Brandishing as a Banner the Anti-Patristic Encyclical of 1920

The innovationist Archbishop Christodoulos is sliding steadily downward to the hinterland of the heresy of syncretism

Athens is by now “more ecumenical than the ecumenist Phanar”

Athens is already leading the way in ecumenical initiatives, and the Phanar follows. Unfortunately, Archbishop Christodoulos of the innovationist New Calendar Church states that he accepts the Patriarchal Encyclical of 1920 and is a genuine exponent of its heretical assumptions.

Let us keep in mind that the Encyclical of 1920
- constitutes the textual basis of the heresy of ecumenism;
- is founded on anti-Orthodox baptismal theology;
- puts forth anti-ecclesiastical dogmatic syncretism;
- preaches the anti-Patristic theology of “common service”;
- prepares the ground for the foundation of the WCC (community of Churches);
- and anticipates the calendar reform, which was implemented in 1924 and which divided the Orthodox vis-à-vis the Festal Calendar.

In this way, Archbishop Christodoulos equates his vision with that of Patriarch Bartholomew, who, in 1995, in Geneva, stated his conviction that the members of the World Council of Churches should

envision a World Council of Churches allowing for the wonderful coöperation of all Christian powers on the ethical, social, missionary, and service front, independently of their basic theological differences, as the well-known Encyclical of the Òcumenical Patriarchate in the year 1920 emphasized more than seventy years ago.

A series of texts on the subject will demonstrates the truly painful truth, that the innovationist Archbishop Christodoulos is sliding steadily downward to the hinterland of the heresy of syncretism.

Text 2
The Dialogue with the Vatican*

“The statements of a sober
Hierarch some twenty years ago ”

It is said that “the times have changed,” that “the Vatican has undergone a change,” that “the prerequisites now exist for dialogue with the Papists,” that “the unity of the Churches is more necessary than ever,” and other such things that all essentially bear witness to the disposition to come to unconditional agreement with the Papists.

The Archbishop, too, is invoking such things in his attempt to persuade the members of the Holy Synod that his visit to the Vatican is vital and imperative.

Let us examine, however, the statements of a sober Hierarch on the subject. Twenty years ago, he set forth the preconditions for the dialogue, without the fulfillment of which everything would lead to ruin.

He wrote:

If these things are not done and if things continue to progress as charged, then it is certain that the dialogue will fail completely, and the honorable clergy with the pious laity will put an end to the charade that is being acted out and placing the Faith in jeopardy. There are issues that tolerate neither speculation nor expediencies. They require clarity and responsibility.

The circumstances required, and still require, clarity and responsibility and not, of course, dissimulations, demagoguery, and hypocrisy. This Hierarch said that clouds were threatening the dialogue. And, twenty years later, not only have the cumulonimbi and black clouds not been dispersed, but they have grown even thicker.

Warning of the consequences, the Hierarch also wrote the following:

Threatening clouds are accumulating in the horizon of the theological dialogue that has been conducted for four
years now between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholics. In a previous Report (dated 9 June 1984), the representatives of our Church lament not only the unacceptable conditions under which the discussions are being held, but also the complaisant spirit that distinguishes the Orthodox in the face of Roman Catholic maneuvering. And a recent report by a university professor [Fr. T. Zissis] on the same subject sounds a note of warning before the inclination that is emerging of some Orthodox to reach the desired outcome—that is, union—as quickly as possible and at all costs: Discussions on every subject are exclusively confined to only the points of agreement, without the existing points of disagreement being noted, something that leaves the impression that there are no dogmatic differences between us. It is evident that, under such conditions, the unifying effort is being dynamited, and a union is not destined to come about; on the contrary, a perilous retrogression will be marked with immeasurable consequences for the Church.

The Hierarch who wrote the above points out the Vatican’s maneuvers and stresses that Orthodoxy is being led to unconditional surrender and to the “betrayal of our Fathers.” Giving voice to the spirit of opposition, he writes that “we are not prepared to tolerate such maneuvers and become perjurers and deserters”!

He writes, specifically:

The reports make mention of a lack of consultation among the Orthodox; of the eagerness of some to reach hasty decisions; of the readiness of others to go along with the Roman Catholics in terms of dogma; of the absence of a profound theological study of the subjects under discussion; of the alienation of Orthodox theology; and of an unequal dialogue, given that the other side comes fully equipped and organized. The charges are appalling and fill us with justifiable and agonizing alarm before the emerging unfitness of some of those who have undertaken to represent the local Orthodox Churches. The fear lingers in our thoughts that we will have a repetition of the Ferrara Synod. And that would be both tragic and ruinous after the so many efforts that
have been made for a rapprochement between the Churches. When the efforts began, none of us had in mind that the “unconditional” surrender of Orthodoxy and the betrayal of our Fathers would be maneuvered. Nor are we prepared to tolerate such maneuvers and become perjurers and deserters….

But we have failed to mention who the Hierarch was that wrote the above, warning us of the consequences.

It was written, on 20 December 1985, on the front page of Ὄρθοδόξος Τύπος by the then Metropolitan of Dimitrias and present Archbishop Christodoulos, vacillating and contradicting himself, as usual.

To ask for an explanation from the Church Administration is not worth the trouble!