for this statement is found in Chapter 56 of Isaiah, the prophet, where he states:

> I will give in my house and within my walls, a monument and a name better than sons and daughters;
> I will give them an everlasting name that shall not be cut off. (Isaiah 56:5).

For millions of people around the world *Yad Vashem* is a constant reminder of the accounts of violence, injustice and destruction of the past, particularly those associated with the *Sho'ah*. As Australia has become the home of many survivors of the Holocaust (*Sho'ah*), and subsequently the home of their children and grandchildren, the concepts of remembering the past, of living peacefully in the present and looking to a more positive future are to be honoured.

---

[3] Yad Vashem, the World Holocaust Remembrance Center, in Jerusalem, is the ultimate source for Holocaust education, documentation and research. It is at the forefront of unceasing efforts to safeguard and impart the memory of the victims and the events of the Sho'ah period; to document accurately one of the darkest chapters in the history of humanity; and to grapple effectively with the ongoing challenges of keeping the memory of the Holocaust relevant today and for future generations.

Secondly, the sentiments expressed in the vision statement resonate clearly with the practical theology of Catholic theologian Johann Baptist Metz (1928 -), his theoretical model and the key categories of *memory*, *narrative* and *solidarity*.[4]

The title, then, invites Catholic and Jewish groups and individuals in Australia to enter into an even greater relationship than the one they already share in order that in remembering the past, and working together in the present, they will indeed shape a future of which they and those who come after them will be proud.

---

[4] John Baptist Metz, *Faith in History and Society*: *Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology* (New York: Crossroad, 1980); *The Emergent Church* (New York: Crossroad, 1981); "Christians and Jews after Auschwitz," *The Emergent Church: The Future of Christianity in a Post-Bourgeois World* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), J. Matthew Ashley, "Introduction: Reading Metz" in *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press) 1998.

CONTENTS

Section One: Remembering the Past

Section Two: Living the Present

Section Three: Shaping the Future

ABBREVIATIONS

ACBC: Australian Catholic Bishops Conference

AJC: American Jewish Committee

CCAR: Central Conference of American Rabbis

CCC: Catechism of the Catholic Church (1993)

CCJ: Council of Christians and Jews

CIC: *Codex Iuris Canonici* (Code of Canon Law)

CJCUC: Center for Jewish-Christian Understanding and Cooperation

CDF: Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith

CRRJ: Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews

DI: *Dominus Iesus – Declaration on the Unity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church (Document of CDF,* 2000)

DM: *The Attitude of the Church towards the Followers of other Religions: Reflections and Orientations on Dialogue and Mission*. (Document of the PCID, 1978)

DP: *Dialogue and Proclamation: Reflections and Orientations on Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.* (Document of the PCID, 1991)

ECAJ: Executive Council of Australian Jewry

ES: *Ecclesiam Suam:* Paths of the Church (Encyclical of Pope Paul VI 1964)

GRDP: Grass Roots Dialogue Project

GS: *Gaudium et Spes:* Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (Vatican II Document, 1965)

ICCJ: International Council of Christians and Jews

ILC: International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee

IJCIC: International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations

LG: *Lumen Gentium:* Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Vatican II Document, 1964)

NA: *Nostra Aetate:* Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions (Vatican II Document,1965)

PBC: Pontifical Biblical Commission

PCID: Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue

QFCC: Queensland Faith Communities Council.

RE: Receptive Ecumenism

TDTW: *To Do the Will of Our Father in Heaven* (CJCUC Document, 2015)

TGATC: *The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable* (CRRJ Document, 2015)

TJPATSS: *The Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible* (PBC Document, 2002)

UR: *Unitatis Redintegratio*: Decree on Ecumenism (Vatican II Document1964)

UUS: *Ut Unum Sint:* That They May All Be One: Encyclical Letter On Commitment to Ecumenism (Pope John Paul II, 1995)

VCCJ: Victorian Council of Christians and Jews

WCC: World Council of Churches

WPG: Working Party Group – between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches

WR: *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah* (CRRJ Document, 1998)

WSCF: World Student Christian Federation

Introduction and Overview

This dissertation is a qualitative, hermeneutical and theological study of the principles and praxis of Catholic-Jewish dialogue from the perspective of an Australian Catholic. Using insights from both traditions, it focuses on the approach of the Catholic Church's post-Vatican II self-understanding and its new "call" to dialogue with the world, other religions and specifically with the Jewish people.

In particular it examines the way in which, since the Second Vatican Council, the Catholic Church's theology has undergone significant transformation in its relationship to Jewish people and their faith. Fundamentally, however, this is a thesis in practical theology, which explores strategies for the enrichment of Catholic-Jewish relations.

The complexity of this study involves historical, political and social realities as well as religious issues. Consequently, the insights of the social sciences, including the sociology of religion, are important for understanding the conscious and sub-conscious values and attitudes integral to each tradition. To add to the complexity, an analysis and an adaptation of the principles of Receptive Ecumenism are undertaken to determine their compatibility with Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

Although written from an Australian-Catholic perspective, this study includes vital insights and initiatives of international scholars and practitioners of interreligious dialogue from both Christian and Jewish traditions. It takes as its major point of reference the 1965 call of the Second Vatican Council Declaration *Nostra Aetate,* which challenges Catholics to foster a relationship with our Jewish brothers and sisters, based

on mutual understanding, love and respect.[1] Further, this study proposes specific strategies and opportunities for encouraging reflection, conversation, education and action among Australian Catholics, and specifically in regard to their relationship with the Jewish community.

The practical-narrative method of political theology provides a framework in which the all-too-often negative experiences of the past may be acknowledged, confronted, owned and even forgiven. Valuable use is made of the practical-political-narrative theology of German theologian, Johann Baptist Metz, along with his particular challenge for Christians to engage in dialogue with Jews in "remembrance of Auschwitz".[2] Specifically, Metz's theological categories of *memory, narrative* and *solidarity* are investigated for their appropriateness in developing strategies for Catholic-Jewish dialogue.[3]

Political theology for Metz is specifically a theology that examines and critiques existing social structures, contemporary cultural movements and current economic thinking and practice, as they relate to the gospel. His categories prove to be particularly useful in this research when applied to the events, memories and injustices experienced in the name of 'religion'. His theology is fundamentally a theology aimed at conversion of the individual, ecclesial communities and the society and community at large - the *polis*. More specifically, his theology aims to: protect narratives from distortion; decode dogmas into practical, understandable material; and use methods of inquiry that highlight the political aspects of religion in the lives of people. This approach has

---

[1] The Documents of Vatican II, *Nostra Aetate* (hereafter NA), *Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions*, par 4, in The Documents of Vatican II, with Notes and Comments by Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Authorities, ed. Walter M.Abbott, S.J., (London and Dublin: Chapman, 1966), 665.

[2] Johann Baptist Metz, "Christians and Jews after Auschwitz", *The Emergent Church: The Future of Christianity in a Post-Bourgeois World* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 17-33; cit. 20.

[3] See for example: Johann Baptist Metz, *The Emergent Church* (New York: Crossroad, 1981); *Faith in History and Society: Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology* (New York: Crossroad, 1980); *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1998). Also, Gerard Hall S.M., "Retrieving Memory, Narrative and Solidarity as Significant Categories for Practical Theology and Christian Engagement," APTO Conference, Baulkham Hills, 8-11 November 2012.

particular application for Catholics and Jews in the task of Christian-Jewish dialogue. Metz's key categories — *memory*, *narrative* and *solidarity* — place the focus on the genuine experiences of Jews and Catholics in a manner that faces the real challenges, promotes productive dialogue and encourages mutual understanding.

As previously stated, this dissertation also examines the principles of Paul Murray's new strategic approach to ecumenical Christian dialogue — called "Receptive Ecumenism" — in order to determine their suitability for Catholic-Jewish dialogue.[4] What is Receptive Ecumenism? In Cardinal Kasper's view, Receptive Ecumenism is the practical expression of "what Pope John Paul II defined as ecumenical dialogue — not only an exchange of ideas but an 'exchange of gifts'. Participation in such an exchange, in which "we will be enriched by the gifts of the others . . . does not mean to become a new church but to become a spiritually renewed church."[5]

In the past, the general ecumenical approach to dialogue was to ask: "What do other traditions need to learn from *us*?" Receptive Ecumenism on the other hand poses the question: "What can *we* learn or receive, with integrity from our various others, in order to facilitate our own growth together".[6] In applying that fundamental principle to Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia, this study endeavours to uncover what the two communities *can* learn, and what they *need to* learn and receive from each other, with neither setting the agenda for the other. The process engages both groups in learning more, not only about the other but also about themselves and their own traditions. It

---

[4] Paul Murray, "Introducing Receptive Ecumenism," The Ecumenist 51, (2014): 1-7.
Note: This model of dialogue is described in terms of listening to each other, discussing religious practices, explaining approaches to specific religious and theological issues in a safe and secure environment, and developing openness, trust, and a capacity to focus on what the other churches have to offer.
[5] Cardinal Walter Kasper, *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism*, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), viii.
[6] Paul D. Murray, ed., *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*: *Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism*, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). ix.

4

involves what interreligious scholar Raimon Panikkar calls *inter-* and *intra*-religious dialogue.[7]

While acknowledging many significant developments in Catholic-Jewish relations in recent decades, the dissertation highlights the need for ongoing initiatives. In reality, many Australian Catholics know few if any Jewish people and are, therefore, ignorant of the richness of Jewish religious history and tradition. Consequently, opportunities for engaging in Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia — dialogues of life, action, theological exchange, and spiritual experience[8] - are relatively sparse and confined to limited select groups within the Catholic community. It seems that members of the Jewish community experience a similar situation. "Grass roots" Australians, religious leaders and laity, from both traditions, are currently in need of encouragement and support to participate in a range of educational opportunities that will strengthen and enrich the personal, pastoral and theological dimensions of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. This dissertation aims to articulate some of the practical ways in which such dialogue can be enhanced.

The inspiration for this study comes from the Mission Statement of *Yad Vashem*, the Holocaust Museum in Jerusalem.[9] *"Remembering the Past, Living the Present, Shaping the Future"* invites both Catholic and Jewish groups to enter into an even greater ongoing relationship than the one they already share. As will be demonstrated, the *Yad Vashem* statement also resonates with the theology and the theoretical model of Catholic theologian Johann Baptist Metz (1928-).[10]

Equally, this research is a reflection on my *inter-* and *intra*-faith journey through engagement in Catholic-Jewish dialogue in light of my own Catholic-Jewish heritage. It is a work that combines my own narrative and faith-journey with an avid interest in

---

[7] Raimon Panikkar, *The Intra-Religious Dialogue* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978/1999)
[8] *Dialogue and Mission*, (hereafter *DM),* Pontifical Council for Non-Christians, 1974. §28-35.
[9] For an explanation of the title and its significance see p. iii.
[10] J. Matthew Ashley, "Introduction: Reading Metz" in *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity*. (Mahwah, N.J.:Paulist Press) 1998.

interreligious praxis. The overriding concern is less with theological principles than with the development of strategies and *praxis* to enhance Catholic-Jewish dialogue, with particular focus on the Australian situation.

Chapter 1: Remembering the Past

**The Shared History of Catholics and Jews in Australia:
From Penal Settlement to Post World War II . . .
and beyond.**

Introduction

There can be no real appreciation of the present, and certainly no hope for the future, without recognition and acceptance of the past. This first chapter provides a broad sweep of the early history of Australian settlement, particularly as it pertains to both Catholic and Jewish communities. It gives a brief account of the period from convict settlement to the present and outlines specific events that have influenced the development of Australia as a nation. It acknowledges the influence of key historical, social and religious issues and significant Church events that have impacted on Catholic–Jewish relations. Finally, challenges confronting multicultural Australia in the 21st century, and their influence on Catholic-Jewish dialogue, are addressed.

Catholic and Jewish settlement in Australia

An important aspect of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia is an understanding of the circumstances that brought the two distinctive faith groups to the colony of Botany Bay. The early, harsh history is a significant factor in the heritage that Australian Catholics and Jews share. While there are obvious religious, cultural and social distinctions between the two groups there are also similarities in the establishment and development of each community. Further, it is important to acknowledge that, from the beginning in 1788, both groups assimilated into the burgeoning society and today are significant and positive contributors to civic and religious life in Australia. Both groups have made enormous contributions to the strong, independent and effective nation Australia has become in the 21st Century.

The early convict era   1788 – 1793

The arrival of the First Fleet of eleven English ships in Botany Bay in January 1788 signalled the beginning of European settlement in the land that is now known as Australia. It also heralded the establishment of a penal colony for hardened criminals, social offenders, many of whom had violently rebelled against poverty and unjust landlords, and political rebels in the strictly nationalistic sense.

Among the approximately 1,530 people who arrived on the First Fleet, 736 were convicts and 17 were the children of convicts. Among the first arrivals to the new colony was a very small cohort of Jewish convicts, judged by historians to be between eight and 14 in number. Most had been transported for relatively trivial crimes. It has been estimated that during the next 60 years over a thousand more people of Jewish descent were sent to Botany Bay as convicts.[1]

While it is uncertain how many of the first 736 convicts were Catholic, it is estimated that while one in ten of all convicts transported from England was a Catholic, half of the first Catholics to arrive from England with the First Fleet had been born in Ireland.[2] As a result *Irish* and *Catholic* became virtually synonymous. There was also a small number of Catholics in the First Fleet who were part of the military garrison, but they were in very minor positions and so had little or no status or authority. While the Protestant English and Scottish convicts sent to Botany Bay "were mostly thieves, nearly one third of the 2,086 offenders transported from Ireland up to 1803 were peasants who had been convicted of riot or sedition, and crimes of political or social protest."[3] It is

---

[1] Suzanne Rutland, "The Convict Era: 1788-1839", *Edge of the Diaspora: two centuries of Jewish settlement in Australia*, 2nd revised edition, (Rose Bay, N.S.W.: Brandl & Schlesinger, 1997), 8–24.
[2] Edmund Campion, *Australian Catholics: The Contribution of Catholics to the Development of Australian Society*, (Ringwood, Victoria: Viking Penguin Press, 1987), 3.
[3] Patrick O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community: An Australian History,* 3rd revised edition, (Kensington, N. S. W.: New South Wales University Press, 1992), 2

not surprising, then, that from the time of their arrival the first Catholics exercised a powerful and sometimes controversial influence throughout colonial society.

Nevertheless, there was also a significant group of Catholic prisoners who were men of piety and could not be given the label of ordinary or commonplace criminals. In this group were two men, James Dempsey, a stonemason, and William Davis whose home became the recognised meeting place for Irish Catholics.[4]   In the absence of priests, these laymen emerged as the spiritual leaders, even reading prayers for those condemned to death.[5]

Arrival of free settlers   1793–1816

The colony was only five years old when, in January 1793, the first immigrant free settlers arrived in Sydney Cove. Newly arrived convicts and newly emancipated Irishmen were often helped or employed by Catholic friends or countrymen. When convicts had completed their sentences they often moved to different parts of the colony where they joined other former convicts and formed local committees. When emancipated Irishmen procured land, they sought other Irishmen to help them work the land.

In 1800 the first Catholic priests arrived in Australia, as convicts – James Harold (1800-1810), James Dixon (1800-1808), and Peter O'Neill (1801-1803) who had been convicted for "complicity" in the Irish 1798 Rebellion.[6] Of the three, Dixon was the only one who was permitted to conduct public Masses, baptisms and weddings in Sydney and Parramatta. Following the 1804 Castle Hill rebellion, which Governor King attributed mainly to the Irish convicts, Father Dixon's privileges of public ministry were withdrawn. All three priests were eventually pardoned and returned to Ireland. It

---

[4] Gideon Goosen, *Religion in Australian Culture: An anthropological view*, Strathfield, N.S.W.: St Paul's Publications, 1997), 102.
[5] Campion, *Australian Catholics*, 5.
[6] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community*, 5-6.

wasn't until 1820, 32 years after the arrival of the First Fleet, that the first two Catholic Chaplains – Fathers Philip Conolly and John Therry - arrived in the colony.

The first free *Jewish* settlers to come to Australia didn't arrive until 1816, 28 years after the arrival of the First Fleet. In the following year, the first Jewish religious society – *Chevra Kadisha,* - a burial society, was established. As Jewish numbers grew over the following decades, mainly as a result of immigration from England and Germany, organised Jewish communities, *kehillas*, were established. But structured Jewish religious life didn't begin in Sydney until the 1830s when the first permanent Jewish congregation was formed. Seven years later, in 1837, the first synagogue, *Beth Tephilah*, was established and in 1844 the first purpose-built Synagogue was opened in York Street, Sydney.[7] By the mid-nineteenth century the predominantly *Ashkenazi*[8] Jewish population had established organised and viable Jewish communities in major cities, and other smaller communities in several country towns.

The road to assimilation   1830 – 1890

Patrick O'Farrell notes that "from the late 1830s Catholics too were growing in numbers and prominence"[9] and making claims for equality and recognition. The prospect of a discordant Irish Catholic element caused concern and hostility and aroused fears in the wider community regarding the future composition and character of Australian society. These concerns and attitudes resulted in an antagonistic sectarian controversy that lasted for generations.[10] The Irish potato famine of 1845–1852 and the Victorian gold rushes of 1850-1861 accelerated the process of free settlement with large numbers of unskilled immigrants coming to Australia from all over the world, including

---

[7] Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora,* 29.
[8] Suzanne Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora: two centuries of Jewish settlement in Australia*, 2nd revised edition, (Rose Bay, N.S.W.: Brandl & Schlesinger, 1997), 413. (Note 10: The *Ashkenazim* (from the Biblical word *Ashkenaz*, regarded in the Middle Ages as the ancestors of the German people) were Northern Jews, deriving from Ancient Palestine and developing in northern, eastern and central Europe. (Ashkenazi Jews generally trace their ancestry back to northern and eastern Europe.)
[9] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community,* 56.
[10] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community,* 56.

Ireland. Among those who immigrated in the 1840s and early 1850s were many young females who were either orphans or from the Irish workhouses.

In this period, it was becoming obvious to both the Church and the Colonial authorities, that colonisation was having an adverse effect on the Aboriginal peoples of the land and that "they should be protected and provided for so far as may be necessary".[11] In 1846, after several failed missionary attempts in Western Australia, the Spanish Benedictine monks under the leadership of Dom Joseph Serra OSB and Dom Rosendo Salvado OSB established the Benedictine Abbey now known as *New Norcia*. This was a monastic community similar to the Benedictine community Archbishop Polding was endeavouring to establish at St Mary's Cathedral in Sydney. After a troubled beginning, *New Norcia* became a self-supporting mission and eventually became both prosperous and permanent. Polding was interested in developing this foundation because, as O'Farrell points out, "it contained a great number of Aboriginals as yet uncontaminated by whites."[12] Both O'Farrell and Campion comment on Archbishop Polding's exemplary understanding and treatment of the indigenous people,[13] and in his *Pastoral Letters* Polding exhibited his "compassionate understanding of the needs of convicts and Aboriginals, an understanding which was never patronising."[14]

This success, unfortunately, was not the case in other parts of the country. For example, while the establishment of the first Catholic Mission to Aborigines in Australia, on Stradbroke Island (off the coast of Brisbane) in 1843 began with great hope, it failed after just three years "because of the lack of planning, unwise expectations of quick conversions and an arrogant disdain for the culture of the people"[15] by the Irish Passionist priests who were assigned to the mission. In spite of that set-back Campion

---

[11] Gregory Haines, Sister Mary Forster, Frank Brophy, *The Eye of Faith: The Pastoral Letters of John Bede Polding,* Kilmore, Victoria: Lowden Publishing Co., 1978), 404.
[12] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community, 76.*
[13] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community,*120; Campion, *Australian Catholics,* 98.
[14] Haines, Forster, Brophy, *The Eye of Faith*, 13.
[15] Campion, *Australian Catholics*, 97, 98.

maintains that Polding's "understanding of Aborigines was remarkable for his time."[16] He had, as early as 1845, in his reply to the New South Wales Parliamentary Committee on the Condition of Aborigines, requested compensation for the loss of their traditional lands, a concept that today would be regarded as equivalent to Aboriginal Land Rights.[17]

Victorian Jewry also expanded rapidly as a result of the gold rushes and their numbers increased from 200 in 1848 to 3000 in 1861.[18] While many Jews were merchants or traders, the majority of early Jewish settlers came from a wide variety of occupational backgrounds and were, on the whole, well accepted into colonial society. During the period 1861 through to 1901 there was little or no organised anti-Semitism or persecution of the Jews. In fact, Jacob Levi Saphir wrote in 1860 "there is no discrimination . . . The Jews live in safety . . . occupy Government positions and administrative posts . . . and hatred towards them has entirely disappeared."[19] None-the-less, the fact remains that, due to ignorance, Jews and Catholics were frequently victims of discrimination because of their religious beliefs, and were often denied employment and excluded from social activities.

Arrival of refugees   1890 – 1920

When a new wave of Jewish refugees fleeing pogroms in Russia and Poland began to arrive in Australia in 1890, the Jewish community became divided, fearful that the 'foreign' Jews would not be able to fit in to the existing Australian way of life. By the end of the 19th century, however, Jews were participating in every facet of civic, economic and social life in Australia and as the 19th century moved into the 20th century Jewish society became even more assimilated into the majority Australian culture with male

---

[16] Campion, *Australian Catholics*, 98.

[17] Note: It is acknowledged in the Joint Pastoral of the Second Provincial Council, 24 April, 1869, over which Polding presided, that "we have dispossessed the aboriginals of the soil" and "in natural justice we are held to compensation." Haines, Forster and Brophy: *The Eye of Faith*, 403.

[18] Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora,* 50.

[19] G.F.J. Bergman and J.S. Levi, *Australian Genesis*, (Melbourne, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 2001), 45.

and female members entering mainstream public life in great numbers and serving in the Australian Armed Forces.[20] In fact, Victorian Rabbi Danglow encouraged members of the Jewish community to participate in the military service, declaring:

> our sons should, and do regard it not only as a duty, but also as a privilege, to participate in the defence of the rights, liberties and the honour of this land of their birth and adoption.[21]

It is acknowledged here, that the most highly regarded Australian military commander of World War I and possibly the greatest military leader in the Allied Forces, was John Monash, an Australian, born of Jewish parents who had migrated from Prussian Poland in 1864.[22] While Monash "was not an observant Jew" according to Rutland, he "always acknowledged his Jewish roots, and in 1927 agreed to be the first president of the Zionist Federation of Australia."[23]

Australia becomes *Home* 1920 – 1950

Following World War 1 there was another stream of predominantly German-Jewish immigrants who settled mainly in Sydney and Melbourne. For Jews to lead a full Jewish life it is important for them to be close to Jewish services, synagogues and facilities such as kosher food outlets. As Jewish identity is very closely linked to being part of a visible Jewish community, individuals and family groups tended to congregate in large numbers in Australia's major cities, particularly Sydney and Melbourne.

Although the Jewish community was the earliest organised non-Anglo-Celtic community in Australia with communities and societies gathered around established synagogues, there were constant societal pressures on them to assimilate and merge,

---

[20] Suzanne Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora: two centuries of Jewish settlement in Australia*, 2nd revised edition, (Rose Bay, N.S.W.: Brandl & Schlesinger, 1997), 133, 134.

[21] Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora*, 134 citing W. D. Rubenstein, *The Jews in Australia, Victoria* (Melbourne: Australian Ethnic Heritage Press, 1986), 115.

[22] Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora*, 137–139. Note: in 1918, in recognition of his outstanding contribution and commitment to the Armed Services, and as Commander in Chief of the Australian Army Corps, King George V knighted Monash. After the war, Sir John Monash continued to excel in public office, was awarded an honorary Doctorate of Laws in 1920 and was appointed Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne in 1923. In 1958 Melbourne's second university was named Monash University in his honour.

[23] Suzanne D. Rutland, *The Jews in Australia* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 49.

particularly by intermarriage. From the 1920s and into the 1930s there were a considerable number of intermarriages, which resulted not only in a decrease in the size of the Australian Jewish community but severely threatened Jewish cultural heritage and identity. The *Sephardic*[24] community at this time was gathering strength in both Sydney and Melbourne,[25] and the Jewish population was further bolstered by the arrival of more refugees from Europe. "In increasing the quotas for Jewish refugees" Rutland writes, "the government was motivated partly by humanitarian considerations and partly by national interest."[26]

In contrast, the interest of Australian Catholics in the outside world prior to and during the 1920s was largely confined to Ireland and they adamantly retained their "Irish working class" attitudes, their self-reliance and their sceptical and cynical attitude towards Britain.[27] While they were happy to share a common Australian nationalism and an isolationist attitude, they entered the 1930s with little interest in, or understanding of, world affairs. During the 1920s and through to the 1930s when the Irish Catholic clergy ruled over "an intensely religious and closely tribal community",[28] Australian born priests began to question the 'superiority' and the dominance of the Irish born and trained clerics. Even before the post World War II influx of European migrant Catholics, Australian Catholicism was losing and rapidly rejecting its Irish orientations and loyalties.[29] O'Farrell points out that as far back as 1885 Cardinal Patrick Francis Moran (Archbishop of Sydney from 1884 to 1911) stated that he did not envisage "Australia's clerical future in terms of exclusively Irish-born clerics." He was determined, however, "to have an ecclesiastical seminary in which Australians would be

---

[24] Suzanne Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora: two centuries of Jewish settlement in Australia*, 413. (Note 9: The *Sephardim* (from Biblical word *Sepharad*, used as early as the second century CE as a name for Spain), were Oriental Jews, deriving from ancient Babylon and developing among Jews living in Mesopotamia, Spain, Portugal and North Africa.) *Sephardic* Jews generally trace their family history back to Spain and Portugal.
[25] Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora, 342.*
[26] Suzanne Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora: two centuries of Jewish settlement in Australia*, 174.
[27] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community, 388.*
[28] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community, 368.*
[29] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community, 238.*

trained as priests."[30] As O'Farrell states, beside Moran's ambitious vision of Catholic imperialism for the Australia of the future, Polding and Vaughan's "Benedictine dream pales into insignificance."[31]

As members of the Catholic laity became better educated they were intent on improving their situation in society and on ensuring their children received the benefits of a "good Catholic education" which would assist them to become upwardly mobile socially, culturally and financially.[32] From their penal beginnings, and especially after the flood of free immigration begun in the 1850s, the Irish Catholic 'lower orders' set out to succeed in society, securing money and rank, as well as public and social recognition. The Public Service became the earliest focal point for the entry ambitions of less affluent Catholics.

The Post World War II era   1950 – 2011

Again, this time in the aftermath of World War II, the Jewish community grew significantly as a result of the influx of Jews from Central and Eastern Europe, many of them survivors of the Holocaust.[33] The new arrivals represented nearly all streams of contemporary Jewish religious life from Chassidic to Progressive Judaism. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics 2011, the small group of approximately 8 Jews who formed the Jewish Community in 1788 had grown to a community numbering 97,300, just 0.5% of the total Australian population.[34]

---

[30] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community*, 238.
[31] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community*, 195.
Note: John Bede Polding OSB, was Vicar Apostolate of New Holland from1834 -1842 and Archbishop of Sydney from 1842-1877; Roger Bede Vaughan OSB, was Archbishop of Sydney from 1877-1893.
Note: See Margaret Walsh, *The Good Sams*: *Sisters of the Good Samaritan 1857-1969* (Mulgrave, Victoria: John Garratt Publishing, 2001), 40. (Initially, Polding hoped that Australia might become a formal part of the English Benedictine Congregation (EBC) with their ongoing support providing monks, nuns and financial assistance. This was not to be, but Polding proceeded with the establishment of the Benedictine monastery at St Mary's and began implementing his own particular scheme for making Sydney an abbey-diocese.)
[32] O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community*, 355.
[33] The vital significance of the Holocaust/*Sho'ah* will be discussed at length in a later section of this paper.
[34] Feature Article: *Characteristics of the Population Yearbook 2009-1010*: Australian Bureau of Statistics 10/11/10: Religious Affiliation in Australia (1986, 1996, 2006, 2011).

In the same way, the arrival of many Catholics from Europe at this time greatly diversified the Catholic population and created a number of problems in the Catholic community. The previously Irish-dominated Catholic culture was forced to accept the presence and the influence of Catholics from other 'foreign' cultural traditions, with different languages, customs and habits. It was difficult for 'newcomers' to assimilate and to become a part of the existing, and to them, unfamiliar Catholic structure. The face of Australian Catholicism had changed forever. However, in contrast to the estimated 100 Catholic convicts who arrived in 1788, the most recent Census shows that the Australian Catholic population in 2011 had increased to 5,439,200 or 25.3% of the Australian population.[35]

The present . . . 2016 and beyond

The present period in Australian history is a graced time when dialogue between Jews and Christians, particularly Catholics, is 'officially' regarded as essential, mutually acceptable and capable of being realised, within certain boundaries. The path leading to this current position has been a long, winding and difficult journey.

There are several key historical, psychological, religious and sociological issues that have contributed to the progress that has been made in Catholic-Jewish dialogue in the last fifty years. While there are many issues, the following *key* issues have been selected because of their specific relevancy to this research: the progression of the Ecumenical Movement; the Holocaust *(*the *Sho'ah)*; the Second Vatican Council and particular Council and post-conciliar documents; Jewish views regarding interreligious dialogue; and the emergence of Receptive Ecumenism.

---

[35] ABS *Characteristics of the Population Yearbook 2009-1010.*

Key historical, psychological, religious and sociological issues:
The progression of the Ecumenical Movement

A significant contribution to the development of this research is the organisation, competence, and influence of the ecumenical movement. It is now widely accepted that the ecumenical movement grew out of the World Student Christian Federation (WSCF) in 1895 which led in turn to the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference in 1910 and ultimately to the establishment of the World Council of Churches (WCC) in Amsterdam in 1948.[36] While the Catholic Church is still not a full member of the WCC it has, since 1965, been a member of a Joint Working Group (JWG) within the WCC and in 1967 the two groups developed an ongoing relationship to deal with interreligious matters.

In 2014 the JWG produced a report on ecumenism and its relation to reception, which is pertinent to this research.[37] Australian Cardinal Edward Cassidy[38], who was president of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity (PCPCU) and President of the Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews (CRRJ), acknowledges the successful working relationship with the WCC,[39] and the close collaboration officials of the Pontifical Commission for Interreligious Dialogue (PCID)[40] had and continue to have with various officials of WCC.

---

[36] Peter Cross, "The Decree on Ecumenism - 40 Years On". *Archdiocese of Melbourne Ecumenical and Interfaith Commission Commemoration of 40th Anniversary of Decree on Ecumenism* (2004), 28 November.
[37] World Council of Churches. *Reception: A Key to Ecumenical Progress.* (Geneva: Joint Working Group between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, 2014), vii–65.
[38] Edward Cardinal Cassidy was President of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity (PCPCU) from 1989 to 2001 and President of the Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews (CRRJ) from 1990 to 2001.
[39] Edward Cardinal Cassidy, *Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue.* (Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2005), 78-82.
[40] Cassidy, *Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue*, 132-138.
Note: In 1964 Pope Paul VI instituted a special department of the Roman Curia for relations with people of other religions – The Secretariat for Non-Christians. It was renamed the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue (PCID) in 1988.

The Holocaust (The Sho'ah)[41]

The point has already been made that, in order to engage in this research with integrity, it is impossible to overlook or disregard the past. The importance for the Jews, and indeed for all humanity, of remembering the *Sho'ah* cannot be underestimated. The purpose of the 'remembering' is not, as political theologian Metz explains, "to revive again the dubious notion of collective guilt" or to "only *mourn* history," but to bring about an awareness of the history in which all share, albeit in very different ways.[42] This is an issue that warrants further discussion and is, therefore, developed as the research progresses.

In 2006 Smith wrote*:* "the Holocaust has become the most important prism through which the relationship between Jews and Christians has been viewed"[43] and, he maintains, the "Holocaust reflects the destructive nature" of that relationship.[44] If past memories reveal "new and dangerous insights for the present," he writes, "they surely fit into the Metzian concept of a memory of suffering (dangerous memory) that impacts on present and future."[45] Boys & Lee addressed these very same issues in the *Catholic-Jewish Colloquium, 1992-1995*.[46] Reporting on the participants' involvement in the colloquium they stated: "the conflictual character of the history means that Jews have little reason to trust Christians in general, and Christians typically come to encounters

---

[41] Note: The biblical word *sho'ah* (used since the Middle Ages to mean "destruction") became the standard Hebrew term used to describe the mass extermination of European Jewry in the 1940s. Jews consider it important to use the Hebrew word sho'ah rather than 'holocaust.' While Aitken, Kessler and others use 'shoah' (*Challenges in Jewish/Christian Relations*, 2006) I have followed the example of Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer (*What is a Jew?* 1953) and Rabbi Lawrence A. Hoffman (revised edition of *What is a Jew?* 1993) for the spelling/style - "Sho'ah" - particularly where it is synonymous with the Holocaust. For direct quotes, where the writer has selected a particular/preferred format, the writer's version will be used.

[42] Metz, Johann Baptist (Author) and Peter Mann (Translator), *The Emergent Church: The Future of Christianity in a Post-Bourgeois World* (New York: Crossroads, 1981), 18.

[43] Stephen Smith, "The Effect of the Holocaust on Jewish-Christian Relations," in *Challenges in Jewish-Christian Relations*, ed. James K. Aitken and Edward Kessler (Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2006), 138.

[44] James K. Aitken and Edward Kessler, ed., *Challenges in Jewish-Christian Relations* (Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2006), 10.

[45] Smith, "The Effect of the Holocaust," 138.

[46] Mary C. Boys and Sara S. Lee. *The Catholic-Jewish Colloquium: An Experiment in Interreligious Learning 1992-1995.* Funded by the Lilly Endowment (1996), 1-59.

with Jews with ambivalence and guilt."[47]

Added to this situation was the 'power imbalance' that existed between Catholics and Jews. "To date," as Smith notes, "most of the relationship (between Christians and Jews) has been spent either competing to dominate or in outright domination of one by the other."[48] In a similar vein, Australian Rabbi Fred Morgan reveals that comments from members of his congregation show that "the past is a scene not of dialogue but rather of disputation, coercion and destructive conflict."[49] Hoffman's view on this is that "while they debated their views and opinions, neither party had an interest in learning from the other and "given the power imbalance, it was a forgone conclusion that the Christians would 'win.'"[50]

It is important for this thesis, and indeed for any Catholic–Jewish dialogue, that these issues of Jewish distrust and Catholic guilt are addressed. The works of two leading sociologists, Canadian Catholic Gregory Baum[51] and Jewish Professor Charles Liebman,[52] provide helpful insights regarding the most appropriate management of painful issues caused by social and religious intolerance, which are clearly relevant to this topic.

The Second Vatican Council 1962-1965

Since Pope John XXIII announced the Second Vatican Council in 1959, much has been written about this historic and extremely significant world event and its far-reaching effects. While Pope John 'dreamed' that the Council would bring about spiritual

---

[47] Boys and Lee, *The Catholic-Jewish Colloquium* 23.
[48] Smith, "The Effect of the Holocaust on Jewish-Christian Relations," 138, 139, 141.
[49] Rabbi Fred Morgan, "Jewish-Christian Dialogue from Jewish Perspectives Over Five Decades." In *Paths to Dialogue in our Age: Australian Perspectives,* Vol. 1, ed. Edmund Kee-Fook Chia and Fatih Erol Tuncer (Melbourne: Australian Catholic University, 2014), 240-241.
[50] Rabbi Lawrence Hoffman, *My People's Passover Haggadah,* (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2008), Vol. 1, 34.
[51] Gregory Baum, "The Impact of Sociology on Catholic Thinking," *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Convention of the Catholic Theological Society of America, New Orleans, Louisiana June 9 – 12* (1975): 1-29. (2)
[52] Charles Liebman, "The Sociology of Religion and the Study of American Jews", *Conservative Judaism* (1981): May/June, 17-33. (30)

renewal (*"aggiornamento"*) for the entire church, he also hoped that the Council would have a pastoral rather than a dogmatic thrust. He was a visionary who saw that the Church needed to be reconciled with the modern world, and he advocated for Christians to be united. Experience had heightened his awareness of the need for the Church to experience a relationship with the non-Christian world and particularly with the Jewish community. Cardinal Suenens in a very personal appraisal of the contribution made by Pope John XIII wrote: "the verdict of history will, I am sure, be that Vatican II was a Pentecostal blessing for which John XXIII did not pray in vain, and for which he offered up his sufferings and his life itself."[53]

In 1963 Pope Paul VI succeeded Pope John XXIII. In his first encyclical, *Ecclesiam Suam*,[54] Pope Paul VI put into place a model of operating that would enable the Council to progress in a methodical and productive manner.

> There [in *Ecclesiam Suam*] the new Pope set out a programme
> in three parts: first *Awareness* through reflection and vigilance;
> secondly, *Renewal* through reform and obedience, poverty and
> love; thirdly *Dialogue* through Christian presence in the world,
> modelling itself on the dialogue of salvation but with a real
> approach to the world.[55]

The promotion of "dialogue" throughout the Council became synonymous with collaboration for many of the relationships within the Church, with other Christians, and with non-Christians. At the conclusion of the Council "dialogue" became a focal point symbolising many of the aspirations of the Council.

Specific Vatican Council, and related Church Documents

There is a relatively small but specific group of Vatican Council documents and a growing number of Post Conciliar documents that warrant attention in view of their

---

[53] Leon-Josef Cardinal Suenens, "A plan for the whole Council", in *Vatican II Revisited: By Those Who Were There,* ed. Alberic Stacpoole OSB, (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986), 88-91.
[54] Pope Paul VI, Encyclical Letter, *Ecclesiam Suam*, (hereafter *ES*) accessed September 9, 2013.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_pvi_enc_06081964_ecclesiam_en.html
[55] Alberic Stacpoole, OSB, "Introduction", in *Vatican II Revisited: By Those Who Were There*: (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986), 8.

direct relevance to Catholic-Jewish dialogue. As not all of the documents can be addressed in this study, the selected documents provide a structure and a broad view of the current situation. The influence of *Ecclesiam Suam*, for example, is very evident in *Gaudium et Spes*[56] which begins with the now famous opening sentence: "The joys and hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men (sic) of this age . . . these too are the joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the followers of Christ."[57] This document did not address just the Catholic community but all humanity and the positive attitude throughout the entire document showed willingness on the part of the Church to engage with the world and to learn from mutually beneficial exchanges.[58] This open exchange approach to dialogue between the Church, other Christians and non-Christians has special significance for this study.   The "Light of All Nations", *Lumen Gentium,*[59] was considered the fundamental Council statement on which all the other documents would be based. Avery Dulles in the introduction to *LG* wrote: "the tone of the document is, moreover, strongly ecumenical. Every effort is made to speak in language . . . readily understood by other Christians and by all men (sic) of good will."[60]

But it is the decree on ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio*,[61] and in particular *Nostra Aetate,*[62] that provide a particular focus and direction for this research. In the very first paragraph of *UR*[63] the issue of disunity among the Christian churches (and by implication between Christian and Jewish communities) and the resulting contradictions, damage and scandal are named as some the Council's principal concerns.

---

[56] Vatican II Council, *Gaudium et Spes* (hereafter *GS*), Vatican Council II, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World in The Documents of Vatican II, ed. Walter M.Abbott, S.J., 199 - 308.
[57] GS, §199.
[58] *GS,* Part 1, Chapter IV, §238 - 248.
[59] Vatican II Council, *Lumen Gentium* (hereafter *LG*), Dogmatic Constitution on the Church in The Documents of Vatican II, ed. Walter M.Abbott, S.J., §14 - 96
[60] Avery Dulles, S.J. "Introduction", in The Documents of Vatican II, with Notes and Comments by Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Authorities ed. Walter M. Abbott, S.J. (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966), 9 – 13.
[61] Vatican II Council, *Unitatis Redintegratio* (herafter *UR*), Decree on Ecumenism, in The Documents of Vatican II, ed. Walter M.Abbott, (London-Dublin: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966), 341 – 366.
[62] Vatican II Council, *Nostra Aetate*, (hereafter *NA)* Declaration on the Church's Relations with non-Christian Religions, in The Documents of Vatican II, ed. Walter M. Abbott, (London-Dublin: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966), 660 – 668.
[63] *UR,* 1.

In *NA*[64] the Council Fathers use the familiar symbolism of the Jewish well-cultivated olive tree and the Gentile grafted wild olive shoots to explain the relationship that exists between Jews and Christians. It is because the two groups share a great "spiritual patrimony,"[65] that the Council wished "to foster and recommend that mutual understanding and respect which is the fruit above all of biblical and theological studies and of fraternal dialogue."[66]

Post-conciliar documents such as *Dialogue and Mission,*[67] *Dialogue and Proclamation,*[68] the encyclical letter of Pope John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint,*[69] as well as *The Jewish People and their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible*[70] *(*JPSSCB) and Kessler's[71] insightful response to JPSSCB, are representative of the wide range of relevant material available for educational purposes on the subject of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. Among more recent ecclesial documents to be considered are *The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable* produced by the Pontifical Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews (2015)[72] and the International Council of Christians and Jews 2015 document, *Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship.*[73] Other relevant documents of the Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference and Commissions for Interreligious Dialogue likewise contain valuable and relevant information. Joint documents by state and national Councils of Christians and Jews, for example *Rightly*

---

[64] *NA*, 4
[65] *NA*, 4
[66] *NA*, 4
[67] Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue (hereafter PCID), *The Attitude of the Church Towards the Followers of Other Religions:* Reflection and Orientations on Dialogue and Mission (hereafter DM), 1984.
[68] PCID, *Dialogue and Proclamation*: *Reflection and Orientations on Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ* (hereafter DP), 1991.
[69] John Paul II, Encyclical, *Ut Unum Sint:* On Commitment to Ecumenism (hereafter *UUS*), 1995.
[70] Pontifical Biblical Commission. *The Jewish People and their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible* (hereafter JPSSCB), 2002.
[71] Edward Kessler, "A Response to the Pontifical Biblical Commission Document: JPSSCB", Jewish-Christian Relations: Insights and Issues in the ongoing Jewish-Christian Dialogue (2003), 1 – 11.
[72] The Pontifical Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, (hereafter CRRJ) *The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable,* (2015).
[73] International Council of Christians and Jews, Executive Board, (hereafter ICCJ) "Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship," *A Statement from the International Council of Christians and Jews on the Golden Jubilee of the Second Vatican Council Declaration, Nostra Aetate,* (2015), par.1- 4.

Explaining the Word of Truth (1994)[74] and *We Remember: Reflections on the Shoah* (1998)[75] are also extremely important educational resources for Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

A seminal essay with particular import for Catholic-Jewish Dialogue is Metz's *Christians and Jews after Auschwitz* which carries the subtitle: "Being a Meditation also on the End of Bourgeois Religion."[76] It establishes the view that inter-religious dialogue is primarily concerned with conversion — not of the 'other' but of 'oneself'.[77] In this essay and in much of his other writing, Metz outlines the major facets of his "practical-narrative political theology of the subject", which highlights the lived and practical *experience* over the merely *theoretical articulation* of Christian life with its forgetfulness of the real lives and deaths of millions of history's victims. This approach is especially relevant in view of the ambiguous history of the relationship between Catholics and Jews.

Jewish responses to Interreligious Dialogue

A representative selection of Catholic and Jewish responses to interreligious dialogue since the Council, indicates the manner in which the concept was received and the reticent responses to suggestions to participate in dialogue. Stransky succinctly described the extreme obstacles *NA* had to overcome to finally arrive at the Council when he commented: "surprises, shocks and setbacks marked that journey."[78] From a Jewish perspective Weissman noted that *NA* "had very little impact in Israel and even in

---

[74] The Council of Christians and Jews, *Rightly Explaining the Word of Truth*, (Melbourne: The Council of Christians and Jews (Victoria) Inc., 1994), 1-16.

[75] Australian Council of Christians and Jews, *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah*, 1998.

[76] Metz, *The Emergent Church*, 17-33.

[77] Johann Baptist Metz, *Faith in History and Society*: *Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology* (New York: Crossroad, 1980); *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1998).
Note: This essay is part of the volume, *The Emergent Church: The Future of Christianity in a Postbourgeois World*. This and two of Metz's other major works also inform this aspect of the study: *Faith in History and Society*: *Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology*; and *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity*.

[78] Thomas F. Stransky, C.S.P. "The Genesis of Nostra Aetate", *America, The National Catholic Weekly*, Vol 193/12. (2005).
http://americamagazine.org/issue/547/article/genesis-nostra-aetate.

the Diaspora, its influence has been somewhat limited."[79] Even though its impact on both Christian and Jewish biblical scholars and theologians was generally positive, there was also significant criticism of its omissions. For example, Kessler's Jewish analysis noted that it "omitted mention of the Holocaust or the existence of the State of Israel,"[80] two highly significant concerns for the Jewish community. As a result, he nominated four core issues he considered essential for any Jewish-Christian dialogue: the Jewish origins of Christianity; antisemitism; the *Sho'ah*; and supersessionism. These are central issues for any discussion in relation to what Jews and Christians hold in common and what divides them.

The publication of *Dabru Emet* (You Shall Tell the Truth)[81] in 2000, signed by 172 Jewish rabbis and intellectuals, was regarded as a sign of hope for those engaged in interreligious dialogue, with the initial sentence indicating that "a dramatic and unprecedented shift in Jewish-Christian relations" had occurred since 1965. In 2002 The Christian Scholars Group on Christian-Jewish Relations responded with *A Sacred Obligation*[82] stating: "it is essential that Christianity both understand and represent Judaism accurately . . . For us this is a sacred obligation."

Signer critiqued *Dabru Emet* using Peter Abelard's[83] *Sic et Non* ("Yes" and "No") method of identifying certain recommendations which, because of their seeming incompatibility, needed further clarification, and he commented that it (*Dabru Emet*) "hides or obscures the very serious differences which are the foundations of both

---

[79] Deborah Weissman, "Has there been a response to NA?" in *Paths to Dialogue in our Age: International Perspectives*, Vol. 2, ed. Edmund Kee-Fook Chia and Fatih Erol Tuncer (Melbourne: Australian Catholic University, 2014), 33.

[80] Edward Kessler, "NA – 50 years on" in *Jewish Christian Relations: Insights and Issues in the ongoing Jewish-Christian Dialogue*, Vol. 7, No 1, (2013). Published in *The Tablet* 1 December 2012.

[81] *Dabru Emet* (You Shall Tell the Truth), (New York Times, 10 September 2000).

[82] The Christian Scholars Group on Christian-Jewish Relations. "*A Sacred Obligation" (following on from Dabru Emet)*. (2002).

[83] Note: Peter Abelard (1079 – 1142) a twelfth century philosopher and theologian with importance in the field of logic. His tendency to disputation is demonstrated by his book Sic et Non, comprising a list of 158 philosophical and theological questions about which there were divided opinions.

communities".[84] This is a highly relevant and complex issue for Catholic-Jewish dialogue, which receives attention later in this study.

The emergence of Receptive Ecumenism

As indicated, this thesis will argue that Receptive Ecumenism provides an important theoretical principle for the practice of Catholic-Jewish Dialogue particularly with reference to Australia. Receptive Ecumenism emerged in 2006 at an international colloquium entitled *Catholic Learning and Receptive Ecumenism.*[85] Its aim was to explore a more contemporary way of engaging in ecumenical activity with other Christian groups.

The inspiration behind the Receptive Ecumenism model was Pope John Paul II's letter *UUS* and there are obvious links with the perspectives expressed in that document. The *UUS* references to "complacency, indifference and insufficient knowledge of one another" also apply to Catholic-Jewish dialogue.[86] The acknowledgement of "the burden of long-standing misgivings inherited from the past" . . . and "mutual misunderstanding and prejudices" are also familiar claims in Catholic and Jewish circles.[87] The exhortation that:

> these disagreements should be faced in a sincere spirit of fraternal charity, of respect for the demands of one's own conscience and of the conscience of the other party, with profound humility and love for the truth[88]

is also a salient reminder to those participating in Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

---

[84] Michael A. Signer, "Dabru Emet: Sic et Non". Paper delivered at the Council of Centers on Jewish-Christian Relations, Baltimore. (2002).

[85] The Department of Theology and Religion at Durham University, in collaboration with Ushaw College, hosted an international colloquium on the theme *Catholic Learning and Receptive Ecumenism.* A second international conference, *Receptive Ecumenism and Ecclesial Learning: Learning to be Church Together,* followed at Ushaw College in 2009 and a third, *Receptive Ecumenism in International Perspective: Contextual Ecclesial Learning*, was held at Fairfield University in the USA in June 2014.

[86] *UUS,* par. 2.

[87] *UUS*, par. 2.

[88] *UUS*, par. 39.

Murray presents the key question underpinning Receptive Ecumenism in the following terms: How can the Catholic Church, true to its own integrity, learn and receive from other Christian traditions aspects of faith, ecclesiology, life, action, worship and spirituality which belong to the whole Church, but which, because of the separation between Christians, the Church has been deprived?[89]

Experts in the fields of ecumenism, theology, Canon Law and Scripture, have attempted to answer that question, and many have raised further queries in relation to the implementation of Receptive Ecumenism. Örsy reinforces Murray's concepts of learning and receiving from each other, but adds they "are authentic only if they support the identity of the receivers and bring them life in abundance."[90] Reese, on the other hand, deals with the practical but often overlooked organisational factors required to ensure that the process succeeds.[91] He cites "the parish and the people in the pews" as issues needing to be addressed, indicating that ecumenical education has not filtered down to the "ordinary" Catholic or to the younger priests and seminarians.[92]

Rush has a similar opinion, suggesting that the situation is so serious that a "reception ecclesiology" is now required to "introduce more participatory and reciprocal structures of reception and dialogue in the church."[93] He promotes the view that this will only be achieved through what is termed "a spirituality of reception" but he concedes that "this would require the serious implementation of the principles of dialogue" at the church's local and universal levels.[94] Avis asks why Receptive Ecumenism is needed, and questions if it is stating the obvious, as "reception is at the heart of ecumenism already.

---

[89] Paul Murray (ed.) *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), ix-x.

[90] Ladislaus Örsy, "Authentic Learning and Receiving – A Search for Criteria," in *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism, ed. Paul Murray, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 39.

[91] Thomas Reese S.J., "Organizational Factors Inhibiting Receptive Catholic Learning" in *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*: *Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism*. Edited by Paul Murray, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 346-355.

[92] Reese, "Organizational Factors Inhibiting Receptive Catholic Learning" 347-349.

[93] Ormond Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II* (New York/Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2004), 83.

[94] Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II*, 84.

So if reception is already present . . . why do we need an initiative called 'receptive ecumenism'?"[95] He also asks if Receptive Ecumenism is posing a threat to existing ecumenical practices, for example "formal bi-lateral dialogue and multilateral dialogues that have been the back-bone of the ecumenical movement for 40 years and more."[96] In a similar way Adams explains his "long-term disagreement with both Scriptural Reasoning and Receptive Ecumenism describing them as "reparative practices" that have experienced high rates of failure.[97] He therefore questions the appropriateness of further development in that area of ecumenism. These responses make it clear that "reception" in the receiving of gifts can expose difficulties. O'Gara points out the distinction between ecumenical *discussion* and other forms of long-term *collaboration*. "Real ecumenical collaboration" she maintains, "calls for willingness to enter into relationships, to risk vulnerability for the sake of the common effort, and to refuse competition as an acceptable mode for serious inquiry."[98]

If dialogue between Australian Catholics and Jews is to be successful now and into the future it is important that both groups first own, acknowledge, and appreciate the history they share. As they engage in further dialogue and understand each other and each other's history, key religious events, celebrations and practices particular to each group also take on new meaning. Their shared understanding of the principles of Receptive Ecumenism will assist in resolving many of the questions and issues that are raised in the course of discussion and dialogue.

Global challenges to Catholic-Jewish Dialogue in 2016 multicultural Australia

Australia is no longer the isolated country it was in 1788, nor are today's Australians deprived of communication with the rest of the world, nor disadvantaged by

---

[95] Paul Avis, "Are we Receiving Receptive Ecumenism?" *Ecclesiology* 8 (2012): 225.

[96] Avis, "Are we Receiving Receptive Ecumenism?" 230.

[97] Nicholas Adams, "Long-Term Disagreement: Philosophical Models in Scriptural Reasoning and Receptive Ecumenism," *Modern Theology* 29:4 (2013), 154-171.

[98] Margaret O'Gara. "Receiving Gifts in Ecumenical Dialogue" in *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism,* ed. Paul Murray (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 26 -38.

distance. As the nations of the world begin to make their way through the first decades of the 21st Century with varying degrees of confidence and assertiveness, Australia finds itself situated in an environment that is multi-cultural, multi-ethnic and multi-religious. Demographically Australia is certainly multicultural. In fact, it is one of the world's *most* multicultural nations whose people identify with more than 270 ethnicities, speak more than 260 languages, and observe all the world's religions.[99]

Given the diversity of religions with which Australians identify, Australia should be a fertile multi-faith environment holding great promise of a rich social, cultural and religious future. But, because of that very diversity, there are also many challenges that have an impact not only on Australian society at large but also have the potential to interfere with the peaceful progress and development of inter-religious dialogue.

Impact of globalisation

It is widely recognised by political and social commentators that globalisation is one of the growing realities that confront modern society. Australia is not immune to this changing situation and, in order to respond effectively to the resulting demands, endeavours to ensure that its domestic institutions and its structural policies are in place. These structures are not limited to the economic sphere but include political, social, technological, educational, demographic and cultural and religious aspects of concern to the Australian community and to the communities of the countries in Australia's region.[100]

In an interview with Peter Kirkwood in 2006 Rabbi David Rosen drew attention to the complexity of globalisation when he commented:

> You can't isolate, or insulate, one community from global issues today, whether it's environmental issues, global warming, or whether it's terrorism and violence. We are so linked today that

---

[99] Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade: United Nations, accessed March 1, 2015, http://www.dfat.gov.au/
[100] Stuart Harris, Consultant, Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Group. *Globalisation in the Asia-Pacific Context* (Parliament of Australia, Research Paper 7, 2001-2002), 19 February 2002.

> we either manage to live together, or we basically have no tomorrow, and no future for our children and grandchildren.[101]

Political challenges

As a result of the post-war increase in overseas migration Australia has, since the mid-1970s, successfully promoted and adopted a national policy of multiculturalism. This policy was "an attempt to construct a community based on variety" in which those from diverse backgrounds, cultures and religions could live productively side-by-side.[102]

At an international level Australia is firmly committed to effective global cooperation, including involvement through the United Nations (UN) and its specialised agencies and regional commissions. Australia, in an effort to promote intercultural and community links, also supports several grassroots programs in the Asia-Pacific region.[103] Engaging with multilateral systems is a key pillar of Australia's foreign policy because, politically, Australia recognises it is part of a complex, inter-connected world in which many less developed countries, on their own, are unable to address complex political issues.[104]

While the current Australian political situation creates an environment that is capable of supporting healthy, vibrant and powerful inter-religious dialogue it is an environment that can easily be influenced by 'outside' politics and even, unfortunately, manipulated by national and international multimedia. Australia is no longer isolated by distance.

---

[101] David Rosen, interview conducted by Peter Kirkwood, Montreal, 13 September, 2006. Cited in *The Quiet Revolution: The Emergence of Interfaith Consciousness* (Sydney, N.S.W.: ABC Books) 2007, 105.

[102] Chilla Bulbeck, *Social Sciences in Australia: An Introduction* (Marrickville, N.S.W.: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1993), 273.

[103] Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade: United Nations, accessed 1 March 2015, http://dfat.gov.au.

[104] Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade: United Nations, accessed 1 March 2015, http://dfat.gov.au.

Social and Cultural Challenges

In modern Australia there is, among other social concerns, an increasing preoccupation with materialism, consumerism, hedonism, escapism and fundamentalism. The growing rejection of formally organised religion is further complicated by moral and ethical relativism and subjectivism.[105] The 'ugly face' of racial discrimination surfaces all too frequently in the Australian community when Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, people of Asian descent, members of the Jewish community and people of Middle Eastern descent or appearance are subjected to racial prejudice and intolerance. This discrimination has resulted in an increasing number of xenophobic insults and racist remarks and behaviour being expressed personally, and in various forms of mass communication. These situations frequently discourage members of all faith traditions from becoming involved in inter-religious dialogue.

To this list of cultural challenges must be added the ever-increasing influence of the social media on Australians, especially on young Australians from all religious backgrounds and affiliations. This is evidenced by the increased interest and activity in the recruitment of young people to fundamentalist groups that are involved in conflicts in other parts of the world.

The Catholic Church, as with other traditions, is attempting to deal with this situation. For example, the 2014 Vatican Document on pastoral orientation for interreligious dialogue acknowledged that, while modern technology can be considered a positive phenomenon, "it also creates opportunity for the globalization of once localised problems such as misunderstanding and intolerance in society, often expressed in violent conflicts, at times inflamed by the manipulation of religious

---

[105] Sandie Cornish, "Working for Social Justice in the 1990s and into the Next Millennium" in *Developing An Australian Theology*, ed. Peter Malone, (Strathfield, N.S.W.: St Paul's Publications, 1990), 209-226.

affiliations and sensitivities."[106]

In Australia, recent public events such as the 2014 Sydney hostage crisis,[107] the 2013 anti-Semitic racist abuse of a Jewish family returning from "a Shabbat dinner with friends",[108] the physical and verbal threats directed at Jewish children on a school bus in Sydney in 2014,[109] and the rise in influence of Islamic State,[110] have shown Australians that national internal revolutions and uprisings originating in other parts of the world, now have serious social, political and cultural repercussions in Australia which previously considered itself outside the range of such conflict and attack.[111] This situation also negatively influences involvement in inter-religious dialogue.

Religious challenges

Religiously, Australia is a pluralist society, exhibiting many elements of an increasingly secular society and with the Australian population's religious affiliations and connections altering significantly from one census to the next. For example, the percentage of Christians in the Australian population in 1996 was 70.9% but in 2011 this number had dropped to 61.1%. The total for non-Christians in the same period more than doubled from 3.5% to 7.2%. The Jewish community remained relatively stable, actually increasing from 0.4% in 1996 to 0.5% in 2011. Another significant sector was the "no religion" group that increased from 25.7% to 31.7% for the same period. These statistics indicate the diversity, the freedom and the plurality of religious thinking

---

[106] Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue. *Dialogue in Truth and Charity: Pastoral Orientation for Interreligious Dialogue*, par. 4, (Vatican City: Libreria EditriceVaticana, 2014).

[107] Note: This crisis, which occurred at the Lindt Chocolate Café in the heart of the Sydney CBD on 16 December 2014, was initially thought to be Australia's first experience of religiously motivated extremist aggression. It was later judged otherwise.

[108] Julie Nathan, Research Officer. *Report on Antisemitism in Australia:1 October 2013 – 30 September 2014.* (Edgecliffe, N.S.W: Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ), 22.

[109] Nathan, *Report on Antisemitism in Australia* (2013 – 2014), 25.

[110] The Sunni militant group Islamic State is also known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) or the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

[111] Nathan, *Report on Antisemitism in Australia*, 25. Reported incidents include the antisemitic abuse hurled at a 12year old Jewish girl by a parent from a non-Jewish opposing team (8 June 2014); a male harassing boys from a Jewish school in Melbourne and threatening one of the boys with a knife (3 August 2014).

and affiliation that exist in Australia.[112]   But this extreme diversity in belief systems produces a complex moral situation in which it is difficult to resolve issues because there is no commonly shared ethical standard.[113]

At an international level Australia is committed to fostering mutual respect and understanding among different religions and is an active participant in UN initiatives, including the Alliance of Civilizations and Ministerial Meetings on Interfaith Dialogue and Cooperation for Peace. In 2009, Australia hosted the Parliament of the World's Religions held in Melbourne and currently co-chairs a regional interfaith dialogue process in Southeast Asia and the Pacific. It is evident that, at both national and international levels, Australia has a commitment to fostering mutual respect and understanding among different religions and cultures.

Conclusion

While many of the social, cultural, political and economic areas such as global warming, a sustainable environment, domestic violence, human trafficking, capital punishment, child labour, detention of refugees, gay marriage and wealth inequality, are well outside the direct capacity of this research, they are indicative of the range of social issues that can be addressed when people from different faith traditions work together for the betterment of Australian society.

So, while Australia's multicultural, multi-religious situation provides an engaging opportunity for Catholic-Jewish dialogue, the reality is that there are also many

---

[112] Note: In an address to the National Archives Commission (Banco Court, Brisbane, 12 June, 2008), entitled *In Celebration of the Constitution*, Justice Patrick Keane made the point that "after the Enlightenment, no-one can claim to insist that the power of the state should be harnessed to enforce his or her visions derived from the poetry of the Bible, or, for that matter, the Koran."
http://www.naa.gov.au/collection/publicaations/papers-and-poscasts/australian-constitution/keane.aspx
The Attorney General's Department and Australian Government Solicitor, Commonwealth of Australia, 2003 states: Section 116 of the Constitution of Australia (1901) "precludes the Commonwealth of Australia from making laws for establishing any religion, imposing any religious observance, or prohibiting the free exercise of any religion." This reflects both the protection of religious practice from state interference and a strong separation of religion from the state.
[113] Gary D. Bouma, "From Religious Diversity to a Multi-Faith Society," *Oxford Journals Social Sciences. Sociology of Religion* 56 (2013): 285-302.

challenges to be encountered in the area of inter-religious dialogue. It is hoped that by addressing some of these concerns this study of inter-religious dialogue, specifically dialogue between Catholics and followers of Judaism, might provide a pathway to greater religious, social, political and cultural engagement, cooperation, collaboration and commitment.

**Chapter 2.   The Relevance of Metz's Category of *Memory*
to Catholic-Jewish Dialogue in Australia.**

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to elucidate the category of *memory* as proposed in the practical-political theology of Johann Baptist Metz and to explore its significance for Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia. This will involve first outlining the essential features of Metz's theology and then identifying the many influences that have contributed to his specific approach to theology.   Metz's complex and varied experiences, particularly in the wake of the Sho'ah, and the insights he gathered from those experiences, are also important factors that contribute to the development of his practical-political model of theology.

Metz's specific understanding of *memory* and some of the key topics that relate to *memory,* including "dangerous memories," *memoria passionis,* Auschwitz, "bourgeois religion," will be discussed. While examining the subject of *memory* is central to this chapter *memory* cannot be discussed satisfactorily without reference to the other two Metzian categories or "pillars" – *narrative* and *solidarity* – though both of these categories will be addressed more fully in subsequent chapters*.*

The significance of Metz's category of *memory* with regard to the Jewish understanding of memory, particularly in relation to Jewish cultural and religious traditions, will then be examined so that similarities and contrasts in the Jewish and Catholic understandings of memory can be identified.

The applicability of Metz's perception of *memory* for Catholic and Jewish dialogue will then be assessed, with particular focus on the Australian setting. The final step will be to determine if the application of Metz's category of *memory* to Catholic-Jewish dialogue is compatible with the principles of Receptive Ecumenism.

In this chapter Metz's theological category of *memory* is addressed comprehensively. The questions of *memory's* applicability to Jewish-Catholic dialogue in Australia and its compatibility with Receptive Ecumenism are considered, but to a much lesser extent at this time. When the roles of *narrative* and *solidarity* have been more fully analysed in Chapters Four and Five and a more comprehensive discussion has occurred the questions of applicability and compatibility will be answered.

Metz's Political Theology - Essential Features and Influences

In the mid 1960s a challenging and at the same time significant theological movement appeared in the public arena. This exciting new theological movement "expressed itself in the *theology of hope*, the *theology of liberation*, and *political theology*."[1]

Sharing common goals that focused on faith and justice, especially justice for those who were poor and suffering, and declaring a commitment to improving the link between the Christian life and political action, indicated that the "modern" theologies were closely connected. There were, however, features that identified Metz's model of *political theology* and differentiated it from the other "modern" theological models of *hope* and *liberation*.[2]

Johann Baptist Metz was a key figure in initiating this particular model of contemporary political theology and it is he who has most consistently attended to its development. In 1968, in the relatively early days of defining "political theology" he wrote:

> I understand political theology, first of all, to be a critical correction of present-day theology inasmuch as this theology shows an extreme privatizing tendency (a tendency, that is, to center upon the private person rather than 'public,' 'political' society).[3]

---

[1] John B. Cobb, *Process Theology as Political Theology*, (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2016), vii.

[2] *Note:* All the leading proponents of the "modern theologies" – the "theology of hope" (Jürgen Moltmann), "liberation theology" (Gustavo Gutiérrez of Peru, Leonardo Boff of Brazil, and Jon Sobrino of Spain, who would popularise the phrase the "preferential option for the poor") and "political theology" (Jürgen Moltmann, Dorothee Sölle and Johann Baptist Metz) - reacted against the transcendental-idealist theologies of Karl Barth and Karl Rahner.

[3] Johann Baptist Metz, Faith in History and Society: toward a practical fundamental theology, (New York: Seabury Press, 1969), 107

As his model developed he later explained that political theology is also a theology sensitive to suffering and that "its governing category is a *memoria passionis*, which includes, and emphasizes, the sufferings of the stranger-other."[4] While Metz was educated in the tradition of transcendental Thomism his understanding and his questioning of the centrality of anthropology in the approach to theology has been an important step in the development of political theology.

One of political theology's central features is its directness in clarifying the relationship of faith to the political, and clearly indicating the action the church must take to ensure that the appropriate action and relationship is realised. As Metz's model progressed he concentrated more on the contemporary understanding of the "new" world and the changing ways of thinking of God, to the point that when he addressed the question of God "he did so entirely in the context of Christian hope for the coming of God"[5] in the lives of the ordinary people and the society in which they lived.

Metz identified three cardinal features of his model of political theology. The first was the task of a 'theological hermeneutic in the contemporary social context'; the second was that the new political theology should be a 'critical corrective over and against a certain privatizing tendency in recent theology'; and the third was because theology and the church actually have massive political importance, political theology must have a "critical function in the church."[6] This view of political theology Metz was promoting was challenging in that it "tries to carry out the same task that Christian theology has always carried out - that of speaking about God by making the connection between the Christian message and the modern world."[7]

[4] Johann-Baptist Metz and Jürgen Moltmann, *Faith and the future: essays on theology, solidarity and modernity,* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), viii.
[5] Cobb, Process Theology as Political Theology, 6.
[6] Cobb, Process Theology as Political Theology, 7.
[7] Metz, Faith in History and Society, 45

J. Matthew Ashley, one of the finest interpreters and analysts of Metz's body of work, summed up the essential features that distinguish Metz's model of political theology. He identified Metz's "profound commitment" to the task of bringing together three acknowledged "elements" or encompassing dimensions of Catholicism, namely the *historical/institutional*, the *intellectual* and the *mystical/volitional* (for Metz the *mystical/political*).[8] Those "three elements" which were first identified by the Catholic Modernist theologian, Friedrich von Hügel, provided Metz with the structure for understanding the balance, the tension, and the 'friction' that exists in the area of religious thinking and in the complexities of ordinary daily life.[9] These "elements" prove helpful in giving order to the construction of this section dealing with the influences of Metz's theology.

The Historical/Institutional Element.

Metz's early positive experiences of the Catholic faith, and his association with the official Church in his developing years leading up to World War II, laid the foundation for his loyalty and commitment to the institutional Church and its traditions.[10] His familiarity with the German Catholic Church in which he was raised, and his later experiences of the post-Auschwitz European Catholic Church that was caught up in the post-war philosophy of modernity, were two powerful influences that shaped not only his faith but his growing consciousness of the challenges facing the church and society globally.

---

[8] J. Matthew Ashley, "Introduction: Reading Metz" in *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity*, trans. J. Matthew Ashley (New York: Paulist Press, 1998), 8.

[9] Ellen Leonard, "Traditions of Spiritual Guidance: Friedrich von Hügel as Spiritual Guide," *The Way 31*, July (1991): 248-258. *Note:* Friedrich van Hügel's "three elements" are his most enduring contribution to theological thinking. His *Mystical Element of Religion* (1908) insisted on the mystic's right to be heard both inside and outside the Church. Two further volumes of *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion* (1921 and 1926) greatly extended his authority as an influential thinker in a field long dominated by a "scholastic and theoretical" approach rather than a "mystical and positive" approach.

[10] Metz, A Passion for God, 1.

Describing his early life in *Facing the Jews,*[11] Metz explains that "the milieu from which I came" was "an arch-Catholic, small Bavarian town" in southern Germany. This provided a rural and traditional environment where the "views of how Jews looked came from *Oberammergeau*" - a town renowned for its once-a-decade performance of the Christian Passion Play. He recalls, that in spite of the fact that his home in *Auerbach* was barely fifty kilometres from the infamous *Flossenbürg* concentration camp where thousands of Jews were exterminated, family members and members of his local community did not even discuss the plight of the Jews at that time, or acknowledge the tragic events happening so close to their home town. In relation to *Auschwitz* Metz wrote that "the catastrophe of *Auschwitz*, which finally became the catastrophe of Christianity, did not enter our consciousness."[12] He attributed that view, and the probable view of many of his generation, to the fact that "the Church milieu of the little town from which I came, and also the milieu of the neighboring town where I attended high school, never called my attention to *Auschwitz*".[13]

In spite of this, when he later confronted *Auschwitz*, he acknowledged it was because of "this catastrophe I began to ask critical questions and to look for additional viewpoints of theological identity."[14] He confessed openly:

> I became aware that, for me, being a Christian meant: being a Christian in the face of Auschwitz, in the face of the Holocaust; and that for me, doing theology meant: doing theology in the face of Auschwitz, in the face of the Holocaust (and though this holds good in a very special way for Christians and theologians in Germany, it does not apply to them exclusively; for the Holocaust is not just a German catastrophe, but – on closer inspection – a Christian catastrophe). I began to ask myself: What sort of theology can one do with one's back to Auschwitz

---

[11] Metz, "Facing the Jews. Christian Theology after Auschwitz," in *The Holocaust as Interruption,* eds. Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and David Tracy (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd., 1984), p. 26 – 33.
[12] Metz, "Facing the Jews," p.27
[13] Metz, "Facing the Jews," p.26
[14] Metz, "Facing the Jews," p.27.

> – before the impending catastrophe, during the catastrophe, after the catastrophe of Auschwitz.[15]

This explains the deeper and more particular motivation which was bound to influence the direction his theology was to take, namely the relationship between tradition and modernity. His particular theological model is best understood, as Waschendenfelder suggests, as a "unified attempt to answer the question of why suffering? Why have Christians lost their ability to live in solidarity with the poor and oppressed?"[16] This question can be seen as arising out of Metz's experiences with the Holocaust, "of his struggle to comprehend how such an event could have arisen in the midst of an essentially Christian culture, and, similarly, why it so quickly has been forgotten by Christians and non-Christians alike." [17]

Of significance to this particular perspective of Metz's theological model are the attitudes exhibited in the 1998 Vatican document *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah*. While it recognises that "the Church's relationship to the Jewish people is unlike the one she shares with any other religion,"[18] it also acknowledges that over the centuries, particularly in Christian Europe, "sentiments of anti-Judaism in some Christian quarters, and the gap which existed between the Church and the Jewish people, led to a generalized discrimination, which ended at times in expulsions or attempts at forced conversions."[19] It questions if the "Nazi persecution of the Jews was not made easier by the anti-Jewish prejudices imbedded in some Christian minds and hearts."[20] In calling members of the Catholic Church to express sorrow for the failure of the past, the document makes it clear that "it is not a matter of mere words, but indeed

---

[15] J.B. Metz, *From a Mysticism of the Elite to a Mysticism of the People. Autobiographical Remarks.*Unpublished manuscript presented to the communities of Catholic Nuns in Cleveland Ohio, Notre Dame, and Boston College, 1981 and 1982, p.2.

[16] Jacob L.C. Waschenfelder, *Johann Baptist Metz's Critique of Religious Apathy, (*Hamilton, Ontario: McMaster University, 1990), 3.

[17] Waschenfelder, *Johann Baptist Metz's Critique of Religious Apathy*, 2.

[18] Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah*, I, para 4.

[19] We Remember, III, para 3.

[20] *We Remember*, IV, para 4.

of binding commitment,"[21] and that "the victims from their graves, and the survivors through the vivid testimony of what they have suffered, have become a loud voice calling the attention of all of humanity."[22]

In addition, relevant to the third section of this thesis – *"Shaping the Future"* - is this document's reminder that any response to the events leading up to, and subsequent to the holocaust "is not only a question of recalling the past. The common future of Jews and Christians demands that we remember, for 'there is no future without memory'."[23] Unfortunately, this is another Catholic Church document that has not been made available, in the pastoral sense, to the majority of Christians and indeed to the members of the Catholic community, some of whom would consider themselves to be taking an "active part in the life of the Catholic Church."

However, it was Metz's personal experiences of the destruction, injustice and lack of respect for human life that accompanied World War II that were forever emblazoned on his memory and played such a large part in directing his future academic pursuits. Very early in his military service as a 16-year-old youth, Metz witnessed a devastating incident when, on returning to the camp, he found that the entire company of 100 youthful friends and military comrades had been killed.

> I saw only the lifeless faces of my comrades, those same comrades with whom I had but days before shared my childhood fears and my youthful laughter. I remember nothing but a soundless cry. And up until today I see myself so. Behind this memory all my childhood dreams have vanished.[24]

There is no doubt that this experience changed, forever, the way Metz viewed the world.

There were other related influences and incidents that Metz was also forced to confront and consider. For example, the largest Protestant church in Germany in the

---

[21] *We Remember*, V, para 2.
[22] We Remember, V, para 4.
[23] *We Remember*, I, para 1.
[24] Johann Baptist Metz, "Hoping Against Hope" in *Love's Strategy: The Political Theology of Johann Baptist Metz,* ed. John K. Downey, (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999), 137.

1930s was the German Evangelical Church in which most of Germany's 40 million Protestants were members. This Church viewed itself as one of the pillars of German culture and society, with a theologically grounded tradition of loyalty to the state. There emerged, within the German Evangelical Church of the 1920s, a movement called the *"German Christians"* which embraced many of the nationalistic and racial aspects of Nazi ideology. Once the Nazis came to power, this group sought the creation of a national "Reich Church" and supported a "nazified" version of Christianity. This was in stark contrast to Metz's experiences and views.

But, it was the *reality* of Auschwitz and the Sho'ah that greatly influenced his thinking and his comprehension of what these disasters meant not only to the Germany he knew but also to the Church to which he belonged. His reaction to Auschwitz was both understandable and valid. As the full horrors of Nazism and its leadership became more obvious, there was inevitably a strong reaction by other German theologians, critical of the type of theological thinking that had supported and maintained the party in its rise to power. Karl Barth, for example, wrote critically as early as 1939 of the situation:

> The German people suffer from the legacy of the greatest of all German Christians, from the mistake of Martin Luther regarding the relation of Law and Gospel, of temporal and spiritual order and power, by which the German's natural paganism has been ideologically clarified, confirmed and strengthened rather than being limited and contained."[25]

Metz revealed his orientation toward a theology that was directed toward the future and stressed his particular focus on relationship between God and humanity. This contrasted with Rahner's transcendental-existential approach of which Metz was critical. An encounter with the neo-Marxist thought of theologian Ernst Bloch, and his association with the work of Jürgen Moltmann and Dorothy Sölle, contributed to his

---

[25] Richard Higginson, "From Carl Schmitt to Dorothee Sölle: has political theology turned full circle?" in *Churchman*, 97:2, 1983), (Durham: St John's College); (pp 132 – 140 *Churchman*)

pursuit of other theological options. As a result of these experiences and influences he began to formulate his particular 'political theology' model which began to address more meaningful engagement of the Catholic Church with the needs of the modern world.

In his searching for a response Metz asked, "What would happen if one took this not to the psychologist but into the Church . . . and if one would not allow oneself to be talked out of such memories even by theology?"[26]

What he perceived as a lack of intervention by the Catholic Church added to his frustration, and to his criticism, of the Church. There was an understandable tension for Metz in his commitment to the "historical-institutional reality of his church" and the manner in which it functioned, and to his intellectual commitment to the reality of the modern world. While Ashley comments on Metz's criticism of nineteenth century Catholic theology, he acknowledges that Metz remained faithful and committed to the Church. Ashley wrote that Metz's criticism was "not because it (the Church) failed to 'keep up with the times,' but because it demonstrated a failure of nerve, a failure of trust that the substance of the tradition was up to a thorough confrontation with modernity."[27] Metz's approach to theology was, therefore, profoundly affected by his personal experiences during World War II, his bewilderment with the actions and attitudes of his countrymen and by his struggle to reconcile those events and other 'dangerous memories' with his own faith.

The specific theological structure he developed was formulated against the appalling background of World War II and the Holocaust of which Auschwitz became a critical reference point and an unforgettable witness to the atrocities and inhumanity that occurred. This forced him to ask the question, as others were doing at the time:

---

[26] Metz, A Passion for God, 2.
[27] Ashley, "Introduction: Reading Metz", 10.

"Can our theology ever be the same after Auschwitz."[28] It could be said that the birth of political theology came about because Metz, and others, refused to worship and pray "with our backs to Auschwitz" and to ignore the other painful events in human history.[29]

The intellectual element

For Metz the *intellectual element*, the second element identified by von Hügel, consisted of three distinct influences – the relationship with Rahner, the influence of the philosophers and the interaction with the critical theorists of the Frankfurt School.

At the conclusion of World War II, Metz returned to his homeland and attended the University of Innsbruck where he studied under Karl Rahner who is one of the most influential Catholic theologians of the 20th century. Rahner became his mentor as well as his teacher, introducing him to the intellectual essentials of religion especially from a Catholic perspective. From exposure to Rahner's theological methods and ideas the young Metz received academic inspiration, stimulation and guidance in doctrine and biblical scholarship, all of which challenged him to question how these theories could be applied to the social struggles of that period.

While Rahner described himself as a "practical theologian" who was concerned for the public and political praxis of Christian faith, critics of his modern theological methods feared that his "theology was too limited by his philosophy with its focus on transcendental ideas and notions."[30] Rahner, himself, acknowledged both the limitations of his theology as well as the need for other thinkers to develop his ideas in new directions. Metz became not just one of his critics but also one of those 'other thinkers.' A view expressed by Bruce Morrill was that Metz developed his political theology "as a corrective to the transcendental fundamental theology of his mentor and friend,

---

[28] Johann Baptist Metz, *The Emergent Church* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 22.
[29] Johann Baptist Metz, "Facing the Jews: Christian Theology after Auschwitz," in *Faith and the Future: Essays on Theology, Solidarity, and Modernity* ed. Concilium Foundation (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1995 (1984)), 41.
[30] Declan Marmion, "Rahner and his Critics" Revisiting the Dialogue," *Australian ejournal of Theology*, 4 (2005).

Rahner."[31] In Marmion's understanding, however, "Rahner supported Metz's political theology as thoroughly orthodox, even if he had some questions about it."[32] In this context, Rahner himself wrote:

> For it has always been clear in my theology that a 'transcendental experience' ... is always mediated through a categorical experience in history, in interpersonal relationships, and in society. If one not only sees and takes seriously these necessary mediations ... but also fills it out in a concrete way, then one already practices in an authentic way political theology ... On the other hand, such a political theology is, if it truly wishes to concern itself with God, not possible without reflection on those essential characteristics of humankind which a transcendental theology discloses. Therefore, I believe that my theology and that of Metz are not necessarily contradictory.[33]

In spite of their differing approaches to theology Rahner and Metz remained respectful of one other, personally and academically. As kindred spirits on the journey of faith seeking understanding they continued to listen to and learn from one another.

During his university studies Metz engaged in further educational development learning from the works of several of the world's great philosophers, historians and theologians including Plato[34], Augustine of Hippo[35] and Thomas Aquinas.[36] While each of these philosophers exerted a considerable influence on Metz's theology of *memory* it was Plato's theory of *anamnesis* that was the major influence on his development of a practical-political theology. But, it was Hegel who provided a formulation that demonstrated that *memory* was not confined to history or abstract truth but was concerned with the history of the freedom of the human spirit. Based as it was on many

---

[31] Bruce Morrill, "Take and Read: Faith in History and Society", *National Catholic Reporter*, May 30, (2016), 4. https://www.ncronline.org.take-and-read-faith-history-and-society (accessed May 30, 2016).

[32] Marmion, "Rahner and his Critics", 4.

[33] Rahner, "Introduction," to James J. Bacik, *Apologetics and the Eclipse of Mystery: According to Karl Rahner* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980), x.

[34] Note: Plato (428/427 – 348/347 BCE), is a major Greek philosopher whose ideas have exerted a many-sided influence on the West's approach to political science.

[35] Note: In "Faith and History in Society" Metz refers to the *Confessions* of Augustine (354-430) as 'the exercise in which "memory acquired the status of hermeneutical category, able to interpret history in the presence of God"',188. In a similar construct to Augustine's grouping of *"memory, will and understanding"* Metz groups *"memory, narrative and solidarity."*

[36] Note: During his early research Metz dealt with the political teaching of Aquinas (1225-1274), and was also influenced by the political science theory of Aristotle (384-322 BCE) a student at Plato's academy.

other models, Hegel's philosophy examined "the relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed [37] An important consideration for Metz from a Christian perspective was that as a result of previous research, memory was no longer limited by earlier concepts of 'abstraction' and 'perception.' "From the formal point of view" he wrote "*memory* has been taken into the context of faith and freedom"[38] and is "in its eschatological orientation, a repetitive memory forwards."[39] Following Hegel's lead, Metz indicated there were three key consequences of the changes in the general understanding and approach to memory, namely that it (1) "is critical (of the present time), (2) operates as a "protest against subjection to previously existing conditions," and (3) "aims to be practical, as a liberating form of criticism."[40]

Over the years, as Metz clarified, modified, developed and re-considered his evolving theological model, these three factors were gradually incorporated into his theology and applied to the developing modern, multicultural and global church.

In the development of his model of practical-political theology Metz was also immensely influenced by the research in critical theory that was being carried out by several thinkers at the Institute for Social Research, also known as the Frankfurt School.[41] In the late 1920s and early 1930s, distinguished theorists of the School such as Theodore Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, and later to a lesser extent, Walter Benjamin, produced compelling explanations and analyses of the changes that had occurred in Western capitalist societies since the Marxist era.[42] These 20th century German

---

[37] Neil Ormerod, *Introducing Contemporary Theologies: The What and the Who of Theology Today*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2002), Georg Hegel (1770-1831) influential German idealist and post-Kantian philosopher.

[38] Metz, Faith in History and Society, 188.

[39] Metz, Faith in History and Society, 188.

[40] Metz, Faith in History and Society, 189.

[41] *See Gerard Hall, "Retrieving Memory*, Narrative and Solidarity as Significant Categories for Practical Theology and Christian Engagement," *APTO Conference – Baulkham Hills. Being Christian in a World with the Marginalized,* 2012. Members of the Frankfurt School who influenced Metz were Walter Benjamin, Herbert Marcuse and Theodore Adorno.

[42] *Note:* Neil Ormerod, Karl Marx, (1818–1883). For Marx, history is the story of a constant dialectical struggle between classes and economic forces. In modern society, the economic war is between the owners of capital and the means of production and the industrial urban workers who sell their labour, i.e. between the *bourgeoisie* and the *proletariat*.

philosophers focused on the development of critical theory, especially as it emerged with Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud.[43] They were among the first critical theorists to examine the effects of mass culture and the rise of the consumer society on the working classes that, in a classical Marxian setting, were to become the instruments of revolution. This critical thinking of the members of the Frankfurt School appealed to Metz as it supported his view that European 'Christian' society had also failed to "raise its prophetic voice" at the time leading up to and during Auschwitz and that the Church and "such institutions as the theological academy and internal church structures have failed in their reactions to secularity." [44]

It was under these influences that Metz began to identify Christianity as a predominantly "bourgeois religion" which "confirmed the middle-class values and capitalistic forces of people who already have abundant prospects and a secure future."[45] Metz explains:

> The bourgeoisie understand that they are no longer sustained by comprehensive traditions of any sort, let alone religious ones . . .The bourgeoisie know that they are sustained by a new principle that rules and underpins all social relations: the principle of exchange. Production, trade, and consumption are all determined in terms of that principle. All other values that had heretofore shaped social existence, and that did not contribute directly to the functioning of this bourgeois exchange society, retreated more and more into the sphere of the private, that is, into the sphere of individual freedom.[46]

Contrary to the bourgeois approach, Metz's desire was for the Church to transform itself and to take on a messianic role of reclaiming its right to respond with compassion to the call of the Gospel.

The accumulation of these influences provided Metz with an understanding of political theology that was a challenge to Rahner's "existential-transcendental" analysis

---

[43] Raymond Geuss, *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas & the Frankfurt School*, Modern European Philosophy (New York, NY: Cambridge University press, 1981 (1999)). 1.
[44] Morrill, "Take and Read: Faith in History and Society," 4.
[45] Hall, Retrieving Memory, 2.
[46] Metz, Faith and History in Society, 49.

of human existence. In order to provide a clearer understanding Metz adopted the alternative terms of categories of *memory*, *narrative*, and *solidarity*, which will be examined more fully later in this thesis. This chapter deals explicitly with the category of memory; narrative and solidarity are mentioned, but are dealt with more thoroughly in following chapters. It is important to note that, in addition to this approach, a highly significant aspect of Metz's political theology is its *mystical* component.

The Mystical/Political element

The emergence of the mystical-political dimension as a key concept of Metz's theology came about, significantly, as a result of Rahner's influence and his ability to bring together spirituality and theology, in the lives of ordinary, everyday believers. Metz maintained that Rahner's approach was successful because it was not only an invitation "into a personal journey" but it was at the same time "an itinerary (route) of mind and spirit into God."[47] Metz, however, questioned how this could be accomplished successfully by those whose beliefs had been severely threatened because of their experience of secularisation on one hand and the horrifying and vast examples of human suffering worldwide, experiences that Metz identified as "dangerous memories."

This line of investigation diverted his thinking away from the Rahnerian principles to "another strand of Christian spirituality, one more engaged or irritated by the presence of evil in creation . . . as well as by the lack of . . . response on the part of God"[48] and results in the biblical "Job-like" characteristics of protest and insistent questioning.[49] In Metz's view this unrelenting questioning contextualizes suffering as a "suffering unto God" which looks back and, in doing so, participates in the biblical history of the Jews who were unwilling to be comforted by myths or easy answers. This

---

[47] Ashley, "Introduction: Reading Metz," 13.
[48] Ashley, Introduction: Reading Metz," 15.
[49] Job 3:1-10 is Job's lament of misery and despair; in 19: 1 Job asks the Lord "How long will you torment me? and in 19:7 when there is no answer to his cry of "Violence!" or to his loud and insistent calls he concludes "there is no justice."

is the foundation of the mystical aspect of Metz's political theology.

Traditionally, "mystical" is associated with the spiritually significant or symbolic yet unfathomable, but Metz's approach viewed mysticism as a contemporary image of a mystical-political partnership where by encountering God in the face of public life, the face of the suffering of the world was encountered. Gradually, this understanding became more widely acceptable and in 2000, at the national gathering of American theologians discussing the connection between the call to holiness and participation in public life, Conn publicly endorsed Metz's approach:

> Here one could image holiness as "suffering unto God" as Johann Baptist Metz presents authentic spirituality as being toward God remembering others' suffering, expecting God's response and willing to act in solidarity with sufferers.[50]

Metz's concept of the mystical-political dimension of Christianity repeatedly calls upon Christians, especially first world Christians, to practice a "mysticism of open or closed eyes" which compels them to respond to the suffering of others, especially the poor and the vulnerable in society. He explains repeatedly that this approach brings theology closer to its "original task," arguing that:

> in the end, the mysticism that Jesus lived out and taught and which should also have directed the logos of Christian theology is not a narrow mysticism of closed eyes, but an empathetic mysticism of opened eyes (cf. e.g. Luke 10:25-37).[51] The God of Jesus cannot be found either here or there if we ignore its perceptions.[52]

Metz also insists that this type of mysticism is not confined to those who profess to be followers of Christ. Ashley observed:

---

[50] Joann Wolski Conn, "A Response to John Haughey," *CTSA Proceedings 55* (2000): 20-22.
References: John Haughey, "Connecting Vatican II's call to Holiness with Public Life," *CTSA Proceedings 55* (2000):1-19) *CTSA Proceedings 55* (2000): 20-22.
Johann Baptist Metz, A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity (New York: Paulist Press, 1998); see James Matthew Ashley, Interruptions: Mysticism, Politics and Theology in the Work of Johann Baptist Metz (Notre Dame:University of Notre Dame Press, 1998).
[51] The Parable of the Good Samaritan, (cf. Mt 22:34-40; Mk 12:28-34).
[52] Johann B. Metz, "With the Eyes of European Theologian," Concilium, ed. Leonardo Boff and Virgil Elizondo (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 6:119.
Note: The passage referred to in the Gospel of Luke tells the story of the Good Samaritan which in its two-pronged summation, *love the Lord your God with all your heart … and your neighbour as yourself*, gives scriptural support to Metz's theory of the "empathetic mysticism of open eyes."

> He has pressed for it not only within Christianity but in society at large and in the academy, as a remedy for the growing forgetfulness and demise of the person as a responsible historical agent (of his or her own and others' histories) and a remedy for the decline into a gentle, anaesthetized "second immaturity." . . . In short, if there is one of the three elements of von Hügel's typology that is most central to Metz's work, it is the mystical-political.[53]

In summary, Metz's mystical-political dimension of Christianity consists of the practice of opening one's eyes to the suffering of others (*the mystical*) and the commitment to work toward social justice (*the political*). "The power of this spirituality," as Ashley rightly comments, "is witnessed by the liberation movements and theologies that risk this sort of transformation."[54]

The concept of memory

Metz's understanding of the concept of memory in his theological model evolved in response to what he saw as a manifestation of society's lack of concern for humanity, the prevalence of extreme secularisation, and by what he perceived to be abandonment by the Church. Civil society and Christianity, in his view, supported and were fascinated by a post-war modern world that looked exclusively to the future.

> The so-called 'new age' in which the process of secularization is taking place is marked by a constant will towards the 'new.' This will towards the new operates on the basis of the social, political, and technological revolutions. Mankind in this new age seems to be fascinated by only one thing: the future as something that has not yet existed.[55]

Metz, on the other hand, identified that this modern 'focus on the future' was causing forgetfulness of the past. In this regard, he wrote "one of the most important problems in this connection is the threatened loss of history, memory and tradition in this view and hence the threatened loss of content in historical activity."[56] While Metz described memory as being central to the formation of consciousness and collective

---

[53] Ashley, "Introduction: Reading Metz," 15.
[54] Ashley, "Introduction: Reading Metz," 17.
[55] Johann Baptist Metz, *Theology of the World*, trans. William Glen-Doepel (New York: Seabury Press, 1969), 113
[56] Metz, Theology of the World, 56

imagination, he also acknowledged the power that memory has to

> define history as the history of what has prevailed, as the history of the successful and the established. There is hardly any reference in history as we know it to the conquered and defeated or to the forgotten or suppressed hopes of our historical existence.[57]

Memory in Metz's theology

Metz's perception of memory went further than investigating the way memory operates or deals with the past, or determining how previous events and experiences are evoked or recalled. Drawing on his memory of the past can give rise to dangerous insights and that established society seems to fear the subversive contents of memory."[58] Human activity, while not necessarily being accountable to the past is, nonetheless, strongly influenced by it.

The different approaches to political theology that developed in the years following the Second World War did so in the shadows of Auschwitz and in the notion of the politically powerful state. As different theologians placed emphasis on different principles, the "new" political theology was described as either prophetic (liberation) theology or in terms of a theology of justice,[59] a theology of hope, a theology of 'ethical and political anticipation.'[60]

experiences of critical theory from the Frankfurt School, and particularly on the inspiration of the Jewish Marxist historian Walter Benjamim, he was able to call attention to the "forgotten history of the victims," to acknowledge that "our

The theologies that emerged offered the reality of the promise of God's Kingdom and Metz described this change in thinking and direction as one

---

[57] Metz, Faith in History, 110.

[58] Metz, Faith in History, 193. "Memory"

[59] Johann Baptist Metz, "Two-fold political theology," in *Political Theology: Contemporary challenges and future directions,* ed. F. Schüssler Fiorenza, K. Tanner, Y. M. Welker (Louisville, CY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013), 16-20

[60] Jürgen Moltmann, "Political theology in ecumenical contexts," in *Political Theology: Contemporary challenges and future directions,* ed. F. Schüssler Fiorenza, K. Tanner, Y. M. Welker (Louisville, CY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013), 1-10. [4]

> which will bring us face to face with the suffering and the victims. . . . It criticizes the high degree of apathy in theological idealism, and its defective sensibility for the interruptive character of historical and political catastrophes ... it (*political theology*) is not theology in terms of a system, but a theology in terms of human subjects.[61]

Relating those particular concepts to Christianity in general and to the Church in particular, Metz argued that theology can become "trivial or irrelevant, and Christian faith a banalised reflection of the prevailing social consensus."[62] He, therefore, challenged Christianity to examine its past by asking "Has not Christianity interpreted itself . . . as a theological 'religion of conquerors' with an excess of answers and a corresponding lack of agonizing questions"?[63] and is there, within the history of Christianity, "a drastic deficit in regard to political resistance and a corresponding excess of political conformity?"[64]

Metz's "new" Political Theology was revolutionary in that it was designed to focus on people and not on systems. In calling for a greater awareness in terms of perception and memory, it focused on 'remembering' the "history of God and humanity - with the twofold aim of hope and resistance; hope about an 'interruption in history' and resistance to 'fight for a level playing field of equality for humanity."[65]

Memory and Auschwitz

As memory in Metz's political theology developed it addressed both faith and life situations at those points in history where people were most vulnerable, and where their faith was threatened by the social and political milieu of the time. Of particular concern to him was the memory of suffering, the memory of guilt, the frequent forgetfulness of the real lives and deaths of millions of history's victims, and, in the

---

[61]Johann Baptist Metz, "Theology in the new paradigm," in *An Eerdmans reader in contemporary political theology,* ed. W. T. Cavanaugh, J.W. Bailey, & C. Hovey (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), 322.

[62] *Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*, ed. P. Scott and W. Cavanaugh (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), section 17 s.v. 'Johann Baptist Metz' (by J. Matthew Ashley), 245.

[63] Johann Baptist Metz, *The Emergent Church,* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 23.

[64] Metz, The Emergent Church, 25.

[65] Metz, "Two-fold political theology" 18.

historical context "after Auschwitz", the dialogue between conqueror and victim. Metz asks "how can I pray, how can I believe, how can I worship, how can I theologize after Auschwitz?" Grayland in response to Metz's question suggests that the real test is for Christians to ask themselves, "do we pray any differently because of Auschwitz?"[66]

Memory and the Church

To counteract the influence of secular thinking prevalent at the time (the late 1960s) Metz proposed that the role of the church and its members was to act as mediators between a currently self-seeking world and the coming of the Kingdom of God. "The believer acts not only "within" the world, but he changes it, he transforms it himself within the framework of the divine promise, which was given and is present to him as an individual only in the solidarity of the covenant."[67] This, Metz notes, is a call to discipleship that will salvage the identity of modern day Christianity. He wrote:

> The crisis in Christianity today is not primarily a crisis of
> the content of faith and its premises, but a crisis of subjects
> and institutions which do not measure up to the demands
> made by faith.[68]

Recognising that the Christian Churches had accepted predominantly middle-class values and attitudes, Metz labeled this "crisis" in the church, "bourgeois religion." He saw this situation as affirming the bourgeois values of a first world society where competition, "progress," social and economic stability and success, were valued to such an extent, that any tension between those values and Gospel values had weakened. The mentality of the "bourgeois religion" had undermined the virtues of unconditional love for the most vulnerable, repentance, "conversion" and compassion.

Metz, therefore, chose to use memory as a mechanism linking the past to the present and to the future, challenging current situations and calling for more just and

---

[66] Joseph Grayland, "Sixty years after Auschwitz: What does it mean for Christian Theology?," *Compass: A Review of Topic Theology* 39, No.1 (2005). http://www.compassreview.org/ (accessed February 6, 2015).
[67] Metz, Theology of the World, 55.
[68] Metz, Theology of the World, 55.

liberating outcomes. He gave the name "practical-political theology" to his theological model because he believed that its major task was to "promote the Church as the prophetic voice of Christian freedom thereby standing up for human subjects against the technocratic megamachine of society."[69] Metz understood memory, then, in two ways, firstly as "a basic category of practical reason" and secondly as "essentially the remembrance of suffering and freedom."[70] This remembrance of suffering and freedom includes the memory of Israel's slavery and its liberation, and the death and resurrection of Jesus, both of which, from a faith perspective as well as from the perspective of Christian identity, are key illustrations of Metz's explanation of the category of memory.

Dangerous Memory

There is, however, another type of memory, according to Metz. These are the memories that shock people out of their complacency with the familiar, and force them to acknowledge the reality of human suffering. He calls these memories of human suffering "dangerous memories" because they "interrupt" the acceptance of "the way things are" and "reveal new and dangerous insights for the present."[71] The revelation of these dangerous insights can be seditious because they question what have become acceptable traditions and practices in society. For Christians memories of suffering in this context are particularly dangerous because those memories "make demands on us,"[72] and by "breaking through the grip of prevailing consciousness" they "make the present unsafe."[73] However, as Hall points out, it is "the memory of God – as the memory of suffering and danger – [that] calls Christians to enter into solidarity with the living

---

[69] Hall, "Retrieving Memory, Narrative and Solidarity," 4.
[70] Russell A. Butkus, "Dangerous Memory: The Transformative Catholic Intellectual" in *As Leaven in the World: Perspectives on Faith, Vocation, and the Intellectual Life,* ed. (Thomas M. Landy, (Wisconsin: Sheed and Ward, 2001), 58.
[71] Metz, "Faith in History and Society,"171.
[72] Metz, "Faith in History and Society," 109.
[73] Metz, "Faith in History and Society," 200.

and the dead."[74]

By linking the memories of past suffering to the historical facts Metz devised a theological model where the "forgotten suffering, suppressed hopes, vanquished possibilities are allowed a meaning in a sacred and messianic history."[75]

Memory and Narrative in the Christian tradition – *memoria passionis*, anamnesis.

The impact of Metz's interaction with Benjamin enabled him to appreciate the power of story, symbol and metaphor in preference to a purely theoretical approach to narrative. Memory for Metz was "always narrative in form," and in "the form of dangerous and liberating stories,"[76] a form Butkus recognised as being the "inextricable link" between narrative and memory in Metz's theology."[77] For Metz, the Christian faith was the narration of a particular memory of the "dangerous memory" of the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the *memoria passionis*, *mort*is *et resurrectionis Jesus Christi.*

In the Catholic celebration of the Eucharist, the prayer of 'thanksgiving,' memory is central, where failures of the community are acknowledged but blessings are also remembered; where the memory of the Last Supper is recalled together with the 'dangerous memory' of Jesus' suffering and experience of injustice. Indeed, the Christian memory includes "passion, suffering and victims; it becomes a 'dangerous memory', in that it confronts a triumphant or complacent society with the injustice and victims that that society created."[78]

A key word for Metz is *'anamnesis'*, which is derived from the Greek word for remembering, but can be more accurately translated as "un-forgetting". He judged this

---

[74] Hall, "Retrieving Memory, Narrative and Solidarity," 7.

[75] Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, "Introduction," *Faith and the future: essays on theology, solidarity, and modernity* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), xvi.

[76] Metz, "Faith in History and Society," 110.

[77] Butkus, "Dangerous Memory," 58.

78 Roger Dawson, "Dangerous Remembrance" in Thinking Faith: The online journal of the Jesuits in Britain, (2013). http://www.thinkingfaith.org. (accessed November 11, 2013.

'un-forgetting' to be an important aspect because it was needed not only for overcoming the forgetfulness of victims, past and present but because it also became a way of being exposed to the sufferings of others. Significantly, *anamnesis* is also the term used to describe the prayer at the Eucharist, the central Catholic liturgical prayer, in which participants are reminded that Jesus told his followers at the Last Supper to "do this in memory of me."

> To break bread so as to keep alive his dangerous memory, is to strive to be a 'messianic' rather than a 'bourgeois' Christianity. It is to recognize that there will be an end time, and that the Messiah will return.[79]

This approach brings into question assumptions in relation to political, financial and social power and violence, and "opens eyes" to the sufferings of others, particularly those who are innocent. There are three particularly relevant and significant areas of memory identified by Hall, forms of memory which enable Christians to connect faith with the misery and oppression of human life. These are 1) the memory of suffering, 2) the memory of guilt and 3) God's remembrance. Hall maintains "Christianity's task is to keep alive the memory of the crucified Lord as a counterpart to the deceptively weak middle-class hope which is devoid of a social and political conscience in the interests of others' sufferings."[80] The power and effectiveness of the category of narrative in relation to political theology will be dealt with more fully in a later chapter.

Memory and Solidarity

From a moral position engaging justice, responsibility and human compassion, Metz observed the importance of the concept of solidarity and incorporated it into his theological model. "The notion of solidarity with the historical victims of violence and

---

79 Michael Kirwan, "Awakening Dangerous Memories," The Way, 47/4 (2008): 25-36 [32] http://www.theway.org.uk/Back/474Kirwan.PDF (accessed July 26, 2015).
80 Hall, "Retrieving Memory, Narrative and Solidarity," 5.

oppression is an important notion in recent theology."[81] He wrote:

> Like memory and narrative, it [solidarity] is one of the
> fundamental definitions of a theology and a Church which aims
> to express its redeeming and liberating force in the history of
> human suffering, not above their heads and ignoring the
> problem of their painful-non-identity.[82]

For Metz, solidarity with the poor, suffering and oppressed peoples, strengthens

Christian identity and gives direction to those opposing bourgeois individualism. This

important category will be examined more closely in a later chapter in order to address

these issues in a more comprehensive way.

Challenges to Metz's theological model.

Associated with Metz's three categories of memory, narrative and solidarity and

all that they contribute to his theological model, he specified "three major challenges

and crises that this political theology has sought above all to confront."[83]

> All three center on the question of suffering: they are in some
> manner "theodicy-intensive." I have grasped the conversation
> with *Marxism* as a coming to grips with the dramatization, in
> terms of social critique, of the question of suffering. *Auschwitz*,
> the *Holocaust*, or better, the *Shoa,* has thrust me more and more
> relentlessly before the question of why we hear and see so little
> of this horrible suffering – or, for that matter, of any of the story
> of the world's suffering – in our Christian theology. And the
> inclusion of the non-European world, especially the hitherto so-
> called "third world" into the purview of theology has shifted
> social suffering and misery, as well as the suffering of the
> (culturally, racially, ethnically) "other," quite into theodicy of
> theology's *logos*.[84]

These challenges influence and also give spirit, life and direction to Metz's

approach in the development of the practical-political model. Metz's theology challenges

Christians on so many levels. It calls Christians to hold dear the memory of suffering in

---

[81] Metz, "Solidarity" in Faith and History, 229.
[82] Metz, "Solidarity" in Faith and History, 229.
[83] Johann Baptist Metz and Jürgen Moltmann, Faith and Future: Essays on Theology, Solidarity, and Modernity (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1995), viii.
[84] Metz and Moltmann, Faith and Future, viii.

history and not to avoid the painful questions of injustice in the world. It challenges all to value solidarity with the suffering and the dead, and to see in the past the future; to reject the tenets of the middle-class complacency and seek instead to live out the dangerous memory of the Passion, a memory which constantly looks for a better social and political world for all people.[85] Hall explained these major challenges succinctly: Marxism (marking the end of cognitive innocence); Auschwitz (marking the end of idealist systems) and the Third World (marking the end of Eurocentrism).[86]

According to Metz, true participation in the Christian life requires remembrance of past and present events that involve suffering in the world; it involves honouring the stories of the narrators, both victims and perpetrators; and it demands standing in solidarity with those who have been wounded in the process. Metz's theological model is distinguishable by the focus he placed on these categories of memory, narrative and solidarity. "Admitting that theology needs to be mystical as well as political, any practical theology of Christian engagement will be enhanced by the resources and insights which political theology provides."[87]

Significance of memory for the Jews

The American Jewish scholar, Yosef Yerushalmi, maintained, "the Jewish people were unique in elevating the very act of *remembering* to a religious imperative."[88] As the Biblical imperative of *remembering* is mentioned 169 times in the Torah, the significance of *memory* for the Jews is obviously important to them. It impacts on many different aspects of Jewish life, both private and communal, and consequently holds a major place

---

[85] Joseph Grayland, "Sixty years after Auschwitz: What does it mean for Christian Theology?" Compass: A Review of Topical Theology Vol. 9, No. 1 (2005). http://www.compassreview.org/autumn05/4.html (accessed February 9, 2015).

[86] Hall, "Retrieving Memory, Narrative and Solidarity," 4.

[87] Hall, "Retrieving Memory, Narrative and Solidarity," 9.

[88] Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1982)

in Jewish understanding and practices, both civil and religious. For the Jews *memory* is not confined to merely *remembering* the past but, as it has a strong influence in the spiritual domain, it relates very forcefully to essential religious principles that shape Jewish life in the present. In Jewish thinking *memory* is considered to be an asset because it is used to recall the history that gives meaning to what is most important to Jewish life and faith.

However, *memory* for the Jews can also be experienced as burdensome or challenging in its demands. It can have an impact similar to that of Metz's "dangerous memories." The impact of 20th century "interruptions" to Jewish life, not least of which has been the Sho'ah, has been extreme. This "interruption" has caused many Jews to question what have become acceptable traditions and practices within both Jewish and non-Jewish societies. Certainly, by looking back at their history the Jews have the opportunity to come to a better understanding of their past, but it is by their "*remembering*" of the past that they are provided with strength and hope for the present and for whatever is to come.

Features of Jewish memory

In Jewish consciousness *memory* is central, especially the *memory* of suffering and victimhood. "Moses said to the people, '*Remember* this day on which you came out of Egypt, out of the house of slavery, because the Lord brought you out from there by strength of hand.'" (Exodus 13:3 NRSV). In obedience to the Torah the Jews have frequently heard the stories of Jewish enslavement, discrimination, marginalisation and disenfranchisment, and over the years those stories have become an authentic feature of Jewish *memory*. "For seven days you shall eat . . . the bread of affliction . . . so that all the days of your life you may *remember* the day of departure from the land of Egypt." (Exodus 16:3).

'*Remembering'* is also foundational to the Jewish religious notion of justice, *tzedek*, which includes 'righteousness' and 'fairness." The very core of Judaism is in the Jewish formula for treating neighbours fairly and respecting their rights, their property and above all their person. It is the *memory* of the injustices and the sufferings borne by their forefathers that make the Jews determined, in justice, not to enslave or marginalise others. The injunction to "*remember*" the injustices of the past is foundational to the Jewish notions of justice and peace and provides the incentive for living peacefully and harmoniously in the community.

Influences – Torah, worship, call to good works.

The important influences on Jewish *memory* are closely related to the principal beliefs of Judaism namely, "Torah (the study of God's word), worship and the performance of good and charitable deeds."[89] Jewish spirituality is dependent on and revolves around the study of Torah, from which the Jews find religious wisdom. One of the important religious traditions for the Jews, a command of the Torah, is to *remember* each day at the conclusion of morning prayers, six particular events in their history, *memories* that tell the story of God's continual care for the people and the people's commitment to follow God's commands.[90]

Traditionally, Shabbat is a time for spiritual refreshment but it, too, is a day for *memories* when family and friends gather in groups to recall old *memories* and to create new ones. The Jews don't just commemorate, they *remember*. They don't just recount someone else's story they re-live their own.

---

[89] Morris Kertzer, *What is a Jew?* Revised by A. Hoffman (New York, NY: Touchstone,1999), 110
[90] The six remembrances bring to mind not only the key elements of the Torah but the living faith that it inspires. Three of the six particular events teach positive lessons of freedom (Exodus) Deuteronomy 16:3, ethics (Sinai) Deuteronomy 4:9-10; leisure and rest (Sabbath) Exodus 20:8; three provide negative warning – dangers of hate crimes (Amalek) Deuteronomy 25: 17-19; idolatory (the golden calf) Deuteronomy 9:7 and slander (Miriam) Deuteronomy 24:9.

The Passover Seder, recalling and remembering the Exodus, is one of the most ancient of Jewish religious observances, but it is always a contemporary event. It involves the recitation of particular passages from the Torah and rabbinic texts, the singing of traditional songs and the use of many long-established symbols and specific foods. In fact, Rosen suggests "we actually ingest and imbibe the experience, in accordance with the words of the *Haggadah* that 'in each and every generation, a person must see himself as if he himself came out of Egypt'."[91] In the recounting of the Israelites' exodus from Egypt, the *memories* focus on the central and foundational event of the nation of Israel. Though it is a story of ancient times, those who participate are encouraged to recall the events and to participate by *remembering* that they also are among those redeemed from slavery in Egypt.

The "collective *memories*" of the Jewish people are a function of their shared faith, cohesiveness and will of the group itself. Through complex and inter-locking social and religious institutions collective *memories* are used to transmit and to re-create the past.[92] This is why much of Jewish tradition and ritual draws on re-enactment, which in turn influences Jewish *memory*. When Yerushalmi wrote about history and *memory* he made it clear that "if there is a secret to Judaism's survival . . . it must surely be Judaism's success in making individuals "*remember*" things that never happened to them personally."[93] This concept is similar to the Catholic liturgical concept of *anamnesis,* which is not merely a recollection of a past event, but the 'making present' of an object or person from the past. These *memories* not only unite the community with the past but they give new life to individuals within communities enabling them to act responsibly and with compassion and justice towards others.

[91]David Rosen, "Memory Community and Identity – A Jewish Perspective," Presentation at the eighth Anglican-Jewish Commission meeting, Dublin, Nisan 5714; Spring 2014. http://www.rabbidavidrosen.net/Articles/Judaism/Memory_Community_and_Identity_Anglican-Jewish_Commission_Dublin_March2014.pdf (accessed October 23, 2014)

[92] Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1982)

[93] Rosen, "Memory Community and Identity – A Jewish Perspective."

Jewish *memories* are created and reinforced by the repetition of the stories contained in the Torah, by various worship experiences and by the individual and community performance of good works.

> For Jews, the paradigmatic story that we read over and over again is how God brought us out of Egypt, took us to Mount Sinai, gave us the Torah, and led us to the promised land, which is still the sacred center of our universe.[94]

Challenges

The subject of memory presents many challenges for the Jews. The memories of past events that involved adverse treatment of the Jews are naturally met with resentment, and related societal and religious negative attitudes toward Judaism have caused painful memories. In addition, current pressures to adapt to modernity conflict with the *memory* of previously deep-rooted traditions. Sendor suggests that while *memories* need to be re-visited, there are several memories that need to be purified in order for their negative impact to be removed or lessened. He "grapples with the challenge of developing a theory of memory that does not keep the Jewish state of mind fixed in a mental space of victimhood and isolation."[95] In response to that challenge he promotes confronting past *memories* believing that confrontation enables the negative memories of the past to be transformed into a more harmonious present. This attitude is similar to what Pope John Paul referred to as "the purification of memory"[96] or "the healing of memory."

---

[94] Kertzer, *What is a Jew?* 278.
[95] Meir Sendor, "The Malleability of Collective Memory" in *Memory and Hope: Forgiveness, Healing and Interfaith Relations,* ed. Alon Goshen-Gottsein (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2015), 25.
[96] International Theological Commission, "Mercy and Reconciliation: The Church and the Faults of the Past," 1999.

Application of the category of *memory* to Catholic-Jewish dialogue

This chapter has focused on Metz's theory of memory and its significance in both Catholic and Jewish religious traditions. Applying the different concepts of memory to Catholic-Jewish dialogue provides a firm foundation for sincere and respectful ongoing discussion. Awareness of the other person's background, religious and life experiences, and the mutual acknowledgement of common social and ethical goals are positive factors that contribute to greater understanding, self-reflective learning, and the healing of memories for both groups. This openness is essential for ongoing, productive interfaith dialogue.

From this perspective, the practical application of *memory* in the furthering of Catholic-Jewish dialogue enables participants:

    i. to acknowledge the conflicting *memories*, and to dialogue about those *memories* with honesty and sensitivity

    ii. to listen to each other's perceptions and descriptions of the same historical *memories*, events and realities and to learn from one another by seeing those events through different eyes

    iii. to heal past hurts and bring about a two-way *Teshuva* - real reconciliation - by jointly dealing with negative *memories*. A safe and positive environment is essential for the giving and receiving of forgiveness for past offences and for any participation in the "purification of *memories."*

The Australian context

In the aftermath of the Second World War, approximately 27,000 survivors of the Holocaust migrated to Australia. In fact, Melbourne's Jewish community has the highest percentage of Holocaust survivors of any Jewish community in the world, outside of Israel. They brought with them not only their Jewish faith and traditions but they also brought memories of their recent pain, sorrow and loss. They carried deep within them the most repeated line in the Torah "you were strangers in the land of Egypt" which, together with many other Jewish teachings gave them courage to

support one another, particularly the weak, the vulnerable and the ill in their communities. Their experiences made them particularly sensitive to the plight of other refugees and migrants and inspired many of them to enact the Jewish principles of *tikkun olam* – repairing the world through social action and the pursuit of social justice; *chesed* – kindness; and *tzedakah* – promoting justice or fairness. While they quickly became self-reliant, their painful memories remained. Applying the principles of *memory* to the sharing of their experiences, including the antisemitic prejudice suffered by many Jewish refugees on their arrival in Australia, would enable both Jewish and non-Jewish Australians to experience meaningful exchange of memories. This experience would assist in furthering dialogue and provide opportunities for even greater and more open dialogue.

Compatibility with Receptive Ecumenism.

The relevant question to be addressed is: Is this understanding of memory compatible with Paul Murray's model of Receptive Ecumenism? Does Metz's approach to memory and the Jewish concept of memory fit the model of Receptive Ecumenism? Using Murray's own explanation that "the *primary emphasis in Receptive Ecumenism is upon learning* rather than teaching" I propose that, even though the theological issues in Murray's model are explicitly Christian, the principles and strategies of Receptive Ecumenism are applicable to Jewish-Catholic dialogue and are compatible with its aims. Murray's understandings or categories of "*reception*" are compatible with Catholic-Jewish dialogue and are compatible with the concepts and practices of memory as described.

In this context "reception" is used to assist in developing awareness of different experiences and aspects of human interaction and exchange, accentuating that human openness and respect for the other and the other's memories are essential. Understandably *reception* is basic to the concept of *memory* as it engages dialogue

partners in remembering positive and negative practices and recalling past and present experiences of *reception* and hospitality or being exposed to their absence, socially, civic-ly or inter-religiously. *Spiritual reception* provides the opportunity for dialogue partners to reflect on, to remember and to describe spiritual experiences and the varying approaches to spirituality in their lives including their relationship with their God. *Spiritual reception* is a personal, intra-religious and an inter-religious exercise and experience through which dialogue partners can gain greater understanding and appreciation of their own faith tradition and respect for the faith tradition of the other partner. For the Jewish partners, *spiritual reception* has special significance and a special relationship with *memory* as they are directed to "remember" significant aspects of their religious history such as the Passover (the exodus from Egypt) and Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement), and personal religious experiences such as bar or bat mitzvah. In the same way Catholics remember significant feasts such as Christmas and Easter, their First Communion day and the reception of other Sacraments. While both *theological reception* and *hermeneutical reception* are linked to *memory* they also have strong links with *narrative* and those links will be developed more thoroughly in a later chapter.

Conclusion

It is evident that the principles of Metz's political theology and, in particular, his category of memory, have a useful contribution to make to the development of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia. It is also clear that this approach is compatible with the principles of Receptive Ecumenism as outlined in Murray's model. The next chapter will outline the theory and the various approaches to inter-religious dialogue and examine the model of Receptive Ecumenism as developed by Paul Murray.

Chapter 3: Theory and Practice
Catholic-Jewish Inter-Religious Dialogue/Reception

Introduction

Early post-World War II pioneering attempts at organising Christian-Jewish Dialogue were, in principle, responses to the malicious carnage that had occurred prior to and during that war. For example, the establishment of the International Council of Christians and Jews in Oxford in 1946 and the 1947 Seelisberg Conference jointly convened in Switzerland by the French Jewish author Jules Isaacs and Catholic priest Paul Denmann, were specific responses to the past incidents, atrocities and horrific events that focused on the *Sho'ah* and its connection to Christian anti-Semitism.

The World Council of Churches, on the other hand, grew from the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910, and its aims were supported and encouraged by the 1920 suggestion of the Ecumenical Patriarch of the Easter Orthodox Church who was urging "closer cooperation among separated Christians." In 1937 there was an agreement among some of the Christian Churches to establish a World Council of Churches. But this was deferred until 1948, three years after the end of World War II, when delegates of 147 churches assembled in Amsterdam. That particular Assembly, however, was criticised for urging conversion of Jews so soon after the *Sho'ah*. Fortunately, since that period, there have been numerous efforts by the official teachers and guides of both Catholic and Jewish communities and by the WCC to develop more integrated and comprehensive approaches to dialogue between Christians and Jews.

My focus here is on the models, principles, approaches, proposals and methods of Catholic-Jewish dialogue that have emerged from those and other initiatives. Essential attributes for successful inter-religious dialogue are discussed and obstacles to dialogue are canvassed with a view to identifying ongoing challenges and establishing positive steps to overcome barriers to Catholic and Jewish dialogue.

Different models of inter-religious dialogue

Over time, various theories and models of inter-religious dialogue, ranging from the elementary to the more complex, have evolved. These theories have emerged from diverse disciplines and understandings of the concepts, principles and purposes of dialogue in general, and are applied to inter-religious relations. Some models consider inter-religious dialogue to be as simple as people meeting together in the daily activities of ordinary life, speaking about their lives and, when the occasion arises, discussing their different faith traditions. On the other hand, Paul Knitter, a renowned scholar in this field, describes religious dialogue as a more intricate process involving the ability to experience the other person's religious worldviews, commitments, values and rituals.[1] He understands inter-religious dialogue as a new way of relating and understanding, but points out that dialogue is more about tolerance than domination, and collaboration rather than 'winning'.[2]

The *Dialogue Decalogue* shaped by Swidler proposes ten basic ground rules for interreligious and inter-ideological dialogue.[3] The primary objective of this Decalogue, which has goals similar to those of Cardinal Cardijn's *Catholic Action Movement,*[4] is for participants "to learn from one another, to grow in perception and then to act accordingly."[5] The Tenth Commandment of Swidler's model, states:

> Each participant eventually must attempt to experience the partner's religion or ideology 'from within'; for religion or ideology is not merely something of the head, but also of the spirit, heart, and 'whole being,' individual and communal.[6]

---

1 Paul F. Knitter, *Jesus and the Other Names* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis,1996), 14

[2] Paul F. Knitter, "The Necessity and Possibility of Interreligious Dialogue," Theologies of Religious Pluralism, Berkley Centre: Faith and Life Lecture Series, accessed February 23, 2015, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DnjQhsF8oNg.

[3] Leonard Swidler, "Dialogue Decalogue: Ground Rules for Interreligious, Interideological Dialogue," *The Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 20:1 (1984): 1-4.

[4] Note: Belgian, Cardinal Joseph Cardijn, (1882-1967) began the Catholic Action Movement, *Young Christian Workers*, which spread to 109 countries during his lifetime. The Movement developed the "See – Judge – Act" process of action by which it was identified.

[5] Swidler, "Dialogue Decalogue," article 1.

[6] Swidler, "Dialogue Decalogue," article 10.

Another voice supporting this particular view of interreligious dialogue is Raimon Panikkar's with his emphasis on an "often-neglected notion," an inner dialogue with oneself - *intra-religious dialogue.* Panikkar cautions anyone taking part in inter-religious dialogue that "the new field of the religious encounter is a challenge and a risk. . . . He [the one taking part] may lose his life – he may also be born again."[7] Similarly, Clooney centres on the importance of personal conversion and the transformation of hearts that occurs for those participating in the dialogical process.[8] He frequently acknowledges that in today's world of ever increasing religious diversity the challenge to be faced is not just the acquisition of knowledge *about* the world's religions, but is actually a greater openness to spiritual transformation *by* them.[9]

The Catholic Church has also developed models of inter-religious dialogue, which are firmly based on principles outlined in its official documents. As previously noted, the most significant document in this area is *Nostra Aetate* (1965),[10] which explicitly addressed Christianity's unbroken relationship with the Jews[11] and clearly defined the Catholic Church's attitude to other religions. The most basic understanding of *dialogue* is dealt with in many other Council documents such as *Lumen Gentium* (1964),[12] *Gaudium Et Spes* (1965),[13] and *Ad Gentes* (1965).[14] Pope John Paul II's 1990 *Encyclical Redemptoris Missio*[15] encourages respect for all human beings as they search for answers

---

[7] Panikkar, *The Intra-Religious Dialogue,"* 27.

[8] Francis X. Clooney, "Comparative Theology and Inter-Religious Dialogue", *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue* (ed C. Cornille), (Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2013), 58.

[9] Clooney, *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning Across Religious Borders* (Chichester, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2010), 8-10.

[10] Vatican II Council, *Nostra Aetate* (hereafter *NA*), *Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions*, in The Documents of Vatican II: Vatican Translation (Strathfield, NSW: St Paul's, 2009), 387-390.

[11] *NA*, 4.

[12] Vatican II Council, *Lumen Gentium* (hereafter *LG), Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, in The Documents of Vatican II: Vatican Translation 17-24. 16, 30.

[13] Vatican II Council, *Gaudium et Spes* (hereafter *GS*), *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, in The Documents of Vatican II: Vatican Translation, 125-197. 21,139.

[14] Vatican II Council, *Ad Gentes* (hereafter *AG*), *Decree on the Mission Activity of the Church*, in The Documents of Vatican II: Vatican Translation, 339-373. Art 11, 348-49

[15] Pope John Paul II Encyclical Letter, *Redemptoris Missio* (hereafter *RM*), 7 December, 1990.

to the deep questions of life[16] and teaches that active inter-religious dialogue is fundamental to the apostolic mission of church members:[17] "each member of the faithful and all Christian Communities are called to practice dialogue, although not always to the same degree or in the same way."[18] *RM* reinforces the view, expressed in many official Catholic Church documents, that "the kingdom is the concern of everyone: individuals, society, and the world."[19] In the spirit of Panikkar, Hall gives support to this directive, placing the emphasis on the benefits for personal transformation. He writes:

> Interfaith dialogue is not a luxury for the few but a requirement of the many, and its implications reach well beyond establishing positive relations among the religions themselves to being a catalyst for personal, social and cultural transformation.[20]

However, for members of the Jewish community with their vastly different history, particular interpretations of events and succession of horrific experiences, inter-religious dialogue has not been a central concern, or a "risk or challenge" many are prepared to take. In explaining the background to their situation, Rabbi Lawrence Hoffman observed that historically Jews have gone through three distinct stages or models in their interaction with Christians, namely *disputation*, *diplomacy* and currently the *new dialogue*.[21] He explains that as far back as the Middle Ages the common form or model of Jewish-Christian relations was through *disputation*, which was characteristically heavily weighted against the Jews taking part in the dispute. With the coming of modernity, a *diplomatic* model was introduced and citizens were encouraged to treat other citizens, whatever their religious differences, with civility. The diplomatic model involves participants coming together, sharing aspects of their respective faiths

---

[16] *RM*, 29, 37.
[17] *RM*, 55, 56.
[18] *RM*, 57.
[19] *RM*, 59.
[20] Gerard Hall, "The Call to Interfaith Dialogue," Australian eJournal of Theology 5 (2005),1.
[21] Lawrence Hoffman, "My People's Passover Haggadah" ed. (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2008), Vol.1, 34.

and striving to understand different factors, concepts and practices which are foreign to them. What is essential is that the participants engaging in this dialogue lay aside attempts to "missionise" or proselytise,[22] an activity that is usually accompanied by an attitude of exclusive superiority and can be equated with the spoken or unspoken belief that one's own religion is the "true" way, or effectively "the only way."[23]

This diplomatic approach was the model of dialogue Bishop Bede Heather proposed at the launch of the *Australian Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations* in 1992. It was a new approach at the time, a more diplomatic model of dialogue, where people were free to express their views, their beliefs, their opinions and their experiences, irrespective of their religious affiliation, and were able to be heard respectfully.[24] This diplomatic model of dialogue which encouraged more "open dialogue in an atmosphere of mutual respect" has been a contributing factor in the ongoing success of dialogue between the Australian Catholic and Jewish communities.

It is encouraging that, in some areas at the present time, Christian-Jewish relations have advanced from the *diplomacy* stage to an authentic *new dialogue* model where Jews and Christians are not only equal partners in the dialogue process but share a willingness to engage with one another.

These more recent changes, due largely to the views expressed in *NA,* have resulted in more positive efforts being made to achieve mutual understanding and appreciation. From a Catholic perspective it is imperative that consideration be given to ensuring that further attempts to engage with the Jewish community in inter-religious dialogue are sensitively adapted to meet the needs and the reality of all members.

---

[22]Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference: Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interfaith Relations. *Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations,* 1982. General Principles: Articles, 3, 4, 5.

[23]Academy for Cultural Diplomacy – Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, *Interfaith diplomacy. Examples of Interfaith Dialogue Achievements: Examples of Interfaith Dialogue that Contribute Toward the Understanding of Global Religious Traditions,* 2017 accessed January 1, 2018. www.culturaldiplomacy.org

[24]Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference: Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interfaith Relations. *Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations,* 1982. Introduction: Article 5.

Basic principles of Inter-Religious Dialogue

As has been previously indicated, developing Catholic theology of inter-religious dialogue resonates with Panikkar's model of inter- and intra-religious dialogue with its emphasis on "the religious encounter being a truly religious one."[25] Similarly, the World Council of Churches' *Guidelines on Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies*[26] states that the basic principles of successful dialogue are the opening of the mind and heart to others, an activity that involves risk and is impossible without sensitivity to the rich and varied life of others.

A vital Catholic Church document, *Dialogue and Mission,[27]* which took its inspiration from Pope Paul VI's 1964 many-layered call to 'dialogue' in *Ecclesiam Suam*,[28] was issued by the Pontifical Council for Non-Christian Religions[29] on Pentecost Sunday 1984. It went further in its defining of basic, guiding principles for Catholics engaged in inter-religious dialogue when it linked dialogue with proclamation of the Gospel. Dialogue with other religions is depicted as an authentic part of Christian life in the same way as having a prayerful and contemplative life, engaging in works for the development and advancement of humanity, taking up the fight against poverty and injustice,[30] and proclaiming the "Good News" by word and action. It also identified significant levels of inter-religious dialogue: dialogue that occurs in *daily life*; dialogue of people engaged in *joint social projects*; dialogue of formal theological exchange; and

---

[25] Panikkar, *The Intra-Religious Dialogue,* 26-47.
[26] World Council of Churches (2010). *Guidelines on Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies.* accessed November 15, 2014. http://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/wcc-programmes/interreligious-dialogueandcooperation/interreligious-trust-and-respect/guidelines-on-dialogue-with-people-of-livingfaiths-and-ideologies.
[27] Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue (PCID), *The Attitude of the Church Towards the Followers of Other Religions: Reflection and Orientations on Dialogue and Mission* (hereafter *DM*), 1984.
[28] Pope Paul VI, Encyclical Letter, *Ecclesiam Suam* (hereafter *ES*), 1964 accessed September 9, 2013. https://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_06081964_ecclesiam.html *ES* is a significant document as it presented a new theology of dialogue and collaboration with other religions.
[29] Known since 1988 as Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue – PCID.
[30] *DM*, 13.

dialogue of those who *share religious experiences.*[31]

In spite of this, there was still concern in some quarters that particular terminology used in *Dialogue and Mission* was problematic. Statements such as: "all persons are constantly called to this conversion. In the course of this process, the decision may be made to leave one's previous spiritual or religious situation in order to direct oneself towards another"[32] were questioned. 'Conversion', for example, appears to be used in the older/former sense of that term and not in the growing understanding of conversion as 'change of heart.' It is not unreasonable to recognise, then, that Section III A), *Mission and Conversion*, could result in misunderstanding, for members of other Christian traditions and particularly for members of the Jewish community who clearly remember the Catholic Church's previous attitude to the conversion of the Jews.

In 1991 the Pontifical Council for Inter-religious Dialogue (PCID) and the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples (CEP) jointly produced *Dialogue and Proclamation*[34] which outlined, under the general headings of "Inter-religious Dialogue" (§14-32) and "Inter-religious Dialogue and Proclamation" (§77-89), the Catholic Church's ongoing commitment to developing relations with other faith traditions. At the outset, the document confirmed the Catholic Church's dedication to proclaiming Christ's Gospel[36] and its resoluteness in fulfilling the principal elements of mission, as previously outlined in *Dialogue and Mission.*[38]

That document clearly states that the goal of a Christian life is the communication of the Gospel message, "the mystery of salvation realized by God for all in Jesus Christ by

---

[31] *DM*, 28 - 35.
[32] *DM*, 37.
[34] Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue and Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples: *Dialogue and Proclamation*: *Reflections and Orientations on Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ*, (hereafter *DP*), 1991.
[36] *DP*, 2.
[38] *DM*, 9 – 19.

the power of the Spirit."[39] It also states that the witness of a Christian life, everything that a Christian does, is a form of proclamation of the Christian faith.[40]

In relation to the understanding of inter-religious dialogue, it also explains that dialogue "includes both witness and the exploration of respective religious convictions."[41] It makes very clear that the specific goal is to "enter into dialogue and collaboration" and by so doing, reach better understanding of and respect for the other.[42] This document clearly stresses that dialogue is not a time for direct or subtle attempts to convert the dialogue partner.[43] If this is true in general, how much more so must it be true when the dialogue is with the Jews, the one people who share so much of sacred scripture with Christians and, as the 2002 Pontifical Biblical Commission document also states, from whom "we have so much to learn in understanding the scriptures we share."[44]

More recently (2015) the Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews released a document outlining developments in the Church's stance towards Judaism, including the fact that, in order to find salvation, Jews do not need to be converted to Catholicism, since God did not revoke the covenant made with Israel.

> The Church is therefore obliged to view evangelization to Jews, who believe in the one God, in a different manner from that to people of other religions and world views. . . . In concrete terms this means that the Catholic Church neither conducts nor supports any specific institutional mission work directed towards Jews.[45]

It is hoped, then, that dialogue with people of other religions will lead all participants, in the spirit of Panikkar's *intra-religious dialogue*, to a deeper

---

[39] *DP*, 10

[40] *DP*, 10.

[41] D*P*, 9.

[42] *DP,* 17.

[43] *DP,* 40.

[44] *DP*, 40, 41; Pontifical Biblical Commission: *The Jewish People and their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible,* (hereafter *TJPATSS),* 2002, 9, 11, 87.

[45] Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews: *The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable,* (hereafter *TGATC*), 2015, 40.

commitment and will ultimately bring about that deeper internal 'conversion' -

"the humble and penitent return of the heart to God.[46]

Importantly, it must be stated that the Catholic Church's position in relation to the issue of conversion[47] was clarified in *Dialogue and Proclamation*. What was previously understood by 'conversion' was based on the knowledge that for centuries the church believed and explicitly taught, that "outside the church there is no salvation."[48] Knitter explains what *Dialogue and Proclamation* states clearly, that "the Church teachers recognize that the goal of dialogue is not primarily conversion to a particular religion but 'conversion to God.'"[49]

The issuing in September 2000 of the Declaration, *Dominus Iesus* [50] by the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, again provoked concerns not only among many non-Catholics and Jews but also among members of the Catholic community engaged in inter-religious dialogue. There were theologians who were critical because, in their opinion, many of the negative statements cast a shadow over Vatican II's positive attitudes. References to the "followers of other religions" being in "a gravely deficient situation in comparison with those who, in the Church, have the fullness of the means of salvation," and again, "the necessity of conversion to Jesus and of adherence to the Church through baptism,"[51] caused confusion and indignation in light of other more encouraging approaches. In defence of that document some Catholic scholars viewed what were judged to be negative statements as an attempt to draw a line or limit within the church for its theological thoughts, rather than as a denial of other religions. Others

---

[46] *DP*, 11; *DM*, 37.
[47] *DP*, 11.
[48] The expression "outside the Church there is no salvation" comes from the Latin phrase *"extra Ecclesiam nulla salus"* which was written by St Cyprian of Carthage, a 3rd century bishop of the Catholic Church. As a result of the developments in theology and inter-religious dialogue during and following the Second Vatican Council, the Catholic Church has promoted a different and more enlightened interpretation of that phrase.
[49] Paul F. Knitter, "The Necessity and Possibility of Interreligious Dialogue," Theologies of Religious Pluralism, Berkley Centre: Faith and Life Lecture Series, accessed February 23, 2015, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DnjQhsF8oNg.
[50] Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: *Dominus Iesus*, (hereafter *DI*), 2000.
[51] *DI,* 22.

thought that the main objective of the Declaration was to curb the theories of relativism and religious pluralism being promoted by some theologians.[52]

In spite of misunderstandings and misleading interpretations, these significant documents[53] further clarified the Catholic Church's position on inter-religious dialogue. As a result, those involved in dialogue began to understand that dialogue "means not only discussion, but also includes all positive and constructive inter-religious relations with individuals and communities of other faiths which are directed at mutual understanding."[54] It involves, as the documents make clear, learning respect for and from each other, accepting differences and being prepared to change one's attitude.

Attributes for successful participation in Inter-Religious Dialogue and obstacles to be overcome

Naturally, different histories, backgrounds, understanding and attitudes impinge on the success of the dialogue process and on the participants' ability to dialogue in a constructive way. There are, of course, specific attributes that are essential to successful, meaningful participation in inter-religious dialogue. Ideally, faith is a significant component of a person's life journey and it is faith in one's own tradition that encourages the constant seeking of God as one travels the inter-religious journey. In a letter to Bishops' Conferences in 1999, Cardinal Arinze wrote that the "Christian who meets other believers is not involved in an activity that is marginal to his or her faith. Rather it is something that arises from the demands of that faith. It flows from faith and should be nourished by faith."[55]

---

[52] *DI*, 4. Note: In an article in *Theological Studies,* 62, 2001, Thomas Rausch S.J. suggested that the CDIF may have exceeded its authority in *DI*; other theologians, including Francis Sullivan in "The Impact of Dominus Iesus on Ecumenism" queried various claims that were made, citing "the church of Christ *is* the Catholic Church" in contrast to what had previously been recommended, "*subsists in* (continues to exist fully in) the Catholic Church"; it was also evident to many that *DI* was an attempt to restrain the spread of relativism and to caution people against the writing of "pluralist" theologians, including Jacques Dupuis whose writing on pluralism, *Toward a Christian Theology of Religious Pluralism*, had been questioned by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

[53] The "significant documents" referred to here are *DM, DP and DI* in particular.

[54] *DM*, 3.

[55] Francis Cardinal Arinze, "Letter to Presidents of Bishops' Conferences on the Spirituality of Dialogue,"

Learning to listen to what the other person in the dialogue is saying, as well as listening to oneself in an attitude of 'spiritual listening', indicates an open mind and heart which is an essential attribute of authentic dialogue. In the Prologue to his Rule, St Benedict, the Father of Western Monasticism, described this type of listening as "listening with the ear of the heart."[56] *Dialogue and Proclamation* suggested examples of the dispositions required for successful dialogue and named obstacles that may arise in inter-religious dialogue. The dispositions cited suggest balance and readiness to be transformed; firm, clear religious convictions; humility devoid of bitterness and religious arrogance; prudence; patience in the face of contradiction; respectful sensitivity, inclining towards generosity, and openness to truth.[57]

Following the 1998 Plenary Assembly of the PCID Cardinal Arinze identified eight attributes required for a Catholic expression of a spirituality of Dialogue. He outlined belief in a loving God; willingness to follow in the footsteps of Christ; desire to be 'converted' to be changed; readiness to be prepared to 'witness' to one's faith identity; commitment to proclaim the faith by the way one lives; an enthusiasm to learn from and understand other believers; and the conviction to carry out this activity in faith, hope and love while being nourished by prayer and sacrifice.[58] In other words to be 'doers' of the Word not just 'hearers'.

Three inter-related attributes that are particularly recommended for participation in inter-religious dialogue are hospitality, humility and *metanoia*. The general concept of hospitality is very familiar to Catholics. Nevertheless, because of previous history of past divisions, exclusions and even hostilities, offering or accepting hospitality in an inter-religious context could be problematic for some. The hospitality

---

Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, (Vatican City, 1999).

[56] Terrence G. Kardong, *Benedict's Rule: A Translation and Commentary*. (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1996), Prologue, 1.

[57] *DP,* 47-54.

[58] Arinze, PCID, 1999, 2-9.

recommended welcomes and invites all to share their struggles, hardships, pain and joy, without judgment. Humility is also needed to acknowledge and accept the inadequacies and injustices of one's own tradition in order to achieve the much needed *metanoia* - the change of heart and spiritual conversion.

Conversely, there are many obstacles that prevent successful dialogue. These include stereotypical generalisations, historical prejudices and inaccuracies, insufficient education in one's own faith, lack of understanding of social norms, understanding and openness, self-sufficiency, intolerance and a polemical approach to discussion or dialogue.[59] As participation in inter-religious dialogue "is closely linked with the process of inculturation,"[60] the reality (that disclosure and/or criticism of things held dear may leave people extremely vulnerable and possibly defensive) cannot be ignored. For both Catholics and Jews this is a potentially difficult situation. Catholics have to deal with their past "high-handedness" in so many areas. Jews have to confront their past griefs and losses and what Rabbi Fred Morgan describes as their "ghetto mentality" which views inter-religious dialogue merely as a pathway to security and self-protection.[61] A leading Jewish figure in inter-religious dialogue circles in America, Leon Klenicki, aptly summarised that situation by stating that "through dialogue, Christianity must overcome the triumphalism of power, Judaism the triumphalism of pain."[62]

In the controversial parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) the story is told of an "outsider" (the Samaritan) providing compassion and hospitality to a wounded "enemy" (the Jewish traveller) who, in turn, had little option but to accept the

---

[59] Murray, *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning,* 19.

[60] Edward Idris Cardinal Cassidy, Rediscovering Vatican II: Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue, (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2005), 237.

[61] Rabbi Fred Morgan, "Pursuing Interfaith Dialogue: From Security to Redemption". Talk delivered at the Council of Christians and Jews (Vic), 21 June 2009, 4-5. Private manuscript.

[62] Leon Klenicki, *Nostra Aetate: A Jewish View* "From Disputation to Dialogue" 2005 Notre Dame de Sion. http://www.notredamedesion.org/en/dialogue_docs.php?a=3b&id=667 Quoted by Leon Klenicki, "Nostra Aetate: A Jewish View 'From Disputation to Dialogue'," in Nostra Aetate: Transforming the Catholic-Jewish Relationship, (ed. P Cunningham, Anti-Defamation League, 2005), 15.

necessary assistance provided by the "outsider." Here the Christian tradition has a powerful model of hospitality, humility and "change of heart". Some biblical scholars suggest that, in addition to the many classical interpretations of this parable, the familiar narrative contains an important message related to religious tolerance, and illustrates a model of dialogue to be used in relation to those classified as "the religious other".[64]

Philip Cunningham, a renowned Catholic writer and President of the International Council of Christians and Jews from 2015 until July 2017, explained that "the renewal catalyzed by Nostra Aetate can properly be described by the Greek word metanoia (Hebrew *teshuvah*), meaning a complete "turning," a total reorientation of attitude or action."[65] This has particular significance for this particular study of Catholic-Jewish dialogue as it creates a strong link with Metz's theology and his powerful categories of memory and narrative. Confronting past antagonisms, judgements, injustices and misunderstandings, honestly and compassionately, may assist in bringing about the necessary change of mind, heart and consciousness for those from both the Jewish and Catholic communities who participate in respectful dialogue.

Distinctive principles of Receptive Ecumenism

Cardinal Kasper, in the foreword to Paul Murray's *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*, referred to a briefing document circulated at the 2006 international colloquium on the subject of Receptive Ecumenism.[66] The document summed up in very clear terms exactly what is meant by the phrase *Receptive Ecumenism* and what its purpose is:

> Whilst the strategy espoused here is a mutual process in which each offers its own gifts as well as receiving from those of others, the primary emphasis is upon learning rather than

---

[64] Denis McBride, The Parables of Jesus (Ligouri, Missouri: Triumph, 1999):149-167

[65] Philip A. Cunningham, "Jewish-Catholic Relationship Transformed," http://archive.adl.org/main_interfaith/nostra_aetate, 2005.

[66] Cardinal Walter Kasper, President of the PCID, in Murray, *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*, vii

> teaching. That is, the ethic in the process of ecclesial learning, or Receptive Ecumenism, is one wherein each tradition takes responsibility for its own potential learning from others and is, in turn, willing to facilitate the learning of others as requested but without dictating terms and without making others' learning a precondition to attending to one's own.[67]

While this statement is specifically designed for *ecumenical* exchange/reception I propose that, while the theological issues are explicitly Christian, the principles or strategies are equally applicable to Catholic-Jewish dialogue. Key words or phrases, such as, "mutual process", "learning rather than teaching", "ecclesial learning", "responsibility", "without dictating the terms" all reinforce the broad structure of Murray's proposal and its key principles. I also suggest that Murray's different applications of the word 'reception', with appropriate modifications, could be adapted to develop a contemporary and more relevant model for inter-religious dialogue.[68]

This focus on the concept of "reception" is a central feature of Murray's approach to ecumenism. The significant emphasis he places on particular characteristics of "reception" illustrates its major significance for the "new" ecumenical process. This approach recommends and supports structural development in the areas of (1) human and (2) spiritual interaction; encourages (3) education at the appropriate levels in the areas of (4) theology, (5) scripture, (6) church tradition and (7) law; acknowledges, respects and responds to the wisdom and the (8) lived experience of all the faithful, the *sensus fidelium*; and encourages the process of "faith seeking understanding" through (9) questioning, and (10) informed interpretation. These aspects of Receptive Ecumenism are relevant to this study of Catholic-Jewish dialogue and will be utilised to develop a "fresh approach" to interfaith dialogue and to elicit meaningful responses to the questions – "What can *we* learn or receive, with integrity from the other, in order to facilitate our own growth together?" and "what *can* the two communities learn, and

---

[67] Murray, *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*, vii
[68] Murray, *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*, 19.

what do they *need* to learn from each other?"

Catholic and Jewish perceptions and understandings of Inter-Religious dialogue

A number of representative voices from both Catholic and Jewish traditions demonstrate various perspectives on inter-religious dialogue and reception. For example, while giving support to the fact that "the Catholic Church recognizes partners in dialogue as equal in dignity as human persons,"[69] Cardinal Tauran also acknowledged that many of its members are *disinterested* in inter-religious dialogue. He claims that some think that inter-religious dialogue is, "if not a betrayal of the mission of the Church to convert every person to Christ, a new method of winning members to Christianity." He also maintains that others believe it is "an effort to control the spread of other religions." His response to these sadly mis-informed comments was "inter-religious dialogue . . . is a journey in search of the truth . . . animated by and expressed in works of charity."[70] Unfortunately, these comments clearly indicate there is a serious lack of education in the area of inter-religious dialogue.

From an organisational perspective, it is clear to Reese that the indifference of "the parish and the people in the pews" is due to "the widespread ignorance of the laity on religious issues"[71] which confirms the sad lack of education not only of the laity - "the people in the pews" - but also acknowledges the absence of appropriate educational opportunities for parish leaders including the clergy. Rush, who suggests that a "receptive ecclesiology" is now required to "introduce more participatory and reciprocal structures of reception and dialogue in the church," holds a similar opinion on the educational gulf.[72] While, in Rush's estimation, this will be achieved only through what is

---

[69] Cardinal Jean-Louis Tauran, "It is a Journey in Search of the Truth," PCID Address Kenya (23 April, 2008), accessed October 13, 2014.
http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/cardinal-says-pope-giving-new-direction-to-dialogue.
[70] Tauran, "It is a Journey in Search of the Truth."
[71] Thomas Reese S.J., "Organizational Factors Inhibiting Receptive Catholic Learning" in *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism,* ed. Paul Murray (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 346-355.
[72] Ormond Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II*, (New York/Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2004), 78-85.

termed "a spirituality of reception", he acknowledges that such an innovation "would require the serious implementation of the principles of dialogue" at the Church's local and universal levels.

From a Jewish perspective, most members of the Jewish community are also not aware of the changes that have come about in inter-religious engagement since Vatican II. In 2014, Debra Weissman, the first Jewish woman to hold the position of President of the International Council of Christians and Jews (ICCJ), revealed that while the publication of *NA* nearly fifty years earlier was a "watershed event" in the history of Catholic-Jewish relations, "it had very little impact in Israel and even in the Diaspora, its influence in Jewish circles has been somewhat limited."[73] Many Jews question whether there is anything to be achieved by engaging in interfaith dialogue, while non-Jews appear to have a lack of understanding of Jewish history, the connection of Judaism to Christianity, and the current Jewish position.[74] One of the basic Jewish criticisms is that most Christians fail to see Judaism as a complete and vibrant faith in its own right, possessing its own integrity and meaning.[75]

Australia has indeed been fortunate to have senior Rabbis including Rabbi John Levi, Rabbi Raymond Apple and Rabbi Fred Morgan who are respected leaders of their own congregations and active contributors in the development of Catholic-Jewish relations. "We all know that much more has to be done in this field in both communities," Rabbi Apple admitted in a newspaper interview . . . "but we must not be satisfied with that, for we have so much in common that we can offer together to a

---

[73] Debra Weissman, "Has there been a response to Nostra Aetate?" in Edmund Chia and Fatih Erol Tuncer eds. Fitzroy, VIC: Australian Catholic University, 2014. *Paths to Dialogue in our Age: Australian Perspectives, Vol.II*. Conference, Australian Catholic University, Melbourne, 2014.

[74] Morgan, "Pursuing Interfaith Dialogue, 2. (For example see Peter Kohn, "Faith in Interfaith", *The Australian Jewish News* (AJN), February 13, 2009; Dvir Abramovich, "The Challenge of Interfaith", AJN February 20, 2009).

[75] Rabbi Fred Morgan, "Jewish-Christian Dialogue from Jewish Perspectives Over Five Decades," in Edmund Chia and Fatih Erol Tuncer eds. Fitzroy, VIC: Australian Catholic University, 2014. *Paths to Dialogue in our Age: Australian Perspectives,* Vol.1. Conference, Australian Catholic University, Melbourne, 2014.

troubled world."[76] But, unfortunately, not all Australian Jews share that level of commitment to Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

It must be acknowledged then, that challenges to Catholic-Jewish mutual understanding and issues around inter-religious reception, are numerous. For example, on rare occasions, when well-meaning but ill-equipped Australian Christians ventured into discussions they were overwhelmed to discover their Jewish partners in dialogue were decidedly not interested in theological matters, and that in fact, theological discussions for them were irrelevant. Rather, their concerns are "anti-Semitism, the integrity of the land of Israel and the inviolability of the State of Israel – all matters bearing on the security and safety for Jews in Australia, Israel and world wide."[77] According to Rabbi Morgan, the Jews are open in their admission that their main concerns are "self-orientated and self-motivated."[78] Understandably, the problem of *reception* for Jews is compounded by the historical experiences that make them suspicious of Christians. Equally, Christians carry a history of ignorance, lack of awareness and often resentment that impedes reception.[79]

These concerns were, and continue to be, inflamed by the trauma of the *Sho'ah*. In this situation, in Metz's judgment, it is vitally necessary for the Catholic parties in the dialogue to seriously listen to what their Jewish counterparts are saying of and about themselves.[80] He firmly believes that "the turning point in relations between Jews and

---

[76] Rabbi Raymond Apple, "In troubled days, religions need to find common ground," Sydney Morning Herald, November 3, 2005. Interview with Linda Morris. accessed November 3, 2005.
http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2005/11/02/1130823281445.html
[77] Rabbi Fred Morgan, "Pursuing Interfaith Dialogue: From Security to Redemption," Address to Council of Christians and Jews (21 June, 2009, 5. Private Manuscript.
Note: See also David Berger, "Jewish Christian Relations: A Jewish Perspective", in Naomi W. Cohen, ed., Essential Papers on Jewish-Christian Relations in the United States: Imagery and Reality (New York: New York University Press, 1990), 352f.
[78] Morgan, "Pursuing Interfaith Dialogue," 5.
[79] See Mary C. Boys and Sara S. Lee, *The Catholic-Jewish Colloquium: An Experiment in Interreligious Learning 1992-1995*, 23.
[80] Johann Baptist Metz, *The Emergent Church: The Future of Christianity in a Postbourgeois World*, Translated by Peter Mann (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 20.

Christians correspond to the radical character of the end point which befell us in Auschwitz."[81]

It is not surprising then that, while the lived history of the two groups may be worlds apart, the experiences of inter-religious dialogue as understood by members of the Jewish community do not differ greatly from those most Catholics have experienced since the Second Vatican Council. It seems that the basic concepts of inter-religious dialogue are still generally not known or understood by the "grass roots" members of either the Jewish or Catholic communities. That situation indicates there is still considerable educational work to be done in Australia to meet the challenges that inter-religious dialogue presents. Fortunately, as will be shown in the following sections, there is also sufficient willingness in specific groups within the two faith communities in Australia for the "new dialogue" journey to present fresh possibilities as together they attempt to encounter the presence of God in each other.

Significant initiatives of both Catholic and Jewish Communities:
Catholic Church initiatives.

Catholic Church leadership,[82] with the assistance of respected Catholic scholars, has facilitated dramatic changes in the thinking and attitudes within the Church, which in turn, has created a spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation between Catholics and Jews at the official level. This environment has produced several significant milestones in Catholic-Jewish relations beginning with the Second Vatican Council.

One of the most prominent themes to emerge from the Second Vatican Council was the "call" to engage in dialogue, a call that was promoted throughout the entire Council and which became synonymous with collaboration for many of the relationships within the Church specifically, but also with those from other faiths. Early in his

---

[81] Metz, *The Emergent Church*, 19.
[82] Note: Under the leadership of the modern Popes - Pope John XXIII (1958-63, Pope Paul VI (1963-78), Pope John Paul II (1978-2005), Benedict XVI (2005-13), Pope Francis (2013-) – the Catholic Church's commitment to dialogue with the Jewish community has strengthened.

pontificate, in *Ecclesiam Suam*,[83] Pope Paul VI set out a programme in three parts: *awareness* through reflection and vigilance; *renewal* through reform and obedience, poverty and love; and *dialogue* through Christian presence in the world, modelling itself on the dialogue of salvation but with a real approach to the world.[84] At the conclusion of the Council "dialogue" — not just discussion — became the focal point symbolising many of the aspirations of the Council, and it continues to be the goal of those seeking to understand the treasure of faith through understanding and acceptance, listening and honest conversation.

The concept of dialogue as "conversation" is a familiar one. It reflects the "new course" set by Pope John XXIII at the time of Vatican II and the emphasis placed on "conversation" in *Ecclesiam* Suam and subsequent Council documents. However, Whelan makes an interesting distinction between the two words "conversation" and "conversion" which is relevant to this discussion. He points out that the two words share the same etymological history "with two Latin words, *conversari* meaning 'to dwell,' 'to keep company with' or 'to abide,' and *convertere* meaning 'to change,' 'to convert', 'to refresh.'"[85] He explains "the first, the *conversari*, is a movement towards the other . . . in some positive and creative way. The second, *convertere*, is a movement towards myself . . . as I open myself to discovery and change in and through this encounter."[86] He likens the process to "leaping into the hermeneutic circle"[87] described by Paul Ricoeur in his theory of interpretation. "Engaging in conversation," Whelan writes, "is submitting

---

[83] *Ecclesiam Suam*, 1964. Articles 8-15.
[84] Dom Alberic Stacpoole, OSB, "Introduction", in *Vatican II Revisitied: By Those Who Were There*, ed. (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986), 8.
[85] Michael Whelan, "Ways of Knowing: Clearing the Ground for Conversation," Paper presented at the International Philosophy, Science and Theology Festival, 2007. 2. accessed June 13, 2015. http://aejt.com.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/92536/Ways_of_Knowing.pdf
[86] Whelan, "Ways of Knowing" 1.
[87] Note: Paul Ricoeur (1981) used the term hermeneutic arc to describe the movement back and forth between a naïve and an in-depth interpretation of text. The point I think Whelan makes is that engagement in interreligious conversation requires (1) examination of what is heard or read (2) understanding and, if necessary, explanation of external factors that impact on what is said, and a greater understanding of the one who speaks, which leads to (3) a new and increased revelation and understanding of oneself as the "interpreter" of the information. The 'arc' or 'circle' involves examination, explanation, understanding, interpretation or "appropriation" resulting in increased knowledge and understanding of self.

oneself and one's world view to interpretation and reinterpretation . . . in an exploration and discovery process that is at once about the world and about me."[88]

Another significant initiative occurred in 1974 when Pope Paul VI established the "Pontifical Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews". It was this Commission that was responsible for producing the *Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration Nostra Aetate.*[89]   *Notes on the Correct Way to Present Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church*[90] followed in 1985. Both these initiatives were seen as positive educational opportunities indicating the Church's sincerity and the importance it placed on furthering dialogue. Pope John Paul II's historic visit to the Great Synagogue in Rome in 1986 demonstrated to the entire Christian world that the Catholic Church officially recognised Judaism as an authentic world religion. In 1993 another initiative of historic and political significance occurred with the signing of the "Full Diplomatic Accord"[91] when the Holy See recognised the existence of the State of Israel and reiterated the Holy See's condemnation of anti-Semitism directed against the Jewish race and individual Jews anywhere.

Further initiatives occurred under the leadership of Cardinal Cassidy, when, in 1998, the Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews issued *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah*[92] in which the Holocaust (*Sho'ah*) and the issue of forgiveness (*Teshuvah*) were addressed publicly. While this document was seen by many as a very positive initiative for Christian-Jewish reconciliation, others were more reserved in their

---

[88] Whelan, "Ways of Knowing:" 2.
[89] *Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration Nostra Aetate* (n. 4), Pontifical Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, 1 December, 1974. Johannes Card. Willebrands, President; Pierre-Marie de Contenson, O.P., Secretary.
[90] *Notes on the Correct Way to Present Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church*, 6 March, 1982. Johannes Card. Willebrands, President; Pierre Duprey, Vice- President; Jorge Meija, Secretary.
[91] Fundamental Agreement Between the Holy See and The State of Israel, Signed in Jerusalem, 30 December, 1993 which corresponds to the sixteenth day of the month of Tevet, in the year 5754. Mgr. Claudio N. Celli, For the Holy See and Dr. Yossi Beilin, For the Government of the State of Israel.
[92] *We Remember: A Reflection on the **Shoah***, Commission for Religious Relations With the Jews, 16 March, 1998. Cardinal Edward Idris Cassidy, President; The Most Reverend Pierre Duprey, Vice-President; The Rev. Remi Hoeckman O.P., Secretary.

responses. The International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations, for example, acknowledged and welcomed sections such as those warning against the dangers of antisemitism, the "unequivocal challenge" the document presented, and "the clear affirmation (that) goes far beyond previous Vatican documents on the subject." But they also expressed their 'disappointment' that "the document only hints at the reality which is succinctly presented in some of the Bishops' statements."[93]

Lindsay, on the other hand, acknowledges that *We Remember* "was both laudable and timely," but at the same time he identifies several instances where, in his opinion, it "missed the mark. "[94] Among his claims are that "institutional guilt is relegated to irrelevancy" and "institutional culpability is diluted to become simply 'remembrance.' [95]

In spite of the flaws that were identified, from a Catholic perspective this was a significant initiative that brought about positive development in the relationship with their Jewish brothers and sisters. In spite of the criticisms, the Jewish leaders affirmed much of what the document was attempting to achieve while at the same time acknowledging the unequivocal challenge that it presented.

In 2000 Pope John Paul II took the initiative to visit the *Yad Vashem Museum* in Jerusalem and to join in prayer at the Western Wall, a most sacred Jewish site. Both actions publicly affirmed the validity of Judaism and the Jewish people's faith and hopes. The fact that Pope Benedict did the same in 2009 confirmed those gestures as belonging to the Church as much as to individuals, and potentially made these and other personal initiatives templates for his successors and models for all Christians to follow.

Pope Francis' Pontificate represents a new chapter of deeper understanding and friendship between Jews and Catholics. At the time of the Pope's election the director of

---

[93] International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations. Response to Vatican Document "We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah." March 1998.
[94] Lindsay, Mark. R. "Mea Culpa and the Magisterium." In *Remembering for the Future.* Edited by RJ.K.Roth, D. Maxwell, M. Levy, W. Whitworth. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001. Vol. 2, 414.
[95] Lindsay, Mea Culpa and the Magisterium, 413, 414.

interfaith dialogue at B'nai B'rith Argentina claimed: "We have a friend in the Vatican. He (Cardinal Bergolio) is a close friend of the Jews."[96] The 2014 Papal visit to the Middle East sent a powerful message of interfaith respect, as it was the first time that leaders of other faiths were part of an official papal delegation. The two men who travelled with Pope Francis, Rabbi Abraham Skorka, former rector of the Latin American Rabbinical Seminary in Buenos Aires, and Sheik Omar Abboud, a former secretary-general of the Islamic Center of Argentina, are friends with whom he frequently collaborated when he was the Archbishop of Buenos Aires. The Pope's aim was to send "an extremely strong and explicit signal" about interfaith dialogue and the "normality" of having friends who belong to other religious traditions. It was reported in the *National Catholic Register* that Menachem Rosensaft, General Counsel for the World Jewish Congress (WSJ), had commented: "The dialogue and the relationship (of Pope Francis) have been unprecedented in terms of warmth and closeness."[97]

The most recent initiative was in December 2015 when the Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews published *The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable* (Rom. 11:29) *A Reflection on Theological Questions pertaining to Catholic-Jewish Relations on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of "Nostra Aetate* (No.4)." On that historic occasion two well-known Jewish representatives, Dr Edward Kessler and Rabbi David Rosen, attended the press release. At this time they both acknowledged the constructive and positive Catholic-Jewish relationships that have developed since *Nostra Aetate* and renewed their commitment to working together. Dr. Kessler said:

> As a Jewish partner in the dialogue I welcome further reflection on what fulfillment means in terms of relations with Judaism and how we can ensure the transformation in relations is not limited to the elite, but extends from the citadels of the Vatican to the pews of the Church as well as from the Offices of the Chief Rabbis to the floors of our synagogues.

---

[96] *Jewish Tribune*, Buenos Aires and Toronto, March 19, 2013
[97] *National Catholic Register*, May 31, 2015.

Jewish responses to Catholic initiatives

While it has not been a common practice for members of the Jewish community to initiate discussion regarding dialogue, it has been encouraging that both Catholic and Jewish leaders and scholars have responded to the various initiatives with integrity, respect and goodwill. As previously mentioned, significant progress began to occur in 1945 when, with the horrors of the Second World War as the catalyst, a small group of concerned British and visiting American Christians and Jews met in London to discuss the effects of the bombing of Britain. From this meeting the proposal to establish the first International Council of Christians and Jews emerged. Its aims were to consider the practical part Christians and Jews can play in educating themselves and their fellow-men for the exercise of responsibility in a society based upon mutual respect, freedom and justice.[98]

This Conference has proved to be one of the great landmark decisions in the development of Christian-Jewish Dialogue. The following year, under the joint sponsorship of the British and American groups, a second international conference was held in the Swiss village of Seelisberg. The participants in this meeting formed a multinational group of 65 members of whom there were 28 Jews[99] and 37 Christians including nine Catholics. At this meeting, all Christian churches were called to reflect on and to renew their understandings of Judaism and their relationships with Jews. The Ten Points of Seelisberg that resulted were specifically addressed "to the churches" with the first four points emphasising the deep and fundamental roots of Christianity in Judaism and the remaining six clarifying that Judaism must no longer be presented

---

[98] William W. Simpson and Ruth Weyl, The Story of the International Council of Christians and Jews, 2009, 19-21, accessed June 25, 2015, http://www.iccj.org/.../201102021125090.

[99] Jules Isaac (1877-1963) a French-Jewish historian was one of the Jewish delegates at this Conference. In order to avoid the mistakes and harm of earlier centuries, he argued eloquently for reform of Christian thinking and preaching about Jews. It is understood that his appeal to Pope John XXIII for Church reform in Catholic teaching and practice concerning Jews influenced the Vatican II document *Nostra Aetate*.

negatively in Christian teaching. This was a major initiative as the challenges that were presented at Seelisberg established the foundations for subsequent research on the complex relations between the two religious traditions and it is acknowledged as The Foundation of the Jewish- Christian Dialogue.[100]

In 2007 the International Council of Christians and Jews recognised that the Ten Points of Seelisberg were in need of refinement. As a result, it produced *A Time for Recommitment: Building the New Relationship between Jews and Christians* targeting. three specific groups:

> 1) Christians and Christian Communities
> 2) Jews and Jewish Communities
> 3) Both Christian and Jewish Communities and Others.

These two documents could rightly be attributed to the initiatives of both Jews and Christians working together. From the initial, tentative conversations participants had grown in their understanding and appreciation of each "other" and, in the process, had grown in their own "self-understanding."

The publication of *Dabru Emet*[101] in 2000, a significant Jewish initiative signed by 172 Jewish rabbis and intellectuals, was regarded as a sign of hope for those engaged in inter-religious dialogue. The initial sentence indicated that "a dramatic and unprecedented shift in Jewish-Christian relations" had occurred since 1965. Signatories to the document affirmed eight basic but crucial elements common to both faiths, when they wrote:

> There is so much we affirm together in our two faiths.
>
> 1. We worship the same God
>
> 2. We seek authority from the same book — the Bible
>   (Jews call it "Tanakh" and Christians, the "Old Testament")

---

[100] Christian Rutishauser, "The 1947 Seelisberg Conference: The Foundation of the Jewish- Christian Dialogue," Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations 2:2 (2007): 34-53.

[101] *Dabru Emet* (You Shall Tell the Truth), (New York Times, 10 September 2000).

3. We Christians can respect the claim of the Jewish people upon the land of Israel

4. We together accept the moral principles of Torah

5. We agree that Nazism was not a Christian phenomenon

6. Together we believe that the humanly irreconcilable difference between Jews and Christians will not be settled until God redeems the entire world as promised in Scripture

7. A new relationship between Jews and Christians will not weaken Jewish practice

8. Jews and Christians must work together for justice and peace

In 2002 The Christian Scholars Group on Christian-Jewish Relations responded with "A Sacred Obligation" (following on from *Dabru Emet*) stating: "It is essential that Christianity both understand and represent Judaism accurately . . . For us this is a sacred obligation."[102] Michael Signer in *Dabru Emet: Sic et Non,* however, critiqued the document using Peter Abelard's *Sic et Non*[103] ("Yes" and "No") method of identifying certain recommendations which, because of their seeming incompatibility, needed further clarification. He raised a highly relevant and complex issue for Catholic-Jewish Dialogue when he commented that in his opinion, *Dabru Emet* "hides or obscures the very serious differences which are the foundations of both communities."[104]

Fortunately, there has been considerable good will on both sides and people realise that it is necessary to go beyond the prejudices and animosities of the pre-Vatican II era. Rabbi A. James Rudin wrote: "We are all children of Vatican II. It has irreversibly changed the way we look at one another."[105] Even though the physical setting for Rudin's article is the United States his references and examples are transferable to the Australian context.

---

[102] The Christian Scholars Group on Christian-Jewish Relations. *A Sacred Obligation (following on from Dabru Emet)*. (2002).

[103] Note: Peter Abelard (1079 – 1142) a twelfth century philosopher and theologian

[104] Michael A. Signer, "Dabru Emet: Sic et Non". Paper delivered at the Council of Centers on Jewish-Christian Relations, Baltimore (2002).

[105] A. James Rudin, "The Dramatic Impact of *Nostra Aetate*" in Twenty Years of Jewish-Catholic Relations (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press,1986), Eugene J. Fisher, A. James Rudin and Marc H. Tanenbaum, eds. 9-18.

Jewish comments in relation to Inter-religious dialogue

At the launch of the Australian Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations in Sydney in 1992 the President of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ), Leslie Caplan, acknowledged the historic significance of the Catholic-Jewish reconciliation process. This process had been initiated by Pope John XXIII and endorsed by the Second Vatican Council in 1965 with the now well-known Declaration *Nostra Aetate*. As could be expected the journey from the Council to that launch point had not been uneventful, with discussion on theological issues such as The Teaching of Contempt, the charge of Deicide, supersessionism, the negative portrayal of Judaism in the Gospels and the recognition of the State of Israel being major concerns for Australian Jewry.

At the time of the launch Mr. Caplan commented that "dialogue can only be possible on the assurance that it is aimed at building bridges of understanding, love and respect for each other, and that it is not aimed at finding some path to unity." He went on to say "there is no doubt that the ideological chasms which remain, and the need to take account of bitter Jewish memories of centuries of Christian persecution culminating in the Holocaust, will still require careful diplomacy."[106] Between 1965 and 1992 there had been considerable activity in the area of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia but it was not visible to the rank and file members of the Catholic community, or to members of the Jewish community. Australian Rebecca Ehrlich maintains that statements that had been produced in that period "stimulated further activity in the Catholic movement for reconciliation, even if they did reflect Christian rather than Jewish world views."[107]

An American Rabbi, Yaakov Ariel, claimed that as a result of the efforts at and following the Second Vatican Council there was "from a Jewish perspective, a profound

---

[106] Rebecca Lacey Ehrlich, "Dialogue, Doctrine and Diplomacy (1): A Consideration of the Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations May 1992", Australian Council of Christians and Jews, 2009. Accessed June 9, 2015 http://ccj.org.au/article/dialogue-doctrine-and-diplomacy-ibr-a-consideration-of-the-guidelinesfor- catholic-jewish-relationsbr-may-1992/

[107] Ehrlich, "Dialogue, Doctrine and Diplomacy" (1).

breakthrough on a global scale in interfaith relations."[108] He also noted, that while the

Council strongly promoted an atmosphere of forgiveness and acceptance between

estranged Christian groups and people of other religions, negative representations of

Jews have deep cultural roots and have not been easy to eradicate. He acknowledged

that efforts to remove negative images of Jews from textbooks at all educational levels

and the encouraging of greater interest in Jewish studies were "stepping stones for

further dialogue and additional declarations on the part of Christian Churches in their

relation to Jews."[109] Other international Jewish scholars including Jonathan Sacks, David

Rosen, Eugene Korn and Marc Saperstein have also made considerable contributions to

the advancing of productive dialogue in recent years.

In a 2007 lecture on *Attitudes to Christianity in Modern Jewish Preaching*[110]

Saperstein critiques the sermons of some previous Rabbis and reveals "the Christian

propositions are presented in a manner that makes them seem absurd on their face, and

contrary to explicit statements of the Bible."[111] He wrote that while they belong to a not

so distant past, in many instances they are presented more like a debate and "it is

certainly not a model for dialogue today."[112] He makes a valid contemporary point when

he writes:

> While the sermon has lost much of its power in contemporary
> Jewish and Christian communities, the impact of the
> contemporary Muslim sermon reminds us of a time not so long
> ago when the Jewish sermon did have significant potential for
> fostering either negative stereotypes of Christianity, or an
> honest and informed openness to the complex diversity in the
> traditions of Christian neighbours."[113]

---

[108] Yaakov Ariel, "Interfaith Dialogue and the Golden Age of Christian-Jewish Relations,"
Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations 6 (2011):1-18.
[109] Yaakov Ariel, "Interfaith Dialogue and the Golden Age of Christian-Jewish Dialogue," 9.
[110] Marc Saperstein, "Attitudes Toward Christianity in Modern Jewish Preaching," Parkes
Seminar, University of Southampton, accessed June 16, 2015.
http://www.lbc.ac.uk/20100525547/Sermons-and-Papers/sermons-a-papers.html
[111] Saperstein, "Attitudes Toward Christianity in Modern Jewish Preaching," 4.
[112] Saperstein, "Attitudes Toward Christianity in Modern Jewish Preaching," 5.
[113] Saperstein, "Attitudes Toward Christianity in Modern Jewish Preaching," 13.

Although, internationally, inter-religious dialogue has made considerable advances, it would be naïve to think that the attitude of Australian mainstream Catholics towards Jews has advanced at the same rate. Jewish observers have noted that official recognition does not necessarily equal full acceptance. Commenting on this aspect, Rabbi Apple remarked that "so far the dialogue has been a rarefied, top echelon exercise so we need to be able to bring the new spirit particularly into Catholic seminaries, teachers' colleges and to the person in the pew."[114] The American situation is similar, according to Yaakov, who observes that while the interfaith dialogue affects the Christian and Jewish communities at large, it remains overwhelmingly the domain of ministers, priests, nuns and rabbis who have become the official spokespersons of their communities, representing their issues, and interests.[115] However he then goes on to comment:

> Not all Catholics and Protestants, even members of mainstream churches, have accepted the legitimacy of Judaism. Still, the developments since the 1960s give room to optimism. At least in Western countries, Christian-Jewish relations have progressed remarkably.[116]

In spite of the many set-backs, in 2004 Rabbi Guiseppe Laras was able to describe the situation at that time from a more positive perspective when he said:

> Jewish-Christian dialogue – despite the limits, the flaws, the disappointments, the criticisms and the attacks, which it continues to cause – is a dynamic reality; we are not in a situation of stasis. And I would like to quote, applying it to us, a verse from the Book of Deuteronomy (5:3):
> "We, all of us who are alive here this day" are armed more with good will and hope than with wisdom and certainties.[118]

---

[114] Rabbi Raymond Apple, in Linda Morris, Sydney Morning Herald, November 3, 2005 "In troubled days, religions need to find common ground."

[115] Yaakov Ariel, "Interfaith Dialogue and the Golden Age of Christian-Jewish Dialogue," 17.

[116] Yaakov Ariel, "Interfaith Dialogue and the Golden Age of Christian-Jewish Dialogue," 17.

[118] Rabbi Guiseppe Laras, "Jewish Perspectives on Christianity," Pontifical Gregorian University, 2004, accessed June 16, 2015 https://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cjl/texts/center/conferences/Bea_Centre_CJ_Relations_04-05/Laras.htm

This change in understanding and attitude did not come about quickly or easily but progressed over many decades mainly as the result of good will and considerable effort from both sides. As has already been noted the publication of *Dabru Emet* in 2000 was a highly significant event that indicated that Jewish scholars were not only sincerely interested in and willing to participate in dialogue but there was "a sincere desire" for dialogue on the part of the signatories. In that document, the Jewish scholars had pointed out that "only by preserving our own traditions can we continue these relations with integrity."[119]

In recent times, there has been greater interaction and more dynamic sharing of views by both Jewish and Christian scholars regarding difficult issues. Outstanding Jewish writers have addressed controversial subjects, providing Christians with a clearer and often a more enlightened understanding of their situation in regard to Jewish reticence to building relationships with Christians.

When questioned on the subject of "true reconciliation" between Christianity and Judaism, Rabbi Apple replied that "dialogue is not about either side seeking to change the other . . . what we are talking about is the respectful understanding between neighbours." He continued, "Catholics will remain Catholics and Jews will remain Jews. There will always be differences but the question is can we live together regardless of difference from the theological, and the answer is we can and we must."[120] Rabbi Apple concentrated positively on the progress that had been made and related that progress to the initiative of *Nostra Aetate*, commenting:

> The Jewish chapter (of *Nostra Aetate*) moved the Church from a mentality of hostility to a sibling convinced that Catholics and Jews are both partners in the mystery of God's plan. All this must be seen as a great achievement. There is still a way to go. But we are embarked upon the path.[121]

---

[119] *Dabru Emet*, Statement 7.
[120] Apple, "In troubled days, religions need to find common ground."
[121] Rabbi Raymond Apple, "Rediscovering Vatican II: Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue," Jewish-Christian Relations: Insights and Issues in the ongoing Jewish-Christian Dialogue, October 2005; accessed

While it is true that there have been advances in Catholic-Jewish dialogue and understanding since *Nostra Aetate* and unprecedented progress since the publication of *Dabru Emet,* there is still a way to go on the path referred to by Rabbi Apple. These positive foundational documents challenge both groups to continue accepting the invitation of the prophet Isaiah quoted by *Dabru* Emet – "Let us go to the house of the Lord . . . He will teach us his ways and we will walk in his paths." (Isa 2:2-3). The fact that the 2015 address given to The Council of Christians and Jews (Vic) by Rabbi Fred Morgan was entitled "A Jewish perspective on 50 years of *Nostra Aetate"* bears witness to the fact the journey continues.

Conclusion

The focus in this Chapter has been on the various models, principles and methods of inter-religious dialogue that have emerged since World War II. There have been several important initiatives and proposals that have influenced and directed the development of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in that time. Guidelines for successful dialogue have been discussed as well as obstacles and challenges that will be encountered.

The issue in this chapter is not so much the positive statements of both Catholic and Jewish communities, but relates to the various and often contradictory ways in which those statements have been received. This demonstrates the impact of the many different experiences, memories, stories, and narratives of those involved in Catholic-Jewish dialogue. These memories and narratives will be further examined in relation to Metz's articulation of the theological category of *narrative* in his model of practical-political theology and for their relevance for Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

January 24, 2015:
http://www.jcrelations.net/Rediscovering_Vatican_II__Ecumenism_and_Interreligious_Dialogue.1890.0.html

Chapter 4 – Narrative

Introduction

This chapter examines the second of Metz's key categories, *narrative.* It will focus on the various ways he makes use of *narrative* to clarify different theories, philosophies and disciplines, and to critique social and political issues with particular emphasis on his use of *narrative* as "a tool" of his particular theological model. An important factor in his model is the protection of "narrative processes" which ensure that the storyteller's experiences, relationships and beliefs are treated respectfully. As Metz's theological model of *narrative* exhibits many areas of creative possibilities which could assist in developing Catholic consciousness and strategies for Catholic-Jewish dialogue, a considerable portion of this chapter will be assigned to this discussion.

As both Judaism and Christianity are strongly narrative religions Metz's method, and the "narrative processes" he promotes, are compared to Jewish approaches to *narrative,* which are closely linked to religious texts, contexts, traditions, customs and practices. An assessment of the two approaches is made to determine their relevancy and to clarify the importance of *narrative* in the area of Catholic-Jewish dialogue, with particular reference to the Australian context.

Paul Murray's model of Receptive Ecumenism, with its emphasis on "exchange" in a variety of forms, including conversation, discussion, story telling, and scriptural interpretation, makes considerable use of *narrative.* Therefore, the question of the compatibility of Metz's category of *narrative* to the principles of Receptive Ecumenism is considered, particularly in those key areas that relate to the *narrative* aspects of Catholic–Jewish dialogue.

Features of Metz's use of *Narrative*

In both *A Theology of the World*[1] and *Faith in History and Society*[2] Metz presents narrative as a central category of Christian thought. His theological interest in *narrative* is a reaction to what he calls "a crisis of identity" in the post-enlightenment bourgeois world. He observes that while "human beings are becoming more and more fully present as human beings . . . Christianity seems to have reached a state of extreme historical crisis."[3] He argues, for example, that "one of the results of the Enlightenment . . . was the breakdown of the unity between religion and society" which resulted in Christian theologians "having to make a case for the relevance of the Christian faith."[4] He addresses this historical crisis by evaluating two opposite, yet key, theological points of view, "the transcendental and idealistic or a narrative and practical Christianity."[5] While he understands that "theology is not an exercise in the telling of stories, but . . . proceeds through speculative thought and argumentation,"[6] he considers the transcendental approach to theology is too limited and privatised and does not allocate sufficient importance to the community dimension of the Christian message.[7] Because his fundamental approach to theology is practical, Metz aligns himself with the narrative and practical model. His commitment to Christianity as a religion that supports freedom and gives hope rather than being a force of oppression is in contrast to the style of theology concerned with theoretical propositions and the systemisation of ideas.

In his frequent references to the narrative and practical structure of his method Metz places emphasis on practical aspects of theology evident in "eschatology,

---

[1] Johann Baptist Metz, *A Theology of the World*, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969).

[2] Johann Baptist Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, (New York: Seabury Press, 1980).

[3] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 154.

[4] Paul Lauritzen, "Is "Narrative" Really a Panacea? The Use of "Narrative" in the Work of Metz and Hauerwas," *Theology and Religious Studies,* Paper 47 (1987): 322-339. 327

[5] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 154.

[6] Mary Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative for Public Theology,* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004), 119.

[7] Declan Marmion, "Rahner and his Critics", *Australian eJournal of Theology 4* (February 2005), 3.

apocalyptical teaching and its concerns with salvation and redemption"[8] – in death, judgement and final destiny, biblical teaching relating to the 'last days' and the doctrine of salvation. He does not give support to either a complete separation of theology and storytelling or a complete fusion of the two, but argues in favour of a third option where he explains:

> The task of theology is properly construed as one of restoring, guiding, and correcting the processes of narration in the Christian community, particularly as that narrative tradition is threatened by our "scientific" culture.[9]

Convinced that theology must be concerned "with human beings not as abstractions but as located in particular socio-political contexts,"[10] Metz sees the role of *narrative* as an important component of his theological model.

The influences on Metz's approach to *Narrative*

Contributing to his understanding of narrative is his association with the work of several writers from diverse philosophies, theologies, and disciplines. These broad influences enriched his thinking and his approach to narrative as a tool of theology. As a student of Rahner, Metz was naturally greatly influenced by his renowned teaching, and by his ground-breaking theological views that were asking searching questions that go to the root of human experience.

Over time Metz questioned Rahner's theology believing that it was prepared to accept, too readily, the world on its own terms. By contrast, his own political theology is more inclined to confront the world and the Church with the demands of the Gospel. Metz was also aware that Rahner's concept of "turn to the subject,"[11] in which the

---

[8] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 205.
[9] Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative,* 119.
[10] Mary Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative*, 110.
[11] See Gerard Hall: "The Three Turns in Modern Theology: Transcendental, Political and Liberation Theologies," Australian Catholic University.https://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/staffhome/gehall/systematic1.htm (accessed September 12, 2014).
Note: "The "turn to the subject" as the foundation of knowledge represented a significant challenge to religious self-understanding. It also challenged the way theology is done. The starting point is no longer God but the

starting point was no longer God but the human person, required more explicit attention to both politics and narrative than Rahner provided.[12]

As their approaches to theology took different directions Rahner's influence on Metz's thinking and theology diminished. Nonetheless, in spite of their theological differences, Metz continued to hold Rahner and his work in high regard:

> Karl Rahner's testimony to the Christian and ecclesial character of my theology is all the more valuable to me in that it certainly in no way conceals the theological differences which exist between us, nor my criticism of his theology.[13]

As has previously been stated, the influence of Hegel is also evident throughout much of Metz's work of exploring and utilizing narrative as an integral part of his model of political theology. Metz's sympathies in developing the "new" political theology clearly have a basis within the philosophy of Hegel and the revisionary Marxist philosophy which Metz learned and experienced during his association with the Frankfurt School. Like many other "Hegelian Marxists" Metz is strongly committed to the wellbeing of humanity that knows its own history. That, together with a will to reconfigure a theology that is founded in practice, places Metz in what could be called the "Hegelian Left."

Another early influence, also associated with the Frankfurt School, is that of the Jewish Marxist, cultural philosopher and cultural critic Walter Benjamin. By drawing on Benjamin's 'messianic' thinking, and his broader critique of modernity, Metz's theological methods became "deeply rooted in praxis, and more specifically in the personal stories of the marginalized and the 'dangerous stories' of tradition that reflect

---

human person. This represents the most significant transformation of theology in what is termed the "modern era.""

[12] Mary Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative for Public Theology* , 110.

[13] Johann Baptist Metz, *The Emergent Church: The Future of Christianity in a Postbourgeois World,* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 122.

them,"[14] giving particular commitment to those more socially disadvantaged, destitute and judged to be inferior.

The work of renowned linguist Harald Weinrich, who is reputed to have coined the term "narrative theology,"[15] is a significant influence on Metz's understanding of and approach to *narrative*. He recognised "that not only theological discourse but present-day society as a whole had entered a 'postnarrative' phase," and Weinrich agreed that "telling stories, even listening to stories, counts in our society as an unscientific occupation."[16] Weinrich acknowledges that "Christianity is a narrative community"[17] and Metz agrees that "[Christianity is] not primarily a community of argument or interpretation but quite simply a narrative community."[18] Both are aware that "post-narrative" thinking and the loss of Christian identity will have repercussions that are detrimental to theological development. Metz perceives narration as a "mode of theology sensitive to experience, and especially to unatoned suffering."[19] In this sense "*narrative* takes on a virtually sacramental quality as 'the medium of salvation and of history'."[20]

Auschwitz symbolises for Metz all those who have suffered, been disadvantaged, persecuted and wronged, including the "lower-ranked" suffering victims of history, the "little people" who struggle to survive in a controlling society and a powerful Church. More specifically Auschwitz has a significant impact on Metz's understanding of the spirit and the faith of Jewish people and this influences his empathetic response to their suffering. As time passed, Auschwitz concentration camp came to represent the many German concentration camps where millions of Jews and others were brutally and

---

[14] *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Practical Theology,* ed B. Miller-McLemore (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 214-223, 214,218, *s.v.* "Narrative Approaches" (by R. Ruard Ganzevoort).

[15] Harald Weinrich, "Narrative Theology," *Concilium,* Vol 5, No 9, (1973), 46-56.

[16] Wienrich, "Narrative Theology," Section IV.

[17] Andreas Mauz, *Theology and Narration. Reflections on the "Narrative Theology"- Debate and Beyond*, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 264, 265.

[18] Mauz, *Theology and Narration,* 265.

[19] Mauz, *Theology and Narration,* 265.

[20] Mauz, *Theology and Narration,* 265.

inhumanely treated and killed during the *Holocaust* that occurred during World War II. For many people, including Metz, Auschwitz - the place where systematic killing methods were perfected - became a symbol. It became synonymous with persecution, injustice, cruelty and death because nowhere else were so many people murdered in such horrific ways in such a short period of time.

For Metz, the *memoria passionis* involves not only the memory of Christ but, in a special way, includes the memory of Auschwitz. Authentic Christianity, for him, is more than knowledge of systems. It contains *narrative* and remembrance knowledge, and has at its centre a dangerous story that invites its followers not merely to reflection, but calls them to discipleship.[21] This "post Auschwitz" discipleship, in Metz's interpretation, has two distinct elements. The first element addresses the narrative history, the articulation of the human condition and the relationship to God experienced by those subjected to "life" in the concentration camps. The second, more challenging element, involves the creation of a *new* narrative model enabling Christians and the Christian *narrative* to connect with their own experience of oppression and pain as well as that of Auschwitz survivors.

Recognising that narrative has a vital contribution to make to practical theology, Metz identifies five distinct qualities or functions where narrative could be utilised beneficially, namely its connection to *experience*; its practical and performative aspect; its pastoral and social value; its function as a medium of salvation and history and its role in providing the structure for practical and critical reason. Metz recognises each of these *narrative* functions to be crucial to the development of practical theology. On examination, each of these functions is also essential to the successful development of Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

---

[21] Johann Baptist Metz and Jürgen Moltmann, *Faith and the Future: Essays on Theology, Solidarity, and Modernity* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 46-47.

Metz's Five Distinctive Qualities or Functions of Narrative:

Narrative and Experience

Christian faith is founded on a series of revelatory events including God's covenant with Israel and the death and resurrection of Jesus. The *memory* of these and similar events is important to Metz's approach to theology as memories continue to be relevant to today's Jews and Christians. Metz does not reject dogma and doctrine but he emphasises the importance of *memory,* believing "that the particular and contingent character of *memories* requires expression in *narrative* form."[22] The narrative structure of both the Hebrew and the Christian scriptures clearly relate statements and stories to enable the reader and the hearer to e*xperience* the ongoing narrative of creation, to hear the proclamation of the kingdom of God, and to share in the vision of the kingdom proclaimed by Jesus. In Metz's view, narrative also has the ability to entrust another with valuable experiences. In relation to scriptural experience, he explains that "the beginning and the end can only be discussed in narrative form" and "what is new and never yet been can only be introduced in narrative."[23]

Metz argues that without *narrative*, genuine experiences of faith run the risk of being silenced or irrelevant. He maintains that such a non-narrative faith becomes vague and indistinct: what remains is experienced as a distant ritual spoken in unfamiliar, dogmatic language, without providing any opportunity for an "exchange experience."[24]

Practical and Performative (effective) Aspect of *Narrative*

The practical aspect of *narrative* has been employed successfully for centuries and in a variety of different "disciplines", for example in moral teaching, practical instruction, personal development, and guidelines for social order. The practical and

---

[22] Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative for Public Theology,* 113.

[23] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 206-207.

[24] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 206.

performative (effective)[25] aspect of *narrative* occurs when the one narrating the experience engages not only with the communication itself but actively involves the listener, transforming the experience "into the experience of those who listen to his (the) stories."[26] In Buber's view stories have the capacity to influence when they become "more than a reflection," when "the story is itself an event and has the quality of a sacred action" and when "the wonder that is narrated becomes powerful once more."[27]

Metz, in developing his model, argues that highlighting the place of *narrative* in practical and performative contexts does not mean that he is conceding his views regarding the perceived differences about truth and reason. He also disagrees with the notion that "appeals to narrative are inevitably 'private' rather than 'public' believing that the 'private' claim is unwarranted."[28]

When considering the relevance of *narrative* in practical theology Metz proposes that if practical and effective aspects of narrative are to be applied to liturgy, in particular to the Eucharistic Prayer and the Sacraments, then:

> The relationship between word and sacrament may be more fully elaborated theologically. Above all, it should be possible to relate the sacramental action more closely to stories of life and suffering and to reveal it as a saving narrative.[29]

He recognises that because the character of memory requires *expression* in narrative form, it is necessary for the stories to be acknowledged and to continue to be told, not only stories of the revelatory events of Christianity, but also stories of the sufferings and hopes of those conquered throughout history. This applies to the *narratives* of both

---

[25] J.L. Austin, *How to do Things with Words*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press,1962). 4-7. Note: Austin investigated several options in his explanation of *performative.* He discussed "operative," "intentional," "constructive," "effective." I have selected "effective" as the option that seems most applicable for this discussion.

[26] See Walter Benjamin, 'Der Ersähler', *Illuminationen* (Frankfurt, 1961), 412.

[27] See M. Buber, *Werke* III, (Munich, 1963), 71.

[28] Stanley Hauerwas & L. Gregory Jones, "Introduction: Why Narrative?" in *Why Narrative? Readings in Narrative Theology,* eds. Stanley Hauerwas and L. Gregory Jones (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989), 15.

[29] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 208.

Catholic and Jewish communities, and to both positive and negative events that continue to be narrated and passed on to the next generation.

The Pastoral and Social Aspect of Narrative

Regarding pastoral and social aspects of everyday life, *narrative* is a valuable spiritual and religious tool that gives meaning to people's lives. Metz believes, though, that it is marginal groups in the Churches who are leading the way in acknowledging, remembering and drawing on the *narrative* potential of Christianity, a quality that is largely neglected by mainstream Christianity. This neglect has resulted in Christianity's narrative potential and ability being hidden from the general community. Metz sees this as a critical and important area of pastoral care and of the proclamation of the faith, both of which need to be addressed. He knows that Christians were a story-telling community before they became "an argumentative and reasoning community," and that story-telling connected human stories with stories of and about God. While he confirms there is a place for both human and divine *narrative*s, he also admits that the difference between the two needs to be acknowledged. Stressing the narrative aspect in pastoral care does not persuade people to "withdraw into the private sphere" but encourages people to share their experiences, telling their own "narratives with a stimulating effect and aiming at social criticism, dangerous stories in other words."[30] In pastoral practice *narrative* is used extensively to assist in dealing with difficult situations. It is important for those engaging in Catholic-Jewish dialogue to be aware that the sensitive use of n*arrative* in social and pastoral circumstances can be a very effective instrument for dealing with controversial issues or the "dangerous stories".

---

[30] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 210.

The Theological Aspect

Theology develops through concentrated thought and debate. Doak, on the other hand, maintains that it "must attend closely to narratives and to the processes of narration"[31] lest as she suggests, "the cognitive function of narrative is denied . . . and theology become irrelevant to the praxis of Christians."[32] Metz's use of *narrative* as a key category in the development of his practical theology indicates the importance *narrative* holds in his theological plan. As Hall points out, Metz frequently reminds his readers that "human consciousness is 'entwined in stories' and . . . stories of life and suffering, as well as poetry and drama, ritual and sacrament, are capable of transforming consciousness . . . issuing forth in practical action."[33] Theology's main concern for Metz is to communicate and to articulate the belief that through the life and work of Jesus humanity has moved from a state of deprivation to liberation and salvation. The use of narrative qualities to address these theological issues makes it possible for communities to gain a better understanding and appreciation of theological issues.[34]

In a similar way, Metz's theology is informed by memories of people's hopes, struggles and suffering and of the *memoria passionis* which sets all suffering in relation to Christ's life, death and resurrection. He states:

> Narrative processes have to be protected, interrupted in order
> to justify them critically and even guided in the direction of a
> competent narrative without which the experience of faith
> like every original experience would be silenced."[35]

Scholars such as MacIntyre,[36] Ricoeur,[37] and Gustafson[38] also accept that the category of narrative is useful for a variety of diverse purposes "to explain human

---

[31] Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative,* 119.
[32] Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative, 119.*
[33] Hall, *Memory, Narrative and Solidarity,* 7.
[34] Metz, *Faith in History and Scoiety*, 210-213.
[35] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 205.
[36] L.Gregory Jones, "Alisdair MacIntyre on Narrative, Community, and the Moral Life," *Modern Theology* 4 (1987): 53-69.
[37] Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative*, 103.
[38] Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative*, 140.

action, . . . to account for the historical development of traditions . . . and to develop a means for imposing order on what is otherwise chaos."[39] While Metz's approach is similar to MacIntyre's in that both recognise the diverse uses of narrative, MacIntyre emphasises that "human life has a fundamentally narrative shape . . . humans are story-telling animals . . . that people place their lives and arguments in narrative histories. "[40]

Metz makes a clear distinction, however, between history and *salvation history*. He describes history as "the experience of reality in conflict and contradiction" and salvation, theologically speaking, as reconciliation by the act of God in Jesus Christ.[41] Root approaches narrative from a soteriological position in which the narrative description of events is designed to explain how the narrative of Jesus Christ is the narrative of redemption.[42] In a similar way Metz explains that "narrative renders the history of suffering and the perceived non-identity of history into the history of salvation and the identity of history in Jesus Christ."[43]

Goldberg's statement that many theologians claim that Gospel narratives "can, do, and ought to affect our lives" has powerful implications.[44] Metz encapsulates the powerful implications of the "dangerous memory," engendered and sustained by the Gospel narratives when he writes:

> Christianity as a community of those who believe in Jesus
> Christ has, from the very beginning, not been primarily a
> community interpreting and arguing, but a community
> remembering and narrating with a practical intention – a
> narrative and evocative memory of the passion, death, and
> resurrection of Jesus. The logos of the cross and resurrection

---

[39] Hauerwas & Jones, *Why Narrative?* 2.

[40] Stanley Hauerwas & L. Gregory Jones, "Introduction: Why Narrative?" in *Why Narrative? Readings in Narrative Theology,* ed. Stanley Hauerwas and L. Gregory Jones (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989), 8.

[41] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 211.

[42] Michael Root, "The Narrative Structure of Soteriology" in *Why Narrative? Readings in Narrative Theology,* ed. Stanley Hauerwas and L. Gregory Jones (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989), 270-275.

[43] Hauerwas & Jones, *Why Narrative? Readings in Narrative Theology,* 15.

[44] Michael Goldberg, *Theology & Narrative: A Critical Introduction*, (Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International, 1991), 228.

> has a narrative structure. Faith in the redemption of history and in the new man can, because of the history of human suffering, be translated into dangerously liberating stories, the hearer who is affected by them becoming not simply a hearer, but a doer of the word.[45]

What makes Metz's theological analysis of *narrative* distinctive is his belief that theology must take into account both the context and the processes of the narrative, and apply them. In this way, the universal justice contained in Christian narratives becomes explicit and Metz's hope for justice, for both the living and the dead, is realised.

The narrative structure of Practical and Critical Reason

When the triumph of historicism, which resulted in the 'crisis of identity,' 'the breakdown of the unity between religion and society' and disregard for 'the narrative and memorative tradition of Christianity,'[46] is taken into account, it is not surprising that Metz questions how "narrative and criticism could be reconciled with each other."[47] In exploring the narrative structure of practical and critical reason he argues that a theology that asks important and relevant "questions does not exclude itself . . . from . . . scientific and social debate."[48] He further promotes the concept that "it is possible for it (theology) to be active in an interdisciplinary manner and in criticizing society."[49] His opposition to the method of historical reason being discussed by other theologians is its disregard of "any narrative element" and its lack of recognition of memory and forgetfulness as cognitive principles. He argues that Christian narrative should not be judged as merely "an illustration and a clarification" but as a major contributing factor to the argumentative structures and elements of Christianity. [50]

---

[45] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 212.
[46] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 154.
[47] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 213.
[48] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 216.
[49] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 216.
[50] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 216.

With regard to the place of narrative in relation to practical and critical reason McClure sums up Metz's philosophy succinctly by stating:

> According to Metz, reason without memory forgets the suffering it has caused in the past. At the same time, memory without critical reason degenerates into a conservative and equally dangerous counter-enlightenment or anti-modernist form of traditionalism.[51]

Metz's approach to the practical and critical structure of theology, therefore, maintains a link with both memory and narrative so that, in spite of society's 'progress,' the oppression and violence of human history is not forgotten but will continue to be critiqued, that "the distinctive quality of narrative will be taken seriously into account"[52] and that Christianity's 'dangerous stories' will continue to be told.

Narrative links to memory and solidarity

While the final category in Metz's method, *solidarity*, is discussed more fully in Chapter 5 a brief outline is useful here to clarify Metz's trilogy of *memory*, *narrative* and *solidarity*. Because of the theological importance Metz places on the relationship of *narrative* to both *memory* and *solidarity*, it is necessary to acknowledge their inter-connectedness and their inter-dependency. The understanding of *solidarity* in this political theology context naturally differs from purely 'secular' social and civic approaches to solidarity. Metz's *solidarity* is firmly based on the dangerous memory of both the victorious and the defeated, the lost, but above all it is bound up with supporting God's loving solidarity with all humanity.

As he so often explains, these three categories are mutually dependent because "memory and narrative only have a practical character when they are considered with

---

[51] John S. McClure, *Other-wise Preaching: A post modern ethic for homiletics* (St Louis, Missouri: Chalice Press, 2001), 107
[52] Metz, *Faith and History in Society,* 217.

solidarity and solidarity has no specifically cognitive status without memory and narrative."[53] Doak also makes it clear, that in Metz's view,

> narrative . . . is thus inextricably interwoven with *solidarity*
> and *memory*: *solidarity* is inspired, nourished, and given its
> direction through the *memories* of Jesus Christ and of others
> who suffer in history, and, as historical *memories*, these are
> *narrative* in form.[54]

The theological categories of *memory*, *narrative* and *solidarity* are central to Metz's theology because together they "allow the character of hope for the oppressed and suffering of the world to emerge."[55] As his theological method developed, *solidarity*, entrenched as it is in particular dangerous narrative memories of suffering, became for Metz more focused on Christianity's relationship with the Jews and the inhumanity of Auschwitz.

The Jewish concept of *Narrative*

The Jewish concept of narrative and Metz's theological approach to narrative are similar in many ways in that both employ *narrative* for a specific reason. They do not see *narrative* simply as an historical rendition of the past but as a way of *remembering* past events, and remembering them not just for the 'now' but for the future, and importantly, remembering in order to influence and make a 'better' future. As noted previously, in the chapter on *Memory,* a key word of the Hebrew bible is not history but *memory*, *zachor,* which occurs hundreds of times in the bible. This was Moses' injunction to future generations: "Take care and watch yourselves closely, so as neither to forget the things that your eyes have seen nor to let them slip from your mind all the days of your life; make them known to your children and your children's children" (Deut 4: 9). In Jewish history, and particularly in Jewish religious history and practice, narrative and storytelling hold significant positions where stories take on a major role of providing the

---

[53] Metz, *Faith and History in Society,* 183.
[54] Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative for Public Theology,* 114-115.
[55] Doak, *Reclaiming Narrative for Public Theology*, 111, 114.

group with shared identity and sense of purpose. Most Jews become aware early in their lives that the important 'life' questions such as 'Who are we?' 'Why are we here?' and 'What is our task?' are all best answered by the telling of a story.

The significance of *Narrative* for Jews

The singular most important event in the history of the Jewish people occurred early in the period following the exodus from Egypt and their settlement in the land of Israel (2448 AM or 1313 – 1273 BCE). This event occurred when Moses, on behalf of the Jewish people, received the Torah (God's Law) on Mount Sinai. This event was recognised by the people as the one that made them into a nation. To this day it is the Torah (God's Law) that binds the Jewish people together as a people, not race or nationality.[56] Kertzer describes the importance of the Torah and its central place in Judaism when he states that "to the observant Jew, the Torah is the very breath of life.[57]

Every Jew knows the narrative surrounding this event, and the story continues to be told throughout the world wherever Jews congregate. The significance of *narrative,* then, is extremely important for the Jews because it touches so many, if not all, aspects of Jewish life. Rabbi Sacks maintains that narrative is crucial to Jewish identity because "Judaism is less about *truth as system* than about *truth as story*. And we are part of that story. That is what it is to be a Jew."[58] The earliest biblical texts included many stories, and those *narratives* have been told and re-told in every age of Hebrew literature.[59]

In broad terms, *narrative* began as simple stories and over time passed through several different stages from the 3rd century (C.E.) when "the subordinate status of the story, did not . . . prevent a wealth of narrative material from being included in the

---

[56] Naftali Brawer, *Brief Guide to Judaism: Theology, History and Practice*, (Philadelphia, PA: Running Press Book Publishers, 2008), 92. Note: AM - *Anno Mundi* - after creation; BCE- Before the Common Era.
[57] Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer, *What is a Jew?* (New York: Touchstone, 1996), 41.
[58] Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, "A Nation of Storytellers," Thoughts4Elul from Rabbi Sacks, 13 September 2014/18 Elul 5774, http://www.rabbisacks.org/ki-tavo-5774-nation-storytellers/ (accessed September 8, 2016).
[59] *Encyclopaedia Judaica,* (The Gale Group, 2008) *s.v.* "Hebrew Fiction: The Story in Talmudic-Midrashic Literature," www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/source/Judaism/hebfiction.html.

talmudic-midrashic literature,"[60] through the medieval period when 'plots' revolving around a biblical hero or biblical event were introduced. Narrative took a different direction in the 11th and 12th centuries (C.E.) with the rise of ethical, romantic and legendary narratives, and again in the 13th to the 16th centuries (C.E.) when there was the gradual progression of ethical narratives influenced by the Ashkenazi[61] and Kabbalah.[62] The 18th and 19th centuries (C.E.) saw the weakening of rabbinic authority and that was reflected in the narratives of the time.[63] The Hebrew narrative has, naturally, been greatly influenced by internal conflict, by the catastrophe and expulsion of the Jews from Spain and Portugal and, more recently, by the establishment of the State of Israel (1948), by the 20th century destructive tragedy of the Sho'ah, and by current world events.

The Jewish narrative, like all narrative, has distinctive features related to the historical and literary period in which it is developed.[64] However, in every period in Jewish culture, from the beginning to the modern era, the re-telling of the biblical narrative continued according to the beliefs, views and literary conventions of the particular period, with each period retelling the narrative in new but historically distinctive ways.

Jews call their Bible "the holy scriptures" or *Tanak* which comprises the *Torah* (law and instruction), *Nevi'im* (the prophets) and *Ketuvim* (the writings).[65] Jewish

---

[60] *Encyclopaedia Judaica,* (The Gale Group, 2008) *s.v.* "Hebrew Fiction: The Story in Talmudic-Midrashic Literature," www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/source/Judaism/hebfiction.html.

[61] Note: Ashkenazi refers to Jews of European descent as opposed to the Sefardim of Spanish/North African descent.

[62] Note: Kabbalah is the most influential stream of Jewish mysticism.

[63] Naftali Brawer, *Judaism: Theology, History and Practice*, (Philadelphia, PA: Running Press, 2008), 148-149.

[64] Note: (1) Biblical Judaism (c20th century - 4th century BCE) (2) Hellenistic Judaism dates from c4th century BCE – 2nd century CE (3) Rabbinic Judaism dates from 2nd century – 18th century CE (4) Modern Judaism from c1780 – present.

[65] The Jewish sacred scriptures are divided as follows: *Torah* or the *Five Books of Moses* (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy); *Nevi'im* is composed of two parts: 1) the Former Prophets – Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings and 2) Latter Prophets - Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Book of the "Twelve"- Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; *Ketuvim* or Writings: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, *Megilloth* or "Scrolls" for special feasts:- Song of Songs, for the feast of Passover; Ruth, for the feast of weeks or Pentecost; Lamentations, for the feast of mourning the

tradition teaches that Moses was given two Torahs, the Bible known as the 'Written Torah' (*Tanak*), and the Rabbinic writing, called the 'Oral Torah' (*Mishnah*)[66] because it was originally handed down by word of mouth. However, Judaism is widely understood as a 'text culture,' which has always been nurtured by study and interpretation.[67] Hebrew literature has a character that is distinctively its own. According to Rabbi Soloveitchik, for example, there are two kinds of storytelling that take place on significant occasions (for example as part of Jewish holidays) – *zachor* the art of remembering and *sipur,* which is the process of active storytelling.[68]   The rabbis of earlier periods would often give sermons commenting on the biblical text that had been read in the synagogue, at other times they would explain an important teaching by using parables. These various narratives were collected and together they form the *midrash* (translated as "search for meaning"). Rabbi Jonathan Sacks believes "there is a special way, a Hebrew one, of telling a story" and "by making the Israelites a nation of storytellers, Moses helped turn them into a people bound by collective responsibility – to one another, to the past and future, and to God."[69]

The Jewish understanding of the role of the biblical storyteller is one of power and authority. The narrator is the one who not only knows the who, the how, the what and the why of the narrative but also knows what the characters thought and felt. The function of the narrator in the Jewish tradition is not to describe or to explain the story but to convey events, characters and dialogue to the listeners and, in addition, while making it clear that the events being narrated are meaningful and connected, to insure

---

destruction of the temple; Ecclesiastes, for the feast of Tabernacles; Esther, for the feast of Purim; Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, 1 and 2 Chronicles.

[66] *Mishnah* – the first comprehensive book of Jewish law, formulated about 200 C.E.

[67] Michael Fishbane, "Spirituality of Texts" in Etz Hayim: Torah and Commentary, *Jewish Publication Society* (2001), http://www.myjewishlearning.com/ (accessed September 8, 2016).

[68] Barry Shrage, "Story Tellers: A New Story of Jewish Identity," *Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Ideas* (2010). http://shma.com/2010/03/story-tellers-a-new-story-of -jewish-identity/
Note: See "Story Tellers" for explanation of *sipur* which is described as "the process of active storytelling, an act of leadership, transformation , and liberation."

[69] Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, "A Nation of Storytellers," Thoughts4Elul from Rabbi Sacks, 13 September 2014/18 Elul 5774, http://www.rabbisacks.org/ki-tavo-5774-nation-storytellers/ (accessed September 8, 2016).

those listening to the story interpret the meaning and the connections for themselves. By making the Israelites a nation of storytellers, Moses helped them to become a people bound by collective responsibility – responsibility to God and to one another, as well as to the past and the future. Moses effectively framed a narrative that successive generations would make their own and teach to their children.

Application of N*arrative* to Catholic Jewish dialogue

In recent decades Christians and Jews have begun to ask questions about one another's scriptures and traditions in the hope that centuries-old barriers of prejudice will be broken, and that there may be more open discussion not only regarding the differences but also the similarities of faith. When various aspects of both Catholic and Jewish traditions are examined, it is clear the category of *narrative* can be effectively applied to Catholic-Jewish dialogue. Of course, not every aspect can be considered here, but there are five particular aspects that provide a basis for *narrative* and ongoing dialogue: the sharing of Scripture (including scriptural reasoning); the place of Jesus; the shadow of suspicion; the Sho'ah or Holocaust; and the State of Israel.

One of the common values Jews and Catholic Christians share is the love of stories, including the many faith stories contained in the Scriptures. Jews and Christians are considered to be "people of the book" who over the centuries have preserved a stable collection of religious, formative and inspirational writing and *narratives* that have had a profound impact on human society and history. While both Catholics and Jews share a deep respect and reverence for Sacred Scripture and the teaching it contains, their particular approaches, terminology and basic understanding frequently cause them to arrive at very different interpretations.

This can be very simply illustrated by comparing the different approaches Jews and Catholics have to the *narrative* of the temptation story in the Garden of Eden in

Chapter 3 in Genesis. For Catholics, this is the story of the fall, the beginning of sin in human life and society, a situation in which all humans participate and for which redemption is required. The Jews have a totally different interpretation of the same story – its purpose is to tell them that every human being has two *yetzers* or tendencies, a tendency for good and a tendency for evil. They understand that the *narrative* is designed to teach them that the option for doing good is theirs and the possibility of doing evil is real.[70] This illustration provides a simple process for "making the Hebrew scriptures a bridge between church and synagogue,"[71] and an integral part of the dialogue between Catholics and Jews, rather than a stumbling block referred to by Paul in his letter to the Romans: "Let us therefore no longer pass judgment on one another, but resolve instead never to put a stumbling block or hindrance in the way of another" (Rom 14:13). In recent times, there has been a greater acknowledgment that Christianity's roots "are profoundly enmeshed in Judaism"[72] to the point that biblical scholar, Cardinal Martini, insists "without a sincere feeling for the Jewish world, and a direct experience of it, one cannot fully understand Christianity."[73]

On the other hand, because of the often anti-Jewish tone and/or comments in the Christian scriptures (the New Testament), many Jews recoil at the thought of having to deal with the *narratives* contained in the Christian texts and view them, understandably, "with varying degrees of dismay and distrust, if not dread."[74] However, while this is an

---

[70] Arthur E. Zannoni, "The Challenge of Hebrew Scriptures in Jewish-Christian Relations," in *Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations,* ed. Michael Shermis and Arthur E. Zannoni (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003), 14-17.

[71] Zannoni, "The Challenge of Hebrew Scriptures in Jewish-Christian Relations," 28.

[72] John T. Pawlikowski, "Jesus, A Pharisee and the Christ," in *Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations,* ed. Michael Shermis and Arthur E. Zannoni (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003), 187.

[73] Cardinal Carlo Maria Martini, "Christianity and Judaism: A Historical and Theological Overview," in *Jews and Christians: Exploring the Past, Present, and the Future,* ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 19.

[74] Michael Cook, "The New Testament: Confronting Its Impact on Jewish-Christian Relations," in *Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations,* ed. Michael Shermis and Arthur E. Zannoni (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003), 39.

obstacle for the Jews it is an opportunity and an obligation for Catholics to develop a willingness to be self-critical of their acceptance of the past, and to stand in judgment on their often offensive and destructive scriptural *narratives* and interpretations in regard to the Jews.[75]

It seems unnecessarily obvious to comment that, in order for Catholics to understand the revelation of Jesus, a young Jewish man of his time, who came from Nazareth and who lived and died a believing and practising traditional Jew, it is important for them to have greater knowledge and understanding of the Hebrew Scriptures (frequently referred to by most Catholics as the Old Testament). As "Jesus was thoroughly schooled in the teachings of the Old Testament" and as the Hebrew Scriptures are at the heart of his message, it could be expected that Jesus, his disciples and the early Christian community would follow the familiar and revered Jewish *narrative* and the traditional customs. Jesus maintained the commitment to community inbred in his Jewish heritage, to the welfare of the Jewish community and to the individual dignity of his fellow Jews. This remained important to him and to his first disciples.[76]

As Christian interpretations and views of the Judaism of Jesus are often distorted it is, at times "difficult, if not impossible, to understand the teachings of Jesus in their context."[77] Comparing Catholic *narratives* regarding Jesus with Jewish *narratives* further reveals the complexities of the Catholic-Jewish relationship. However, it is an opportunity, in the spirit of Receptive Ecumenism, "to learn from one another."

---

[75] Mary C. Boys, *Has God Only One Blessing? Judaism as a Source of Christian Self-Understanding* (Mahwah, NJ: Stimulus Books, 2000), 177-198
Note: In Chapter 11, "A New Lens on Scripture," Mary Boyce deals with many of the practicalities and challenges of reading and interpreting the Scriptures. These include the role of the community of faith in the understanding of 'anti-Jewish' and supersessionist texts, of the place and the various "portraits" of the Pharisees, and "a theory for wrestling with problematic texts."
[76] Boys, *Has God Only One Blessing?* 91-110.
[77] Boys, *Has God Only One Blessing?* 110.
Note: For more information see Part III: "Christian Origins in Context" particularly Chapter 6 "The Complex World of First-Century Judaism."

The relatively "small" steps that can be taken in an effort to understand each other's *narrative* can be extremely vital experiences for both Catholic and Jewish participants. Those taking part in dialogue have the opportunity to express their own understandings, but also to hear and respect the *narratives* expressed in the other's view of the Scriptures they revere, and in traditions that have been handed down. These opportunities for exchange can also create an environment of trust in which each partner in the dialogue can admit to past and/or present bias and prejudice in many areas of religious, social and civic life. Inevitably, this process raises serious questions regarding the dual 'suspicion of the other,' questions which have frequently been fed by the long-standing prejudicial and critical *narratives* experienced by both Christians and Jews. Because negative *narratives* involving suspicion and mistrust on both sides have endured through centuries, this is an issue that needs to be openly addressed and remedied.

Metz's political theology, particularly when his key categories of *memory*, *narrative* and *solidarity* are considered together, has parallels with the Jewish experience of the Holocaust and the *narratives* that surround it. Metz's concept of *solidarity* is comparable in many ways to the Jewish affirmation of life and hope after Auschwitz, which is symbolised by the establishment of the Jewish state of Israel and the restoration of the Jewish homeland. Experts in interfaith dialogue, while acknowledging the potentially volatile situation politically, are convinced this issue of "the homeland" needs to be raised in Catholic-Jewish dialogue in order that the Catholic participants in the dialogue have opportunity to hear, perhaps for the first time, the Jewish *narrative*

about the land and its importance to Judaism. It is clear to many supporters of Catholic-Jewish dialogue that any dialogue that ignores this issue will be a short-lived dialogue.[78]

It is also important for Catholics to recognise that the Sho'ah, the Holocaust, is not exclusively a Jewish *narrative*. It is also a very real part of the *narrative* of Christian Europe at that time. Not only were the perpetrators of this inhumane violence nominally 'Christians'[79] but, unfortunately Christians, including Church 'officials,' did little to prevent or resist the atrocity. "Sad to say," McGarry reports, "vigorous church resistance and courageous outcry were difficult to find."[80] This was a situation Metz deeply regretted. The holocaust then, must be acknowledged as a 'shared' *narrative*.

A better understanding of the Jewish *narrative* surrounding justice could benefit members of the Australian Catholic Church as they too struggle to deal with the oppression of indigenous Australians, asylum seekers, refugees, and other victims of structural mis-use of power in modern Australian society. Based on shared *narratives*, discussion and dialogue between the two groups, subjects that deal with pressing social justice and ethical issues such as peace, power, the environment and economic equality, assume a very important status and could be mutually beneficial.[81] Just as Metz's category of *memory* can be successfully applied to Catholic-Jewish dialogue, so too *narrative* provides valuable opportunities for constructive, honest and successful dialogue to take place.

---

[78]Robert Andrew Everett, "The Land in Jewish Christian Dialogue," in *Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations,* ed. Michael Shermis and Arthur E. Zannoni, (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003), 110.

[79] Michael B. McGarry, "The Holocaust: Tragedy of Christian History," in *Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations,* ed. Michael Shermis and Arthur E. Zonnoni (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003), 64.

[80]McGarry, "The Holocaust: Tragedy of Christian History," 67.

[81]Note: For fuller discussion regarding relationship between history, Church policies, Jews and Judaism see Chapter 4 "Jews and Christians in Historical Perspective" in Mary C. Boys, *Has God Only One Blessing? Judaism as a Source of Christian Self-Understanding* (Mahwah, NJ: Stimulus Books, 2000), 39-74

Narrative **in the Australian context**

The *narrative* associated with Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia is an amazingly rich story, unfortunately known by too few Australian Catholics and Jews. The following previously noted facts make up this *narrative*: a) the first Catholics and Jews arrived in Australia in the First Fleet; b) many Australian Catholics and Jews have come to Australia as immigrants, refugees, and survivors; c) the largest number of Holocaust survivors outside of Israel have made their homes in Australia; d) several generations of Catholics and Jews have been born in Australia; e) both groups have made outstanding contributions to the development and support of the land they now call home.

While there have been attempts at official levels to "own" the Catholic-Jewish *narrative* in terms of documentation and inter-action, many people at grassroots level have had little opportunity to share their own faith and family story, to hear the story of the 'other' and have had even less opportunity to hear the shared Australian Catholic-Jewish *narrative*. The benefits of such a program for both groups would exhibit "a better understanding of the other's pain," a raised awareness of "the destruction of human rights," and an "opportunity to pursue peace through sharing narratives."[82] On another level there have been a number of successful projects to have the *narrative* communicated to a larger audience, involving both Jews and Catholics. The work of significant groups such as the national and state Councils of Christians and Jews[83] have been most effective in this area.

The past fifty years have seen changes and developments within the Australian Catholic Church in its relationship to Judaism. At official levels, much has been done in

---

[82] Ron Hoenig, "Hearing the painful Narrative of the Other," Australian Council of Christians and Jews (15 October, 2008), http://ccj.org.au/article/hearing-the-painful-narrative-of-the-other/ (accessed August 15, 2014).

[83] These groups, among others, include Councils of Christians and Jews in Victoria (1985), New South Wales (1988), Canberra, Perth and South Australia, and the Australian Council of Christians and Jews, and the Victorian Council of Churches' Commission on Interfaith and Community Relations.

the development of diocesan guidelines and in the establishment of Archdiocesan and Diocesan Commissions or Councils for interfaith dialogue. The structure of *narrative* is accessible to Catholics, but the story itself and its importance to the Catholic community has not been adequately shared with, or conveyed to, "the masses." This significantly important *narrative* has been confined to small "informed" groups who have, fortunately, in their relationships with their partners in dialogue, accompanied the recommendations of the documents with actions of respect, understanding and friendship. However, for the narrative to be understood and communicated appropriately within the Catholic community, it will be necessary for preachers and teachers to receive the necessary ongoing formation.[84]

Narrative compatibility with the demands of Receptive Ecumenism

This research indicates that Metz's category of *narrative* is compatible with the principles of *receptive ecumenism*, particularly in areas involving *theological reception*, *scriptural reception* and *hermeneutical reception*. These are areas where questions in relation to "what can be learned or *received* with integrity from the other?" take on significant importance and indicate that the desired outcome, "in order to facilitate our growth together," is a possibility. Larini's comments on the shift that has taken place in recent years, a shift that has taken the discussion from "the legal to the ecclesiological implications of reception, and then to its hermeneutical basis,"[85] indicates that the time for adaptation and a broader approach to theological, scriptural and hermeneutical understanding has arrived. From a scriptural perspective, the proposal presented by Boys aligns with Metz's underlying approach to the scriptural narrative:

---

[84] Mary Raeburn, "The Catholic Church's Response to Nostra Aetate", *Gesher Anniversaries* (2015): 34-35.
[85] Riccardo Larini, "Texts and Contexts – Hermeneutical Reflections on Receptive Ecumenism" in *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism*, ed. Paul Murray with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 89 – 101.

> Deepening Christian self-understanding rests on the foundation of informed and imaginative interpretation of the Bible. A more satisfactory understanding of Christianity's relationship with Judaism depends in large measure on reading Scripture with sensitivity to its literary and historical context.[86]

Further education in the informed reading of scriptural texts and the acquisition of the necessary skills to interpret texts is essential for both Catholic and Jewish readers if they are to better understand Judaism and the origins of Christianity. Narratives related to the person of Jesus, the complex historical narrative of the relationship between Jews and Christians (and Catholics in particular), the impact of the Sho'ah, and the importance of the Jewish homeland to name but a few topics, provide the contexts for shared, productive, stimulating discussions regarding the narratives of both groups.

Conclusion

The research and discussion to this point has dealt with past and present situations regarding Catholic-Jewish dialogue, and with their relationship with Metz's political theology, especially its categories of *memory* and *narrative*. The discussion has also researched the principles of *Receptive Ecumenism* and estimated the applicability of those principles to Catholic-Jewish dialogue, particularly with reference to the Australian context. Finally, the relevant *Receptive Ecumenism* question which asks "*What can we learn from one another*?" has been applied to the discussion.

The next two chapters will reverse the earlier model used for this research. I will deal with the application of Metz's category of *solidarity* in Chapter 5 where it is also relevant to discuss the three key categories of *memory, narrative* and *solidarity* together.

Chapter 6 will then perform the difficult task of investigating some of the future possibilities and proposed further developments in Catholic-Jewish relations in Australia.

---

[86] Boys, *Has God Only One Blessing?* 177.

In doing so, it will assess the feasibility of applying Metz's three key categories of *memory, narrative* and *solidarity* to Catholic Jewish dialogue and will, in particular, assess the compatibility of the key principles of *Receptive Ecumenism* with Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia.

Chapter 5   Solidarity

Introduction

This chapter will investigate Metz's understanding of the third of his categories, *solidarity,* and discuss it in relation to his model of practical-political theology. This will involve identifying selected key features of Metz's *solidarity* and particular influences on his approach to this category*.* The significance of *solidarity* for Metz will be discussed, together with its impact on Catholic theology and Catholic life and thinking. By acknowledging the 'unity' and centrality of *memory, narrative* and *solidarity* in Metz's theological model, their essential relationship to one another will be clarified.

The Jewish understanding of *solidarity* will be researched and compared to Metz's understanding, with differences and similarities being acknowledged. The applicability of Metz's third category of *solidarity* to Catholic-Jewish dialogue and its relevance in the Australian dialogue context will then be evaluated. Finally, as with *memory* and *narrative*, the question of the compatibility of Metz's category of *solidarity* with Murray's principles of Receptive Ecumenism will be ascertained.

Metz's Understanding of *Solidarity*

In explaining the faith of Christians Metz wrote simply but insistently of his "hope in *solidarity.*"[1] In clarifying this definition, he encourages others to grasp the concept that "*solidarity* be understood in a strictly universal sense as a *solidarity* that has to justify itself not only with regard to the living and future generations, but also with regard to the dead."[2] He goes on to explain that "the Christian does not hope just for himself - he also has to hope for others and, in this hope, for himself."[3]

---

[1] Johann Baptist Metz, *Faith in History and Society* (New York: Seabury Press, 1980),76.
[2] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 76.
[3] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 76.

In describing *solidarity* more specifically, Metz brings together the characteristics of this category and identifies its unifying role in the development of his Catholic model of practical-fundamental theology. He explains:

> As a category of practical fundamental theology, solidarity is above all a category of help, support and togetherness, by which the subject, suffering acutely and threatened, can be raised up. Like memory and narrative, it is one of the fundamental definitions of a theology and a Church which aims to express its redeeming and liberating force in the history of human suffering, not above men's heads and ignoring the problem of their painful non-identity.[4]

He describes this approach to theology as "a practical work of fundamental theology or a fundamental theology with a practical aim."[5]

As Metz was developing his theological model, modernity was proving to be a threat to the legitimacy of existing Christian theology and the relevance of Christian spirituality, and was promoting the privatisation of religion. In response, his theology addressed the apathy and individualism of that era by promoting awareness of *solidarity* and apocalyptic eschatology, and by emphasising the concept of a common humanity. "Christianity," he wrote, "is not able to remain neutral in the struggle for world-wide solidarity for the sake of the needy and the underprivileged."[6] At the same time, Baum was advocating along similar lines:

> Vatican II criticized a Christian outlook that is overly individualistic. What counts today is solidarity with the community, especially the poor and exploited; what counts now is a new, critical awareness which makes us see the structures of domination in the world, including our own institutional participation in them; what counts is a new sense of social responsibility which makes us recognize that we are in fact collectively responsible for who we shall be in the future; what counts is a new sensitivity to the divine mystery present in people, in their interaction and their struggles to enter more deeply into their humanity.[7]

---

[4] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 229.
[5] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* ix.
[6] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 235.
[7] Gregory Baum, "Chosenness in Christian Tradition," *SIDIC Periodical* XIII, *The Chosen People* (1980/2): 9-13. Originally published by Gregory Baum and Rabbi Gunther Plaut, "Jewish-Christian Dialogue on Divine

122

Metz acknowledges the supreme role of Christ in overcoming death, guilt and the destruction of life in all its forms, and the role of personal and communal prayer as essential elements in the life of the Christian. He insists that it is through remembering Jesus Christ that we remember "promises that have been made and hopes that are experienced as a result of those promises."[8] The centrality of the *memoria passionis Jesu Christi* in Metz's approach further endorses "the continued christocentric focus of his theology."[9]

Metz also firmly believes that the followers of Christ have a distinct responsibility to work in *solidarity* to overcome the suffering that oppresses, discriminates and annihilates so unjustly. To promote a theological awareness of the other and the relationship with God, Metz proposes the concept of *solidarity,* which extends beyond one's immediate neighbours to the distant other, to the dead, and to all who's suffering and victimisation have as yet received no response.[10]

Metz's understanding of *solidarity* and his attitude towards it, involve more than "standing with" another or placing oneself in the same situation as the other. In an approach, similar to Panikkar's regarding the perceived risks involved in "the religious encounter,"[11] Metz states that engaging with *solidarity* means opening oneself to the possibility of undergoing a change of heart, a conversion. In his view, those who act in *solidarity* are called not only to take a stance, but also to actively take a risk in which they are called to "transformation." Metz's political theology therefore engages not only with the political elements but also with the human, conversion of hearts and

---

Election", in *The Ecumenist: Journal for Promoting Christian Unity*, Volume17, no. 1, November-December (1978).

[8] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 200.

[9] Johann Baptist Metz, "The Future in the Memory of Suffering," in *Faith and the Future: Essays on Theology, Solidarity and Modernity* ed. John Baptist Metz and Jürgen Moltmann (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1995), 11 -13. See also note 16 Doak, 223.

[10] Jo Robson, "Towards a Spirituality of Solidarity with Johann Baptist Metz and Edith Stein," *Teresianum* 65, (2014): 235-262.

[11] Raimon Panikkar, *The Intra-Religious Dialogue* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), 27.

modification of lives.

Solidarity, then, is promoted by Metz as both "mystical and universal" and "political and particular," concepts that he further explains in practical terms: "This double structure protects the universal aspect of solidarity from apathy and its partisan nature from hatred and forgetfulness."[12] This practical aspect of Metz's model complements the political and theological aspects of his theology.

The influences that contribute to this understanding

As has been discussed previously, Metz experienced the tension between two existing schools of Catholic theological thought: the first was more rigid and theoretical; the second was more practical. Because of the obvious inequalities that existed at the time, especially between the "rich churches of the North and the poor churches of the South", Metz began to question if the Catholic Church was in reality a "universal" church or "just a 'europocentric church' with 'dependencies in the poor areas of the world."[13] Finally, Metz concluded "the church's crisis was due to a deficit in discipleship and to difficulties in adapting to Jesus."[14] "The 'church of discipleship' which is demanded" he wrote, "does not amount to a special church of the few that easily distances itself from every form of a 'people's' church. But rather it introduces the transition from 'an over-adapted church to a church of discipleship' . . . (from) a traditional 'church for the people' to a living 'church of the people'."[15] This reflection encouraged him to formulate what he saw to be an alternative position.

Marxism and the critical reasoning of the Frankfurt School continued to have an influence on Metz's thinking and they became two essential factors in the development of his category of *solidarity.* It was from Marxism's "theory-praxis" approach that Metz

---

[12] Metz, Faith in History and Society, 232.
[13] Johann Baptist Metz, "For a Renewed Church Before a New Council: A Concept in Four Theses," in *Toward Vatican III: The Work That Needs to Be Done*, ed. David Tracy with Hans Küng and Johann B. Metz (New York: The Seabury Press, 1978), 138.
[14] Metz, "For a Renewed Church Before a New Council," 139.
[15] Metz, "For a Renewed Church Before a New Council," 139.

developed a model of theology that was not a neutral form of knowledge disconnected from the political and social experience of life, but a theology that was actively engaged in the politically expedient and communal aspects of the Christian life. Walter Benjamin, too, continued to have an influence on his thinking particularly as he reflected on the areas of "unfair-suffering" made clear by the relationship between *memory*, *narrative* and *solidarity*. Hegel's theory of "absolute idealism"[16] also had an influence on Metz's approach to *solidarity* as he came to understand that "solidarity with the victims in the modern economic colonies makes us attentive to the many victims in our own neighbourhood"[17] He also acknowledged the influence and the "apocalyptic wisdom" of Ernst Bloch and "a vision that he inherited from the Jewish traditions that have for too long been closed to Christianity."[18]

Furthermore, Metz also had an affinity with some of his contemporary, influential Protestant theologians who influenced his philosophical approach to theology. For example, as far back as the outbreak of World War I Karl Barth was struck, in the same vein as Metz was later, by what he deemed the lack of strong theological foundation to separate a nation's action from the church." Likewise, Bonhoeffer's statement that "the ultimate test of a moral society is the kind of world that it leaves to its children"[19] agreed with Metz's basic philosophy regarding *solidarity*. Moltmann, who shared some, but not all theological viewpoints with Metz, and with whom Metz collaborated on many occasions, echoed Metz's thoughts when he wrote:

> because we cannot know whether humanity is going to survive or not, we have to act today as if the future of the whole of humanity were dependent on us – and yet at the same time

---

[16] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 233.

[17] Matthew Lamb, *Solidarity with Victims: Toward a Theology of Social Transformation,* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 20.

[18] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 169.

[19] Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Letters and Papers from Prison,* Revised Edition, edited by Eberhard Bethge. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967), 5-6. **Note:** This is the "popular" translation of the relevant quote from Bonhoeffer's *Letters and Papers from Prison* which is: "The ultimate question for responsible people to ask is not how we are to extricate ourselves heroically from the affair, but how the coming generation is to live."

trust wholly that God is faithful to his creation and will not let it go."[20]

Of course, Metz would also have been influenced by the production of post Vatican II Church documents particularly as they related to Catholic-Jewish relations.[21] This becomes evident in his reflections in the wake of the Holocaust (Sho'ah) as he recognises "not only the need for a totally new approach to the Church's theology of Judaism but understood that such a change will impact all theological statements within Christianity, not merely the Church's theology of Judaism and the Jewish people."[22] Metz's concept of *solidarity* was richly influenced by forces within and beyond the Catholic Church and has resulted in his theological approach being extended beyond the church to all humanity.

The essential features of *Solidarity* for Metz

For Metz *solidarity* has many purposes and functions, but he acknowledges that "as a category of practical fundamental theology, solidarity is above all a category of help, support and togetherness, by which the subject, suffering acutely and threatened, can be raised up."[23] As stated elsewhere, Metz identifies *solidarity*, on the one hand, as mystical and universal; and, on the other, as both political and particular. He also determined that *solidarity* required "a rather more precise form"[24] and considered two methods for addressing *solidarity*: one, the rational, "found in contemporary theories of science and action"; and the other "second kind of solidarity is world-wide."[25] The logic of the rational form, as Metz explains, is to focus more on need than on rationality, in a sense on compassion rather than justice. Reinforcing his basic argument, he insists: "It is

---

[20] Jurgen Möltmann, "Has Modern Society Any Future?" in *Faith and the Future: Essays on Theology, Solidarity, and Modernity,* ed Johann-Baptist Metz and Jürgen Moltmann (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1995), 177.
[21] (1) *The 1974 Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration Nostra Aaetate.* (2) *1985 Notes on the Correct Way to present Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Teaching in the Roman Catholic Church.*
[22] John T. Pawlikowski, "Judaism and Catholic Morality: The View of the Encyclical" in *Veritatis Splendor: American Responses,* ed. Michael E. Allsopp, John J. O'Keefe (Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward, 1995), 177.
[23] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 229.
[24] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 233.
[25] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 232.

only in the world-wide perspective that the theological category of solidarity can acquire its full dimensions."[26]

Metz's hope is that the Church's commitment to the development of a worldwide community through *solidarity* will result in radical transformation and reconciliation that will be free from violence and hatred[27] and extend to those who have been overcome and left behind in the march of progress. This hope includes those who have already died, for "God is a God of the living and the dead and a God of universal justice and the resurrection of the dead," and "the dead, after all, also belong equally to the universal community of all men in solidarity with each other."[28]

Another distinctive characteristic of his approach is his rejection of a "reciprocal form" of *solidarity*, and his preference for a Christian solidarity that was supportive of the categories of *dangerous memory* and *narrative* rather than one based on mutual exchange. Metz rejects any approach that limits support that can be provided universally and to all, without discrimination. Similarly, Lamb points out that "such *solidarity* is self-critical" and involves much more "than an optimist's sympathy for 'the less fortunate,' or a pessimist's collectivity."[29]

Many of the salient features of *solidarity* have been discussed previously in relation to some of the Catholic Church's challenges regarding discipleship and "the poor" and also regarding the application of *solidarity* to all humanity. From a universal and political perspective, therefore, Metz sees *solidarity* as one of the predominant, and consequently important, features associated with his theology.

It is Metz's hope that the Church's commitment to the development of a worldwide community through *solidarity* will result in radical transformation and

---

[26] Metz, *Faith in History and Society, 234.*
[27] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 235, 236.
[28] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 74,75.
[29] Matthew L. Lamb, *Solidarity with Victims: Toward a Theology of Social Transformation,* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), ix.

reconciliation that will be free from violence and hatred[30] and extend to those who have been overcome and left behind in the march of progress. This hope included those who have already died, for "God is a God of the living and the dead and a God of universal justice and the resurrection of the dead," and "the dead, after all, also belong equally to the universal community of all men in solidarity with each other."[31]

While Metz insists "the Christian praxis of *solidarity* will always be directed towards the imitation of Christ," he also acknowledges that the followers of Christ cannot remain neutral in the struggle for world-wide *solidarity* . . . but are compelled to take part in the struggle."[32] Then again, action must always be supported by prayer, which is "one of the indispensable ways in which this *solidarity* is expressed" and, in Metz's opinion, "this has to be stressed."[33] This establishes the fact that, in practical fundamental theology, *solidarity* is regarded as not only mystical and universal in nature but also as political and particular with a rational and world-wide perspective.[34] It also confirms that *solidarity* is a central factor in Metz's theological model.

The significance of *Solidarity* for the development of Practical-Political Theology

Metz's understanding of *solidarity* differs fundamentally from other 'popularly accepted' forms of solidarity such as social solidarity, civic solidarity, secular political solidarity, and even the solidarity of social action in which many members of the Catholic Church are actively engaged. It definitely has more in common with the rallying cries of liberation theology, which are focused on solidarity with the poor and the oppressed. Clearly, the significance of *solidarity* for Metz is much more than all these titles suggest or illustrate. Frequently, Metz emphasises global inequality and calls all Catholics to recognise "the great contrast between the Church of the North and the

---

[30] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 235, 236.
[31] Metz, *Faith in History and Society, 74,75*.
[32] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 235.
[33] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 72.
[34] Mary Doak, "Towards a Narrative Public Theology" in *Reclaiming Narrative for Public theology,* 113

Church of the South. "Solidarity," he wrote, "is strictly universal in its application to practical fundamental theology. It extends to those who have been overcome and left behind in the march of progress."[35]

The challenge he directed to Christians to be in *solidarity* is significant and far-reaching in its implications. He states:

> We who are the Christians of the first world are no longer allowed to understand and live our Christian life separate from the provocation and the prophecy that thrust their way to us out of the poor churches. Their cry for liberation and justice must be matched, in our situation, by the will to a conversion of hearts and a revision of life – a will which has certainly to take on an organized political form as well.[36]

This statement explains what, in Metz's view, *political* theology as *practical* fundamental theology is about: conversion of hearts and the revision of life. He states that "the Church will only become a Church in solidarity when it ceases to be a protectionist 'Church for the people' and becomes a real Church of the people'."[37]

In 1978, in *Toward Vatican III*, Metz called for "a necessary change in the life of the church . . . to take place first in the direction of the church's stronger concentration on the North-South axis (thesis 1) and, in connection with this, in the direction of the mystical-political realization of the church's life through discipleship and apocalyptic (theses 2-4)."[38] Such a change, in Metz's view, is significant in enabling the Church to "more credibly witness that even the damaged and the oppressed in life has an invincible hope and promise that cannot be explained away as projection and opium of the people."[39]

---

[35] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 231.
[36] Johann Baptist Metz, *The Emergent Church:The Future of Christianity in a Postbourgeois World*, (New York: Crossroad, 1981), vii.
[37] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 231.
[38] Johann Baptist Metz, "For a Renewed Church Before a New Council: A Concept in Four Theses," in *Toward Vatican III: The Work That Needs to Be Done*, ed. David Tracy with Hans Küng and Johann B. Metz (New York: The Seabury Press, 1978), 137.
[39] Metz, "For a Renewed Church Before a New Council: A Concept in Four Theses" 141.

Solidarity, Memory and Narrative connections

As has been noted previously, for Metz the categories of *memory*, *narrative* and *solidarity* stand together, having a significant connection to one another. His concise explanation of this unifying relationship illuminates the realistic nature of his practical fundamental theology. He writes: "It is only if they are taken together that *memory*, *narrative* and *solidarity* can be regarded as the basic categories of a practical fundamental theology."[40] He explains that just as *memory* and *narrative* cannot become practical categories of theology without *solidarity*, neither can *solidarity* express its practical humanizing form without *memory* and *narrative*.[41]

The prospect of developing the category of *solidarity* in the modern world, "a rationalized society based on exchange," which is contrary to the basic Christian commandment of love for all people, is a difficult if not impossible expectation. Nevertheless, Metz insisted "no practical fundamental theology can accept uncritically an idyllic application of the idea of *solidarity*."[42] Ultimately, *solidarity* is as vital as the other two categories of Metz's theology in that it holds everything else together. All three must be present together, supporting and informing one another.

The Jewish understanding of *Solidarity*

While the concept of *solidarity* is extremely important in the Hebrew scripture, in Jewish theology and in daily life, Metz's particular approach to *solidarity*, as well as his insights and his specific interpretation of *solidarity*, are at first sight, not easily applicable to traditional Jewish life and religious thinking. The Jewish meaning closest to Metz's understanding of *solidarity* would appear to be *hesed*, loosely translated as "loving kindness" but closely linked to the word "compassion." Further investigations reveal that, according to the *Kabbala* tradition, *hesed* (loving kindness) is believed to

---

[40] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 183.
[41] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 230.
[42] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 231.

work strategically in partnership with another quality, *gevurah* (strength).[43] But a closer analysis of the word, *hesed*, reveals not only its rich cultural, historical and scriptural foundation but, conceptually, shows there is a similarity in practice with Metz's category of *solidarity.*

Clarification of terminology

Because of its importance to Jewish scripture, theology and worship, and to the moral principles leading to the performance of good and charitable deeds, the Hebrew word *hesed* requires further clarification. While it is a common biblical term for describing God's love for humankind and God's special relationship with the children of Israel, Biblical scholars have had difficulty in translating *hesed* into English as there is no precise equivalent. English bibles try to represent it by using words such as "kindness," "loyalty," "steadfast love," "favour" and "devotion." In ancient Greek translations of the Bible the equivalent word is "mercy" but several other words are also used, including the words for "righteousness," "glory," and "hope"[44] and, in the prophetic literature of Judaism, "righteousness" has a specific meaning, synonymous with "moral justice."[45] Richard understands that the Greek term *agape* is "best translated today not by "love" but rather by "solidarity" and he maintains "the continuity of *hesed-agape-solidarity* expresses therefore the essential ethic of the whole Judeo-Christian tradition."[46]

The understanding of *hesed* used in this section is based on the Jewish belief that God engages with humanity and forms a covenant, giving to all people and, in a particular way to the people of Israel, "a common life, with common concerns and

---

[43] Rabbi Shimon Leiberman, "Kabbala #12: Chesed and Gevurah: The Two Sided Approach" http://www.aish.com/sp/k/Kabbala_12_Chesed_and_Gevurah_The_Two_Sided_Approach.html (accessed December 8, 2016)

[44] Will Kynes, "God's Grace in the Old Testament: Considering the Hesed of the Lord," *Knowing and Doing*, C.S. Lewis Institute, Summer Issue (2010). http://.www.cslewisinstitute.org/webfm_send/430 (accessed December 8, 2016).

[45] *Jewish Encyclopedia*, "The Unedited Full-text of 1906," s.v. "Right and Righteousness" (by Emil G. Hirsch)

[46] Pablo Richard, "Jewish and Christian Liberation Theology," in *Judaism, Christianity and Liberation: An Agenda for Dialogue*, ed. Otto Maduro (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1991), 34.

responsibilities."[47] The widening of the meaning of the Hebrew *hesed* to include "loving-kindness," "mercy," and "goodness" was the result of Israel's continual waywardness[48] and God's continual forgiveness.

Jewish understanding of *Hesed/Solidarity*

What bound the Jewish people together in a form of unity was the fact that, through them, God established a covenant with all humanity. "God said to Noah and to his sons with him . . . I am establishing my covenant with you and your descendants after you, and with every living creature." (Gen. 9:8-17). The term *hesed* defined the essence of this divine and human relationship, based as it is on mercy, compassion and justice and, as a result, Israel's national cohesion became firmly based on their corporate covenant with God.

But, over time, relationships among the people became strained and disagreements arose among them over the structure of the Israelite religion. One section of the community proposed "the group is everything": another argued for "more recognition being given to individual freedom."[49] The outcome was that the Israelites began to see their "society as an aggregate of groups rather than as a collection of individuals, that in worship (the second of the three principal tenets of Judaism) the king could embody the aspirations of the whole community, and that individuals in worship or prayer could feel that their experiences were those of the whole group."[50] At a personal level, members of the same tribe, sharing kinship, even the same occupation were regarded as being members of a united group. Terms such as "household," "father's house," "clan" and "location" were also used to identify groups and form them into alliances.

---

[47] G. W. Grogan, "The Old Testament Concept of Solidarity in Hebrews," *Tynedale Bulletin,* 49:1 (1998): 159.
[48] Norman H. Snaith, "Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament," in *A Theological Word Book of the Bible,* ed. Alan Richardson (New York: Macmillan, 1951), 136-137.
[49] Grogan, "The Old Testament Concept of Solidarity," 161.
[50] Grogan, "The Old Testament Concept of Solidarity," 160.

While the establishment of the new covenant described in Jeremiah did have an individual dimension the covenant was still with the houses of Israel and Judah.[51] "The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and house of Judah. It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt . . . I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God and they will be my people." (Jer. 31: 31-34).

Theologically the word *hesed* is important in that it stands more than any other word for the attitude that both parties to a covenant ought to maintain towards one another. Here the "twin ideas of love and loyalty" are united.[52] According to Snaith, the theological importance of *hesed* is that it signifies a contractual arrangement, a covenant, in which both parties have responsibilities and commitments.[53] One of *hesed's* major functions is to convey the inter-relatedness that comes from spiritual, divine, human, personal and corporate encounters among the Jewish community.

 Another of the three principal tenets of Judaism, the Torah, has many examples of the encounters between the divine and the human and between individuals. *Hesed* is one of the richest and most powerful words in the Hebrew scripture, reflecting, as it does, the loyal love that people committed to the God of Israel should have for one another, particularly for those who have no claim on them.[54] Practical examples of *hesed* abound in the Hebrew scripture - from Genesis "Your servant has found favor with you, and you have shown me great kindness in saving my life" (Gen. 19:19); through Job "Those who withhold kindness from a friend forsake the fear of the Almighty" (Job 6:

---

[51] Grogan, "The Old Testament Concept of Solidarity," 165.

[52] Norman H. Snaith, "Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament," in *A Theological Word Book of the Bible,* ed. Alan Richardson (New York: Macmillan, 1951), 136-137.

[53] Norman H. Snaith, "Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament," in *A Theological Word Book of the Bible,* ed. Alan Richardson (New York: Macmillan, 1951), 136-137.

[54] "The Hebrew term "hesed" and what it means for our lives today" in *Discover the Word*, (October18, 2010). https://discovertheword.org/2010/10/18/the-hebrew-term-hesed-and-what-it-means-for-our-lives-today/ (accessed December 8, 2016).

14); to Zechariah "Thus says the Lord of hosts: Render true judgments, show kindness and mercy to one another; do not oppress the widow, the orphan, the alien or the poor" (Zech 7:9).

For generations, indeed for thousands of years, Jewish tradition and contemplative thought have placed the relationship that exists between the individual and the community at the centre of traditional inter-relational life. The practice of exercising compassion for others was rooted in the hearts of the righteous in ancient Israel, and the tradition continues as members of the Jewish community continue to be instructed, from early childhood, to exercise "compassion." The practice of "compassion" is connected to the important third tenet of Judaism – *tzedakah* - "the Hebrew word for charity or just or righteous giving" which is closely related to *hesed*. The Jewish concept of *true* charity is that it is "anonymous, growing out of a genuine sense of compassion and a will to act justly, not a desire for power or self aggrandizement."[55] What God demands of the Jewish people, in the words of Micah, is "to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God." (Mic. 6:8).

These traditional Jewish concepts and practices were put to the test during the period leading to the holocaust (Sho'ah), when Jews were pitted against other Jews, in the Nazi hope that *hesed,* the strong bond that existed between and among the members of the Jewish community, would be broken.

Applying the Category of *Solidarity* to Catholic-Jewish Dialogue.

It is clear that there are certain significant differences between Metz's understanding of *solidarity* and the Jewish understanding of *hesed*. It is also evident that both *solidarity* and *hesed*, as they are defined, are primary values in their respective traditions and have a strong influence on their particular approaches to compassion, justice, ethics, forgiveness and righteousness. A Christian expression of *solidarity,* for

---

[55] Rabbi Morris Kertzer, *What is a Jew? A Guide to the Beliefs, Traditions, and practices of Judaism* (New York: Touchstone, 1996), 110-111.

example, is active engagement in social justice with the aim of advancing the kingdom of God on earth. Many members of the Jewish community have a similar understanding based on their practice of *tikkun olam* (literally, the act of "repairing the world") which Rabbi Fred Morgan explains is "underwritten in the Torah as the mission for the Jewish people."[56] It is possible that a greater understanding of *hesed* and *tikkun olam* would assist in the Catholic appreciation of Metz's category of *solidarity*, in the same way as the Jewish understanding of *solidarity* would contribute to the Jewish practices of *hesed* and *tikkun olam.* From a different and political perspective Richard maintains "the recovery of our basic original biblical identity through the practice of *solidarity"* (in the respective tradition's understanding) "is the only possible future, for Judaism as well as Christians."[57]

With that understanding, then, it would be reasonable to expect that members of both traditions engaging in dialogue would respectfully consider the factors that influence the two philosophies, theologies and ethics and would give their support to the concepts under discussion. This understanding would in turn contribute to positive outcomes in any subsequent appropriate joint endeavours based on the category of *solidarity* and/or *hesed*. Metz's description of *solidarity* as "above all a category of help, support and togetherness by which the subject, suffering acutely and threatened, can be raised up,"[58] is a familiar philosophy for both groups. Richard declared that for Christians in particular this would involve "great humility" and courage as they would have to acknowledge their injustices of the past and their oppression of the Jewish people.[59]

---

[56] Fred Morgan, "Jewish-Christian Dialogue from Jewish Perspectives Over Five Decades," in *Paths to Dialogue in our Age:Australian Perspectives,* Vol. *1,* ed. Edmund Kee-Fook Chia and Fatih Erol Tuncer (Melbourne: Australian Catholic University, 2014), 255-256.
[57] Pablo Richard, "Jewish and Christian Liberation Theology," in *Judaism, Christianity and Liberation: An Agenda for Dialogue*, ed. Otto Maduro (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1991), 34.
[58] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 229.
[59] Richard, "Jewish and Christian Liberation Theology" 34.

The form of a *solidarity* that Metz proposes is "based on the memory of the dead and those who have been overcome"[60] which, in some Jewish circles, may not be an acceptable proposal. For instance, in Orthodox synagogues children are excluded, for family reasons, from reciting memorial prayers during the memorial service within the liturgy. Within Reform Judaism, however, the memorial service "has been expanded to include victims of the Holocaust and the members believe children should be present to pray for the six million Jews who lost their lives and who may have no family members to cherish their memory."[61]

Over the last twenty years there has been a greater Christian response to commemorating the Holocaust, the Sho'ah, with Christians on occasions joining with the Jewish community to remember, while at other times remembering as a Christian community in a spirit of sincere repentance. In an effort to reach the wider Christian community, in a spirit of *solidarity* and *hesed,* Churches are often encouraged to include a special commemorative prayer in the liturgy on the Sunday nearest to *Yom HaSho'ah*.[62]

From a much broader practical perspective, the combination of Metz's universal and practical category of *solidarity* and the Jewish understanding of *hesed* has the potential to provide an enriching learning opportunity for participants in Catholic-Jewish dialogue. It is yet another occasion where the relevant principle of Receptive Ecumenism that asks, "What can we learn, and receive with integrity, from one another?"[63] could be addressed effectively.

---

[60] Metz, *Faith in History and Society,* 229.

[61] Kertzer, *What is a Jew?* 75.

[62] Verna Holyhead, "Christians Remember the Shoah", Introduction by Marianne Dacy, in *Pathways to understanding: a handbook on Christian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Marianne Dacy (Melbourne, Australia: Victorian Council of Churches, 1994), 99.

[63] Note: In the secular sense the English word, solidarity, evolved from a 19th century French word "solidaire" and, as a by-product of the Enlightenment, is broadly related to the French goals of liberty, equality and fraternity. It is often employed in the social sciences, philosophy and Catholic social teaching. In Metz's understanding of *solidarity* the emphasis is on religious relationships, elements of justice, and concern for all, living and dead.

Solidarity in the Australian context

The most pertinent description to explain *solidarity*, among the many given by the Australian Catholic Social Justice Council, is "solidarity acknowledges that our responsibilities to each other cross national, racial, cultural, economic and ideological differences," and "presents a spiritual and material solidarity with all people, especially those who are marginalised."[64] These qualities could be both useful guidelines and social barometers when applied to Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia.

As has already been discussed Australia has a varied racial and cultural history and is continuing to expand multi-culturally, and to becoming more economically and ideologically different. To a lesser degree, Australians are slowly becoming more aware of the importance of developing a greater appreciation and respect for people of different faith traditions, so *spiritual* solidarity is a crucial element particularly for Catholic-Jewish dialogue. While Australia is not free of negative racial and religious issues, including anti-semitism, it has not experienced segregation and persecution to the same extent as some other multi-cultural societies. The gradual introduction of inter-religious dialogue into Australian society has had a largely positive impact on inter-religious relationships, providing a greater sense of peace, acceptance, appreciation and solidarity among the different religious traditions, at least at an "official" level. Ochs clarifies the growing relationship between faith and modern society, pointing out that "the modern Jew and Christian need each other's help to overcome the burden of their shared modernity."[65]

The Rabbi Emeritus of Temple Beth Israel in Melbourne and an Australian leader in Jewish-Christian dialogue, Rabbi Fred Morgan, wrote:

---

[64] "Catholic Social Teaching," *Australian Catholic Social Justice Council*, Australian Catholic Bishops Conference. 8 December 2000. *Amended 2006.* http://www.socialjustice.catholic.org.au/social-teaching (accessed December, 2016).

[65] Peter Ochs and David Ford, "A Third Epoch: The Future of Discourse in Jewish-Christian Relations," in *Challenges in Jewish-Christian Relations*, ed. James K. Aitken and Edward Kessler (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2006), 167.

> Within the Jewish world a growing number of scholars and lay people see Jewish-Christian engagement as a sacred activity that can break down the prejudices and misconceptions of the past, enable Jews and Christians to become more sensitive to the values and beliefs that each holds dear, and so contribute to bringing God's presence into the world.[66]

In the same way that sharing each other's *narratives* can be beneficial to Australian dialogue so too sharing experiences of *solidarity* can build trust and a sense of community. Australia's Jewish population includes a significant number of holocaust (Sho'ah) survivors and descendants of victims of the Sho'ah who have not only experienced *hesed* at a very personal level but have much to teach the Catholic members of any dialogue group about their experience of Catholic *solidarity*, or lack thereof.

One of the obstacles still to be overcome in Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia is what Sweeney refers to as "The Tribe". The members of the Catholic "tribe" in its unique way and the members of the Jewish "tribe" in another way still have the urge to stay where they are safe and comfortable. Klenicki warned against the dangers of remaining in a "tribal" mode of thinking and acting when he wrote:

> Certain temptations must be avoided: for instance, total negativism regarding the possibilities and future of dialogue based on past experiences. Another is self-pity for past persecutions and pains; those were very real events, unfortunate parts of Christian history. But self-righteousness is not an answer to the challenge of dialogue, one of the most difficult challenges to a religious person.
> The right Jewish attitude in this situation requires self-searching and a spirit of reconciliation. It entails recognition of the dialogue partner as a subject of faith, a child of God.
> It also calls for a perception of Christianity's role in bringing God's covenant to humanity following the obligation placed upon Noah, the biblical symbol for humankind. Through dialogue, Christianity must overcome the triumphalism of power, Judaism the triumphalism of pain.[67]

---

[66] Fred Morgan, "Jewish-Christian Dialogue from Jewish Perspectives Over Five Decades," 256.
[67] Leon Klenicki, "Nostra Aetate: A Jewish view 'From Disputation to Dialogue'" ADL, October 20 (2005) http://archive.adl.org/main_interfaith/nostra_aetate2cb9.html#.WKRedRRLddk (accessed June 20, 2015).

Compatibility of *Solidarity* with the Principles of Receptive Ecumenism

Örsy's statement regarding receptive learning among Christian churches is also applicable to inter-religious dialogue, particularly dialogue between Catholic and Jewish traditions. **"Receptive learning"** he wrote "is a delicate operation: it is authentic when it is marked by truth and transfused by prudence."[68] The qualities of respect for one another, openness to learning from another and receiving from another are also foundational in Catholic-Jewish dialogue. In Catholic-Jewish dialogue, as in ecumenical dialogue, while one tradition has the role of being "the giving community" the other has the position of being "the receiving community." To achieve a positive outcome, both groups must be prepared to be honest and humble, rely on God's help, and accept the goodwill and integrity of the other. O'Gara observes that in the process of interacting with ecumenical dialogue partners, "receiving gifts is not always easy."[69] That situation also applies to Catholic-Jewish dialogue where sensitivity to the offering of "gifts" or the non-acceptance or rejection of gifts, is an important factor that must be addressed.

The category of *solidarity* can, in a sense, be seen as a more active and more practical element or activity in inter-religious dialogue and is perhaps less threatening to the participants than the theological and intellectual approaches of the other two categories. Also, many of the characteristics that define the category of *solidarity* are compatible with the principles of Receptive Ecumenism as outlined by Murray, and provide a natural route of entry into dialogue between members of Catholic and Jewish communities.

As has already been discussed, *solidarity* and *hesed* share some basic similarities while they also have a number of significant differences. Many of the significant

---

[68] Ladislas Örsy, Authentic *Learning* and *Receiving* – A Search for Criteria," in *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism*, ed.Paul Murray with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 39.

[69] Margaret O'Gara, "Receiving Gifts in Ecumenical Dialogue," in *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism,* ed. Paul Murray with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 33.

characteristics of Murray's approach to *reception* are also compatible with Metz's category of *solidarity*. There are three distinctive approaches that can reduce difficulties regarding involvement in "reception" – learning personally, learning together, and learning from each other. Human reception is related to acceptance and interest in the other and is a part of the development of social skills. Murray's "spiritual reception" comes about when religious and spiritual exchange occurs during liturgical experiences or through formal and informal explanations of central religious beliefs. Education and sharing in each other's theological understanding and scriptural appreciation broaden and enrich the experience of theological and scriptural reception. The opportunity for Catholics to be exposed to the scriptural reception of the *Tanakh* (the Hebrew name for the Bible) would be an amazing opportunity enabling them to develop a greater understanding of the foundations of Christianity and greater reverence and respect for the Jewish faith of which Christianity is a "new shoot." The reverse is true for the Jews in receiving a greater understanding of Jewish life through the exchange of first century (C.E.) Christian scriptures.

Catholics have church tradition and church law and the Jews have "tradition" including the oral tradition *Midrash* and the *Talmud*, and *halachah (*Jewish religious law). The exchange of tradition and law in both cases acknowledges, respects and responds to the wisdom and the lived experience of the faithful, in the Catholic Church the *sensus fidelium.* While there are structural differences and queries that would inevitably arise in the process of this particular type of reception, the questioning and acting together in *solidarity* would mean both groups would be better informed. By being correctly informed they would be better able to interpret the information, rather than relying on past myths and prejudices.

Applying O'Gara's ecumenical theory to Catholic Jewish dialogue indicates that like "the work of ecumenical gift exchange, inter-religious exchange is nurtured by long-

term dialogue among . . . partners who learn to give and receive from each other,"[70] Murray's theory and the principles of Receptive Ecumenism are compatible with the principles of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. Collaboration, then, is vital if the dialogue is to receive the impetus to bring about the renewal it recognises as essential.

Conclusion

This chapter identified key features of Metz's category of *solidarity* and suggested areas in which it has contributed to the development of his model of practical political theology. It is evident that Metz's particular approach to *solidarity* has made an impact on post Vatican II Catholic life and thinking, with regard to the dignity of the individual and the recognition of all humans as subjects before God.

Comparing the two understandings, Metz's *solidarity* and Jewish *hesed*, revealed a similar 'spirit' of care and concern for those who have suffered, and a willingness to pursue justice and peace in the world. An examination of the two different traditions indicated that there is sufficient common understanding for the two groups to engage in joint ventures, which could be a significant activity shared in the spirit of Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

The relevance of *solidarity* in the Australian context was considered and judged to be extremely important in light of the shared history of members of both traditions. Applying O'Gara's ecumenical theory to Catholic-Jewish dialogue indicates that like "the work of ecumenical gift exchange inter-religious exchange is nurtured by long-term dialogue among . . . partners who learn to give and receive from each other."[71]

Metz's concept of *solidarity* and the Jewish understanding of solidarity were shown to be compatible with the principles of Receptive Ecumenism, and together could be applied positively to the principles and hopes of Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

---

[70] O'Gara, "Receiving Gifts in Ecumenical Dialogue," 33.

[71] O'Gara, "Receiving Gifts in Ecumenical Dialogue," 33.

Chapter 6   The Way Forward to Shaping the Future

Introduction

The mixed responses to *Nostra Aetate*,[1] in both Catholic and Jewish sectors, have been discussed previously, together with explanations of the various theories and approaches in relation to inter-religious dialogue.

But, twenty years after the end of World War II and the Holocaust, certainly influenced by the Second Vatican Council and *Nostra Aetate,* and with the establishment of the Council of Christians and Jews (CCJ), a remarkable and completely unforeseen shift in the balance of power between Christians and Jews was emerging.

Some Christians had begun to understand and to accept, at least vicariously, something of the burden of suffering, denigration and disempowerment experienced by the Jews for centuries. A limited number had also begun to re-evaluate some of their relevant, central beliefs of Christianity such as the part "the Jews" had in the death of Jesus, supersessionism, and involuntary Jewish conversion. While Christians were grappling with their guilt and deep-seated avoidance mechanisms, the Jews were struggling with fears of annihilation and victimisation. Both groups were vulnerable and at risk of 'losing control' of the future they hoped for. As Hoffman recalls "We shared what we had in common and nodded respectfully when we differed, still convinced, however, that we had nothing to learn from one another."[2]

Even these seemingly minor experiences, somehow, brought about an extraordinary shift of power, a shift to a greater "power balance" between Christians and Jews. In fact, the scales of power altered dramatically as people's understanding and

---

[1] Vatican II Council, *Nostra Aetate* (hereafter *NA)*, *Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions*, par. 4 in *The Documents of Vatican II, with Notes and Comments by Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Authorities,* ed. Walter M Abbott, S.J., (London and Dublin: Chapman, 1966), 665.

[2] Rabbi Lawrence Hoffman, *My People's Passover Haggadah,* (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2008), Vol. 1, 34.

experience developed, and they began to speak to one another as "fellow citizens," companions and friends. It became clearly evident from these observations and experiences that meaningful dialogue *can* take place when there is common understanding, shared experiences, respectful and non-threatening conversation and discussion, and where a common acceptance of existing differences is clearly understood and addressed by both groups.[3]

This chapter, then, will identify and compare two "views" of what *Nostra Aetate* is calling Australians to now and into the future. One will be a view from a Catholic perspective, and the other from a Jewish perspective. The Catholic perspective will examine the real and the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the existing dialogue process using the four forms of dialogue recommended in the 1984 Vatican document *Dialogue and Mission*: "the dialogue of everyday life - for all; the dialogue of deeds or action - working collaboratively together; the dialogue of theological exchange - for improved understanding; the dialogue of religious experience - for the sharing of spiritual riches."[4] Jewish responses to key Vatican documents, and important initiatives by Jewish writers and scholars who are closely engaged in dialogue, particularly in Australia, will provide the Jewish perspective. The relevance of Metz's key categories of *memory, narrative* and *solidarity* will then be summarily presented in relation to the two perspectives.

A major aim of this chapter is to identify expectations, hopes and challenges for the future of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia. Practical proposals and future planning for ongoing development, and "projects" that will enable that dialogue to flourish, will be discussed. The recent (2015) Vatican document, *"The Gifts and the*

---

[3] Smith. *The Effect of the Holocaust*, 151.
[4] Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue (PCID), *The attitude of the Church Towards the Followers of Other Religions: Reflection and Orientations on Dialogue and Mission* (hereafter *DM*), 1984, 13-15.

Calling of God,"[5] and some of the Jewish responses[6] to that document will be a major focus in informing that ongoing development.

This approach to the future development of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia will be tested against the fundamental principle within Paul Murray's *Receptive Ecumenism*: "that each tradition should focus first on the self-critical question: 'What can *we* learn, or *receive*, with integrity from *our* various others in order to facilitate our own growth together'."[7]

An Australian Catholic perspective

When *Nostra Aetate* was released in 1965, it took the world, including the Catholic world, by surprise. In spite of the shock, fifty years later, *Nostra Aetate* is rightly considered to be one of the Council's major documents, a document that has been instrumental in bringing about a new direction for the Catholic Church, particularly in its relation with Judaism and the Jewish people. Yet, it appears, that there are still significant numbers of Catholics in Australia who are unaware of the existence and therefore the significance of this Council document. Consequently, their knowledge and experience of inter-religious dialogue would not meet the goals recommended and hoped for by *Nostra Aetate.*

Since the Vatican Council many Catholics, without a great understanding of what is involved, appear to be more at ease with "being ecumenical," even attending, occasionally, an inter-church event.[8] Unfortunately, for most of these "ordinary" Catholics, participating in any form of inter-religious dialogue is not considered at all.

---

[5] Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, Vatican, *The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable: A Reflection on Theological Questions Pertaining to Catholic-Jewish Relations on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of "Nostra Aetate,"* (10 December 2015).

[6] Lisa Palmieri-Billig, *The gifts and calling of God are irrevocable, a Jewish perspective,* American Jewish Committee, 13 December, 2015.

[7] Paul Murray, *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning,* ix.

[8] The World Day of Prayer is an international ecumenical Christian laywomen's initiative. It is run under the motto "Informed Prayer and Prayerful Action," and is celebrated annually in over 170 countries on the first Friday in March. The movement aims to bring together women (and more recently men have been included) of various races, cultures and traditions in a yearly common Day of Prayer, as well as in closer fellowship, understanding and action throughout the year.

This is largely due to the fact that their knowledge and understanding of what is involved in inter-religious dialogue is limited and they are unaware of their faith obligations in this area of Catholic life. This indicates not only a level of indifference or ignorance of religious issues, but also the lack of educational opportunities available to the laity at local and often diocesan levels.[9]

In 1992 the Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference released the *Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations*. At that time, this was a revolutionary move by the Australian Church, but a belated one, coming twenty-seven years after the promulgation of *Nostra Aetate*. The Chairman, Bishop Bede Heather, strongly urged the implementation of the Guidelines hoping that the document would give the Church in Australia a new impetus to Catholic-Jewish understanding. It has taken many years for that hope to be realised.

The responsibility for providing more realistic educational processes lies with the Catholic hierarchy, with the Diocesan Commissions or Councils set up to promote inter-religious dialogue, and with parish clergy. "The role of the leader, the thinker, the theologian" in Sweeney's view, "is to persist in the patient and imaginative search for ways through present dilemmas in service of the 'new thing' God is always doing."[10]

At an "official level", the Australian Catholic Bishops Committee for Ecumenism (ACBC) and members of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ), whose members come from Orthodox as well as Progressive Judaism, meet regularly. Catholics and Jews serve together on International, National and State Councils of Christians and Jews and most Catholic Dioceses have an inter-religious commission or council. All are committed to the advancement of inter-religious dialogue within Australian society.

Sadly, as the formal education of clergy and those in formation does not appear to place a great deal of emphasis on education or training in the areas of inter-religious

---

[9] Thomas J. Reese, "Organizational Factors Inhibiting Receptive Catholic Learning," in *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning,* ed. Paul Murray (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 346-355.

[10] James Sweeney, "Receptive Ecumenism, Ecclesial Learning and the 'Tribe'," in *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning,* ed. Paul Murray, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 343-344.

dialogue, the future is not very positive. At the parish level, many clergy are absorbed in local parish duties with little time, interest or inclination to engage in inter-religious dialogue and as a result there is little local inter-religious activity in Catholic parishes.

One of the criticisms of the Catholic Church's approach to Catholic-Jewish dialogue is that it is often directed to the more "academic", already educated sector and is therefore limited to "the few". For the "people in the pews" to be adequately equipped to approach the Christian life and their Catholicity positively and with humility in new, realistic and productive ways, an improved level of educational support is crucial.

Many members of the Australian laity ("the People of God" in the Council's terminology, and in Reese's interpretation, "the people in the pews") have not had the advantage of being exposed to significant areas of post conciliar education. One has to consider whose responsibility it was to ensure that the benefits that emerged from the Council, especially the theological and spiritual gifts, were offered, recommended and promoted to "the People of God".

In Rush's opinion, it is the local church's responsibility to provide, for both clergy *and* laity, ongoing reflection on theological matters that emanated from the Council and to facilitate opportunities for that information to be accepted and received, in other words, to enable *theological reception* to take place. In a similar way, the experience of *spiritual reception*[11] of the Council's teaching is to be available to the *whole* church. The People of God, then, must have the opportunity to *know* the teaching, to be assisted to absorb the spirit that drives the teaching, and then to acquire and develop the will to assimilate it into their daily lives, to actually experience *spiritual reception*.[12] It would be helpful for the wellbeing, the faith and the spirit of the Catholic community if both these

---

[11] Ormond Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermeneutical Principles* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2004), 52-55.
[12] Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II,* 52-55.

areas of *reception* were to be revisited and re-enlivened, particularly in local Australian communities and parishes.

In 1984, with the publication of *Dialogue and Mission*, the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue evaluated the practices and structures of dialogue that had been occurring in different parts of the church in the previous twenty years. It identified the four "most important and typical forms" of dialogue to continue the work begun by *Nostra Aetate.*

The first form identified was the dialogue of life, in which "every follower of Christ, by reason of his human and Christian vocation, is called to live dialogue in his daily life."[13] What this form was recommending was for people to strive to live in an open and neighbourly spirit, sharing their joys and sorrows, their human problems and preoccupations and offering support and encouragement to others.

On a positive level, Australians from all the major faith traditions draw on their religious faith and its teaching to engage in working together to assist others in times of social and humanitarian upheavals and natural disasters, in Australia and in other parts of the world. This is what *Dialogue and Mission* refers to as the "dialogue of deeds" or action. Articles 31 and 32 in *DM* strongly encourage Catholics, and indeed all Christians, to "work together with other believers by virtue of their respective faiths." Australians may not be familiar with the recommendations of *DM* but Australians of all faiths and no faith are always involved in working together in times of crisis, supporting one another as members of the human family.[14] For many Australians the influence of faith is frequently the major inspiration for those taking part in "good deeds" of all kinds, particularly those "directed toward the liberation and advancement of mankind."[15]

---

[13] *DM*, 30.
[14] *DM*, 32.
[15] *DM*, 31.

Australia is indeed fortunate in the area of "the dialogue of specialists," the third form of inter-religious dialogue recommended in *DM*. Where feasible, Catholic scholars and diocesan Episcopal Commissions attend official meetings with Jewish experts in biblical scholarship and theological studies and, in the spirit of dialogue, deal with contemporary religious issues and community needs. As partners in dialogue they have adhered to the principles outlined in Articles 34 and 35 of *DM*, which promote "mutual understanding and respect of each other's spiritual values and cultural categories and promote communion and fellowship among people."[16]

Providentially, most Australian bishops, theologians, and inter-religious experts are well equipped to critique the existing situation and willing to give support to common social action especially in areas of social justice and peace. They are aware that, in recent times, confidence in church leadership, on several levels, is diminished and that this diminishment impacts on the progress of several ministries including Catholic-Jewish dialogue. But they are also aware that if Catholic-Jewish relations and dialogue are to progress, the church's approach to inter-religious dialogue will need the official church's support and its ongoing reassessment.

The final form of dialogue recommended by *DM* is "the dialogue of religious experience." This is an area of inter-religious dialogue where the "ordinary" Catholic has the opportunity to learn not only about "the other," but about one's own tradition, theology and religious culture. If the Catholic partners in the dialogue are to share, with integrity, their Catholic understandings and experiences of subjects such as faith, prayer, contemplation, liturgical practices and religious duties they must be adequately informed. This exchange of religious "experience" is both enlightening and enriching for dialogue participants and may even dispel some previously held religious myths and

---

[16] *DM,* 34, 35.

prejudices. This form of dialogue has the potential to be mutually enriching "promoting and preserving the highest values and spiritual ideals of man (sic)".[17]

From a Catholic perspective exchanges of religious "experiences" with members of both Catholic and Jewish communities are rich opportunities that should be available to all but, in reality, are gifts for the fortunate few. Controversial issues most certainly arise during this form of dialogue. In these exchanges, Catholic issues that are stumbling blocks for the Jews surface, as do Jewish challenges to Catholic subjects and practices. But, in a respectful environment of charity and mutual trust, the gains to be achieved and the gifts to be received, "with integrity," can be life giving.

Two key events in Catholic-Jewish relations, of which most Catholics are not aware, occurred in 1993 and 1998. In 1993 formal diplomatic relations between the Holy See and the State of Israel were adopted. From the Vatican's point of view the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two states is part of Christian-Jewish reconciliation. From a Jewish point of view, it was a "public affirmation of the Jewish people's right to a homeland"[18] and honours the covenant God made with them. The land of Israel (*Eretz Yisrael)* is central to Judaism for it is in Israel their spiritual, religious and political identity was shaped. In spite of all that, the spiritual significance of the land of Israel for Jews remains difficult for many Christians to fathom. For Jews, the recognition of their homeland is not only an acknowledgement of them as individuals, or the acceptance of Judaism as a religion in its own right, but it is a "full and final acknowledgement of Jews *as a people.*"[19] From a justice perspective, Catholics often feel uncomfortable with the tension that exists between the Jewish importance of the land, and the rights of the Palestinian people to have access to the land of their birth.

---

[17] *DM*, 35.

[18] Noam Marans, "From Regret to Acclaim: A Jewish Reaction to Nostra Aetate, Celebrating 50 Years of the Catholic Church's Dialogue with Jews,*"* American Jewish Committee – Global Jewish Advocacy (2015) http://www.ajc.org/site/apps/nlnet/content3.aspx?c=7oJILSPwFfJSG&b=8480869&ct=14736165. (accessed July 11, 2016).

[19] Mary Boys, *Has God Only One Blessing?*265.

These are issues that need to be appropriately addressed if the Catholic Church as a community is to have a part in bringing about peace and healing to Israel and its people.[20]

The other event of significance occurred in 1998 when the Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews produced "a Catholic document on the *Sho'ah* and anti-semitism entitled "*We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah".* Cardinal Cassidy, the then President of the Commission, and an Australian, invited "all men and women of good will to reflect deeply on the significance of the *Shoah*. The victims from their graves," he wrote "and the survivors through their vivid testimony of what they have suffered, have become a loud voice calling the attention of all of humanity."[21]

What appears to be lacking, from the Catholic perspective, is awareness, vision, incentive, and appropriate educational opportunities to participate in inter-religious dialogue at an acceptable level. Until educational opportunities in all aspects of inter-religious dialogue and specifically Catholic-Jewish dialogue, are available to all the faithful, in a format that is relevant and appropriate, it cannot be said that the dialogue of life is truly "for all."[22]

An Australian Jewish perspective

Post World War II migration of Jews from Europe, and more recently from South Africa, resulted in the revitalisation of the Australian Jewish community, which now numbers approximately 100,000 or just over 0.5% of the Australian population.[23] As has been referenced previously Australia, proportionally, has the highest concentration of Holocaust survivors in the world, outside of Israel.

---

[20] Andrew P.B. White, "Israel within Jewish-Christian Relations," in *Challenges in Jewish-Christian Relations,* ed. James K. Aiken and Edward Kessler (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2006), 135.
[21] Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah,* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1998), 13-14.
[22] *DM,* #30.
[23] Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Characteristics of the Population Yearbook 2009-1010: 10/11/10.*

There are many Orthodox Jewish congregations in Australia, but there is also a smaller, yet strong and active, Progressive Judaism movement spread across the States and Territories. It seems less difficult for the Progressive Judaism communities in Australia to become involved in inter-faith dialogue, and their work with Christian groups has been very effective and greatly appreciated. Fortunately, there are indications, internationally, that Orthodox Judaism may be changing its attitude to inter-faith dialogue. Within both national and international Jewish religious leadership there is a concern, similar to that shared by members of the Catholic community, regarding the lack of commitment to the faith on the part of their younger members.[24]

Rabbi Raymond Apple who was the Senior Rabbi of the Great Synagogue of Sydney between 1972 and 2005 was one of Australia's highest profile rabbis and the leading spokesman for Judaism in Australia. In the 1970s and 1980s he and members of the Notre Dame de Sion Order, more commonly known as the Sisters of our Lady of Sion, worked together to establish Christian-Jewish relations. Prior to this time any attempts of this kind had been directed at combating anti-semitism. Their efforts provided the groundwork for the acceptance and implementation of *Nostra Aetate* in Sydney, and for the reception of the Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference *Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations* in 1992. While there was some criticism of the Guidelines from the Jewish community, the Guidelines were a beginning. It was impossible to address every issue that was raised at that time or to deal extensively with the criticism that followed.

It is important to recognise here that *Nostra Aetate* is directed to Christians, and in particular to Catholic Christians, but not to Jews. Nevertheless, because *Nostra Aetate* provided the mandate for bringing about constructive change in inter-religious dialogue, and in Catholic-Jewish dialogue in particular, it came to be recognised, in many official Jewish circles, as groundbreaking and transformative. In 1986, for example, the hope

---

[24] Australian Council of Christians and Jews, "The Jewish Community," http://www.ccj.org.au/
(accessed July 11, 2016).

and the promise of *Nostra Aetate* were even being compared to the impact and the influence of the *Magna Carta* and the *Constitution of the United States*.[25] In considering the dramatic improvement in Catholic-Jewish relations since *Nostra Aetate* was released, Rabbi Rudin acknowledged: "We are all children of Vatican II. It has irreversibly changed the way we look at one another."[26] Fortunately, members of the American Jewish community remain positive and are convinced that "*Nostra Aetate's* power is not limited to the past, but rather ongoing, in the present and the future."[27]

In Australia, however, some of the more conservative sections of the Jewish community have remained untouched by *Nostra Aetate*. There are others who, belonging to more liberal Jewish communities and organisations, consider that *Nostra Aetate* has been a catalyst for transformation in Jewish-Christian relations and has even "transformed Jewish history."[28] Jeremy Jones, from the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ), reflecting on the 2005 international and domestic position of Jewish-Catholic relations said "we have moved dramatically from a position of suspicion and distrust to one of respect and co-operation, where we can discuss all issues openly and frankly."[29]

A statement presented to Pope Francis by the International Council of Christians and Jews in 2015 declared "too many Christians and too many Jews are unaware of the rapprochement that is unfolding between us."[30] It went on to explain that people still

[25] Rudin, "The Dramatic Impact of *Nostra Aetate*," 15.

[26] Rudin, "The Dramatic Impact of *Nostra Aetate*," 18.
Note: This statement was made by Rabbi Rudin in his position as Director of the American Jewish Committee of International Affairs.

[27] Noam Marans, "From Regret to Acclaim: A Jewish Reaction to Nostra Aetate, Celebrating 50 Years of the Catholic Church's Dialogue with Jews," American Jewish Committee – Global Jewish Advocacy (2015) http://www.ajc.org/site/apps/nlnet/content3.aspx?c=7oJILSPwFfJSG&b=8480869&ct=14736165. (accessed July 11, 2016).

[28] Marans, "From Regret to Acclaim."

[29] Jeremy Jones, Co-Chair 8th annual Conversation of the Australian Catholic Bishops' Committee for Ecumenism (ACBC) and the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ), May 2005, St Mary's Cathedral.

[30] International Council of Christians and Jews, Executive Board, (hereafter ICCJ) "Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship," *A Statement from the International Council of Christians and Jews on the Golden Jubilee of the Second Vatican Council Declaration, Nostra Aetate,* (2015), 1- 4.

choose to "cling to the 'mental ghettos' to which they have become accustomed."[31] However, in order to overcome the fear of prejudice and rejection, the Council statement suggests that for Christians and Jews to ensure better self and mutual understanding it is more important than ever to have a "rigorous and constant education to a true knowledge of each other's traditions."[32]

A very significant event occurred in December 2015 when 48 Orthodox Rabbis who lead communities, institutions and seminaries in Israel, the United States and Europe, published for the first time since Vatican II, a Statement advocating a partnership with Christianity. While the document, "*To Do the Will of Our Father in Heaven*" did not have any Australian signatories, this statement, is a very positive indication for Australia that Orthodox thinking is shifting and that Orthodox rabbis are prepared to enter into contemporary dialogues and religious encounters with Christians.

The statement opened with these encouraging and inspiring words:

> After nearly two millennia of mutual hostility and alienation, we Orthodox Rabbis, recognize the opportunity now before us. We seek to do the will of our Father in Heaven by accepting the hand offered to us by our Christian brothers and sisters. Jews and Christians must work together as partners to address the moral challenges of our era.[33]

The reason given for this shift in thinking was that since the Second Vatican Council, "the official teachings of the Catholic Church about Judaism have changed fundamentally and irrevocably."[34] This historic Jewish Statement, which has received very little recognition in Australia, declared that *Nostra Aetate* had initiated the process of reconciliation between the two communities, but it was the later official Church

---

[31] ICCJ, "Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship," 3.
[32] ICCJ, "Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship," 3.
[33] Center for Jewish-Christian Understanding and Cooperation (CJCUC), "To Do the Will of Our Father in Heaven: Towards a Partnership between Jews and Christians," Orthodox Rabbinic Statement on Christianity, Israel, 3 December, 2015. Introduction.
[34] CJCUC, Para 2.

documents it inspired, that affirmed that the official Church leaders "unequivocally reject any form of anti-Semitism, affirm the eternal Covenant . . . reject deicide and stress the unique relationship between Christians and Jews"[35]

In spite of obvious inadequacies and difficulties, there have been small groups of Australian Christians and Jews who have been pro-active in the area of interfaith dialogue for decades. The Victorian Branch of the Council of Christians and Jews, which has a current membership of over 400, was the first branch to be established in Australia in 1985. In spite of historical prejudices, it has been very successful in achieving mutual respect and understanding among its members. It has, to its credit, a successful publishing history beginning with the first edition of the very successful interfaith periodical, *Gesher,* in 1990. In 1994, a courageous decision by the Victorian Council resulted in the production of an important 16-page document, *Rightly Explaining the Word of Truth*,[36] which was circulated widely. This document presented guidelines for Christian clergy and teachers to assist them in improving their understanding and making the proper use of Christian scripture in relation to the Jews.

The Council of Christians and Jews in Australia has expanded, to the extent that in 2016 there are branches in Victoria (established 1985), New South Wales (established 1988), Western Australia (established 1995), South Australia, and the Australian Capital Territory (ratified 2010). Other States have different, yet similar, practical interfaith groups where Catholics and Jews work together to advance inter-religious dialogue, using the responsibility given to them to learn from each other.[37]

Using similar approaches to both the third and the fourth models of inter-faith dialogue in *Dialogue and Mission,* the *International* Council of Christians and Jews has

---

[35] CJCUC, Para 2.

[36] The Council of Christians and Jews, *Rightly Explaining the Word of Truth*, (Melbourne: The Council of Christians and Jews (Victoria) Inc., 1994), 1-16.

[37] Note: In Queensland, for example, the Forum for Jews, Christians and Muslims under the auspice of Queensland Churches Together, has been meeting regularly since 2007. In spite of the small numbers of Jewish residents in Queensland, the Jewish Board of Deputies has provided members for this Forum since its beginning. The three faith groups work productively and effectively together and have formed strong relationships.

suggested specific recommendations for building better Jewish-Christian relationships. In mid 2015, in a statement presented to Pope Francis members of the *International Council of Christians and Jews* (in which Australia has membership) rejoiced that Jews and Christians can now "work and study together in a sustained way, thereby, enriching each other's covenantal lives."[38]

> Christians who study rabbinic texts with Jewish guides soon perceive the injustice of the timeworn caricature of Judaism as heartless legalism or its ancestral innovators, the Pharisees, as more concerned about rubrics than people. Similarly, Jews who explore church traditions with Christian companions can encounter a questing and humble spirituality far removed from any arrogance and condescension they may have expected.[39]

However, as the Statement explains, the long shadow of the Sho'ah is still present and raises difficult questions for both groups, questions that must ultimately be addressed. While Jews struggle with the awful legacy of discrimination, victimisation, and fears of annihilation, Christians have to confront their part in a long history of anti-Semitism and persecution and the guilt and self-recrimination for being apathetic. "We believe" the delegates wrote "that only together can Christians and Jews help each other heal and effectively confront the fraught legacy of the *Sho'ah*."[40]

This research has revealed that both Catholics and Jews accept the fact that dialogue between and within the groups is essential, but it must be *authentic* dialogue, not merely "lip service" or a "feel good" activity. Rabbi Emeritus Fred Morgan from the Progressive *Temple Beth Israel* in Melbourne has through many decades of engagement in Christian-Jewish dialogue concluded that there are four key measures of success or failure in Jewish-Christian dialogue. These he named *dialogical symmetry*, *opening the*

---

[38] ICCJ, "Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship," 3.
[39] ICCJ, "Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship," 3.
[40] ICCJ, "Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship," 4.

hermeneutical circle, the hospitality quotient and *the Menschlichkeit* ("humankindness")

factor.[41]

He observed that the dialogue that had emerged post World War II was not

"dialogical symmetry" but was in fact one-way, *asymmetrical*, with Christian members

looking for forgiveness for their prejudices and hatred of centuries, in return for the

Jews extending them pardon. This "unequal" dialogue is even more evident when

comparison is made between *The Ten Points of Seelisberg*[42] (1947), and *The 12 points of*

Berlin[43] (2009), both documents released by the International Council of Christians and

Jews. The *Seelisberg* document was addressed solely to the Christian world and focused

on Christian attitudes and behaviour towards Jews. The *Berlin* document, written over

sixty years later, was a more "equal" statement with each group, Christians and Christian

Communities, Jews and Jewish Communities, and *united* Christian and Jewish

Communities and others, all invited to accept the call and the challenge to engage in

constructive dialogue.

The *united* call lists four areas of action, which in 2016, seem even more relevant

than when they were written – *interreligious* and *intercultural* education, interreligious

friendship and *cooperation* as well as *social justice in the global society*, dialogue with

political and economic bodies and the call to *network* with all those whose work

responds to the demands of *environmental stewardship*.

Another previously mentioned and very important statement in Jewish-Christian

dialogue was *Dabru Emet* (You Shall Tell the Truth)[44] released in 2000. Signed by 172

Jewish Rabbis and scholars from every sector of the Jewish community it was responded

---

[41] Rabbi Fred Morgan, "Dialogue 4 Success: Four measures of success and failure in Jewish-Christian dialogue," *Gesher, Many Shades of Dialogue,* Volume 4, no. 4 (2013): 14-17.

[42] International Council of Christians and Jews, 5.8.1947. "An Address to the Churches: International Council of Christians and Jews, The 10 Points of Seelisburg," http://www.jcrelations.net. (accessed October 4, 2011).

[43] International Council of Christians and Jews, July 2009. "A Time for Recommitment: The Twelve Points of Berlin: Building a new Relationship between Jews and Christians," http://www.iccj.org/A-Time-for-Recommitment-The-Twelve-Points-of-Berlin.184.0.html, (accessed October 3, 2014).

[44] *Dabru Emet* (You Shall Tell the Truth), New York Times, 10 September 2000)

to in 2002 by The Christian Scholars Group on Christian-Jewish Relations in a document entitled *"A Sacred Obligation* (following on from *Dabru Emet)"*.[45] Neither of these important documents received wide recognition in the broad Australian Catholic and Jewish Communities.

On reflection, there is a similarity between Morgan's four key measures written in 2013 and the four forms of dialogue recommended in *Dialogue and Mission* in 1984. Both are concerned with mutual support and encouragement, both encourage mutual study of each other's religious texts, opening "the *hermeneutical* circle" as Morgan describes it, providing hospitality to each other with "respect for the dignity of others . . . expressed through acts of generosity and righteousness . . . which in Jewish cultural-religious terminology are referred to as *Menschlichkeit*, "human-ness."[46]

In light of these documents, and the opportunities they present, it is clearly in Australia's best interests that all members of the Catholic and Jewish communities work together to advance dialogue. If taken seriously this form of dialogue could bring about a level of self awareness among members in both communities, decrease the impact of presuppositions and past history that hinder empathy, insight, and compassion and bring about a distinctive Australian adaptation of *Menschlichkei*t, "human-ness."

Relevance of Metz's categories

Previous discussion of each of Metz's categories of *memory*, *narrative* and *solidarity* has assessed that Metz's political practical theology is applicable to Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia. The category of *memory* is very pertinent, particularly for members of the Australian Jewish community. The bitter memories of the past, especially the recent past, are still "just below the surface" for many Australians and "exchanging" or communicating these memories to "the other" could assist in achieving

---

[45] The Christian Scholars Group on Christian-Jewish Relations. "*A Sacred Obligation" (following on from Dabru Emet)* (2002).
[46] Morgan, "Dialogue 4 Success," 16.

greater understanding and acceptance. However, as Metz states, *memory* needs to go "beyond its local application" and be experienced as a liberating form of hope. "In its practical intention" he affirms, "the memory of freedom is primarily a *memoria passionis,* a memory of suffering."[47] According to Metz's theology, *memory,* when placed in the context of faith and freedom, has the ability to liberate from hurtful personal memories and accumulated fears and distress of the past. [48]

The *narrative* category provides the opportunity for exchange not only of, personal stories but stories of faith, understanding of theology, and the telling of stories in distinctive ways, including stories through and around particular liturgical ceremonies. How much richer would the celebration of Easter be for Catholics if they had the opportunity to hear from a member of the Jewish community what a pivotal place the Passover has in the Jewish liturgical year. The recognition of Catholic "identity" at the rite of Catholic Baptism would be a revelation for members of the Jewish community who hold their own Jewish identity with such great reverence and respect.

The category of *solidarity* as has previously been discussed shares enough similarities with the Jewish *hesed* and makes the category of *solidarity* a strong link in the Catholic Jewish dialogue process. The category of *solidarity* also conveys to modern Australians that "we stand together, and for one another." (Ecclesiastes 4: 9). These understandings cannot be learned in the short term, but must be *experienced* in the long term.

Expectations, hopes and challenges for the future
 "The Gifts and the Call of God"

There is no doubt that the number of official statements made by representative groups in recent years, of both the Catholic and the Jewish traditions,

---

[47] Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, 195.
[48] Metz, *Faith in History and Society, 188.*

have influenced the shifts that are occurring in Jewish and Catholic relations. Discussions related to those documents have revealed there are still questions to be answered and facts to be clarified. From an educational perspective, Boys suggests that even though "questions may catch us off balance and expose superficial understandings, they are critical for our religious maturity."[49] "We need questions," she writes, "to launch us into a commitment to lifelong education in faith . . . to force us to deal with the shadow side of our faith."[50] In this situation in particular, it is important that questions are dealt with sensitively, responded to in balanced and respectful ways and, when required, with input from scholars from both traditions.

However, as the recent document, *The Gifts and the Calling of God* states, "texts and documents as important as they are, cannot replace personal encounters and face-to-face dialogue."[51] The document states explicitly that it is not a "magisterial document or doctrinal teaching of the Catholic Church," but a "reflection . . . on current theological questions that have developed since the Second Vatican Council."[52] It acknowledges the massive steps that have been taken in that period during which bonds of friendship were formed and trust developed "so that it is possible now to address even controversial subjects together, without the danger of permanent damage being done to the dialogue."[53]

This is clearly a Catholic text and concerned with the future, providing, as the Preface describes it, as "a new stimulus for the future"[54] in the area of Jewish Catholic relations. However, this is another document that has not been widely circulated in the Australian Catholic community. The document states that while "there seems to be a

---

[49] Mary C. Boys, "Touching the Heart of Faith: Challenges of Christian-Jewish Dialogue," *Sacred Heart University Review,* Vol.19: Iss.1, Article 5 (1999), 1-13.

[50] Boys, "Touching the Heart of Faith", 1.

[51] Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, "The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable," *A Reflection on Theological Questions Pertaining to Catholic-Jewish Relations on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of "Nostra Aetate" (No.4)*, 2015, article 8.

[52] Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, "The Gifts and the Calling of God," Preface.

[53] Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, "The Gifts and the Calling of God, para10,11.

[54] Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, "The Gifts and the Calling of God, Preface.

recognition, even critique, that much of the dialogue of the past fifty years, has been non-theological" there is "an implicit call/invitation to move to a more theological level."[55] From a Catholic perspective providing adequate, appropriate theological education, particularly at a parish level, presents a serious challenge.

The document has been received positively by some Jews and some Catholics and has also received a level of criticism, again from sections of both the Jewish and Catholic communities. One of the criticisms is that in the area of goals, Section 7 (articles 44-49), there is no "sustained reflection on the goals of, or the means, the practical steps, to undertake the explicitly theological dialogue that the document as a whole is advocating."[56] That said, other areas mentioned, for example reciprocal education, training of clergy, dialogue training for all not just for specialists, and education in combating all manifestations of racial discrimination and anti-semitism (even though they have been proposed by previous documents and exhortations) have not been adequately addressed in Australia and so they have not been implemented.

A very direct proposal and recommendation regarding reciprocal education was made in 2013 by the International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee:

> We recommend that all Jewish and Catholic seminaries
> include instruction about *Nostra Aetate* and the
> subsequent documents of the Holy See implementing
> the Council's Declaration in their curricula. As a new
> generation of Jewish and Catholic leaders arises, we
> underscore the profound ways that *Nostra Aetate* changed
> the relationship between Jews and Catholics. It is
> imperative that the next generation embraces these teachings and
> ensures that they reach every corner of the world.[57]

---

[55] Eileen Schuller, "A Catholic Reflection on The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable," University of Toronto,1-8. https://www.scarboromissions.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/DrSchuller_CatholicReflection_TheGifts_CallingofGod_160412.pdf (accessed July 11, 2016), 3.

[56] Schuller, "A Catholic Reflection on the Gifts and Calling,"8.

[57] Holy See Press Office, Joint Statement of the 22nd International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee Meeting, Madrid (October 13-16, 2013), https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/it/bollettino/pubblico/2013/10/18/0674/01515.html (accessed December 8, 2016).

The Jewish response to the document, *The Gifts and the Calling of God*, was, in many ways, more positive than the Catholic response. The presence of two Jewish representatives at the launch was, for the Jews, "a powerful and eloquent testimony of the rediscovered fraternity between Catholic and Jews . . . reflecting the truly revolutionary change in the Catholic approach towards Jews and Judaism."[58]

Another positive aspect was that three theological "mysteries" which have been a concern for the Jewish partner in dialogue, were addressed: firstly, the affirmation that the two separate Covenants, that of Abraham and his descendants . . . and that of Christians . . . are not self-contradictory but both, paradoxically, are eternally valid. Christianity, the *new covenant* is not seen as a "replacement" for the Jewish covenant; secondly, that missionary activities directed towards Jews (while implicit in previous documents) are, for the first time in a Vatican document, clearly forbidden; and thirdly, in the view of the Catholic Church, the lack of Jewish belief in the divinity of Jesus no longer bars Jews from salvation. In a report for The American Jewish Committee, Palmieri-Billig wrote: "For the Jewish partner . . . these are probably the most significant statements, and they pave the way for a new trust and openness in the ongoing dialogue between the two 'fraternal' faiths."[59]

Is there a future for Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia?

Australia is in a unique place in its social and religious history. It is a constantly changing, multicultural, pluralistic society, where it is recognised that women can attain political leadership at both State and Federal levels, and where freedom of religion is recognised as a right. But as Boys points out "recognition of difference" does not constitute understanding or acceptance.[60] This is particularly relevant in the Australian

---

[58] Lisa Palmieri-Billig, "The gifts and calling of God are irrevocable, a Jewish perspective, *American Jewish Committee*, representative to the Holy See, 2015.
[59] Palmieri-Billig, "The gifts and the calling of God," 1.
[60] Mary C. Boys and Sara A. Lee, *Christians and Jews in Dialogue: Learning in the Presence of the Other* (Woodstock, Vermont: Skylight Paths Publishing, 2006), 1.

religious context. As Australia has a substantial mix of cultures and faith traditions other than Christian, this is a challenge facing 21st century Australian inter-religious dialogue and in particular Catholic-Jewish dialogue. There are choices that can be made – Australians can "retreat" by ignoring the situation, or they can "circle the wagons" by ceasing to communicate with people from the other faith traditions in order to avoid their ideas or beliefs, or they can demonstrate that it is possible to approach another tradition with openness and respect and find one's own faith and life enriched and expanded. The third option is, realistically, the only viable option.

In 2014 the Victorian Council of Christians and Jews initiated a courageous example of the third option – *The Grass Roots Dialogue Project.* It involves "sending trained presenters into churches and synagogues to share their personal stories, to describe how their faith tradition impacts their lives, and has led them to become involved in this inter-faith program." [61]

This initiative is a move away from a "conversion" or mission approach to dialogue, to one that requires greater commitment, mutual understanding and acceptance, respect for common social and ethical goals, and self-reflective learning about the other. This approach will not eliminate misunderstandings, confusion and even pain, but these will be dealt with in a safe, accepting environment.

Previous models of dialogue have been confined to a small group of already committed participants. This model will engage the "grass roots" people in the churches and in the synagogues, the "rank and file" members of both communities. For many people, this could be their first encounter with interfaith dialogue.[62] They will learn dialogue is not about proselytising or politics, but about a sacred and necessary religious activity to which all Christians are called by virtue of their baptism.

---

[61] The Council of Christians and Jews (Vic), "A Briefing for the Jewish community: Grass Roots Dialogue Project, Rabbi Fred Morgan, (2015).

[62] The Council of Christians and Jews (Vic), "A Briefing for the Jewish community: Grass Roots Dialogue Project, (2015).

From official Catholic Church documents beginning with *Nostra Aetate* in 1965 to the Orthodox Rabbis' most recent document in 2015 there have been many discussions and recommendations regarding Catholic-Jewish dialogue. The following suggestions, which have been gathered from a range of official sources, could assist the future development of Catholic-Jewish Dialogue groups in Australia.

1. To continue engaging with one another according to the mandate in *Nostra Aetate.*

2. To take encouragement from the many positive aspects of Catholic-Jewish dialogue that have been discussed and/or flagged during this research.

3. To make available to the "people in the pews" and the people in the Synagogues, through appropriate reading and discussion, the riches of the various Catholic and Jewish documents, including the official document recently released by the Orthodox Rabbis.

4. To support a shared education programme where Catholics and Jews could learn not only about their partner in dialogue and the faith that gives direction to their lives, but also learn more about their own faith and come to appreciate its gifts more, personally and communally.

5. To invest time, energy and personnel in establishing a Catholic-Jewish programme of "discovery" similar to the successful colloquium conducted by Mary Boys and Sara Lee from 1992-1995.[63]

6. To work together to bring about the successful implementation of the recommendations in *The Gifts and the Calling of God*, and to seriously take up the challenges contained in Section 7: *The Goals of Dialogue with Judaism.*

7. To join with the other dialogue partner for significant religious events. For example Catholics could attend a remembrance ceremony, *Yom HaSho'ah*, or hold a simple prayer service - *"A Sho'ah Memorial Service"* - in the parish church, to which members of the Jewish community could be invited. [64]

8. To support and expand initiatives such as the *2015 Grassroots* progamme initiated by the Council of Christians and Jews (Vic).

---

[63] Mary C. Boys and Sara S. Lee, *The Catholic-Jewish Colloquium: An Experiment in Interreligious Learning1992-1995.*

[64]Verna Holyhead, "A Shoah Memorial Service for Christians who Remember 1933-1945," in *Pathways to Understanding: a handbook on Christian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Marianne Dacy, (Melbourne: Victorian Council of Churches, 1994), 96-115.

However, irrespective of how "complete" a list of recommendations is, or how engaging a programme may be, the most important factor in inter-religious learning is the discussion that follows, where people share in depth and where community-building occurs. "Interreligious learning" as Boys and Lee point out, "necessitates helping participants 'get inside' the religious tradition of the other so that they see the other tradition as offering a living, vital way of life." That, in turn, "encourages participants to give voice to those 'affective attachments' that root *them* deeply in *their* tradition."[65]

Is there compatibility with the principles of Receptive Ecumenism?

Those members of the Catholic and Jewish communities who have been actively involved in dialogue attest to the fact that what they have had the privilege to experience is testimony that, when well delivered, inter-religious dialogue can change people's views and be experienced as a truly religious encounter. While it may not solve fundamental or theological problems, without it no one can hope to "learn from the other." The recommendations indicate that there are ample opportunities for learning *across* traditions, which in turn will enable transformation *within* traditions. In a talk delivered to *Queensland Churches Together* in 2012 Paul Murray said:

> The openness to growth, change, examination of conscience and grace-filled conversion that lies at the heart of life pertains as much to the ecclesial as to the person: allowing, that is, one's own tradition to be challenged to expand and to rethink how it understands and does think in relation to issues.[66]

The fundamental principle of *Receptive Ecumenism* is answered positively in Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia. Both traditions can reflect on and focus on what Murray refers to as "the self-critical question" by continually asking "What can we learn, or receive with integrity from our various others in order to facilitate our own growth

---

[65] Mary C. Boys and Sara S. Lee, *Christians and Jews in Dialogue*, 112. (Italics are mine.)
[66] Paul D. Murray, "Receptive Ecumenism and Its Application at the Local Level," *Queensland Churches Together*, 10th August 2012.

together." There is so much more to learn and so much more to appreciate in one's own tradition and in the tradition of the dialogue partner.

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed both Catholic and Jewish perspectives of the past and the directions taken by Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia since Vatican II. It is acknowledged that there have been mixed responses in both communities to the documents promoting and critiquing the dialogue processes. However, the undeniable fact is there is sufficient interest and commitment from the relatively few, but committed groups and individuals, for progress in this very important area of Catholic and Jewish life to continue. In a very positive way "we have begun to care for each other, be concerned about each other's pain, rejoice in each other's rich spiritual heritage, and desire the best for each other."[67]

The relevance of Metz's practical political theology in relation to his key categories of *memory, narrative and solidarity*, has been considered in relation to Catholic Jewish dialogue in Australia. Expectations, hopes and challenges for the future of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia have been identified. Finally, the possibility of applying the principles of Receptive Ecumenism to Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia has been determined.

It is clear that the area needing greater support and encouragement is education, at all levels, and in relevant and appropriate formats, both formal and informal. New initiatives in this area would enable members of both communities to not only remember the past, but would help to shape the future of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia.

The concluding chapter that follows will review the discussion and the relevancy of Metz's key issues of *memory, narrative* and *solidarity* discussed in the preceding

---

[67] ICCJ, "Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship," 4.

chapters, particularly in regard to Catholic-Jewish dialogue in the Australian context. It will assess the claims of the compatibility of inter-religious dialogue with Receptive Ecumenism and identify some of the *in*-compatibilities.

Drawing on the principles of Receptive Ecumenism to assist in the development of Catholic-Jewish dialogue and indeed interreligious dialogue in general has been an innovative approach. Further research in this area will be beneficial to all who are engaged in furthering inter-religious dialogue in their faith communities and respect and cooperation in their local and civic communities.

Conclusion

This research set out to study Catholic-Jewish dialogue in the Australian context and to test the possibilities for further development of productive dialogue in the future. There is obviously still much more research to be done and more discoveries to be made in this area, but the exploration has begun and new initiatives are emerging.

As has been discussed previously, explicit and formal Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia dates back to 1985 to the *Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations* prepared by the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs.[1] While this thesis is focussed on the importance of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia, it in no way reduces the value of on-going dialogue between other faith traditions e.g. Catholic-Muslim dialogue, Catholic-Hindu dialogue, etc. Indeed, most Dioceses within the Australian Catholic Church are involved in both ecumenical and interfaith dialogue under the direction of Diocesan Commissions or Councils.

However, an example of an extended/developed/refined form of "dialogue" is the Brisbane Catholic Church's active involvement in the recently established (2017) Queensland Faith Communities Council (QFCC). Officially formed on 23rd May, 2017, the QFCC represents an exciting milestone in the cause of supporting and protecting freedom of religion and conscience in what is a diverse State, politically, culturally and religiously. Fifteen faith groups (including the Catholic Church, The Queensland Jewish Board of Deputies, Islamic Council of Queensland, Sikh Nashkam Society of Australia, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Buddhist Council of Queensland, Inc., The Spiritual Assembly of Baha'is in Brisbane, Inc. and Queensland Churches Together which represents 16 Christian Churches which are involved in interfaith dialogue in a

---

[1] Australian Catholic Bishops Conference: Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical ad Interfaith Relations: The Faithfulness of the Lord endures for ever: *Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations*, November 1992.

variety of ways) publicly joined together in mutual respect to advance interfaith understanding and to build a stronger community.

QFCC's vision is committed to the advancement of interfaith understanding and collaboration within the broader community, while its mission "is to engage in dialogue that enhances our understanding of shared values as a way of developing respect for our diversity. We achieve this . . . by working together . . . to support positive outcomes of religious freedom, social justice, inclusivity and diversity."[2] It has to be acknowledged that while this Council is still in its infancy it has the potential to provide opportunities for greater communication and understanding among all faith groups.

The use of the practical-narrative-political theological method of Johann Baptist Metz, and his key categories of *memory, narrative and solidarity*, provided a firm structure that allowed for extensive analysis of Catholic and Jewish perspectives regarding dialogue, and revealed 'sensitive' areas belonging to each faith tradition. These are areas that need to be known, respected and honoured by the partners in dialogue. While there are many areas that can never be agreed upon, the shared history, beliefs and values are many, and provide a firm foundation for further spiritual, religious and cultural development.

Of course, there are many issues that still need to be addressed, but a willingness to participate in meaningful dialogue is a positive first step in overcoming past misunderstandings and to admit that each one has much to learn from the experience of the other. Further emphasis on the fundamental relationship that already exists between Christians and members of the Jewish tradition is required to overcome past suspicions and to develop trust.

---

[2] From Vision and Mission Statements. Queensland Faith Communities Council. Launched 23rd May 2017, Brisbane, Queensland.

Testing the compatibility of the principles of *Receptive Ecumenism* with Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia was difficult. The only real primary source to draw on was Paul Murray's *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning.* Secondary sources proved to be very mixed in their views and there were varying opinions on the appropriateness of Receptive Ecumenism within the Christian churches. However, there was no model to explore, or opinions to be sought regarding the application of the principles of Receptive Ecumenism in an *inter-religious situation.*

This study aimed to assess the claims that the principles of Receptive Ecumenism are compatibile with Catholic-Jewish interreligious dialogue and it identified certain areas of difficulty or incompatibility. However, the exercise proved that the principles *are* transferable and that Receptive Ecumenism could be a valuable tool to be used in inter-religious dialogue and particularly in Catholic-Jewish dialogue, when supported by sound educational opportunities and experiences.

There is currently no opportunity for these suggestions, hopes and "dreams" for the furthering of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in Australia to be tested. However, Paul Murray's principle used throughout this study as a guide, is still relevant: What can *we* learn or receive, with integrity from our various others, in order to facilitate our own growth together?[3] Drawing on the principles of Receptive Ecumenism to assist in the development of Catholic-Jewish dialogue and indeed interreligious dialogue in general is an innovative approach. There is obviously still much more research to be done in this area too, and if more "discoveries" are to be made, then necessary processes will need to be enabled and supported.

---

[3] Paul D. Murray, ed., *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*: *Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism*, ed*. (*Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). ix.

This dissertation aims to exhibit critical reflection on and constructive arguments for both Catholic and Jewish involvement in inter-religious dialogue, and suggests possible opportunities for further development in Catholic-Jewish engagement in Australia.

Finally, it also proposes some practical recommendations and opens up a vast range of questions for ongoing research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott (S.J.), Walter M., Editor. *The Documents of Vatican II*. London-Dublin: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966.

Academy for Cultural Diplomacy – Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, *Interfaith diplomacy. Examples of Inter-faith Dialogue Achievements: Examples of Interfaith Dialogue that Contribute Toward the Understanding of Global Religious Traditions,* 2017. Accessed January 1, 2017. www.culturaldiplomacy.org

Adams, Nicholas. "Long-Term Disagreement: Philosophical Reasoning and Receptive Ecumenism." *Modern Theology* 4 (2013): 154-171.

Aitken, James K. and Edward Kessler, eds. *Challenges in Jewish-Christian Relations*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2006.

——. "Introduction." In *Challenges in Jewish-Christian Relations*. Edited by James K. Aitken and Edward Kessler, 1-14. Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2006.

Anderson, Gary. "What Can a Catholic Learn from the History of Jewish Biblical Exegesis?" *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* Volume 1 (2005-2006): 186-195.

Apple (Rabbi), Raymond. Sydney Morning Herald, November 3, 2005. Interview with Linda Morris. Accessed November 3, 2005. http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2005/11/02/1130823281445.html

——. "Rediscovering Vatican II: Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue," *Jewish-Christian Relations: Insights and Issues in the ongoing Jewish-Christian Dialogue*, October 2005. Accessed January 24, 2015. http://www.jcrelations.net/Rediscovering_Vatican_II__Ecumenism_and_Interreligiou s_Dialogue.1890.0.html.

Ariel (Rabbi), Yaakov. "Interfaith Dialogue and the Golden Age of Christian-Jewish Relations." *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* 6 (2011): 1-18.

Arinze (Cardinal), Francis. "Letter to Presidents of Bishops' Conferences on the Spirituality of Dialogue," Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, Vatican City, 1999.

Austin, J. L., *How to do Things with Words* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962).

Australian Bureau of Statistics: Statistics 10/11/10: Religious Affiliation in Australia (1986, 1996, 2006, 2011).

Australian Catholic Bishops Conference. *A statement from the Catholic Bishops of Australia to mark the 40th anniversary of 'Nostra Aetate,'* November 25, 2005. Accessed September 27th, 2015. https://www.catholic.org.au/acbc-media/downloads/all-downloads/bishops-1/plenary-meeting-1/312-a-statement-from-the-catholic-bishops-of-australia-to-mark-the-40th-anniversary-of-nostra-aetate-1/file

———. "Catholic Social Teaching," *Australian Catholic Social Justice Council*, 8 December 2000. *Amended 2006.* Accessed 8th December, 2016. http://www.socialjustice.catholic.org.au/social-teaching

Australian Council of Christians and Jews, "The Jewish Community." Accessed July 11th, 2016. http://www.ccj.org.au/

Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade: United Nations, accessed 1 March 2015, http://dfat.gov.au.

Avis, Paul. "Are We Receiving 'Receptive Ecumenism,'" *Ecclesiology* 8 (2012): 223–234.

Banki, Judith. "The Image of the Jews in Catholic Teaching," A Memorandum to The Secretariat for Christian Unity. Submitted by The American Jewish Committee, New York, 22nd June, 1961.

Banki, Judith Hershcopf. "Catholics and Jews: Confronting the Holocaust Together." Delivered at the Nostra Aetate Commemorative Conference, Sao Paulo, Brazil, October, 1985.

Banki, Judith and John Pawlikowski, eds., *Ethics in the Shadow of the Holocaust: Christian and Jewish Perspectives*. Franklin, WI: Sheed and Ward, 2001.

Baum, Gregory. "The Impact of Sociology on Catholic Thinking." *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Convention of the Catholic Theological Society of America, New Orleans, Louisiana June 9 – 12* (1975):1-29.

———. "Chosenness in Christian Tradition." *SIDIC Periodical* XIII, (1980/2): 9-13.

Bernardin (Cardinal), Joseph. *A Blessing to Each Other: Cardinal Joseph Bernardin and Jewish-Catholic Dialogue.* Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1996.

Berling, Judith A. *Understanding Other Religious Worlds: A Guide for Interreligious Education.* Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2004.

Bergman, G.F.J. and J.S. Levi. *Australian Genesis*. Melbourne, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 2001.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Letters and Papers from Prison,* Revised Edition, edited by Eberhard Bethge. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967.

Borowsky, Irvin J. ed. *Defining New Christian/Jewish Dialogue.* New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2004.

Bouma, Gary D. "From Religious Diversity to a Multi-Faith Society," *Oxford Journals Social Sciences. Sociology of Religion* 56, (2013): 288-289.

Boyarin (Rabbi), Daniel. *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ*. New York: The New Press, 2012.

Boys, Mary C. and Sara S. Lee. *The Catholic-Jewish Colloquium: An Experiment in Interreligious Learning 1992-1995*. Funded by the Lilly Endowment, 1996.

———. "The Catholic-Jewish Colloquium: An Experiment in Interreligious Learning 1992-1995." *Religious Education* 91/4 (Fall 1996): 421-66.

Boys, Mary C. "Touching the Heart of Faith: Challenges of Christian Jewish Dialogue." *Sacred Heart University Review* Volume19/1, Article 5 (1999): 55-67.

———. *Has God Only One Blessing? Judaism as a Source of Christian Self-Understanding.* Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2000.

Boys, Mary C. and Sara S. Lee. *Christians and Jews in Dialogue: Learning in the Presence of the Other*. Woodstock, Vermont: Skylight Paths Publishing, 2006.

Boys, Mary C., "Does the Catholic Church Have a Mission 'with' Jews or 'to' Jews?" *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* 3, (2008): 2-19.

Boys, Mary C. and Scott C. Alexander. "Christian Hospitality and Pastoral Practices from a Roman Catholic Perspective." *Theological Education* 47/1 (2012): 47-73.

Braaten, Carl E. and R. Jenson, eds. *Jews and Christians: People of God.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003.

Brawer (Rabbi), Naftali. *Judaism: Theology, History and Practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Running Press Book Publishers, 2008.

Brill, Alan. "Does the Church 'Get' the Holocaust? A Response to Kevin Madigan's Has the Papacy 'Owned' Vatican Guilt for the Church's Role in the Holocaust." *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* Volume 4 (2009): CP1-9.

Bulbeck, Chilla. *Social Sciences in Australia: An Introduction*. Marrickville, NSW: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1993.

Butkus, Russell A. "Dangerous Memory: The Transformative Catholic Intellectual." In *As Leaven in the World: Perspectives on Faith, Vocation, and the Intellectual Life*. ed. Thomas M. Landy, 49-64. Wisconsin: Sheed and Ward, 2001.

Campion, Edmund. *Australian Catholics: The Contribution of Catholics to the Development of Australian Society*. Ringwood, Victoria: Viking Penguin Press, 1987.

Carey (The Right Honourable), George. "Jewish-Christian relations – From Holocaust to Hope." *The Inaugural Donald Coggan Lecture*, The National Cathedral, Washington DC. 24/4/2001.

Cardin, Nina Beth and Fayette Breaux Veverka. "Living with the Other: Are Irreconcilable Differences Between Christians and Jews a Blessing, a Curse, or Both?" In *Irreconcilable Differences*: *A Learning Resource for Jews and Christians.* Edited by David F. Sandmel, Rosann M. Catalano and Christopher M. Leighton, 179-191. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2001.

Cassidy (Cardinal), Edward. *Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2005.

———. *Rediscovering Vatican II: Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2005.

Center for Jewish-Christian Understanding and Cooperation (CJCUC), "To Do the Will of Our Father in Heaven: Towards a Partnership between Jews and Christians," Orthodox Rabbinic Statement on Christianity, Israel, 3rd December, 2015.

Christian Scholars Group on Christian-Jewish Relations. *A Sacred Obligation (following on from Dabru Emet)*. 2002.

Clooney, Francis X. "Comparative Theology and Inter-Religious Dialogue." In *Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue.* Edited by Catherine Cornille, 4: 51-63. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.

Cobb, John B. Jnr., *Process Theology as Political Theology*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2016, (Previously 1982 Manchester University Press).

Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah.* Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1998.

Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, "The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable," *A Reflection on Theological Questions Pertaining to Catholic-Jewish Relations on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of "Nostra Aetate,"* 2015.

Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: Declaration *Dominus Iesus*, on the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church, 2000.

Cook, Michael. "The New Testament: Confronting Its Impact on Jewish-Christian Relations." In *Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations.* Edited by Michael Shermis and Arthur E. Zannoni, 34-62. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003.

Cornille, Catherine. *The Impossibility of Inter-Religious Dialogue*. New York: Crossroads, 2008.

Cornille, Catherine, ed. *Criteria of Discernment in Interreligious Dialogue.* Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2009.

Cornish, Sandie. "Working for Social Justice in the 1990s and into the Next Millennium" in *Developing An Australian Theology*. Edited by Peter Malone, 209-226. Strathfield, NSW: St Paul's Publications, 1990.

Cross, Peter. "The Decree on Ecumenism - 40 Years On." *Archdiocese of Melbourne Ecumenical and Interfaith Commission Commemoration of 40th Anniversary of Decree on Ecumenism*, 2004.

Cox, Harvey. *Common Prayers: Faith, Family, and a Christian's Journey Through the Jewish Year.* New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2001.

Cunningham, Philip A. and Jan Katzew. "Do Christians and Jews Worship the Same God?" in *Irreconcilable Differences*. *A Learning Resource for Jews and Christians.* Edited by David F. Sandmel, Rosann M. Catalano and Christopher M. Leighton, 33-51. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2001.

Cunningham, Philip A. "Nostra Aetate After 40 Years," in *Midstream* (Sept/Oct 2005). Accessed June 7th 2010. http://www.sju.edu/int/academics/cas/resources/cunningham/articles.html

———. "Themes in Catholic Post-Nostra Aetate Theology." *Current Dialogue 53 (Special Issue)* (2012): 10-20.

———. "Congratulations to *Gesher* on its Silver Anniversary!" *Gesher: Anniversaries* (2015): 9.

Dacy, Marianne, ed. *Pathways to Understanding: a handbook on Christian-Jewish Relations.* Melbourne, Victoria: Victorian Council of Churches, 1994.

D'Costa, Gavin. "Roman Catholic Reflections on Discerning God." In *Criteria of Discernment in Interreligious Dialogue.* Edited by Catherine Cornille, 69-86. Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2009.

Dawson, Roger. "Dangerous Remembrance" in *Thinking Faith: The online journal of the Jesuits in Britain,* (2013). Accessed November 11, 2013. http://www.thinkingfaith.org.

Doak, Mary. *Reclaiming Narrative for Public Theology.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004.

Downey, John K., ed. *Love's Strategy: The Political Theology of John Baptist Metz.* Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

Dulles (S.J.), Avery. "Introduction." In *The Documents of Vatican II, with Notes and Comments by Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Authorities*. Edited by Walter M. Abbott, S.J., 9-13. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966.

Dulles (S.J.), Avery, Leon Klenicki and Edward Idris Cassidy, eds.*The Holocaust Never to Be Forgotten: Reflections on the Holy See's Document "We Remember."* New York: Paulist Press, 2001.

Ehrlich, Rebecca Lacey. "Dialogue, Doctrine and Diplomacy (1): A Consideration of the Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations May 1992," Australian Council of Christians and Jews, 2009. Accessed June 9, 2015. http://ccj.org.au/article/dialogue-doctrine-and-diplomacy-ibr-a-consideration-of-the-guidelinesfor-catholic-jewish-relationsbr-may-1992/

Everett, Robert Andrew. "The Land in Jewish Christian Dialogue." In *Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations.* Edited by Michael Shermis and Arthur E. Zannoni, 87-117. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003.

Fisher, Eugene J., James A. Rudin and Marc H. Tanenbaum. Eds. *Twenty Years of Jewish-Catholic Relations.* Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1986.

Fisher, Eugene J. Introduction: 'Nostra Aetate', For Our Times and For the Future." In *Twenty Years of Jewish-Catholic Relations.* Edited by Eugene Fisher, James A. Rudin and Marc H. Tanenbaum, 1-7. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1986.

Fisher, Eugene J. and Leon Klenicki. eds. *In Our Time: The Flowering of Jewish-Catholic Dialogue.* Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1990.

Fisher, Eugene J. "The Impact of Christian-Jewish Dialogue on Catholic-Biblical Studies." *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* Volume 3 (2008): 1-5.

Fitzgerald (M.Afr.) Archbishop, Michael. *What the Catholic Church Has Learnt from Interreligious Dialogue.* Address delivered at conference "In Our Time: Interreligious Relations in a Divided World," Brandeis University, 2006.

———. *Discovering Catholic Identity through Encounter with People of Other Religions.* Conference Vatican II After Fifty Years: Dialogue and Catholic Identity. Georgetown University, Washington DC, 2012.

Frydman-Kohl (Rabbi), Baruch. "Jewish Reflection on: 'The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable." *Regis College, University of Toronto.* 12 April 2016 – Nisan 5776. Accessed July 11th, 2016. http://www/scarbobomissions.ca/wpcontent/uploads/2016/04/RabbiBaruch_JewishReflection_The Gifts_CallingofGod_160412.pdf

Ganzevoort, R. Ruard. "Narrative Approaches" in *Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Practical Theology.* Edited by B. Miller-McLemore, 20: 214-223. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Geuss, Raymond. *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas & the Frankfurt School*, Modern European Philosophy. New York, NY: Cambridge University press, 1981 (1999).

Goosen, Gideon. *Religion in Australian Culture: An anthropological view.* Strathfield, NSW: St Paul's Publications, 1997.

———. "The rationale behind interreligious dialogue." *Compass: A Review of Topical Theology*, 42/1 (2008).

Grayland, Joseph. "Sixty years after Auschwitz. What does it mean for Christian Theology?" *Compass: A Review of Topic Theology* 39, No.1 (2005). http://www.compassreview.org/ (accessed February 6, 2015).

Greenberg, Irving. "The Relationship of Judaism and Christianity: Towards a New Organic Model." In *Twenty Years of Jewish-Catholic Relations*. Edited by Eugene Fisher, 191–21. Mahwah, NJ.: Paulist Press, 1986.

Grogan, G.W. "The Old Testament Concept of Solidarity in Hebrews." *Tynedale Bulletin,* 49:1 (1998): 159-173.

Haines, Gregory Sister Mary Forster and Frank Brophy, eds. *The Eye of Faith: The Pastoral Letters of John Bede Polding,* Kilmore, Victoria: Lowden Publishing Co., 1978.

Hall (SM), Gerard. "The Call to Interfaith Dialogue," *Australian E-Journal of Theology* 5 (2005). Accessed March 19th 2014. http://aejt.com.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/395510/AEJT_5.9_Hall.pdf

———. "The Three Turns in Modern Theology: Transcendental, Political and Liberation Theologies." Australian Catholic University. (Accessed September 12, 2014). https://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/staffhome/gehall/systematic1.htm

———. *Retrieving Memory, Narrative and Solidarity as Significant Categories for Practical Theology and Christian Engagement*. APTO Conference, Baulkham Hills, 8-11 November, 2012.

Harris, Stuart, Consultant, Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Group. *Globalisation in the Asia-Pacific Context* (Parliament of Australia, Research Paper 7, 2001-2002).

Haueras, Stanley and L. Gregory Jones, eds. *Why Narrative? Readings in Narrative Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.

Henn (O.F.M. Cap), William. "The Reception of Vatican II's Teaching on Ecumenism into the Life of the Catholic Church." The Holy See. *www.vatican.va/jubilee_2000.*

Hinze, Bradford E. and Irfan A. Omar Omar,, eds. *Heirs of Abraham: The Future of Muslim, Jewish, and Christian Relations*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2005.

Hoffman (Rabbi), Lawrence. Ed. *My People's Passover Haggadah* (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2008, Vol.1, 34.

Hoenig, Ron "Hearing the painful Narrative of the Other," *Australian Council of Christians and Jews* (15 October, 2008). Accessed August 15th, 2014. http://ccj.org.au/article/hearing-the-painful-narrative-of-the-other/

Holyhead, Verna. "Christians Remember the Shoah." Introduction by Marianne Dacy. In *Pathways to understanding: a handbook on Christian-Jewish Relations*. Edited by Marianne Dacy, 99-115. Melbourne, Australia: Victorian Council of Churches, 1994.

Holy See Press Office, Joint Statement of the 22nd International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee Meeting, Madrid (October 13-16th, 2013). Accessed December 8th, 2016. https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/it/bollettino/pubblico/2013/10/18/0674/01515.html

Hunerman, Peter. *Jewish–Christian Relations: A Conciliar Discovery and Its Methodological Consequences for Dogmatic Theology*. Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University, 2004.

International Council of Christians and Jews. "An Address to the Churches: International Council of Christians and Jews: The 10 Points of Seelisburg." (5th August, 1947). Accessed October 4th, 2011. http://www.jcrelations.net.

———. *Jews and Christians in Search of a Common Religious Basis for Contributing Towards a Better World.* (1/3/1993).

———. "A Time for Recommitment: The Twelve Points of Berlin: Building a new Relationship between Jews and Christians." (July 2009). Accessed October 3rd, 2014. http://www.iccj.org/A-Time-for-Recommitment-The-Twelve-Points-of-Berlin.184.0.html

International Council of Christians and Jews, Executive Board, "Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship," *A Statement from the International Council of Christians and Jews on the Golden Jubilee of the Second Vatican Council Declaration, Nostra Aetate,* (2015), par.1- 4.

International Theological Commission, "Mercy and Reconciliation: The Church and the Faults of the Past," 1999.

Kardong, Terrence G. *Benedict's Rule: A Translation and Commentary.* Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1996.

Kasper (Cardinal), Walter. "Foreword." In *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*: *Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism.* Edited by Paul D. Murray with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri, vii-viii. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Kertzer (Rabbi), Morris N. Revised by Rabbi Lawrence A. Hoffman. *What is a Jew? A Guide to the Beliefs, Traditions, and Practices of Judaism That Answers Questions For Both Jew and Non-Jew.* New York: The World Publishing Company, 1993.

Kessler, Edward. "A Response to the Pontifical Biblical Commission Document: The Jewish People and their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible (JPSSCB)." *Jewish-Christian Relations: Insights and Issues in the ongoing Jewish-Christian Dialogue* (2003): 1–11.

———. "NA – 50 years on." *Jewish Christian Relations: Insights and Issues in the ongoing Jewish-Christian Dialogue*, Vol. 7, No 1, (2013). Published in *The Tablet* 1 December 2012.

Kirkwood, Peter. *The Quiet Revolution: The Emergence of Interfaith Consciousness*. Sydney, N.S.W.: ABC Books, 2007.

Kirwan, Michael, "Awakening Dangerous Memories," *The Way*, 47/4 (2008): 25-36. Accessed July 26, 2015.

Klenicki, Leon. "Nostra Aetate: A Jewish View 'From Disputation to Dialogue'." 10-16. Accessed June 20th, 2015. http://theolibrary.shc.edu/jewish.htm

Knitter, Paul F. *Jesus and the Other Names*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1996.

———. "The Necessity and Possibility of Interreligious Dialogue: Theologies of Religious Pluralism," Berkley Centre: Faith and Life Lecture Series. Accessed February 23rd, 2015. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DnjQhsF8oNg.

Kurtz, Peter. *Gods in the Global Village: The World's Religions in Sociological Perspective.* Thousand Oaks, US: Sage Publications, 2006.

Kynes, Will. "God's Grace in the Old Testament: Considering the Hesed of the Lord." *Knowing and Doing*, C.S. Lewis Institute, Summer Issue (2010). Accessed December 8, 2016. http://.www.cslewisinstitute.org/webfm_send/430

Lane, Dermot A. *Stepping Stones to Other Religions: A Christian Theology of Inter-Religious Dialogue.* Dublin: Veritas Publications, 2011.

Laras (Rabbi), Guiseppe. "Jewish Perspectives on Christianity," Pontifical Gregorian University, 2004. Accessed June 16, 2015. https://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cjl/texts/center/conferences/Bea_Centre_CJ_Relations_04-05/Laras.htm.

Larini, Riccardo. "Texts and Contexts – Hermeneutical Reflections on Receptive Ecumenism." In *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism.* Edited by Paul Murray with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri, 89-101. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Lauritzen, Paul, "Is "Narrative" Really a Panacea? The Use of "Narrative" in the Work of Metz and Hauerwas," *Theology and Religious Studies,* Paper 47 (1987): 322-339.

Leiberman (Rabbi), Shimon. "Kabbala #12: Chesed and Gevurah: The Two Sided Approach." Accessed December 8th, 2016. http://www.aish.com/sp/k/Kabbala_12_Chesed_and_Gevurah_The_Two_Sided_Approach.html

Leonard, Ellen, "Traditions of Spiritual Guidance: Friedrich von Hügel as Spiritual Guide," *The Way 31,* July (1991): 248-258.

Levi (Rabbi), John S. "Strike Me Lucky! Judaism in Australia." (1997). Accessed March 20th, 2015. http://users.esc.net.au/~nhabel/lectures/levi.pdf .

Liebman, Charles. "The Sociology of Religion and the Study of American Jews." *Conservative Judaism* May/June (1981): 17-33.

Lindsay, Mark R. "Mea Culpa and the Magisterium." In *Remembering for the Future. The Holocaust in an age of Genocide.* Edited by R. J. K. Roth, M. Levy, W. Whitworth, 1139 - 1350. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

Madigan, Kevin. "A survey of Jewish Reaction to the Vatican Statement on the Holocaust." In *Remembering for the Future. The Holocaust in an age of Genocide.* Edited by R. J. K. Roth, M. Levy, W. Whitworth, 1351- 1362. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

Marans (Rabbi), Noam. "From Regret to Acclaim: A Jewish Reaction to Nostra Aetate: Celebrating 50 Years of the Catholic Church's Dialogue with Jews."*Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.* May 20th, 2015. American Jewish Committee – Global Jewish Advocacy. Accessed October, 20th, 2015. http://www.ajc.org/site/c.7oJILSPwFfJSG/b.8449641/kBD8F/Home.htm

Marmion (SM), Declan. *Rahner and His Critics: Revisiting the Dialogue.* Australian eJournal of Theology 4 (2005). Accessed March 30th, 2006. http://aejt.com.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/395536/AEJT_4.10_Marmion.pdf

Martini (Cardinal), Carlo Maria. "Christianity and Judaism: A Historical and Theological Overview." In *Jews and Christians: Exploring the Past, Present, and the Future.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad, 1990.

Mauz, Andreas. *Theology and Narration. Reflections on the "Narrative Theology"- Debate and Beyond*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.

McBride, Denis. *The Parables of Jesus.* Ligouri, Missouri: Triumph, 1999.

McDade, John SJ. "'Nostra Aetate'& Interfaith Dialogue." *The Pastoral Review* November: (2005).

McGarry, Michael B. "The Holocaust: Tragedy of Christian History." In *Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations*. Edited by Michael Shermis and Arthur E. Zannoni, 63-86. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003.

McLean, George and Hogan, John P., eds. *Multiple Paths to God: Nostra Aetate 40 Years Later.* Washington DC: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2005.

———. *Introduction. Widening the Tent. Multiple Paths to God: Nostra Aetate 40 Years Later.* Washington DC: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, (2005): 1-9.

———. *Ecumenism and Nostra Aetate in the 21st Century.* Washington DC: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, (2005): 35-40.

Metz, Johann Baptist Metz. "For a Renewed Church Before a New Council: A Concept in Four Theses." In *Toward Vatican Three:The Work That Needs to Be Done.* Edited by David Tracy with Hans Küng and Johann B. Metz, 137-145. East Malvern, Victoria, Australia: Dove Communications, 1978.

Metz, Johann Baptist. *Faith in History and Society*: *toward a practical fundamental theology*. New York: Crossroad, 1980.

———. *The Emergent Church: The Future of Christianity in a Post-Bourgeois World.* Translated by Peter Mann. New York: Crossroad, 1981.

———. *From a Mysticism of the Elite to a Mysticism of the People: Autobiographical Remarks.* Unpublished manuscript presented to the communities of Catholic Nuns in Cleveland Ohio, Notre Dame, and Boston College, 1981,1982.

———."Facing the Jews: Christian Theology after Auschwitz." *Concilium* 175, no.5 (1984): 26-33.

———. "A Short Apology of Narrative." In *Why Narrative? Readings in Narrative Theology*. Edited by Stanley Haueras and L. Gregory Jones, 251-262. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.

———. "With the Eyes of European Theologian," in *Concilium 6*, eds. Leonardo Boff and Virgil Elizondo, Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990: 119.

Metz, Johann Baptist and Jürgen Moltmann. *Faith and the Future: essays on Theology, Solidarity and Modernity.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995.

———. "The Future in the Memory of Suffering." In *Faith and the Future: Essays on Theology, Solidarity and Modernity*. Edited by John Baptist Metz and Jürgen Moltmann, 3-16. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1995.

———. *A Passion for God: the mystical-political dimension of Christianity:* New York: Paulist Press, 1998.

———. "Theology in the new paradigm," in *An Eerdmans reader in contemporary political theology.* eds. W. T. Cavanaugh, J.W. Bailey, & C. Hovey, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012, 322.

———. "Two-fold political theology," in *Political Theology: Contemporary challenges and future directions.* Edited by F. Schüssler Fiorenza, K. Tanner, Y. M. Welker, 16-20. Louisville, CY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013.

Mirsky, Yehudah. "Jewish-Christian Dialogue Today." In *Jewish-Christian Relations: Insights and Issues in the ongoing Jewish-Christian Dialogue.* (01/03/2011): 1-3.

Moltmann, Jürgen "Political theology in ecumenical contexts," in *Political Theology: Contemporary challenges and future directions,* ed. F. Schüssler Fiorenza, K. Tanner, Y. M. Welker (Louisville, CY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013), 1-10.

Morgan (Rabbi), Fred. *Pursuing Interfaith Dialogue: From Security to Redemption.* Paper delivered at Council of Christians and Jews (Vic), 21 June 2009.

———. "Dialogue 4 Success: Four measures of success and failure in Jewish-Christian dialogue." *Gesher: Many Shades of Dialogue (2013)*: 14-17.

———. "Jewish-Christian Dialogue from Jewish Perspectives Over Five Decades." In *Paths to Dialogue in our Age: Australian Perspectives*, Vol. 1. Edited by Edmund Kee-Fook Chia and Fatih Erol Tuncer, 237-256. Melbourne: Australian Catholic University, 2014.

———. *Grass Roots Dialogue Project: A briefing for the Jewish community.* The Council of Christians and Jews (Vic), 25th May, 2015.

———. "Whither Jewish-Christian Dialogue? A Jewish Perspective on 50 Years of Nostra Aetate." Address to The Council of Christians and Jews (Vic), 14th June 2015.

Morrill, Bruce T. *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory: Political and Liturgical Theology in Dialogue.* Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Murray, Paul D., ed. with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri. *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

———. "Receptive Ecumenism and Catholic Learning – Establishing the Agenda." In *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*: *Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism.* Edited by Paul D. Murray with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri, 5-25. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

———. "Preface." In *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*: *Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism.* Edited by Paul D. Murray with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri, ix-xv. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

———. *Receptive Ecumenism and its Application at the Local Level.* Queensland Churches Together, 10th August, 2012.

———. "Introducing Receptive Ecumenism," *The Ecumenist* 51, (2014): 1-7.

National Jewish Scholars Project, *Dabru Emet* ("You Shall Tell the Truth"). *New York Times*, 10 September 2000.

Ochs, Peter and David Ford, "A Third Epoch: The Future of Discourse in Jewish-Christian Relations." In *Challenges in Jewish-Christian Relations*. Edited by James K. Aitken and Edward Kessler, 153-170. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2006.

O'Farrell, Patrick. *The Catholic Church and Community: An Australian History,* 3rd rev. ed. Kensington, NSW: New South Wales University Press, 1992.

O'Gara, Margaret. "Receiving Gifts in Ecumenical Dialogue." In *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*: *Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism.* Edited by Paul D. Murray with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri, 26-38. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Ormerod, Neil. *Introducing Contemporary Theologies: The What and the Who of Theology Today,* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2002.

Örsy, Ladislaus. "Authentic Learning and Receiving – A Search for Criteria." In *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning*: *Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism.* Edited by Paul D. Murray with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri, 39-51. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Palmieri-Billig, Lisa. "The gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable," a Jewish perspective. The significance to Jews of an important new Vatican document." The American Jewish Committee – AJC liaison to the Holy See. Vatican, December 12th, 2015.

Panikkar, R. *The Intra-Religious Dialogue.* New York: Paulist Press, 1978; rev.ed. New York: Paulist Press, 1999.

Pascoe, David. "Hospitality Grounded in Humility: A Foundation for Inter-Ecclesial Learning". Conference Paper - *Receptive Ecumenism and Ecclesial Learning: Learning to be Church Together*. Durham, UK: January 2009.

Pawlikowski (OSM), John. *Jesus and the Theology of Israel*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989.

———. "Judaism and Catholic Morality: The View of the Encyclical." In *Veritatis Splendor: American Responses.* Editors Michael E. Allsopp, John J. O'Keefe, 177-193. Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward, 1995.

———. "Introduction to Gerald Sloyan's Article on Christian Persecution of Jews over the Centuries," United States Holocaust Museum (1998). Accessed March 8th, 2016. http://www.ushamm.org/research/center/persecution/persecution.pdf.

———. "Jesus, A Pharisee and the Christ." In *Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations*. Edited by Michael Shermis and Arthur E. Zannoni, 174-201. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003.

———. "60 Years – the Ten Points of Seelisberg." *Jewish-Christian Relations. Insights and Issues in the ongoing Jewish-Christian Dialogue* 14.9.2007.

———. "Vatican II's 'Nostra Aetate': Has its view of Judaism Impacted the Church's Self-Understanding." In *Paths to Dialogue in our Age: International Perspectives*, Vol. 2. Edited by Edmund Kee-Fook Chia and Fatih Erol Tuncer, 20-32. Melbourne: Australian Catholic University, 2014.

———. "Fifty Years of Christian-Jewish Dialogue – What Has It Changed?" Journal of Ecumenical Studies, 49:1, Winter (2014): 99-106.

Pessah, Amy Grossblat, K. J. Myers, C. M. Leighton. "How Do Jews and Christians Read the Bible?" In *Irreconcilable Differences. A Learning Resource for Jews and Christians*. Edited by David F. Sandmel, Rosann M. Catalano and Christopher M. Leighton, 53-74. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2001.

Pontifical Biblical Commission. *The Jewish People and their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible*, 2002.

Pontifical Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, *The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable*. 2015.

Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue: *The Attitude of the Church towards the Followers of Other Religions: Reflections and Orientations on Dialogue and Mission, 1984*. Strathfield, NSW: Columban Mission Institute, 2008.

Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue: *Dialogue and Proclamation: Reflection and Orientations on Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ,1991*. Strathfield, NSW: Columban Mission Institute, 2008.

Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue. *Dialogue in Truth and Charity: Pastoral Orientation for Interreligious Dialogue*, par. 4, Vatican City: Libreria EditriceVaticana, 2014.

Pope John Paul II, Encyclical Letter, Redemptoris Missio, On the permanent validity of the Church's missionary mandate 7 December, 1990.

———. Encyclical Letter, *Ut Unum Sint: On Commitment to Ecumenism*, 1995.

Pope Paul VI, Encyclical Letter, *Ecclesiam Suam* (hereafter *ES*), 1964 accessed September 9, 2013.
https://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_06081964_ecclesiam.html

Putney, Bishop Michael. "Inter-religious Relations and Australian Catholic Bishops Conference." Paper delivered at *One Humanity, Many Faiths: An Interfaith Summit*

for Peace and Harmony in Australia and the Asia-Pacific Region, Brisbane, Queensland, 2009.

———. *My Ecumenical Journey*. Adelaide: ATF Theology, 2014.

———. "Jewish-Catholic Relations Today in the Light of Forty Years of Nostra Aetate." In *My Ecumenical Journey.* Edited by Elizabeth Delaney SGS, Gerard Kelly and Ormond Rush, 191-201. Adelaide: ATF Theology, 2014.

———. "An Australian Catholic Comment on 'We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah.' (1998)." In *My Ecumenical Journey.* Edited by Elizabeth Delaney SGS, Gerard Kelly and Ormond Rush, 127-135. Adelaide: ATF Theology, 2014.

Raeburn (nds), Mary. "The Catholic Church's Response to Nostra Aetate." *Gesher: Anniversaries* (2015): 34-35.

Rausch (S.J.), Thomas. *Theological Studies,* 62, 2001.

Reese (S.J.), Thomas J. "Organizational Factors Inhibiting Receptive Catholic Learning." In *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism* Edited by Paul D. Murray with the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri, 346-356. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Richard, Pablo. "Jewish and Christian Liberation Theology." In *Judaism, Christianity and Liberation: An Agenda for Dialogue*. Edited by Otto Maduro, 33-39. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1991.

Ronson (OCD), Jon. "Towards a Spirituality of solidarity with Johann Baptist Metz and Edith Stein," *Teresianum* 65 (2014): 235-262.

Rosen (Rabbi), David. "'Dabru Emet': Its Significance for the Jewish-Christian Dialogue." Address given at the 20th Anniversary celebration of the Dutch Council of Christians and Jews (OJEC) at Tilburg. The Netherlands, November 6th 2001.

———. *Learning From Each Other – Reflections of a Jew*. Address at Fordham University, 28.10.2003.

———. *Faith in daily action – the meaning of Jewish religion praxis*. Lecture delivered at King's College, London 28.2.2013.

———. *Memory, Community and Identity – A Jewish Perspective.* Presentation at the eighth Anglican-Jewish Commission meeting Dublin, Nisan 5714; Spring 2014.

Rubenstein, W.D. *The Jews in Australia, Victoria*. Melbourne: Australian Ethnic Heritage Press, 1986.

Rudin (Rabbi), A. James. "The Dramatic Impact of Nostra Aetate." In *Twenty Years of Jewish-Catholic Relations*. Edited by Eugene J. Fisher, A. James Rudin and Marc H. Tanenbaum, 9-18. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1986.

Rutishauser, Christian. "The 1947 Seelisberg Conference: The Foundation of the Jewish-Christian Dialogue." *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* 2:2 (2007): 34-53.

Rutland, Suzanne. *Edge of the Diaspora: two centuries of Jewish settlement in Australia*. 2nd rev. ed. Rose Bay, NSW: Brandl & Schlesinger, 1997.

———. *The Jews in Australia*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Ryan, Maurice, ed. *Jewish-Christian Relations. A Textbook for Australian Students*. Melbourne: David Lovell Publishing, 2004.

Sacks (Rabbi), Lord Jonathan. "Democratised Holiness: What Yom Kippur Teaches Us About Moral Responsibility." *ABC Religion and Ethics*. 3rd Oct 2014.

———. "Nostra Aetate Fifty Years On," *First Things,* The Institute on Religion and Public Life, October, 2015. Accessed November 16th, 2016. https://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2015/10/nostra-aetate-fifty-years-on.

Sandmel, David F., Catalano, R., Leighton, C. *Irreconcilable Differences? A Learning Resource for Jews and Christians*. Colorado: Westview Press, 2001.

Saperstein (Rabbi), Marc. "Attitudes Toward Christianity in Modern Jewish Preaching," Parkes Seminar, University of Southampton, 6th November, 2007. Accessed June 16th, 2015. http://www.southampton.ac.uk/parkes/news/seminars/2007/11/06_attitudes_toward_christianity.page

Schuller (OSU), Eileen. "A Catholic Reflection on The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable." *Regis College, University of Toronto* (2016). Accessed July 11th, 2016. https://www.scarboromissions.ca/wpcontent/uploads/2016/04/DrSchuller_CatholicReflection_TheGifts_CallingofGod_160412.pdf

Schüssler-Fiorenza, Elizabeth and David Tracy, eds.*The Holocaust as Interruption*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd., 1984.

Schüssler-Fiorenza, Francis. "Introduction." In *Faith and the future: essays on theology, solidarity, and modernity*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1992.

Sendor, Meir, "The Malleability of Collective Memory" in *Memory and Hope: Forgiveness, Healing and Interfaith Relations*. Edited by Alon Goshen-Gottsein. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2015.

Signer, Michael A. "Dabru Emet: Sic et Non". Paper delivered at the Council of Centers on Jewish-Christian Relations, Baltimore, 2002.

Simpson, William W. and Ruth Weyl, "The Story of the International Council of Christians and Jews." *International Council of Christians and Jews* (2009). Accessed June 25, 2015. http://iccj.org/…/201102021125090.

Smith, Stephen. "The Effect of the Holocaust on Jewish-Christian Relations," in *Challenges in Jewish-Christian Relations*. Edited by James K. Aitken and Edward Kessler, 137-152. Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2006.

Snaith, Norman H. "Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament." In *A Theological Word Book of the Bible.* Edited by Alan Richardson, New York: Macmillan, 1951. 136-137.

Stacpoole (OSB), Alberic Stacpoole. "Introduction", in *Vatican II Revisited: By Those Who Were There*. Editor, 1-15. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986.

Stransky (F.C.S.P.), Thomas. "The Genesis of Nostra Aetate." *America, The National Catholic Weekly*, Volume193/12 (2005): Accessed March 30th, 2013. http://www.americamagazine.org/issue/547/article/genesis-nostra-aetate.

Suenens (Cardinal), Leon-Josef. "A plan for the whole Council." In *Vatican II Revisited: By Those Who Were There,* Edited by Alberic Stacpoole OSB, 88-105. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986.

Sweeney (CP), James. "Receptive Ecumenism, Ecclesial Learning, and the 'Tribe'." In *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning:* Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism. Edited by Paul D. Murray With the assistance of Luca Badini-Confalonieri, 333-345. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Swidler, Leonard. "Dialogue Decalogue: Ground Rules for Interreligious, Interideological Dialogue." *The Journal of Ecumenical Studies,* 20:1, (1984): 1-4

Tanenbaum (Rabbi), Marc. "A Jewish Viewpoint on Nostra Aetate." In *Twenty Years of Jewish-Catholic Relations.* Edited by Eugene Fisher, James A. Rudin and Marc H. Tanenbaum, 39-60. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1986.Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1986.

Tauran (Cardinal), Jean Louis. "Interreligious Dialogue – a risk or an opportunity?" *Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue*. Adapted from a lecture given at Heythrop College, University of London, 27th May 2008.

———. "It is a Journey in Search of the Truth," PCID Address Kenya (23 April, 2008), accessed October 13, 2014. http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/cardinal-says-pope-giving-new-direction-to-dialogue.

The Christian Scholars Group on Christian-Jewish Relations. *A Sacred Obligation (following on from Dabru Emet)*, 2002.

The Council of Christians and Jews, *Rightly Explaining the Word of Truth*, (Melbourne: The Council of Christians and Jews (Victoria) Inc., 1-16, 1994.

———. *Re-reading Paul: A fresh look at his attitude to Torah and to Judaism*, (Melbourne: The Council of Christians and Jews (Victoria) Inc., 1999.

The Council of Christians and Jews (Vic.), "A Briefing for the Jewish community: Grass Roots Dialogue Project, 2015.

The Documents of Vatican II: Vatican Translation. With Notes and Index. Strathfield NSW: St Pauls Publications, 2009.

Vatican II Council. *Nostra Aetate, Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions,* in *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter M. Abbott, 660-668. London, UK: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966.

———. *Gaudium et Spes*, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, in The Documents of Vatican II, ed. Walter M. Abbott, S.J., (London-Dublin: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966).

———. *Unitatis Redintegratio*, Decree on Ecumenism, in *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter M.Abbott, (London-Dublin: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966), 341–366.

Walsh, Margaret. *The Good Sams*: *Sisters of the Good Samaritan 1857–1969.* Mulgrave, Victoria: John Garratt Publishing, 2001.

Waschenfelder, Jacob L. C. *Johann Baptist Metz's Critiques of Religious Apathy.* Hamilton, McMaster University, 1990.

Weinrich, Harald. "Narrative Theology," *Concilium,* Vol 5, No 9, (1973), 46-56.

Weissman, Deborah. "Has there been a response to NA?" In *Paths to Dialogue in our Age: International Perspectives*, Vol. 2. Edited by Edmund Kee-Fook Chia and Fatih Erol Tuncer, 33-49. Melbourne: Australian Catholic University, 2014.

Whelan, Michael, "Ways of Knowing: Clearing the Ground for Conversation," Paper presented at the International Philosophy, Science and Theology Festival, 2007. Accessed June 13, 2015. http://aejt.com.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/92536/Ways_of_Knowing.pdf

White, Andrew P. B. "Israel within Jewish-Christian Relations." In *Challenges in Jewish-Christian Relations.* Edited by James K. Aiken and Edward Kessler, 125-136. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2006.

Wijlens, Miriam. "Receptive Ecumenism and Canonical Structures: A Mutual challenge and Support". *Proceedings, Canon Law Society of Australia and New Zealand* 45 (2011): 45-58.

World Council of Churches (2010). *Guidelines on Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies*. Accessed November 15, 2014. http://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/wcc-programmes/interreligious-dialogueandcooperation/interreligious-trust-and-respect/guidelines-on-dialogue-with-people-of-livingfaiths-and-ideologies.

World Council of Churches. *Reception: A Key to Ecumenical Progress.* Joint Working Group between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 2014.

Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory.* Washington D.C.: University of Washington Press, 1982.

Zannoni, Arthur E. "The Challenge of Hebrew Scriptures in Jewish-Christian Relations." In *Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations.* Edited by Michael Shermis and Arthur E. Zannoni, 14-17. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003).

Relevant Dates from 1960-2015
in relation to the implementation of *Nostra Aetate* and subsequent responses

Date	Event
13/06/1960	Jules Isaac's private audience with Pope John XXIII in the Vatican to discuss the Teaching of Contempt.
11/10/1962 - 08/12/1965	Second Vatican Council.
01/01/1964	Pope Paul VI became first Pope to engage in face to face dialogue with Jewish officials.
28/10/1965	*Nostra Aetate* promulgated, Second Vatican Council.
24/05/1970	International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations [IJCIC] formed.
1970s - 1980s	Rabbi Raymond Apple and Sisters of Notre Dame de Sion worked together to establish Christian-Jewish Relations in Australia.
22/10/1974	Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews [CRRJ] established.
01/12/1974	(1) [CRRJ] - *Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration*.
17/11/1980	Pope John Paul II attends Conference of Rabbis, Mainz, Germany.
10/061984 (Pentecost)	Pontifical Commission for International Dialogue [PCID] – "Reflections and Orientations on *Dialogue and Mission - The Attitude of the Church Towards the Followers of Other Religions"* (DM).
07/05/1985	*Guidelines for Catholic-Jewish Relations*, Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs.

Relevant Dates from 1960-2015
in relation to the implementation of *Nostra Aetate* and subsequent responses

24/6/1985	(2) [CRRJ] - Publication of: *Notes on the correct way to present the Jews and Judaism in preaching and catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church*.
1985	Formation of Council of Christians and Jews (Melbourne) [VCCJ].
1988	Formation of Council of Christians and Jews (Sydney) - [CCJ NSW].
1990	(1) [VCCJ] - Publication of the interfaith Journal/Magazine - *Gesher*
30/11/1992	Australian Catholic Bishops Conference [ACBC] - Launch of *Australian Guidelines for Catholic Jewish Relations*.
09/11/1994	(2) [VCCJ] - Victorian Council of Christians and Jews – publication of *Rightly Explaining the Word of Truth*.
1995	Council of Christians and Jews, Western Australia [CCJWA] formed.
16/03/1998	(3) CRRJ – Publication of *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah*.
01/03/1998	Response to the Vatican Document: *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah*.
1999	(VCCJ) - Victorian Council of Christians and Jews - *Re-reading Paul: A Fresh Look at His Attitude to Torah and Judaism*.

Relevant Dates from 1960-2015
in relation to the implementation of *Nostra Aetate* and subsequent responses

23/03/2000	John Paul II visited Auschwitz-Birkenau, and the Roman Synagogue, and made an historical pilgrimage to the Holy Land, showing a desire and a willingness to mend Catholic relations with the Jews.
01/03/2000	*(CCAR) - Central Conference of American Rabbis: Recognizing Bonds between the Jewish and Catholic Communities*.
01/09/2000	*National Jewish Scholars Project: Dabru Emet: A Jewish Statement on Christians and Christianity.*
24/05/2001	(PBC) - Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Jewish People and their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible,* dealing explicitly with Jewish-Catholic dialogue.
2002	Publication of *The Christian Scholars Group - A Sacred Obligation* (following on from *Dabru Emet).*
May 2005	Australian Catholic Bishops Conference [ACBC] and the Executive Committee of Australian Jews [ECAJ] - 8th Annual Conversation.
05/12/2009	Pope Benedict XVI travelled to Israel where he visited major Christian holy sites, and Yad Vashem and the Western Wall, and met with Jewish, Christian and Muslim Religious leaders.
2010	[CCJ (ACT)] - Council of Christians and Jews (ACT) - Membership ratified.
01/02/2011	(ILC) - International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee formed.
01/05/2011	*Statement on a Jewish Understanding of Christians and Christianity.* Center for Jewish-Christian Understanding & Cooperation.

Relevant Dates from 1960-2015
in relation to the implementation of *Nostra Aetate* and subsequent responses

01/05/2014	Pope Francis made a State Visit to Israel accompanied by Rabbi Abraham Skorka and Muslim leader, Omar Abboud. He prayed at the Western Wall, visited Yad Vashem and met with two Chief Rabbis, giving witness, at many different levels, to successful inter-religious principles and dialogue.
28/05/2015	*A briefing for the Jewish Community: Grass Roots Dialogue Project.* The Council of Christians and Jews (Vic).
14/06/2015	*Whither Jewish-Christian Dialogue? A Jewish Perspective on 50 Years of Nostra Aetate.* Rabbi Fred Morgan AM.
30/06/2015	International Committee of Christians and Jews [ICCJ] *Celebrating and Deepening the New Christian-Jewish Relationship.* A Statement on the Golden Jubilee of *Nostra Aetate.*
03/12/2015	Orthodox Rabbinic Statement on Christianity, Center for Jewish-Christian Understanding and Cooperation (CJCUC) "*To Do the Will of Our Father in Heaven.*
12/10/15	(4) (CRRJ) Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews *"The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable"* (Rom. 11:29) A Reflection on Theological Questions pertaining to Catholic-Jewish Relations on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of *"Nostra Aetate."*
December 2015	American Jewish Committee response - *The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable: A Jewish Perspective.*