

then decided to resolve the matter once and for all. On 15 March Jerzy Urban, the government spokesman, announced that the Polish authorities would enforce their ban on crucifixes in Polish schools. On the same day the Main Council of the Polish Episcopate met in Warsaw to hear an account of the Garwolin incident by Bishop Mazur. In the communique issued at the end of the session the bishops stated that they were "deeply shocked by the recent events" and demanded that crucifixes remain in the classrooms "in accordance with the wishes of Catholic society including young people". The Church's pledge to defend the crucifixes was repeated by Cardinal Glemp himself on 16 March at St John's Cathedral in Warsaw, and over 700 pupils from nine secondary schools in Warsaw signed an open letter in which they upheld the decision that to remove crucifixes was contrary to the Polish Constitution which guarantees freedom of conscience; they accused the authorities of an attempt to "enslave the Polish people".

On the same day, in his opening address

to a national conference of the Communist Party in Warsaw, General Wojciech Jaruzelski claimed that the Polish authorities were genuinely committed to good relations and cooperation with the Catholic Church. The general omitted any direct reference to the dispute over crucifixes, speaking vaguely of "misunderstandings and frictions" that arise in church-state relations, "especially in the context of the principle of the separation of Church and State". The only sign that he considers the dispute politically dangerous came with a renewed threat of "irreparable losses" which conflict between Church and State would bring, which he has been issuing at all critical moments since the imposition of martial law. General Jaruzelski absolved the authorities from any blame for recent tension and instead accused "western centres" which "manipulated strain in church-state relations". He also attacked Catholic activists who "try to turn churches into show halls [...] with the support of those who have confused the pulpit with the Radio Free Europe microphone".

GRAŻYNA SIKORSKA

## Leaders of Church and State in Hungary speak on Church-State Relations in their country

*János Kádár*

János Kádár, the First Secretary of the Hungarian Communist Party, articulated the principles on which church-state relations are conducted in Hungary while visiting Poland in October 1983. The following text from his address to an audience of workers in Warsaw on 27 October appeared in *Informationsdienst für Lutherische Minderheitskirchen in Europa* — IDL, 12/1983, 28 November 1983; and an abridged text in *Népszabadság*, 28 October 1983.

"In our country, in which more churches are active than in Poland, the situation is somewhat different from yours. We have regulated relations between the Churches and the State. I am of the opinion that we have handled these matters with principle and honour. We have made our principles quite clear. We respect the autonomy of the Churches. But we wish that the Churches should similarly respect the laws and the constitution. The Churches should also — when it is possible — be in harmony with the fundamental endeavours of the people. On these points we have been in agree-

ment. There are written agreements and other forms of understandings between the Churches and the State. In the Patriotic People's Front Communists, non-Communists and representatives from different spheres of activity work together. Here the heads of all the Churches and confessions are represented on the Front's council which encompasses the whole nation. Thus there is unity, irrespective of world-view, with regard to the efforts of the people and to the building of a socialist society. I myself participated in the last Congress of the Patriotic People's Front, at which I listened to speakers including church leaders. Furthermore, I held up as an example to others the leader of the Catholic Church, because, while this Church insists on its creeds, it equally seizes opportunities for the construction of socialism among its own people. In the midst of this gathering I would also like to speak of my meeting with Pope Paul VI. During our conversation I said that church-state relations had been regulated in Hungary. I also mentioned that, in my opinion, this is very important,

because we have helped Hungarian citizens — the faithful — to solve the important problem of their conscience. Before liberation, the system of large estates and of capitalism existed in our country. We as Communists announced that the system of large estates must be liquidated, and that the factories of the capitalists must be confiscated. At that time there lived among us a reactionary church leader\*, a man with royalist views about politics. He was the enemy of land reform and of socialism. 'Yes', I said to the Pope, 'the faithful did not know what do do. If they wanted to go to church, then they became enemies of the State and of the socialistic endeavours of the State, and if they believed in material progress, then they were the enemies of the Church. No believer can divide himself in two halves. Every believer wants to live on the earth, and he then wants — according to his faith — salvation. So what should he do?' I said to the Pope: 'Thankfully the regulation of church-state relations has succeeded in bringing about a solution of this dilemma for us. Now the believer can follow the way of progress in his everyday life, and shall no longer be considered an enemy of the State.' I respect all Hungarian citizens who do their work, because this work contributes to the building of socialism, irrespective of whether they are churchmen, party members or people without party affiliation. In this regard there is no difference between citizens. Citizens are not placed either in category one, or in category two. The personal affairs of citizens are arranged in the manner held by them to be right. One may go to church and be happy there. Others may play dominoes, drink vodka, or do something else. The important fact is that the Communists among us have no special rights, and that they have in addition a greater obligation to work more than those unconnected with the Party. All citizens have equal rights, independent of their class, of their occupations, and of their world-view."

#### *Bishop Káldy*

The candidacy of the Hungarian Lutheran Bishop Zoltán Káldy for the Presidency of the Lutheran World Federation has been the subject of much speculation. Customarily this office has been filled by the most senior clerical official of the Church hosting

the LWF's sexennial Assembly, which elects the Federation's President. According to this precedent, Bishop Káldy may have expected that his election would be a mere formality since the forthcoming Assembly is to be held in Budapest in the summer of 1984. However, public criticism has been raised of the official theology of the Hungarian Lutheran Church, "Diaconia Theology", of which Bishop Káldy is the main architect and proponent. The essence of this criticism is to be found in an article by Dr Vilmos Vajta, former Director of the Ecumenical Institute at Strasbourg, which appeared in *Lutherische Monatshefte* in March 1983.\* Such criticism has led many observers to question the suitability of Bishop Káldy to serve as the head of the world's largest Protestant body for the next six years. (See *The Lutheran*, 15 February 1984, p. 17).

To counter the negative influence of this charge, Bishop Káldy's Church has undertaken a campaign to improve his presidential prospects. The Hungarian Lutheran Church has taken the unprecedented step of announcing Bishop Káldy's candidacy before the meeting of the Assembly, and has threatened that "if the LWF consciously allows this opportunity to pass, the minority churches of Eastern Europe would rightly view this as discrimination, which would bring with it consequences for future church relations." (*Informationsdienst für Lutherische Minderheitskirchen in Europa* — IDL, 7.8.83). It has also made personal attacks on several prominent critics suggesting that they are "slanders" and "smugglers". Furthermore, Bishop Káldy has himself given several interviews recently which have touched upon some of the issues raised by his critics.

The following represents a selection of questions and answers from an interview given by Bishop Káldy on Hungarian Radio's feature programme "Close-ups of Public Life", as reproduced in *Hungarian Church Press* of 1 November 1983 (with some corrections to the English phraseology, editing of repetitions, and cuts (marked [. . .]) by RCL).

*Hungarian Radio:* Some people think that what has happened between the State and

\*A translation of this article, and of subsequent reactions to it, appear on pp. 130-48 of this issue of *RCL* — *Ed.*

\*Cardinal Mindszenty — *Ed.*

the Church is nothing but a compromise which the Church has made for the purpose of prolonging in this way its own life. What is your reply to this?

*Bishop Káldy:* This would be tactics on the part of the Church, and I would consider it dishonest to cooperate with Marxists with the sole ulterior motive of prolonging its life. I must say, first of all — for I am a Christian — that I don't believe in the demise of the Church. It is on the basis of their ideology that our Marxist friends speak of this, but I can't accept their position. Consequently, the Church needs no tactics to prolong its life. My position is that the Church, if it is really the Church that takes the path of diaconia — that is, if it helps people — does have a future without any tactics. Hence I cannot accept the opinion of some pastors even when it is only occasionally aired that the Church must find a *modus vivendi*, that is, to try this way of surviving. Unfortunately, some people abroad see our service in socialist society in this way. I am convinced that we don't need this. [ . . . ]

*Hungarian Radio:* Why does the Church not criticise [the government's policies] in given instances?

*Bishop Káldy:* The Evangelical Lutheran Church in Hungary, of which I am bishop, does engage in criticism in suitable ways. We are in a position to do this in various forms. What I am going to say might sound curious: when we preach — without directly criticising Marxist ideology — by the very fact that, in the Hungarian Lutheran Church, 300 pastors tell the congregation every Sunday that God lives, that God exists, we actually apply criticism to that part of Marxist ideology which denies, criticises this. We do criticise by our preaching, but indirectly. Then we have our church press, the weekly *Evangélikus Élet*, the monthly *Lelkipásztor* and the quarterly *Diakónia*, and these periodicals are for sale on the streets. In these papers we openly criticise negative features of our social, economic and political life. From what position? We think that we are all in the same boat in our society. This society is our society as well. This country is our country. [ . . . ] In this way we are within the boat when we criticise, and that means that we criticise what is our own. [ . . . ] When we, in our sermons, speak of the morale of our people at work, of how they should make use of their working time, care for quality,

deserve their wages, see to it that they do not have “sticky fingers” but appreciate and care for the publicly owned things as their own, then we definitely become involved, on the economic level, in the life of our society. Then we become involved in political matters also. [ . . . ] Take the problem of peace: the Churches are in a position to render a great service to the cause of peace in all parts of the world. All the more so as in the present state of international tension there are Churches on both sides of the front line, and they might help in effecting a breakthrough, in working for détente, for mutual understanding, for the providing of more authentic information. When I am abroad and I tell people about the great developments that have taken place in our country as compared with our past, this is a political act as well.

*Hungarian Radio:* You have spoken of the fact that moral development is lagging behind economic progress. What is your explanation of this?

*Bishop Káldy:* If we want economic progress, we need moral progress. Our experts may produce fine results in agriculture and industry, we may have an ever-improving technology, but all this will be in vain if the man who handles technology does not himself become qualitatively better, that is, if he does not improve his character in every realm of his life, not only in his relation to work.

*Hungarian Radio:* Are you thinking of the family?

*Bishop Káldy:* Of the family, too. But also of the qualities of true humanity, the whole question of people's mentality and disposition. If people do not become humanised, they will be unable, in the long run, to keep the present achievements, for these can only be maintained by qualitatively better people. A significant sector of our society has fallen back morally. My opinion is that there are indications of a certain loosening of morals in our society. Of course there is also a very wide stratum which offers maximum human values, the right mentality and character. I am thinking both of party members and of those who are not party members. I would be glad to see Christians, acting out their faith, being able to produce the same quality of thinking and action as these people. But, on the other hand, I have also heard from communists that they have met Christians whose conduct and humanity they highly respect. At the same time, I

must speak sincerely about my experience: many people, precisely because there is work in Hungary, because it is easy to get a job and it is virtually impossible to go unemployed, have taken the way of selfishness. I am shocked to see that some of the people in our society are again beginning to care only for themselves. They find the five working days meaningful only in that they lead to a good week-end. It is exactly the reverse, order that I consider should be the normal pattern of life. [ . . . ]

*Hungarian Radio:* Speaking of moral regression, you have indicated that this might refer not only to work and working morale, but to family life as well. [ . . . ] Some speak of the crisis of the family.

*Bishop Káldy:* The crisis of the family is a world-wide phenomenon. It is not a specifically Hungarian illness. The family, in our given historical circumstances, has indeed changed. I regret this. I don't believe that by speaking my mind on this issue I shall become classified as a conservative, stick-in-the-mud, "typically churchly" person, specifically because of my insistence on the significance of the family in modern society — in socialist society as well. Why? Because family provides the atmosphere and the start which determine the whole life of a person. [ . . . ] If I ask about the human qualities of the citizens who will continue to build our society, then I must attach very great importance to the role of the family. [ . . . ]

*Hungarian Radio:* I can hardly believe that only people who constitute the family should be made responsible for the fact that the family is no longer the kind of community it used to be or, as you believe, ought to be. Should not we rather speak of a reaction to certain social and economic factors which result in the fact that the family is no longer what you would like to see?

*Bishop Káldy:* There can be no doubt that outward circumstances shape family life. Do not think that I am simply plugging for an old and traditional pattern. [ . . . ] On the other hand, I must tell you that the effect of our society upon [ . . . ] the life of the family community is sometimes of the negative kind. Mothers are independent bread-winners, and wives, because of their own earnings, are, in economic matters, no longer tied so strongly to their husbands as before. The work of women in various places outside the home is, to my mind, a positive fact. My wife, too, works, and I am glad that she is working. But if it depended on me, I would shorten the working hours of mothers. It is possible that the time will come in our society when mothers will not be required to work 8 hours a day but only 4 to 6 hours, so that they would have time for the family, for the education of their children. Another new motive at work in the family is that women, adult women too, are studying in increasing numbers. Another aspect of this matter is that certain professions — e.g. the medical and educational — are becoming the domain of women, with certain consequences. But there is another problem. When I point it out, I hope I shall not sound like a stickler for propriety in clerical garb. Certain aspects of literary and fine arts in our contemporary society are not serving to heighten our respect for the family. Our Budapest theatres show plays that harm the public image of the family, and many films have the same deleterious effect. I must say that our cinemas offer some western films which I would not let in because they promote moral laxity. The ethic of our society differs from that of a capitalist society.

## Church Peace Committee Founded in Hungary

Against the background of the deployment of Cruise and Pershing missiles in western Europe, and the corresponding increased activities of the western "peace movement", the Hungarian press has highlighted the role of the Churches in the country's official "peace movement". On 8 December 1983 the Communist Party daily *Népszabadság* reported the founding of the Church Peace Committee on the previous day. This organisation encompasses the

national leadership of the Lutheran, Reformed, Free Church, Jewish, Unitarian and Orthodox communities. At the head of the Committee stand Bishop Tibor Bartha as President and Zoltán Aranyos as General Secretary. Both are of the Reformed Church. Following its first meeting the Committee issued the following statement: "We see with profound shock that in our times certain powers which frequently refer to the defence of Christian moral and