

representation undermines the essential premises of democracy.

Europe's biggest employer of foreign labor is West Germany, which has been trying to reduce its migrant population since early 1973, well before the oil crisis. But Germany's "guest" worker population *cum* dependents has hit a record four million—despite the country's prolonged recruiting ban and its various investment and incentive schemes designed to encourage the departure of foreigners. Expected from abroad are yet another 1.4 million dependents of workers already in the country, who are entitled to residence rights. According to conservative estimates in Bonn, the foreigners may well produce a million offspring within a decade.

Apart from workers from the British Commonwealth and Irish immigrants, "guest" workers lack political power. As recent statistics published by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the E.C. indicate, the foreign workers' children, officially natives of the countries of their birth, are likely to inherit the inferior social and employment status of their parents. About a fifth of their children of school age are believed to be receiving no education.

Hence the embarrassment at E.C. headquarters in Brussels following passage of an uncontroversial resolution by the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva expressing particular concern about "the situation of the children of migrant workers and the effects upon their cultural, medical and psychosocial well being and the difficulties of adaption and separation to which they are exposed." The resolution requested all U.N. organizations to give special consideration to the issue in the context of the International Year of the Child and to ensure wide dissemination of information on measures to improve the lot of migrant workers and their families.

Earlier, a comprehensive report on the housing of migrant workers, published by the European Commission, proposed the establishment of a fund to finance urgent measures to end discrimination. The study had been compiled by thirty specialists throughout the E.C., including anthropologists, social geographers, economists, psychologists, and sociologists, all of them independent of both the European Commission and the national governments. It is significant that they treated the issue as a long-term problem with considerable effect on the entire Community.

Paradoxically, immigration restrictions imposed on foreign labor are likely to increase, rather than decrease, unemployment among European natives, according to an OECD study. Another study published in Geneva, this one by the U.N.'s Economic Commission for Europe, argues that economic recovery in Western Europe may well depend on a fresh influx of foreign labor.

Even were it possible—and, indeed, desirable—to expel the foreign workers, their places would soon be taken by others. Portugal, Spain, and Greece are likely to join the E.C. within the foresee-

able future, opening the door to vast numbers of South Europeans from rural areas who lack industrial skills. The cherished E.C. principle of free circulation of labor within the Community thus may well perpetuate Western Europe's embarrassment over its imported poverty.

*Thomas Land is a British journalist.*

## EXCURSUS IV

### *Elliott Wright on Eastern Orthodoxy's Great Council*

Eastern Orthodoxy never acts rashly. Patience over the past thousand years has helped ancient patriarchates and medieval national churches to survive Huns, Catholic crusaders, Muslim Arabs and Turks, Protestant missionaries, Communists, and the British. But, as a virtue, even patience is supposed to bear fruit, and that means a change in the seasons. Today the third largest, the most immutable branch of Christianity is budding with a possibility that is destined, if it matures, to produce the rare phenomenon of perceptible change in Orthodoxy.

"Something Is Stirring in World Orthodoxy," says the title of a new booklet by Stanley S. Harakas, dean of Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological Seminary, Brookline, Massachusetts. The "something" is preparation for a "Great and Holy Council," Orthodoxy's first since the eighth century, to grapple with modernity's effects on church life and order. While date, place, and composition of the gathering are yet to be decided, the planning, begun in 1961 through the initiative of the late Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I, has progressed to the point of collecting reactions to a proposed agenda. The first public discussion of ten tentative topics, proposed in 1976 by a preconciliar conference, took place in late summer at the third international conference of the Orthodox Theological Society of America.

The importance of a contemporary Eastern council for the Orthodox themselves and for ecumenism can hardly be overstated. Interestingly, Orthodoxy does not need a rebirth of conciliarism to establish doctrinal unity. Its unity is based in a common liturgy expressing a common Eucharistic theology. What is needed for internal peace is collective attention to administrative controversies and structural irregularities that threaten the practice of unity and weaken witness to unity.

Long before the East-West schism of 1054, Eastern Christianity developed a pattern of jurisdictional decentralization. It has never desired a single magisterium as powerful as the papacy. The four oldest patriarchates (Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople) and the several national churches in Eastern Europe are administratively quite as

independent as are provinces of the world Anglican Communion. The Ecumenical Patriarch (of Constantinople) is only "first among equals" within the hierarchy, endowed with primacy of honor.

**This pattern of administrative diversity** has been battered, however, by political and ethnic tensions, and has never been extended into the "Orthodox diaspora"—the West and the Third World. The diaspora, in fact, is currently a major source of inter-Orthodox conflict, as dramatized across the 1970's by disagreement between the churches of Russia and Constantinople on how to set up an independent, unified jurisdiction in North America. Moscow in 1970 granted autocephality (independence) to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America, estranged from its "mother church" since the Bolshevik Revolution. The resulting Orthodox Church in America (OCA) suggested itself as a possible structure for unifying the two dozen overlapping American dioceses or archdioceses administered from the old Orthodox hegemony. Constantinople objected, insisting that autocephality cannot be granted unilaterally, and subtly reasserting an old claim over "new lands." Constantinople refused to recognize the OCA. One upshot of the confrontation was the rekindling of animosities between Constantinople, the "Second Rome," and Moscow, the "Third Rome." More serious was the ripple of tension, although fellowship has been maintained, between the million-member OCA and the larger Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of the Americas, which is under the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

The diaspora stands first on the Council's proposed agenda, now being studied by the independent churches, which can select the items they wish to address in position papers. If the preparation, and an eventual pan-Orthodox meeting, can produce a solution to structural complications in the diaspora, the laborious conciliar task will be worth it, according to the informal consensus at the recent theological society conference. The four-day program left no doubt that Orthodoxy's most prominent North American theologians, of every ethnic division, want a single, self-governing church here. Americans are not slow to note that the diaspora currently represents the most promising arena for Orthodox creativity and evangelization, since every mother church except one is in a controlled situation within a Muslim or Communist state. The exception is the Church of Greece, which, some say, is controlled by whatever government sits in Athens.

As a whole, the ten-item Council agenda is modest compared with the Second Vatican Council's broad-based approach to Catholic renewal or with the World Council of Churches' politicized vision of Christian unity. Formal theology is omitted in deference to Orthodoxy's historical confession of doctrinal unity. Social ethics is relegated to a single entry. Major emphases are on practical issues of structure, Christian practice such as fasting, and the

nature and extent of ecumenical involvement. The decision to keep the agenda short gives the enterprise the look of an experiment, as though the planners are saying, "If we handle these topics in conciliar forum, we can go on to other matters latter."

**To approach the first Orthodox council** in twelve hundred years cautiously is wise, for it remains to be seen whether the gathering will actually take place. Will problems crying out for inter-Orthodox resolution themselves sabotage the process? Is Orthodoxy in its motherlands too politically unfree to bring its best to a council? Can a pan-Orthodox council in continuity with the Ecumenical Synods of the first Christian millennium be held at all, since the early conciliar events were "imperial"—called and hosted by Constantine and his heirs to deal with specific heresies and orthodox observances?

Alexander Schmemmann, dean of St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary, Crestwood, New York, warns that the forthcoming council should not be automatically compared with the Ecumenical Synods summoned by imperial decrees of a vanished empire. The modern Orthodox Church, he says, must seek another definition of "conciliarity." Schmemmann proposes a definition with theological, liturgical, and spiritual dimensions reaching toward restored relationships between God and man, man and man, and man and the world. Any Orthodox council, he adds, should above all be "an explosion of joy"—joy that "we are still around...and faith is always young."

Can a modern "Great and Holy Council" happen? "Ours is to prepare; whether we have it or not depends on the will of God," says Schmemmann. This is an Orthodox answer.

*Elliott Wright is a freelance journalist.*

### *Jacek Wejroch* Epigrams

- A cardsharp will always give the excuse that those who lost played with the same marked cards.
- A spoonful of wagon grease is enough to spoil a barrel of honey, but a spoonful of honey is not enough to spoil a barrel of wagon grease.
- Those who are merciless should not appeal to relativism.
- Dirty work has its own aesthetes.
- Formerly, philosophers interpreted the world; today they interpret their colleagues' ideas.
- If what is impossible can become so simple, what is simple may turn out to be possible.
- Do the hungry of this world die too quietly, or do the well-fed live too loudly?

*Jacek Wejroch, a freelance essayist and writer in Poland, is a member of the editorial board of the Catholic monthly, *Wież*. Translation from the Polish was prepared by Thomas Bird, a member of the Queens College, CUNY, faculty and an editor of *Queens Slavic Papers*.*