



The Orthodox Informer

“For it is a commandment of the Lord not to be silent at a time when the Faith is in jeopardy. Speak, Scripture says, and hold not thy peace.... For this reason, I, the wretched one, fearing the Tribunal, also speak.”

(St. Theodore the Studite, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1321)

■ The advancing course of the syncretistic axis of the Vatican, Athens, and the Phanar



Dossier

A. Vatican-Phanar

B. Vatican-Athens

“The foundations of the Faith have been undermined for decades by the panheresy of ecumenism.”

(*Protopresbyter Theodoros Zeses*, *Orthodoxos Typos*, No. 1665 [17 Nov. 2006], p. 1)

“Who is able to suffer these things without sighing? What is incontrovertible has become a matter of doubt.”

(St. Basil the Great, “*On the Holy Spirit*,” § 70)

THE RECENT occurrences at the Phanar (29-30 November 2006) and the Vatican (14-16 December 2006), involving *ecumenists* from the East and the West, have demonstrated, in the clearest and most forceful possible way, that the panheresy of *ecumenism* has deeply corroded the Orthodox self-awareness of those Shepherds who have embraced the *syncretistic vision* of the anti-Patristic *Encyclical of 1920*, the very foundation and basis of the contemporary *inter-Christian and interfaith movement*.

This corrosion has long been leading these Shepherds “**far from the way of the Holy Fathers**” (Father Theodoros Zeses, *O. T.*, No. 1670 [22 December 2006], p. 1), since their thoughts, words, and actions run entirely contrary to the **Patristic bequeathal**, which is most lucid in its exhortation to us:



Phanar, 30 November 2006



Vatican, 14 December 2006

“And may you have no communion with the schismatics, and by no means with the heretics”; “for you know how I, too, have turned away from them”; “rather, you should take care to unite yourselves firstly with the Lord and then with the Saints, so that they, also, might receive you as friends and acquaintances in the eternal abodes.””

(St. Anthony the Great, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. XXVI, col. 969C-972A)

The recent advancement and reinforcement of the *syncretistic axis* of the Vatican, Athens, and the Phanar are finally awakening the volcano of *anti-ecumenism*, and hopeful developments are soon to be expected from the standpoint of *Orthodox resistance* and *walling-off*, especially on the part of the *New Calendarist anti-ecumenists*, for the rallying, at long last, of the truly Orthodox.

In conclusion, all of these things fully justify the stance of the Orthodox *anti-ecumenists*, following the *Calendar of the Fathers*, who have, since 1924, walled themselves off from the ecumenists, resisting the panheresy of syncretism in a God-pleasing manner.

♦ **A series** of texts on the subject, which we will be publishing, demonstrates this *awakening*, the truly Patristic character of which may it preserve to the end,

“for the union and harmony of the Church”; “that the divisions among the Churches might be banished and the bond of peace might join us all together”; “and that we might drive the inventors of vain discourses of innovation far from the precinct of the Church.”

(Seventh Œcumenical Synod, Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1118E, 1003D; Vol. XIII, col. 404C)

A Small Commentary on Major Events*

*“It is not right
to scoff at the good distress of the Faithful;
to develop ecclesiastical public relations for short-sighted
demands, with justifications that do not persuade;
to renew or enhance the profile of certain ecclesiastical leaders;
not to tell the whole truth;
to scandalize the small flock
(and they are justifiably scandalized);
or to expect aid from powers condemned for worldliness,
alienation, arrogance, and an anti-evangelical spirit.”*

by Athonite Monk Moses

Our note: *In this and the many other articles written by New Calendarist anti-ecumenists since December 2006, in justifiable opposition to the events that took place at the Phanar and the Vatican, the refrain is repeated: “We will never split off from the Church....”*

- *We reckon it wholly irresponsible for authors constantly to repeat this refrain, for—apart from anything else—it betrays the existence of an unjustifiable anxiety before the obligation of the truly Orthodox to break off communion with so-called Orthodox ecumenist Bishops.*

- *We remind our readers that those who have walled themselves off (i.e., those who have broken ecclesiastical communion with clergy preaching condemned heresies publicly and bareheaded in the Church) “have not sundered the union of the Church with any schism”—that is, they have not broken off or departed from the Church—, “but, on the contrary, have been sedulous to rescue the Church from schisms and divisions”; wherefore, “they are not subject to canonical sanction,” “but will*

be even worthy of the honor befitting those of right belief”; “for they have condemned not Bishops, but pseudo-Bishops and pseudo-teachers” (Fifteenth Canon of the First-Second Synod).

- Unfortunately, we have not discerned a corresponding, completely justifiable anxiety on the part of the New Calendar anti-ecumenists over the truly shocking fact that **“the foundations of the Faith have been undermined for decades by the panheresy of ecumenism,”** (Father Theodoros Zeses), on account of which the unity of the Church of the Saints in Heaven has been sundered from the ecumenist Church on earth.

Which comes first: unity with the Saints or unity with the official ecumenist administrations, which possess a mere veneer of Orthodoxy?

- ◆ Have they perhaps not heeded or fully understood the pertinent input by the respected Professor Ioannes Kornarakes, who concluded his admirable critical analysis of the Statement by the Sacred Community of the Holy Mountain (17/30 December 2006) with the following most eloquent questions:

- By what **illumination** are [the Athonite Abbots] informed that it is the **“certain faithful and pious Orthodox”**—these defenders of the Sacred Canons and of the Patristic Tradition—who should be the ones cut off from the body of the Church, in the event that—God forbid!—a schism is created?

- Why do they speak of ones who are both pious and Orthodox, but outside of the body of the Church? If the local Church persists in heresies condemned by the Fathers and the Sacred Canons, thereby no longer constituting a Church, but a **“church,”** should not the **heresy** be cut off from the Church?

- How, one wonders, do the Abbots understand the nature of the Church? As being both heretical and a Church? Who should be cut off? And from whom?

(*Ὁρθόδοξος Τύπος*, No. 1674 [26 January 2007], p 5.)

THE RECENT visit of Pope Benedict XVI to the Phanar and of Archbishop Christodoulos to the Vatican gave rise to many thoughts, commentaries, apprehensions, and fears.

There were various discussions: On one side, reassuring and enthusiastic talk about historic and important meetings; on the other side, protests over inadmissible complaisance, concessions, and joint prayers.

There was and still is, on the part of many, a great silence that is inexpressible, fearful, and truly disquieting.

The visit of the Pontiff to the Phanar was preceded by Œcumenical Patriarch Bartholomew's visit to the Holy Mountain, approximately one month earlier. The visit of the Pope was followed by the visit of the Archbishop to the Vatican.

There seems to be some reason for the sequence of these visits. At the time, the Athonites did not speak about the impending visit of the Pope. The Archbishop would not attend a Liturgy, it was reported, as had happened at the Phanar. The one covers up for and justifies the other.

No one speaks resolutely. Whoever speaks, when not regarded as a fanatic, is labeled reactionary, narrow-minded, myopic, behind the times, or even ludicrous and quaint.

Of course, we must stress the fact that, unfortunately, the way of Orthodox tradition has sometimes been defended in an un-Orthodox manner, with curses, insults, fury, threats, shouting, extreme positions, unsubstantiated opinions, and untrue exaggerations.

One needs a great deal of knowledge, responsibility, sobriety, composure, poise, and discretion. One wrong is not corrected by another wrong. No good comes from passion.

We will never split off from the Church. We will always remain faithful children of our One, Holy, Apostolic, and Orthodox Mother Church. Within its bosom, we will all unceasingly breathe and act with modesty, humility, genuineness, sincerity, and fearlessness. We will make known our dismay, our thought, our complaint, our embitterment, our anxiety, our disquiet, and our hope.

The bad situation, the distortions, and the falsifications great-

ly scandalize sensitive consciences.

Is this wrong? Are *we* not allowed to express ourselves? Should we confine ourselves to our prayer ropes? Is this how one characterizes love for monasticism? We should only ever cheer, approve, and applaud, and thus we will be good monks? Even when the Divine and Sacred Canons and the *Pedalion* of the Church, sacred Tradition, the ancient order, sacred institutions, the discourses handed down to us by our Fathers, and the way of our Holy Father are pushed aside and misinterpreted? Are the Sacred Canons of our Church concerning joint prayer with heretics not valid?

Is it not joint prayer when the Patriarch embraces the Pope at the exclamation “Let us love one another”? Is this a matter of courtesy? What does the sacred kiss of peace at this holy hour signify? Is the recitation of the “Our Father” by the Pope during the Divine Liturgy not joint prayer? Do the Sacred Canons have an expiration date? Have they been altered and transformed? What essential progress comes from such a meeting, or when the Pope, in the midst of the Phanar, spoke of Papal primacy and then, in Ephesus, concerning union of the Christian East and West through the Unia? Will union be accomplished by our becoming Orthodox Uniates?

What was the aim of the Archbishop’s visit to the Vatican, accomplished despite the negative resolution by the majority of the Hierarchy of the Church of Greece? Publicity? Promotion? Advertisement? To supplant the Phanar? To engage in repeated discussions about peace, solidarity, anti-terrorism, and the development of public relations? All of these things are givens, well known; they exist and continue. These things are said and done by others, too: by those of other religions, by atheists, by politicians, and by various other figures.

In what way has Papism changed, such that we run after it? Have the great discourses on historical memory and Greek Orthodox Tradition been forgotten? Do we not know what Papism has been doing for a millennium? Were our Saints fundamentalists for drawing the strict attention of the Faithful to the great

Papal threat? When something is done for the first time, it does not necessarily mean that it is a positive historical event. Were the caution and circumspection of so many learned, wise, virtuous, humble people, of so many Saints, Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and monks for so many centuries erroneous? Are we surely wiser than all of the foregoing? That an impiety is again repeated does not in the least mean that it is sanctified or receives atonement.



We recall the late Archbishop Seraphim of Athens, who was not renowned for his great erudition, but who seriously queried, with great discretion, if Roman Catholicism is a Church, and what relation Christ could have with the lancers of the West....

Today, certain Bishops do not consider Papists to be heretics; they do not regard joint prayers as being of any importance. The times, they say, have changed. But does the Church of Christ change? Unfortunately, some of the higher clergy, having come from religious organizations, play a proud and leading rôle in ecumenism and secularization. It is saddening that they also nullify certain of their gifts. It seems that we would now do better to seek the less well-educated Fathers, more modest clergymen, more pious, and more liturgically-oriented.

It is with sincere pain and love that we write these simple, unadorned, and heartfelt lines. It would be superfluous to re-emphasize our infinite respect for the institutions and figures of the Church. We criticize particular tactics with true pain and great love.

We speak, of course, not as Saints—if the Saints alone could speak, then the preaching of the Church would have to cease—but as Her faithful children. We, too, could easily keep silent. We are not feigning bravery. It is not bravery to defend truths, but rather our obligation and necessary duty.

We could applaud movements, visits, embraces, and gestures of good will. We could diffuse smiles, emotion, sentimentality, and talk of beauty and love. It is not at all difficult. But we cannot persuade

ourselves to do it. We are strictly held in check by the sacred past of the Monk-Martyrs and Confessors of the Holy Mountain, which engenders and nourishes Saints.

We will humbly, fervently, and wholeheartedly continue, of course, night and day to pray “for the union of all,” “for the good estate of the holy Churches of God,” and “for those who teach aright the word of Truth.”

Dialogues can continue only if they convey the Truth of Orthodoxy, according to Father Georges Florovsky; when the heterodox “are substantially aided when Orthodox Christians, through their consistent Orthodox stance, indicate to them the enormity of their spiritual ailment and the manner of their cure,” according to the document, dated 9 April, 1980, by the Sacred Community of the Holy Mountain.

The truth of Orthodoxy must always be conveyed fearlessly, with integrity, authenticity, and humility. Always “in truth and love,” “in fear of God,” “in hope,” and “in fervent supplication.”

We are not judging anyone. In censuring others, we censure ourselves. There are many people who think these simple and important things. It is not right to scoff at the good distress of the Faithful; to develop ecclesiastical public relations for short-sighted demands, with justifications that do not persuade; to renew or enhance the profile of certain ecclesiastical leaders; not to tell the whole truth, to scandalize the small flock (and they are justifiably scandalized); or to expect aid from powers condemned for worldliness, alienation, arrogance, and an anti-evangelical spirit.

Having said this, we repeat that we are not sufficient unto ourselves. We would all do well to struggle patiently and persistently to become more Orthodox. We are not maximizing the events, we are not chasing after phantoms, we do not fear where there is nothing to fear, we do not betray our responsibility and our duty, but we pray yet more fervently and humbly, now, for the illumination of all.



* Source: *Ἐορθόδοξος Τύπος*, No. 1670 (2 February 2007), pp. 1, 7. Publication lay-out ours.