

A PROBLEM AND AN APPEAL

*A Necessary Presupposition for the beginning and the success
of the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox
and the Roman Catholic Churches.*

B Y

Prof. CHRYSOSTOMOS - GERASSIME ZAPHIRIS
Metropolitan of Peristerion

Those who are involved in and concerned with the Ecumenical Movement and the rapprochement between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches closely followed with lively interest and much satisfaction the meeting of the Joint Orthodox—Roman Catholic Coordinating Subcommittee which met in Rome last March (29 March—1 April). This meeting between representatives of the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches had been decided by the Full Orthodox Technical Commission on Dialogue with the Roman Catholics at its last meeting held at the Patriarchal Centre in Chambésy, Geneva (14—18 November 1977)¹ in order to prepare the Theological Dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church.

1. The establishment of the «Inter-Orthodox Technical Commission of Theologians dates back to the seven - year period following the lifting of the anathemata between Rome and Constantinople, when the Ecumenical Patriarchate addressed its No. 697 Encyclical and Patriarchal Letter of November 1974 to the local Orthodox Churches. In this Encyclical, which is of invaluable historical significance, the Ecumenical Patriarchate speaks about «the need to establish a special Inter-Orthodox Technical Commission of Theologians which would undertake for the moment the task of gathering and evaluating the conclusions reached by the Local Orthodox Churches in their individual study of the bi-lateral dialogue between Orthodox and Roman Catholics, and of setting a common Pan-Orthodox course and understanding on the matter».

Following the acceptance of the proposal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate by the Local Orthodox Churches, Ecumenical Patriarch Demetrios addressed a special message to His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, in which he informs the Pope of the Eastern Orthodox Church's decision to «advance the sacred matter of the ties with Rome and to progress from the Dialogue of Love to the preparation of the Theological Dialogue with her. Thus following Pan-Orthodox deliberation we have ar-

Both the Orthodox and Roman Catholic sides stressed the necessity and the benefits to be derived from the imminent Theological Dialogue (of love in truth) between the two Churches. Moreover, both sides displayed and discerned in each other a spirit of brotherhood, mutual understanding and good will, and a desire to discuss in depth and breadth the theological differences existing between the two Churches.

Following the meeting of the Joint Coordinating Subcommittee, which set the initial framework of subjects and method within which the dialogue is to be carried on, the two Churches began to prepare more systematically for a Theological Dialogue which promises to be not only lengthy but also difficult and many-sided. As one can easily discern, this dialogue is to be the most essential and the greatest—from both an ecclesiastico-historical and an ecclesiological view-point—ever to delve into, and create issues for, the theologies of both Churches and their representatives and theologians. This holds true not only for the Roman Catholic Church but also for the Orthodox which already for a considerable length of time has been engaged in dialogue with the Anglicans, Old-Catholics and other Protestant Churches. The dialogue with the Church of Rome, however, presents the following peculiarity: *Theologically*, both Churches, acknowledging the value and importance of Sacred Tradition as being parallel to that of Holy Scripture, and within this dimension of Tradition, especially as constituting the teaching and entire life of the Church of the first eight centuries, find themselves very close to each other. *Psychologically*, they find themselves farther apart from each other than they are from, let us say, the Anglicans and certain other Protestant Churches. Many Orthodox Theologians, starting out from the psychological factors, emphatically maintain that the Theological Dialogue between Orthodoxy and Protestantism for example is easier in certain respects than that between Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism—despite the fact that the Roman Catholic Church is closer to Orthodoxy than Protestantism is in general, especially as regards its teaching.

Thus there is a theological affinity, but at the same time also a historico-psychological distance which must be taken into serious consideration.

rived at the Pan-Orthodox decision to establish a special Inter-Orthodox Technical Commission in order to prepare the dialogue on the part of the Orthodox (see *Episkepsis*, Issue VII, 1976 (No. 130/2 p. 42).

In order to bridge this historico-psychological «gap» — for there are those who view matters more pessimistically and openly talk of a «gap» — between the two Churches, various initiatives have been taken from time to time and various meetings have taken place between the leaders of the two Churches and between their representatives. These contacts, visits and meetings — sometimes held on a theological level — between responsible representatives of these Churches have «broken the ice» which existed for centuries between the two Churches, and in some measure have broken the barrier of hostile polemics. Yet the historico-psychological distance which has existed between them for centuries continues to remain unbridged, even though it appears to have been reduced in some way, apparently if not in reality.

Without a doubt, the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church, whenever visiting the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the other Autocephalous Orthodox Churches, bear messages of love, brotherhood, good will and cooperation from the Primate of the Western Church. These messages strike a positive response in the souls of the Orthodox; yet without being able to take root in them. Thus, judging things from a perspective of long-term duration, we say that these have not brought forth the fruits anticipated and this because the Orthodox — and I am here referring at least to the faithful of the Church of Greece — continue to display a distrust for the written or oral declarations emanating from the Vatican. They continue to be instilled with a kind of phobia and distrust for the pronouncements of the Roman Catholic Church, and understandably so, because they have suffered much. And these sufferings are not simply things of the past, for were they such, the Orthodox people and the younger generation could easily cast them into oblivion.

On the contrary, the Roman Catholic Church's entire negative policy towards the Orthodox which we have in mind at this particular point and which is a cause of uneasiness for the Orthodox people, though having ceased in the manner in which it used to be carried on, still continues to exist in a new garb and in various external forms. That which has not changed in the Roman Catholic Church's policy toward the Orthodox is the inner intention of its outward manifestations and the ultimate purpose towards which these tend over a long duration of time and which was, is and will be the undermining of Orthodoxy through the Unia².

2. This is also the final conclusion of the meeting of the Heads and Repre-

* * *

It is our humble opinion that the indication of good disposition and brotherhood, cooperation and unity between the two Churches very often spoken about by the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church must of necessity and immediately be combined with the abolition of Roman Catholic propaganda and the repeal of the scandalous installation of a Uniat hierarch in the midst of an Orthodox pleroma. If the Unia is not done away with, then the various contacts between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches, which from time to time have taken place, and the dialogue, that of love first and then that of truth (i.e. the Theological Dialogue), cannot be considered as being carried on «in obedience to the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren» (I Peter 1,22).

Moreover, the Pan-Orthodox Conference of Rhodes clearly and precisely defined those conditions under which the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholics could begin. The first indispensable condition set by this Conference for the beginning of such a dialogue was that it be carried on «on an equal basis». In their discussions the participants in this Conference firmly put forth as an actual and permanent presupposition for the dialogue with the Roman Catholics that Church's abolition of the Unia and the subjection and embodiment of the so-called Uniat churches within the Church of Rome and its canonical hierarchy.

No local Orthodox Church can either abrogate or even temporarily set aside this basic and fundamental Pan-Orthodox presupposition for the inception of the Theological Dialogue. As a decision of a Pan-Orthodox Conference it possesses a universal (catholic) ecclesio-

sentatives of the Orthodox Churches, held in Moscow in 1948. Clearly, sincerely, and with a sense of full responsibility as spiritual leaders, they declared that «throughout the course of many centuries and up to the present time, Papism, through bloody wars and acts of violence of every kind, has attempted to proselytize the Orthodox and to convert them to Roman Catholicism either directly or indirectly through the Unia, as they did for example to the Romanians in Transylvania in 1700, to the Bulgarians in Turkey in 1859/60 and to the 240,000 Serbian Albanians and Croats during the last World War, and as they did in Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Ukraine and Byelorussia. For the bishops of Rome, kings of a secular state (Patromonium Sancti Petri), this policy has always been the supreme law». (quoted from J. Karmiris, *The Dogmatic and Symbolic Monuments of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, Vol II² pp. 1047-1048).

logical dimension for the Orthodox and an analogous character. The establishment of a Technical Commission of Theologians for the preparation of the Theological Dialogue between the two Churches, the meeting of the members of the Joint Coordinating Sub-commission of Orthodox and Roman Catholics as well as the official exchange of visits in no way signify an over-stepping or by-passing of this Pan-Orthodox decision which, as we have well emphasized above, refers not to the preparatory stage of the Dialogue, but to the Theological Dialogue itself. When the time shall arrive for the beginning of the Dialogue, this Pan Orthodox decision will constitute the condition *sine qua non* and the dividing line between the «yes» and «no», between the «possumus» and the «non possumus» in this dialogue³.

The decision taken by the Church of Greece on this matter is clear. It agrees that a dialogue be initiated and carried on with the Roman Catholic Church under two basic conditions: *first*, no Uniat (cleric or layman) is to participate either in the Technical Commission for the Preparation of the dialogue nor in the Theological Commission which shall carry on the dialogue itself, and *secondly*, the Roman Catholic Church must cease its propaganda against the Church of Greece's pleroma and no longer appoint an Uniat Archbishop to Athens. This explicit decision taken by the Church of Greece was conveyed by me on orders of my Church to the members of the Inter-Orthodox Technical Commission of Theologians at the Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Chambésy⁴.

3. Herein we must especially underline the fact that the carrying out of the Theological Dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church, as decided by four Pan-Orthodox Conferences, was postponed by the Third and Fourth Pan-Orthodox Conference solely because this indispensable prerequisite, i.e. the abolition of the Unia, was not met. According to the decisions of the Pan-Orthodox Conferences, the preservation of the Unia «constitutes a great obstacle for the carrying on of the dialogue».

4. With all sincerity and boldness and yet at the same time with a spirit of Christian love and a sense of ecclesiastical responsibility, His Beatitude, Archbishop Seraphim of Athens and all Greece, some years ago while referring to the Unia stated straight-forwardly that «the Unia does not unite, it divides. This is the general opinion prevalent within Orthodoxy on the matter, and we are fortunate in that by so speaking we believe ourselves to be expressing the general view-point of the Orthodox Church on the question of the Unia... For the Church of Greece the appointment of a new Uniat bishop for the handful of Uniats who constitute the Uniat parish in Greece has caused distress between us and the Roman Catholic Church... In no way can we, as Greek Orthodox in particular, or as Orthodox in general, toler-

The Apostolic Church of Greece has put forth the abolition of the Unia as an essential prerequisite for the commencement of the Theological Dialogue. She has done so for purely theological and ecclesiological reasons and not because she is in any danger from the small Uniat community in Greece. The Church of Greece insists upon the above-mentioned prerequisite even after the historical decision taken at Constantinople by Patriarch Demetrios and Pope John Paul II during the latter's recent visit to Turkey to begin the Theological Dialogue.

*
* *

The problem of the Unia is not only a problem for the Church of Greece but for all of Orthodoxy, which attaches great importance and gravity to the solving of this problem. This priority given by the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East to the solution of this problem is not due exclusively to the actions of the Unia against Orthodoxy but also to purely ecclesiological reasons. This is quite clear, for the propaganda spread by the Roman Catholic Church through the Unia is nothing more than two different manifestations of a distorted theological conception of the «Church», a conception unknown to the theology of the undivided Church of the first eight centuries, and which arose from the legalistic, scholastic and Aristotelian structure of the Roman spirit that transformed the Roman Catholic Church from a purely ecclesiastical entity into an ecclesio-political organization. As precisely such an organization it at first came into conflict with New Rome (1054) in two ways: a) by its ecclesiastical make-up, and b) by its political and autocratic extentions. It later came into conflict with the German Empire and other Roman Catholic Nations and governments in Europe (1073/5 and following).

It is our sincere belief that if the Vatican were to abolish and denounce her propoganda and the Unia, it would signify the «de-politization» and «de-Romanization» of the Roman Catholic Church.

*
* *

It is impossible to conceive of a dialogue of love — let alone a

ate the perpetuation within the bosom of the Orthodox Church of an illegitimate presence such as that of the Unia. («For the entire text see the Statement in *Episkepsis*, Issue No. VI 1975, pp. 6-9).

Theological Dialogue of truth in love — at a time when the Unia continues to act to the detriment of Orthodoxy and to constitute a stumbling block for the entire Ecumenical Movement. The Vatican's church policy in Greece⁵, the Middle East and towards the Eastern Orthodox Churches has up to the present clearly demonstrated that it continues its ambivalent tactics, always in accordance with its interests and expediency, which in these particular areas in many ways is dependent upon a strong and dynamic Unia, through which it seeks to spread its influence, i.e. to undermine those in whose midst the Unia functions, thereby strengthening the secular character of the Roman Catholic Church.

Contrary to what Roman Catholic Theologians incessantly claim, the Unia is not that necessary thing needed to bridge the gap and close the psychological distance separating Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism. On the contrary, the Unia only serves to widen the existing psychological chasm and to lessen the possibilities of solving theological differences. This is true because the Unia is not the outgrowth of theological differences. If it were, then, once having cut themselves off from the body of the Orthodox Church they should have joined themselves with the Roman Catholic Church—without any sort of distinction. The Unia, however, is purely the consequence of the ecclesiastico-political structure and character of the Western Church. The Roman Catholic Church has elevated the Unia to the rank of a special system and has made its operation one of the chief aims of its missionary activities. Under the guise of preserving the Orthodox liturgical rites and Church customs, the Roman Catholic Church has managed to impose upon the Uniats, of course through pressures brought upon them by the State, the innovations of Papal primacy and *Filioque*. Since the Unia is the child of ecclesiastico-political and not ecclesiological factors, it has only a single goal in view: the undermining of Orthodoxy, especially where the Orthodox population is homegenous.

5. It should be mentioned in passing that the Roman Catholic Church, not content with the five dioceses (of Syros, Tenos, Naxos, Thyra and Kerkyra) provided by the Protocol of London (1830-1923) and the Treaty of 1864 concerning the Ionian Islands, arbitrarily added a sixth diocese, viz., that of Athens. Immediately upon its establishment (1912) it appointed the French citizen, Louis Petit as «Archbishop of Athens», a title used for purposes of political expediency and religious propaganda. However, he was never recognized as such: the State and naturally the Church recognizing only the signature of the Priest of the Church of St. Dionysios the Areopagite as valid.

In accordance with this ecclesiastico-political activity of the Vatican then, not only is the proselytism of Orthodox attempted, chiefly in the more poverty-stricken areas, but also the abrogation of internationally recognised and legally established privileges of the Orthodox Church. We refer here chiefly to the Roman Catholic Church's attempt to overturn the status quo of the Sacred Shrines in the Holy Land for her own benefit and naturally at the expense of the Orthodox Church, which prevails in this area, and to the detriment of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre. Proof of this are the Vatican's contacts with various political representatives of the Middle-East countries and countries of the Eastern Block. These political deliberations of the Vatican about the future of the Sacred Shrines were carried on not only in absence of, but also in complete ignorance of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem which is the unique and exclusive Church authority, able by contractual and legal power and by privileges internationally granted, to speak responsibly about the future of the Sacred Shrines in the Holy Land and to come into contact with the political authorities in this highly sensitive and volatile geographical area.

*
* *

In the light of the ecclesio-political activity of the Vatican State and the overthrow of the age-long historical privileges of the Eastern Orthodox Church, we must examine the now celebrated letter of Pope John Paul II to the Uniat Archbishop of the Ukraine, Cardinal Joseph Slipiy (19 March 1979).

Through this letter the Pope clearly and expressedly ignored Church History and attempted to attribute a significance and content to the Uniat community in Ukrainia which it does not possess. The Pope tried to achieve this by characterizing the Ukrainian Uniat community as the most authentic expression of the Church of Russia. It was only natural that both the letter and the spirit of the Papal epistle provoked the indignation of all the Orthodox Churches, and especially that of the Russian Church whose name is nowhere mentioned in the letter.

This letter caused much sorrow and disappointment in the hearts and consciences of the Orthodox World. Furthermore, it disarmed the Orthodox Ecumenists and provided the anti-ecumenical circles with a perfect opportunity to confirm and verify their argument that basi-

cally the Vatican has not changed its tactics, but continues its activities under a new guise.

The Russian Church expressed its reaction to the Pope's epistle to Cardinal Slipiy in a special letter addressed to the Vatican by Metropolitan Juvenaliy of Krutitsy and Kolomna, President of the Russian Church's Commission on Foreign Relations. In answer, a reply which attempted to explain away the matter was sent by Cardinal Willebrands to Metropolitan Juvenaliy, but it failed to satisfy the heads of the Russian Church because the Church of Russia is not, according to Cardinal Willebrands, the sole «heir to the glorious tradition of St. Vladimir», but only «an heir» (*Une heretière*) of this tradition, the other being the Uniat Community of Ukrainia.

Generally speaking, both the Pope's letter to Cardinal Slipiy and Cardinal Willebrand's reply to Metropolitan Juvenaliy clearly demonstrate just how sincere and objective the Theological Dialogue which is about to commence between Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism is going to be! Likewise, these letters clearly present the ulterior motives for which the Roman Catholics desire the Theological Dialogue with the Orthodox Church. We must underline herein, once and for all, that while the predispositions of both sides which are to engage in dialogue appear to be absolutely identical, deep-down they are in fact quite different. This furthermore derives from the Pope's letter which a) somewhat smells of medieval Roman Catholic Church policy and possesses nothing of the qualities characterizing today's age of inter-Christian dialogue; b) contradicts all that Vatican II has decreed concerning the relations between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches; c) tears down the entire structure which the ever-memorable Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras and the progressive personality of the late Paul VI succeeded in erecting with their many struggles and sacrifices; d) rekindles the former claims of the Holy See over the Orthodox Churches and attempts at diminishing the missionary labors of the Ecumenical Patriarchate which, according to the text of the Pope's letter, Christianized the Russians in particular, and the Slavs in general, not directly but through Rome: a contention which is historically unfounded; e) creates a climate of mistrust and coldness between the two Churches, and this coldness will naturally have a negative effect upon the forth-coming Theological Dialogue between the two Churches. An indispensable presupposition for its success is the cultivation of a climate of mutual trust and understanding and not one of mistrust and expediency.

The conviction of the Head of the Roman Catholic Church that «the union of Brest retains up to the present its ecclesiastical and religious force» greatly perplexes the Orthodox who are to carry on the Theological Dialogue. The Holy See's view of the Unia as an important means for the restoration of the unity and union of the Churches certainly makes the Dialogue, if not impossible, at least extremely difficult, and its outcome most doubtful and problematic. The Orthodox are extremely sensitive about the Unia as our Roman Catholic brethren well know. And for the common welfare of both Churches the Pope at all costs should have avoided provoking this sensitivity in the above-mentioned letter.

Especially sensitive on this issue is the pleroma of the Apostolic Church of Greece, the only Orthodox Church possessing both free theological thought and the determination to labor for the union of the Churches without giving way even in the least to the ecclesio-political pressures of the Vatican. It is now a well-known secret that the Church of Greece constitutes one of the main targets of the Vatican's ecclesio-political policy. Besides, this has become common knowledge from both past and present acts of the Vatican, and most especially from its recent establishment of diplomatic relations with Greece—despite the strong protests of the Church of Greece, evoked not from political, but from purely theological and ecclesiological considerations. This act has once again wounded the Church of Greece's sensitivity, and she is seriously asking herself what are the Vatican's real designs and ulterior motives.

*
* *

One could point out a number of such events which have as their purpose the understating, limiting and confining of Orthodoxy's work and activity. However, such an enumeration would lead us away from the main purpose of this paper. Besides these events are widely known⁶.

6. Besides the related steps taken by the Vatican in the recent past, we could mention, symptomatically, the information spread about a special agreement between the Vatican and the Egyptian Government to establish a tripart religious Tabernacle on Mt. Sinai. This would contain a Moslem Mosque, a Christian Church and a Jewish Synagogue in order to emphasize the convergence of the three great monotheistic religions in one and the same place. The initiative belongs to the Moslems.

Should this information be verified, then we believe that no further comment is necessary, for every man of good faith will naturally ask himself: «Doesn't the Orthodox Church's centuries-old presence on Mt. Sinai count for anything?»

Here, however, only one fact should be especially underlined: that such initiatives, more of a political than an ecclesiological nature, doubtlessly well prepared and carefully planned, undertaken by the Vatican hamper the dialogue, which essentially becomes not a dialogue of love, nor a dialogue of truth, but simply a dialogue of appearances, or more correctly, a dialogue having ecclesiastico-political aims rather than one advancing the unity of the Churches

The continuing employment of propaganda at present and especially that emanating from the Unia under different forms and shapes, can in no way be compromised with all that the Vatican officially proclaims. Nor can it be harmoniously included within the framework of the impending Theological dialogue, let alone the Dialogue of Love, which as such must needs be at least «unfeigned». The simultaneous carrying on of the Theological Dialogue of truth in love and illicit prosyletism against the Orthodox Church through the Unia, which has been repeatedly condemned in so many ways in the consciences of the Orthodox, can in no way be compromised theologically, ecclesiologicaly or psychologically⁷.

*
* *

In the eyes and conscience of the Orthodox pleroma, the Vatican, through the ecclesiastico-political tactics that it employs appears, — and we say this with deep sorrow — to be inconsistent with all that it has proclaimed from time to time in regard to the Orthodox Eastern Church. Both the Eastern Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches should, for the general welfare of Christianity and for the sake of Christian unity, abandon those emotional attachments which from the inception of the Ecumenical Movement up to the present have defined in many ways their relations, and delve into the depth of their differences, those regarding Christian truth and not the emotions of their respective pleromata. Emotions in themselves are not sufficient for the uni-

7. The recent appointment of a new Uniat Bishop by the Roman Catholic Church, despite the brotherly counsel the Church of Greece to the contrary, clearly shows that the Vatican, despite the recent opening in the relations between East and West, has no desire to serve the cause of the unification of the Churches and Confessions at the expense of her own self-interests. This act of the Curia Romana, a strong politico-ecclesiastical organisation of the Vatican, demonstrates nothing but contempt for the Church of Greece. It is an act miles apart from the brotherly love in Christ proclaimed by the Vatican.

fying of the two Churches. On the contrary, they can lead to decisions similar to those taken in the past, both at Lyons and at Florence. But the question arises: Is this what we are now seeking? And is this unforgivable repetition of past errors to be tolerated? Of course not. In order to avoid just such a thing — in which case «the last error shall be worse than the first»—it is imperative that we give priority to the study of the faith and the revealed truth, which in no way must be sacrificed, even for the sake of love and concord. And it must in no way be sacrificed or compromised because such a compromise is tantamount to a betrayal of truth itself⁸.

*
* *

The Orthodox Church ardently desires «to promote the holy cause of sacred ties with Rome and to move from the dialogue of love to the preparation of a theological dialogue with her»⁹. This desire has been expressed by Pan-Orthodox decision. Nevertheless, this impending dialogue must be executed on the basis of certain presuppositions: one of these is, as we have already stated, the complete abolition of the Unia and the propaganda and corrosion exercised by it against the Orthodox.

The Orthodox approach the table of theological discussions with a full and clear diagnosis of the evil which *par excellence* poisons the relations between the Eastern and Western Churches. It is up to the Roman Catholic Church, and to her alone, to either combat or sustain this evil, which disturbs and tries in every manner to undermine the body of the Orthodox Church. The course of the theological dialogue and the restoration of union between the two Churches will, in the main, depend upon the positive or negative position taken by the Roman Catholic Church in regard to this evil, for every possible agreement will stumble against the matter of the Unia. Consequently, no agreement whatsoever will possess the power of validity for the life of the faithful. Rather it will be simply an achievement of some theological coincidence or coincidences, a sterile paper document addressed solely to

8. Cf. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans*, 22,2: «If you observe piety being overlooked in any point, do not prefer concord to truth, but rather remain steadfast in truth even unto death... and never betray it».

9. Message of the Ecumenical Patriarch Demetrios to Pope Paul, in *Episkopsis*, issue VII, 1976, p. 14.

theologians and not expressing the inner soul nor contributing to the pastoral mission of the Church.

The late Melkite Patriarch Maximos IV who, as it is known, was leader of the Uniats, during the historical meeting of Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I and Pope Paul VI, made the following significant, and indeed, true statement: «If we are an obstacle in the path leading to the unity of the Churches, then we should get out of the way». The Orthodox Church has, does, and will never cease to proclaim with a loud voice that the Unia not only constitutes an obstacle but is also an insurmountable obstruction to the union of the Churches.

*
* *

In order to surmount this obstruction we most ardently appeal to our sister Roman Catholic Church and ask that she proceed to the accomplishment of this act of good will and abolish the Unia. And then, as brothers, inspired solely by «dove unfeigned» and with a view toward restoring Church unity we shall proceed to the Dialogue of Truth, upon the completion of which we shall be able, by the Lord's grace, to share the common cup.

Of course this cannot be achieved so long as the Unia continues its existence, for the Unia acts, either directly or indirectly, in a destructive way in every form and in every stage of any serious and responsible Theological Dialogue, as well as in every effort to advance the cause of the union of the Churches.

Will the election of His Holiness, the new Pope *John* (in the love and calling of the beloved disciple), *Paul* (in the faith and hope of the Apostle of the Nations), give us the possibility to look forward in the near future to this gesture of good will in behalf of the general welfare, viz. the abolition of the Unia?

At this point we close our appeal and our prayer with the Patriotic: «*Genoito*» (May it be sol).