Honourable Very Reverend Protopresbyter Heikki Theodoros Huttunen,

thank you for the documents that we have received on the 14th July, 2016 via Mrs. V. Engels from the main office of CEC.

Let us take the liberty to react to the document What Future for Europe? I have discussed it with our bishop Rev. Jan Waclawek.

I) General remarks
We appreciate that its authors have expended a lot of work to make it up. It is important that it treats of the issue of values in the EU. However, we deem that it rather summarizes the up-to-now known facts and does not bring out anything new and/or radical. It reiterates the principles that have been presented and highlighted before, like solidarity, helping the poor, human rights, justice etc. Naming them is right, but the tenor of so doing is very general, inconcrete and vague. This is almost in opposition to its effort to criticize some aspects of the EU.

We suppose that if CEC aims to call EU to return to values, it should stress values so, that their Christian and biblical character would be visible, or stress Christian values that haven’t been accentuated, e.g. faith in God. The question is how this should be presented. Those who already believe in God would be invited (and challenged) to take God and faith in Him more seriously and assume the stance of humbleness, to which this faith leads, and to renounce the stance of pride and self-aggrandizement away from which this faith leads too. Those who do not believe could be invited (and challenged) to assume this humbleness and rejection of pride and self-aggrandizement as well. Various secular forms of this stance (of humbleness or tameness), which is an opposite of pride, could be propounded. This clear reverence toward God as well that posture of humbleness could also be stressed as and become unifying element of people not only in the EU structures, but also in the EU. On the part of unbelievers only the posture of that humbleness would be understood as that unifying principle – for unbelievers as well as for believers.

Another more general Christian incentive would be that of repentance which includes self-reflection, willingness to acknowledge and mend one’s (EU) mistakes: what EU has done wrong, what it did not engage. A basic part of this repentance would be confession of
Europe’s abandoning and/or disowning Christian faith, although it presents the foundation of its culture and civilization.

With this critical self-reflection, an effort to reflect critically today’s chief trends, individualism, hedonism, materialism, and search for ways how to obviate them and promote counter-values, like altruism, self-restraint, modesty, unselfishness, and sense for spiritual, moral values etc. can and should be coupled. Another broad stream to confront presents the uncritical and borderless benevolence or charitableness, which shores up e.g. sexual minorities, immigrants or adherents of other than Christian religion, and does not ponder the future effects of this benevolence. And the same time the CEC should point to the fact that this benevolence disadvantages Christians and Christian-based concepts. How many law suits have been conducted thus far against those who in some way voiced their disagreement with homosexuality and gender ideology! Or how many times they were removed from their office, prosecuted and/or defamed! E.g. because they have said, that homoerotism was not on a par with heterosexuality, that marriage was only a bond betwixt one man and one woman or because they were in support of motherhood. In fact such tolerance is and functions as relativistic totalitarianism, anti-Christian aimed.

Furthermore the churches could contribute to the process of renewal or reorientation of EU by stressing the import of family and its implications: marriage, motherhood and fatherhood, engendering and raising children.

It is difficult to judge the economical, structural, and other headings of the EU, as specifics would have to be known here. This would need help of specialists. But their findings could be processed from the Christian viewpoint.

II) Remarks to the text directly

In the article VI Multiple and interacting crises, concerning refugees from Islamic countries an abuse they commit and their integration should be discussed and solved too, not only mention a Christian duty of welcoming them. Further the idea that other Islamic states situated close to the lands that refugees abandon, could receive them should be tackled. The refugees’ journey would shorten itself considerably and they would be found themselves in lands that share their culture and religion.

In regard to the article IX A community of values and soul searching project we would like to ask what is meant by searching for values? Which values do the authors mean? Are not these values already here, in the Christian religion?

The situation concerning the section XII Europe: A common home is similar: it speaks that Europe needs to search for values, needs vision and commitment, but the document does not even mention looking for God, does not speak about return to Christianity.

III) Concluding remarks

To our up-to-now observations we would add that this document hardly mentions God. The document compiled by a Christian organization should contain clear references thereto and not only marginal ones (p.g. 14, 15). What is even more, it mention Jesus Christ probably only on the page 15, also marginally. His cross and resurrection is not mentioned at all. Further the values tackled deal concern solely the second table of the Decalogue, in a watered-down form.

One technical remark: the document could be half shorter, especially in view of its diffuseness.

Honourable Very Reverend Huttenen, we wish you a lot God’s blessing.

Respectfully, 

Rev. Marek Řičan, Th.D., theological officer
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