



CHURCH NEWS

AN INDEPENDENT PUBLICATION OF ORTHODOX CHURCH OPINION
March -- April, 1997

Vol. 9;3 (No. 59)

Republication permitted upon acknowledgement of source

With this third issue (No. 59) of Volume 9 (which is the fifth complimentary issue of our series in English) we would like to avoid sending anyone unwanted literature which might clog up their mailbox. So we request that if you wish to continue receiving "Church News" in English please write to us in that regard.

Both the Russian and English versions exist only on the basis of the voluntary support of our readers. We will gratefully accept any donations to cover the costs of publishing, mailing and maintaining subscriptions to our various sources.

A CLARIFICATION: One of our readers in France clarified our article concerning Archbishop Theophan of Poltava (Feb., 1997; Vol 9. # 3; page 3): Archbishop Theophan died in France on February 6, 1940 in Province, in the village of Limeray.

The editors thank our careful reader for this clarification.

CHURCH NEWS
639 Center Street
Oradell, NJ 07649

FROM LIFE OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH ABROAD

Further details about the betrayal by Archbishop Mark

Our Editorial Office has received from the fathers of Holy Transfiguration Monastery in Boston (which was ejected from the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad for violating basic canons and official ecclesiastical rules by the successors of Metropolitan Philaret) a letter written by a resident of Tula, Alexander Mousatov. Along with it we also received an excellent translation of this letter into English. Those interested may send us a self-addressed envelope and \$2.00 to cover xerox copies and postal expenses. Please let us know in which language the copy is required. The name of addressee was deleted, but it seems it was written to a priest.

Unfortunately, the letter is too long for us to reproduce it in full in our bulletin. It is enough to say that the author in the most detailed manner analyzes Archbishop Mark's letter to Metropolitan Vitaly (see issue # 57 of "Church News"). As early as the second paragraph Mr. Mousatov writes, "The point is that Vladyka Mark has either cruelly deceived himself, or is treacherously lying. Whatever is more to your liking -- choose yourself".

From this letter it is obvious, that its composer himself was a participant in such "academic conferences" as were described by Archbishop Mark, and most probably at some time was one of their organizers, because he knows all the finest details connected with arranging such conferences. While proving beyond any doubt that in Archbishop Mark's meeting with Patriarch there was absolutely nothing accidental and that the "conference" was only an excuse, Mousatov gives us a very important and interesting revelation: "...It is even more surprising that he who lost "the gift of sight" is an experienced political struggler and was active as a former member of the National Labor Union, the fearless "eagle", as Vladyka was known before receiving clerical rank. Perhaps it is all the fault of his unsuccessful and only trip to Leningrad many years ago, when the young NLUist arrived there with propaganda literature, and was caught red-handed by the stern security organs of the KGB? Perhaps it was precisely at that time, under someone's unceremonious and harsh pressure, he began somewhat to adjust his views... and perhaps the present masters are simply demanding a little more?" Then the author again is turning to the theme of the NLU, verifying the absurdity of Archbishop Mark's statement regarding the Patriarch's words, that "we did not realize that during the Soviet era the Moscow Patriarchate did not have the possibility of suspending clergymen or defrocking them, if like Valentine, they enjoyed the support of the authorities (of the Ministry of Religion)... As Mousatov says: "The Patriarch's story is a ridiculous bugbear for the benefit of the Western mind. But it worked. Why? After all, the members of the NLU studied the political system of the USSR scrupulously enough: they knew their enemy well. And Mr. "Eagle" was one of the most informed of them. Why does he believe it all now? Has he forgotten everything? Or did they order him to form a new view in the course of his sojourn in Russia of not quite four days?"

The NLU organisation in the beginning of the 40's gained quite a popularity among ultra-nationalistic youth to whom NLU offered the possibility of sneaking into Russia in order to work there against Communism. Yet it was rather soon discovered that the NLU was infiltrated by the Bolsheviks and the youngsters who were dropped in the Briansk forest were caught like birds. Several dozens of them perished.

Certainly, the Synod of Bishops knew of the close connections of a young German convert from Eastern Germany to the NLU. Yet it is very doubtful that he would ever have become a bishop in the Church Abroad in times of Metropolitan Philaret had the latter known of his arrest in Leningrad and of active participation in this provocative organisation. Experience showed that in every case of unrest in a diocese, a parish or a healthy nationalist organization one of the leaders would be for sure a member of the NLU!

The bulletin "Vertograd-Info" # 1 published an interview which Archbishop Mark gave to the newspaper "Radonezh." Among the questions posed to him was also the following:

"Radonezh: May we consider, Vladyko, that your trips and those discussions which are taking place now are in a sort of obedience to your Superiors in the ROCA?"

"Archbishop Mark: The idea of having such discussions was born here in our diocese, but some time ago *we received the blessing of the Council of Bishops of our Church, so it can be said, this is done according to obedience.* [Emphasis ours.]

"Radonezh: Vladyko, a faint hope is expressed in the above mentioned article that if an invitation were received from the Moscow Patriarchate, then there is a possibility that some one from the episcopate of the ROCA might participate, at least as an observer on the Bishops Council of the ROC?"

"Archbp. Mark: Such a thought arose in our last Council. I think it is a realistic possibility, which, not at this minute but in a foreseeable future will have to be considered seriously..."

Only now, after the passage of several years, do the children of the ROCA accidentally find out from papers published in Russia that *the Council of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad formally blessed Archbishop Mark to enter into discussions with the Moscow Patriarchate!* Why was such a question, which concerns the ENTIRE Church Abroad, never discussed, perhaps at an especially convened All-Abroad Council? It seems that a complete about face of the course of the ROCA is being carried out behind the backs of her faithful children!

From the pages of "Church Life" (# 5-6), 1996:

The official section announces the establishment of two committees:

Among those chosen to compose the first "in regard to checking over 'The Statutes of the ROCA' include Archbishop Mark, Bishop Daniel and Bishop Ambrosios." Those chosen for the second "to compose an epistle" include Archbishop Seraphim, Bishop Evtikhy and Bishop Cyril.

This epistle is so meaningless and also long that we have not published it, although we offer it to those who might want the text. As yet there have been no requests.

Nothing is known about this resolution concerning "checking over the Statutes of the ROCA." However, from an letter of an very well informed catacomb cleric to Metropolitan Vitaly it is evident that Bishop Daniel proposed to the Council to declare his own "autocephaly"!

At the session of the Council on Aug. 22/Sept. 4, 1996, "there was a discussion about the Synod's administration and after a discussion of all sides of this subject, the Council of Bishops reached the following resolution:

1. To relieve Bishop Gabriel of the post of Vicar of Brisbane and appoint him to be Bishop of Manhattan and Deputy Secretary of the Synod of Bishops.

2. To appoint Bishop Michael of Toronto to be a personal assistant to Metropolitan Vitaly.

3. To appoint a permanent employee for the Synod's office."

The last resolution is especially worrying because it testifies to the fact that the Office of the Synod of Bishops does not have even one permanent employee! And yet this office must oversee 8 regular dioceses and also dioceses which have had no bishop for several years and are supervised by administrators. This includes Argentina, Brasil, Venezuela and Chile, three dioceses in Russia, the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem and 5 parishes directly under the Metropolitan!

The session of Aug. 23/Sept. 5 "included a discussion in reference to the situation in our Russian parishes and communities. In particular, the question of the Suzdal schism was discussed. After discussing these questions it was resolved:

To create a committee concerning the departure of Bishop Valentine, formerly of Suzdal, with membership to include the following hierarchs: Archbishop Laurus, Archbishop Hilarion, Bishop Evtikhy and Bishop Mitrophan." [our emphasis].

All the members of this committee as if particularly selected with this in mind, at various periods clearly showed themselves to be in favour of friendly relations with the Moscow Patriarchate

"Concerning the question of matters regarding our Russian dioceses it was resolved: To allow the Russian bishops to take it upon themselves to hold regular Episcopal Conferences regarding matters concerning the dioceses and parishes in Russia, to be chaired by His Grace Bishop Eutikhy of Ishima and Siberia and to submit an annual report to the Synod of Bishops".

It is worth noting that Bishop Evtikhy, who is sympathetic to the Patriarchate, is appointed chairman of this Episcopal Conference, irregardless of the fact that among their bishops is Archbishop Lazarus and following him Bishop Benjamin!

It seems that out of fear that the Russian bishops might still make a wrong step from the true path, the Synod of Bishops appointed as its representative to the conference His Grace Bishop Michael, who has just returned from spending an entire month in Russia. In connection with this the journal "Pravoslavnaya Rus" # 3 (1576) for March, 1997, reports that, "According to a resolution of the Council of Bishops of the ROCA, which granted to the Conference of the Russian Bishops the right establish for themselves the borders of their Russian Dioceses, it was resolved:

1. To reestablish His Grace Archbishop Lazarus with rights of a ruling Bishop with title of Odessa and Tambov.

2. *On the territory of the Odessa Diocese Archbishop Lazarus and Bishop Agathangel enjoy equal rights and may in an equal manner make use of the legal status of the Odessa Diocese".* [emphasis ours]

Unfortunately the Russian Bishops, as well as the representative of Metropolitan Vitaly, Bishop Michael, must not have ever heard that according to the practice of the Orthodox Church there may not be two diocesan Bishops with equal rights within the borders of one and the same diocese!

The session of Aug. 24/Sept. 6. "held a discussion regarding the petition for acceptance into the Free Church of Russia of clergyman Arseny (Kiselev) who was consecrated a Bishop by the suspended Bishop of Suzdal, Valentine. The The Committee included the following hierarchs: Archbishop Seraphim, Bishop Evtikhy and Bishop Amvrosy who recommended that the petition of this clergyman be declined.

Resolved: To accept the recommendation of the committee regarding the consecration in the Valentine schism of the so-called Bishop Arseny (Kiselev)."

At the same session, in the paragraph 3, it was resolved: "To appoint Priest Peter Holodny as the managing administrator of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem and make him totally responsible for the financial and proprietary matters regarding the Mission and to regularly report to the Synod of Bishops on the Mission's condition".

Paragraph 5 states the following: "To rescind the previously reached decision of the Synod of Bishops to sell land which is of no spiritual value; categorically to forbid any one from selling or to leasing for long periods real estate belonging to the REM, the OPS or the Synod of Bishops; To consider these lands as the property of the Russian people

which are entrusted to us for safekeeping. As history shows, money which was received from the sale of plots in Holy Land is not pleasing to God, because it did not bring any spiritual benefit."

Probably this is a case unique in the history of the Church Abroad in which one hears that in the opinion of members of the Council of Bishops that money might bring "spiritual benefit." No one doubts that money is a must and is beneficial, but certainly it brings no "spiritual benefit."

This resolution about the REM raises a question: does it mean that the plot in Jericho was provisionally sold with the permission of the Synod of Bishops (which was later revoked) or it all was personally arranged by two conscienceless Chiefs of the Mission?

According to the long established tradition of the ROCA, immediately following the Council a Synod meeting is held with the participation of those Bishops who have not yet left for home and at which minor problems are discussed and ukaze's (decrees) are drawn up in accordance with the Council's decisions. So "Church Life" informs us of a meeting on Aug. 30/Sept. 12, 1996, and the following decree about the REM:

"1. In accordance with the resolution of the Council of Bishops held on Aug. 26/Sept. 8, 1996, to issue an ukaz regarding the disagreement in the Church concerning the sale of Church holdings and real estate in the Holy Land."

For some reason, this decree does not say to whom this ukaz is to be addressed.

"2. To acquaint all the bishops with the arbitration court's decision after the court's decree is translated."

The litigation, which lasted for many years, in defense of the independence of the Orthodox Palestine Society as a PRIVATE institution according to the latter's Statutes, and dismissing the claims of the Synod of Bishops to its subordination (including property rights) -- was resolved by that court decision, and was signed by the judge-arbitrator on March 31, 1996. It seems that from April to September the Synod of Bishops had no possibility of obtaining a translation (from English) in order to "acquaint the bishops with the arbitration court's decision" in time for the Council's sessions, although Bishop Anthony Grabbe received it on April 4th, in other words, just a few days after it was signed in Israel.

Yet the Synod of Bishops, wanting to verify the correctness of the court's decree, which gave OPS complete independence including its right to property, requested that an American court approve the decree of Israel's Court. This wish of the Synod of Bishops only provided its lawyers with additional income, since according to international law, the court decisions of one country are recognized as reciprocally valid in another. The approval of Israel's court by an American one was signed by Judge James Parkinson on Jan. 22, 1997.

It should be remembered that according to decree of the Synod of Bishops from March 11/24, 1969, "the Synod of Bishops TEMPORARILY accepts the care for the Society" which was necessary in those years in order to secure its defense on the part of the American government, because the Synod of Bishops was formally incorporated as an American Corporation. Such a decision was taken in response to Archimandrite Anthony Grabbe's request made in the name of the Council of the OPS. The ukaz to Archim. Anthony on this, numbered # 203, was signed by Metropolitan Philaret and Archbishop Laurus, the Secretary to the Synod of Bishops.

"On Aug. 8/Sept. 10, 1996, heard: The resolution of the Council of Bishops regarding the case of Bishop Valentine and his group."

This resolution is almost identical with those made in 1994 and 1995, yet in the resolution of the Council of Bishops of 1996 in regard to the defrocking of Archbishop Valentine some canons are added which were utilized by the Council as a justification for this decree. So, after the exposition of the case, paragraph 4 states: "Because Bishop Valentine caused a church schism and while under suspension continued to serve, he in this way violated the 28th Apostolic Canon, the 29th (38th in English) of the Council of Carthage and the 88th (at the end) of St. Basil the Great."

The Apostolic 28th canon refers not to a suspended cleric, but to one "who has been justly *deposed from office for proven crimes*," in another words, to one who has already been deposed.

The 29th rule of Carthage reads as follows: "If presbyters or deacons be accused, the legal number of bishops selected from a proximate locality as requested by the accused, shall be empaneled; that is, in case of a presbyter six; of a deacon three, together with the bishop of the accused -- to investigate the charges: observing the same canons concerning days, and postponements, investigations and persons for both the accusers and the accused. As for the other ranks of clergy, the local bishop alone shall hear and resolve the cases." [Translation revised from that of the only English edition]

It is completely unclear what relationship these canons can have at all to the case of any bishop, for they concern priests and deacons only and the procedure regarding bishops is much more complicated and lengthy.

Rule 38 of the same Council (in the English "Rudder", Canon 37) reads as follows: "It has pleased the whole Council to decree that in regard to anyone who, on account of his indolence, whether a bishop or any clergyman whatsoever, who has been denied Communion, if during the time of his excommunication before he has been heard, he should dare to participate in Communion, let him himself be judged to have pronounced sentence upon himself." [Translation revised]

In the commentary on the Canons of the Ecumenical and Local Councils by Bishop Gregory (Grabbe) he explains that, "This canon has in mind a bishop or a clergyman who was convicted by a *court* of the first instance and is making an appeal to the court of second instance." It is common knowledge that no court trial of Bishop Valentine was

ever held. He was never served an article of accusation, was never summoned to stand trial and therefore this canon, as it concerns an appeal, cannot be applied in this case.

The 88th Canonical Letter of St. Basil the Great also has no connection with the case of Bishop Valentine. St. Basil writes a canonical letter to an aged Presbyter Gregory, who justifies, by the state of his health and age, his refusal to part with a woman living in his household and to replace her with a man. We would call her today a cell attendant. In case he refuses to part with her, St. Basil threatens him with excommunication and even anathematization! The indication of only "the end" of this canon probably is some sort of insurance on the part of the compilers of this list of canons, just in case someone were to open "The Rudder" and unexpectedly realize that it has no relation to the case of Bishop Valentine, as is true, for example, of the 57th Canon of Carthage Council about "Donatists and children baptized by Donatists" already introduced into the case against Bishop Valentine.

As for the 88th Canon of St. Basil, one may think that it could be better applied to a situation closer to the Synod of Bishops itself.

The Council also states in paragraph 3 (in the section "the situation of the matter") that "the reference to Bishop Valentine to the Ukaz # 362 of His Holiness Patriarch Tikhon from 7/20 of November, 1920, cannot be recognized as valid because the ukaz provides for the practical impossibility of communication with *the central authority* (our emphasis) which in this case cannot be asserted."

The Council of Bishops of the ROCA stubbornly insists that it itself is this "central authority" for Russia, although in the first paragraph of "The Statutes of the ROCA", it quite clearly states that the Church Abroad exists *temporarily* as autonomous, until the fall of communism in Russia. This is how the matter was understood by the previous First Hierarchy of the ROCA, Metropolitan Philaret, who in his letter to A.I. Solzhenitsyn in 1974 wrote:

"Your fear that we are counting on returning to Russia as some kind of judges or leaders can only be attributed to a misunderstanding or to incorrect information which someone has foisted upon you. Amongst us we know of no one with such thoughts. But if the liberation of Russia were to take place and we could be reunited with a restored and canonical Orthodox authority, then we would assume that we were a part of the Russian hierarchy. We simply have not considered how much weight we would carry in such an event. The flock abroad is numerically a drop in the ocean when compared with the whole of the Russian people."

The Russian hierarchs at the beginning did everything in their power not to cut their ties with the Synod Abroad. Archbishops Lazarus and Valentine were fully justified when they stated that they have no connections with the "central authorities" from Abroad. The editors of "Church News" have on file copies of several written reports from both of those bishops with their complaints to Synod that not one of their written communications was answered over a period of 2 years! Some time before their forced departure from the ROCA, the Russian Bishops brought it to the attention of the Synod Abroad that conditions of the church life in Russia are ripe for their independent existence. Based on the Patriarchal Ukaz # 362. Incidentally, a very well founded memorandum was presented to the Synod of Bishops on Sept. 20/Oct., 1993, (with copies to the entire episcopate), by Their Graces Bishop Benjamin of Chernomorsky and Kubansky and Archbishop Lazarus himself, who now, for some reason, have repudiated their former opinion.

Referring to a whole number of wrongly applied canons, without an investigation or trial, entirely basing their decision upon the "recommendation of the Committee for the Matter of the Falling into Schism of Bishop Valentine," the Council of Bishops resolved: "To consider Bishop Valentine to be deposed on the basis of the above canons, and his so-called sacraments to be invalid; and in order to inform Bishop Valentine of this resolution to forward it to him and to publish it in the church press."

Demonstrating an amazing consensus with this decision of the Council of Bishops of the ROCA, after waiting in vain for some 6 years, (of course, this too was done without any investigation or trial), the Moscow Patriarchate also "deposed" Archbishop Valentine. Still, even in 1994 the Patriarchate offered Archbishop Valentin, not only verbally but in writing, to give him a "fine diocese in central Russia", if he repents and returns to its bosom!

Our office received very reliable information that the question of the defrocking of Archbishop Valentine by the Moscow Patriarchate was raised by Archbishop Mark of Berlin himself at his recent meeting with the Patriarch. The latter responded by saying then that all the other Russian bishops should be also defrocked. To this Archbishop Mark replied that Archbishop Lazarus, due to poor health should not be considered and "Bishop Evtikhy is my assistant"!

On August 30/Sept. 12, 1996, the Council elected new members to the Synod, which now consists of:

The Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Synod, Metropolitan Vitaly

The Deputy Presiding Bishop, Archbishop Anthony of San Francisco, nearly blind and very weak

The Secretary of the Synod, Archbishop Laurus of Syracuse and Trinity

The Deputy Secretary, Bishop Gabriel

The Members of the Synod: Archbishop Mark of Berlin, Germany and Great Britain

Archbishop Hilarion of Sydney, Australia and New Zealand

Substitute members are: Archbishop Alipy of Chicago and Detroit and

Bishop Amvrossy of Vevey.

THE SITUATION WITH THE ORTHODOX PALESTINE SOCIETY'S JERICHO REAL ESTATE

Bishop Anthony (Grabbe) on Feb. 2nd, 1997, met with the Russian envoy to the USA, Mr. Y.M. Vorontsov, regarding the case of the illegal seizure of real estate in Jericho. Although it was seized by Yasser Arafat's associates (Palestinians), nevertheless, according to the statement of the latter this act was initiated by the local Russian diplomatic representatives. While still the USSR, the communist government organized the "Historical Orthodox Palestine Society under the Moscow Academy of Sciences." It is no secret that the Academy was and still is a governmental agency. Since the OPS, from the very beginning of its existence (according to the extant documentation), was independent from any ecclesiastical or governmental bureau. Thus, as a private organization, interference by a government agency and its claims to the property of the OPS are ILLEGAL. It was decided that Bishop Anthony (who was elected by the Society as its longtime President) will write to the Russian Minister of Internal Affairs, Mr. Primakov. The covering letter of Bishop Anthony and the appropriate documentation will be forwarded by the Russian Embassy in Washington. Within three week's time if the expected answer is not received, then the Council of the Orthodox Palestine Society intends to initiate litigation against both the Palestinians and the illegal actions of the Russian government.

FROM THE LIFE OF THE RUSSIAN FREE CHURCH

(Selections from the minutes)

The Synod meeting on Nov. 10/23, 1996, in Suzdal heard a letter from Hegumen Seraphim, the head of the Theophany Convent in the village of Vishegorod of the Dedovich Region in the Pskov Province. The letter said in part: "Bishop Evtikhy is acting in an unchristian manner with a false front. Clearly he has established a blatant system of spies, has set traps, has seized opportunities, has avoided responding, and when a matter or question requires an answer, he denounces to the authorities, slanders, lies, insults, looks for opportunities for intrigues, pitting one against the other and all of this under the cover of piety. Indeed, the episcopal council has been occupied with the selection and placement of cadres to disrupt the royal church in Russia." [We are not sure of the specific meaning of this last reference.]

His Grace Bishop Theodore acquainted the members of Synod with the opinions of some catacomb Christians about Bishop Evtikhy (Kourochkin) being a convinced heretic. Evidence which supports this opinion is to be found in the periodical of the true Orthodox Christians "Russian Orthodoxy" (# 3, 1996) where on the basis of a numerous list of materials and documents the authors show that Bishop Evtikhy:

1. introduces a new teaching on the Church, permitting the "salvation of people to be not dependent upon the salvation of their hierarchy who have apostacized from the faith";
2. introduces a sectarian teaching of the validity of sacraments without dependence upon the confession of the faith of their celebrants;
3. permits the possibility of salvation outside the Church of Christ and denies the necessity of the uniting to it by schismatics and heretics;
4. sins against the 9th article of the Nicene Creed on the unity of the Church, permitting the possibility of her separation into equally grace filled branches: the Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate who are not in Communion with each other;
5. introduces an ecumenist "theology of baptism" that permits union with the Sergianist Church (the Moscow Patriarchate) based on the mutual acceptance of Baptism and other sacraments by both the ROCA and the MP.

Therefore, it not being possible to remain under the authority of Bishop Evtikhy, this monastic community together with its spiritual father left the Church Abroad, became a member of the Free Russian Orthodox Church and received an ukaz of acceptance.

A NEW PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA

The bulletin "The Sentinel" for April, 1997, states that after the death of Patriarch Parthenios, the successor to his throne a native of Cyprus was elected, Peter (Papapetrou), who prior his election was Metropolitan of Cameroon and West Africa.

The newly elected Patriarch is fluent in French, English and Arabic and on many occasions represented Patriarch Parthenios at ecumenical conferences. He is 48 years old.

RENOVATIONIST METROPOLITAN IN THE MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE

The bulletin "Vertograd-Info" # 1 for 1997 published a sermon by Metropolitan Vladimir of St. Petersburg, which he delivered on the day of the commemoration of St. John of Kronstadt. After he related to the faithful the uselessness of confession before Communion because the sacrament of Confession is not necessarily connected with Communion and many Eastern Churches let their faithful receive Communion without Confession; that St. John prayed

for sick heretics and even non-Christians, of his conducting general confessions -- he declared that, "St. John openly stated that he *was opposed to all political movements*"(?!). This is a total fabrication: Fr. John was a convinced monarchist, blasted revolutionaries and was a member of The Union of the Russian People. This was an organization of peasants begun by Archbishop Vitaly Maximenko supporting Orthodoxy and the monarchy. Besides, is renovationism in the Church in no way a political movement?!

Then he said: "We are together with you in such a close relation that, forgive me, but I will tell you of one difference among all the Orthodox: almost the entire Orthodox world has adopted the Gregorian calendar, celebrates Christmas according the Gregorian calendar on December 25th, as it should be. The Patriarch of Constantinople celebrates Christmas, the Patriarch of Alexandria celebrates Christmas, of Antioch celebrates it, of Jerusalem celebrates it [the last is a blatant lie], the Orthodox in America celebrate it, the Romanian Patriarch celebrates it, the Bulgaran Patriarchate celebrates it... Only we, Russia and Serbia and a few parishes in Greece [a lie again: not "a few" parishes, but half of Greece and the entire Holy Mountain of Athos!] are Old Calendarists. Are we smarter than all; are we better than all? And we are waiting for 13 days to pass, when we will celebrate it according to the Julian calendar, by which no one anywhere lives!... Every nation has its own calendars: religious, historical, national. But they live according to the Gregorian calendar. But if we now start to talk about this, we will be accused that we want to violate Orthodoxy, although astronomy has no connection with religion. The calendar -- yes -- but the scientists say of any calendar which is being used in the world, that none of them are exact and all need to be corrected.

If Fr. John were here, certainly he would correct it. He would state in a loud voice that it has to be corrected, it has to be done!..."

Fortunately, a loud commotion started in the flock of this wolf in sheep's clothing: in the church voices were raised in protest: "heretic; Arius; wolf; anathema; we do not need the Roman Catholic faith; we are Orthodox; let it never happen" and similar things. And the convent choir, which was chanting the Liturgy, with a blessing from their abbess, then refused to sing "many years" when it was proclaimed at the end of the sermon".

A priest, George Tchistiakov, in a long article in The Church-Society Herald # 8 declared that "this uproar, which caused a scandal on Jan. 2nd in St. Petersburg during a sermon of Metropolitan Vladimir in the St. John Convent, only testifies that church going people in Russia are ailing today, and very seriously. Vladyka spoke about how grieved he is by divisions among Orthodox. 'Almost all the world accepted Gregorian calendar, and we are waiting for 13 days to pass.' At this point a very loud commotion started in the church, those present yelled insults at a bishop who was standing on the ambo."

"What happened in St. Petersburg is the apotheosis of unchurchliness, a triumph of secular meetings, reoccurrence of the renovationist fever, when the activists from the "Living Church" tore the omophorions off bishops and even committed treason..." "If we want to be Christ's disciples, we should think not about ourselves only, but others too. Then we will be convinced that the last week of December and the first days of January, whether we want it or not, coincide with non-working days and are free of any business for every generation and the entire country. And as far as the 7th of January is concerned, on that day everybody is obliged to go to work and so on, children's vacations come to an end and as a result, it is no holiday at all."

It is quite obvious that this priest is a renovationist just like Metr. Vladimir.

Incidentally, Church tradition tells us that the sermons of St. John Chrysostom were often interrupted by the enthusiastic applause of the faithful. A Nativity sermon by St. Paul, Bishop of Emessa, which was delivered in the presence of his friend St. Cyril of Alexandria, not only was interrupted by applause, but also by people's loud confessions of faith, for example: "This is our belief; this is the gift of God: O worthy teacher of the faith Cyril! This is what we have waited to hear! He who denies this, let him be anathema!" This very interesting historical testimony of unity of faith of a bishop and his people at the period of the fifth century was published in the Nativity Encyclical of Bishop Ephraim of Boston in the "Orthodox Christian Witness" # 4 (1406).

The Orthodox Greeks even in our times are not afraid to demonstrate their approval or disapproval of their hierarchy. When Patriarch Athenagoras, after his compromising discussions with the Roman Pope showed up in America, in some places he was threatened during services with having his beard cut off! Therefore, until the Greek flock became more or less accustomed to this apostacy of their bishops from Orthodoxy, many of them avoided being vested in the middle of church, but snuck in (sometimes even with police protection) through side doors, as befits hirelings -- according to the Gospel -- and not shepherds.

The Moscow Patriarchate categorically condemned this renovationist public speech and expressed surprise that "having an archpastoral record of service some 35 years in length, you express thoughts of an extremely individual character, which complicated and will complicate your service on the St. Petersburg cathedra." The newspaper "Radonezh" published extracts from the Patriarchal letter in # 3 (47) issue of January, 1997.

At the end of January Metropolitan Vladimir gave an interview to a reporter of the "Ecumenical News International" of Feb. 10, on the theme of ecumenism. The Metropolitan admitted that he has to take into consideration the uproars on the part of clergy and lay people, who protest his ecumenical "contacts." "It is hard for me to pin-point why this happens: maybe it is also the influence of the schismatic ROCA, which is happy to compromise the Moscow Patriarchate by any available means."

Metropolitan Vladimir is no stranger to the disapproval of the Russian faithful. A paper "The Russian Herald" ("Ruskii Vestnik") in issue # 43-45 published an open letter to Metropolitan Vladimir, copies of which were sent to Patriarch Alexis, diocesan bishops, the abbots of stavropigial monasteries and some newspapers. This letter was signed "the Orthodox Christians of Tsarskoye Selo, October, 1996. Altogether 50 signatures." The authors of this letter address him through an "open letter" "because all the previous communications sent through the dean -- do not reach their goal and letters sent by lay people through the chancery or post office are not accepted."

These unfortunate people complain that "on Pascha, on April 14th of the current year, during the divine Liturgy our priests prayed and communed at the altar of Sophia Cathedral with the Roman Catholic heretics. The initiator of this crude violation of the Conciliar regulations of our Church is the rector of this cathedral, Archpriest Gennady Zverev. He, who himself not for first time is a participant in similar actions, has persuaded other priests to participate in this Uniate service, and with them all the parishioners; without informing anyone about it. Since that time, the Roman Catholics have been permitted, and not just once, to participate in the divine services, pray, and address the congregation from the solea of Sophia Cathedral."

Analogous cases happened in the Tsar's Theodore Cathedral (Tsarskoye Tselo) where the rector is Priest Marcellus Vetrov. At the end of their letter the congregation's members write: "Since their actions scandalized quite a few, we DEMAND from the priests who sinned a PUBLIC repentance. And until they publicly repent, we cannot consider them to be our pastors, receive from them a blessing and the Holy Sacraments."

"What happened in St. Petersburg" and in Tsarskoye Selo, not only is not an illness, but on the contrary, a joyous occurrence, which shows that the atheists were unable to totally destroy in the national soul the remnants of the Orthodox communal [sobornaya] spirit. May the Lord grant that such "apotheoses of unchurchliness" would occur in every church in the Moscow Patriarchate and that the Orthodox people would together depose their hierarchs, who cooperated with the communist government and therefore are twice anathemized: first by St. Patriarch Tikhon and then, by the Catacomb Church. The hierarchs of the Moscow Patriarchate led the Russian Church into an abyss of ecumenist heresies, endless "theologizing", the Balamand union and agreements with monophysites.

Metropolitan Vladimir of Petersburg is far from alone in his renovationist politics. The question of changing to the Gregorian calendar always and in every Orthodox Church caused only schism. When it became known that Metropolitan Philaret of Minsk and Belorussia (code name in the KGB "Ostrovsky") started a move to introduce the Western calendar in Belarus, this immediately brought a strong reaction from the clergy and flock, and one of the Belorussian Bishops even refused to sign a lawless decree for renovationist reform!

A ROMAN CATHOLIC CATECHISM IN RUSSIAN TRANSLATION

In the bulletin "The Sentinel" for the month of March we learn that the Vatican released its Catechism in Russian. The Catechism was introduced at the Vatican press office. Attending were Cardinal Ratzinger, prefect for the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and Archbishop Tadeusz Kondrusiel, the Apostolic Administrator of European Russia. Ratzinger said at this occasion that, "It may be a valuable tool for deepening understanding and communion with the Orthodox Church as well as opening new paths of dialogue with non-Christians and non-believers in the immense Russian territory".

From the information in this journal it is obvious that the Moscow Patriarchate participated in this crime. Kondrusiewicz said, "It must be pointed out that the work of translating the catechism took on a rather ecumenical character. *At my request, the Patriarch of Moscow and all the Russias, Alexis II, delegated a noted Orthodox theologian to share in the work of translating the catechism.*"

The translation of this catechism was done partly in Russia and partly in France, in Meudon. All the translation expenses were paid entirely by New York's Cardinal O'Connor and the printing by the Catholic fund "Aid to the Church in Need" which is active in Russia with the blessing of the false Patriarch of Moscow.

Simultaneous with the publication of this catechism the sect the Jehovah's Witnesses published and distributed free of charge its own translation of the Bible into Russian, which was made from the Hebrew by some Archimandrite Macarios. The Jehovah's' claim that they found this text in the rare book collection of the "Russian National Library."

A SERBIAN ORTHODOX BISHOP ABOUT ECUMENISM

Against the backdrop of the almost total betrayal of Church Truth by the contemporary episcopate of the universal Orthodox Church, it is especially pleasant to read the purely Orthodox declarations of individual hierarchs. So, the official publication of the Serbian Orthodox Church "Pravoslavije" of Dec. 15, 1996, in the section "Practical Study of the Faith" published an excellent article by Bishop Artemije about ecumenism. We know about him that a few years ago he presented to the Council of Bishops of the ROCA a report on the proposed withdrawal of the Serbian Church from the WCC. Unfortunately, the size of our bulletin does not permit us to publish in full this remarkable article.

Bishop Artemije, as a title, puts several questions to which he gradually gives answers. The first question is how should an Orthodox Christian (monk or a lay person) regard a non-Orthodox, a Jew, Muslim, Protestant or a Roman Catholic?

Then he asks, is it permitted for an Orthodox to enter a heterodox house of prayer? Is it permissible to be present at non-Orthodox gatherings and participate in their prayers?

"In one question there are several questions," says Bishop Artemije. "The question we are facing in our times, which is weighed down with theoretical and practical ecumenism -- a time when many values, moral as well as spiritual, are questioned. Once people planned to build in the city of Babylon a tower, but at the will of God all the languages became confused and the nations were scattered. Today the people want to build a tower of united Christianity, but not upon Christ, upon the Truth, but upon compromises between the truth and the lie, between light and darkness, between Christ and Beliar."

He then writes: "What, then, is ecumenism? It is the invention of the very same original snake (who is the Devil, Satan, Rev. 12: 9) who offered to make our forefathers in Paradise gods, not with God's help, but rather, against God with the help of the Devil. Likewise, the contemporary ecumenists want to realise the unity of Christians, for which Christ prayed in his hierarchical prayer (Jn. 17:21), but not upon Truth and not in the Truth, but upon compromises, lies and hypocrisy..." But this did not lead to the goal which they had in mind -- "the unity of Churches", but led to a transgression, which had never happened before, to discord and schism within the united Church of Christ, the Orthodox Church. And in our times (as has happened many times in the history of Church) Christ's words, that the gates of Hades will not prevail against His Church (Mt. 16:18) are fulfilled. And truly, in every Orthodox Church there are (among the clergy and people) those, who do not agree to the poison of ecumenism, no matter with which kind of a gravy it is offered."

To the question, how one should regard non-Christians and non-Orthodox, Bishop Artemije gives an rather long answer whose sense can be summarized with two words: in a Christian and humane manner, which so far concerned the question as related to "biological needs." In questions related to faith no compromises are permitted: under no conditions may an Orthodox pray with a non-Orthodox person, as is stated in a number of canons. But to pray *for them*, for their enlightenment and that they find the wisdom to enter the path of truth one may and should, because it will be a manifestation of true love toward them.

Then there is the question: if an Orthodox may enter an heterodox house of prayer? And he answers: "Yes, one may! But immediately one should pose questions of motive and intention: what for? Is there a simple curiosity, a scientific consideration and study of the object, a respectful piety or just for one to pray inwardly? Thus, the entrance receives its moral qualifications dependent upon motive and goal. The Apostle Paul says that "All things are lawful unto me, but not all things are expedient" (1 Cor. 6:12). Thus, "only" to enter a heterodox house of prayer of itself is not a sin, but everything depends upon our intentions. St. Basil the Great says that "someone who wonders about the teachings of non-Orthodox does not do anything to glorify the name of God. Therefore, there is no need to be amazed about their prayers, and even less to be in prayerful relations with them."

To the question, if one may participate in non-Orthodox prayer gatherings, Bishop Artemije categorically replies: in no way, under no conditions and not even under compulsion because it violates the canons of the Church.

Unfortunately, the Serbian episcopate, in spite of this splendid declaration of Bishop Artemije, remains caught in the nets of ecumenism and there is nothing to suggest that it is planning to liberate itself from them. But as is stressed by Bishop Artemije, each Orthodox Church has some "clerics and lay people" who disagree with ecumenism. It is worth noting that Bishop Artemije speaks of clergy and lay people and makes no mention of bishops!

AN EXAMPLE OF "TRADITIONALISM"

The journal "Orthodox Tradition" for January, 1997, published by Bishop Auxentius of the group following Metr. Kyprianos (into communion with which the ROCA was drawn by the same Archbishop Mark) has a very interesting section "Questions and Comments from Readers." We include below one question and its answer from the editors that will testify of itself as to the "traditionalism" of the Kyprianos hierarchy.

"...A year or so ago an Orthodox bishop claimed that your... bishop (Chrysostom?) ordained a man (Fr. [name deleted]) that was married to a widow of a former priest and, when called to account for this, tried to hide under the "seal of confession." If you are going to call everyone to perfection, maybe you should start with yourselves (Fr. [Initials deleted], Canada).

"The case which you mention, which involves complex issues of confessional, jurisdictional, and canonical kinds, was placed before our Synod of Bishops. In fact, it was ultimately decided that there were no canonical impediments to the clergyman's ordination (a man of exceptional educational credentials and moral uprightness, incidentally). Had this not been the case, however, our Church would have had every right to exercise "economy" in this circumstance, had it seen fit to do so. Our traditionalism does not obviate the exercise of "economy", but rather properly defines its scope, limits, and application. We call no one to "perfection," but to spiritual sobriety and personal integrity -- the same sobriety

and integrity which prevent us from discussing private and confessional matters in a public forum and which other clergy, whatever their jurisdiction or opinion of our Church, would do well to embrace in their own self-conduct."

A HISTORICAL "ORDINATION"

The bulletin "Ecumenical News International" of Feb. 10, states that in Australia an Anglican Bishop "ordained" for the first time an Aboriginal woman Gloria Shipp to the priesthood. At this ceremony he combined two rites: an Anglican and a pagan.

The new priestess (!?) Gloria Shipp informed a reporter that "traditional Christianity and Aboriginal spirituality go together and that was shown at the ordination." This event happened some 300 km from Sydney in the city of Dobbo. Before the "Christians" who came to attend this ceremony entered the church, they went through the ceremony of smoke in order to be purified of evil spirits. Gloria Shipp explained: "It's a purification. We know the Holy Spirit's there, but that's the way to do it!"

"FASTING" BY AN ANGLICAN BISHOP

The paper "Daily Mail" of Feb. 14, published in England, reported that an Anglican Bishop for the time of Lent gave up reading the Bible and instead will read the Koran.

Westerners long ago lost any idea of what a traditional Orthodox Lent is and all of their confessions "give up" for this period only something they find pleasant, like smoking, chocolate, some entertainment and so on.

Bishop Allen Smithson is convinced that the Western World can learn quite a bit from the Muslims and he even intends in the future to include in his services texts of some discoveries he made while reading a Muslim sacred book! The Anglican Bishop reads 20 pages of the Koran daily and hopes to complete it within 40 days. "When it is over, I hope I have found great spiritual truths and insights that will benefit me." He thinks that "There are qualities of holiness and commitment which the faithful Muslim shows that the Western world can learn from!"

ABOUT THE DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE

Everyone reading about an institution thus designated would doubtlessly imagine that it is one of the departments in a Church administration which had something to do with the world outside of that Church. But such a notion is quite deceiving. The Russian newspaper "Radonezh" in # 3 (47) published a very long article by Alexis Novikov, from which it is obvious that the role of this establishment is much more important than one might suspect.

From the year 1989 the Department of External Affairs of Moscow Patriarchate has been headed by Archbishop Cyril (Goundiayev). Probably it would not be a mistake to characterize him as one of the most repellent hierarchs of the Moscow Patriarchate. When giving his first interview to "The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate" after being appointed he himself outlined the scope of his future activity: "The DEA accomplishes immense tasks in organizing our dioceses, monasteries and parishes abroad, and also is the administrative-diplomatic department of the Moscow Patriarchate. The DEA concerns itself with administering all the proceedings of the Russian Orthodox Church which are even not connected with external activities, for example local bishops councils, various jubilees, celebrations and even simple arrivals and the assignment of lodgings in Moscow for bishops and other persons invited by the Patriarchate."

If the DEA is necessary for organizing dioceses, monasteries and parishes -- what activity is left to the diocesan bishops?

The author of this article proves very convincingly that "it is not the Synod [of its Bishops] that really represents the Church organization to the external world and concerns itself with the contacts amongst all spheres of the activity of the Moscow Patriarchate, but the DEA, whose role in this way becomes unprecedented." "Actually, the DEA is a quite independent structure within the ROC, which at the same time acts in her name and is, in a way, irreplaceable."

"Theoretically," writes Novikov, "the DEA is under the jurisdiction of Holy Synod,..." but "in practice the hierarchical structure of this Church is arranged in an upside-down form: there is the Synod -- the Council of Bishops -- the local councils, while the Department of External Affairs, whose duty it is to administer the councils, is invisibly present at all three levels. It constantly maintains the ecumenical contacts, only periodically reporting on some of their results. At the same time, it constantly keeps in touch with all the governmental agencies, while neither the Synod nor the Councils, it seems, are in reality able to control all aspects of these contacts. Thus it is apparent that within the ROC there is a powerful structure which has a realistic influence upon the overall affairs of the Church and is largely independent from the canonical church leadership."

The author of this article is aware that someone has to practically organize the Bishops' Councils, someone has to be in touch with governmental administrative agencies, but "compatibility of all of those functions in one organization, makes her the center of influence, thus not so much assisting, as parallel to, the canonical church structures. While its leadership has a very wide scope of independent activities in the various fields of church life. The scandals which occurred recently and which are connected with the activities of the DEA just one again verify this." A. Novikov, quite

correctly notes that the two bishops cannot simultaneously and completely independently from each other represent the Church at the highest level and a second organization may in no way duplicate a canonical church structure in its activities.

It is interesting that in the church circles in Russia Cyril Goundiayev is already spoken of as the future deputy of the present Patriarch.

The paper "Moscovsky Komsomolets" of Feb. 18 published a long article devoted to Metropolitan Cyril, terming him the "Tobacco Metropolitan." About the scandal of the duty free import of 50,000 tons of tobacco, chicken legs and alcohol we have written long and much, so that we do not find in this anything new about Cyril Goundiayev. Yet, the paper informs us of the close ties of this Metropolitan with high governmental authorities. Thus, he celebrated on Nov. 20, 1996, his jubilee needing two large banquet rooms of the Danilovsky Hotel to accomodate the tables set up for the invited guests. The Deputy Premier Resin was commissioned by the President of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin, to deliver the honorary Medal of Friendship and a leading deputy of the presidential administration, Yurii Yarov, read to the guest of honor a greeting from Anatoly Chubais which said, "Your noble activity is well known within Russia as well as widely outside its borders... Your fruitful contribution to the development of the relationship between the state and the Church is beyond dispute... Through your active civil position your efforts to strengthen the spirituality and morality in Russian society you have gained the appreciation of those in Russia and abroad."

It is no surprise that in the figure of Cyril Goundiayev some already see a future patriarch!

A LETTER OF METROPOLITAN PHILARET TO A PRIEST OF THE ROCA

In the previous issue for February we published a letter by Metr. Philaret addressed to the Abbess of the Lesna Convent in France concerning his opinion of the Evlogian schism indicating that the reposed First Hierarch did not touch upon the problem of the Moscow Patriarchate because at that time any connection of the ROCA with the USSR-Russia did not exist. The present letter affords us an idea of the relationship of Metr. Philaret to the Moscow Patriarchate at a later time. (Translation enclosed)

**A Letter from Metropolitan Philaret (Voznesensky)
To a Priest of the Church Abroad
Concerning Fr. Dimitry Dudko and the Moscow Patriarchate***

June 26/July 9, 1980

Father _____,

For a long time now I have been intending to write a few words to you, but somehow I haven't managed to "get around to it".¹ But at last I have collected myself, and so I write.

When I, while still in Australia,² began to receive information from America — already "post factum",³ that here [in New York City] there had been protests, demonstrations, and even *molebens* in front of the Soviet consulate, I became quite alarmed and regretted that I was not here, since I would have decisively opposed much of what took place. In particular, holding a *moleben* in such a place.⁴ Did they not sing the Lord's song in a strange land?⁵ What cause was there to display the holy things of the Church's services before the gaze of the frenzied servants of Antichrist? Was it really not possible to pray in church?

I must say frankly that I am always seized by dismay when I hear of "protests", "demonstrations", and the like. In the USSR, life is governed by him (the one with horns) who fears only Christ and His Cross; and who fears nothing else in the world. And he merely chortles over protests and demonstrations. "Public opinion"? Why, the antichrist regime has nothing but the uttermost contempt for it! They wanted to seize Czechoslovakia — and they seized it, paying no heed to the commotion that was raised. They wanted to invade Afghanistan — and they invaded it, again paying no attention to the protests and threats of the various Carters & Co.⁶ All attempts to shape public opinion in

* From *Tserkovny Novosti* (Church News), No. 59, March 1997.

¹ Quotation marks, parentheses, all emphasis, and ellipsis marks are those of Metropolitan Philaret. All bracketed insertions and footnotes are the translator's.

² Metropolitan Philaret had been in Australia on an extended pastoral visit from Dec. 7/20, 1979 until April 3/16, 1980. (See *Pravoslavnyaya Rus*, No. 5, March 1/14, 1980, p. 8; and No. 8, April 15/28, 1980, p. 12.)

³ Here Metropolitan Philaret had written the Latin phrase in by hand.

⁴ The first demonstration — held on Jan. 1/14, 1979, in front of the headquarters of the Soviet mission to the UN — had been organized by the Coalition for a Free Russia, as a protest against Soviet aggression in Afghanistan. Yu. Mashkov, a participant reporting on the event, erroneously stated that it had been done "with the blessing of the First Hierarch of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, Metropolitan Philaret". (See *Pravoslavnyaya Rus*, No. 3, Feb. 1/14, 1980, pp. 15-16.)

A second demonstration, with a *moleben* followed by a procession, was organized by the Committee for the Defense of Persecuted Orthodox Christians, on Feb. 11/24, 1980, in support of the recently-arrested Fr. Dimitry Dudko, Fr. Gleb Yakunin and others. A similar demonstration was held in San Francisco on this day. (See *Pravoslavnyaya Rus*, No. 7, April 1/14, 1980, p. 12.)

⁵ Cf. Psalm 136, v. 5.

⁶ At the time of these demonstrations, the Synod had sent a telegram and then a letter to President Carter concerning the current persecutions in the USSR. (See *Pravoslavnyaya Rus*, No. 8, April 15/28, 1980, p. 13.)

the so-called Free World in favor of those suffering from Communism are powerless and fruitless, since the Free World stubbornly closes its eyes and imitates the ostrich, which hides its head under its wing and imagines that it cannot be seen...⁷

In bewilderment did I read in the newspaper how one journalist approvingly cites your words: “Fr. ___ is correct when he writes: Russia is arising from the dead! We must believe in this; for we believe in Christ the Saviour Who arose from the dead.”⁸

I cannot understand — what is the connection between the one and the other? Personally, I believe in the Resurrection of Christ — for me this is the most precious thing in the world. But I absolutely cannot see why **must** I believe that Russia is “resurrecting”? I hope that she truly will arise, when the all-powerful nod for it will be given by God. But at present, not only do I not share your enthusiasm, but I am greatly alarmed for the Russian people. The falsehood and emptiness of atheism is obvious to them. But alas, it is not true Orthodoxy that is being disseminated there. There, under the guise of Orthodoxy, the Russian people are being offered Bulgakovism, Berdyaevism, and similar rubbish of the Evlogian schism.⁹ The sects are flourishing there: the Baptists, etc. The official Church preaches cooperation with the God-hating regime, lauding it in every possible way.¹⁰ The true Orthodox Church has gone into the catacombs, hidden from the common masses... Is that, then, the “rebirth of Orthodoxy”?... And are you not perhaps taking a bit too much upon yourself, proclaiming to the whole world that Orthodoxy is being reborn in Russia? God grant that the Truth should overcome all errors and should triumph over them. But for the present it is still too soon to speak of it, since the influence of the anti-Orthodox elements are still so very strong there; not to mention the fact that the antichrist Soviet regime, as long as it rules Russia, will never permit the triumph of Orthodoxy. It is not without cause that the true Orthodox Church concealed Herself in the catacombs and is fiercely persecuted.

⁷ For an Orthodox view on how to help our persecuted brethren. see the letter, “Compassion for the Suffering”, in *Orthodox Christian Witness*, Vol. 14, No. 9, 1980, pp. 1-12.

⁸ Of course, here both “arise” and “resurrect” (and their various related forms) are derived from the same root in Russian.

⁹ In 1931 Metropolitan Evlogy (Georgievsky, 1868-1946), having already withdrawn from the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, placed himself and his flock under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople, thus forming the “Temporary Patriarchal Russian Orthodox Exarchate”, based in Paris. Although the Exarchate itself was abolished in 1965 under pressure from Moscow, the present successors of Metropolitan Evlogy and his adherents remain in submission to the Ecumenical Patriarchate as its Russian Orthodox Archdiocese of Western Europe. For further information in English, see: *A History of the Russian Church Abroad: 1917-1971* (Seattle: Saint Nectarios Press, 1972).

Fr. Sergius Bulgakov (1871-1944), and Nicholas Berdyaev (1874-1948) were among a group of free-thinkers and intelligentsia who were expelled from Russia by the Soviet government in the 1920s. They were associated with Metropolitan Evlogy’s Theological Institute of St. Sergius in Paris, of which Fr. Sergius was even dean. Their Gnostic, false teaching of “Sophiology” was condemned as heresy by the Second Pan-Diaspora Sobor of the ROCA in 1938. (For an English translation of the report submitted to the Sobor by Count Paul Grabbe [Bishop Gregory’s father], see *Living Orthodoxy*, Vol. 16, No. 6, Nov.-Dec., 1994, pp. 15-28.) It should be noted that the Moscow Patriarchate also condemned Fr. Sergius Bulgakov as a heresiarch.

¹⁰ Alas, they did not hearken to the wise admonition of Saint Theodosius of the Kiev Caves: “Live in peace not only with your friends, but also with your enemies; but only with your personal enemies, and not with the enemies of God.”

Now a few words on the tragedy of poor Fr. Dimitry Dudko.¹¹

From the very beginning of his activities, when his name was being mentioned more and more often as a pillar of Orthodoxy, and moreover, the members of the Synod, the hierarchs, were joining their voices to this; I however, the author of these lines, immediately kept out of it and forewarned my fellow hierarchs that a disaster might happen here. How so? Because in the USSR, according to the precise definition of Archimandrite Constantine,¹² there is now a **satan-ocracy**. There rules he whom the Saviour called a liar and the father of lies.¹³ This lie reigns there. Therefore one cannot trust anything that occurs there. Any seemingly spiritually encouraging fact may turn out to be a falsification, a forgery, a deception or a provocation...

Why did this calamity befall Fr. Dimitry Dudko? Let's assume the best, not suspecting him of conscious collaboration with the KGB and betrayal of his convictions, but simply noting the sad fact that he did not endure, but was "broken"; he capitulated before the enemies of the Church. Why? It would seem that he did display courage and daring; and then suddenly, such an inglorious end. Why?!

Because his activity took place **outside of the true Church...**¹⁴

What then is the "Soviet church"? Archimandrite Constantine has often and insistently stated that the most horrible thing that the God-hating regime has done in Russia is the creation of the "Soviet church", which the Bolsheviks presented to the people as the true Church, having driven the genuine Orthodox Church into the catacombs or into the concentration camps.

This pseudo-church has been twice anathematized. His Holiness Patriarch Tikhon and the All-Russian Church Sobor anathematized the Communists and *all their collaborators*. This dread anathema has not been lifted till this day and remains in force, since it can be lifted only by a similar All-Russian Church Sobor, as the canonical supreme, ecclesiastical authority.¹⁵ And a terrifying thing happened in 1927, when the head of the

¹¹ Fr. Dimitry Dudko had been arrested on Jan. 2 15. 1980. After six months spent under arrest and in prison he publicly recanted on television and in the press.

¹² Archimandrite Constantine (in the world. Cyril Zaitsev. 1887-1975). spiritual father of the brotherhood of Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville. N. Y.. instructor at the seminary, and editor of *Pravoslavnaya Rus and Orthodox Life*. (For a short obituary see: *Orthodox Life*, Vol. 25, No. 6, Nov.-Dec., 1975, p. 3; for a fuller biography, see: *Orthodox Word*, Vol. 12, No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1976, pp. 20-27.)

¹³ John 8: 44.

¹⁴ At this time the then Archbishop Vitaly (Ustinov) of Montreal concurred totally with Metropolitan Philaret's evaluation. In a sympathetic yet uncompromising article which he published in the August 1980 *Parish Newsletter* of his St. Nicholas Cathedral in Montreal (and which was subsequently printed in English, at his request, in the *Orthodox Christian Witness*, Vol. 14, No. 51, 1981, pp. 7-9), he wrote: "...And in this good, urgent impulse of ours we somehow completely forgot a very important fact which no power can erase from life... Fr. Dimitry forgot, as we all did, this fact which cannot be wiped away by time or by life. And this fact is the Soviet Moscow Patriarchate. We are in no way mistaken when we call the Patriarchate Soviet... Such a corrupt, anti-canonical organism was not able, of course, to inspire Fr. Dimitry to follow the way of confession, much less of martyrdom, to the end. Fr. Dimitry's whole mistake is found in the fact that, although he often condemned and exposed his Soviet hierarchs, still he never separated himself from the Patriarchate as an organism, but even defended it as his own legal authority."

¹⁵ Some have asserted that Patriarch Tikhon (Bellavin, 1865-1925) himself subsequently retreated from this bold position and cooperated with the Soviets, and that Metropolitan Sergius's Declaration of 1927 was the logical and organic development of Patriarch Tikhon's policy. Such was not the case:

Church, Metropolitan Sergius, by his infamous and apostate Declaration, subjected the Russian Church to the Bolsheviks and proclaimed collaboration with them.¹⁶ And thus in a most exact sense was fulfilled the expression in the prayer at the beginning of Confession:¹⁷ “having fallen under their own anathema”!¹⁸ For in 1918 the Church anathematized all the confederates of Communism, while in 1927 she herself joined the camp of these collaborators and began to laud the red, God-hating regime — to laud the red beast spoken of in the Apocalypse.¹⁹

As if that is not enough. When Metropolitan Sergius promulgated his criminal Declaration, then the faithful children of the Church immediately separated themselves from the Soviet church, and thus the Catacomb Church was formed. And she, in her turn, has anathematized the official church for its betrayal of Christ.²⁰

And it was within this very church of the evil-doers that the activities of Fr. Dimitry Dudko occurred, who has frankly declared in the press that he is not going to break with the Soviet church but will remain in her.²¹ Had his spiritual eyes been open, and had he seen the true nature of the official church, he might have found within himself the cour-

“In fact, the text of Tikhon’s Epistle had been doctored. The opening of Russian archives makes it possible to ascertain that Tikhon had significantly qualified his call for obedience to the regime by adding that it was due only to the extent that its orders did not ‘contradict the faith and piety (*vere i blagochestiu*).’ Since in the eyes of the Church virtually all of the Communists’ actions violated the tenets of Christianity, the injunction — as actually written, not as made public — had a rather hollow ring.” (Richard Pipes, *Russia Under the Bolshevik Regime* [New York: Vintage Books, 1995], pp. 345-46.)

¹⁶ Metropolitan Sergius Stragorodsky (1867-1944), one of the deputies of the *Locum tenens* of the Patriarchal Throne. On July 16/29, 1927, he issued his infamous Declaration. At a historic meeting with Stalin on Aug. 22/Sept. 4, 1943, permission was received to convoke a Bishops’ Sobor in order to elect a new “Patriarch” of Russia. Four days later, on Aug. 26/Sept. 8, the duly assembled Sobor of nineteen hastily summoned bishops chose Metropolitan Sergius to be the first Soviet Patriarch.

¹⁷ In the Russian order for this rite, the prayer in which this phrase occurs precedes the penitent’s recitation of his sins.

¹⁸ In like manner, as Bishop Gregory [Grabbe] noted in sorrow: “Indeed, by not investigating the matter seriously and by forgetting about this previously confirmed anathematizing of the New Calendarists/Ecumenists (or perhaps not venturing to abrogate this resolution), our Sobor, as frightful as it may be to admit it, has fallen under its own anathema. Had it probed the net spread before it more carefully, it would never have issued such a contradictory Decision.”. (See *Tserkovnyy Novosti* [Church News], No. 40, Sept.-Oct., 1994, pp. 2-4.)

¹⁹ Rev. 12: 3.

The Moscow Patriarchate’s collaboration with the godless regime was not passive, but very active betrayal — especially abroad, through the Peace Programs, the Ecumenical Movement and the World Council of Churches. By denying before the whole world that the Church in Russia was undergoing persecution, by assisting in the closure and destruction of churches, by surrendering the persecuted faithful over to the Soviet authorities for supposedly “political” offenses, and by making common cause with the murderers of the true Orthodox Christians, the Moscow Patriarchate is guilty likewise of the blood of all the New Martyrs.

See the sobering account of an incident from the life of Saint Martin of Tours (as related by his biographer, Sulpitius Severus), and commentary on it, in the article: “An Evil Communion”, *Orthodox Christian Witness*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 1-11.

²⁰ See the testimony of the first Catacomb hierarch, the New Martyr, Bishop Maxim (Zhizhilenko) of Serpukhov. Vladyka Maxim also testifies to Patriarch Tikhon’s true feelings about the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. (Ivan Andreyev, *Russia’s Catacomb Saints* [Platina: St. Herman of Alaska Press, 1982], pp. 52-68.)

²¹ For a penetrating analysis of the case of Fr. Dimitry Dudko and his relation to the Soviet hierarchy, see the article “Shadows in the Midst of Light and Darkness”, in *Orthodox Christian Witness*, Vol. 13, No. 38, 1980, pp. 1-18.

age to say: “I have hated the congregation of evil-doers, and with the ungodly will I not sit”²² — I am breaking off with the company of the enemies of God, and I am withdrawing from the Soviet church”. Why, then for us he would have become one of our own — his courage would have destroyed the barrier which irrevocably stands between us by virtue of the fact that the Sobor adopted as its guiding principle the Testament of Metropolitan Anastasy.²³ For in this Testament it is ordered that we must not have any communion **whatsoever** with the Soviets, not only no communion in prayer, but not even ordinary contact in daily life.²⁴ But as long as Fr. Dimitry would have refused to remain in the Soviet pseudo-church, and would have withdrawn from membership in her — the barrier would no longer have applied to him.²⁵

I recall a marvelous case of the direct and miraculous aid of God to those who remained faithful to the end. They banished a group of nuns belonging to the Catacomb Church to Solovki.²⁶ The Chekists told them: “Get settled now, and tomorrow you will go to some sort of work”. But they received an unexpected answer: “We will not go and work.”

“What, have you gone out of your minds. Do you know what we will do with you?” screamed the Chekists. There followed the calm reply of people who in their faithfulness feared nothing: “What shall be, shall be — but what is pleasing unto God shall be, and not what suits you executioners and criminals. You may do with us what you please: starve us, torture us, hang, shoot, or burn us with fire. But we give you notice once and

²² Ps. 25: 5. The word here rendered as “congregation” is, in the original Greek and Slavonic texts, *ecclesia / tserkov*, i.e., “church”.

²³ Metropolitan Anastasy (Gribanovsky, 1873-1965). Metropolitan Philaret’s predecessor as First Hierarch of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad.

²⁴ The pertinent concluding passage of the Testament reads thus:

“As regards the Moscow Patriarchate and its hierarchs, for so long as they are found in close, active, and benevolent cooperation with the Soviet regime, which openly confesses its total godlessness and strives to implant atheism in the entire Russian nation, then the Church Abroad, maintaining Her purity, must not have any canonical, prayerful, or even ordinary communion with them whatsoever, at the same time, leaving each one of them to the final judgment of the Sobor of the future free Russian Church.”

For the full English text of Metropolitan Anastasy’s Testament, see *Orthodox Life*, Vol. 15, No. 3, May-June, 1965, pp. 10-12. The Russian is found in *Pravoslavnaya Rus*, No. 10, May 15/28, 1965, pp. 1-2.

In 1980 Archbishop Vitaly was still of the same opinion, and — as though echoing Metropolitan Philaret on this point — stated in his article on Fr. Dimitry Dudko cited above (p. 3, note 14, of this present letter):

“Then the True Church went into the catacombs, into a position of illegal existence. From that time to this day the Soviet Moscow Patriarchate is liable to judgment, and until that future true council there can be no kind of contact, not even in everyday matters, as Metropolitan Anastasy, reposed in God, commanded us in his last will and testament.”

²⁵ As it turned out, Fr. Dimitry Dudko’s decision to loyally “remain with the hierarchy that has been given us” (to quote his own words), did him little good. The Moscow Patriarchate refused to lift a finger to help him. The then Metropolitan Alexis of Tallinn and Estonia (Ridiger, the present Patriarch), while on a visit to Austria, in reply to questions about the numerous recent arrests of Orthodox believers, stated: “In the Soviet Union citizens are never arrested for their religious or ideological convictions”. (*Keston News Service*, Keston College, England, Issue No. 94, March 21, 1980. p. 1.)

²⁶ The infamous concentration camp for clergy and monastics, located in the former Solovets Monastery on islands in the White Sea.

for all: we do not recognize you, you servants of Antichrist, as the lawful authority and we will not fulfill your orders in any way!...”

In the morning the infuriated Chekists drove the nuns up onto the “hill of death”. Thus was called a high hill where in winter an icy wind always blew. In that wind a man would freeze to death within a quarter of an hour. The nuns, clad in their shabby *rassas*, are led up the hill by Red Army men in their sheepskin coats. The nuns go happily, joyously along, chanting psalms and prayers. The soldiers left them at the top of the hill and then descended. They hear how they continue their chanting. Half hour, an hour, two, yet more — all the while the sound of chanting carries from above. Night fell. The guards approach the nuns — they are alive, unharmed, and continue chanting their prayers. The amazed soldiers led them home to the camp. News of this spread immediately throughout the entire camp. And when on the following day the guards were changed and yet the same thing happened, the camp authorities were bewildered and they left the nuns in peace...²⁷

Is this not a victory? Behold what it means to be faithful unto death — as the marvelous words of the Apocalypse say: “be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life”.²⁸ In this instance, it’s an obvious miracle, as it was with the three youths in the Babylonian furnace, only there the death-bearing element was fire, but here a death-dealing and killing cold. Behold how God rewards faithfulness!

And hear my heartfelt conviction: if the entire mass of the many millions of Russians would evidence a like faithfulness, as did those nuns, and would refuse to obey the bandits who have been oppressing the Russian nation, then Communism would collapse in a second. For the succor of God, which had saved in a miraculous manner the nuns while on their way to certain death, would come likewise to the Russian people. But as long as the nation recognizes the regime and obeys it, even if all the while cursing it in their hearts, that regime will remain in place.

Of course, the nuns were strengthened by the power of God, just as the ancient martyrs; without this aid they would not have endured. But their *podvig* [martyric exploit] was accomplished within the true Church, filled with grace and Truth. For the true Church, according to the apostolic teaching, is the **Body of Christ** — the Lord abides in Her and leads Her as Her Divine Head.

Will anyone dare to assert that the Lord and His grace abide in the church of the evil-doers,²⁹ which lauds His demonized enemies and collaborates with them, which because of this is found under a twofold anathema, as indicated above? Can a church which has united with the God-haters possess grace?! The answer is obvious!

The hierarch Theophan the Recluse³⁰ in his own day warned that a terrible time was approaching when people would behold before their eyes all the appearance of church grandeur — solemn services, church order, and such — while on the inside there

²⁷ For the full account in English, see: Ivan Andreyev, *Russia's Catacomb Saints* (Platina: St. Herman of Alaska Press, 1982), pp. 78-84. For the Russian, see: *Pravoslavnaya Rus*, No. 3, Feb. 1/14, 1977, pp. 12-13.

²⁸ Rev. 2: 10.

²⁹ This hearkens back to Psalm 25:5 — “the congregation of evil-doers” cited earlier.

³⁰ Bishop Theophan (Gorov, 1815-1891), glorified as a saint by the Moscow Patriarchate in 1988.

would be total betrayal of the Spirit of Christ. Is this not what we see in the Soviet church? Patriarchs, Metropolitans, all the priestly and monastic orders — and at the very same time, an alliance with the God-haters, that is, a manifest betrayal of Christ.³¹

To this company belongs also Fr. Dimitry Dudko. Of course, his sincere religious feelings compelled him to preach concerning God and not to condone many of the disgraceful happenings in the lives of Russian people. But for him, Pimen was, and likely still is, his spiritual head, the head of the Soviet hierarchy; while for us it not at all so. For our Sobor in 1971 passed a resolution: on the basis of such and such canons to consider the election of Pimen as unlawful and invalid, and to consider all his acts and decrees as having no force or significance.³²

How difficult is poor Fr. Dimitry Dudko's position now! What is he to do? Continue his pastoral work? And what can he say to the faithful? Say the same thing that he said before his "repentance"? But then, he has already renounced this! Say the opposite? Why, they believed him before when he preached that which won for him the trust and respect of the faithful — and now, how will he look them in the face? One girl correctly said that there is one way out for him: make a genuine repentance in atonement for the one he just now made. But in order to do that he must depart from the church of the evildoers for the true Church, and there make his repentance. However, in return, the red church will undoubtedly deal with him with particular malice and cruelty. Of course, by crossing over to the true Church, he will pass over into the realm of Divine grace and strength, which can fortify him just as it fortified those catacomb nuns. God grant that he find the true and saving path.

I should also like to note the following. The Catacomb Church in Russia relates to the Church Abroad with love and total confidence. However, one thing is incomprehensible to the Catacomb Christians: they can't understand why our Church, which realizes

³¹ Even pious and astute laymen within the Moscow Patriarchate came to realize that her hierarchs were "betraying the Church not out of fear, but for conscience sake", to quote Boris Talantov, one of the authors of the famous "Open Letter of the Kirov Believers to Patriarch Alexis" which so enraged Metropolitan Nikodim (Rotov, 1929-1978), of sorry memory. In June of 1969 Boris Talantov was arrested and later sentenced to two years in prison for "anti-Soviet activities". He died in prison in January 1971. See: his exposé, "The Leaven of Herod", by B. Talantov. *Orthodox Word*, Vol. 7, No. 6, Nov.-Dec. 1971, pp. 273-293. Concerning Metropolitan Nikodim, see: "On the Death of a Soviet Bishop", *Orthodox Christian Witness*, Vol. 12, No. 10, 1978, pp. 1-8.

³² This Bishops' Sobor met in September of 1971 in Montreal. One of the issues which it discussed was the election, in June of 1971, of Metropolitan Pimen (Izvekov, 1910-1990) as "Patriarch" of Russia. The pertinent passage of this resolution, signed by all the hierarchs present, reads thus:

"Therefore, elections of patriarchs performed in another manner [i.e., than the Sobor of 1917] which is not free, do not express the voice of the Russian Orthodox Church and are not lawful. Not only the election of the present Pimen, calling himself patriarch, but likewise the elections of his two predecessors must also be considered unlawful. ...All the elections of Patriarchs of Moscow, beginning in 1943, are invalid on the basis of the Thirtieth Canon of the Holy Apostles, and the Third Canon of the Seventh Ecumenical Council..."

If Sergius, Alexis, and Pimen were unlawful "hierarchs", then what can be said of the "ordinations" and the other "Mysteries" performed by them? If both his predecessors were invalid, what of Pimen's own "ordination" to the priesthood and episcopacy? Manifestly, neither they, nor those ordained by them, have any grace to impart to anyone. For the full text of this resolution, see: *Pravoslavnaya Rus*, No. 18, Sept. 15/28, 1971, pp. 6-7; the English text appears in *Orthodox Word*, Vol. 7, No. 6, Nov.-Dec. 1971, pp. 294-301.

beyond a doubt that the Soviet hierarchy has betrayed Christ and is no longer a bearer of grace, nevertheless receives clergy of the Soviet church in their existing orders, not re-ordaining them, as ones already having grace. For the clergy and flock receive grace from the hierarchy, and if it [the hierarchy] has betrayed the Truth and deprived itself of grace, from where then does the clergy have grace? It is along these lines that the Catacomb Christians pose the question.

The answer to this is simple. The Church has the authority in certain cases to employ the principle of *economia* — condescension. The hierarch Saint Basil the Great said that, in order not to drive many away from the Church, it is necessary sometimes to permit condescension and not apply the church canons in all their severity. When our Church accepted Roman Catholic clergy “in their orders”, without ordaining them, She acted according to this principle.³³ And Metropolitan Anthony [Khrapovitsky], elucidating this issue, pointed out that the outward form — successive ordination from Apostolic times — that the Roman Catholics do have, whereas the grace, which the Roman Catholic church has lost, is received by those uniting [themselves to the Church] from the plenitude of grace present in the Orthodox Church, at the very moment of their joining. “The form is filled with content”, said Vladyka Anthony.³⁴

In precisely the same manner, in receiving the Soviet clergy, we apply the principle of *economia*. And we receive the clergymen from Moscow not as ones possessing grace, but as ones receiving it by the very act of union. But to recognize the church of the evil-doers as the bearer and repository of grace, that we, of course, cannot do. For outside of Orthodoxy there is **no** grace; and the Soviet church has deprived itself of grace.³⁵

In concluding my lengthy letter, I should like to point several things out to you, Father. The Bishops’ Sobor resolved to be guided by and to fulfill the Testament of Metropolitan Anastasy, in which the late First Hierarch bade us not to have any communion with the Soviet church whatsoever, not only no prayerful communion, but not even ordinary contact.³⁶ On what basis then have you and other clergymen had direct relations

³³ Note that here Metropolitan Philaret put the words *in their orders* within quotation marks, as if to emphasize their invalidity.

³⁴ In an earlier letter written to Mother Magdalena, Abbess of Lesna Convent, Metropolitan Philaret had quoted Metropolitan Anthony as having specifically referred to the Roman Catholics as heretics. (*Tserkovny Novosti* [Church News], No. 58, Feb. 1997.)

At the same Bishops’ Sobor of 1971, mentioned above by Metropolitan Philaret, it was resolved, in view of the growing confusion caused by Ecumenism concerning the true boundaries of the Church, to henceforth follow the stricter practice and baptize all heretics who come to the Church. For the full text of this resolution and an excellent exposition by the then Fr. George Grabbe on the application of strictness and *economia*, see *Orthodox Life*, Vol. 29, No. 2, March-April, 1979, pp. 35-43. The text of this resolution had also appeared earlier in *Orthodox Word*, Vol. 7, No. 6, Nov.-Dec. 1971, pp. 294-301.

³⁵ That this is not merely the personal opinion of Metropolitan Philaret can be ascertained from a perusal of the writings of many of the hierarchs of the Catacomb Church and of the ROCA. For an excellent survey and analysis of this material, see the two-part series in *Orthodox Christian Witness*: “Worse Than Any Heresy”, *OCW*, Vol. 15, No. 28, 1982, pp. 1-16; and “A Sequel”, *OCW*, Vol. 15, No. 34, 1980, pp. 1-10.

³⁶ The Third Pan-Diaspora Sobor of 1974 paraphrased this passage from Metropolitan Anastasy’s Testament in its Resolution No. V. (*Pravoslavnyaya Rus*, No. 21, Nov. 1/14, 1974, pp. 12-13.)

In its *Epistle to the Flock*, signed by all eighteen hierarchs present, the Bishops’ Sobor of 1976 again makes mention of this passage thus: “Our Church Abroad, as is well-known, constitutes a part of the Russian Mother-Church, her free part. Although we, following the Testament of His Beatitude,

with Fr. Dudko? And have written him letters, etc.? No matter how sincere a man you³⁷ may have considered him to be, nevertheless, can your private opinion annul a ruling adopted by the Church? Now, had Fr. Dudko said: I am breaking with the official church and leaving her — then you could have entered into lively contact with him. But in the absence of that, your actions constitute a violation of ecclesiastical discipline. Dudko wrote to me personally, but I did not answer him — although I could have said much.³⁸ By the way, on what basis did you,³⁹ even before this, take it into your head to commemorate an archbishop of the Soviet church during the Great Entrance? Who gave you the right to do that, which hierarch — who, how, where, when?... Be more careful, my dear, zealous, but, ah, too impetuous fellow minister!

Peace to you and the mercy of the Lord. To Matushka and the children too.

With love,

† Metropolitan Philaret

Metropolitan Anastasy, of blessed memory, have no communion whatsoever with the Moscow Patriarchate; yet we have never broken with the Russian Church, our Mother-Church.” (*Pravoslavnaya Rus*, No. 21, Nov. 1/14. 1976, pp. 1-4.)

In an earlier epistle written by Metropolitan Philaret on behalf of the hierarchy, and in response to Alexander Solzhenitsyn’s letter to the Third Pan-Diaspora Sobor, the First Hierarch speculated on what might be the future role of the ROCA in Russia:

“Your fear that we are counting on returning to Russia as some sort of judges or commanders can only be attributed to a misunderstanding or to disinformation which someone has foisted upon you. We know of no one amongst us with such thoughts. But if the liberation of Russia should take place and we could be reunited with a restored Orthodox and canonical authority, then we would assume that we are a part of the Russian hierarchy. We simply have not considered how much weight we would carry in such an event. Numerically the flock abroad is a drop in the sea when compared with the ocean of the Russian nation.” (*Pravoslavnaya Rus*, No. 19, Oct. 1/14, 1974, pp. 5-6.)

³⁷ Here, and in the two following sentences, the Metropolitan has switched from the singular *thou* to the plural *you* in order to indicate that these passages refer to both the recipient of this letter and his like-minded fellow clergymen.

³⁸ For the full English translation of Fr. Dimitry Dudko’s letter to Metropolitan Philaret, see *Orthodox Life*, Vol. 29, No. 6, 1979, pp. 28-30. This is followed by a lengthy related article by Bishop Gregory [Grabbe] entitled: “The Russian Church in the Wilderness and in this World”, pp. 31-44.

It should be noted here that the editorial introduction to Fr. Dimitry Dudko’s letter makes the following statement:

“In an exchange of correspondence which took place between the Synod’s Archbishop Anthony [Bartoshevich] of Geneva and Fr. Dudko, the archbishop allayed Fr. Dimitry’s fears somewhat by informing him that the Synod does not in fact deny that there is grace in the mysteries of the Soviet [sic] Patriarchate, accepts baptisms performed by its clerics, and has even received certain priests into its own fold. Fr. Dudko replied that he himself had evidently fallen victim to misinformation concerning the true state of affairs, supplied him by ‘friends’, and expressed his continued and abiding respect for the Synod’s official stance...”

As can be seen from all that Metropolitan Philaret has written above, this statement is simply not true. It would appear that it is the editors themselves, and *not* Fr. Dimitry Dudko, who have “evidently fallen victim to misinformation concerning the true state of affairs”.

³⁹ Here the Metropolitan reverts to the singular *thou*.