

THE JEWISH QUESTION IN THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

Gregory Benevitch¹

If only it were all so simple! If only there were evil people somewhere insidiously committing evil deeds and it were necessary only to separate them from the rest of us and destroy them. But the dividing line between good and evil cuts through the heart of every human being, and who is willing to destroy his own heart?

Alexandr Solzhenitsyn

The Gulag Archipelago.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.

The problem of anti-Semitism in the Russian Orthodox Church as in society in general has various dimensions. One of them is the sociological dimension. I would like to start with this aspect of the problem to clear up some possible misunderstanding on this point on the part of the Western audience. Let me cite the general conclusion of the article by Vladimir Borzenko, 'Anti-Semitism and Orthodoxy in Russian today (a sociologist's view)', written in 1992, to be published by Keston Institute in Religion, State and Society, vol. 23 N 1 1995: "The general level of anti-Semitism in Russia is lower than the average in comparison with developed European countries". According to Borzenko, who supports his statement through the results of serious sociological surveys, "In practically every category and in practically every question there was less evidence of anti-Semitism among Orthodox subgroups than among atheists. Not more than around 10 per cent of the Russian population as a whole could be said to be anti-Semitic."

What is there then to discuss if the situation is so good? I do not think that Borzenko's results are wrong, however, Russia is not a Western country. This figure of 10 per cent in Russia may have different implications than similar figures, say, in England or in the USA. Before the Revolution, communists constituted no more than 10 per cent of the population, nevertheless, amidst the total crisis of society, and the weakness of all other political parties in 1917, this small but ideologically strong group was large enough to gain power and to direct the Russian people into the communist future.

In the other words, the level of anti-Semitism in Russia might be quite less of a concern if only we had no crisis in our economy, politics, ideology and culture, that is a general crisis of society. However, the problem of this crisis is not the topic of my lecture.

What scandalises me as an Orthodox Christian is that there is such a phenomenon as anti-Semitism in the Russian Orthodox Church at all, even if it is not so widespread as it may seem.

Moreover, one can find some very dangerous signs of anti-Semitism not so much among the so to speak simpler Christians than among the Russian Orthodox intelligentsia both clergy and laity. The

¹ *With light edits for readability by tpkatsa*

Protocols of the Elders of Zion which were born in the depths of the tsarist police and then played their evil part in Nazi Germany appeared in our Church's shops amidst a whole variety of new Black Hundred literature. Not only some dreadful pamphlets about Jewish sacrifices of Christian babies can be easily found in St Petersburg, Moscow or Sergiev Posad but, what is more dangerous, some literature written by priests or monks containing a simple answer to the question, who is to blame for all the misfortunes of Russian history is also widespread.

Now I would like to draw your attention to quite a different problem. Yes, it is a matter of fact that maybe nowhere in the world is anti-Semitism so openly aggressive as in modern Russian Orthodoxy. However, one may easily find another striking tendency. I do not know if any Christian body in the world can boast of so great a number of Jews becoming Christians than the Russian Orthodox Church.

I do not like counting but I may testify that I personally know a lot of Jews who became, and are becoming Christians in this Church. Father Alexander Men is the most famous one. There are many Jews among priests and monks as well as among the best theologians. Life in Russia now is quite hard and Jews can easily emigrate to Israel or to America and lead a much better life. Those who stay in Russia, however, often have some spiritual reasons. The strongest one is their Christianity and their love for the Russian spiritual and cultural tradition which is inseparable from Russian Orthodoxy.

It seems that the number of Jews who became Christians in Russia is so great that it makes Russians themselves jealous: something opposite to the process described by Apostle Paul in Rom.11.11.² After years of institutionalized atheism in Russia, a phenomenon which also comprised Russia's Jews, who usually were Jews not by their education and religion but only by blood, Jews have been among the first to search for the religious values lost during the years of communism. Admirers of the older Russian classical culture in which they were once raised, many of them have been brought to the Church. The reason being, that Russian culture itself is Christian through and through.

Russians who find these Jews who became Christians in their, as they sometimes erroneously think, national Church are not always happy. Hence we can find a slogan: A Jewish Church for Jews. This is the title of an article by N. Dubrovin published in the right-wing nationalist news-paper Zemschina N 99. The author of this article refers to the Revelation of St John and sees the signs of the Last Days in this process of the conversion of Jews to Christianity. He is really frightened that this process can ruin the national characteristics of the Russian Church and argues for establishing a Jewish Church in Israel with its branches in all countries where Jews live and want to be Christians.

Now let me pass on to more serious, theological issues. As you know, the problem of anti-Semitism was solved in Western Christianity within the so called "Theology after Auschwitz". This theology was happy to proclaim that all the Christian Fathers and teachers of the Church in whose writings one can easily find some negative attitudes towards the Jews, all these Fathers, were wrong and even bear their part of the responsibility for Auschwitz.

² That is why one cannot agree with Jurgen Moltmann's statement: "For a gentile Christian... there is nothing more positive for his salvation than the Jewish no to Christ." Jewish monotheism and Christian Trinitarian Doctrine, A dialogue by Pinchas Lapide and Jurgen Moltmann, Fortress Press Philadelphia 1981, p 89. Modern Russian experience gives us quite an opposite result.

Now we come to the central problem of the Orthodox Church. I believe that Orthodoxy will never reject its own heritage. Nobody will dare to say that St John Chrysostom or St Maximus the Confessor were wrong. Nobody will dare to say that for centuries Orthodox Christian teachers were wrong, but we who are sinful and have not even a glimpse of their sanctity are right. This theological solution to the Jewish problem is impossible in Orthodoxy. Unlike Protestantism and modern Catholicism Orthodox Christianity is at least as faithful to its own Tradition as is Orthodox Judaism.

But what is really interesting: the Orthodox Fathers' attitude towards Jews does not at all frighten those Jews who become Orthodox Christians in Russia, does not prevent them from becoming Christians. Yes, being a Jew one cannot be pleased by these words of the Christian Fathers, but who ever said and when was it ever said that Christianity was established to bring us pleasure. Christianity does bring us pleasure, but a spiritual one, nevertheless, it demands from us something: to hate one's "soul in this world" (Jn.12.25), which is not a pleasant exercise.

The Anti-Semitism of Russian Orthodox Christians, however, is quite different from the anti-Judaism of the Fathers of the Church. The Fathers never said a word against Jews who became Christians, though this process was never of real importance, to say the truth.

In early Christianity, as today, national or cultural circumstances led to the administrative disunity of the Church, a state of affairs censured by St Paul. Unfortunately, in modern Orthodoxy in such countries as the USA or England it often happens that in one city you can find three or even five national Orthodox Churches. I would say this is the main problem of our Church, its greatest disease, especially when they are not in sacramental communion with each other. As for the Jews who come to Orthodoxy in Russia, I believe, there is something of God's providence in this process, because Jews remind Russian Orthodox Christians of the universal character of the Church which cannot be confined to any local concrete cultural forms. Each side in Russian Orthodoxy is taught by God in its own way. Jews are taught to hate their own souls when they are faced with the anti-Judaism of the Fathers which can also be found in the Church's services in the words of the hymns. Russians, on their part, are taught to hate their souls, which means to love their fellow-Jews in the Church in spite of all cultural, ethnic and other differences. All are taught to "hate their souls in this world", which means to hate their own innate sinfulness, their failures to love God and their neighbours. This is a hard task for both sides, though God never demands simple things from his chosen people, and both Jews and Russian Christians claim to be one, claim to be God's beloved Israel.

From the point of view of the Orthodox Church it is not correct to speak about the Church on the one hand and Israel on the other, as the post-Auschwitz theology often does. The Christian Church is not a Church of the Gentiles. Here lies the main misunderstanding of the Church on the part of both Judaism and the post-Auschwitz theology. Non-Orthodox Christians can call themselves gentiles if they want (take for example German theologian Jurgen Moltmann), Orthodox Christians will never call themselves gentiles and will never acknowledge this name being called in this way by the Jews. The reason is quite simple, the main point of Christ's mission in this respect was to destroy the wall of separation between Israel and Gentiles. According to Apostle Paul, Christ for us "is our peace who has made us both one and has broken down the dividing wall of enmity" (Eph 2.14). And this wall of

separation is really destroyed in the Church as we believe. Orthodox Christians from any ethnic, cultural or national background become Israel in the Church, that very Israel of Abraham, Jacob and Isaac. This feeling of oneness with Israel of patriarchs and prophets is really very deep in Orthodoxy, and there are many feasts celebrated in their memory along with the memory of the Christian saints.*[* Characteristically, until Vatican II only one commemoration of Old Testament's figures was known in the calendar of the Latin Church, that of the Macobees. Only Vatican II has suggested to celebrate a new feast of patriarchs and prophets, which was always celebrated and even several times a year in the Orthodox Church. (see Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, Herder & Herder 1968, v III, p. 28). See also on this question, "Orthodoxy: Jewish and Christian." Fr. A. James Berstein, Conciliar Press, 1990]³

At this point one may immediately ask, how about Jews themselves, does the Orthodox Church say that after the Christ-event those from the Jews, who do not accept him, do not belong to God's beloved Israel any more? I think that the answer to this question on the part of the Church should be the same as to the question about Non-Orthodox Christians. This answer was proposed in the 19th century by the great Russian religious thinker Aleksey Khomiakov. He said that the Church, i.e. Orthodox Church, knows Herself as the Church, in other words as God's Israel. As for all other Christians, and, I would add, non-Christians, or even atheists, we do not judge them. Only God knows whether they belong to his people, his beloved Israel or not. The only thing which we know for certain that there can be only one Israel, one people of God, as there is only one God, and our Church understands Herself as a witness for this oneness. In other words, we believe that only in Christ the very opposition of Jewish Israel and non-Jewish Gentiles which is the main source of enmity between them, is abolished. It is abolished in the New and yet Old Israel of God which is the Church of both Jews and Non-Jews who believe in Christ.

Instead of Moltmann's phrase: "Christendom can gain Salvation only together with Israel" *ibid.* p 90, I would say, "Christendom can gain Salvation only being Israel", and I would add: "Jews can gain Salvation only being that same Israel."

There cannot be two Israels or Israel and the Church, as the "theology after Auschwitz" tries to argue. God demands love from men, not just "togetherness" in the terms of Moltmann even less so, tolerance and indifference which is often the case with Judaism and Christianity now in the West. I do not mean that anti-Semitism could ever be justified, even if only on the basis of anti-Judaism. Yet anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism are not inseparably connected as theology after Auschwitz and Judaism itself try to argue. One can convict Judaism and be not anti-Semitic. The problem is that some still fail to make the distinction between anti-Semitism and anti-Judaism. Now, after such historical experience as pogroms in Kishinev our Church is obliged to express clearly Her teaching, that She does not identify the Jews with Judaism. Our Church has no need to betray Her tradition, She may keep her heritage and reject anti-Semitism.

³ Characteristically, until Vatican II only one commemoration of Old Testament's figures was known in the calendar of the Latin Church, that of the Macobees. Only Vatican II has suggested to celebrate a new feast of patriarchs and prophets, which was always celebrated and even several times a year in the Orthodox Church. (see Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, Herder & Herder 1968, v III, p. 28). See also on this question, "Orthodoxy: Jewish and Christian." Fr. A. James Berstein, Conciliar Press, 1990

What it means to keep the heritage of the Fathers in the modern world can be clearly shown by the example of the so called problem of 'the killers of God'. It is well known that since the time of the Nestorian controversy when the notion of the Theotokos was in question and was finally approved by the Church, it became common to call the Jews "the killers of God". Can we after Auschwitz still keep this awful word? The Theology after Auschwitz and Vatican II clearly answer, "no". But that means to reject the authority of the Church Fathers, for whom this term was quite usual. However, there is another solution to this problem, a problem which is really serious, I think, because according to Borzenko's surveys, a lot of Orthodox Christians still believe in Jewish responsibility for the crucifixion of Christ. But there are two different questions in fact. One is: who killed Christ? the other one: who is guilty? yes, speaking historically about Jewish guilt and Christian guilt we inevitably come to the fact of Christ's Cross. The fact that Jews killed Christ and failed to believe in Him was the source for Christian hatred towards Judaism. The Theology after Auschwitz (the Protestant one) often tries to solve this problem on the basis that not Jews but Romans, especially Pontius Pilate, are guilty of killing Christ. This theology does not agree with all those Church Fathers who clearly said that Jews were the killers of God.

Orthodox theology cannot agree in this point with the Theology after Auschwitz. And this is an issue of great importance. If we say that the Romans killed Christ there is still a possibility for someone who attentively reads the Gospels to say that the Jews did it (see for example Acts 2.22,23). So, there is still a possibility for anti-Semitism. The Orthodox position is more profound, I believe. We say that no matter who it was who killed Christ, his guilt has been taken by Christ upon Himself. Being God He (with His Father and the Holy Spirit) is the only true source of the Cross. Thus when we say that Jews (and if you like - Romans) killed Christ we must add that their sin was taken on by Christ. That is why we cannot accuse anybody of His death. If Jews do not acknowledge that their forefathers killed God it is a matter of their freedom, we Christians with our Church Fathers can say both things - that Jews killed God and that their sin is expiated by His blood. So, only we in Christ can say that they are not guilty.

It is a paradox of Judaism that until the Jews accept Christ's divinity, that they crucified God on Golgotha (God, against whom it is impossible to perpetrate an act of violence) they will remain unreconciled with God.⁴ On the other hand, if those who took no part in those events would consider anybody (Jews in particular) guilty of the death of Christ, then they are practically denying Christ's divinity. That is, like Jews, they do not recognise Him as Saviour even if they themselves claim to be Christians.

I know, yet, another approach to the issue of "the killing of God", a Catholic approach, which is also popular among some Jews in Russia. This solution to the problem presupposes that those, maybe a few hundred, Jews who forced Pontius Pilate to kill Christ are indeed the killers of Christ, but not the whole nation, even less so those Jews who live today. This idea seems to be quite reasonable. But may I ask,

⁴ This idea that the main mistake of the Jews was that they failed to understand that Christ's suffering was voluntary, can be found already in early Christian thought. See for example Act of Martyrdom of Pionius the Presbyter (dated around 300 a.c.): "For you have also heard that the Jews say, 'Christ was a man and died as a criminal...' What this people forget is that this criminal departed from life at his own choice". (The Acts of Christian Martyrs, trans by Herbert Musurillo, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1972 p. 155)

are modern Jews "... still beloved by God for the sake of the fathers"? (Rom.11.28) With Apostle Paul I believe they are. If "the gifts and the calling of God" (Rom.11.29) are transmitted from generation to generation, that is some event in the past has its effect in the future, than what is the reason to think that the event of the Cross does not have its effect even up till now.

Being a Jew myself I see no other way for me to be reconciled with God than to be an Orthodox Christian, which does not mean of course that I allow any attempt to accuse Jews of killing Christ. I repeat once more: it is one thing to say with our Holy Fathers: Jews killed Christ, it is another thing to say that they are guilty. The one statement is true, the another - false, if only we believe that Christ is God.

Even after Vatican II the Catholic theology still speaks about the guilt of those who crucified Christ. A possibility to think in the terms of culpability is opened by the Council's definition itself: "What happened in his Passions cannot be blamed upon all the Jews then living without distinction, nor upon the Jews of today"(Nostra Aetate, n 4). This definition still contains an idea that somebody can be blamed for the crucifixion of Christ. And this is precisely the case in the Catholic theology, which though trying to diminish this guilt, still speaks in the terms of culpability. See for example in "Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, v II, p.7: 'That the ignorance of those responsible for the crucifixion substantially mitigated their guilt even if did not eliminate it altogether is a teaching with firm roots in the New Testament (Lk. 23.34).'

However, in the New Testament, precisely in the place mentioned in "Commentary", we find something quite different, Christ praying to his Father to forgive his killers. How can we still speak about the guilt of the killers of Christ, if he himself has forgiven them?

Moreover, such Orthodox Fathers as St. Maximus the Confessor teach that Christ has voluntarily chosen his Cross and has been crucified to save those who has killed him, as well as all humanity. (See Exp. Or. Dom. PG 90. 347 C: "He restores (human) nature to itself not only in that having become man he kept a free will tranquil and undisturbed... even in the face of those who were crucifying him, he even chose death for them rather than life, as the voluntary character of the passions shows, which was accomplished by the disposition of love (for them, who were crucifying him) by one who underwent this passion." (English translation of this place in St. Maximus, given in 'Maximus Confessor, Selected Writings' N.Y. 1985 p. 104, is not correct - - instead of "death 'for them" it gives, "at their hands". My reading agrees with A.Riou "Le Monde et L'Eglise Selon Maxime le Confesseur", Beauchesne, Paris, 1973,p.185, and with Russian translation by A.Sidorov, "Tvorenia Prepodobnogo Maxima Ispovednika", Moskva, Martis, 1993, p. 187)

But St. Maximus says nothing new as compared to the Gospel. And one can find it clearly in the Creed: Christ came down from heaven for the sake of us... Whom? Us, Orthodox Christians? - No. - "Us, men"; that is - all humanity. Which means, that no human being is by nature an enemy of Christ (be he a Jew, American or Russian). Every nation is predestined to Salvation. Who teaches otherwise, rejects the Gospel and the Creed.

Those who are in Christ - that is in the Church - cannot blame anybody (in the past, present or future) for Christ's death, since he himself, as both God and man, has forgiven his killers. His passion was "passionless" (as we sing) which would have been impossible, if he had been putting blame on anybody. To be in the Church, means to have "the same mind that was in Christ Jesus"(Phlp. 2. 5.). One may certainly argue that the Fathers calling Jews "the killers of God" were accusing them and really thought that they are guilty. At least there is a possibility to understand their words in this way. Let us now examine this argument. Yes, if the Fathers thought that the Jews were guilty they would have been judging them. Now, as we know, Christ said: do not judge. Thus, if they were judging the Jews they were not in fact holy. That means that they are not the Holy Fathers at all! What a threat for the whole Orthodox tradition!

But let us now examine our own words. How can we know whether they were judging or not? Only a man himself and God can know what is in a man's soul. The problem of drawing the difference between fact and judgment is a problem raised in modern philosophy, it was as such unknown to the Fathers, that is why we cannot find anything in their writings which might have drawn this distinction. Nevertheless, the Fathers knew such a word as "apatheia", and holiness in fact is something inseparable from "apatheia." What does "apatheia" mean? But "apatheia" presupposes that one who is in this state does not judge anybody. Now, if you like, it is in the rules of the game to try to read the Fathers' writings in the spirit which they claimed to be theirs. Moreover, I would say that it is within our freedom to read their words in whatever spirit we choose. This freedom is given to us by the written word, we do not hear the voice which might to some extent represent the emotional state of a speaker. If we understand the Fathers' words as a judgment we judge ourselves, because one cannot be in the state of true "apatheia" when one deals with a judgment (that is one is forced to agree with it or to disagree with it ,or to be indifferent to it, which is also far from real "apatheia"). The only way to be in the spirit of "apatheia" is not to presuppose a judgment, to abstain from looking for it, even to guard one's heart against reading the judgment into somebody's words.

Having in mind what I have said above, one may find an answer to the question posed by Prof. Vitaly Borovoy (see Orthodox Christians and Jews on Continuity and Renewal, The Third Academic Meeting between Orthodoxy and Judaism, ed. by Malcolm Lowe, Immanuel 26/27, 1994).

Characterizing the situation in the Russian Orthodox Church as regards the Jewish question, Rev. Prof. Vitaly Borovoy has said:

Lately, the Russian Church has proclaimed new saints. Some of them are counted among the greatest forerunners of piety, service, ascetic life, etc. However, they were exponents of the political ideas of their days as well - the end of the XIX and beginning of the XX centuries - they were monarchists, antisemites, because many Jews participated in the revolution.

Now then, people pick out some of their opinions and call us traitors to the Orthodox faith. I call upon all Orthodox ... to help us to rightly explain to our people the real meaning of the spirit of the teaching of the Holy Fathers, and not to base ourselves upon certain of their views that have a purely historical character. That is really important, for we all live in a climate of spiritual

terrorism that those categories create, according to which we are, as it were, prisoners of Jewish influence. (pp 64-5).

There are two problems in fact, which are posed here. The first one is a problem of canonization of saints. To my mind, if somebody was proclaimed by the Church as a saint, it is not correct (and even blasphemous) to say that he was an anti-Semite. Otherwise, people may think that it is possible (and allowed) to be Orthodox and to be anti-Semite, that one can be even a saint being anti-Semite.

Let me say once more, only God knows whether those which say something against the Jews, are convicting them being in the state of "apatheia", or they are hating them and blaming them, being passionate anti-Semites. One can hate the evil of the world without hating those who commit this evil.

Now, insofar as the Church has proclaimed, say, John of Kronstadt, as her saint, it means that she believes that he was not a hater of the Jews or Communists or anyone else, otherwise, he was not a saint. There is no other answer to this question, I believe.

The second problem, posed by Prof. Vitaly Borovoy, is a problem of historicity of truth. Yes, it is true that the teaching of the Church Fathers, as any other teaching, is always proclaimed in some historical context. However, it is not right to reject some of their words on the ground that we live in the different moment of history. Everything said by the Fathers can be useful and can be applied to our situation, being properly interpreted.

Since we believe that saints, convicting somebody, hated the sin and the devil, not the sinners, we may apply their words when the same sin is committed today. It is precisely on the ground of dispassionate character of the Fathers' words that their truth does not vanish with time.

TOWARDS THE POST-GULAG THEOLOGY

Jurgen Moltmann to whom I has already referred several times, because he is the leader of Protestant theology-after-Auschwitz, said in 1978:"To built the bridge from the Jewish to the gentile shore and the reverse can certainly take place only in the experience of a common suffering... It is imaginable, and I expect, that Jews and Christians one day will undergo a common persecution and then will discover the redeeming love of God that binds them at the most profound level" *ibid.*p 67. It is strange enough, though understandable, that this famous German theologian overlooked that such common persecution of Christians and Jews already happened in Russia in the 20th century. What follows, as well as what has been already said, is nothing else but results of analysis of this historical experience.

To look at my subject in another way, I would like to touch upon some historical and psychological aspects of the problem of anti-Semitism in the Russian Orthodox Church, this time in the context of the world-wide Ecumenical movement.

An important issue for the Western Ecumenical movement is the relationship between Christians and Jews. One aspect of that relationship and the dialogue which should ensue from it, is the post-Auschwitz theology, elaborated and understood by many Christians in the West as a form of atonement for "Christian guilt."

In Russia we have no analogy to this theology. We have no analogy to this theology because the Russian people underwent a different experience. Instead of Nazism, we had Communism, which, instead of the Holocaust inflicted as its largest wound on our consciousness: the Gulag.

So, what we need is post-Kolyma theology (to name the location of the worst labour camps in the Gulag). It would be essential to compare the lessons from Kolyma and Auschwitz, but I reserve this task for the future in order to draw your attention solely to the situation in our Orthodox Church.

The fact is that the most conservative among Russian Orthodox Christians use anti-Semitism to oppose any kind of ecumenical dialogue - - be it Jewish - Christian dialogue or Russian Orthodox dialogue with other Christian bodies. They argue that Western Christianity, abandoning the teaching of the Fathers particularly on the Jewish problem, has been captured by Jews; and their specific evidence for this and their target is post-Auschwitz theology.

Still, before we perhaps too eagerly accuse these Russian Orthodox circles of complicity in the Nazi attempt to exterminate the Jews or even attribute doctrinaire anti-Semitism to them - I would like to remind you of a point I made earlier: that Russia's experience differed from that of the West. Russia did not experience Nazism, Russia experienced Communism.

We must keep this in mind because that experience has kept free-speaking, open, and liberal Russian Orthodox Christians in dialogue with their conservative counterparts in the Russian Church. And this is very important, to some extent because conservatives are quite influential in the Church and through dominance in the Church affect society at large.

So, as I see it, the first and the most important ecumenical task for liberal Russian Orthodox Christians is to maintain the dialogue within our own Russian Orthodox Church. This poses great difficulties and problems; among them that of anti-Semitism.

We all know some of these difficulties and problems, especially as we identify ourselves with one side or another. It appears to me that the burden or task of initiating a dialogue lies with the liberal Christians. The isolationist or separatist tendencies of [the] conservative inhibit conservatives from initiating dialogue, and these tendencies create certain dangers for both Church and society.

In initiating dialogue, the liberal must be open to any aspect of truth which may come from the conservatives. And the liberal must be alert to conservative premises, ready to help clarify them because often the conservative has not recognized them. Love for them, as fellow human beings, as fellow-Christians, is what establishes the need and desire to communicate with them, even when irrationality seems so evident and strong. And who knows: what if they represent our own unconsciousness?

Now, with this ground work, I return to the Jewish problem in the Russian context. As I noted, the greatest wound in Russian history is Communism. And the fact is, many Jews played an active role in the Revolution. I clearly remember that as recently as ten years ago, my Jewish relatives proudly declared that the Russian Revolution was created by Jews. Of course, that is an exaggeration, but we

must have it in mind that if the Jews themselves were (and are) saying such things, it is not surprising that some Russian Orthodox would say the same thing.

We must also take into account the fact that the Communist Revolution was atheistic - that it was not only opposed to the bourgeoisie, but to the Church as well. Moreover, millions of those who were killed in the labour camps during the Russian Revolution were Christians (though not all of them, of course). Russian clergymen and monks were the first martyrs in the atheistic revolution. Already in the late thirties and especially after the war the situation radically changed and Jews themselves became the victims of Stalin's camps. But immediately after the revolution emancipated Jews, Jews who abandoned their own tradition, were the most valuable agents in the Communist attempts to destroy the Church. Fr. Alexander Men once said: "When a Jew betrays his dedication to God he betrays himself and easily finds himself in the power of dark forces. Being chosen is a great and terrible responsibility." (Vestnik RHD 117, 1976 p 113).

Here I would like to recall another personal experience: some of my Jewish relatives, older men, sometimes proudly, sometimes bitterly said that among GPU agents in Leningrad the second language was Yiddish. Forty per cent of the GPU officers in Leningrad in the 1920s and 1930s, they said, were Jews. Whether the percentage is accurate or not is for me not so important as the memory of that account and what it says to my conscience.

So, you see, we have had an experience in Russia very different from that in the West. Of course I have no intention of justifying anti-Semites - not even on the basis of so-called "Jewish guilt" relating to the misfortunes of the Russian history. From the historical point of view, there may well be the same reasons for Jewish hatred of Christianity and the national state. Or at least there may be reasons for Jewish indifference towards both. But the worst way possible to discuss the issue at hand is to think and talk in terms of culpability. In fact, we Christians can answer that question quite simply - "Everybody is guilty because everybody has sinned". And if we try to deny this by insisting that we are responsible only for our "individual" sins, and need not repent for the sins of our forefathers, we betray them. It appears to me that one of the ways in which we truly pray for our forefathers is to accept the responsibility for their sins.

First of all, this means [that we do] not repeat those sins. For Jews, this means not being an enemy of Christianity and/or the new Russian national state. For non-Jewish Russians, it means refusing to hate and to accuse the Jews; for above all moral arguments, their hatred may arise that same kind of reaction to pogroms and all manner of anti-Semitism which had occurred even before the Revolution.

Some of our conservatives, Jewish as well as Russian, see the emigration of Jews from Russia, especially sending them to Israel or the USA as the best way out of this problem. But this raises a human rights issue. Suppose a person selected for emigration does not want to leave? Must we resort to totalitarian methods to avoid a new hatred? I do not think that this can be justified.

Further, we must acknowledge the fact that such hatred is a given reality of everyday life. That is why it is so important to determine what to do about it. Jews who do not want to be hated nor to hate can leave Russia. But Russians cannot leave Russia in order to abstain from hating Jews who stay in

Russia. (It would be unnatural in fact). So some conservative Christians among these Russians seriously talk about violent expulsion of Jews. Psychologically they clearly do not want to feel hatred, but it is a fact of spiritual life. Being Christians, they maybe unconsciously sense that hatred is a sin. But they cannot shake of that strong feeling of hatred which is rooted in that awful wound in Russian history the name of which is Communism and the Gulag.

I hope that this helps us to understand that modern Christian anti-Semitism in Russia with its slogan, "Jews leave Russia!" has a positive spiritual motive. Those Russian Orthodox Christians do not want to feel hatred, but they do. And to rid themselves of it, they seek violent expulsion of the Jews. They want to be in peace with themselves, but the presence of Russian Jewry confounds them.

We must formulate the problem anew. Western Christians feel guilty about such things as Auschwitz, when, after cremating Jewish children, German officers received Holy Communion, as Christians, in a nearby Church. In Russia, the situation is quite different. Here, many of the victims were Christians and many of the executioners, especially after the Revolution, were Jews. Herein lies an ideological source of hatred, of anti-Semitism. But conservative Russian Orthodox survivors of communist terror and those who share with them the burden of their past seek for the inner peace. They do not want to hate. Still it seems that history itself imposes upon them the necessity to hate, as if God sent the Jews to live in Russia to show His Christian people that they lack something.

But what is it that they lack? History would seem to doom them to hatred. But their commitment as Christians calls them to love - not only to love for their fellow Christians but also to love for their enemies. And that means to love for the Jews.

It is not enough to resolve the Jewish problem negatively only - to come to not hating Jews. This is to take the road of history, a road which finally brings Russian Christianity to hatred. This is the road which leads to the idea of the (violent) expulsion of the Jews. It is itself a product of hatred. And the case of Poland shows that expulsion of Jews does not terminate anti-Semitism.

So, we liberal Christians, may need to say our conservative brothers and sisters the following: "In our search for justice and freedom we, liberals, often forget to seek sanctity and inner peace as well. We admire you for seeking them. But it is a reality of our sinful world that someone always seeks to present himself as our enemy. For you, Russians, this is the role of the Jew. But Jews are given to you by our Lord that you may learn to love your enemies. This is how he Himself lived, and died. And it is the only way for you to attain inner peace."

This does not mean, by the way, that Russian Christians must out of their own spiritual resources forgive the Jews. Human resources are absolutely inadequate for the task. Only in Christ through the Holy Spirit is forgiveness possible.

Passionless ("apatheia") which is so dear to the heart of everybody who belongs to the Orthodox Tradition, is the goal of Christian asceticism, the gates of the contemplative life. But passionless and forgiveness are the same. It is true that only humility can bring us to that height. But those who call the Jews (or anybody else) the enemies of Christ, or the enemies of the Church, or the enemies of the

Russian nation, teach to not forgive; those teachers are not only far from Christ themselves, but do not let others come to him. Those are the real "Judeoi" of today, whom Christ has convicted.

THE JEWISH QUESTION IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

To approach the conclusion of my lecture, I would like to touch upon the most complicated problem of the source of anti-Semitism. The main lesson which Non-Orthodox Christianity has drawn from Auschwitz was that anti-Semitism is inseparable from anti-Judaism and has its roots in it. That is why theologians such as Jurgen Moltmann try to find a positive meaning of Judaism. One should mention in this respect that Judaism itself argues in favour of the same cause. As Rabbi Schmuël Boteach, one of the leading chasidic thinkers today, pointed out, "The Talmud says that the reason for anti-Semitism began at Sinai... At Sinai... the Almighty ... gives the Jewish people the Law as an essential code which would transform them into a moral nation". But, adds Rabbi Schmuël, this was not enough, "the Jews were also charged with spreading this new message to all the people of the world. In their capacity as a "light unto the nations", they were responsible for disseminating God-given ethics to all corners of the globe. Seen from a different perspective, they were considered a nuisance to the people whose desire it was to dominate those weaker than themselves. So began the hatred for the Jew, whose principal purpose for existence was to bring the knowledge of God... closer to the world." (Moses of Oxford, Andre Deutsch, London 1994 v.2 p 661).

Here, in this inseparable connection of anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, if it is really inseparable, lies, I believe, the main problem for the Orthodox Church. Our Church cannot reject the writings of the Church Fathers which convict Judaism as post-Auschwitz theology easily does. Moreover, there is evidence that our hierarchs often feel that to convict anti-Semitism openly as a sin or to speak in defence of Jews to forestall possible pogroms would mean to some extent to defend Judaism. Our Patriarch in fact was already accused by some circles in the Church of being an admirer of Judaism precisely when he tried to say something convicting anti-Semitism. Thus, our hierarchs are afraid that, so-called simpler Christians, might perceive them as displaying a positive attitude to Judaism when in fact defending Jews. And expression of such positive feeling which is now so widespread in the West, cannot be accepted by the mass of the Orthodox believers. The reason being, that, as they well know, such an attitude towards Judaism has been condemned by the Church as the source of the heresy of so-called "Judaizers" when, in the 16th century, there was a real danger for the Russian Orthodox Church to mix Orthodox teaching with Judaism. It was one of the few heresies which has shaken Orthodoxy in Russia, and the memory of this danger is still alive. Thus everyone who says something in defense of the Jews in our Church falls under suspicion of being sympathetic to Judaism and likely to fall into the heresy of the Judaizers.

This keeps our hierarchs, who otherwise in some personal interviews express their negative attitudes toward anti-Semitism, from an official Synodical declaration on this point. Deacon Andrej Kuraev, who for some time was close to our Patriarch, once said: "Anti-Semitism is a sin," then, he added, "I would like to warn everybody that the Orthodox Church will never be able to wipe out anti-Semitism just like

that, simply having the top men in the hierarchy speak out against it... it can be only the gradual process of transforming the human soul." (Evreskaia gazeta - the Jewish newspaper - N1 1992).

Yes, it is certainly true that anti-Semitism cannot be wiped out immediately only by the top men in the hierarchy speaking out against it. But if they (or, better the Church as a whole through Her Council) do not speak out against anti-Semitism, it is even less likely to be stamped out. But our hierarchs who, I believe, are not anti-Semites themselves, do not raise their pastoral voice against anti-Semitism because they are afraid of being misunderstood by simple Christians, as defending Judaism, the defense of which is not in the Tradition of the Orthodox Church. This is why they maintain silence, which is certainly both compromising and dangerous.

Here I want to return to my previous observation, namely that it is a point of view of Judaism and now also of post-Auschwitz theology that the root of anti-Semitism lies within anti-Judaism, that our attitude towards Jews is inseparable from our attitude towards Judaism, that one cannot abolish the possibility of anti-Semitism without having a positive attitude towards Judaism as a religion.

Now, I want to pose my main question, ARE WE, ORTHODOX CHRISTIANS, OBLIGED TO SHARE WITH JUDAISM AND NON-ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY THEIR IDEA OF THE INSEPARABILITY OF THE JEWS AS A PEOPLE FROM JUDAISM AS A RELIGION ?. Did the reason for anti-Semitism really begin at Sinai? To answer this question, I want to rely upon the authority of Scripture. Let us ask ourselves, whether the Egyptians were anti-Semitic after their first-born babies died before the Jews left Egypt? If anti-Semitism is a hatred towards Jews, I think, the Egyptians at this moment were already complete anti-Semites. However, the Jews had not accepted the Law before their departure from Egypt.

God had separated the Jews from other nations, namely the Egyptians, He had chosen them from among the Gentiles and only after doing so did He give them the Law. The Jews were hated by the Gentiles because God was on their side, because this, comparatively small and weak people, was from the time of Egyptian captivity down to our time mysteriously supported by God, who in this way showed their chosenness. The Jews were hated not, as rabbi Schmueel put it, because they were a nuisance: the gentiles could easily have avoided a mere nuisance. But, in this case, they could not. The reason being that God was on the side of the Jews (see for example Is. 41.8-16). Anti-Semitism is a hatred towards Jews as the chosen nation, as the nation which is separated from all other nations of the world who are not even nations for them, but simply gentiles. This is precisely the basis for anti-Semitism, not Sinai. This last statement is not my private opinion, it can be supported from the Scripture. As I have already mentioned, Apostle Paul in his Epistle to Ephesians (2.14) speaks about Christ as of "our peace who has made us [i.e. Jews and non-Jews] one and has broken down the dividing wall of enmity." This enmity on the part of the Gentiles was nothing else than what we now call anti-Semitism. And Paul goes on to say that in Christ this enmity can be abolished. Why?

Not because Christ has established something like monotheism for gentiles as Moltmann erroneously teaches, but precisely because through Christ, as our Church believes, the Jewish faith was fulfilled. Christ is praised by our Church as "The Light of Revelation unto Gentiles"(see Is. 42. 6.;49. 6; Lk. 2.

32; Acts 13. 47). Christianity was not established as some new religion, it was accepted by chosen Jews who were the first Christians precisely because their belief in Christ as Messiah was for them nothing else but the fulfillment of the Jewish faith, that is the faith of their forefathers from Abraham down to the time of Christ. Christianity is not another religion different religion from the faith of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, the prophets up to St. John the Baptist and Mary the Theotokos. Since the time of Abraham there have indeed been new revelations of this faith, and the revelation of the Law at Sinai is one of them. Nevertheless, the Covenant, established by God with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is the same Covenant which afterwards was established with the whole Jewish nation, and the same Covenant was established through Christ with those, both Jews and non-Jews, who believe in Him. As there is only one God, there is only one Covenant. What is new in this respect is not the Covenant itself but the open possibility to participate in this Covenant. Firstly, this possibility was confined only to one person and his sons, albeit not all of them, but only to those who were chosen by God. Then this Covenant was opened to the whole Jewish nation. And here we are faced with a serious problem. Insofar as the Covenant established with the Jewish nation is the same Covenant as established with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, only those from the Jews who shared the same faith as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob really participated in God's Covenant. These were the righteous among Jews, and they constituted the true Israel. Not all Jews in fact participated in the Covenant with Abraham, but only these righteous, though on the part of God the Covenant was open to all Jews. To teach otherwise would mean to say that those of the Jews who worshiped idols or violated the Law were still participating in the Covenant of God.

Now, what happened after Christ? According to the teaching of the Church, Christ's blood, his suffering and voluntary death opened the Covenant of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, that same Covenant which was also the Covenant established at Sinai to those from the gentiles who believed in Christ.

I repeat once more. Christ was not a founder of a new religion, nor was Christianity a branch of the Jewish faith, i.e. some part of it, because a part is always smaller than the whole. It was the same faith of Abraham and Moses, but now fulfilled, being also opened to gentiles, as it had been promised to Abraham (Gen. 12.3; cf. Gal 3. 8-15).

This statement means that those non-Jewish Christians who do not consider themselves in one God-beloved Israel with Abraham, Moses and the other Jewish righteous, do not belong to the Church. But, what is not less important, since God through Christ has opened his Covenant to the Gentiles, those, from the Jews, who do not consider themselves to be in one beloved Israel of God with righteous Christians from all other nations do not belong to Israel either and do not participate in the Covenant of God.

There is only one way to participate in the Covenant - to believe that there is one Israel, one Covenant, one faith, since there is only one God. Unlike modern liberal theologians, both Jewish and non-Jewish, true Orthodox Jews and Orthodox Christians, I believe, understand well that there cannot be two Israels, two or more different Covenants of God or two or more Gods. When we in our Church speak about the New and the Old Israel, the New and the Old Testament, we are not counting. "New" does not mean the next, which substituted the first or even is counted together with it or side by side with it.

This again is not my private opinion, but the teaching of the Fathers. St. Maximus the Confessor, one of the greatest of them, clearly states: "The two Testaments completely agree with one another, but they do so more by grace, toward the fulfilment of a single mystery (*eis henos musteriou sumplerosin*) than by synthesis (*kata ten sunthesin*) PG 90 681-AB. The exceptional, special place which according to the teaching of the Church is occupied by the Incarnation of the Logos, the Son of God consists of the fact that it is the last and ultimate Revelation of the God's Covenant with mankind. It is the ultimate fulfilment of previous revelations of the same Covenant."

Unlike Judaism and liberal non-Orthodox Christianity, we do not wait for any new revelation of God's Covenant. Everything has been already done through Christ. Nothing more is needed for our salvation. It is true precisely because all revelations of God's Covenant took place through one and the same Logos, the Word of God who in the last days became flesh, as is clear from the teaching of the Church: as St. Maximus put it, "The Logos of God, who is fully God, wills to bring about the mystery of his embodiment always and in all things"(Amb.7 - 1084 C15 - D2).

By the Logos, the Word of God, God created this world, including man and in this way established His Covenant with Adam, then by the Same Logos God renewed the Same Covenant with Noah, by the Same Logos God again established this Covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the Same Logos was revealed, being embodied in the Law at Sinai, the same Logos has spoken through the prophets, and finally He has been revealed to us in Jesus the Christ. There is only one Israel, one Covenant, one faith, as there is only one God and one Christ. Adam being saved by Christ is a new Adam, however, it is the same Adam, not somebody else.

Now precisely because Christianity is the same Covenant as the Covenant established at Sinai with the Jews, it establishes in Christ (i.e. in belief in Christ) the long-awaited peace between Jews and Gentiles. After Christ the Covenant of God, the Covenant of Abraham and Moses became open to gentiles, and there is no reason for them to hate Jews as a chosen nation.

Now, if, as Rabbi Schmu'el rightly considers, the Covenant at Sinai should be the "light unto nations", there is only one ultimate way to let the nations participate in this Covenant. The possibility for those from the gentiles to partake of this Covenant was as we Christians believe, opened by Christ. This was the faith of the first Christians from the Jews. They, I repeat once again, have not established a new Israel or a new religion, as if "new" has substituted what was before. **Christianity for them was nothing else but fulfilment of the Jewish faith**, or, better the fulfilment of faith and hope of all the righteous, from Adam down to the Virgin Mary. In Christ this faith and hope is also opened to those from the Gentiles, which means that peace and love can be established between Jews and non-Jews.

Now, as I have said, since the main body of the Jews rejected Christ (which means that they did not want to believe that reconciliation with gentiles has already been achieved) they did not accept the new Covenant with God. But since the new Covenant is nothing else than the Old Covenant, they placed themselves outside of the people of God. According to the Church's teaching one cannot be in the Covenant of God if one acknowledges only the new or only the old Covenant or erroneously thinks that they are not one.

The Church is built on the foundation of one God, one Christ, one Israel, one Covenant, and those who reject any Revelation of this Covenant, or its oneness, do not participate in this Covenant and place themselves outside of the Church.

Post-Auschwitz theology does not understand the mystery of the Church when it says that the Orthodox Church teaches that Christianity (i.e. the New Israel) claims to replace the Old Israel, which substitution, according to Moltmann, is the main source of anti-Semitism. The Orthodox Church does not claim to replace the Old Israel precisely because the New Israel (i.e. the Church) is nothing else but that very Israel of Abraham, Moses and the prophets, but already opened (revealed) to those non-Jews who believe in Christ.⁵

The Catholic position could be clarified with a help of the "Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II". One can find here all main ideas accepted by the commission of Cardinal Bea which elaborated the Declaration on the Relationship of the Church (Latin Church) to non-Christian religions (particularly Judaism). Take for example the recommendation, how to teach people on the issue under consideration: "...It should be shown how... the New Covenant confirmed, renewed and transcended the Old, and how the New Testament fulfilled and superseded the Old, but nevertheless did not render it invalid"(see v. III, p.18). Or, "Despite all their differences, the two covenants do not contradict each other. They are rather two stages of God's dealing with mankind. Doubtless the New in many respects transcends the Old"(p.23).

Here we find all this set of ideas, connected with such words as "supersede", "transcend" and "two covenants", which makes this Latin teaching ambiguous and unacceptable to Orthodoxy. There is no doubt that Moltmann's ideas are nothing else than a reaction to these Latin teaching. That is why, when he tries to avoid the danger of this approach, he suggests another, opposite, but equally wrong solution to the issue, speaking about "togetherness" of the Church of Gentiles (as he calls her) and Jewish Israel, as if there could be some other Israel than the Church.

As for the Orthodox position, it is expressed best of all in St.Maximus' words about so-called Old Testament: "The grace is completely free of old age" (1.Th.Ec. 89). Which means that after Christ the Law and prophets, being given by Grace are still new. They were neither superseded by so-called New Testament, nor become "old", but, being at one with the Gospel, were revealed anew, as being given by the same Grace.

The Jewish nation was chosen, and God's Covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob at Sinai was opened (revealed) to the Jews. This Covenant was opened to them, but it does not mean that all Jews automatically participated in this Covenant. Only potentially, now, after Sinai, can each of the Jews participate in this Covenant. Moreover, each one should participate in this Covenant, and is obliged to do so, as a Jew. This obligation means responsibility. After Sinai the Jews became the most responsible of all peoples of the world. This does not mean that all Jews were as righteous, just and faithful as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and wished to be the "light unto the nations", not keeping this light to

⁵ As it is quite usual for the Protestant theology, Moltmann presumably disagrees with the Catholic teaching on this issue, which is very ambiguous. As for the Orthodox mystery of the Church, it is simply hidden from him.

themselves. Thus only righteous Jews participated in the Covenant with God, only the righteous among the Jews constituted Israel, just as not all sons of Abraham participated in the Covenant of God. This is precisely what Paul says: "Those who are the children of the flesh these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted as the seed" (Rom 8.9). The Jews were first chosen from the gentiles, but from Sinai and up to Christ, the righteous were being chosen by God from the chosen nation of the Jews to constitute the true Israel. And they challenged the rest of the "chosen nation", and were persecuted by it.

Though the Jews were chosen by God from among the nations, the true Israel of God was never a nation chosen from among the nations. It was the Jews who were chosen from among nations, but the true Israel, after Sinai, and before Christ, was constituted from those who were chosen by God from among the chosen Jewish nation. Now the Church, because it is the same true Israel, is also chosen not from among gentiles, as the Jewish nation was, but from among the nations. The character of the presence of the Orthodox Church is different in different nations. However, those who are chosen from their nation, belong to one Israel of God.

It was not the Church but Nazi Germans who tried to replace the Jews as a chosen nation. Moltmann should not place the responsibility for it elsewhere. Nazi Germans tried to replace the Jews because these Germans had lost the true faith in Christ. For if they had had faith in Christ and in God (and that Christ is God) they would have known that through Christ, God opened his Covenant with the Jews to all people of the world. After Christ there is no such a thing as a chosen nation (in its old sense) because now God chooses his Israel from among all the nations, both Jews and non-Jews.

Having lost this true understanding of God's Israel (which is not a nation among nations, but the people of chosen from among different nations), Nazis saw in the Jews the nation which claimed to be chosen, to have some exclusive rights on the gifts of God. And to say the truth, the Jews themselves who did not accept Christ, that is did not allow that men from some other nation could participate in the Covenant of God being non-Jews (according to the Law), these Jews themselves had no arguments against this Nazi understanding of the Jewish claim to be the chosen nation.

Now, insofar as the Nazi Germans had lost their Christian belief and true understanding of the Church, nothing could prevent them from anti-Semitism. Their anti-Semitism, however, was different from the anti-Semitism of the Gentiles of the ancient world, which simply did not accept the Jewish idea of the chosen nation and treated "the god of the Jews" as one among other gods.

It was impossible for Germans, this nation of a great philosophical tradition with deep Christian roots, to think in the terms of "national gods". They knew pretty well that the Jews claim that only one God, not some national god, has chosen their nation. That is why Nazi Germans claimed the same, that their nation is chosen. Both claims were absolute. Hence, religious, mysterious character of the Holocaust. One should not forget that Germans tried to deprive of life not only the Jews, but also the Gypsies, which represented for them the idea of the Gentiles (or heathens), in the same way as the Egyptians were the first Gentiles, punished as we read it in the Bible, by the Jews according to the will of God.

As it is well known, the main theological heresy of the Nazi ideologists was their complete rejection of the Old Testament and "the god of the Jews". This "god" according to Nazi ideology, happened to be the false god of the Church (i.e. Catholics and Protestants). "Church's Yahweh is now dead, as Wotan was dead 1500 years ago,"- proclaimed A. Rosenberg in his "Myth of the 20th century". And Nazi Germans tried to replace this "Jewish god" (i.e. god invented by the Jews, as they thought) by the god of their own imagination (see on this question Fr. Sergei Bulgakov, "Christianity and the Jewish Question", Ymca-Press, Paris 1991 p. 22f.).

From the point of view of diminishing the role of the Covenant, established by God with the Jews, this Nazi "theology" is nothing else than a completion of the tendency which always has been present in the non-Orthodox theology. The root of this error is a failure to preserve the oneness of God's revelation, the oneness of the Covenant, established with the Jews, with that, established by Jesus. What we find now in the non-Orthodox theology is nothing else than an attempt to raise up the value of the Covenant established with the Jews, the valour of the Old Testament. The problem, however, is, that theology-after-Auschwitz still fails to acknowledge the oneness of the Covenant. This is the reason, why this theology has been drawn to a necessity of speaking about the positive value of Judaism and even (as it is in the case of Moltmann) says that it is good when the Jews still adhere to Judaism not becoming Christians. Needless to say that this ideas are foreign to the Orthodox Church.

Thus, the error of the non-Orthodox theology is obvious, it is a failure to preserve the oneness of all the aspect of God's dispensation, and finally, the oneness of God (the error of Moltmann).

However, there is still another danger as regards this problem. One may keep the oneness of the Covenant and fail to acknowledge the difference between the stages of God's revelation, the special importance of each stage. The teaching of the Fathers on this issue is quite clear. St Maximus the Confessor, for example, whom I have cited speaking about the problem of oneness of the Covenant and the Bible, was not less insistent teaching about the special role of each part of God's revelation. According to St Maximus, in one economy (dispensation) of God, the Old Testament realizes "the movement of the flesh towards the spirit, and the New Testament leads the spirit towards God (Thal 63.PG 90 C D). Both movements are inseparable from each other and constitute one movement to God, nevertheless each of them is absolutely necessary as such. Moreover, it is the movement of the spirit to God which fulfills and gives a true sense to the movement of the flesh to the spirit. At the same time, without the first stage, what we finally achieve is a false god.

Our spirit cannot come to God if it is still carnal, if it still serves our flesh. There is a great danger when we try to approach God still having a carnal spirit. In this case we approach not true God of Israel, but the god of our imagination, the god which we create ourselves, to serve our carnal needs.

This, I believe, is a main danger for the Russian Orthodox Christians. I do not mean that the Russian Orthodox Church, being understood as the Church of the saints and righteous, chosen from among the Russian nation, has ever failed in her understanding of this problem. However, those who have been calling themselves Orthodox Christians, but have always been persecuting true Israel of God, which dwells in Russia, these men, I believe, have had a carnal spirit and have created the god for their own

flesh, the god of the Russian nation. It was this god, which in fact was nothing else than an idol, which was finally rejected by the majority of the Russian population during the communist revolution. The reason was, that this god which was understood as the god which serves for the prosperity and well-being of the people and the Russian state in general, this god failed to be effective. The communists suggested some other kind of ideology leading to prosperity, and finally, though not without resistance and hesitation, the Russian nation rejected its old idol and accepted the new one. Several facts should be given here to prove this, perhaps, unexpected statement. There is a myth about the holiness of the Russian people in general, and peasants in particular. Though nobody can say about the number of the saints, chosen from among the Russian people (which I believe is very great), one may say about the general or common view of the Church (which is inseparable from the Orthodox view of God) among the Russian peasants. Thus according to the analysis of the church's books of registration of confession, it was quite usual for the Russian peasants in the end of the 19th century not to confess their sins and not to partake the holy communion for several years. Only around 20 per cent per year of the peasants in the central Russia used to go to confession (see Litvak B.G. "Krestianskoie dvijenie v Rosii v 1773 - 1904 godah" M. Nauka, 1989 p.206). Besides, one should remember those peasant's revolts and uprisings which were a common event in the Russia after the abolition of the serfdom in 1861, as well as revolts of Rasin and Pugachev, described in the Russian literature, particularly by Pushkin. A lot of people was killed in these revolts, houses of landowners were burned, their property was plundered. All these acts could certainly be justified from the point of view of the class struggle, though not from the point of view of the teaching of the Church. (On the problem of decay of the Russian peasant's community see an excellent study of Svetlana Lourie in her book "Metamorfozi traditsionnogo soznania", St.Peterburg, 1994 pp 169-211).

The parallel process has been taking place within Judaism. As I have said, according to the teaching of the Church Fathers, without accepting the revelation of the New Testament, without Christ, the spiritual way of the Old Testament cannot be fulfilled. It does not mean that righteous of the Old Testament are less saintly than the Christian saints. Both of them, being in Christ, are in one glory of the Holy Spirit. As our Church believes, all righteous of the Old Testament have accepted Christ, being saved by Him from hell. However, this "hell" for them was nothing else than what is known in the Orthodox theology as "divine darkness" of ignorance of the End of God's dispensation. They have acknowledged Him (i.e. Christ, the Beginning and the End) precisely because they believed in Him, whom they had not yet seen.

As for Judaism, it rejects Christ who has already come, it does not acknowledge Him, which means, that it does not believe in Him. This is something different from the faith of the righteous of the Old Testament. Now, since Judaism has rejected Christ, it has closed the way to God for the Jewish people which adhere to this religion. Nevertheless, being a religion, it was obliged to lead to some god. And being the religion of the Absolute God, it was obliged to lead to the Absolute God, to the only true one. However, this god could not be true God of the Jewish faith (before Christ). He was something else, an absolutely false god created within Judaism.

The Old Testament, according to the teaching of the Fathers, should play the role of lifting of our flesh towards the spirit (the images of Moses, climbing the Sinai, and of the prophet Elijah are the best examples of this movement). Being absolutely perverted in Judaism, however, this movement finally gave birth to the idea which absolutely enslaves the spirit, making it carnal. Practically, it was realized in Judaism in the idea of Messiah who will establish the Jewish state, and will give his people endless prosperity and power over other nations. Now, in so far as this ideal of the earthly prosperity, given by Messiah was not fulfilled, the Jews having noticed that peoples around them live much better than themselves, rejected their false religion. They (at least a great part of them) went away from Judaism, that is became one of the ethnic bodies of the European nations. This part of the Jews did not believe in the coming of Messiah any more. However, they still had this ideal of the earthly prosperity. Though now, they could not claim that this prosperity will be especially for the Jews. And finally they (I mean Marx, of course, who was the first of them) elaborated a new ideal - earthly prosperity for all peoples of the world, regardless their nationality. (And to some extent this ideal was more biblical, though certainly also carnal, than that of the Judaism. The Bible says that all nations should finally participate in the Covenant of God) And new messianic Levites, called communists, and new messianic nation, called proletariat (those, chosen from among all nations, who seek earthly well-being), should realize (i.e. bring about) this ideal in history for themselves and all others, who will accept it. Those who will not accept it, are the enemies of the proletariat.

Needless to say, that this teaching became popular among the Jews in all European countries, but especially among those who were very poor, as it was in Poland, Ukraine, Belorussia (all this places belonged to the Russian Empire). Thus, it was Russia, where, besides Jewish movement, this new ideal of the Jews has met a powerful support on the part of the Russian "intelligentsia", and, finally, simple people. These Russian Orthodox Christians who were carnal Christians, in fact, finally rejected their "god", being seduced by the communists, a lot of which (though not all of them of cause) were Jews. I have not enough place to analyse this process, but I should mention that it was not the Jews who drew Russian intelligentsia from Orthodoxy, they were easily seduced by the Western culture and spirituality, some of them have stopped at this stage, others have made a next step, into communist movement, following the teaching of Marx.

As for the Russian peasants, when the Bolsheviks had fulfilled their promise about land after the Revolution, most of the peasants in the central Russia were completely satisfied, and were ready to acknowledge their ideology, being more cooler and cooler towards the Church. Though in the 1920's the Bolsheviks were still afraid to persecute the Church in the villages, the number of those who attended the Church's service was reduced to one third of that before the Revolution (see Golubih N., *Ocherki gluhoi derevni*, M; L.: Znanie, 1925).

It was not hard to seduce these false Christians, who, being carnal had no other ideal than well-being (both material and cultural), that is, prosperous life on earth, protected by God which life (and which God) was put in question in the time before the Revolution. Each of the bodies of the Russian Revolution has its own responsibility for what has happened. One of them played the role of seducer, the other was that of the seduced.

From the analysis which I have made, one may easily conclude, that the Jews, are nothing else, but an instrument of the devil, that they are a devilish nation, the race of the anti-Christ. Nevertheless, according to the teaching of the Church, even the devil cannot make anything, if it is not allowed to him by God. And if we are true Christians, we should acknowledge that nothing can happen against the will of God. Certainly, the communist idea was a temptation, and majority of the Russian people appeared to be carnal Christians. But God even before this temptation knew that they are carnal ones, and He did not want, I believe, to see in His Church the men who call themselves true Christians, Godly men, being not-Christians in fact. There is a great responsibility in calling oneself the member of the Orthodox Church (the only true Church as we believe, God's beloved Israel). If we call ourselves Orthodox Christians, God demands from us to be true Orthodox Christians. And if we fail, He punishes us, teaching in this way. If we do not want to be taught by God, we may not call ourselves Orthodox Christians, He will leave us alone to lead that life which we want. (Though, certainly God never rejects anybody up to the end, because each man still has some hope in this life, which means that to some extent he believes. According to this level of belief God is with him and teaches him).

Thus, God has punished the Russian people, which claimed to be an Orthodox people. In the same way God is punishing the Jews during the whole world history down to Auschwitz. He is punishing those who claim to be His beloved Israel, to make us (both Jews and non-Jews) His beloved Israel indeed. Whom He loves, He is punishing in this world. (And who knows, what will happen in the world to come?).

The majority of the Russian nation was seduced. No Revolution could have won, being not supported by the mass of the Russian population. However, there was a small part of the nation which has preserved its Orthodox faith. I do not mean here those from the White army who, calling themselves Christians, with the arms in their hands were killing their compatriots. The Civil war was not a war between the true Christians and unbelievers. It was the war between those who was seduced only by the Western culture and spirituality and those who went up to the end in their fall, down to communism. Neither of them were the true Orthodox Christians. Both of them were punished by God.

When I speak about those who were not seduced, I mean a small part of the Orthodox Christians (the remnant of the Russian Orthodox people) who were indeed God's beloved Israel dwelling in Russia at that moment. It was the Russian Orthodox Church of the Patriarch Tikhon, who has rejected the possibility for a Christian to participate in the Civil war. Here are his words addressed to his flock: "No, far better that they should inflict bloody wounds on us that we should turn to vengeance, let alone vengeance in the form of a massacre, against our enemies or against those who appear to us to be the source of our misfortunes" (cited after an article by L. Il'ina in *Pravoslavny Peterburg* [Orthodox Petersburg], n. 6, 1993). Yes, he has convicted Bolsheviks, he, I believe, had a clear vision that they were a tool in the hands of the devil. Nevertheless, he warned the Christians against hatred and bloodshed, he prayed for his enemies, and he has forgiven them. I see no other possibility of this behaviour, than St. Tikhon's understanding that everything happens according to the will of God, that there is no devil who can act without permission, permission to teach us, men, even in this terrible way, punishing us. Otherwise, this forgiveness will be impossible.

The role of the Jews in the Russian revolution (as in the world's communist movement in general) is really terrible. Nevertheless, it is not fatal as Fr. Sergei Bulgakov has put it.⁶

For Russian Christians, it is not enough to be a good person, a moral man, to forgive the Jews. One cannot be "moral" or "civilised" when millions from one's nation are killed, when churches are destroyed, when there is no holy place in the world which is not defiled by the Communists with the Jews as their leaders.

Yes, all holy places were defiled in the Russian land. Yet, there was still a holy place in the hearts of the Russian Orthodox Christians who belong to the true Church of Patriarch Tikhon. These Christians, though having a moral right to blame the Jews, being not seduced themselves, did not allow it to themselves. As it was during the time of the Mongol-Tatar Yoke, the true Church said: this was sent to us for our sins. Thus, those who have not sins of their own (personal sins), have to acknowledge as their own the sins of their fellow-Christians. Moreover, praying for their enemies, forgiving them, they acknowledged that even the sins of the Communists, the sins of the Jews are also theirs. For they never has blamed anybody for what has happened, which means that they did not think that it was the Jews who were the source of the events of the Russian Revolution. Everything came from God for our sins. This was the attitude of the Russian Church, the Church of Patriarch Tikhon.⁷

If now we return in the modern Russia, we can easily answer the question, why the majority of the Russian people, especially of the old age are less anti-Semitic than people in the West. After the bloodshed of the Revolution and Stalinism, nobody who was involved in this process can blame anyone else. The Russians, who themselves were supporters of the Communist regime (voluntarily or involuntarily) have no right to blame the Jews. Even less right have the Jews to blame Russians for the persecutions suffered by the Jews during the years of Communism. One should have a very bad conscience if one allows oneself to blame anybody in this situation.

However, there are some Christians who, being faced with the tragedy of the Russian history and being more or less free from any participation in the communist past, feel a great temptation to hate the Jews, to call them the children of the devil, the tribe of the anti-Christ. Even more great a temptation have those Orthodox Christians, who were involved in the Communist regime themselves and after the fall of the communism want to find somebody whom to blame for their sins. Unlike unbelievers, they clearly understand, that by supporting communists they have sinned. And they often unconsciously want to find who has seduced them, to get rid from this sin. What they need, is a pure conscience. But the way they try to gain this pure conscience has nothing in common with the teaching of the Church.

⁶ As for Bolshevism, historical truth demands from us to acknowledge, anyway, the fatal character of the fatal influence of the Jewry at the head of the communist clique, regardless of the fact that the great majority of the Russian state belongs to different nationalities, and first of all Russian", *ibid.* p.67]. This role was not fatal precisely because nothing is fatal in this world, everything happens according to God's will, and being seen from this perspective could be forgiven.

⁷ Thus the holy martyr Metropolitan Benjamin of St. Petersburg, for example, said at his trial: "Whatever your verdict may be, I know that it is not pronounced by you but comes from the Lord, and that whatever happens to me I shall say: Praise the Lord". The following words belong to Archimandrite Sergei Shein: "I have not fought a battle against Soviet power, I have fought a battle only against myself. I shall meet death in peace, knowing that it, as everything else is from God"(see Il'ina, *ibid.*)

Nobody, even if he himself was not involved in the communist past, even if he has no personal sins, can belong to the Church of Patriarch Tikhon and other Russians new martyrs, to the Church of St. Silouan the Athonite who up to the end of his life was praying for the enemies of the Church (namely Communists), nobody can belong to this to true Israel of God, if he blames anybody, if he hates, if he does not forgive.

As for the Jews who live in Russia, I see no other way for them to get rid from their fears, the fears to be blamed as a tribe of the anti-Christ, than to be in the Church of St. Patriarch Tikhon. Only here, in the true Church of our Saviour, they can find a place where the fear for the guilt of their forefathers can disappear. Only here, they may know for certain that nobody will blame them for their blood. Even in America they could not have found such safety.

CONCLUSION

To end this discussion, I would like to raise my last question: anti-Semitism, does it exist? At the first glance this question seems to be at least strange, if not absurd. Whether anti-Semitism is not a fact of an everyday life? It is not only exists, it is widespread. However, what is widespread, is not anti-Semitism, if we define anti-Semitism as a hatred towards the Jews. We know a different forms of this hatred. One of them is a hatred towards the Jews as towards the "chosen nation" on the part of some other nation, which claim to be chosen. This was the hatred of Nazi-Germans. However, this anti-Semitism is not a pure anti-Semitism. Or, better, it is not anti-Semitism at all. The Jews were hated by Nazis not as a race, but precisely because Nazis thought that the Jews are an obstacle for their own chosenness. Thus, Nazis hated the Jews not as a race (people of such and such biological and physiological features) but as a nation, which from their point of view represents the embodiment of some idea. Thus, Nazis failed to distinguish between the Jews as a race and the Jewish nation. They were not racists in fact, they were Nazis, that is, they made an idol of their own nation. Yes, they spoke about the Aryan race, opposing it to other races, particularly the Jewish. However, their ideology was based on the National-Socialism. What they tried, but failed to do, is to distinguish the race from nation.

There is yet another kind of anti-Semitism, so-called Christian anti-Semitism. It consists of a hatred toward the Jews as toward the people which failed to accept Christ and crucified him. In other words, the Jews are hated in this case on the ground of the negative attitude towards their religious belief. And again, it is not the race of the Jews which is hated here, but the race which is mixed up in the minds of so-called anti-Semites with some religion.

Let me consider yet another type of "anti-Semitism", namely the hatred towards the Jews as towards the race which is in conspiracy against the whole world. It is clear that here again we meet with the failure to distinguish the race from an idea.

Finally, there is a sort of primitive anti-Semitism, when the Jews are hated on the ground of their alleged cunning behaviour, avarice, parasitism, and so on. Those who hate the Jews on this ground, also fail to distinguish the race from the cultural and psychological ideas or types. There is an idea of

avarice or, say, parasitism in the minds of haters of the Jews, and they connect this idea with this race. Nobody can hate some race as such, not projecting some idea on the race.

It may seem from the analysis which I have made above that pure anti-Semitism is impossible. Yes, it is impossible, if we define anti-Semitism as a hatred towards the Jews. But there is still another way to be anti-Semite: to deprive the Jews of existence not physically, but theoretically (though no theory ends just like that, in theory, it seeks to be realized in practice). What I mean, is first of all the ideas of Marx. It was nobody else, but Marx who, hating his own blood, had a dream of disappearance of the Jewish nation, of its complete emancipation (see his article "On the Jewish question" in "Deutsche-Französische Jahrbucher" and a chapter on the Jewish question in "Die heilige Familie"). Marx thought that in a modern secular world where the Jews do not believe in God any more, the only source (reason) for existence of this nation as such is capitalism (money, which became the new god for the Jews). Thus, this nation is entirely superfluous. The Jewish question can be solved with an abolition of capitalism. The Jews as people will simply disappear. But even anti-Semitism of Marx is not the last type of anti-Semitism, not the pure one. Marx still thought that there was some ground for existence of this people in the past, there is some ground for its existence in the present, though there will be no ground for its existence in the future.

There is still another way to be anti-Semite: to deny that the Jews really exist. This anti-Semitism is the only pure one, because in its substance "anti-Semitism" means negation of the Semites (i.e. the Jews). Those who hate the Jews, or his own blood (his past) at least acknowledge that they do exist. Sometimes, as in the case of Nazis, they would like to deprive the Jews of being. However, from the very beginning even Nazis (even Marx) acknowledge the existence of the Jews. Moreover, they take this existence in account as seriously as it possible.

True anti-Semites, pure anti-Semites are those who deny the existence of the Jews. One may say, what a strange idea! who can deny that the Jews do exist?! What an absurd idea! Yes, this idea is a strange one. Nevertheless, even logically speaking it is not excluded altogether. Such a thought about the Jews is possible. Moreover, if one feels hatred toward the Jews or if one, being a Jew himself, feels that one is hated, to get rid from this hatred (to teach others and oneself how one should think about such things as race), one may propose a cunning idea: There is no such a thing as "race" or "nationality" or, say, "sex". Only persons, or individuals do exist. Such persons may have different features, different peculiarities, which characterize them. Moreover one may add: It is precisely this idea of existence of the Jewish race, which is a source of anti-Semitism. If we get rid of this idea, of the idea of "race" as such, we may overcome the problem of anti-Semitism, and the problem of all national conflicts. There are only individuals with different features, there are no races at all.

What a temptation to think in this way! This temptation, however, is not something unreal, especially having in mind a modern quest for the solution to national conflicts, particularly in Europe. One, being a Christian may say: each of us is a human being, a person, an image of God, what matter how we look like, or what language we use (one may learn any language in fact, make any culture his own). Take for example the Russian Jewry. The Jews in Russia often do not know either any of the Jewish languages, nor the Jewish culture, neither religion. They speak Russian, they are brought up in the Russian culture.

To say that they are Russians, is also not true, it may offend both, the Russians and the Jews. The best way possible to avoid this national problems, is not to use such concepts as "race" at all. Each of us is a human being with his own peculiarities. It is enough.

Moreover, this so-to-speak "humanism" may use as its support the Christian ideas. It may say: Yes, there was such a thing as racial and national divisions, but after Christ they are abolished. Was it not Christ himself who has destroyed the wall of separation between the Jews and the Gentiles, barbarians and Skiffs, in a word, between all races and nations?

Yes, we Orthodox Christians do believe that Christ has destroyed the wall of separation between the Jews and the Gentiles, as between races in general. It was in Pentecost, when in the Holy Spirit all nations or races of the world were called to participate in one Covenant of God. However, even the ancient, pagan world did not know such a racial hatred as the modern world does. Christ has destroyed the wall of separation, nevertheless, he has not abolished racial difference itself, as he has not abolished death trampling death.

The real core of Christ's mission was not to abolish racial divisions as such, but to open us a way for the love for people of the other race. In the same way now, after Christ, the way is opened to us for being not afraid of death. It is easy to love a "man" in general an abstract "man". But there is no such a man in reality. It is hard to love a person of different race, culture or nation. He is the other. And Christ has opened a possibility to love the other, not a man like ourselves.

To deny the existence of racial and national divisions is both non-realistic and dangerous. Take for example the situation in Russia. After the failure to solve the national problem within the framework of communist internationalism, after the collapse of the USSR, each people of Russia seeks to confirm its national existence. Yes, there are some serious problems in this respect for minor peoples. However, the people which is in the most complicated situation, are Russians themselves (I mean Russians by blood, those who feel themselves to be Russians). It is hard for them to understand what this phrase, "Russian people" means. There is such a country as Russia. And all Russian citizens of whatever blood they could be, are Russians, if they live in Russia (even the Jews!). If now we take the Russian culture, here we can also find that both Russians by blood and non-Russians may write, say, poetry in Russian (moreover, they may write poetry in Russian, living in America and being Jews by blood, as Brodsky. What a scandal, for the Russian nationalists!). Even in the Russian Orthodox Church one may find Christians of different nationalities. Thus, Russians by blood have a serious problem of self-identification. They are afraid of being assimilated in the modern, as they call it, Western (or American) cosmopolitan internationalism. They want to find a place where they could feel themselves Russians, some typically Russian place. [Not a restaurant or club which is good for emigrants, but a place for the whole Russian people].

If now, in this situation, some "humanists" say that there is no such a thing as "race" (or blood), that is, Russians should not worry about their existence as a people, what reaction, it may provoke? Nothing, but hatred. National problems cannot be solved on the the ground of "humanism", even if it is "Christian". Moreover, they may become even more painful, if some try to solve them in this way. Each

nation, each race, should have some place where it can be not afraid of losing its existence as a unique form of humanity, which cannot be replaced by any other form of humanity, or reduced to some abstract "human nature".

Both tendencies (of reducing and replacing), working together, can be found in the modern world. The Western, especially American, pluralistic ideology teaches us to begin with the concept of "individual human being". There are individuals with their peculiar features. Those of them who have some common features and, thus, common interests organize some groups, to defend their common interests. There are "Blacks", "Jews", "homosexuals", "women", "lesbians" - all sort of groups in what ever way individuals may organise themselves. This culture (or its ideology) teaches that each group of people has its own rights, and we should respect them as such and abstain from offending people of each group acknowledging their rights and self-identification. This culture teaches us meeting with, say, a man with a black skin, immediately connect him with other man with a black skin, to avoid racism. In the same way, it teaches us to respect the rights of women while speaking with a woman, to avoid sexism, precisely by remembering that she is a woman. And so on, and so forth.

Moreover, according to the rules of the game of the pluralistic society, none of these groups can claim that it represents the Truth. There is a truth of women, truth of homosexuals, truth of the Jews, of blacks, and so on. Each part of society has its right to declare its truth, though each part should acknowledge that its truth is not the whole Truth.

This pluralism has certainly a deep roots in the Protestantism with its chain of divisions, and, on its turn, effects the religious pluralism of the West at large.

As for the problem of self-identification, it cannot be solved positively in such a society. If one participates in different groups (say, one may be "black", "homosexual", "middle-class" American) one cannot be satisfied in one's self-identification, precisely because no group or their sum does represent the whole Truth. And one cannot be satisfied, not being in the Truth, but merely participating in it.

One may certainly organise his own group. However, even in this case one cannot be satisfied (or, better one may be satisfied only for a short moment of time when one is in the process of separating oneself from one's mother-group, in the moment of individualization). However, when addressing the world, one is obliged to acknowledge immediately all other truths, and in this way one loses one's self-satisfaction.

There is still another way to be satisfied, in the Western society - to identify oneself with the very idea of pluralism - to be an ideologist of the Western society. But there are still some societies in the world which do not acknowledge pluralism. Thus, an ideologist of the pluralism is obliged either to treat them as entirely untrue, or acknowledge that they have their own truth. If he acknowledges that they have their own truth, he cannot be a true pluralist any more, because in this case he acknowledges some other idea, which is impossible for him as for pluralist. Thus, he loses his job.

However, if he denies that other, non-pluralistic societies have any truth, he calls them the "empire of evil". In this way he acknowledges that evil exists. He becomes a Manichean. He dedicates his life to

the struggle with Evil, and being an ideologist, he involves his nation in this struggle. But since Evil still exists, he cannot be in peace with himself, nor his society.

Pluralistic society is a society of divisions, society of a nuclear reaction, of a split, which nobody can stop. The origin of this split is clear: Individuals, or small groups go away from their mother-groups to organise some new groups. But these new ones cannot satisfy anybody either. At the same time pluralistic society is monolithic as regards other, non-pluralistic societies. Nobody who participates in the game of pluralistic society can be satisfied. However, the energy of the split, the energy of division remains within the monolithic society. The society preserves this energy, and accumulates its force.

On the other hand, we, in Russia, have tendencies of a different kind. During the years of totalitarianism there was only one truth which claimed to be the Truth, held in society. And even the Church's hierarchs were obliged to acknowledge this communist ideology as the only true one, at least for the life in this world. As regards the life after death, Christians were allowed to have their own opinions, it was not a serious problem for the communist ideology.

Feeling itself to be in the Truth, this society was not happy about the existence of other societies, with other ideologies, because there can be only one Truth. It tried to spread its Truth in other countries. It was in confrontation with the countries of the West, with the pluralistic societies.

Now Russian society has no Truth of its own. To some extent it has accepted the pluralistic model of the West. However, the Western democracy has two dimensions of its being:

1. the dynamism of inner divisions (the nuclear reaction which gives the energy for the life of society), and
2. its monolithic attitude towards the external, non-pluralistic societies, which are treated as "evil".

As for Russia, the West is no more the enemy for our country. Such countries as China, have their own problems and are not aggressive or strong enough at the moment. Moreover, Russia is not yet devoted to the values of the pluralism enough to be its serious defender and propagandist abroad. Thus, there is no ground for any ideology to consolidate the Russian nation. And without this consolidation the process of inner divisions of the nuclear split which is typical for pluralistic societies, does not lead to the accumulation of energy (as it happens, say, in America), but leads only to the waste of the energy of the Russian nation.

Thus, some, who worry about the future of the country and seek to play their role in it, gaining power to save Russia, voluntary or involuntary come to the idea that there is no other way to consolidate the Russian nation than in its opposition to the West (beginning with the opposition to the Western values). Insofar as communism has failed to win the Cold war, they see no other variant than to use what they understand as typically Russian - the Russian Orthodox Church, to consolidate the Russian nation. They seek to proclaim Russia as "the Orthodox country."

But since there is an Orthodox Church, say, in America, England, France, Syria, Greece, they cannot proclaim that Orthodoxy is something typically Russian. The only possibility to say such a thing can be opened if they say that all other Orthodox Churches are not Orthodox at all, and only the Russian

Orthodox Church is true (one exception is made for Serbia, since the Serbs are the first enemies of the West).

I do not want to judge the Orthodox Church dwelling in the West. She has her own problems of existence in the pluralistic societies, where pluralism and its ancestor humanism propose their own seduction to the Church. If the Orthodox Church, for example, is ready to call Christians of other confessions "the Church" (say, the Anglican Church), she voluntarily or involuntarily participates in the pluralistic games of this world, losing her mission to be the witness for the world to come, for the oneness of all in Christ.

However my responsibility lies within the Russian Orthodox Church. Here I see another even more serious danger: to make an ideology out of the Orthodox Church. Yes, it is true that Russian politicians are seeking for the ideology to win the power and to consolidate the nation. And the situation in the world and in world's history is such that the only ideology which can consolidate the Russian nation now should be anti-Western. And there is no other serious ground to build anti-Western ideology than by proclaiming Orthodoxy as something typically Russian, denying the Orthodoxy of the Orthodox Church in the West.

Thus, the Russian Orthodox Church is faced with the greatest temptation in her history, which is even more serious than during the years of the Revolution and communism. Those politicians who seek power, are comparatively weak without the support of the Church, having no authority among the Russian nation. They promise all the goods of the world to the Church's hierarchs and the Church in general, if only they gain power. They promise to abolish the spread of any non-Orthodox religions in Russia, they promise to promote religious education at school. They promise to share political power with the Church, and so on and so forth...

However, in spite of all sufferings of our country, in spite of all temptations on the part of politicians and ideologists (who above all speculate on the glorious past of our Church, on her role in the Russian history), above all these temptations, **OUR CHURCH SHOULD NOT ALLOW TO USE HER HOLY NAME IN THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER, IN THE IDEOLOGY.** She should not allow to declare Russia as the only one true Orthodox country in the world. These ideas are nothing else but spiritual cancer, satanic temptation.

Even if the Orthodox Church in the West does make some mistakes, even if all Orthodox Churches dwelling in the Western countries one day go astray, the Russian Orthodox Church should not allow to proclaim her the only true one. There is only one true Orthodox Church - the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, in which we believe according to our Creed. We do not say: I believe in the Russian Orthodox Church.

Yes, it would be a serious dogmatic mistake to say that the Russian Orthodox Church is not the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. The Orthodox Church in each country is one and the same Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. However, one cannot say, that the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church is the Russian Orthodox Church. This difference between the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church and the Russian Orthodox Church should be preserved in our mind. Otherwise we cannot safely go through the temptations of our time.

If now we return to the Jewish question, one may acknowledge that as usual, attitude towards the Jews may serve as a touch stone of spiritual health (now of the Church). Facing the phenomenon of post-Auschwitz theology which has won in the West, Russian "Orthodox" ideologists have no other idea than to invent something opposite (they are happy in fact to do it, making out of post-Auschwitz theology a nice pretext for consolidating people on the ground of cursing the West Christianity).

This kind of thing is quite usual, by the way, in the history of Christianity. Christian anti-Judaism, and anti-Semitism, was often a reaction to the eternal divisions among Christians themselves in their attitude towards the Jews. The real debate was never between Christians and Jews but among Christians (see John G. Gager "The Origins of anti-Semitism, Oxford University Press, 1985 p. 269). While one part of Christians was attracted to Judaism other was convicting it, often using anti-Judaism (and anti-Semitism) as its tool.

I do not mean that one should not convict Judaism or post-Auschwitz theology. I myself in this paper have said a lot on this matter. However, while convicting Judaism or post-Auschwitz theology one should always draw the difference between the Jews as a people and Judaism as a religion. If this difference is not drawn, if the Jews as a people are cursed for all sins of Judaism and non-Orthodox Christianity, then, we may say, that Orthodoxy is seriously ill.

And it is of special importance, because there are a lot of Jews who have come to the Orthodox Church in Russia, and even more who might have come, if only this anti-Semitism were not in the Orthodox Church.

The same thing is with opposing the West in general. The Russian Orthodox Church should teach her members that they should not be anti-American. We have no right to blame any nation, any race. Our enemies are not flesh and blood, but the evil spirits. It is not only the "Western world" which lies in evil. "Russian world", lies in evil either. Or, better, as our Church teaches, the whole world, "world" as such lies in evil. Yet, she teaches that Christ has vanquished the world.

There is only one place for each nation, for each race where it may find peace, where it may become itself, where it may be cured. This place is the Church, the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, God's beloved Israel. If only one man from some race comes to the Church, it means that all his race comes to the Church, being in him. For our nation (or race) is in us. Only in the Church we can be cured from the painful divisions of our humanity, these divisions between nations and races which are described in the story about the tower of Babylon. It is only the one Catholic Apostolic Church, where the event of Pentecost, in which every nation and race is called to participate in God's Covenant, which has continued since the time of the Apostles.