



The Orthodox Resistance Against the Ecclesiastical Heresy of Syncretistic Ecumenism

Basic Ecclesiastical and Canonical Positions

“It is the command of the Lord not to be silent at such a time as the Faith is endangered; rather, speak frankly and do not be silent.”

(St. Theodore the Studite,
P.G., Vol. 99, col. 1321AB)

a. The self-identity of the Synod in Resistance

1. The Holy Synod in Resistance, with the help of God and the protection of the *Theotokos*, shepherds those pious Orthodox Christians who are, in the first place, *Anti-Ecumenists* and follow the *Patristic Calendar of the Church* (i.e., the Old Calendar), forming the *Ecclesiastical Community of the Anti-Ecumenists of the Patristic Calendar*.

2. The pious *Anti-Ecumenists* broke Mysteriological communion in 1924 with the so-called official Churches, which participate in the *Ecumenical Movement* and have adopted or accepted without protest the *New Calendar*, because they consider *Ecumenism* to be an ecclesiological heresy and the *New Calendar* a condemnable innovation.

3. The work of the Holy Synod in Resistance is primarily *unitive*, since it seeks to inform the faithful with regard to the heretical character of the *Ecumenical Movement*.

4. The sober and responsible promulgation of information on this subject will, with the help of God, awaken the *synodal (conciliar) conscience* of the Orthodox Church, with the aim of convoking a *General Union Synod* in the Truth of the Faith, so as to condemn heresy and to restore the festal unity of the Orthodox.

b. The Non-Innovationists and Walling-Off

1. The entirety of the *Anti-Ecumenists*, who have turned away from the innovation of Ecumenism and of the New Calendar, have by this stand of theirs, i.e., *walling themselves off* from the *Innovators*, not occasioned a *Schism* in the Church, but have been obedient to Her and have remained united to Her.

2. The Holy Fathers and the Sacred Canons praise and bless those who have *walled themselves off*, that is, who are separated from innovating shepherds for *dogmatic* reasons, when the latter publicly preach wrong beliefs and heresies.¹

3. The sin of *Schism* exists exclusively and solely in that instance where some segment of the clergy and the people, “**without cause**” and “**without reason**,” sever relations with the canonical Shepherds of the Church, citing “**addressable issues**” or the personal shortcomings of their Hierarchs.²

4. The heresy of *Ecumenism*, from which the heretical innovation of the *New Calendar* derived, cannot be reckoned and characterized as an “**addressable issue**,” since it has brought about, in many and varied ways, deep theological divisions and has justly and validly been characterized as “**something much worse than panheresy**,” as “**an illness unto death**,”³ as the “**most hideous syncretism**,” as “**the worst of all heresies**,”⁴ and, finally, as an “**unheard-of betrayal**.”⁵

5. Moreover, those who follow the *Patristic Church Calendar* and are *Anti-Ecumenists* are not only not *Schismatics*, but form the *Non-Innovating Pleroma (Fullness)* of the Orthodox Church, which has walled itself off legally and canonically from the *Innovators* and is in ***God-pleasing resistance***,⁶ that is, struggling for the pacification and unity of the Church.

c. The Calendar Issue and Ecumenism

1. The firm connection between the *Ecumenical Movement* and the *Calendar Change* is so wholly demonstrable, both theologically and histori-

cally, that it can be shown that there is between them even a *causal relationship*.

2. The sources confirm that the *Advocates of the Calendar Change* in 1924 endowed the *Calendar Issue* with a clear *ecumenical dimension*, since,

a. motivated by the sense that they constituted “**members of a pan-Christian brotherhood,**”

b. they conferred together with the conviction that “**the hour had come for a restoration of Christian unity perhaps on this point,**”

c. focusing on its “**usefulness to pan-Christian unity,**”

d. aiming at the “**rapprochement of the two Christian worlds of the East and West in the celebration of the great Christian feasts,**”

e. and reckoning the New Calendar to be “**the first stone in the rebuilding of the unity of all of the churches of God.**”⁷

3. Also, the direct connection of *Ecumenism* and the *Calendar Issue* was fully known to one *Advocate of the Calendar Change* in 1924, that is, none other than Archbishop Chrysostomos Papadopoulos of Athens (†1938), who not only consciously embraced the presupposition of the *Change*—namely, the Oecumenical Patriarchate’s ecumenist *Encyclical of 1920*—, but collaborated with the innovationist [Patriarch] Meletios Mataxakis in efforts to effectuate it, to the end that Chrysostomos Papadopoulos is today considered a pioneer *Ecumenist* and one of the *founders* of the World Council of Churches.⁸

d. Syncretistic Ecumenism

1. The heretical and syncretistic character of *Ecumenism* was confirmed and publicly put forth by a *cloud* of distinguished individuals, from 1920 on (and in 1924, in particular), their stand against this panheresy constituting an indisputable *criterion* and *touchstone* for every Orthodox.

2. The ever-memorable Professor, Andreas Theodorou († 2004), described *Ecumenism* as

“*something far worse than panheresy*”; “*Ecumenism is an unpardonable assault, an absurd theory, not to mention a legitimization and justification of heresy; Ecumenism within the sacred realm of Orthodoxy is an illness unto death; Ecumenism, this frightful beast of the Apocalypse, the two-headed ecclesiological monster, is strangling by asphyxiation, with its tentacles, the whole body of Christ. The danger looming in*

this latest danger is perhaps greater than any in the history of the Church."⁹

3. The late Professor Constantine Mouratides (†) categorically opined that

*"Within the ranks of the World Council of Churches [that principle authoritative body of the Ecumenical Movement], there occurs that which is by the teaching" of the Holy Fathers "most strictly forbidden and condemned, that is, coöperation of Orthodoxy and Heresy and, correspondingly, the collaboration of Orthodox and Heretics on matters of Faith, such as the collaborative redaction of theological texts and mutual participation in gatherings for worship and the common representation of the Christian religions with regard to the great problems of mankind, etc."; all of these things constitute a "clear violation of the God-inspired sacred Canons and fundamental ecclesiastical Principles, by which the very essence and, in general, the redemptive course of Orthodoxy are brought to harm."*¹⁰

4. The recent "Inter-Orthodox Congress in Thessaloniki" (20-24 September, 2004), the theme of which was "*Ecumenism: Its Genesis, Expectations, and Disappointments,*" after its some sixty *Clarifications and Conclusions*, characterized *Inter-Christian and Inter-Religious Ecumenism*

*as a "panheresy," as the "greatest ecclesiological heresy in the history of the Church," "with profound soteriological ramifications," and proclaimed that "inter-religious meetings and inter-religious dialogue have led to unallowable syncretism."*¹¹

e. Divisions Among the Anti-Ecumenists

1. In the sacred resistance against syncretistic *Ecumenism*, by the allowance of God, the Old *Calendarist* Orthodox *Anti-Ecumenists* are divided into a variety of *Ecclesiastical Communities* which are not in communion with one another, for the essential reason that they do not have a **common ecclesiological self-awareness**.

2. One segment of the pious *Old Calendarists* has strayed into unproductive *anti-New Calendarism*, while others have *retreated into themselves*,

adopting a non-theological introversion that has led them to declare their **ecclesiological and soteriological exclusivity**.

3. The Holy Synod in Resistance reckons desirable Its coöperation and the eventuality of union with these various communities of Old Calendarists *in principio* [in principle], though only, of course, if they fulfill the criteria of **valid ecclesiastical bodies**.

4. Therefore, we acknowledge that this coöperation, with the aim of uniting the various *Communities* of Old Calendarists that have surfaced, is not at the present attainable, in the first place since there prevails an unheard-of confusion of **theological criteria**, but primarily because of the unbridgeable chasm of **ecclesiastical heterogeneity**.

5. This stand is based on the conviction that the indispensable presuppositions of every unitive effort within the *Old Calendar movement* rest in the full clarification of the following **two portentous issues**:

a. The status of **yet-uncondemned heretics and those in communion with them**, as in the case of the innovating *Ecumenists* within the Body of the Church;¹²

b. the criteria for ascertaining what **valid ecclesiastical bodies are**, since the abrogation of every theological, canonical, and moral [ethical] boundary, on the pretext of struggle against the *Innovation* of ecumenism—a phenomenon that is unfortunately already commonplace—, has altogether annulled **the sovereignty of the Church**, discouraging every prospect for unity.

6. One is reminded, significantly enough, that St. Theodore the Studite, referring *ad hoc* to these matters, describes, with total Patristic confirmation “by all of the Saints,” the marks of the “irreproachable” *Clergyman* of “known good repute” with whom it behooves the Orthodox resisters, in times of heretical confusion, to have communion,

a. since, according to the Saint, heresy is not the only impediment to communion; there are other impediments: those of a canonical nature, such as “improprieties suspected or reported about the way one lives”;

b. for, canonical impediments and “manifest” “improprieties in the way one lives,” “even if secondary,” by comparison to heresy, “are not deemed lesser by those who piously investigate them,” as though “one contravened the other”;

c. and because there remains in force, even today, the so very timely Patristic injunction: “Scrutinize, inquire carefully: for unexamined communion [with others] is not without danger; indeed it entails great danger”

(Divine Chrysostomos). “Let us hence examine and inquire about those with whom it behooves us to be in communion.”¹³

f. Towards Peace and Unity

1. The vision of the pacification and reunion of the separated Orthodox requires the following three clear, effective, and salvific *therapeutic* actions on the part of the *Innovators*, with humility, repentance, and on the basis of Patristic Orthodoxy:

a. To proclaim the *exclusiveness* (exclusive primacy) of Orthodox Ecclesiology and Soteriology.

b. To renounce the syncretistic *Ecumenical Movement*, as well as the (putative) comprehensiveness of ecumenical ecclesiology, and to withdraw, at the same time, from its authoritative bodies.

c. To restore the festal unity of the Orthodox, by way of a return to the **“Julian Calendar kept for centuries by the Orthodox Church,”** since it was always considered **“solely suitable in the Church,”** **“by its having been handed down from the Fathers and ecclesiastically sanctioned from the beginning.”**¹⁴

2. Those profoundly and solely guilty of the tragic division of the Orthodox, and indeed for all of the consequences thereof, are the innovating *Ecumenists*, who must, while there is still time, shoulder the responsibility; for, according to the Divine Chrysostomos:

“[N]othing so vexes God as the dividing of the Church,”
*and “even the blood of martyrdom cannot expunge this sin.”*¹⁵

*From the Office
of the Holy Synod in Resistance
2 October 2006 (Old Style)
† Sts. Cyprian and Justina*

-
1. **Holy First-and-Second Synod**, *Sacred Canon XV*.
 2. **Holy Apostles**, *Sacred Canon XXXI*; **Holy First-and-Second Synod**, *Sacred Canon XV*; **St. Basil the Great**, *Sacred Canon I*. See also “*Commentary on the Holy Canon in Question*.”
 3. **Andreas Theodorou**, *Orthodoxy Today and Yesterday* [in Greek], p. 21 (Athens: Ek-doseis “Orthodoxou Typos,” 1973).
 4. **Archimandrite Epiphanius Theodoropoulos**, *Articles, Studies, Letters* [in Greek], Vol. I, pp. 163-164 (Athens, 1981).

5. **Archimandrite Justin Popovich**, “An Orthodox View and Witness” [in Greek], in *Koinonia* (March-April, 1975), pp. 95-101.
6. **St. Theodore the Studite**, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1045 D, Epistle XXX-IX: “To Theophilus the Abbot” (*E.L.I.*).
7. **Dionysios M. Batistatos (Ed.)**, *Acts and Decisions of the Pan-Orthodox Synod of Constantinople (10 May-8 June, 1923)* [in Greek], pp. 72, 14, 6, 57, 189 (Athens, 1982).
8. **Antonios M. Papadopoulos**, “The Stand of the Church of Greece Against the Relations of the Orthodox Church With the Heterodox” [in Greek], in *The Witness and Service of Orthodoxy Today*, Vol. II, pp. 85-87 (Thessaloniki: Ekdoseis “Adelphon Kyriakide,” 1998); **Archimandrite Theokletos A. Strangas**, *History of the Church of Greece* [in Greek], Vol. II, pp. 901-914 (Athens, 19070).
9. **Andreas Theodoropoulos**, *op. cit.*, pp. 21, 23.
10. **Constantine D. Mouratides**, *The Ecumenical Movement: The Contemporary Great Temptation of Orthodoxy* [in Greek], pp. 71-72, 87 (Athens: Ekdoseis “Orthodoxou Typos, 1973).
11. “**Inter-Orthodox Congress in Thessaloniki**” (20-24 September 2004) “Expectations” [in Greek], in *Orthodoxos Typos*, No. 1577 (15 December 2004), p. 5; *Theodromia*, October-December 2004, pp. 504-521; *Parakatatheke*, No. 38 (September-October 2004), pp. 2-212.
12. See our study, “The Status of Uncondemned Heretics in the Church” [in Greek], in *Orthodoxos Enstasis kai Martyria*, Ser. B, No. 1 (January 2000), pp. 1936.
13. See St. Theodore the Studite, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. XCIX, cols. 1101-1108, Epistle LIII, “To the Reader Stephan and Those With him” (*E.L.I.*).
14. **Basileios T. Staurides, Evangelia A. Barellas**, *History of the Ecumenical Movement* [in Greek], p. 325, “Patriarchal and Synodal Encyclical of 1924,” *Analekta Blatadon XLVII* (Thessaloniki: Ekdoseis “P.I.P.M. [Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies], 1996).
15. **Divine Chrysostomos**, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. LXII, col. 5, Homily XI, “On the Epistle to the Ephesians,” 4.

