



CHRISTIAN PEACE CONFERENCE

93

I / 1988

CONTENTS:

30th Anniversary of the CPC	Bishop Károly Tóth	1
Turning to the Future	Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios	3
New Thinking and New Humanism	Academician Ivan Frolov	10
New Thinking in Theology?	Rev. Lubomír Mišejevský	14
New Thinking and the Christian Ethos	Prof. Elias Philippides	16
The Spirituality of Russian Orthodoxy	Archpriest Georgi Goncharov	20
Peace-making Pilgrimage	Rev. Christie Rosa	23

The quarterly CHRISTIAN PEACE CONFERENCE is published by the International Secretariat of the Christian Peace Conference.

Editor: The Rev. Jiří Svoboda

Editorial Board: Mrs. R. R. Andriamanjato (Madagascar), Prof. Dick Boer (the Netherlands), Archpriest Georgiy Goncharov (USSR), Mag. Klaus Ehrler (Westberlin), Prof. Carl-Jürgen Kaltenborn (GDR), Mr. John Ligoo (Kenya), Sister Stephanie Lindsey (USA/Mexico), Daniel P. Melville (India), Rev. Christoph W. Schmauch (USA), Dr. Raúl Gomez Treto (Cuba), Dr. Günter Wirth (GDR)

Editorial Offices: Jungmannova 9, Praha 1, Czechoslovakia

TURN TO THE FUTURE

New Thinking, New Ethos,
New Responsibilities

will be the theme of the meeting of the COMMITTEE FOR THE CONTINUATION OF WORK OF THE CHRISTIAN PEACE CONFERENCE which is to be held in Görlitz, GDR from October 17 to 22, 1988. The biblical theme is "Plough new ground" (Hosea 10:12).

The Continuation Committee (CCW) is the highest decision-making body of the CPC between All-Christian Peace Assemblies. Over 200 CCW members, speakers, observers and guests are expected to attend this gathering in Görlitz.

30th Anniversary of the CPC

BISHOP KÁROLY TÓTH, HUNGARY

This year we will commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of the foundation of the CPC and will do so with mixed feelings. On the one hand we can be proud that the vision of our founding fathers and mothers has proved right. From the very beginning all the determining features of church peace work today were evident in the CPC. At the time of the foundation of the CPC it was rightly recognized that when humanity entered the nuclear age it arrived at a decisive historical turning-point. Accordingly, the churches of Jesus Christ could not remain silent, feeling compelled to strive to recognize the signs of the times by seeking God's message in this unique historical situation. The founders of our movement were al-

ready aware that nuclear annihilation might bring death to the whole of Creation and that it was a challenge to our faith in the Triune God, the God, the Creator of Life, the Lord, the Saviour of Life, and the Spirit of Life and Truth. One point that should be quite clear is that in their protest and struggle against the nuclear threat these founders were motivated not by fear, but by a sense of responsibility and the commitment of the Christian faith. Their methods, which consisted of changing confrontation into dialogue, also proved to be right. Also well-founded was their basic conviction that the Christian church could not face the nuclear challenge unless united. This is why they were inspired by the vision of holding a universal Christian Council, and very early on — indeed within a matter of a few years or even at the very beginning of the movement — they discovered that their struggle against nuclear danger had to be connected with the struggle for justice and human dignity. They knew that they could only face this unique challenge by constantly

listening to and being obedient to the Word of God and, with humility and readiness for renewal, by being prepared to get rid of the historical ballast that the churches had accumulated over the centuries.

If we review the subjects dealt with in the CPC during these thirty years we have to state in all modesty that almost all the topics and discussions proved timely and right. This is true, for example of the struggle against the Cold War, the insistence on the need for détente between East and West, the necessity for rapprochement between the two parts of Germany as a prelude to European security and cooperation, the admission of China into the United Nations Organisation, the recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people, and so on. This all happened in an environment and context of suspicion and misunderstanding on the part of many churches in the world which accused the

Prof. Dr. Hans-Joachim wand speaking at the First Christian Peace Conference in 1958



CPC of one-sidedness and thus could not understand or accept the movement at that time.

The CPC has been of great service to churches by taking on itself the risk of rethinking and remodelling the substance of Christian witness in societies where the church has already lost almost all credibility. The CPC has played a considerable role in changing the attitudes towards the Church of those social forces which did not accept it as a positive and constructive social phenomenon.

Although at the beginning of its work the CPC was suspected by many of being a "counter-oekumene" or an "Eastern oekumene", its positive contribution and loyalty to the WCC has helped to solve not a few difficult problems between East and West.

But there is another side to these mixed feelings with which we celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of the CPC. Namely, we do not want to be self-righteous and we do want to avoid the temptation

of being self-indulgent, for this would be an erroneous way of celebrating. Indeed, in looking back over the thirty years it has to be admitted that many mistakes have been made due to inexperience, naïvety and excessive enthusiasm, as well as an incorrect assessment of a number of historical and political events. The fact that the peace issue did not earlier become the central task of the churches all over the world is also due to our weakness and lack of proper arguments or a correct theological and spiritual approach. However the basic vision still proves to be right, and that is that the central message of the Gospel of Jesus Christ is one of peace and reconciliation which has to be given relevance in our world. It is now evident that this message has reached many millions and that an ever-increasing number of people recognize that the greatest treasure of human life and the whole of Creation is "Peace which is the fruit of justice" (Isaiah 32, v. 17).

Published below are three lectures given at the Second Symposium of the Christian Peace Conference on the Questions of Globalism, which was held in Prague in November 1987. A more detailed report of this symposium is given in CPC Information N. 387.

The lecture given by Metropolitan Mar Gregorios from India, vice-present of the CPC and one of the presidents of the World Council of Churches, on the very theme of the approaching Continuation Committee meeting deserves the attention of all, not just the participants.

Professor Ivan Frolov, President of the Philosophical Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and Dr. Lubomír Miřejovský, General Secretary of the CPC, tackle the same subject (i.e. the roots, the nature and the challenge of New Thinking) from two independent points of view — from the philosophical and from the theological one, the former as an outstanding marxist, the latter as a Christian thinker. Reading through their contributions, one can only agree with the view expressed spontaneously by the participants of the Second Globalism Symposium, that such thought provoking and friendly dialogue is worth continuing.

Turning to the Future

METROPOLITAN PAULOS MAR GREGORIOS, INDIA

Disarmament, Global Development and Global Common Security

If all goes well, the epoch-making first step should be behind us by mid-December. The auguries are good for the signing of the first major treaty for the reduction of nuclear weapons. The Washington Summit meeting between President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev begins on December 9th.

The intermediate-range and short-range nuclear weapons of the USA and the USSR will be totally eliminated if the treaty is signed. This applies to all ground-launched missile systems of the two leading nuclear powers — Pershings, Cruise Missiles, SS-4s, SS-12s, SS-20s and Pershing 1-As — everything ground-launched between 500 and 5000 km range. We hope that in less than a year from December 1987, the treaty will be ratified and

implemented. The hope is that the Ia aging Pershing missiles owned by the USA and deployed in the FRG, would also be included.

All those intermediate and shorter range weapons together constitute about 4% of the total nuclear arsenals. Negotiations must advance for an agreement to scrap 50% of the strategic missiles also during 1988. There will still be enough left over — about 48% of present arsenals — to destroy our planet several times over. We cannot rest in security until all nuclear weapons of all nuclear powers are totally eliminated — including tactical or battlefield nuclear weapons; but the trend today is to strengthen the navies, that is, ships, aircraft-carriers and submarines with more and more nuclear weapons. The struggle for total elimination has therefore to be unrelenting. The time for peace movements to rest on our oars is still very far in the future. Especially as land-based nuclear weapons gradually yield place to water-based weapons and as new technologies of naval battles are being evolved, we have to focus on making the oceans and seas free from nuclear weapons.

It should be a matter of some concern for all of us that the intermediate and short-range nuclear missiles now planned to be eliminated, including cruise missiles, are the ones that a space-based ABM defense system cannot cope with because of their shorter acceleration path or low altitude. It could very well be the strategy of those who depend more on space-based ABM to eliminate those nuclear weapons it cannot easily cope with. And the partial reduction of nuclear weapons may be only a step towards perfecting a pre-emptive first attack strategy. The elimination of these weapons increases the "security" of the one who can pull the trigger first. The refusal of the USA to discontinue SDI research is an indication that a winnable nuclear war fighting strategy is not yet abandoned. And since there is no nuclear freeze, new and more deadly weapons continue to be added to the stockpiles. Most of the work for peace will still be ahead of us after the Summit.

In this connection I need to say a word about the recent UN International Conference on the Relation between Development and Disarmament, held at the UN headquarters in New York from August 24th to September 11th, in accordance with a UN General Assembly resolution (39/151-C) of December 17th, 1984. The proposal originally came from President Francois Mitterand of France. His idea seems to have been based on proposals before the UN since at least 1978 to create an International Disarmament Fund for Development. The

General Assembly has adopted several resolutions (in 1980, 81, 82, 83 and 84) appealing to all states to reduce military budgets and reallocate resources to development.

President Mitterand had envisioned a future in which resources saved by disarmament would be channelled into development, particularly development in the developing countries. There must have been the hope that, once such a fund was set up, the developing countries would become more interested in disarmament, since they would stand to benefit from it directly. The UN Conference this year did not adopt a resolution to create the International Disarmament Fund for Development. What it did, however, has turned out to be even more significant. The consensus document produced by the 150 nations participating in the Conference, has been called a landmark. The USA did not participate, on the plea that disarmament and development are two independent processes and should not be considered together in a conference — a point of view the 150 nations unanimously repudiated. The document becomes a landmark for the following reasons:

a) It not only officially and politically recognized the inseparable relation between disarmament and development. It pointed out that global military expenditures were a major cause of distorted and unjust global development; that we have to choose between continuing the arms race and the growing militarization on the one hand, and a more equitable global development on the other.

b) It recognized officially the "non-military threats to security" — in hunger and poverty, ill-health and illiteracy. It thus enlarged the concept of security to involve North-South relations which are always a factor in East-West relations. So long as some people remained victims of oppression, exploitation and injustice, there could be no final peace or security. Economic security for all is an essential part of Global Common Security.

c) It recognized the triangular relationship between Disarmament, Development and Common Security. We have seen more clearly that Global Common Security, based on mutual trust and cooperation among nations is an essential aspect of just and equitable development in the world. International Security must not be dependent on the force of arms or on the threat to use force. Common Security, Development and Disarmament are thus integrally related to each other. Long-term equitable global development, as well as general and complete disarmament are both dependent on devising and setting up a system of international, Global, Common Security.

The Global Economic Crisis — Its meaning and significance

October 19th, 1987, marks the beginning of the end of the military-industrial complex. On that day, now called Black Monday, the value of stocks in the Market Economy world crashed dramatically. In one day, shareholders worldwide lost 500 billion dollars — about the amount of the total of two-third world debt. The Dow Jones index climbed down 508 points in one day — something unprecedented in Market Economy history.

Even the last Great Depression did not see such a dramatic fall. In the three years from September 1st, 1929 to July 1st, 1932, the value of shares in the New York Stock Exchange fell by 74 billion dollars only — from a total of \$ 90 billion to \$ 16 billion. Granting that the purchasing power of the dollar was many times higher and the volume of stocks much smaller in the 20s, the crash then was less abrupt. The loss of Market Economy Wealth worldwide in the month of October 1987 alone is estimated at 2 trillion dollars — about the equivalent of the national debt of the largest debtor nation in the world today, the USA.

Mr. Donald R. Regan, formerly Treasury Secretary and Chief of Staff of President Ronald Reagan, in a Washington Post article (25th October 1987) entitled "No More Business as Usual", warned that the so-called "economic recovery" of the last 5 years is now in jeopardy. In this article Mr. Regan does not acknowledge his own share of responsibility in initiating the policies that led to the present crash. But Mr. Regan recognized seven

factors that have led to the recent stock market crash:

- a) Deficit budgeting in USA
- b) Unfavorable Trade Balance for the USA
- c) Proposed trade tax bill that would adversely affect US traders
- d) Non-productive expenditures like excessive military spending
- e) The Federal Government's fiscal policy of tight money and high interest rates
- f) Unreliability and instability of dollar as international and national currency
- g) Talks about increasing budget deficit, rather than reducing it.

It is clear now that Reaganomics, which artificially and temporarily boosted the markets through heavy military expenditure and by greater export of arms to other countries, was a colossal failure in solving the problems of capitalism. In fact it has turned out to be a disaster.

What has happened to the global economy during the 70s, when we were close to an East-West détente, can now lead us to global catastrophe, unless we take some resolute actions.

There was a measure of military-strategic parity between the USA and the USSR in the early 70s. It was at that time that both the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM systems (May 26, 1972) and the SALT-I agreement were signed (1972). The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe could have led to remarkable progress in détente, if all the three baskets of the Helsinki Agreement could have been implemented.

The vested interests of the market economy world were frightened by the possibility of a real détente, a freeze in nuclear weapons, and a reduction of arms manufacture and trade. The market economy world had by that time invested a great deal of money in arms production. Especially Western economies were heavily militarized, giving comparatively less attention to civilian production and to research on genuine human needs like health, education, culture, shelter, pollution control, and ecobalance. Something similar was happening also in the Soviet Union, where the pressures on military spending and research acted as a constraint on raising the standards of civilian consumption and existence. If the détente had actually progressed, the people of the Soviet Union stood to gain directly. Since all military and civilian production in that country are centrally planned and centrally implemented, it would have been comparatively easier for the military sector of the Soviet economy to be converted to civilian use.

In the market economy world on the other hand, the bulk of military — related production was in



private hands, though military production had created a large public sector in capitalist countries (one of the many contradictions of capitalism). Another factor was the growing conflict between US and West-European capitalist interests. The US share of world capitalist output stood at 55.8% in 1948. It dwindled to 40.4% by 1970. Meanwhile Western Europe's share rose to 34.3%, coming close to the US share by 1970. Today Europe (East + West) accounts for 55% of world industrial output, according to 1985 figures. Much of this was military production, and a large share of it in private hands. An East-West détente was perceived to be inimical to the interests of the market economy industrial barons, and they developed a strategy, in cooperation with the military structures, to undermine the détente. NATO deployment of Pershing-II missiles and ground-based cruise missiles was a major step in this strategy of undermining the détente.

What changed the whole picture was the influx of petro-dollars into the Western economy. The Arab strategy to use an increase in oil prices as a pressure tactic on the West to force it to settle the Middle East problem actually back-fired. While increased oil prices created considerable strain on the Western industrial system, it was more than compensated by Arab beneficiaries of the price increase being naively willing to plough back most of the money into the Western economy, through investments, through purchase of expensive weapons, and through an inordinate rise in Arab tourism in the West.

This actually played into the hands of the military-industrial complex. On the one hand the West had more money to invest in arms production, and the market was readily provided by a few Arab nations. Liquid cash was still bulging the pockets of Western banks, and they persuaded other Two-Third world nations to take easy loans and to spend it on buying military and civilian goods from the Western industrial-military system. Two-Third world debt thus arose from \$ 90 billion in 1971 to \$ 274 billion by 1977. By the 80s about \$ 100 billion was being paid out every year by the poor nations to the rich nations by way of debt service including interest.

The petrodollars did a double damage to the developing countries:

- a) it led to accelerated militarization of the Third World and artificially boosting the market economy; and
- b) it dragged many countries into a Shylockian deadlock where the debt burden became a new way of sucking the poor countries' wealth into the rich countries of the market economy world.

Another factor which helped the capitalist economy to go on for some time were regional wars in the Two-Third world, principally the Iraq-Iran war, the Middle East conflict, the military equipping of Pakistan and the Afghan Mujahiddeen, the Central American conflicts, the Malvinas war between Britain and Argentina, and the Southern Africa conflicts. The Iraq-Iran war alone to which more than 35 nations seem to have contributed or sold weapons, cost 500 billion dollars, most of which went to boost military production and military trade in the market economy world.

But all these temporary and artificial means of bolstering up capitalism have now been demonstrated to be ineffective in rescuing capitalism from collapse.

We can say that while the Oct. 19th crash does not immediately lead to a world-wide depression, it must at least lead to the insight that the military expenditures, which are non-productive, cannot indefinitely bolster up the market economy world. The market economy world will have to think in terms of better solutions than military manufactures and military trade to increase its stability and its capacity to sustain itself. It also has another consequence which we are still reluctant to recognize: namely, that military solutions to world problems cannot be final. Let me cite to you some statements made, first from the "US News and World Report". In 1950, this Journal said: "Business will not go to pot so long as war is a threat." That is, business depends on the threat of war remaining in the world. "So long as every alarm can step up spending, lending for defence at home and aid abroad, so long as that can happen, our economy is safe." So long as new wars can be created, the economy is safe. That's what the journal said 37 years ago. It's a fantastic way of thinking to assume that the Cold War was the best way to bolster up the economy. That was not simply the "US News and World Report" which said that. A very liberal friend of mine, Jerome Wiesner, the President of MIT, made a similar statement. He is not a rightist; he was scientific advisor to Kennedy and Johnson; "the armaments industry has provided a sort of automatic stabilizer for the whole economy, for the American economy". A more left oriented man, Herbert Gintis wrote in the "Review of Radical Political Economics": "The military industrial complex has eliminated the spectre of secular stagnation". Stagnation in the market economy was avoided by the military industrial complex. This was stated even by a leftist. We are now moving beyond that stage. We are coming to a new stage where we can no longer prop up the economy by military expenditures. That is the lesson which

comes from Oct. 19 crash. I would say that crash is one of the healthiest things that has happened to us recently.

The Developments in Global Science/Technology

On the third issue I must say two things very briefly. I could say many more things about new developments in world science and technology. Here I can only illustrate, by mentioning two new developments, leaving aside others like information technology, technology as a commodity, new super-computer technology and so on.

One of the most frightening developments in global science technology is the division of the scientific community into two parts. In the world scientific community, researchers and technologists are now engaged in serving the military industrial complex. They are in the service of defence production and the scientific development of defence production is becoming more and more of a secret business. And these scientists are sworn to a kind of secrecy. They are not supposed to share their scientific knowledge with their scientific colleagues. This is something new in science. Science was always regarded as public knowledge, which can be shared, discussed, disputed, experimented, tried wherever necessary, this is no longer the case. Military knowledge is becoming more and more a secret property and in the scientific community there is a new polarization. A large number of scientists are now turning towards opposition to nuclear and other military developments in science and technology. A large number of scientists are saying that we must liberate science and technology from its captivity to the military-industrial complex and re-deploy it to solve the problems of humanity as a whole. That number of scientists — thank God — is increasing constantly. At the same time, a large number of scientists are being clubbed together into a scientific secret pact. They do not want to look at the moral issues at all. They are concerned only about the higher salaries and better facilities, for their research work which the ordinary academy or university cannot provide but which the military industry provides. This polarization is one major development in the global scientific community which we have to watch. I would also like to say that within that military-scientific community there are two foci: one is that of directed energy weapons, that is laser beams, particle beams and other directed energy weapons with complex electronic guidance systems. This is the new secret knowledge that they are building up. And we have to worry about this development of new weapons while nuclear weapons are becoming obsolete, new weapons are

being created. We should demand that science and technology be accountable to the public about what they are doing and not pledged to this kind of immoral secrecy. They must be accountable to the total scientific community but also to the common public. That is the demand that the peace movements have to make.

There is another development that I am not even competent to discuss adequately. I will just mention it, that is the developments in super-conductivity. This is a major breakthrough which has happened this year. We have been researching to find a conducting medium without any resistance at normal temperature. All the previously known conducting mediums which have no resistance can be so only at extremely low temperatures, which are very expensive to maintain. We have the possibility now of getting ceramics, synthetic ceramics, which can conduct electricity without any loss, without creating heat or resistance in the conducting medium. This can have many positive consequences, but it can also have one negative consequence. That is fusion technology, which has been at a standstill for some time, making a few occasional jumps. Fusion of atoms is dependent on a medium which can contain the very high heat produced by fusion without itself melting. And they have been trying to build a plasma case which will contain the excessive heat produced by fusion. Now superconductivity produces the possibility that there may be solid containers, for this high fusion temperature. We are not there yet, but the breakthrough made this year in superconductivity can lead to the possibility of solid containers for high temperatures produced by fusion. This can be exceedingly problematic for us. It has some positive effects — it makes the magnetic cushion effect easier and more economic — you know these hovercraft which just sail on a magnetic cushion — there would not be any heat produced by that process so that it would be made a little easier. It can also make it possible to develop huge multikilometre long particle accelerators. You know that the accelerator in Geneva at CERN is many kilometres long and already it is underground, the huge particle accelerator. Now with the new fusion technology, with the new superconductivity technology, we are in a position to create huge particle accelerators with which we might make more experiments and research about thermonuclear fusion, and there is a big danger in that. It also can help in space travel, because loss-free energy accumulators can now be created. This means that space travel may be made easier by this new discovery.

Well, what I am saying is that there are new

discoveries, and like all discoveries in science they are capable of positive and negative results, but we as the public have a responsibility to watch these things. That is the first thing I wanted to say.

New Thinking

Now, finally, I come to the point which is the easiest, probably, to do and about which most of you already know more than I do. I will still try to look at this new thinking and the concept of socialist reconstruction. I don't want to describe *perestroika* and *glasnost* technically. I have been trying, however, to look at the literature arising on the subject in various parts of the socialist world. I see the following six or seven points in this new thinking. The most important first point apart from the radically humanist moral framework, is the expansion of democracy and self-management. That is the major primary element that is being stressed in the practical aspect of this new thinking. It is actually an old idea in Marxism, but it had been suppressed in favor of a heavily centralized economy, and administration. This has been the norm within socialism for some time, which is a violation of an original affirmation of Marx. Now they are coming back to this intrinsic principle of Marxism in order to create local self-government, local responsibility within the economic production units, and a certain amount of pluralism within the economic and political structure. That's the first idea, self-administration; it almost reminds one of the French idea of the late 60s of "*autogestion*", which is also a Marxist idea which the French leftists picked up in the 60s, but now it is being dusted and brought back by official Socialism itself. It is a very interesting development which has many possibilities for the future development of socialism.

Secondly, the idea that the assets of the economic unit belong to the people has so far been only in the text-books. It has not always been realized. The people even in the socialist countries have never felt that "this factory belongs to us". A new law has been passed by the Soviet parliament in June 87 which says that the assets of an economic unit belong to its personnel or workers. That's the new law, that the workers own the factory and I don't know what this really means. There have been a number of surveys made by Pravda to see to what extent this is becoming real. Izvestia had made another survey of the workers in several factories and they discovered that 85% of those polled stated that the workers are not yet in control. That survey has been published within the Soviet Union itself; the Izvestia study shows that even though the law is passed by the Soviet go-

vernment, its implementation has not proceeded very far. The open publication of this survey by Izvestia is itself a very new development. These facts are now openly available to the public; the public can discuss these questions, that a law passed by the Soviet Union is not yet implemented in the factories; that is already something. They are saying that public property does not mean that it is a no-man's-land, but that the workers are co-owners, therefore directly responsible for the performance of the local economic unit. To what extent that will become real, I do not know.

The third element, which is interesting to me is a new motto which reminds me of the old capitalist motto which said "what is good for General Motors is good for America". There is a new version of that in the socialist countries, which says "what is good for the people is good for socialism". This is a very interesting motto. It means that issues need *not* be handled on an ideologically dogmatic basis, trying to force a kind of class analysis on every phenomenon; but authorities have to see that what is good for the people in each particular situation is ultimately good for socialism. This is a bold new step, away from the ideological dogmatic sterility, and I think this is a very important attempt to implement Lenin's dictum that socialism is not simply a system of centralized control, but "given social ownership of the means of production" it is "the system of civilized co-operators" (V. I. Lenin, *On Co-operation*, in: *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow 1971, p. 763).

Fourth, the role of the market is now recognized but not in an absolute way, as if the market can look after itself. The market goes with central planning and control. Along with central planning and controlling the market can also function, which means the assessment of the market forces is not totally negative anymore. You have to take the reality of market forces and take that into account in your planning and regulating of the economy. Again it is a very interesting assessment of the dialectic between central planning and market forces. It is a bold new step. The new *perestroika* also wants to emphasize that the social guarantees to the people can never be revoked. Whatever reconstruction you do, the socialist guarantees to the people cannot be revoked. The social guarantees of employment, housing, old-age pension, education, health, etc. cannot be revoked, but they also say that this should not lead to parasitism. Sometimes, the social guarantees are leading to parasitism, people living on the economy without producing anything. That can no longer be accepted.

Fifth, the four points of Lenin are now being reemphasized. Industrialization must go at the high-

est possible speed, farming must become cooperative. The four main points in Lenin's vision are (a) farming cooperatives, (b) fast industrialization, (c) cultural revolution, i.e. constantly new cultural forces being generated without which the human factor cannot operate effectively, and (d) ethnic harmony. These four principles of Lenin, are being reemphasized in the new revolution, in the new reconstruction. But as I said, these reforms are not yet 100% successful. *Izvestia* which sells 8 million copies made a sample survey of its readers, and 85% of those who responded to the poll said that formalism and red tape are still evident in the economy. Another survey reveals that only 25% agreed that there is some improvement in the bureaucracy, 75% still think there is no improvement in the bureaucratic weight in the economy. Another survey, more positive, says that 63% of those polled believe that there is more *glasnost*, more openness in discussion, and in corporate tackling of problems within the economic unit. But still only 33% believe that ordinary workers are taking a larger role in management. These are interesting figures which are now published for general discussion.

I want to conclude by saying that in this vision which is behind socialist reconstruction now, there are two basic insights. One is the vision of a new world — a new world in which people of different ideologies can live together, and cooperate together without having only adversary relations. This vision has to be regenerated and fostered because it underlies everything. Tomorrow we won't have a world where all nations are socialist. In the world of tomorrow, it is now generally accepted, we will have socialist nations as well as market economy nations. But people with different ideologies and economic systems must learn to live together in that world and not wait until everybody becomes socialist, to have that peaceful world. The peaceful world must come now, and whatever antagonistic and negative images socialism may have had in the past, it must now receive a more humanist image and reality; and that, I think, is the central vision of perestroika.

The second aspect of that vision is one which should make us all rejoice. It is the aspect of *glasnost* or openness. Openness means that truth must be faced and not covered up. This has again two faces — one that of correctly understanding and recognizing the present in terms of a clear and unambiguous assessment of the past which has led to the present. This means recognizing past mistakes of socialism and making amends. There is no doubt that personality cult, arbitrary authority, and cruelty and deceit in dealing with fellow-

human beings were failures of the Stalinist period. These should not only be acknowledged, but also be purged from socialist practice. The second face is open creative discussion of all problems among the people, and also between authorities and peoples, among workers and managers in an economic production unit, amongst nationalities in the Soviet Union, among artists, intellectuals and the people — at all levels. This means that socialism is achieving a new maturity. This *glasnost* will have to be responsibly exercised by a mature people. If anyone misuses this openness for personal ambition and careerism, such persons will have to be reprimanded and restrained.

Conclusion

I have touched upon four significant trends in the global situation. I have not tried to give a comprehensive picture, but only to point to some. The four trends I have touched upon lead to some clear conclusions.

(a) Nuclear disarmament, with a comprehensive test ban treaty, a freeze, and total elimination of all nuclear weapons by all nations with a ban on research and development of new weapons remains a first priority.

(b) The development of Global Common Security through international trust and co-operation, without resort to weapons and with full attention given to economic and cultural insecurity of the majority of the world's people should receive more attention from peace movements.

(c) The one world which we are to build is inescapably one of cultural, ideological and social plurality; in it science/technology has to be liberated from its present bondage to war and profit; science/technology should not only be responsible to the people, but must be re-oriented to serve the genuine interests and cultural creativity of different peoples in their own ways. The religions of the world have to be taken seriously by Socialism, since 80% of the world population have varying degrees of adherence to various religions. The religions on the other hand should abandon their uninformed anti-communism and should both take socialism seriously, and help creatively in the evolving of a new moral order in a pluralistic world acceptable to religionists and secularists.

(d) The new thinking and new reconstruction in socialist countries should be welcomed by all peace forces, not only because they can lead us to relaxation of tensions, and to peace, but also because it can lead us to the vision of a new world where all of us can live together in freedom and dignity in just and peaceful societies.

New Thinking and New Humanism

ACADEMICIAN IVAN FROLOV, SOVIET UNION

I remember with great pleasure our first colloquy held here, in Prague, three years ago. I can see that its results are perceptible now, and that the movement aimed at the investigation and comprehension of global problems from various standpoints — including the philosophical one — is being successfully developed.

This is of great importance, because the very idea of the struggle for peace, the idea of peace-making policy must start from the solution of some concrete and very important problems — those which we call global, or common to all humankind. They involve, in the first place, problems of peace, disarmament, ecology, demographic problems, problems of food, raw materials, and also problems in the domain of scientific exchange, and of the exchange of cultural values. And, finally, all that directly and immediately concerns humankind, its position in the present-day world, its future.

This is how all these problems are viewed in the Marxist interpretation of global problems. To us, it is humankind and its future which are at the centre of the whole system of global problems. We believe that the most important starting premise for further progress, and for the survival of humankind in general, is the resolution of the problems of peace and disarmament. But in our constructive positive work, in our concentration on solving global problems we take as the starting point the priority of humanitarian values.

Today, I would like to speak not about the general problems related to what is now called "globalism" — but rather I want to concentrate on what we understand by new thinking; what we understand by the notion of new political thinking; on the relationship between all that and humanitarian values; and on what new trends are emerging or have already emerged. Also, I would like to express my belief that just as we now have the right to speak about the necessity and possibility, reality, even, of the establishment of new thinking, including political thinking — so, in the same way we should speak, and we do speak now about the necessity, possibility and reality of the establishment of a new humanism, of new forms of humanism, which would correspond to the new thinking.

To do so, we ought to examine the predominant characteristics of the new political thinking and then relate them to those principles of humanism which are being established in the world at present on various philosophical bases and which Marxism and socialism are also trying to establish in forms specific to them. If we take as our point of departure the fact that the new political thinking is centred on the concept of an interrelated, interacting, integrated world, or, in other words, that the new political thinking is based on the premise that the world is a united whole — then we are saying that this world is the world of a human race that is also whole and integrated.

We say that such approaches should be seen as a priority, and that values common to all humankind should be established as the most important ones; but, by doing so, we are also saying that human values should be seen as a priority. We are saying that an integrated human race should be seen as a priority and, taking this as the point of departure and considering humankind from this standpoint, we can no longer oppose different human beings to each other on the basis of various factors which divide them in the contemporary world. This does not mean that we do not see these factors. I stress, however, that under the new conditions of the developing relations of an economical, political, scientific and cultural nature, which increasingly unite the world, reveal its integrity — and, moreover, if we assert that such integrated relations have priority — under such conditions we should learn how to see those common features which not only unite humankind, but also characterize human beings. If we place social relations which underlie the new political thinking, beyond the sphere of humankind, beyond the new things now being revealed in that sphere, we will separate this thinking from its main feature: the humanitarian basis which should be our point of departure. And it is precisely in this sense that we refer to humankind and to its future as a global problem.

Very many new and interesting aspects which can be used for analysis and consideration are re-

vealed if one separates those global and common features which characterize humankind today and its future. This does not only relate to the biological and genetic aspects of human nature, which are "neutral" from the social and class point of view.

However, we should by no means underestimate this biological and genetic side of human nature, particularly as it is increasingly being subjected to further trials, as many problems, such as ecological ones, are getting worse. We face the most urgent task of adapting the biological nature of humankind to the present-day world surrounding it, which has greatly changed as a result of anthropogenic effects. These effects are so deep that they already affect many human structures, including the genetic ones — in other words, they endanger human heredity, and thus, the future of humankind. Moreover, progress in the field of, e.g., the development of genetic engineering, biotechnology, which opens the way for the application of genetic engineering research to human beings, creates the extremely dangerous threat of manipulating the human genotype for antihumane purposes, although very often such purposes are disguised under some humanitarian considerations.

In this connection we should investigate ("we" meaning the human community as a whole) how science with its many contemporary progressive trends should be developed under such conditions where humankind is increasingly becoming the object of scientific studies and of possible manipulation. Under the conditions of an intensive development of new kinds of technology, including the so-called new medicine, which allows us to interfere with some very intimate aspects of the functioning of the human organism, a great number of interesting and important global problems arise, which — no doubt — will already be occupying the minds of researchers and moralists at the end of this century, and certainly at the beginning of the next. It is the discussion and research in this domain — often referred to as the ethics of science or the ethics of scientific knowledge — which will largely define the future position of science. Accordingly, this new trend in research can be defined as an analysis of socioethical, humanitarian principles and regulating factors of scientific knowledge. If the new thinking establishes the priority of humanitarian values, then in this domain, the domain of the ethical basis of science, we also have as our point of departure the establishment of the priority of socioethical values, and thus the possibility and necessity of some kind of regulation of scientific research.

Humanitarian values are above knowledge. And

science, the scientists themselves are increasingly finding themselves in an unprecedented situation, where they are beginning to talk about the necessity of introducing certain rules to regulate various experiments involving human beings. You know that the World Health Organization has even worked out certain recommendations in this respect, which act at the level of moral principles, moral resolutions, without, however, having any legislative character. Numerous principles of this type have been reflected in the legislation of many countries. It seems that in the future the United Nations Organization will increasingly be engaged in the development of such rules and procedures, which, if I may say so, would simply help humankind to survive under the conditions of an uncontrolled development of scientific and technical progress.

I should say that already 20 years ago several cases of possible experiments involving human beings were worked out and identified and that situations were defined in which experiments with human beings are not possible. This was carried out by a number of scientists and theologians under the guidance of the World Council of Churches.

I studied these cases with great interest, and they became the source of many subsequent positive solutions. Unfortunately, so far the analysis of these problems has attracted very little attention. This is very sad. Of course, these problems are very involved and are not too easily understood by the general public. We know, of course, that not many years ago problems related, for instance, to atomic energy were also regarded as completely mysterious. The whole insidiousness of this new threat consists precisely in the fact that it has not yet been grasped by the general public, has not been properly recognized. Indeed — even the danger involved in atomic tests, radiation and the like was not adequately recognized even after the sombre experience of the explosion of atomic bombs over Japan in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

At that time, as you know, the extent of the new danger was realized only by the clearest and most advanced thinkers, such as Albert Einstein, and, among others, Frédéric Joliot Curie. I stress his name, because, as you know, he was a Marxist and a communist, and at the same time one of the initiators of the famous Russell-Einstein manifesto. It was published more than 30 years ago, but it was in this manifesto that the basis of what we now call the new thinking was formulated. For the first time, it was said there that we should realize we are a united human race in these new conditions, and we must discard everything else and learn to think on new lines.

It seems to me that our task now should be to continue to draw attention to the new problems mentioned here, and that we should try to make people aware of the menace and threat inherent to these problems not post-factum, that is, not after some disaster has already happened to humankind. Hopefully, we are sufficiently sensible to prevent such danger. On the other hand, I must admit that from the literature and from my knowledge of the attitudes in the world scientific community I can see only very few hopeful elements. The movement has started, it is irreversible, but it is still regarded as something external with respect to science, something that is said to fetter the freedom of scientific knowledge, to be capable of slowing down progress in technology and science. This lack of understanding arose in the scientific community as a result of elementary ignorance, and it continues to develop, paradoxical as this may appear. This ignorance, unfortunately, which has arisen on a scientific basis, assumes very dangerous forms of scientific complacency. Here again I can see that our aims and tasks coincide — we should develop broad approaches, humanitarian in their nature, among the scientists as well.

I see our common task as being to assert that humankind and humanitarian values, are our priority (including values related to science and to progress in science and technology); we should develop the ethical self-awareness of scientists, and of the whole of humankind today, because it is only on these lines that humankind can survive and develop freely under the conditions of the ever accelerating progress in science and technology. I would even say that, if the progress in science and technology and its development could be imagined as proceeding in an arithmetic progression, then the ethical self-awareness of scientists should develop in a geometrical progression, if everything is to continue in a direction beneficial to humankind. Otherwise we will find ourselves facing once again a number of considerable difficulties, which — and I stress that — are much more menacing than those which we have to tackle now. This, perhaps, is a not too comforting prospect, but you know very well that the Bible tells us that by multiplying knowledge we multiply sorrow. This is indeed the case, unfortunately; at the same time, however, the Bible gives us — I think — very sensible advice: that we need good reasoning and what is called wisdom. We understand this in philosophical terms — religion understands the same thing in its own way.

I would like to stress that the need to assert the priority of values common to the whole human race, the priority of humankind, of humanitarian

values, at the present moment does not simply involve making appeals or acting just in the scientific and technical domain. This is real practical work in which we need to be engaged in the domain of our social life. And we strive to establish and to create in practice a new image of socialism — a theoretical concept of socialism: at the same time, we strive to put this concept into practice, with humankind in the centre of it as the principal value, not merely in words but in deeds. So that humankind really and in the true sense of the word would become the measure of all, the measure of all things, as Protagoras said, including all sciences, every kind of progress.

You may have noticed that in the process of what we call “perestroika” this occupies one of the central positions in the activities of our party. I would like to draw your attention, in this connection, to the report read by the Secretary General of our party Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Great October revolution in our country. You may see that this idea penetrates the whole content of the report, all its sections. With this aim — the aim of establishing a new face, a new image, a new theoretical model of socialism — we turn to the history of our development, including the history of the development of our country.

This is served by the policy of “glasnost”, openness, truthfulness, which is being developed more and more in our country. We strive to present our history with all fairness, so that all those who played any part in it would not sink into oblivion, because it is not possible to assert a new truth basing it on concealments, and thus, in fact, on lies.

You know, of course, that Kant said that to be silent does not mean to tell a lie. In some cases lies may be expressed through something in a concrete way, while to be silent does not mean to act immorally. But I do not agree, because in many cases to be silent may even be more immoral than an obvious lie. A lie may be refuted — while concealment has as its aim to simply force out of people’s consciousness things that may be so important for their life.

You can see that, when talking about problems of our “perestroika” and democratization processes, about the reform of economics, we keep stressing that humankind stands at the centre of all this. And we try to impart to our society, to an ever increasing degree, features of real humanism. Also, we try, while developing the processes of democratization, to overcome what has emerged as a very dangerous evil and what philosophers call alienation. I think that the notion was introduced

by Hegel, who named it *Entfremdung*. That was the point where the analysis of social alienation began. Unfortunately, it appears that in socialism too some elements of such alienation may arise. This does not mean that they ensue from its nature, that they are normal in socialism. No, but, if no efforts are made to put into practise the humanitarian principles of socialism, and if, on the contrary, something opposite to these principles, something which distorts them takes place, the phenomenon of alienation may appear. This happens in spite of the very great mass enthusiasm which accompanies some periods of alienation. I would like to draw your attention to the latter point. Often we can hear people saying: How can there be alienation, if mass enthusiasm predominates? Paradoxical though it may sound, it is very often just such mass enthusiasm, like any form of enthusiasm — if it is something that distracts people from practical, sensible, calm and humane activity, as any form of fanaticism does — which is accompanied by elements of alienation.

Therefore, in the process of the development of democratization (and we are now at the very beginning of all that has been planned), we have a great deal of work ahead of us. This work is being carried out now, including scientific research and analysis of the existing social, legislative, and legal establishments and procedures. This is basically what will now occupy our party and our scientific community.

And, finally, I would like to draw your attention to the way in which this assertion of humanitarian priorities in our internal activities, i.e. in the building of socialism, is also achieved in the international forum. The concept of the new political thinking means the assertion of the priority of values common to humankind over all other values, including class values. You can see how logically all this is now being transposed into the international domain. I would like to point out, however, that very often this new thinking is acknowledged when it is asserted by us in the international domain, but arouses doubts if it concerns socialism. I would like to stress that — as pointed out in the report by Mr. Gorbachev — in the same way that our foreign policy quite naturally ensues from our internal policy, so the ideas and activities intended to establish the priority of humanitarian values are taken from our internal life, from the life of socialism, and are transposed into the activities of our foreign policy.

At present, these ideas very strongly affect what we call the domain of human spiritual life, the domain of morality. It may well be that our basic activities in this respect in the near future will be



concentrated on these very problems. In this context, I would also like to mention the Philosophical Society of the Soviet Union, whose chairman I have the honour to be. It is because of the analysis of moral problems that we have been brought to reconsider the whole complex of global problems. I am very glad that this new way of seeing human values, this new understanding of the freedom and responsibility of humankind in the contemporary world is coming more and more to be asserted in many mass movements, including those having a religious character. And this is why I have great pleasure in being able to participate in your work for a second time — I would like to stress this — since I feel that here I am among people who sympathize with what I am saying.

I would also like to draw your attention to a new movement which has been developing since 1984, called "The Ecoforum for Peace". Its headquarters are situated in Bulgaria, but the movement has already become worldwide, and it unites scientists and ecologists from various countries of the world.

Also worth mentioning are the activities of the international Institute of Life, where in recent months we have all been working on a common project (predominantly the work of Soviet and American scientists, many of whom are Nobel

Prize winners) entitled "Science in the service of humankind: global problems". A report was issued, summarizing our meetings and our work, which was discussed in detail and presented — as promised by the leaders of the international Institute of Life — to the heads of two superpowers which are at present playing such an active role — namely, the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

I hope that this creates certain precedents and that, the more such movements develop, in particular among the world scientific community, the more the new thinking, too, will develop, and the more humanitarian values will be able to assert themselves. They remain the same — whether we call them new or something else. I myself speak about a new, real humanism — this is how I describe the Marxist humanism. To me, this

humanism is not what is behind us, but what is ahead; it is bound to develop further, and in this sense it is new. This is by no means casuistics, this is reality, and the main thing is that it is very closely related to politics, as you can see — this is what I have tried to demonstrate.

It is our duty to increasingly develop humanitarian principles and perhaps to find more points of contact between them, also based on an analysis of global problems. Without betraying our principles, we may now find more points of contact in this humanitarian domain particularly through the assertion of what we call the new thinking, the new political thinking, which — please let me stress this once again — asserts that the values common to humankind should have priority over all other values, including class values.

New Thinking in Theology?

REV. LUBOMÍR MIREJOVSKÝ, CZECHOSLOVAKIA

I believe that new thinking in theology is necessary and that it is also possible. I would like to share some insights with you which could make new theological thinking conceivable, and suggest some approaches which could lead to a more mature theological reflection.

To begin with I would like to state that the hope for something "New", and that the expectations that the "New" will bring final answers and solutions, have accompanied the human species during its whole history. We Christians have the Old and New Testament. However, since the call of Albert Einstein for new thinking in the nuclear age the search for new thinking and new action has become as qualitatively different as the nuclear age is from the mechanical age. Even more new things came into appearance after Einstein: worldwide peace movements, the struggle for nuclear disarmament, the idea of disarmament for development, an intensive search for a system of comprehensive security, and many others. We have been witnessing this newness of notions and ideas and most of our lives has been a part of the process of discoveries. Therefore the question arises, should not also theology reconsider its role, its capabilities and its own renewal? Not just to follow the trend for newness, but to keep its ability to reflect new realities and to continue its mission

to be a tool of protection, a source of wisdom, an instrument of redemptive energy.

Looking at the surface one might be tempted to believe that theology is an intellectual play of words and notions, and that it is understood only by those who are initiated into its mysteries and are for some reason able to appreciate it. There are people who tend to believe that a theological system, especially if expressed by some form of creed, catechism or confession, has only a historical value, and cannot be changed. How could an antique object be put to work again?

Let us consider the issue together. What is a theological system really? And how does it operate? In my understanding a theological system is a coherent whole of essential principles and notions arranged in rational dependence or connections. It consists of a basic chain or ring of interconnected ideas of existential character and a number of peripheral notions and conceptions closely woven into a consistent structure. Any individual or group accepting such a system either by faith, education or intellectual reflection will use it as a guideline or orientation scale throughout their experience of reality, which would look chaotic or absurd without such a network of reference. Theological systems provide the puzzling experience of life with logic and purpose, add to the

stability of personality and serve as a piloting star over the ocean of endless time and space. To give an example of a typical theological system based on the Reformation (Protestant) tradition, I invite you to imagine the following image of the dynamics of existence. In the beginning is God, creating the world and the heaven above. He populates the Earth with all the living things. He finds his creation good. However, Adam and Eve disobey their Creator and through their sin bring the whole of humankind to the fall. This is the origin of evil and all suffering. God calls Abraham and the chosen people to be the mediators of redemption. The second Adam, Christ, the Son of God, through His obedience, Crucifixion and Resurrection, opens the way for salvation and life to all who believe in him. The Church is the Body of Christ, the communion of those saved from sin. It is this image that the believers keep in their hearts. It is the basic structure of their faith. This structure is so coherent that each one of its elements cannot be changed. It cannot be made "new".

Related to this basic system are the peripheral systems of notions such as ecclesiology, concepts of family, society, justice, peace and many others. They are more flexible and open to new perceptions to the peripheral systems, with the help of the basic system of faith, is called reflection. The strange thing about this psychological process is the fact that it is not just an intellectual game but that it actually affects the stability, orientation and action of the reflecting person or group of persons who accept the results of such reflection. Once a group accepts the results of such reflection which usually is a complicated process, it keeps guarding its identity and also guarding its own system of existential values.

It is important to realize that a theological system has a lasting and decisive impact on life, decision-making, and actions of individuals as well as groups (confessional bodies).

When talking about new theological thinking we are expressing a desire to establish a coherent system of existential values which would not be valid just for one group (confession) but which would help to sustain life and the future of all our neighbours, and of the whole world. Most of the existing theological systems were developed in the course of centuries and are well defined to protect the identity of an individual, family or other limited group such as a church or confessional body. Some systems identify the interest of a church group with the interests of a nation or some specific social system. They are oriented to groups with well defined boundaries. As a matter of fact, most of the systems have a boundary-de-

fining capacity by determining who is a friend, who is an enemy, what is good, what is bad, for the group. This is precisely the weakness and danger of the old systems. New theological thinking and a new theological system should have a quality of a safeguarding power for the whole of humankind, for the whole of life, for the whole of creation; in other words, it should be global or universal or, if you will, it should have a cosmic character. When I use the word cosmic I refer to the Gospel of St. John where the Apostle speaks about God's loving the *world*, about the Word coming to the *world* and about God's saving the *world*. In all these cases in Greek the word "Cosmos" is used. In this sense the cosmic character of the new theological thinking should be understood.

Looking for such a system of religious and existential notions, we would wish to create and accept a theological structure, strong enough to help solve conflicts rather than to promote them, and to have the ability of integrating all available spiritual energies into a universal unity, inspiring people to cooperation and sharing among all living creatures. This goal, like a high mountain peak, can be reached from different sides. There is not only one way to the peak, there are many; it is dependent on the spiritual landscape from which the ascent is started, and on the ability of the climber, on his or her religious and cultural background. For the Christians, and their search for a theology cosmic in character, the unavoidable and necessary threshold is a new recovery of the biblical tradition. Our problem is that we read the Bible through the glasses of the old dogmatic structures, of our past education, and our own religious traditions. Sometimes we just don't know what the Bible really says, repeating instead what we were taught by our own teachers and professors.

The recovery of the full meaning of the Bible starts in the process of reading it in the context of contemporary experience. An important step in this direction was achieved by the "Theology of Liberation", which has discovered the close relation between liberation and salvation, and the work of God in history. New theological thinking should be able to see God not only in the history and life of the Church, but also in the long history of humankind as a whole. The basic Christian concepts like "judgement", "justice", "redemption", "salvation", "life", and of course "sin", should be related to the phenomena of different forces of the historical process.

The "Kingdom of God" should be understood as the presence of the redemptive and liberating force in the course of history and in actual human

relationships: The meaning of "repentance" in Hebrew "shuf", means "turn around"; the Greek "metanoia" means "change of thinking". These terms are now being discussed in the contemporary historical context, and in many places, even our Marxist friends are reflecting on it. The meaning of God's "covenant" with the whole creation, with all men and women and with the beasts of this earth, brings us closer to a better understanding of the mysterious sustaining force of being. The Christian peace movements have played a decisive part in recovering the concept of "peace" (shalom). I think that this is probably the only biblical concept that has been discussed thoroughly in its relationship to all new realities of our present world.

The previous theological reflections which could be called old theology, were centered on the individual, on a specific church; new theology must discover the dynamic of the collective. For instance, what is collective guilt, who is responsible for World War II, who is responsible for the suffering in the

concentration camps? Is it Hitler and his friends, or who? What is, or is there collective responsibility?

The question of collective sin is something that has to be thought about in greater detail. So must also collective suffering, and of course the difficult question of the concept of collective or universal redemption.

These are just a few suggestions as to what the recovery of biblical terms could do for the renewing of our own theological reflection. There are of course many other ways to influence the reflection and the formation of a theological system with cosmic outreach. I am sure that meetings like this one influence our theological thinking indirectly and contribute to our own growth. Let me therefore repeat in conclusion, we need a new theology and new theological system which will provide us with sufficient energy and vision to advance the redemption and total renewal of our world.

New Thinking and the Christian Ethos

PROF. ELIAS PHILIPIDES, GREECE

What is New Thinking?

People are invariably curious about anything new, just like the Athenians walking about the Agora, as Paul tells us. Similarly, the current New Thinking in the USSR has provoked a great deal of debate, speculation and reflection.

Something new may arise from various different factors:

- It may be seen as a new stage of growth of a living organism or system which was basically to be expected, such as adolescence inevitably following on from puberty. The rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat can also be understood in this way.
- It may take the form of self-criticism and attempts to rectify hesitation, mistakes and incorrect developments.
- It may be a call for a new beginning and a revival of former motivation, for time brings not only growth, but also fatigue.
- Finally, it may be a reaction to new and unexpected challenges from outside.

Just which of these descriptions apply to the New Thinking in the Soviet Union could only be established after lengthy discussion. One thing is certain, however: New Thinking represents a qualitative shift involving both a loss and gain of quality. On the one hand, quality is inevitably lost as New Thinking becomes established; while on the other, quality is bound to increase with the growing expectations of the population with regard to the fulfilment of their basic needs, as well as with the experience gained in this process. This qualitative change in a system is the inevitable result of its socio-historical development, and must not be misunderstood as a mere admission of major or minor failure. Nor should it be regarded as a stage in the development of the system which was planned or foreseen by its founders, to be sought in the "classic" writings of that system, and thus legitimized.

Every qualitative change in the world has a moral value, and as such invariably represents a challenge and a question for Christians. This is especially true of the New Thinking, since it con-

cerns the Christian world as a whole. The New Thinking is directed at the creation of a world moral order above and independent of ideologies, religions, nationalisms, blocs and individual interests. This sense of global responsibility and opening up to the rest of the world includes the preservation of life and culture on Earth and the formation of a world society in peace, coexistence and cooperation. All this bears considerable similarity to the Christian responsibility for Creation and humankind. The Church of Jesus Christ embraces the world with two arms: one is responsibility for Creation, and the other, love for the world.

Christian Responsibility for Creation

Paradise was the first "development project" in the history of humanity. God placed Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, a secure area with optimal living conditions, and entrusted them with the mission of turning the whole Earth into a Paradise.

Up to the middle of the twentieth century, people interpreted God's blessed instructions to humans to spread and rule over the entire planet as giving them the right to ruthlessly conquer and plunder the Earth. Nature was considered wild and shameful, the human being as its more cultured opposite. Only people were permitted to lay claim to nature, never the other way round. The present environmental crisis has revealed this hostility to nature to be based on a mistaken premise which has had disastrous consequences.

Human beings' God-given mission to spread over all the Earth was not an absolute right which could be exercised irresponsibly. It was much rather a task entrusted to humanity which the latter was to fulfil successfully in the prevailing conditions. This mission was not intended to be a mere human pastime, but rather to take the form of creative participation in the care and preservation of God's Creation.

The divine "Paradise project" aimed to create a human society which was (a) self-supporting and autonomous (b) communicative (c) capable of development and (d) imbued with the presence of God.

The existence of an alternative to this ideal plan confirms the freedom of the human being. The Bible depicts this alternative path of development as the moral crisis and fall of humanity, however, because it led to the division of the human community, the emergence of specific individual interests and the rejection of joint responsibility for Creation. The divine alternative represents what is right, useful and long-term, while the human alternative inclines towards what is potential, ar-

bitrary and short-term. If one assumes that there is a certain order in Creation and that human beings display a lack of natural instinct, it is true to say that their potential does not always coincide with what is right. Here lies the very core of original sin: human beings wanted to become God, not by taking a share in responsibility for Creation, but by making their potentiality absolute, that is, they wanted to use their biological and intellectual capacities for their own selfish ends, and not in order to achieve an objective in harmony with the rest of Creation. Once people had rejected the divine alternative, selfishness came to dominate their relations with nature as well as with each other.

Despite its secular nature and its somewhat belated appearance, New Thinking can be welcomed by Christians as a call for reconsideration, repentance and turning back (Metanoia) to the divine plan of preservation of Creation and the human community.

The common basis of New Thinking and the Christian ethos is a global conception of the world: the world is identified with the planet Earth, and the Earth is round and uniform, a flawless unity. Viewed from outer space, the Earth is beautiful — no borders or spheres of influence are visible on its surface.

This global thinking thus arrives at the following assertions:

- (a) The world is interdependent: there can only be one future for all, either progress and cooperation, or destruction.
- (b) As a starting-point we should take all that unites people, not what divides them.
- (c) Human beings are the world's focal point, with their biological and social make-up and psychological, intellectual, cultural and moral needs.
- (d) Morals must take precedence over religious beliefs and political views and individual, selfish interests.

The CPC can pride itself on the fact that New Thinking as a world policy did not take it by surprise. Indeed, for years the CPC has been working for understanding, confidence and cooperation between people, churches and nations, on the basis of our joint responsibility for the one world, particularly in view of the threat of nuclear holocaust. Moreover, the CPC has the privilege of enjoying the enriching contribution made by the Orthodox Churches' theology of Creation. We should recall that since 1973, the Russian Orthodox Church has worked to awaken all religions to awareness of their common interest and joint responsibility for humankind. A decisive stage in this new process

of Christian awakening was seen in the great "Conference of Religious Forces for the Salvation of the Sacred Gift of Life from Nuclear Catastrophe" held in Moscow from May 10—14, 1982. Global thinking is the supreme concern of Christians today, in the nuclear age — and, indeed, not only of Christians.

Love for the World

Ever since the establishment of the Church, their attitude to the world has been one of the greatest problems for Christians. Such difficulties arise first of all from the Bible itself, for how should we interpret the contradictory things it tells us about the Christian attitude to the world?

There are essentially two main directions. One of them points to this attitude as a positive one: "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). The other direction considers that this attitude should be negative: "...know ye not, that the friendship of the world is enmity with God" (James 4:4).

This contradiction can, however, be resolved if one bears in mind the differences between Creation and the world. Creation is the work of God, while the world is not a direct work of God, but also partly the result of the human fall from Grace. The world consists of various elements: (a) fallen Creation (b) human works and (c) the reign of evil, for "the whole world lies in wickedness" (1 John 5:19). Thus Creation represents the ideal, and the world represents reality.

God loves the world for two reasons: firstly, because He still regards it as His Creation, despite its fall, just as the father still considers his prodigal son as his own (Luke 15:11—32). Secondly, He does not wish to renounce His prerogative as Creator nor deliver the world into the hands of evil: "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10). This is why the sending of Jesus into the world was two things: an expression of God's love for His Creation (John 3:16), and at the same time an action to liberate the fallen Creation from the devil: "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil" (1 John 3:8).

For Christians, the problem lies in the fact that Creation and the world cannot be separated from each other in spatial terms. Because of the desire for spatial clarity, and due to the intellectual lethargy and historical compromises of the Church, Creation was banished to heaven, and many Christians were led to expect the end of the world rather than the return of Jesus to Earth. The over-

lapping in space of Creation and the world confronts us with a problem, in the solving of which emerges one of the supreme Christian virtues: qualitatively distinguishing between spirits (1 Cor. 12:10).

As an ideal, Creation represents for Christians an example to be followed, whilst on the other hand the world, as reality, is a constant challenge to us. In other words, Creation is of an axiomatic nature, while the world is of an operative nature. Without this operative character, without contact to the reality of the world, theology would be nothing but theogony. Similarly, were it to forget its axiomatic function, theology would become pure activism, or an ideology of domination, as has often been the case in the past.

Hence Christian love is no colourless varnish which takes an identical form in every situation, but is critical and takes sides, because it wants to save and to liberate. In short, its concern is to put the (new) Creation in the place of the world and prevent the world from spreading over the entire Creation.

One example may be given by way of illustration. As mentioned previously, it is particularly difficult to separate Creation and the world from each other in spatial terms, because the human being is a product of Creation as well as part of the world. However, with respect to those areas which humans have not yet reached, which have not yet fallen under the influence of people, it is possible to say that there, Creation is entirely alone. This applies especially to outer space. The image of the night sky with its shining stars has in all ages been a symbol of Creation: "Every good gift and every perfect gift comes from above and cometh down from the Father of lights" (James 1:17). This is the reason why the militarization of outer space constitutes the direct spatial and moral expansion of the world over Creation. While such attempts are being made, Christians should not sit passively by.

Christian love is service to Creation in the world, Christians are the servants and priests of Creation within this world: every sacrament, every action — regardless of whether carried out by Christian or non-Christian, as long as it corresponds to Christian principles — is able to contribute to the renewal of the world according to the previously conceived plan for Creation. Christian love, as a policy of Creation, must be constantly accompanied by an attempt to distinguish between spirits, to avoid being blind, naïve or selfrighteous.

Many Christians see the world merely as a source of temptation. This is clearly a mistaken view, or at least only half the truth. The apostle James,

a most critical thinker, sees temptation as having another cause: "... each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desire" (James 1:14).

It would be well to make a distinction between temptation and tests or trials, which is a very important one:

- Temptation is always an attack which entices people to do evil deeds, whereas tests explore a believer's potential and capacities.
- Temptation must be stongly resisted by the Christian, who must resist, refrain from doing a thing; a test, on the other hand, demands the individual to prove his or her worth. It is a challenge which can only be met by action, and whose perception depends on the sensitivity of the Christian conscience.

Thus, the world is not, first and foremost, a source of constant temptation, but in fact a testing-ground of Christian credibility, consistency, willingness to serve, watchfulness and reliability.

And it is not only this. Christians are often prejudiced against sound initiatives coming from the world, even if they bear the seal of Christian principles. Many Christians believe that they alone are programmed to do good, while the world can do nothing but evil. Apart from the fact that such an attitude denies God the right to exert direct influence on the world, that is, it deprives Him of freedom in dealing with the world and His Creation, this view confuses the qualitative separation of Creation and the world with their spatial separation. Within the world itself, elements of God's Creation glow like sparks, and this finds expression in the twofold nature of the human being, who belongs to the order of the world as well as to the order of Creation.

The new human being of salvation and rebirth is neither a creature hovering somewhere above the world, nor does it represent a return to the original Paradisical state. Rather, it marks the beginning of a new world liberated from the domination of evil. Just as life in the Church or in Christendom cannot evade the influence of evil, nor can the effects of the riven Creation within the world be avoided. As Archbishop German Timofeev reminded us, it was this realization which caused Tertullian to ascertain that the human soul is by nature Christian.

Thus Christians do not treat the world in an arrogant or overbearing manner, but with humility and watchfulness, and will praise God when the world pleasantly surprises them.

The Strategy of Love

Love is frequently misunderstood by Christians

as the opposite of politics, following the maxim "Politics divides, love unites". Here politics is obviously understood as the attempt to impose particular interests against the will of others. However, New Thinking is opposed to such political practices, for it does not identify itself with specific individual interests, but with global interests.

Between the specific and the global lies coexistence. Once the danger of a nuclear inferno had been recognized, the first reasonable reaction took the form of support for peaceful coexistence of differing social systems. Coexistence already contained a rejection of war, preferring a policy based on the political settlement of conflicts. Qualitatively, however, coexistence is of a lower level than New Thinking, for the following reasons:

- (a) Coexistence depends on the goodwill of the other side;
- (b) It does not necessarily lead to cooperation: on the contrary, it may even deepen the division of the world by providing a moral justification for it. Cain did not want to be his brother's keeper;
- (c) Coexistence is very unstable and may be dissolved at any time;
- (d) It does not pledge either side to moral renewal, nor to critical consideration of the causes of the division.

On the other hand, New Thinking is a fundamental turnaround. It sees the world as a unified whole, and thus takes the initiative for the whole, even if the other side opposes this. For the first time in the history of disarmament talks, a world power took the initiative and declared a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, despite the fact that the other side made clear its opposition to such a step.

We are all aware of the role played by the element of surprise in the policy of confrontation of the past with regard to armaments and security, when one side attempted to secure for itself tactical advantages in negotiations. In New Thinking, surprise has become initiative, an initiative not speculating as to the unpreparedness of the other side, but which, with concern for the general good, counts on the other side's moral vigilance, and challenges it to move also onto this higher standard of behaviour towards the other. Such an initiative does not find malicious enjoyment, but is regretful, when the other side's moral reaction remains on a lower level.

It is to be hoped that global thinking will become the basis for a new order in international relations, helping humankind to discover a common language, regardless of race, religion, ideology and individual interests. Amen.

The Spirituality of Russian Orthodoxy

ARCHPRIEST GEORGI GONCHAROV, SOVIET UNION

"But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things will be yours as well" (Mt 6,33)

This year, the anniversary of the Millennium of the Baptism of Rus, it is especially important for today's Christians to touch the spiritual and cultural sources of the Russian Orthodox Church, and thus feel the continuous link between the ages and generations. This link helps them find a point of support and to move forward to create good and eternal things.

In the Paschal epistle of Pimen, the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, we can read: "We affirm that the Baptism of Russia had a beneficial influence on the development of culture, morality, family life and other elements of the life of our people. The history of the Church is the history of the spiritual life of each of its members... Vast is the host of those distinguished in faith and piety... Their love edifies us also today."

The immense spiritual wealth accumulated by the Russian Orthodox Church throughout its historical existence lasting one thousand years is open to those who sincerely wish to acquaint themselves with it. The theme of spirituality in the Russian Orthodox Church is very broad, and unfortunately has not yet been sufficiently investigated. As part of the preparations for the official celebration of the Millennium of the Baptism of Rus, an international conference was held from May 11—19, 1987 in Moscow on "Theology and spirituality of the Russian Orthodox Church". In his introductory lecture entitled "The sources of the spiritual tradition of the Russian Orthodox Church" Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galicia stressed that this subject, "which encompasses new and as yet unexplored depths of Russian theological thought and religious experience... promises to reveal many and important things to us."

Bearing in mind the inexhaustible spiritual wealth which exists within the Church, and at the same time the very limited space of this article, we shall try to give a schematic outline of the basic stages of development and progress of this spiritual experience.

Orthodox spirituality as such is expressed in the liturgy (divine services), church music, church architecture (building of churches), in Russian piety, in literature (above all, in religious and church writings), and of course, in its saints, in the remarkable phenomenon of "starchestvo".

Many manifestations of the Russian Christian spirituality have become spiritual and cultural treasures, known and esteemed all over the world. Let us mention the magnificent churches of St Sophia in Kiev and Novgorod, the Church of the Veil of the Virgin Mary on the river Nerl and others, the famous icons "The Trinity", "The Saviour Not-Made-by-Hands" (Veraicon) etc., painted by the Blessed Andrei Rublev, Dionysios, Daniil Chernyi, Simon Ushakov, the enchanting melodies of church music, the beautiful works of ancient and classical literature, such as Metropolitan Illarion's "Treatise on the Law and Grace", Presbyter Kirill, the Bishop of Turov, Epiphanius the Most Wise, N. V. Gogol, F. M. Dostoyevsky, A. K. Tolstoy, L. N. Tolstoy, and others. It is generally acknowledged in history that the Christianization of ancient pagan Rus at the end of the 10th century was an event of great significance. Due to Christianity, Rus joined the family of European nations, became "known and recognized" in all quarters of the world, as says Metropolitan Illarion in the "treatise on the Law and Grace" (mid-eleventh century) — a literary work remarkable for the perfection of its form.

An immense role in the dissemination, development and strengthening of Christian spirituality and civilization was played by monasteries which were founded and which grew in size and number following the Baptism. The Blessed Antonios and Theodosios founded the famous Kievo-Pecherskaya Lavra, which became the principal model for other Russian monasteries. In Kievan Rus the Lavra was the centre of ancient Russian education, one of the inspirational sources of spirituality. It should be mentioned that throughout the thousand years of the existence of the Russian Orthodox Church its spiritual life has been very closely related to the

Orthodox monasteries in Mount Athos, that is, (Greece) there has been continuous spiritual communication between them.

In the monasteries the first schools of piety were founded, there was emphasis on love and esteem for books and the first libraries were established. Chronicles were written, copies made of lectures of the Holy Church Fathers and philosophical works and the first steps taken towards scientific research. "There is great profit in learning from books", says the chronicler, "for books tell us and teach us the route to penitence, and thus we find wisdom..." The monasteries created the ideal of the Russian ascetic monk, who devoted himself to the service of God, striving for spiritual perfection, and to free himself from base and vicious passions. According to Russian saints, serving God meant serving goodness, justice, and social prosperity. The ideal of the moral and spiritual beauty of a Russian was first expressed in "bearers of the spirit", commemorated in the hagiographic writings. Hagiographic literature (lives of the saints) has always been favourite reading in Russia. Christ says in the Gospel: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in heaven" (Mt 5.16). These words were addressed directly to the spiritbearing people chosen by God: priests, laymen, men and women, representatives of various strata of the population. Illuminated by celestial light, the saints themselves became light for others (examples from the life of the Blessed Sergei of Radonezh, Serafim of Sarov). This is probably the secret meaning of a spiritual deed, and of "starchestvo" in particular. The saints became the focal point for all those in search of justice, truth, consolation, peace and love. It is probably no accident that among the first saints who shone in the Russian land were Boris and Gleb, who asserted the triumph of the idea of reconciliation. The whole of the "Legend of Boris and Gleb" aims to condemn the strife between princes and fratricidal wars ravaging the Russian lands.

When speaking about Russian spirituality, one cannot pass over in silence the importance of the Trinity-St Sergy Lavra and its role in the subsequent formation and strengthening of piety. Here the marvellous image of "starets" Sergy of Radonezh (1314—1392) comes to mind as the "head and teacher of all monasteries that are in Russia". The Blessed Sergy of Radonezh is one of the greatest Russian saints, not only a spiritual teacher and "tutor of many", but also one of the great builders of Russian national unity.

According to F. M. Dostoyevsky, St Theodosios

Pecherskii and St Sergy of Radonezh expressed truly national ideals. The Blessed Sergy of Radonezh used his immense spiritual authority in order to help to cast off the Tatar-Mongol yoke which paralyzed national life, and, to create a centralized state. The name of Blessed Sergy is inextricably connected with the glorious victory won by the Russian army in the Kulikovo field on September 8th 1380. The well-known Russian historian V. O. Klyuchevskii called him "the educator, full-of-grace, of the Russian national spirit...". And he continues: "For fifty years the Blessed Sergy did his quiet work in the hermitage of Radonezh. For half a century people who came to him drew from his hermitage (monastery), along with water from his spring, consolation and encouragement and, having returned to their circle, shared it by drops with others... These drops of moral influence contributed to two developments which, also helped to found our national social system, and both are linked with the name of Blessed Sergy. One of these is a great event which took place during Sergy's lifetime, the other is the long, complex historical process which had its beginning only during his lifetime."

Due to objective causes, in the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries the monastic life moved closer to the north of the country. The intensive spiritual life became in turn a kind of catalyst for colonization in the north of Russia. To make his living, a monk would have to cut down the wood around his cell. Other hermits, attracted by rumours about his saintly life, would begin to settle near to him, and would be followed by peasants. In this way new lands were brought into cultivation. In addition to spiritual nourishment, monasteries were considerable social assistance. In the difficult years of poor crops, the monasteries regarded it as their evangelical duty to serve the hungry, the poor, the humiliated. Many monasteries also offered shelter to the sick and destitute.

To a certain extent the subsequent understanding of the spiritual nature of Christian mission in the Russian mind was reflected in the 15th century in the person of the Blessed Josif of Volokolamsk and Nil of Sorsk. If the Blessed Nil strove to conquer the world by the spiritual transformation and education of a new man, the Blessed Josif strove to achieve the same goal, but did not draw back from external activities and social services. Both of them were regarded as saintly already in their lifetime, and were canonized after their death. And thus the Church accepted and gave her blessing to these two routes leading to the Kingdom of God.

A very perceptible spiritual influence in the

17th—18th centuries was exerted by Bishop Dimitry of Rostov, who in the course of his saintly life collected and wrote Lives of the Saints — “Chetii-Minei” — as well as other works on spiritual subjects. It should be mentioned here that the edifying “Chetii-Minei” was very popular with Russian people, and in the years that followed attracted the creative attention of many outstanding Russian writers.

In one of his sermons, Bishop Dimitry discusses the interpretation of various degrees of perfection in virtue, as given by the Church Fathers. The one who serves God because of the Kingdom of Heaven is like a hired man who labours for his pay, in order to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. The one who serves God out of fear of torture is like a slave; while the one who toils for God out of love of God becomes His Son. Based on this conception, attaining spiritual perfection ascends to love, to the appeal of the Gospel (Mt. 5,48).

The Orthodox conception of spirituality itself cannot be appreciated without assuming the spiritual heritage of the ancient and the subsequent Church Fathers, such as Athanasius the Great, Gregory the Theologian, Basil the Great, John Chrysostomos, Hieronymus, John of Damascus, John Climacus, and many others. Thus we can trace the progression of the uniting, strengthening and eternally renewing Spirit from a historical perspective . . .

In the 18th century, at the time of the complicated Church reform of Peter I, through which many negative aspects were brought into the Church, the high spiritual tension did not weaken, and was particularly strongly reflected in Bishop Tikhon of Zadonsk. His spiritual teaching does not deviate from Russian spiritual traditions, and concentrates on the all-embracing Paschal joy. In his work, F. M. Dostoyevsky highly appreciated the spiritual image of Tikhon of Zadonsk.

The 19th and the beginning of the 20th century brought a spiritual revival in Russia in the form of “starchestvo”. In “Boris Godunov” A. S. Pushkin says: “I am called ‘starets’ because . . . I abandoned the sinful vanity and retired to live as a hermit.” Starets Serafim of Sarov (1759—1833) is one of the most venerated saints in Russia. He rises before us as an inexhaustible source of spiritual benevolence. It seems that the idea of Russian spirituality is concentrated in his personality: the transfiguration of every creature through freely-given love and compassion. He raises the ideal of true spirituality — of the abolition of every hatred, every division . . .

Approximately at the same time in the Optino hermitage, a remarkable level of spiritual perfec-

tion was reached through “starchestvo”. The great “starets” Paisii Velichkovskii, who revived the ancient spiritual tradition, along with Leonid, Makarios, Ambrosios and others, tried to teach people humility of mind, evangelical love, and, to instruct them as to how to control their will according to the commandments of the Gospel. As one of the researchers of Russian spirituality said, “They were indeed teachers of Russian piety, and their cells were in some way university chairs, where the Russian people received its spiritual education”. The Protospesbyter I. Meyendorf wrote that “The spiritual heirs of ancient Russian saints, — the “starets” of Optino, became true witnesses of Christian experience in the lay society”.

Due to the enormous activity devoted to the translation and publishing of writings of the Holy Fathers, and also owing to the continuous striving for spiritual perfection, the Optino monastery attracted, at various periods, outstanding Russian thinkers such as I. V. Kirievsky, N. V. Gogol, F. M. Dostoyevsky, A. K. Tolstoy, L. N. Tolstoy, K. N. Leontyev, V. S. Solovyev, and others. They were looking for spiritual and moral ideals for their creative art, and they found them there. Drinking from the spiritual source, they transformed what was hidden there with their creative imagination and then carried these hidden treasures not only to their countrymen, but also far beyond the frontiers of their own country.

“The tragedies of Aeschylus and dramas of Shakespeare could not have upset the souls of their contemporaries more than ‘Idiot’ and ‘The Karamazov Brothers’ soused us,” — wrote the great French writer Romain Rolland. “We sought there our spiritual food and our daily bread, when we were already too short of our own black soil to assuage our hunger. Who but the Russian writers were our guides? Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky created our soul . . .” A Soviet literary critic Yu. I. Seleznev gave an extremely precise description of the work of the great writer Dostoyevsky: “The novels of Dostoyevsky told mankind about great battles fought for hearts and souls of people, about the quest and the fall, about renunciation and finding routes to the truth, goodness and beauty through suffering and error, telling of false ideas and false prophets through suffering of the soul . . . They give the reader the greatest freedom of conscience, the possibility to examine his conscience, his convictions, his ideals . . .” In the novel “The Karamazov Brothers” he created the greatest portrait of a Russian monk in “starets” Zosima.

G. I. Uspensky shares with us his thoughts: “. . . our national ‘ugodnik’ — (saint) —, though he renounces worldly cares, lives only for the world.

He is a lay worker..." An excellent writer, N. S. Leskov, who competently revealed the mysteries of the Russian national character in his books "The Enchanted Wanderer", "The Engraved Angel" and others, described the Russian's thorny path of searching for the spiritual and moral idea leading to God. Another famous writer, D. S. Mamin-Sibiriyak, wrote in his letter to N. S. Barsky: "In my opinion, 'The Bogatyrs' (the well-known painting by V. N. Vasnetsov 'The Bogatyrs' — G. G.) are an excellent supplement to the saints. Both here and there we have representatives of their own country; behind them we seem to see the Russia over which they stand guard. The predominant feature of the bogatyrs is their physical strength... The saints demonstrate another side of Russian history, more important still, namely, the moral bulwark and the Holy of Holies of the future of a nation... of many millions."

Throughout the thousand years of the existence of our Church, its spiritual influence has continued to be felt; and it is still perceived today in the new social structures. The celebration of the all-Christian anniversary brings to mind — from along the centuries and up to the present day — the unceasing experience of spiritual accumulation, striving for a clear recognition of the high destiny of Man. "Today we have many reasons to be proud of what our ancestors have accomplished," and we can agree with the outstanding Soviet academician B. P. Rauschenbach, author of the article "Why did Vladimir baptise Russia" in the magazine "The Communist". He goes on: "with thankfulness we remember their selfless labor. What happened 1000 years ago was important in the history of our country."

The subject of spirituality is also topical and desirable under the present conditions, particularly in the period of perestroika and glasnost, with the transformation of many areas of life, including

social life in the USSR. Spiritual and moral conditions are some of the most important factors in the "perestroika", in the strengthening of the moral basis of society. Thanks to efforts of the Soviet Fund of Culture, where the Russian Orthodox Church is also represented, along with other social organizations of the USSR, this year, the anniversary of the Millenium of the Baptism of Rus, a monument will be built to the Blessed Sergy Radonezhsky as the national hero. In the last two or three years a secular society, called "Charity" has been founded in several cities, intended to provide assistance to the old and the sick.

It is encouraging to know that at precisely this memorable time, the state has handed over to the Russian Orthodox Church a number of ancient monasteries, including the Danilov Monastery, Optina hermitage and Tolgskii Monastery, which are being restored. The latter is to house social services for elderly people. The fact that new churches are being built in the eparchies gladdens the hearts of the faithful and instils the hope of new possibilities of serving God and people and of the revival of the eternal spiritual and moral ideals.

One must admit that the present rapid increase in scientific and technical development has greatly exceeded that of the spiritual and moral condition of man. As academician D. S. Likhachev puts it, in the contemporary world we can observe a certain "ecology of the spirit". In the last few years, this disproportion has revealed to people in an alarming fashion global problems with catastrophic consequences, such as the nuclear threat, ecological crisis, the frightening poverty in the "third world", AIDS, and so on. These problems cannot be solved unless we first strengthen the spiritual and moral potential of each specific society, and of the world community as a whole.

PEACE-MAKING PILGRIMAGE

REV. CHRISTIE ROSA, SRI LANKA

The Strains of Struggle

We must be constantly enlightened and steadied by the end purpose and definitive goal of our efforts. It is the end purpose and definitive goal which lend meaning, authenticity and relevance to our striving for peace. This is stated with sharp

clarity by the writer of the letter to the Hebrews — "Looking unto Jesus the pioneer and perfecter of our faith". It is this commitment to overriding purpose that empowers us to withstand the stress and strain in the pilgrimage of Peace-making.

We experience daily the reality of death through hunger. It is a fact that more people starve to

death every two days than were killed by the Hiroshima bomb. Every year between 13 and 18 million people die of starvation. More than 1 billion people live in the world today, more than ever before in human history, and their numbers are growing. In 1980, there were 340 million people in 87 developing countries not receiving enough calories to prevent stunted growth and serious health risks. The World Bank Report, "Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security in Developing Countries" (Washington, D.C. 1986) predicts that poverty will persist, its victims will multiply, and the numbers are likely to keep on growing.

The stark global shame and scandal in the face of those millions perishing through hunger is that global military expenditure totals about \$ 1 trillion a year and continues to increase rapidly. The arms race — in all parts of the world — pre-empt's resources that could be used more productively to eliminate widespread hunger and starvation with their concomitants of illiteracy, disease and death. Let us struggle to prevent the arms arsenal wasting over \$ 1,7 million each minute while over 40,000 children die of malnutrition and hunger each day. Let such criminality cry out to high Heaven while millions are condemned to death through hunger. We are so used to seeing starving, dying, that we are brutalized to passive acceptance of the inevitability of poverty.

It is a sacred duty that we who are committed to the search for peace should cease from creating enemy-images, imagining, building scenarios and living with such images in a state of hatred and enmity. But for the millions who are condemned to survive in grinding poverty, there is no alternative but to identify and recognize the exploitative forces of the TNCs, the local elites in collaboration with foreign agents, the military industrial complex and the global monetary mechanism which are inimical to their development. We can never come to terms with and work in partnership with capitalism, imperialism, neo-colonialism, neo-globalism, zionism and apartheid. In the uncompromising struggle to combat oppressive forces, we need be wary of the processes of aid, subsidies, unjust trade practices, protectionism, grants loans and other disguised traps whose aim is to buy us up and keep us and our people in subjection in perpetuity. It is only a Christ-purposed life that can give us sufficient stamina in the strain and the struggle of the costly pilgrimage of peace-making.

Never Alone

Encouragement in full measure dawns on us as we realize that we are not alone in the struggle.

Millions of others surround us in the struggle for liberation from oppression and exploitation, the struggle to eliminate hunger, illiteracy, disease and death. We are strengthened in the communion of the saints, the martyrs and the company of heaven who fought the good fight and have preceded us to the presence of our Living Lord, who is the pioneer and perfecter of our faith. We are not alone in the struggle for survival and life in peace, for millions upon millions in heaven and on earth are spurring us on, encouraging and cheering us.

Global interdependence is no fashionable or comforting concept to us in the developing countries. To put it bluntly, we stand globally interdependent with those who struggle with us against forces who are inimical to our survival and those crushed in losing efforts to keep the wolf from the door.

But to speak of global interdependence in the struggle is to limit our horizons, for the extent of our concern goes beyond the limits of global action to dimensions of cosmic proportion. The great cloud of witnesses known and unknown, who fought the good fight, finished their race and kept the faith are in profound solidarity with us who are in the struggle here and now.

On the Way

As pilgrims of peace-making, we must "run with perseverance the race that is set before us". To keep faith and keep pace with the oppressed millions we need to stand alongside them, moving and travelling. At no moment can we relax and take a holiday from peace-making or take time off from active duty. Our movement, the Christian Peace Conference was appropriately named by its founders — as a Conference which is perpetually in session for Peace, Justice and Liberation.

While on the way, we have not only to fight the structures of exploitation, but simultaneously act to provide food for the hungry, clothes to the naked, shelter to the homeless, learning to the illiterate. That is not all, for on the way we also have to bury our dead, and receive our new born.

While on the way, we are captivated by the penetrating words of Gabriele Mistral in the plea of life for our children for whose lives we need to answer — "We are guilty of many errors and many faults, but our worst crime is the abandoning of our children, neglecting the fountain of life. Many of the things we need can wait. But the child cannot wait. Right now is the time his bones are being formed, his blood is being developed. To him we cannot answer 'Tomorrow'. His name is 'Today'."