

CHRISTIAN ORTHODOXY AND JUDAISM IN THE MODERN WORLD

DISCUSSION

Chairman: Rabbi Dr. Jordan Pearlson

Rabbi Dr. Jordan Pearlson: May I have the privilege of making a few remarks as the chairman on the degree to which, first of all, we have been witnesses over the past few days, within the diversities of the Orthodox Churches, to the very important but often neglected interaction between religion and specific cultures. Emphases have differed, patterns have differed, and again it helps to teach us, to bring into individual focus those of this fraternity who are here because they want to be here. We again are reminded that we are a benevolent minority, and it is easy in speaking only as ourselves to presume a coherence, a benevolence, a swift and immediate potential for reconciliation which may exist at the tip of the iceberg, yet not exist in the massive iceberg that is in the dark and murky waters beneath. Some of the perceptions, one senses here, had to be discussed over years. We cannot presume that we will move so very swiftly. It took us years in our discussions with other churches, for instance, to raise issues we hear again and again and which ring a bell in the ears of those who are veterans.

But again, just to touch on Judaism, as we know, it is not a product which ended in the year 70. Judaism involves a continuum, and time and again we realize the degree to which, in the minds of many with whom we dialogue, Judaism is perceived as something which came to its

conclusion with the written Jewish Scriptures, rather than something which is the Judaism of the two Torahs, the Written Torah and the Oral Tradition which continues to grow, expand and deepen.

Secondly, we heard in significant detail from the speakers elements which dealt with problems we have spoken of with others over the years and which await the opportunity to be discussed further with our brethren here, and they include the very troubling issue of supersessionism (the claim that the Church is the "New Israel" that has replaced the "Old Israel"). This is a situation in which the Christian constantly will affirm and reaffirm that "we are against hating you" without confronting the radical issue where the Jew is concerned. Often our Christian brethren will accept us only in *potentia* and not in *essentia*, suggesting that we can be loved only to the extent that we will become like them but not as we are. We are seen as a potential, something different than what we are.

Speaking as a North American Jew who grew up with many Greek friends, I also know that there are people in North America who are Greek but are not Greek Christians. In the same way, a distinction should be made in our thinking about Judaism, a distinction between the relationships inherent within the familial structure of Judaism, between those who are the descendants, the children of Abraham, *Avraham* whom we call *Avinu*, our Father, and those within our family who are profoundly attached to the doctrinal evolution from the gifts revealed to Moses, *Moshe Rabbenu*, Moses who was our teacher. And we have, I noticed, again and again in our thinking shifted from the one conceptualization into the other rather easily, without giving proper attention to the profundity of the difference.

Finally, I would remind us, for the discussion that follows, that we have in North America a series of guidelines for dialogue called the Brown Macafee guidelines. The most important insight is that I have no right to tell you what you believe. When I am concerned with what you believe, I ask a question. I can only tell you what I believe, here I may make a statement. With those elements in mind, let us now open the floor to discussion.

Prof. Nicholas Bratsiotis: I am a professor of theology of Old Testament at the University of Athens. At the same school my honorable colleague, Prof. Oikonomou, teaches hermeneutics (interpretation) of the Old Testament. In saying so, I want to stress the significance the Holy Scripture of our brethren, the Jews, has for us.

I would like to make several remarks. 1) The first one should not be understood as implying even the slightest chauvinistic insult. The honorable Judge Finestein referred to the exceptional contribution of Judaism to Western civilization. I want to underline something we certainly

all know: not the contribution of Hellenism, which is well-known, but that the channel through which the important contribution of Judaism came to Western civilization is the Church.

2) This contribution applies not only to Western civilization, but to humanity at large. No legislator in all the world has remained uninfluenced by the Decalogue.

3) Concerning the Crusades to which the speaker referred: Judaism suffered considerably from the Crusades, notwithstanding the fact that its holy places were liberated. But Constantinople was destroyed by the Crusaders as well. In saying this I want to underscore the fact that the fate of the Orthodox somehow converges with the fate of our brethren the Jews.

4) Prof. Borovoy singled out the significance of the relations between Jews and Orthodox in Russia. This gives me the opportunity to ask for a correction of the generalization I heard on the part of the honorable Judge Finestein, according to whom there were persecutions of Jews everywhere. I want to remind you that in the Hellenic world, where there exists the most ancient Jewish community of Europe, there never has been a persecution of our brethren the Jews, because we consider such a thing wholly pointless. This is not just due to Greek mentality, but to the Orthodox faith, as we become aware of it here at this place. We consider any racist or other expression of fanaticism a particular sin. And I do not refer to that which brothers did for brothers during the German occupation, when Orthodox reached the point of being executed because they saved Jewish brethren. That is known by all. I will refer to another typical example: for centuries the Patriarchate of Jerusalem has had privileges even the sultan never dared to call into question. Still, we recently have become witnesses to an unacceptable stance on the part of the State of Israel against the presence of the Patriarchate. This stance even got to the point of brutalities at the expense of clergymen and even the Patriarch. An objective observer could say that what happened is a consequence of other events of the recent past, when extremist Jews killed at Jacob's Well an Orthodox clergyman. With this, I am not implying that there is an anti-Orthodox Jewish fury. I refer to these sad events to stress the fact that they did not provoke any resentment against the Jewish element in Greece. Nobody felt he could do the same thing to our brethren the Jews. We contented ourselves with statements on the diplomatic and the academic level. And from that point of view, I consider it a particular success that Greece has been chosen as the meeting place for our encounter.

5) I want to stress, in order to avoid misunderstandings about what Prof. Borovoy mentioned in our discussion of "Hermeneutics and Tradition," that in the Orthodox Divine Liturgy (Eucharist) — which is a

dogmatic text of our Church — there is absolutely no hostile allusion to the Jews. On the contrary there is a laudatory remembrance of ancient Israel, as there is an honorable place for the prophets in Orthodox iconography. Obviously Prof. Borovoy referred to several hymns of Holy Thursday and Holy Friday that are not necessarily important and which include such allusions against the Jewish people. A wise professor of mine in Old Testament studies removed by his own initiative those four or five hymns. Perhaps the Orthodox should proceed in a common action to remove these allusions in general.

Mr. Mikhail A. Tchlenov: I would like, first of all, to agree with Prof. Borovoy, who underlined the variety that distinguishes today the two movements. This fact complicates their general analysis. He has shown us with his great erudition the different forms in which Judaism manifests itself today — its purely religious and its secular form, its Soviet and its Western variant. We could say the same thing, at one level or the other, for Orthodoxy, which exists in its purely religious form, especially at the Patriarchates, but which in reality moves in a wider field, which we could call potential Orthodox, secular Orthodox, in which the whole of the Slav population of the former U.S.S.R. moves.

I have to tell you that the manner in which Russian Jews, the Jews of the former U.S.S.R., approach Christianity, Orthodoxy, is ambiguous. On the one hand it is about relations between brothers, grounded on Holy Scripture — the basis of both religions. I do not want to limit myself to only a general statement on brotherhood, I wish to be more specific. There is no doubt that Orthodoxy is the religion of the overwhelming majority of the people of Eastern Europe. The unprecedented persecutions which the Jewish population of the U.S.S.R. suffered in the middle of the twentieth century have led it, I would say, to alienate itself from its cultural heritage and to embrace certain values of the non-Jewish population that surrounded it. We can say that Christianity has shown itself to be the more simple solution for the Jews of the U.S.S.R.

Young people, who in the 'fifties, 'sixties, 'seventies demanded some moral orientation, discovered that a religion which expresses itself almost totally in the symbol of faith can offer them what they ask from religion, a religion which requires some special education and some knowledge of a heritage they had lost. That is to say, on the one hand we see a positive approach to Christianity, which ended up being the sole bearer of moral values for a people which had acquired from the communist establishment the wrong moral values. On the other hand, it was the feeling of guilt that bound the Jews of the U.S.S.R. to Christianity, because to a high degree all the calamities we referred to — the obligatory denial of God imposed on this pious people, the loss of bonds between the generations, the total extinction of cultural elements, the prohibition

for many decades of the self-expression of the Jewish people, not to forget the terrifying amount of victims, the wiping out of the intellectual elite, the closing down, virtually, of all Jewish institutions — all this was bound up (and I refer to the stereotypes) with a general cultural model which covered the surrounding population.

For many non-Orthodox peoples of the U.S.S.R., the persecutions were associated with the Russians. It is understood that the persecutors also included Latvians, Georgians and many other nationalities. Yet at this point we should not forget that the revolution in Russia was brought about by Russians, because they were in the majority. In these proceedings at the beginning of this century, all peoples of Russia participated, and they could not have done otherwise. We should keep in mind here the sins of Tsarist Russia as well, a state that was responsible for the most terrible persecutions against the Jews in the nineteenth century, starting with the medieval decree on the limits of residence, continuing with the limitations of the right to education in the twentieth century — a thing we did not encounter in any other civilized country — and ending with the persecutions, the physical extinction, phenomena which cannot be justified from any moral point of view.

Still, I do not want to return to our earlier discussion concerning memory, because memory is a very sensitive concept, rather complicated and very often dangerous. Today it is not the evaluation of events of the past or personalities who participated in them that matters; what matters is the pure and honorable stance which the authorities of Divine Revelation propose, which Christians and Jews alike accept. Grounded on this moral and pure stance, which we can determine in common, we will proceed to evaluate the events and personalities of our history. Both sides, Christians and Jews, need those moral orientations.

It is with satisfaction that I can relate that today, in the framework of the Jewish community of the former U.S.S.R., there are no anti-Christian, anti-Orthodox attitudes to be observed. On the contrary, I would say that we encounter respect over against Orthodoxy, because it is the bearer of eternal moral values. For this reason I was especially pleased when I heard Prof. Borovoy define these moral relations with the Jews of the U.S.S.R. I was pleased as well, when I heard him characterize the phenomenon of allegations about a “collective responsibility” of Jews over against Christianity as medieval, sinister and unheard of.

I was pleased when I heard his rejection of antisemitism. Really, this pure stance of the Church has not been voiced as it should be; and what is more significant, it does not reach the simple believer. Very rightly so, the multiplicity that exists in the bosom of the Church has been referred to as well as the official antisemitism of the (Russian) Church abroad, of several Christian fraternities, like the Brotherhood of Saint

John, of other organizations which have not been referred to but which I mention, purely fascist ones that operate under the banner of Orthodoxy — for example the organization Barkasov — and which incite to continue the genocide of the Jews which had not been completed by Hitler. I have to say, however, that I encounter such positions in the corridors of the Russian Church as well, especially from the number two prelate of the Church, whom, it is true, the official Church has isolated with its official statement that Metropolitan Ivan expresses his personal views concerning the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Father Vsevolod Tsaplin, representative of the Department of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Church, asserted in the Russian press that an Orthodox who visits the public baths has to take care not to find a Jew next to him, because according to the holy canons the Orthodox are not allowed to bathe together with Jews. This type of assertion leaks to the press, but the pure stance that Orthodox and Jews possess common moral values, unfortunately, does not reach the mass media.

Therefore, before we continue our evaluations of particular historical personalities, let us determine these common moral values.

Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Peristerion: I would like to say that the question to whom the land belongs in which Israel is located, should not be excluded. For both the Old and New Testament point out an undisputed fact, that is the history or the unity of the human race. The apostle Paul tries to show every time to the Christian and the Jewish element that there is perfect unity of the human race. To what extent the twelve tribes of Israel took which part of the world is another problem. For anthropological reasons, the unity of the human race has to be subordinate to the fact that that country belongs only to Israel. And the Christians are the New Israel, an ontological, spiritual unity of Israel. The observation of the historical and divine memory leads us to exactly this point. Memory absolutely has to be activated at the event of the acquisition of the country.

I see a difference in approaching the problems between the Judaism of the Diaspora and of Israel. The first one, which has a large experience of minority rights, tries to support minorities wherever they are. On the other hand, Judaism of the Diaspora does not intervene to support the minorities that exist in Israel. It is here that an ambiguity occurs.

Regarding the remark by Prof. Bratsiotis that the contribution of Judaism, at least in Europe, passed through the channels of the Church, it is a fact that the early Christian community transmitted to the Christianity of the West all the elements which it had taken from Judaism.

As to hymns of Holy Thursday and Holy Friday, I do not consider it possible to change them because they are a subject of this same Testa-

ment. All hymns of the Holy Week are almost a copy of the stories of the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. As a Church we do not have the right to rewrite the Gospel, and as a consequence we cannot erase the contents of the hymns. On the other hand, we should not forget that these hymns express the scheme of divine economy, not only as it was expressed by the authors of the New Testament, but also as it was expressed by the Prophets of the Old Testament, for instance the prophet Isaiah. We cannot, therefore, change the scheme of the divine economy by removing one element or the other. It is absurd in the christological and the soteriological field.

Another remark in the introduction by Prof. Borovoy concerns the unity of the Old and New Testaments. As an eminent Russian theologian, he said that the unity of the two Testaments will be complete when the Jews will return to the bosom of the Church. That is almost the opposite of the tradition of the Fathers, a tradition which from the times of Origen and henceforth expresses the unity of the two Testaments by means of the explanation of Palm Sunday, when Jesus as a youth takes the mule on which nobody had ridden, places on the robes and becomes the sign of the prophecy of Zachariah.

Rabbi Dr. Norman Solomon: This academic consultation has been called a builder of bridges between Orthodoxy and Judaism, and such a statement implies that there is a dialogue here of two parties. It seems to me, however, that this is a misleading definition. The only dialogue which can possibly take place is in fact a dialogue of three parties. There are Jews, there are Orthodox Christians, and there is the modern world enveloping us within which we all live. None of us is living in the world which saw the birth of our two great faiths. Therefore, there is a third dialogue partner, and that third dialogue partner is the modern world-view. I have felt several times that we were ignoring the modern world-view and simply presenting to each other totally traditional perspectives as if they could be set in isolation. A dialogue presupposes a common language, not in the sense that it has to be English, or Greek, or Russian, but rather in the sense of a shared culture within which people could work. What is our common culture?

If I look at the contemporary world, many of its dominant ideas are those which have emerged only in recent centuries. The first of them, which at first sounds as if it could be an ancient idea, is that of human equality. I almost hear you shout at me from all sides, "But we have always taught that all human beings are equal." Perhaps, but I refer to the sense that the legal rights of every individual are equal within the state, irrespective of ethnic or religious origin. This does seem to be for Europe, at least, a modern idea, and yet it is a very important context for us because, time and time again, I have felt I was seen not so much

as an equal citizen of an impartial state or world order, but as some sort of fossil of the Old Testament. Friends, I am not a fossil of the Old Testament, and I refuse to be defined in terms of someone else's theology. I wish to be seen as a person who shares in the general equality of humankind before the laws which operate here.

But there are some even more profound aspects of the modern world-view which must affect our discourse. One of these is the concept of historical criticism of the source of our faiths. Clearly, this has application in the field of biblical studies. Indeed, in a conversation in the corridors last night, I exchanged with an Orthodox professor the curious notion that as scholars we use one text for our Scriptures, the text of the Septuagint. We may use, for instance, the edition of Rahlfs, and yet in our churches a different one. In our synagogues we use the traditional masoretic text of Scripture. In our universities, we use a more carefully prepared edition collated from many ancient manuscripts. And certainly the questions which these pose are immense, especially when we apply them to the other historical sources of our traditions.

Then, of course, there is the impact of scientific thinking on our world-view. I will not take time to spell out its implications except to remark that frequently I have heard in the discourse of participants references such as the following: "What is our religious language?" "What is the impact of our terminology?" "What does this say with regard to traditional notions of authority in religion or of the meaning of our creeds?"

Finally, I wish to pose a question to both of our speakers. I would like to learn from them: In what way can religious Jews and Orthodox Christians engage intellectually with the modern world? What are the shared challenges in this and what if any are the shared responses?

Prof. John Karavidopoulos: The preceding interventions have been rather historical. Allow me to make a remark of theological critique and self-criticism. The Jewish people is the chosen people of God, for it accepts God as Lord of history. The people are an instrument in the hands of God to bring a message of hope and brotherhood between men. But when a people considers itself lord of history and has for an instrument God to achieve its goals, then it surely finds itself beyond the commandments of the Bible. That goes for the Christian people as well: it is the beloved people of God for it feels God to be the Lord of history and itself an instrument in the hands of God to announce to the world the biblical hope and the message of love. When, however, it considers itself to be omnipotent within history — as it happens in the world — it is in danger of finding itself outside the biblical framework. I believe that sincere and honest dialogue helps to understand God as Lord of history, and that our peoples are instruments in the hands of God to

bring the message of hope to the contemporary world.

Dr. Geoffrey Wigoder: Just a few factual comments in reply to the remarks that were made about the situation in Israel. First of all, it was said that an unacceptable stance was taken by Israel regarding patriarchal property. Israel has no stance regarding patriarchal property. The stance of Israel is the rule of the law. The whole question of the ownership of the patriarchal property in the Saint John's Hospice in the Old City of Jerusalem remains unclear. The Patriarchate has sold or rented considerable property out in the Old City, and the ownership of the Saint John's Hospice remains before the courts as a dispute whether it was sold or not. But the decision will be the legal one which will be decided by the rule of the law.

Secondly, the shooting at Jacob's Well was not carried out by "extremist Jews" but by a single disturbed person who also killed two Jews in other attacks. He was eventually caught and placed in a mental institution.

Thirdly, there are certainly general problems about extremists in Israel which disturb most of us in Israel, just as we hear about the problems of extremists in Russia. They are condemned by the government and every action is taken when they go beyond the law. The fact is that Israel is a democracy. Its constitution guarantees freedom of religion. Immediately after 1967, a special law was passed guaranteeing the Holy Places, and this has been meticulously observed and kept by the Israel government. There are also many human rights organizations in Israel today which take to court any violation, especially over issues concerning the minorities.

Fourthly, I would like to say that I was present at the residence of the President of Israel on New Year's Eve when the representatives of the Christian communities of Israel were received and given a New Year's Eve welcome. The spokesman for the Christian communities was the Greek Patriarch, who spoke of the warm relations between the Greek Orthodox Church and the Israel government, and this is something that exists on many levels throughout the country.

Rev. Prof. Theodore Stylianopoulos: First, I would like to thank Judge Finestein for his comprehensive but clear presentation. I want to make one remark about the anxieties he enumerated that we share as Jews and Christians in the modern world, namely the question of survival in the Diaspora. On this issue, there is an important difference in the experience of Jews and Orthodox Christians in so far as it relates to the religious and ethnic elements of their identity. I come from the Orthodox Diaspora. We have no doubt that we are going to survive as Christians. As a matter of fact, many of us look forward to the day when we stand on our own feet as Orthodox Christians.

With respect to the presentation of Prof. Borovoy, I want to thank him and congratulate him for a courageous mediating position among the Orthodox, pertaining to Christian and Jewish relations. It was an expression of powerful theological and emotive consciousness of Orthodox deep religiosity. Some would agree exactly, others would say that it is too conciliatory and lacking sufficient theological backing and against the justified tradition or popular Orthodox consciousness, and a few would say that it is not enough. But for us it is important to realize now that we are involved in the beginnings of a long discussion in Jewish-Christian relations. And there is some variety of views among the Orthodox themselves on these matters. The discussion needs to go on for more understanding of the issues. Various angles of them and more specific subjects are needed to shed more light on them, with the help of the divine light.

I would like to make one correction respectfully in so far as Prof. Borovoy, referring to an earlier article that I wrote in 1972 in the first meeting between Orthodox and Jewish theologians, ties me to Roy Eckardt's view of the election of the present-day Jewish people according to Saint Paul as a non-functioning election. I have, in a scholarly way, changed my mind, and I do not any longer agree with Eckardt. I do not believe that there is such a thing as non-functioning election, even from a Christian point of view. Regardless of whether Israel is disobedient, as Christians have been disobedient over the centuries, the faithfulness of God remains. As a Father to the children, who has deep and unbreakable faithfulness to His children, the election does continue for Jews in the present day as well.

Rabbi Prof. Walter S. Wurzbarger: I'm glad I have the opportunity to speak right after Prof. Stylianopoulos because he actually echoed many of the positions I would want to advance and submit for your consideration.

I believe, to begin with, we have a great problem in the meaning of the term "covenant." We have to realize that there is a basic asymmetry between the Jewish and the Greek Orthodox position on the covenant. Jews maintain that the covenant with Israel is irrevocable, independent and irrespective of any mode of conduct or faithfulness to the provisions of the covenant. Obviously, the prophets, time and again, admonished Israel for their lack of faithfulness and warned of the expected divine punishments. But nonetheless, the Jewish belief is that in spite of all that transpired, the covenant itself is irrevocable. And therefore, the position of the Jewish people is that we are the Israel, and therefore the Land of Israel is the Land of Israel, although it does not mean that we can violate any kind of ethical moral imperatives in our relationships to any inhabitants of the land. But Jews will believe that the Land of Israel

is theirs by virtue of a covenant, and ultimately this is our fervent messianic hope that the Jewish people will be brought back to the Land of Israel, and therefore this is what we identify with our redemption.

It must also be pointed out that there is a certain asymmetry in a dialogue between any particular church and Judaism, because really Jews represent a variety of religious beliefs. I must confess that I share very little with some of the members of the Jewish delegation in terms of my religious convictions. I happen to believe in revelation of God in the most literal sense. I believe the Torah is divinely revealed, and many of my friends in the Jewish delegation would not subscribe to my theological affirmations. What makes us one delegation of Judaism is the fact we all believe in the significance of the continuing existence of the Jewish people. And we believe that God in some sense has assigned to us a mission to exist as a Jewish people. It is this awareness of what Prof. Kaufmann used to define as a religious ethnicism, which is not simply the case that we combine ethnicism with religion, but from our perspective the very existence of the Jewish people serves a divine purpose, and therefore our election from our perspective is irrevocable and we have to carry out a mission. This election does not justify any kind of conduct on our part which would contravene the biblical teachings. However, it means that irrespective of any future development, we are chosen by God and we believe that somehow God will see to it that we shall return to the teachings of our faith, and that is the ultimate goal of our national existence, which of course has universal implications.

I was very happy to hear it pointed out that Christianity was a very important factor in bringing many of the insights of Judaism to the world at large, because Maimonides already formulated it in his Laws of Kings when he stated that it is within the divine plan that other religions came and spread about the ideals which ultimately will lead to the establishment of the Kingdom of God. I may also add that it's almost an exercise in futility to speak about eschatological conceptions versus belief in the here and now. The important thing is that here and now we cultivate the kind of relationships where we look to each other with mutual respect and love in spite of our very profound theological differences, and even beyond our ultimate beliefs in the eschatological destiny in our respective communities. Ours is not to fulfill the task — I'm quoting an ancient Jewish sage — our task is to begin right now. We are human beings and, in the here and now, we should make sure that our religious commitments are leading to love and not divisiveness.

Rabbi Dr. Jordan Pearson: The floor closes with that insight from Rabbi Tarphon (Avot 2:15), whom some have identified with the Trypho of Justin's *Dialogue*. Now we turn in inverse order to our panelists.

Rev. Prof. Vitaly Borovoy: I would like, first of all, to thank all who showed interest in the thoughts that I expressed in my speech, and especially my brother Tchlenov, vice-chairman of the Jewish community of Moscow, for the understanding he showed concerning my point of view. I am sorry, however, that I had been notified to shorten my speech, which I did. I spoke as clearly as I could on topics that not only interest us but you too, hoping that in that way I would provoke discussions and questions. But nothing of the sort happened regarding a tragic topic that agonizes our community and has torn it apart, and concerns the evaluation of the role of the Jews in the Russian Revolution and the Soviet state bodies. This split can be observed within the Church as well. We have come to the point where the second prelate of the Russian Church, the Metropolitan of Petersburg, has expressed his views concerning the forgery of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. That article, together with two preceding ones, has gathered reactionary, chauvinistic and hyper-patriotic powers around the Metropolitan; the Patriarch has forbidden their publication in the official ecclesiastical press, because those articles do not express the Russian Church in its entirety. Then he turned with a further article to the communist newspaper, *Sovietskaya Rossiya*, and was turned into a hero of Soviet Russia. Then the Patriarch made a formal statement that the views of Metropolitan John did not express the views of the Russian Church, but were purely personal and that the Church did not support them. I agree with the view of brother Tchlenov, that we should not only express our opposition to these views but should also give some kind of evaluation.

Now concerning the remaining remarks: Metropolitan Peristerion referred to the hymns of Holy Thursday and Holy Friday, which contain intense anti-Jewish tendencies. Perhaps I did not express myself well at this point, for, coming from the Russian Church, it is impossible to suggest the slightest change in the Divine Liturgy — that would be suicide! I suggest to my brothers from the Eastern Orthodox Churches to help us to explain to our people the real meaning of these lines in the hymns and the teachings of the Fathers, that is my request. For me the Old Testament and the New Testament are a unity, that is what I said.

I agree with Rabbi Solomon that in our dialogue three sides should participate: contemporary Judaism, contemporary Orthodoxy and the contemporary world, because we are often isolated from the world and do not understand its development. I believe that for the Orthodox that third side does exist. We are members of the World Council of Churches, of the Council of European Churches, and those ecumenical institutions have conducted a continuous dialogue with the world, and we participated in that dialogue. People can find their spiritual nourishment in this dialogue, people who, although they are not believers,

have sustained through this, in one way or another, their link with religion and respect the historical values of Orthodoxy and Judaism. I believe that in the future we should have a permanent consultation concerning "Memory and Responsibility," a very significant and dangerous topic in our days, that turns against us. Remembrance has to return in the form of Christian responsibility. For that reason I proposed to discuss that topic. I could explain my views and our brethren the Jews could explain that the Jews who participated in the revolution, participated as atheist revolutionaries.

Judge Israel Finestein: There are several matters that have been raised which were dealt with in the course of the discussion. I shall not deal with those matters. The discussions, both yesterday and today, seem to drive one to state one's own credo, against the background of which one can then be seen to be moving in a certain direction.

I'm of the belief that there is a design. It is inscrutable, which means unknowable, and it is intellectually more acceptable to believe that there is a design than to believe that everything always has been, is and will be mere chance. I declare my belief in that design. Each of us Jews, Orthodox Christians and others, have their roles to play in accordance with their own consciousness. Orthodox Christians, and indeed Christianity, take a world-outlook; so does Judaism, and in our prayers as Jews we pray not only for our own particularity, but we pray for the whole of mankind and regard our particularity as an instrument within the design for the fulfillment of purposes which are directed to the benefit of the whole of mankind. We are all, we Jews and Orthodox Christians, concerned to preserve our identities, acknowledging our differences, appreciating in some ways our ideological conflicts, and yet at the time being true to the principle that we are all servants of a great design in accordance with our conscience, and that service requires that we should live together fairly, honestly, openly, in dialogue. That is my personal credo. That is why I am here. Apart from the fact of holding some office in London, for which I might have expected to be invited, the overwhelming reason for my accepting the invitation to give the paper I gave was because of the personal beliefs I hold, beliefs that many of you who are my friends here have heard me express before.

May I say that the Jews are well aware of the contention by Christians that they are the New Israel. Indeed, in many cemeteries in England, particularly in Eastern England, Christian cemeteries which I have seen, there are on the gravestones declarations that this man or this woman, Christians, were good Israelites. It strikes a Jewish observer very strangely to see Mr. John Smith, who is a Christian, inscribed on his gravestone as a good Israelite, by which was meant he was a faithful member of the New Israel. But the Jews continued as Jews, as human beings.

Some years ago, a famous English historian who was Minister of Education in a famous cabinet, Herbert Fisher, wrote a very popular work, scholarly as well as popular, called *The History of Europe*, and it's in many households in Britain till this day. And he opens that massive work by the inevitable reference to the triple origins of the West and indeed the East for that matter, Athens, Rome and Jerusalem, and I do not put them in any particular historical order by my putting them in that form. Here we are in Athens. Out of courtesy to our host, I mention Athens first, and of course one acknowledges the contribution of Greece to the world, the relations between Greece and Israel by means of which each is benefited. And he deals with each of these contributions, except somehow the Jewish role in his book gets lost. He deals in detail with the history of Hellas and the history of Rome. As far as Jews are concerned, he talks about the destruction of the Temple by the Romans. And then he makes further reference to the Crusades, and in due course he talks about the rise of Hitler and the emergence of antisemitism in the nineteenth century, leading up to its culmination in the *Shoah*. He brings his story up to the outbreak of the Second World War. The fact was the Jewish people were around and about all over the place throughout those millennia. They get lost in his history.

And it's those Jews that I'm talking about, and they continued to play their noble part in a whole variety of ways of which I mentioned a few earlier on in the day. And I invite you, my friends, to consider that fact of which we Jews are acutely aware. Every single Jew in the world, in my opinion, is likely to be acutely aware through all that he has heard from his parents and his grandparents, through all the gestures and the nuances of language and all the artifacts that he may have seen about him, acutely aware that we have been around and about a very great deal, and no one seems to have wanted us.

Those that were fortunate enough to reach a position with high influence or some distinction in public life and were regarded as having achieved great things — because we Jews have been in that predicament, in that condition — somehow managed by way of extraordinarily good circumstances to find themselves become Karl Marxes, Sigmund Freuds, Albert Einsteins, or whatever. But those eminences in no way have eroded the bedrock fact of our true condition over the millennia, and I make no claim that I have the answer as to why that should have been so. I do not point a finger in any direction. I place blame on no one here. I say to you as a fellow human being that we have a task between us so to conduct ourselves as to rid the world as best as we can of that malaise which created that situation which arose in a religious context, which now is engaging itself in secular contexts, but in regard to which religious leaders of all denominations have a major role to play be-

cause we are all in the same boat. That malaise can strike at the roots of all of us, and therefore we are brothers in arms, metaphorically speaking. We are comrades in a common cause to better the world by being true to our own heritages and to better the world so that the design, whatever it be, may be fulfilled most speedily. And as the rabbis would say, in our day and soon, in the interest of the whole of humankind.

If I close on that note, and if I don't refer to any detail, it's partly because details have been given already, partly because I think what I have said captures it all, and partly because of constraints of time. But I do end in that way not as a preacher, but as a lawyer, interested in hard facts, and in trying to improve the situation of my client. Who is my client? My client is the whole of humankind, ladies and gentlemen.

Rabbi Dr. Jordan Pearson: Thank you both.

My friends, in the work in which we are engaged, we are about a thousand years behind schedule at this point in history. Where we should have talked like this for over a thousand years, we find ourselves still talking at a time when our conversations with Mecca and the faiths that came out of Benares should be becoming more and more pressing, and we still have to go through those doors.

Hostility is something the body itself feeds. When we are angry and we hate, adrenaline begins to flow and the body itself helps the process. Benevolence takes ten to twenty times the same energies to come into being. For that, on behalf of the Jewish delegation, for their part in bringing these forces into being, may I take the position that I have as chair to express our profound thanks for the wonderful statement by the Patriarch Bartholomaios, and especially for the intense moral courage of Metropolitan Damaskinos in bringing these sessions about. Our work is cut out for us. We need every ally we can find, and we need to get our house in order because it is only a matter of a very short time before we must talk to Islam and those faiths which were born in Benares.

IMMANUEL 26/27