



OLD CALENDAR ORTHODOX CHURCH OF GREECE
HOLY SYNOD IN RESISTANCE

**The Holy Synod in Resistance
and Her Attitude Towards the Union
of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad with the
Moscow Patriarchate**

I. Introduction

1. On the Feast of the Ascension of our Savior, Thursday 4/17 May 2007, upon completion of the process of rapprochement, *union* was realized, at a fully official level, between the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, under His Eminence, Metropolitan Laurus, and the Moscow Patriarchate.

2. Thus, the venerable Russian Orthodox Church Abroad has fully united, through the Moscow Patriarchate, with all of the *ecumenists*, that is, with the so-called official local Churches, which have adopted or tolerate the *New Calendar*, participating in the *ecumenical movement* and its various institutional organs, on the basis of 1920 *Encyclical of the Church of Constantinople*.

3. An immediate consequence of this union is the now total relinquishment by the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad of the splendid *anti-ecumenical Tradition* that she articulated under her

third Chief Hierarch, the very saintly Metropolitan Philaret (†1985), and which she expressed with singular theological clarity, depth, and consistency.

4. In 1994, the Holy Synod in Resistance established full Eucharistic communion with the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, on the basis of the common *anti-ecumenist self-understanding* of the two Synods, which was evinced chiefly through their non-communication with all of the official ecumenist jurisdictions.

5. However, this communion was finally severed in 2005, as it became evident, on the one hand, that the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad was on a steadfast and irrevocable course towards union with the Moscow Patriarchate and, on the other hand, that she had jettisoned her *anti-ecumenist outlook and her coöperation* with the Holy Synod in Resistance; but the formal declaration and complete implementation of this rupture was postponed out of extreme *oikonomia*, so as to take effect without further ado, immediately, and automatically upon the opening of communion between the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate.

6. The truly disappointing eclipse of an outstanding champion against the syncretistic heresy of ecumenism provokes the deepest sorrow among *Old Calendarist Orthodox anti-ecumenists* everywhere. This sorrow, however, is mitigated by the very gratifying news that a significant portion of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad disagrees with the *union* that has been accomplished and is now regrouping as an independent jurisdiction, in the awareness that it constitutes the authentic continuation of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad.

7. The Holy Synod in Resistance will, with especial joy, continue to have communion with this portion of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, as long as it truly desires such communion, and also as long as it possesses a clearly *anti-ecumenist self-understand-*

ing, not maintaining any kind of communion, directly or indirectly, with the *Orthodox ecumenists*.

8. To this end, we have deemed it expedient to publish on our website the more pertinent *official documents* of the Holy Synod in Resistance, which, on the one hand, clearly attest to the responsible way in which she handled relations with the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad during the years 2000-2006, and, on the other hand, contain the unshakeable bases for communion with the “*remnant chosen by Grace*” (Romans 11:5), that is, that portion of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad which rejects the recent *union* with the Moscow Patriarchate.

9. Furthermore, our aim in publishing these *official documents* is to demonstrate how superficial and, in many ways, irresponsible is the wish and suggestion expressed by certain *New Calendarists* that the much-fragmented *Old Calendarist* Orthodox should emulate the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad by placing themselves under the official ecumenist jurisdictions, since the latter forget or overlook that, while the historical basis and occasion for the rift among the Russians (1917-) has been removed and no longer exists, it was quite different from the dispute which divided, and continues to divide—since it still exists and is, indeed, reinforced daily—, the Orthodox into *ecumenists and resisters* (1920, 1924-).

*From the Chancery
of the Holy Synod in Resistance
Fili, Attika, 10 May 2007 (Old Style)
Holy Apostle Simon the Zealot*

II. Documents

1. *Epistle, Protocol No. 340 (1 January 2001)*
2. *Statement on the Recent Rapprochement Between the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate*
3. *Epistle, Protocol No. 408 (11 October 2004)*
4. *Epistle, Protocol No. 409 (5 December 2004)*

5. *Epistle, Protocol No. 412 (22 November 2005)*
6. *The Unity and Common Perspective of the Old Calendarist Orthodox Anti-Ecumenists of Greece, Romania, and Bulgaria*

III. “A Descent from the Cross of Orthodox Witness”

The present document is a sermon by His Eminence, Bishop Photii of Triaditza, delivered during the Divine Liturgy on the Feast of the Ascension of our Savior, in the Cathedral of the Dormition of the Theotokos, in Sofia, Bulgaria (4/17 May 2007).

The God-Man Christ, beloved Faithful, came from the Truth, brought the Truth to us as a gift, and returned to the Truth, lifting up human nature, on the fortieth day after His Resurrection, to the very Throne of the Holy, Consubstantial, Life-giving, and Indivisible Trinity.

The Savior came not only to show us the path toward the Truth; He came as one Who was Himself the Truth and the Way to it. Christ the Lord levelled down the walls between earthly humans and the celestial Truth.

Indeed, if we do not rise above the terrestrial dust, if we do not rally courage enough to transcend our own nothingness, and overcome our voluptuous desires for earthly things, we are unable to walk on the path towards the Truth; we are unable to be children of the Truth; and we are unable to live with the Truth and in the Truth.

And the path leading towards the Truth leads all the way upwards, and never downwards, just as Christ’s path led up to Golgotha. Our very first step in rising from the earth to Heaven, our very first rupture with earthly bounds is our ascent upon the cross, as Christ Himself was raised from the earth upon the Cross, in order that He might draw every man toward Himself: toward the Truth, toward the Way, and toward Life.

The path from the cross to Heaven, to immortal life, is indeed sometimes of extensive duration and of long distance—very long;

sometimes it may be traversed in but an instant, as was the case with many of the Holy New Martyrs of Batak, whose memory we celebrate today, together with Christ's glorious Ascension.

However, there is nothing at all so grievous as one who, having once torn himself away from the earth and ascended his cross, afterwards becomes frightened by the way of the Cross and the Resurrection, or who has been misled by the earthly desire to feel again the earthy dust under his feet.

Lo, today the Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad descends from the cross of its Orthodox witness.

Today, by serving the liturgy together, the stage is set for the Church Abroad to be absorbed into the organism of the Moscow Patriarchate.

Lo, today the Archpriests seal their descent from their cross by exchanging a liturgical kiss with those who beckoned them to descend from the cross, as they had themselves done in the past.

How painful is the lie, which in our days calls the descent an ascent, and the fall a rising!

When the Hierarchs of the Church Abroad were raised from the earth on the cross of witnessing for Orthodoxy, they were called schismatics; when they descended from the cross, when they delivered to Cæsar—be he even an ecclesiastical Cæsar—that which belongs to God, they immediately rose in his eyes and became his brethren.

Indeed, is there anything more disheartening than to see how falsehood bedecks itself with the garments of Truth?

Indeed, those who descended from the cross pronounce, and will continue to pronounce, just as many words of fidelity to the Church and Orthodoxy—words glorifying the exploits of the Martyrs and Confessors; but is it really decent to plait wreaths of verbal praise for spiritual heroes, having oneself fled in disgrace from the battlefield?

Is it not immoral, having yourself abandoned your witness to the Truth for the sake of earthly benefits and gains, to glorify persons who held the love of Truth to be higher than their own lives?

And yet, Cæsar will not celebrate his victory for long. He will not be jubilant for long, that what is God's has been delivered to him by the hands of Bishops, with the sole purpose of acquiring his favor. For God is never mocked! For the God-Man, after His Ascension, abides with us, with all who, even though weak, aspire to tread the path leading upward, and only upward—to Golgotha and the Cross, and thence toward the Heavenly Homeland, from which there pour down on us the streams of the love of the New Martyrs of Batak, of the Holy New Martyrs and Confessors of Russia, and of all the citizens of Heaven, who walked their earthly path in the never-setting light of the Way, the Truth, and the Life! Amen.





OLD CALENDAR ORTHODOX CHURCH OF GREECE
HOLY SYNOD IN RESISTANCE

Protocol No. 340

To the Holy Synod of the
Russian Orthodox Church Abroad
care of His Eminence,
Archbishop Laurus
New York, U.S.A.

Fili, Attika
1 January 2001 (Old Style)
Circumcision of Our Savior
St. Basil the Great

Most Reverend Holy Hierarchs, beloved Brethren and concelbrants with Our Humility, greeting Your Eminences fraternally in the Lord with a holy kiss, we take the greatest pleasure in addressing you.

We greet you all at the beginning of the New Year of Our Lord's goodness, which ushers in the third millennium after Christ, offering up doxology to God in the Highest for His indescribable bounty. May His Name be blessed!

I. Through our present fraternal epistle, which also expresses the unanimous opinion of all of the members of our Holy Synod in Resistance, I wish to make it known to Your Eminences that, after reading with particular attention the epistle of last October from your Holy Synod to your flock, we gave thanks to Our Lord, Who preserves your Orthodox Church Abroad united and vibrant and

Who grants her the wisdom to discern His holy will, which is “*good, acceptable, and perfect,*” on the basis of newly developing historical circumstances and challenges.

We are, to be sure, aware of the trial through which part of your God-saved flock is passing, evidently on account of an incorrect understanding of the spirit of your epistle. For this reason, we sincerely beseech that the Lord God may bring peace to the hearts of all and that love, unity, and peace, sweet in reality and in name, may thus prevail—this surety of spiritual progress and unimpeded fulfillment of the saving work of the Church.

In connection with this communication of ours, we deem it expedient to bring to the attention of Your Eminences certain thoughts and views “*for edification, and not for destruction,*” which stem from our sense of responsibility before the universal Church, and the purpose of which is to safeguard the unity of our Holy Synods.

* * *

II. The aim of our unity, inaugurated in 1994 as a natural corollary of our common Orthodox confession, was to present a joint witness to the truth before the official Orthodox jurisdictions, which are enmeshed, in our day, in the apostasy of ecumenism, following the example of such eminent Hierarchs and lodestars of your Holy Synod as the sainted Metropolitan Philaret (†1985) and Archbishop Averky (†1976).

Such, first and foremost, was the meaning, for us, of Eucharistic communion with you, and the fruitful collaboration that we had anticipated was abundantly evident during the first two years of our union, that is, up until 1996.

(1) Since that time, and in spite of our sincere sentiments of love and respect towards you, we have noticed that you maintain a “distance” towards us, and furthermore, we have encountered, oddly enough, a disagreeable and, at times, unfraternal attitude on the part of certain Hierarchs of your Holy Synod, having been compelled, with much patience, forbearance, and prayer, to respond to

certain accusations and to furnish the requisite elucidations with alacrity and clarity, as we did, for example, in our official Synodal Letter, Protocol No. 244 (10 January 1997).

(2) Subsequently, certain ecclesiastical acts of your Holy Synod posed understandable dilemmas for us, insofar as the ecclesiological identity of our Holy Synod, which is openly and unswervingly anti-ecumenical, has never permitted us to have communion with the official Orthodox jurisdictions, since they are actively involved in the *ecumenical movement* and belong to the *World Council of Churches*, whereas your Synod—albeit charily, yet without, at any rate, making a secret of it—has been acting in a contrary manner.

(3) Indeed, we surmise that this direct or indirect—though steady—communion of some of your clergy with certain official ecumenist jurisdictions derives from a specific strategy of your Synod, which, although we accept it in part, we nonetheless cannot overlook, since we observe, with justifiable disquiet, that this tactic of yours is leading you into two impasses:

(i) into an inconsistency of theory and practice, whereby your synodally and emphatically stated anti-ecumenist self-understanding is vitiated in practice through communion with the ecumenists or those in communion with them;

(ii) into a *de facto* abrogation of one of the principal goals of our existence as walled-off Orthodox communities, namely, the continuous and fraternal reminder, on our part, to the ecumenists of their ungodly course and their constant estrangement from the Synodal and Patristic Tradition of Orthodoxy.

(4) In writing the foregoing, we have in mind primarily your well-known, putatively unofficial, and sporadic communion with the Serbian Church, which, it should not be forgotten, participates fully in the contemporary syncretistic inter-Christian and interfaith ecumenical movement, notwithstanding the hopeful inquietude and reaction within her fold, on the part of both clergy and laity.

(5) It is noteworthy that these increasing concelebrations of some of your Hierarchs with certain official jurisdictions involved in ecumenism came to the point of being held, and overtly promoted, up to the very eve of the meeting of your venerable Synod this past October, putting us in such an awkward position vis-à-vis our justly disquieted flock that it was difficult for us to reassure it, in view of the fact that one of our clergy has already broken communion with us on account of your vacillating position towards the ecumenists.

(6) At this juncture, we can assert that certain resolutions issued at the recent meeting of your Hierarchy increase our anxiety over the future and therefore impel us to agonized and fervent prayer, since, for example, the appointment and promotion to more responsible positions within your Hierarchy of persons adversely disposed towards us, such as His Eminence, Bishop Ambrose, and also your transparently official position towards the Serbian Church and towards certain other local Churches, such as those of Georgia and Czechoslovakia, are indicative of the fact that you and we do not have a common understanding of the attitude to be maintained towards official Church administrations involved in ecumenism.

(7) Moreover, the recent acknowledgement on your part of the official communion that exists with the Serbs, and also your plea that this communion not be severed, and, in addition, your sympathetic attitude towards certain local Churches, which may appear at first sight to be more conservative by comparison with the rest, confirm our perception that you are, in essence, being steadily led towards a gradual relinquishment of the splendid anti-ecumenical Tradition of your Holy Synod, a Tradition that was formed during the past thirty-five years and expressed with singular theological clarity.

(8) Thus, it is evident that this gradual relinquishment of your erstwhile anti-ecumenical Tradition is turning into a dead letter the declaration contained in your recent Synodal Epistle concerning the need to preserve the purity of the Faith and of anti-ecumenism unadulterated, since this preservation would obligate you to conform

fully to the demands of Orthodox resistance and walling-off, for the Patristic criterion thereof is permanently valid:

“putting truth and one’s own firmness in the right Faith before everything” (St. Basil the Great, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXXII, col. 925BC).

(9) We hope that—on the basis of what we have set forth above in summary form—our reference to “understandable dilemmas” (§II.2) has become clear. These dilemmas assume an almost dramatic form, when we take into serious consideration the fact that our common struggle of Faith and Confession, in the past century, was replete with heroic and holy figures in Russia, Greece, Romania, and Bulgaria, who chose witness, martyrdom, and “*the reproach of Christ*” as the only tried and salvific way, in preference to *reprehensible communion* with the official, but ecumenist, Orthodox jurisdictions.

(10) It would not be possible, in any case, for us to ignore the Martyrs and Confessors, our forebears in the Faith, refusing to “*remember our leaders*,” especially at a time when the so-called official Orthodox, as you have perhaps already been informed, only recently, after all Liturgizing together and celebrating the Feast of the Nativity at the Phanar and in Nicæa, according to the New Calendar, issued a joint “*Message*” (26 December 2000), upholding, *inter alia*, the contemporary *ecumenical movement*, which they present as a supposedly imperative endeavor to restore unity among Christians by means of the dialogue of truth and love, as if the *ecumenical movement* were merely an innocuous “dialogue of truth and love,” and emphatically proclaiming the following, *inter alia*:

Any rupture in the unity of the Church on the pretext of preserving customs or traditions or of supposedly defending true Orthodoxy must be considered unacceptable and reprehensible. As the entire life of the Orthodox Church attests, differences over customs in no way impede Eucharistic communion between Orthodox Churches, while preservation of the genuine Orthodox Faith is safeguarded through the Synodal system, which

has always constituted the final arbiter in the Church concerning matters of faith. (¶10).

(11) It is clear that our position and yours is characterized as “*unacceptable and reprehensible.*” However, we are not “*rupturing the unity of the Church*” over secondary issues, but walling ourselves off lawfully and canonically from those Orthodox ecumenists who, since 1920, have, through syncretistic coöperation and joint prayers with the heterodox, and also through ecumenical theology and theological dialogues, become so corroded that your Holy Synod rightly declared in 1971 (Montréal, 14-28 September 1971) that “*ecumenism is a heresy contrary to the dogma of the Church.*”

(12) It should be observed, besides, that the foregoing “condemnations” of you and us were signed not only by the greatest of the ecumenists, Patriarch Bartholomew, but also by Patriarchs Petros of Alexandria, Ignatios of Antioch, and Teoctist of Romania, Archbishop Anastasios of Tirana, Metropolitan Ambrose of Oulu (Finland), Archbishop Christodoulos of Athens, Patriarch Maxim of Sofia, *et al.*, and by those adhering to the Old Calendar, yet participating in ecumenism and the *World Council of Churches* and agreeing in every respect with the other Primates, namely, Patriarch Pavle of Serbia, Metropolitan Abraham, the representative of the Georgian Church, and Archbishop Nicholas of the Czech Lands and Slovakia, Patriarch Alexey of Moscow being absent on account of the well-worn question of Estonia, and certainly not because of any difference over the aforementioned accords.

* * *

Your Eminences, Holy Hierarchs:

III. The constantly hardening attitude towards you and us on the part of the Orthodox ecumenists caught up in innovation and heresy, reaching, indeed, the truly tragic point of their re-Ordaining our clergy when they accede to them, has impelled us—by way

of the present epistle—to endeavor, on the one hand, to foster a deeper awareness of the ecclesiological foundations of our Orthodox communities and, on the other hand, to renew our resolution to continue our Orthodox and God-pleasing resistance, so as to put into effect the Synodal conscience of the Church, for the purpose of condemning the heresy of ecumenism and its corollaries at a Pan-Orthodox or Œcumenical Synod, in order that the Church, which today is divided, may thereby be united in the Orthodox Faith.

(1) Our Holy Synod is resolved, by the Grace of God, to continue living up to the confidence of its anguished flock and not to have—as it has not had hitherto—either direct or indirect communion with the Orthodox ecumenists.

(2) Our stand, in conformity in every respect with the Synodal and Patristic Tradition of Orthodoxy, wards off any relativization of the truth, curbs escalating interconfessional and interfaith syncretism, and finally preserves the Church from dogmatic, ethical, and canonical “minimalism.”

(3) It is very clear that this broad spectrum of Orthodox and God-pleasing resistance ultimately constitutes the hope of pious Orthodox Christians everywhere, who observe with profound disquiet the participation of the official jurisdictions in the aforementioned pernicious process, as a necessary consequence of their participation in the ecumenical movement and the *World Council of Churches*.

(4) Our Holy Synod, perceiving this disquiet on the part of pious Orthodox Christians, and being aware of her calling, is ready to provide assistance to all who approach her in their desire to remain within the saving bounds of anti-innovationist Orthodoxy, not sparing any efforts or sacrifices, as she has, moreover, always done, with God’s help.

(5) We are most deeply convinced that the continual increase of walled-off anti-ecumenist communities within the various local of-

ficial jurisdictions is our **historic vocation**. In responding to this, we maintain our Orthodox identity, by Divine Grace, and we preserve the Apostolic and Patristic “**legacy**” unadulterated, in the hope of the miracle of union through the condemnation of the heresy of ecumenism.

(6) The sensitivity of your Holy Synod to this vision has always been an inspiration to us—indeed, it was for this reason that we opened Eucharistic communion with you—, and we now pray fervently that the Divine Founder of the Church will enlighten, strengthen, and guide you in the continuation of your anti-ecumenical Tradition in concordance with the precepts of our common “*Leaders*” and in full awareness of the lofty demands of our extremely confused age.

(7) A fraternal response on your part to our present humble epistle would be an occasion of especial and deep joy for us, so that the “*unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace*” (Ephesians 4:3) between us might thus be made manifest.

* * *

In conclusion, bestowing once again on Your Eminences a fraternal kiss in the Lord and beseeching the Divine Founder of the Church that He grant you as many years of health and joy as possible, we remain, with profound love in Christ and with all respect,

The beloved brother in Christ of Your Eminences,

† Metropolitan Cyprian of Oropos and Fili,
First Hierarch of the Holy Synod in Resistance



OLD CALENDAR ORTHODOX CHURCH OF GREECE
HOLY SYNOD IN RESISTANCE

The Holy Synod in Resistance and the
Russian Orthodox Church Abroad

**Statement on the Recent Rapproche-
ment Between the Russian Orthodox Church
Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate**

A. The Russian Orthodox Church Abroad

The Russian Orthodox Church Abroad (ROCA) is that part of the Russian Church that fled Russia after the 1917 Revolution and which was dispersed throughout Europe, America, Asia, and Australia. It was established on canonical grounds with approval from St. Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia (1919, 1920, 1922), from the Patriarchate of Constantinople (1920), and from the Serbian Orthodox Church, which hosted it (1921-). It has maintained no communion with the Moscow Patriarchate on the grounds of its special relations with the atheistic and anti-ecclesiastical Soviet régime, relations which became fully established after the repose of the Holy Patriarch Tikhon (1925), when Metropolitan Sergius of Nizhegorod, whom the government had designated Locum Tenens of the vacant Patriarchal throne, made his notorious “Declaration” of loyalty to the Soviets in 1927 (“Sergianism”).

The ROCA formed a synodal jurisdiction on the basis of the foregoing, having as its Chief Hierarchs Metropolitans Anthony (†1936), Anastassy (†1965), Philaret (†1985), Vitaly (retired, 2001), and at present Metropolitan Laurus (October 2001-), constituting thereby the free part of the historical Russian Church and maintaining its rich ecclesiastical heritage. For this reason, it was from the very outset opposed to the spirit of innovation, reform, and ecumenism. It has always followed the traditional Church Calendar, and in 1983 it issued a synodal condemnation of ecumenism.

This stand led the ROCA to the gradual cessation, particularly after the Second World War, and especially since 1965, of all communion with the other local Orthodox Churches, with which, up to that point, it had maintained unofficial or informal relations.

B. Relations with the Greek Old Calendarists

In 1960, in the U.S.A, and in 1962, in Greece, the ROCA Consecrated Bishops for the Greek Old Calendarists, who, after the calendar change of 1924, were organized as a separate ecclesiastical community.

In 1969, the Holy Synod of the ROCA, under Metropolitan Philaret, recognized these Consecrations and entered into full ecclesiastical communion with them. The Greek Old Calendarists were at the time under the jurisdiction of the ever-memorable Archbishop Auxentios, with whom the ROCA broke communion, however, in 1978, on the grounds of canonical infractions on the part of the Greeks.

The ROCA, under Metropolitan Vitaly, opened full ecclesiastical communion with the Romanian Old Calendarists under Metropolitan Vlasie in 1992; then, in the year 1994, with the Greek Old Calendarists under Metropolitan Cyprian of Oropos and Fili, as well as the Bulgarian Old Calendarists under Bishop Photii of Triaditza.

C. Rapprochement Between the ROCA and Moscow

The ten-year-old union of the ROCA and the Greek, Romanian, and Bulgarian Old Calendarists had as its basis, aside from the obvious need for mutual reinforcement and support, a common anti-ecumenical self-consciousness, manifested primarily in the cessation of communion with all of the “official” local Orthodox Churches, which participate in the ecumenical movement and are active members of the World Council of Churches (1948-), and also a concerted, and therefore more effective, confrontation of the proliferation of ecumenism within the local Orthodox Churches.

However, over time it became obvious that the ROCA was going through a progressive crisis with regard to its ecclesiological identity; and its overtures, albeit unofficial at the outset, towards the Moscow Patriarchate (beginning in 2000), and towards the ecumenist jurisdictions in general provoked initial disquietude in the Holy Synod in Resistance, a fruit of which was, first and foremost, an official letter (Protocol No. 340/1 January 2001) addressed to the Holy Synod of the ROCA by Metropolitan Cyprian of Oropos and Fili, President of the Synod in Resistance.

In this letter, with the consent of the Holy Synod, His Eminence wrote the following, among other things:

“Our Holy Synod is resolved, by the Grace of God, to continue, in response to the confidence placed in it by its pious and anguished flock, refraining—as it has hitherto—from direct or indirect communion with the Orthodox ecumenists.”

His Eminence also pointed out to our Russian brethren that

“you are, in essence, on a steady course towards the gradual relinquishment of the glorious anti-ecumenist tradition of your Church that has been fostered during

the past thirty-five years and which has been expounded with singular theological clarity.”

With the elevation of a new Chief Hierarchy for the ROCA in October of 2001, which provoked a schism within its ranks by reason of this new direction, the Synod in Resistance maintained communion with Metropolitan Laurus and the Bishops with him because, in spite of its reservations, it was satisfied that the policy statements of the new Primate were genuinely Orthodox and because it viewed as hyperbolic the complaints of those outside and within Russia who, albeit after the fact, did not recognize his election.

Notwithstanding this, already last year (in 2003), the situation began to give rise to justifiable concern, in particular because of the vigorous promotion of a clearly new direction in the ROCA, in spite of its statements and confirmations to the contrary.

Precisely because of this unpleasant development, Metropolitan Cyprian, in a number of memoranda to the ROCA, expressed the opposition of our Synod in Resistance to the steps being taken by the ROCA, that is, its rapprochement with Moscow, reminding its Bishops at all times that, even if the other reasons for separation from the Moscow Patriarchate were regarded as essentially no longer valid, there was still one absolutely insurmountable impediment to union; namely, the heresy of ecumenism.

D. The Acceleration of Contacts Towards Rapprochement

Unfortunately, contacts and overtures between the ROCA and Moscow have increased and accelerated, and this with intense pressure from the Russian authorities, using the Moscow Patriarchate as the primary tool for exerting such pressure, and, to be sure, with the guiding influence of the Serbian Orthodox Church over certain elements in the ROCA. The most important steps in this journey towards union were the following:

1) The meeting in New York City, in September 2003, of Hierarchical representatives of the ROCA with the President of Russia [an ex-KGB General—*Trans.*], Vladimir Putin;

2) The meeting in Moscow, in November 2003, of Hierarchical representatives of the ROCA with Patriarch Alexis and members of the Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate;

3) The official visit to Moscow, in May 2004, of Metropolitan Laurus, during which, in an atmosphere of prayerful communion, a dialogue concerning union was conducted and it was decided to establish Committees for Dialogue and to set the agenda for union discussions;

4) The inauguration, in June 2004, of the work of the Committees for Dialogue in Moscow, and the elaboration of common statements of agreement to be submitted to the respective Hierarchs of each Church for evaluation.

Anticipating the meeting of the full Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate in October and the usual meeting of the full Synod of the ROCA at the beginning of 2005, we may conclude that these developments will be very swift and dramatic.

Official voices in both the ROCA and the Moscow Patriarchate assure us that, in fact, this union has been decided upon and that its accomplishment is now a matter of time, since the things that unite them, as they tellingly put it, are very cogent, whereas the things that divide them, are matters of secondary importance, including the issue of ecumenism.

E. The Resisters in the Face of These Developments

The Holy Synod in Resistance, in common thought with our Romanian and Bulgarian Old Calendarist brethren, are following these developments, with which, of course, they are *prima facie* in disagreement at a root level, with attention and prayer.

With regard to the issue of immediate and official cessation of communion with the ROCA so quickly after the initiation of these proceedings towards rapprochement, we have not deemed such final action to be the most efficacious solution, but have decided to continue gradually distancing ourselves from this situation, keeping in mind that, for several years now, we have, in effect, had almost no communion with the ROCA. It is our intention to exercise benevolent influence in a healthy direction over the various factions within the ROCA.

In the face of these truly dramatic developments, even if we are nearing the boundaries of economy, we consider it preferable to maintain our stand of forbearance in delaying official and definitive cessation of communion with the ROCA, in the hope that this planned union will be averted by some miraculous intervention, calling upon the intercessions of the Most Blessed *Theotokos* and all the Saints, and especially the New Martyrs of Russia and St. John of Shanghai and San Francisco, by whose special protection and guidance our communion with the ROCA was, from the beginning, accomplished.

If and when the union of a portion of the ROCA with Moscow becomes certain, definite, and irrevocable (God forbid!), we will immediately cease communion with that group, continuing our communion with the remaining portion of the Church, if they should, indeed, wish such communion—providing, of course, that they also maintain a clear anti-ecumenical stance, refusing communion with the ecumenists at all costs, whether directly or indirectly.

*From the Chancery
of the Holy Synod in Resistance,
Fili, Attika, 20 July 2004 (Old Style)
Holy and Glorious Prophet Elias the Thesbite*



OLD CALENDAR ORTHODOX CHURCH OF GREECE
HOLY SYNOD IN RESISTANCE

Protocol No. 408

To the Holy Synod of the
Russian Orthodox Church Abroad,
per His Eminence,
Metropolitan Laurus
New York, U.S.A.

Fili, Attika
11 October 2004 (Old Style)
Holy Fathers of the
Seventh Œcumenical Synod

Your Eminence, Metropolitan Laurus;
Most Reverend Holy Hierarchs:

Beloved Brethren in Christ and Divinely-wise Fathers, greeting Your Eminences with a holy kiss, we take the greatest pleasure in addressing you.

Having completed, by the Grace of our Savior, the second month of the new Church year, and honoring the memory of the Holy Fathers of the Seventh Œcumenical Synod, we greet you all and humbly pray that you might have health and strength for your lofty duties, under the illuminating and protecting Veil of the Most Blessed *Theotokos* and Ever-Virgin Mary.

* * *

I. Through our present fraternal epistle, I wish to inform Your Eminences, with the authorization of our Holy Synod in Resistance, which recently convened for its regular annual meeting, on 3 October 2004 (Old Style), about the following matter.

When we addressed ourselves to you in an official Synodal Epistle (Protocol No. 340/I January 2001 [Old Style]), about four years ago, we concluded our somewhat lengthy text by saying that

“a brotherly reply on your part to the present humble epistle would give us especial and profound joy, so that we might thereby make clear the ‘unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace’ (Ephesians 4:3) that exists between us.”

To this day we have yet to taste of this joy; that is to say, we have not received any epistle through which, with your Hierarchical wisdom, you might express the official views of the venerable Russian Orthodox Church Abroad on the very serious ecclesiological questions set forth in our aforementioned Synodal Epistle.

* * *

II. This protracted silence of yours, coupled with a long-standing and total absence of Eucharistic communion with one another, and combined with the onward march of ecumenism, as promoted by those claiming to be the official representatives of Orthodoxy (see, for example, the concluding event in the visit of Patriarch Bartholomew to the Vatican, 29-30 June 2004), and with the steady and rapid unionist rapprochement of your venerable Synod with the Moscow Patriarchate, to which let us add the openly publicized concelebrations of your Hierarchs with certain ecumenist official jurisdictions—for example, with the Serbian Patriarchate—, has understandably given rise to deep anguish in us and our rational flock, and has increased to the utmost the disquiet that we have already expressed.

We are convinced that these startling and truly dramatic developments, which we, along with our Old Calendarist Orthodox

brethren in Romania and Bulgaria, have been following with attention and prayer, and with which we must express yet again our fundamental disagreement, are diametrically opposed to the heroic stand taken by a number of holy persons and Confessors in Russia, Greece, Romania, Bulgaria, and the Diaspora.

These individuals preferred confession and martyrdom as the only way of salvation, rejecting as reprehensible any communion with the official Orthodox jurisdictions, both on account of the Church-hating Sergianism [of the Moscow Patriarchate] and on account of the heretical ecumenism [espoused by all such Churches] and its immediate by-products, deriving from the *program of the 1920 Encyclical of the Patriarchate of Constantinople*, and they have confirmed, and continue to confirm, the correctness of their stand through miracles and signs.

How, reverend and beloved brethren in Christ, could we possibly ignore the Martyrs and Confessors, our forebears in the Faith, who contended valiantly in the preceding century?

Indeed, how can we henceforth “*remember our leaders*,” if in practice we deny their good “*legacy*,” according to which the so-called ecumenical movement is leading to the apostasy of the last times?

Your Holy Synod is, of course, free to choose its own position with regard to its relations both with the ecumenical movement and with the Moscow Patriarchate, and so this intervention of ours could not be characterized as an act of misguided meddling in the affairs of another jurisdiction; it is, in fact, an expression of brotherly and pastoral duty, for the following reasons:

(a) our union with your Holy Synod, in the year of salvation 1994, came about on the basis of theological, nay ecclesiological *criteria*, which we now find that you are overturning in practice, without informing us straightforwardly or officially;

(b) the manifestly new course of your venerable Synod is having direct consequences and repercussions, both theological and practical, for our flock, which, naturally, is awaiting convincing answers to the manifold questions raised by your new policy; it has always

had a profound awareness that its existence, since 1924, as an Orthodox community walled off within the bounds of the Church of Greece, is due exclusively and solely to the heresy of ecumenism.

* * *

III. We, Holy Fathers and Brothers, like our Romanian and Bulgarian brethren, entered, more than ten years ago, into Eucharistic communion with your Holy Synod, on the basis of our common Orthodox confession, and with the prospect of giving a common witness to the Truth before the official Orthodox jurisdictions that have fallen into ecumenism, in continuity, furthermore, with the policy marked out by such ever-memorable Hierarchs as the saintly Metropolitan Philaret and the zealous Archbishop Averky.

Consequently, in keeping with the foregoing, our Holy Synod in Resistance is resolved, by the Grace of God, in response to the confidence placed in it by its pious and anguished flock, to continue refraining—as it has hitherto—from direct or indirect communion with the Orthodox ecumenists, including the Moscow Patriarchate.

We disagree radically with the *outlook* and with the general mentality of the ecumenists in question, because these are in direct opposition to the theology of the Fathers, as has been pointed out, moreover, in many different ways by some very prominent Orthodox theologians (such as the late Archimandrite Justin [Popović]).

As well, the Orthodox ecumenists have been proven untrustworthy, since, as a sober and in-depth scrutiny of the genesis and development of ecumenism (especially from 1920 onwards) demonstrates, they are guilty of duplicity and insincerity: they say and do one set of things in the circles of those of like mind with them (Orthodox and heterodox), but preach something else to the Faithful who are against ecumenism, in order to appease them.

Following the Holy Fathers, who exhort us thus: “*we are especially bound to avoid communion with those whose beliefs we abhor*” (St. Athanasios the Great, “Epistle to Those Who Practice the Solitary Life and are Established in Faith in God,” *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. XXVI, col. 1188BC), we believe that “*coming together*” and “*commun-*

ing” with ecumenists is not only not a matter of indifference, but also makes us “*enemies of God*” (St. Theodore the Studite, “Epistle I.39, ‘To Theophilus the Abbot,’” *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1049A), and, furthermore, leads us, through inveterate hobnobbing, “*into the mire of ungodliness*” (St. Athanasios, *ibid.*).

On the contrary, the stand of *God-pleasing resistance and walling-off*, which, entirely in accord with Synodal and Patristic Tradition of Orthodoxy throughout the centuries, involves breaking all communion, direct or indirect, with the ecumenists, accomplishes the following three salvific objectives, by the Grace of God:

(a) *it averts the relativization of the Truth and the resultant loss of any sense of the danger of heresy*, which is, unfortunately, fostered through hobnobbing with the heterodox and also through the acceptance by Orthodox ecumenists of the supposed ecclesiality of heterodox communities;

(b) *it checks the galloping inter-Christian and interfaith syncretism which the ecumenical movement openly encourages in its domain*, deeming it necessary that the Orthodox Church engage, together with the heterodox and the adherents of non-Christian religions, in common service to the world;

(c) *it preserves the one, unique Church, that is, Orthodoxy, from dogmatic, canonical, and ethical minimalism*, which is promoted above all within the ambit of the World Council of Churches, and which legitimates *de facto* the sundry deviations of Western Christianity, in particular, thereby destroying the sure boundaries of life and salvation in Christ marked out by the Fathers.

We have always been very deeply convinced that the constant increase of walled-off, anti-ecumenist communities within the local official jurisdictions not only does not constitute a “*schism*,” but is actually our **historic vocation**. If we respond to this vocation, we will, by Divine Grace, protect our Orthodox identity and will preserve the Apostolic and Patristic “*legacy*” unadulterated, in the hope

of the miracle of a reunion of the Faithful through the condemnation of the heresy of ecumenism.

* * *

IV. Needless to say, it is neither feasible nor permissible for the Holy Synod in Resistance to impose her own views, which flow directly from her fundamental ecclesiological principles, on those in communion with her; however, she does feel obligated to be completely consistent with her self-identity, and she feels it necessary, in the name of our common and mutual Patristic and Synodal Tradition, invoking the God-persuading intercessions of the Immaculate Mother of God and of all the Saints, to entreat and exhort your Holy Synod, with anguished brotherly love in Christ, to refrain from liturgical and prayerful communion with the official ecumenist jurisdictions, and to halt all further efforts towards union with the Moscow Patriarchate.

If you continue—God forbid!—to abandon the splendid Tradition of anti-ecumenism that you have hitherto upheld, and if, in addition, you continue to remain silent towards the written appeals from our Holy Synod in Resistance right up to the beginning of the year of salvation 2005, we will be obligated, with the deepest sorrow, to regard the rupture of all mutual ecclesiastical relations that has already been in effect for some years as complete and final, and to proclaim this officially, for the information of our gravely and justifiably concerned rational flock.

* * *

In conclusion, bestowing once again on Your Eminences a fraternal kiss in the Lord and beseeching the Divine Founder of the Church that He ever guide you in the paths of His will, we remain, with profound love in Christ and with all respect

The beloved brother in Christ of Your Eminences,

+ Metropolitan Cyprian of Oropos and Fili,
First Hierarchy of the Holy Synod in Resistance

• **Attachments:**

1. Our Synodal Epistle (Protocol No. 340 [I January 2001 (Old Style)]).
2. The Communiqué of 20 July 2004 (Old Style) from the Chancery of the Holy Synod in Resistance: “Statement on the Recent Rapprochement Between the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate.”



OLD CALENDAR ORTHODOX CHURCH OF GREECE
HOLY SYNOD IN RESISTANCE

Protocol No. 409

To the Holy Synod of the
Russian Orthodox Church Abroad
per His Eminence,
Metropolitan Laurus
New York, U.S.A.

Fili, Attika
5 December 2004 (Old Style)
St. Sabbas the Sanctified

Your Eminence, Metropolitan Laurus;
Most Reverend Holy Hierarchs:

Beloved Brethren and Fathers in Christ, greeting Your Eminences with a holy kiss, we take the greatest pleasure in addressing you.

Finding ourselves, by the Grace of Our Savior, in the midst of the Holy Fast, and approaching the Feasts of the Divine Epiphany of Our Lord Jesus Christ, we offer a humble wish to all of you that you might worship the Great Mystery of Piety, that is, the Incarnation of the Word, in health of soul and body and with ineffable spiritual consolation, by the intercessions of our Immaculate Lady, the *Theotokos*.

I. A short while ago, we had the honor of receiving an epistle, dated 4/17 November 2004, from your First Hierarch, His Eminence, Metropolitan Laurus, and at the outset we rejoiced with especial joy over this communication between us; but subsequently, after reading it, we felt astonishment [that is, at your suggestion that we unite with the ecumenist New Calendar Church of Greece—*Trans.*].

This astonishment of ours was due to the fact that, although I had recently sent to your Holy Synod our **Synodal Letter, Protocol No. 408 (11 October 2004 [Old Style])**, four pages in length, in which a great many serious issues pertaining to ecclesiastical relations between you and us were set forth, and through which you were asked for an immediate, clear, and cogent response to these issues, strangely enough, the aforementioned epistle from His Eminence, Metropolitan Laurus made no reference to our letter, but contained only some generalities regarding the rapprochement between the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate. These generalities are, moreover, familiar from other sources, which enjoy wide circulation in the press, both electronic and printed.

II. The Old Calendarist Orthodox in Greece, most holy Brother and venerable First Hierarch, have always maintained sentiments of profound gratitude towards the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, because it was through her that they were able to combine zeal for the preservation of Church Tradition, as you pointedly write, with Ordinations at the hands of canonical Hierarchs.

Nonetheless, our Orthodox ecclesiastical community in resistance has always had the feeling that it is not confronting [as you say] certain “wounds” of “division” or certain “ecclesiastical infirmities” of secondary importance, in need of “healing” by means of a dialogue.

Our position and our action of walling-off and resistance are due, as we have often, and with documentation, made clear, to the fact that the official Orthodox jurisdictions are openly ecumenist, that is, that they have adopted the ecclesiological panheresy of ecumenism (1920 *et seq.*), the syncretistic practices of which now constitute the

invariable behavior of these ecclesiastical administrations—at a pan-Orthodox level, at that—, which promote this behavior so actively, steadfastly, and programmatically, that for well nigh three decades now they have been in the vanguard of participation in the natural outcome thereof, namely, the indisputably syncretistic interfaith movement, with very grave soteriological repercussions.

III. The Churches of Constantinople and Athens, Most Reverend Metropolitan, are not working, as you write, to “*heal divisions and infirmities*,” that is, to examine the possibility that they are in error regarding the Faith and to reject their anti-Patristic beliefs and return to unity with the Church of the Saints who dwell in Heaven, from which they have, unfortunately, cut themselves off.

Quite to the contrary: their efforts, persisting firmly, as they do, in the cacodoxy of ecumenism, aim at the subjugation and absorption of the Old Calendarist Orthodox in resistance through the creation of a kind of *intra-Orthodox Unia*, such as is now, for instance, exemplified in America by the dreadfully fallen Hierarchs Paisios and Vikentios.

Of what benefit can it be to the latter to retain the traditional Church Calendar, while at the same time they are in communion with the apostasy of inter-Christian and interfaith ecumenism? Did the Phanariots perhaps respect the Consecrations of both these Bishops, which derived indirectly from canonical Hierarchs, that is, from your Holy Synod?

IV. In any case, not wishing to raise objections to all of the thoughts contained in your epistle, Your Eminence, I hope that you will allow our Holy Synod to abide by all that it upholds in its aforementioned letter and to consider that this letter remains in essence unanswered by Your Eminence *qua* First Hierarch.

Our respect and gratitude to your Holy Synod is upheld, and will be upheld, by the Grace of God, while our sorrow is tempered by the hope that the Most Blessed *Theotokos* will not ultimately permit you to enter into full communion with those Orthodox jurisdictions that may be official, but have fallen into ecumenism, and

which, solely through a consistent Orthodox and God-pleasing resistance and walling-off, have the chance of waking up and recovering the Patristic identity that they have lost.

I append to the present epistle a relatively recent article of ours entitled “*Athens is ‘More Ecumenical than the Ecumenical Phanar,’*” so that you might ascertain how well-founded our views are and what is the true climate that prevails at the Phanar and in Athens.

Symptomatic of the fact that the Phanar labors in the *captivity of ecumenism* is its promotion, *inter alia*, of the anti-Orthodox theology of Baptismal, and that last September, at the *Thirteenth Meeting* between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Protestant “*Evangelical Church in Germany*” (Phanar, 16-22 September 2004), it was proclaimed that “*we each regard the other’s members as baptized and we reject any re-baptism*” (Joint Communiqué, 22 September 2004, website of the Patriarchate of Constantinople).

The Patriarchate of Belgrade could never be regarded as a model, either, of Orthodox anti-ecumenism as of old, in the days of the ever-memorable Father Justin (Popović), or as an Orthodox “*clinic for ecclesiastical infirmities,*” since just recently it announced, among other things, to the utmost sorrow of the pious, that it is in the vanguard of “*pan-Christian assemblies,*” through all of the anti-Orthodox activities that took place and were vigorously promoted at the “*Inter-Church*” *Conference in Subotica-Becej, Serbia* (22-24 November 2004) [see the section “*News*” of the website of the Patriarchate of Serbia].

V. Patristic and canonical Tradition is not only completely unaware of any cure of *ecclesiastical infirmities* necessitated by deviations from dogmatic truth, in communion with the sickness of heresy and without a radical theological critique of false belief, but actually enjoins Orthodox resistance and walling-off, *ad referendum*, of course, to a major Synod for decisive and complete healing.

And we could not follow any other path, Venerable First Hierarch, when the Holy Fathers proclaim their conviction that heresy, and consequently, panheretical ecumenism

not only does not bind up the wounded, but also smites those whose wounds have been bound; not only does not raise up the downcast, but also strives to cast down those who stand; not only does not gather together the dispersed, but also divides those gathered together” (St. Celestine of Rome, “Epistle to the Clergy and People of Constantinople,” in *Acta Conciliorum Œcumenicorum*, ed. E. Schwartz, Vol. IV, p. 85).

Indeed, a rupture of communion or coöperation for reasons of Faith should not, say the Saints, be postponed even in cases where love for a sibling is, at first sight, a serious consideration, and certainly when love for one’s countrymen is at issue. In fact, in the latter case it is enjoined with even more zeal:

‘When the word of truth is in dispute,’ St. John Chrysostomos declares, ‘recognize who your kinsman is and who is the stranger. Even if you have a brother from the same father and the same mother, and he does not commune with you in the law of truth, let him be more a barbarian in your eyes than a Scythian’ (*Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LV, col. 461).

* * *

In conclusion, abiding by the contents of our Synodal Letter, Protocol No. 408 (11 October 2004 [Old Style]), we bestow on Your Eminences a fraternal kiss in the Lord, beseeching the Divine Founder of the Church that He ever guide you in the paths of His will, and we remain, with profound love and respect in Christ,

The beloved brother in Christ of Your Eminences,

+ Metropolitan Cyprian of Oropos and Fili,
First Hierarch of the Holy Synod in Resistance

Attachment:



OLD CALENDAR ORTHODOX CHURCH OF GREECE
HOLY SYNOD IN RESISTANCE

Protocol No. 412

To the Holy Synod of the Fili, Attika
Russian Orthodox Church Abroad 22 November 2005 (Old Style)
per His Eminence, Afterfeast of the Entrance of the *Theotokos*
Metropolitan Laurus
New York, U.S.A.

Your Eminence, Metropolitan Laurus;
Your Eminences and Graces, Holy Hierarchs:

Beloved Brothers and Fathers in Christ, embracing Your Eminences and Graces, we beseech the Divine Founder of the Church to grant to us the gift of peace and unity.

Honoring and celebrating the Entrance of the Most Blessed *Theotokos*, this Great Feast of the Mother of God, we humbly pray that the Grace of her God-entreating adjurations might strengthen you, as well as all Orthodox Shepherds throughout the world, in the right teaching of the Word of Truth unto the end, *that the world might believe.*

I. I have the honor of addressing to Your Eminences and Graces my present humble Epistle, with the unanimous consent and approval of our Holy Synod of the Orthodox in Resistance, after prayerful deliberation and the invocation of the guidance of the Mother of God.

At its recent annual meeting (thirty-first session/4 October 2005 [Old Style]), our Holy Synod was fully briefed concerning various activities and documents of your venerable Synod pertaining to the ongoing dialogue between the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate.

Our particular interest was drawn to certain documents, which appeared simultaneously this past June on the official websites of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate.

The introductory document bears the title: “*Concerning the Joint Working Meetings of the Commissions of the Moscow Patriarchate and the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia.*” In one section of this document, there is a reference to our Holy Synod in Resistance.

May we be allowed, Most Reverend Brethren, to express not only our profound astonishment over the contents of the report in question, but also our sincere distress, because, by way of this document, as well as other recent and related activities and documents of your Holy Synod in the course of its journey towards “*Canonical Communion*” with Moscow, it is demonstrated that any further hopes for the preservation or rekindling of our ecclesiastical communion have, unfortunately, been fully and irrevocably dashed.

II. These sentiments of ours are entirely justified, and all the more so in that, while awaiting an answer to our four-page **Synodal Letter (Protocol No. 409/5 December 2004 [Old Style])**, in which we responded to the Epistle, dated **4/17 November 2004**, of your First Hierarchy, His Eminence, Metropolitan Laurus, we finally became cognizant of the aforementioned electronic [Internet] text, in which the aforesaid reference places in some confusion the meaning and chronology of our recent correspondence.

Thus, we feel obliged, Most Reverend Brethren, motivated by brotherly love in Christ, to remind you in brief of certain points in our **Synodal Letters** to you, with the assurance that this is not a question of causing further vexation to your Holy Synod, even as we will never relinquish our feelings of gratitude and respect for the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad.

(1) In our **Synodal Epistle (Protocol No. 408/II October 2004 [Old Style])**, noting your protracted silence towards our **Synodal Letter (Protocol No. 340/I January 2001 [Old Style])**, we observed that this silence,

“coupled with a long-standing and total absence of Eucharistic communion with one another, and also with the onward march of ecumenism, as fostered by those reputed to be the official representatives of Orthodoxy (see, in this regard, the culminating event in the visit of Patriarch Bartholomew to the Vatican, 29-30 June 2004), and thirdly with the steady and rapid unionist rapprochement of your respected Synod with the Moscow Patriarchate—to which let us add the vigorously promoted concelebrations of your Hierarchs with official ecumenist jurisdictions, such as the Serbian Patriarchate—understandably gave rise to deep anguish in us and our rational flock and increased to the utmost our already expressed disquietude.”

At that time, we also said that

“these startling and truly dramatic developments, which we, along with our Old Calendarist Orthodox brethren in Romania and Bulgaria, have been following with attention and prayer, and with which we must express yet again our fundamental disagreement, are diametrically opposed, according to our conviction, to the heroic stand taken by a number of holy persons and Confessors in Russia, Greece, Romania, Bulgaria, and the Diaspora.”

And we concluded as follows:

“If you continue—God forbid!—to abandon the splendid anti-ecumenical Tradition that you have hitherto upheld, and if, in addition, you persist in remaining silent in the face of the written appeals from our Holy Synod in Resistance through the beginning of the year of salvation 2005, we will be obligated, with the deepest sorrow, to regard as complete and decisive the rupture of all mutual ecclesiastical relations, which has already been in effect for some years, and to proclaim this officially, so as to inform our rational flock, which is gravely and justifiably concerned.”

(2) We immediately responded to the Letter of 4/17 November 2004 from His Eminence, Metropolitan Laurus with our Synodal Letter (Protocol No. 409/5 December 2004 [Old Style]), in which the following points, among many others, were made:

“In any case, not wishing to raise objections to all of the thoughts contained in your epistle, Your Eminence, I hope that you will allow our Holy Synod to abide by all that it upholds in its aforementioned Letter and to consider that this Letter remains in essence unanswered by Your Eminence qua First Hierarch.”

III. On the basis of the foregoing, Most Reverend Brethren, insofar as, in the meantime, there has emerged a climate that is diametrically opposed to that which led us, in 1994, to Eucharistic communion, our Holy Synod in Resistance has now categorically and finally decided—with deepest sorrow—officially to sever ecclesiastical relations with you.

The recent course of your Holy Synod, specifically with regard to its relations with the ecumenist Patriarchate of Moscow and to its conception of ecumenism, as this is expressed, for example, in your agreed statement with the Moscow Patriarchate, *“Concerning the Attitude of the Orthodox Church Towards the Heterodox and Inter-Confessional Organizations,”* is totally incompatible with its ecclesiology.

cal self-understanding as it was in 1994, since in its Resolution, at that time, to enter into union with us, it confessed the following:

“...[T]he Council [Synod] of Bishops holds that at the present time, when apostasy is spreading and many [so-called] official representatives of Orthodoxy, such as the Patriarchate of Constantinople and other Patriarchates, are succumbing to and embracing the position of the modernists and ecumenists, it is very important for the true Orthodox to unite, stand together, and oppose the betrayers of the Orthodoxy of the Holy Fathers” (Resolution of the Synod of Bishops, No. 3/50/148, 3/16 August 1994).

IV. Having set forth at length, Most Reverend Brethren, our ecclesiological views (especially in our **Synodal Epistles: Protocol No. 340/1 January 2001 [Old Style]**, **Protocol No. 408/11 October 2004 [Old Style]**, and **Protocol No. 409/5 December 2004 [Old Style]**), on the basis of which we repeatedly expressed to you our anxieties and objections regarding the truly new orientation of your Holy Synod towards the syncretistic ecumenical movement, our Holy Synod, at its **thirty-first meeting (4 October 2005 [Old Style])**, arrived at the following decision, which was distressing, in view of the bond of love in Christ that has existed [between us] for decades, but obligatory, for the sake of consistency with its own ecclesiological position:

1. Resolved: to sever, fully and decisively, ecclesiastical communion with the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, under His Eminence, Metropolitan Laurus, whose name has, for a year, already been deleted from the *Diptychs*.

2. Resolved: by a majority, out of extreme oikonomia, and for purely pastoral reasons not to declare, for the time being, this rupture of communion formally or to implement it in full.

3. Resolved: that the formal declaration and full implementation of this Act will take effect without further ado, immediately and automatically, upon the opening of communion between the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate.

4. Resolved: that the present Synodal Epistle shall be published on our website after its dispatch to the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, and that all of the relevant official documents will be published when the decision to break communion is fully implemented.

5. These Synodal Resolutions, and the fourth in particular, are also deemed necessary for the further purpose of formally and officially keeping informed our rational flock in Christ and the Old Calendarist Orthodox in Greece and abroad, in general, who are ascertaining, to their sorrow, that yet another sacred *champion* is succumbing to the pressures of the panheresy of ecumenism.

That which was already resolutely pointed out years ago by the ever-memorable Andreas Theodorou, Professor at the School of Theology of the University of Athens (†2004), is now becoming clearer:

“Ecumenism, this dreadful beast of the Apocalypse, this two-headed ecclesiological monstrosity, is completely suffocating the entire immaculate Body of Orthodoxy with its tentacles. The danger posed by ecumenism is perhaps the greatest in the history of the Orthodox Church.”

And it is, in fact, the “greatest” [danger], because, as Konstantinos Mouratides, another anti-ecumenist professor [at the University of Athens], most correctly observes:

“In the domain of the World Council of Churches [and of inter-confessional organizations in general], that which is categorically ruled out and condemned by the teaching” of the Holy Fathers, “that is, coöperation between Orthodoxy and heresy, and, correspond-

ingly, between Orthodox and heretics, in matters of Faith, is coming to fruition—collaboration in composing theological documents, joint participation in worship services, and joint representation of the Christian religion in discussions of the great problems facing humanity”; however, participation of such a kind constitutes “a flagrant transgression of the God-inspired sacred Canons and fundamental ecclesiastical principles, through which the very essence and the general redemptive course of Orthodoxy is attacked.”

* * *

With inexpressible sorrow, but also in the hope that the Grace of the Mother of God, through the intercessions of St. John Maximovich [of Shanghai and San Francisco], the most holy Metropolitan Philaret, and all the Russian New Martyrs, will awaken anew your Patristic zeal, so that your Holy Synod might prove once again to be an estimable force, a fortress and a fortified city, and a shield and breastplate of Orthodoxy in our truly apocalyptic times, we remain, as the least among Orthodox Hierarchs,

† Metropolitan Cyprian of Oropos and Fili,
First Hierarch of the Holy Synod in Resistance

The Unity and Common Perspective of the Old Calendarist Orthodox Anti-Ecumenists of Greece, Romania, and Bulgaria

In Fili, Attica

2 October 2006 (Old Style)

† Feast of Sts. Cyprian and Justina

a. The Old Calendarist Orthodox Anti-Ecumenists of Greece, Romania, and Bulgaria, under their Most Reverend Presidents, Metropolitan Cyprian of Oropos and Fili, Metropolitan Vlasie of Romania, and Bishop Photii of Triaditza, reckon it necessary, at this propitious point in time, to declare their ecclesiastical harmony and unity, as well as their common perspective on their sacred resistance against the ecclesiological heresy of *Ecumenism* and the condemnable innovation of the *New Calendar*.

b. As we know, the Anti-Ecumenists broke Mysteriological communion with the so-called “official” local Churches in 1924, which have either, on the one hand, adopted or accepted without protest the *New Calendar*, or, on the other hand, taken part in the *Ecumenical Movement* and its various legislative bodies (the *World Council of Churches*, the *Council of European Churches*, etc.), with a resulting ecclesiological erosion, by stages, to the point, indeed, of considering even the heretical Communions (Papists, Monophysites, Anglicans, and others) as valid ecclesiastical bodies and as supposed *Sister Churches*.

c. The *Old Calendarist Orthodox Anti-Ecumenists* were from the very outset profoundly convinced of the heretical and syncretistic nature of *Ecumenism*, reckoning it essentially a panheresy and the greatest ecclesiological heresy in the history of the Church.

d. On account of their steadfastness in this confession, the *Anti-Ecumenists* have, since 1924, undergone martyric struggles, unbear-

able pressures, and even a certain *social exclusion*, bringing to the forefront a cloud of Confessors of the Faith, under the luminous leadership of great ecclesiastical Figures (the Most Holy Metropolitan Glykerios, the Confessor hierarch Chrysostomos, former Metropolitan of Florina, and others).

e. To this God-pleasing work of the *Anti-Ecumenists*, this fundamental union, which seeks, by the synodal condemnation of *Ecumenism* and the restoration of the *Old (viz., the Church or Patristic) Calendar*, the pacification and reunion of those who are separated, the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad was also, in the past, resolutely tied, particularly under the Most Holy Metropolitan Philaret (1965-1985) and thereafter, both in its Patristic stand against *Ecumenism* and by its communion with the *Old Calendarist Anti-Ecumenists* of Greece, Romania, and Bulgaria.

f. However, in the last few years, we have undergone a great spiritual trial, by verification of the fact that the venerable Russian Orthodox Church Abroad has steadfastly moved towards ecclesiastical union with the Patriarchate of Moscow, and through it with all of the Orthodox Ecumenists, thereby ceasing to constitute a prominent bastion in confronting the syncretistic heresy of *Ecumenism*; furthermore, this is an indisputable fact, since the Church Abroad has communed wholly openly with the Patriarchate of Serbia (May 2006), which is in clear violation of the *Anti- Ecumenical Legacy* of the ever-memorable Confessor, Archimandrite Justin Popović, and which in various ways is already playing a leading role in pro-Papist and ecumenical developments.

g. On account of these facts, things of profound grief to us, the Orthodox *Anti-Ecumenists* of Greece, Romania, and Bulgaria feel the need to express anew the following:

1. That they remain, by the Grace of God, united indissolubly through the love of Christ and by their common ecclesiological self-conscience and perspective on unity;

2. are unable to follow the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad in Its course towards union with the *Ecumenists*;

3. address to It a final appeal in the love of Christ to stop all proceedings with Moscow, and

4. entreat It to hold without change to the *Anti-Ecumenical Legacy* of the illustrious and Holy Figures of its Church, who have been the mutual boast of all *Orthodox Old Calendarists*.

† Metropolitan Cyprian of Oropos and Fili, First Hierarch

† Metropolitan Vlasie of Romania, First Hierarch

† Bishop Photii of Triaditza, Chief Hierarch