

## The Church on Relations with Heretics

Matthew Raphael Johnson  
Johnstown, PA  
First Published, 2011, Revised  
April 2016

The Orthodox do not expect the other Christians to be converted to Orthodoxy in its historic and cultural reality of the past and the present and to become members of the Orthodox Church—Statement of the Orthodox delegates at the WCC General Assembly in Nairobi in 1975

We order any Bishop, or Presbyter, that has accepted any heretics' Baptism, or sacrifice, to be deposed; for "what consonance hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath the believer with an infidel?" (Canon 56 of the Apostles)

Many have begun to upbraid me for my ecclesiology. This is the well known position that those outside the True Orthodox fold do not have the grace of the sacraments. The simple fact of the matter is that there cannot be two Orthodoxies. One is true, the others, false. Today, there are two "orthodoxies," the first, based at the Phanar, and is an integral part of the global ecumenical movement and globalist elite forces. The other is the "suffering Orthodox," those in resistance, who refuse to recognize or compromise with the secularization of the world, which, to a great extent, now almost completely dominates the mind of "world Orthodoxy." It needs to be emphasized that no argument can be made that, when a bishop defects to heresy, his people automatically go with him or the priests resisting him no longer can function. This is a specifically modern error that sees the episcopacy as made up of isolated egos rather than as offices.

Overwhelmingly, the True Orthodox in Greece and elsewhere have rejected the idea that grace can exist in a church body that holds that heretics, that is, Roman Catholics and Anglicans, do have sacraments and can achieve salvation. They have rejected the idea that two orthodoxies can exist side by side. It was the Greek new calendar church that first claimed that the True Orthodox do not have mysteries, yet the papists do. However, this only affects actual heretics, not the people who know better in these poor dioceses. A bishop is not needed for the church to exist.

It was the New Calendarists who launched bloody and violent reprisals against the True Orthodox in Bulgaria, Romania and Greece, destroying churches, profaning the mysteries and assaulting priests and faithful.

These are spiritual thieves, plundering the spiritual flock, and they will enter the sheepfold (the Church), climbing up some other way, using force and trampling upon the divine statutes. The Lord calls them robbers (cf. St. John 10:1). Indeed, their first task will be the persecution of the true pastors, their imprisonment and exile, for without this it will be impossible for them to plunder the sheep.

Therefore, my son, when you see the violation of patristic tradition and the divine order in the Church, the order established by God, know that the heretics have already appeared, although for the time being they may conceal their impiety, or they will distort the Divine Faith imperceptibly, in order to succeed better in seducing and enticing the inexperienced into the net. (St. Anatolii the Younger of Optina, 1922).

Ecumenism is a heresy because it claims that grace exists outside of Orthodoxy, and, as a result, truth has no relation to salvation, grace or sacraments. Those who are a part of the ecumenical movement hold this to a man, and hence, there can be no question from a strict canonical point of view that they are no longer Orthodox. The patristic/canonical authority for all this, though familiar to most, is reprinted below. Those who are new to this controversy must read this material. The True Orthodox number about 2000 parishes throughout the world, and have pronounced synodically that the synods of Moscow and the Greek world are schismatic. There is no official statement on the Romanians, Serbs, Georgians or Bulgarians. These have been considered “irregular,” such as the Matthewites or certain Ukrainian groups, rather than graceless.

In other words, the True Orthodox have not synodically rejected the grace of the Serbs, etc. Since Serbia and Georgia have left the World Council of Churches (WCC) there is some reason to hold them as a part of Orthodoxy, however irregular due to their communion with the Phanar. Nevertheless, the independent Serbian metropolitanate of Christopher, a 33rd degree Mason has refused to follow Belgrade in this matter, one can easily conclude that the Serbs in America fall into the same heresy as the Greeks. Since Serbs in America receive communion maybe once a year, it is a rather moot point whether they are a part of Orthodoxy.

It should be reiterated that these synodal decisions of the True Orthodox, Russian and Greek, refer only to sacramental grace. The pious Orthodox, maybe confused as to their status, receive all the grace they need. For the simpler people, we cannot expect them to wade into this confusing mess of the True Orthodox political arena. The Old Calendarists have failed to offer a compelling alternative to the ecumenists and thus, there is no moral culpability for those who remain in the Phanar-based churches. The people are not responsible for the stupidity and ignorance of their bishops. The bishop is not the church, nor do bishops “rule” anything. They are products of the monastic life and exist as an administrative head for clergy, finances and other practical matters. There is no distinction in grace or holiness, just in function.

It is a noteworthy error of our times that the defection of a bishop means that his people are thereby treated the same. This, however, is bad history. The famed historian WA Jurgens writes:

At one point in the Church’s history, only a few years before Gregory’s [Nazianzus] present preaching (+380 A.D.), perhaps the number of catholic bishops in possession of sees, as opposed to Arian bishops in possession of sees, was no greater than something between 1% and 3% of the total. Had doctrine been determined by popularity, today we should all be deniers of Christ and opponents of the Spirit.” (W.A. Jurgens, *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, II, 39-40).

Does this mean that the overwhelming majority of Christendom was thereby damned because of this? Utter nonsense. God cannot be unjust, and he certainly cannot be stupid. Hence,

that question is useless. In those areas where bishops defected, the faithful remained in the church and fully sanctified as if they had the sacraments. Sacraments do not come from the bishop as if he is a magician. The bishop is dependent on the people for any functional authority he might have, not the other way around. The lack of a governing bishop tells us nothing about the souls of those present in those (or our) times and does not remove them from the church. A bishop is not necessarily required for the church to exist and it is self-interested arrogance for them to think otherwise. Priests keeping the faith would automatically have the authority of the church (from any of the world's remaining bishops or from God directly) to function normally. The sacraments would remain in the absence of a bishop. The alternative is too outrageous to contemplate. Keep in mind, of course, that we're speaking of extraordinary circumstances of grave crisis.

However, we read in the Apostolic Constitutions:

The Bishop, he is the minister of the word, the guardian of knowledge, the mediator between God and you in your worship of Him. He is the teacher of piety; and, next after God, he is your Father. . . he is your ruler and governor; he is your king and potentate; he is, next after God, your earthly god, who ought to enjoy honor from you. . . for let the Bishop preside over you as one honored with the dignity of God, which he is to exercise over the clergy, and by which he is to govern all the people.

This is clearly hyperbolic. Few bishops in history, let alone in our sorry times, could remotely come close to this standard. Calling him “an earthly god” is close to idolatry and hence, must be taken as a form of encomium typical for the times rather than a literal truth. Most of the time, the bishop is a distant figure, almost entirely unknown to the average parishioner. Words like this cannot remotely apply to such people and were never meant to. The above words must be rejected as literal truths. Almost without exception, the nativity and pascal epistles of modern bishops are useless, nothing more than a list of platitudes no one bothers to read anymore. He is too distant and too busy to ever be a “father” to anyone other than that handful of priests close to him.

The “bishop” is not an individual person. Such ideological fabrications did not exist at the time. The “individual” as in the isolated, Cartesian ego is a modern invention. It is dangerous to import modern errors to the ancient world. He is always referred to in the plural: he is a manifestation of the local synod and does not rule without them. The “bishop” refers to an office, one that rules with the synod of priests, abbots and laity of the diocese. This office can exist even without a living occupant. This is like saying that if no good people exist, goodness as such does not exist. Only moderns could make this stupid error.

It should also be remembered that the great Theophanes of Jerusalem, in his consecration of the Autocephalous Ukrainian Church under Hetman St. Peter Saidachny, gave the lay Brotherhoods the identical jurisdictional powers of a bishop. Since bishops at that time were so outrageously corrupt, he recognized that laymen were taking the office of bishop to themselves. This was not only a necessity, but good theology: the bishop is not a person and was never meant to be considered one in essence. It is an office.

Further, during the Synod that elected St. Tikhon Patriarch during World War I, AV Vasilev wrote:

The main task of the Holy Synod is to lay the foundations for the restoration in the life of our Church and our Homeland of the principle of sobornost confessed by us in the 9<sup>th</sup> clause of the Creed, but scorned and repressed in life. If we confess the Church as Catholic and Apostolic, and the Apostle defines it as the body of Christ, as a living organism in which all the members are inter-connected and coordinated with one another, this means that such a co-ordination is not alien to the principle of sobornost and sobornost is not the full equality of identical members or particles, but contains within it the recognition of the personal and hierarchical elements. Sobornost does not deny authority, but demands from it the predisposition to voluntary obedience to it. Thus, authority, which defines itself as service, according to the word of Jesus Christ “the first of you shall be the servant to all” – and those subject to it, who voluntarily obey the authority recognized by them, concord, like-mindedness and unanimity, at the basis of which lie mutual trust and love – this is sobornost. And only with sobornost is it possible to have true Christian liberty and equality and fraternity of people and nations. . . . In sobornost the personal hierarchical and public elements are in close harmony. The Orthodox interpretation of sobornost contains the concept of universality, but it is more profound and indicates inner self-discipline, integrity, both of the spiritual strength, will-power, intellect and feelings of the individual, and in society and the nation as a whole - on the concertedness of the organism-members which make it up...(Appendix XXXI of the Acts of the 1918 Synod).

From this, it was decreed on November 9<sup>th</sup> of that year that “In the Orthodox Russian Church, the supreme authority – legislative, administrative, judicial and executive – shall be vested in the Local Council composed of bishops, clergy and laymen which is convened periodically at certain times.”<sup>1</sup> The local sobor is essential in that it is, taken together, the office of “bishop.” There are no “individuals” in the Orthodox church as this abstraction did not exist until capitalism needed it.

The fact remains that the New Calendar was anathematized by all Orthodoxy, all the historic patriarchates, prior to 1921. Between 1902 and 1904, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople have anathematized the New Calendar and the papal mentality that undergirds it. No Orthodox body, outside of the most severe emergency, has the authority to rewrite tradition to suit their needs. Certainly this applies to something so intimately familiar to all Orthodox as the calendar. It created a schism in Orthodoxy, introduced Orthodoxy to the structured, elite-funded ecumenical movement, and created an “Orthodox papacy” in the Phanar.

The Masonic Young Turk movement made certain that all Patriarchs of Constantinople were Masons, and that includes the well known Mason Meletios IV (both patriarch of Constantinople and Alexandria, even after his formal deposition, who had reached the 33<sup>rd</sup> degree), as well as lesser known Masons such as Basil III and Photius II. The Lodge at Constantinople, under Patriarch Meletios IV recognizes the sacraments of the Anglicans. In 1948, another Freemason is “elected,” Athenagoras a 33<sup>rd</sup> degree Mason. Athenagoras said, “We are in error and sin if we think that the Orthodox Faith came down from heaven and that the other dogmas [i.e. religions] are unworthy. Three hundred million men have chosen

---

1 These are from the essay from Lev Regelson, “The Patriarchate and Sobornost”  
<http://www.apocalypticism.ru/Patriarchschip-and-Sobornost.htm>

Mohammedanism as the way to God, and further hundreds of millions are Protestants, Catholics and Buddhists. The aim of every religion is to make man better.”

Iakovos, head of the Greek sect in America, and a Mason, of sorry memory, referred to the canons as “pseudo-documents” and “prejudices” that prevent union with the western “Christians.” He is venerated still by the Greek church, though has yet to be “canonized.” He believed that the Talmudic Jews were our “fathers in the faith,” and regularly received cash advances from the ADL. The Patriarchs of Constantinople regularly pray and concelebrate with the popes. In 1965, the papal name is inserted into the diptychs of Constantinople, denoting full communion. The ROCOR under St. +Filaret the New Confessor, rejects all communion with the ecumenists as a result, and joins with the Greek Old Calendarists, long confessing the gracelessness of the ecumenist mysteries. After Filaret's death, the ROCOR's policy will change, something predicted by the great Archbishop Averky of blessed memory.

Demetrius is then elected “Patriarch of Constantinople” in 1972, and in his case, is a public Mason, reaching the 33rd degree, having, as all Masons, taken their oath to Lucifer/Prometheus at the 13th degree, and repeated thereafter. He will proclaim that the Roman Catholics and Anglicans have sacraments, and that, therefore, they are part of the Orthodox church. All of “world Orthodoxy” accepts it. He writes the following:

. . . the Holy Church of Christ in Constantinople embraces the Bishop of Rome and the Holy Church in Rome, in the incense, acceptable to the Lord, of the pentarchy of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, in which the Bishop of Rome is defined as presiding in love and honor, ascribing all honor to Your Holiness, . . . first in rank and honor in the universal Body of the Lord.

The facts are clear: all of the Patriarchs of Constantinople have been Masons and Luciferians since the 1920s. Parthenios of Alexandria himself was a Mason and praised Islam as a “true Religion” as president of the World Council of Churches. Yet “world Orthodoxy” maintained communion with him, and made communion with the Phanar their core argument for being “canonical.” In the meantime, the Syrians entered into communion with the Jacobites and encouraged Anglican parishes to become “Orthodox” without ever abjuring Anglicanism. So under the AOC in America, Anglican parishes, using organs, unleavened bread and openly venerating post-schism saints, are called “western rite Orthodox.”

The Phanar had long since been venerating post-schism western “saints,” and icons are painted of Paul VI of Rome and placed in the churches of the New Skete “monastery” in New York. By 2003, the ROCOR is concelebrating with the Masonic Phanar in Ireland and elsewhere. Specifically, on April 24, 2003, the ROCOR and the Phanar concelebrate in Dublin, Ireland. The ROCOR, despite all they have done for humanity, were (and are) taken in by the lures of worldly influence and mainstream “acceptance.” The result? Confusion, more schism and more harsh feelings and ill-will.

But the worst, the most openly evil, was the 1983 Vancouver Statement of the WCC, which explicitly “affirmed” an ecclesiology that rejected the necessity of Christ for Salvation. This was the first in a series of steps that allowed the Serbs, long on the WCC payroll, to eventually bite the hand that fed them and leave that organization.

The document in question is called, “My Neighbor's Faith and Mine, Theological Discoveries Through Interfaith Dialogue: A Study Guide” (Geneva: WCC, 1986). After claiming the need for “a more adequate theology of religions,” the group stated,

That in Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word, the entire human family has been united to God in an irrevocable bond and covenant. The saving presence of God's activity in all creation and human history comes to its focal point in the event of Christ. . . because we have seen and experienced goodness, truth, and holiness among followers of other paths and ways than that of Jesus Christ. . . we find ourselves recognizing a need to move beyond a theology which confines salvation to the explicit personal commitment to Jesus Christ.

This was signed by all members of the WCC, including all Greek New Calendar jurisdictions that have yet to repent of it. World Orthodoxy continues to commune with the Phanar. As a result, there can be no question that Moscow, Bucharest, Athens, the Greeks and the Finns are heretics, worse than papists (for at least the latter do not claim to be "Orthodox"), and a humiliation for all True Orthodox peoples.

Allow me to be clear: The vulgar quoting from canons is not the aim here. The canons, almost completely unknown to the "average Orthodox" in the nave, are necessary to good church order, but they are not sufficient to it. We call the Orthodox Church the manifestation of the Spirit, that is, the Third Person of the Trinity, rather than the manifestation of Christ in the flesh. The Spirit, and this is at the root of the difference between the papal party (east and west) and the Orthodox one, is the representative of a Holy Freedom.

We are freed from the law, but it is a far cry from saying we are freed from the necessity of true church order. Hence, the reality is that to be "canonical" is a phrase with no meaning, deriving as it does from the pens of hobbyists, neophytes and amateurs. But what the Spirit gives to us is a freedom within order and the fullness of the faith: canon law, the living witness of the saints, monastic typika, the divine services, pilgrimage, mystical experience, the giving of alms and the giving of self in a very real and often painful way. All of these together (and all of these that cannot be rendered in language) are at the basis of good Orthodox order and canonical life. And it is here, even more than the violation of a strict canonical order, that the difference between the two Orthodox churches arise.

The typical listing of canons condemning ecumenism and prayer with heretics can be found anywhere. For this, I've provided some of the lesser known canons and conceptions of the Orthodox church against all manner of ecumenism.

But inasmuch as we have mentioned heretics as dead persons, and ourselves as having salvation in the divine Scriptures, I fear lest, as Paul wrote to the Corinthians (II Cor. 11:3), some of the honest ones be led astray from simplicity and chastity by the craftiness of men, and thereafter begin relying upon other things, the so-called apocrypha, deceived by the likeness of the titles with the names of the true books, I beg you to be tolerant if what things I am writing about with a view to their necessity and usefulness to the Church are things which you already know and understand thoroughly (Canons of St. Peter of Alexandria, 304, confirmed by the 1<sup>st</sup> Ecumenical Synod).

Question: Whether a Clergyman ought to pray when Arians or other heretics are present, or it does not matter, at a time when he himself is making the prayer, that is to say, the offering?

Answer: In the divine anaphora, or offering, the Deacon addresses before the embrace the congregation, saying: "Those of ye who are not in communion, depart." There ought not, therefore, to be any persons present such as those mentioned, unless they promise to repent and to leave the heresy. (Canons of St. Timothy of Alexandria, c. 372, confirmed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> canon of the 6<sup>th</sup> ecumenical synod).

As for those heretics who betake themselves to Orthodoxy, and to the lot of the saved. . . . (From the 2<sup>nd</sup> canon from the 2<sup>nd</sup> ecumenical synod. There is no salvation outside the Orthodox church).

How can anyone that has been unable to deposit his own sins outside the Church manage in baptizing another person to let him have a remission of sins? But even the question itself which arises in baptism is a witness to the truth. For in saying to the one being baptized, "Believest thou in an everlasting life, and that thou shall receive a remission of sins?" we are saying nothing else than that it can be given in the Catholic Church, but that among heretics where there is no Church it is impossible to receive a remission of sins. And for this reason the advocates of the heretics ought either to change the essence of the question for something else, or else give the truth a trial, unless they have something to add the Church to them, as a bonus. But it is necessary for anyone that has been baptized to be anointed, in order that, upon receiving the chrism, he may become a partaker of Christ. But no heretic can sanctify oil, seeing that he has neither an altar nor a church. Not a drop of chrism can exist among heretics. For it is obvious to you that no oil at all can be sanctified amongst them for use in connection with the Eucharist. For we ought to be well aware, and not ignorant, of the fact that it has been written: "let not the oil of a sinner anoint my head" (Ps. 140:6); which indeed even in olden times the Holy Spirit made known in psalms, lest anyone, having been sidetracked and led astray from the straight way, be anointed by the heretics, who are opponents of Christ. (From the 1<sup>st</sup> Canon of the Synod at Carthage under Cyprian. There can be no sacraments under heretical churchmen).

It is decreed that Bishops and Clerics shall not leave any legacy to non-Orthodox Christians, even though these be blood relatives, nor shall Bishops or Clerics make such persons any gift of property of their own by bequest, as has been said. (From the Synod of Carthage, 419. This is often extended to all Orthodox given the differences between the clerical and lay orders is only one of function. Our responsibilities and life must be identical. Non-Orthodox cannot even be named in a will.)

If in the Matricia, or, at any rate, in the sees, any Bishop becomes neglectful in regard to the heretics, be reminded of his duty by neighboring diligent Bishops, and his scornfulness be pointed out to him, so as to leave him no excuse or justification; and if from the day that he was so reminded, within six months, while he continues residing in the same province, he shall fail to exercise due care to make converts to the catholic unity, he shall be denied communion until he

fulfills this obligation. But if there be no epexergastes (i.e., civil collaborator) in those regions to come to his aid, let no charge be brought against the Bishop. (From canon 132 of the The Second Regional Synod of Constantinople held in 394. Ecumenism is seen by the fathers to be so severe that bishops can be penalized for not taking strict enough action against them).

Do not err, my brethren: if anyone follow a schismatic, he will not inherit the Kingdom of God. If any man walk about with strange doctrine, he cannot lie down with the passion. Take care, then, to use one Eucharist, so that whatever you do, you do according to God: for there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the union of His Blood; one altar, as there is one bishop with the presbytery and my fellow servants, the deacons. (St. Ignatius Of Antioch, Epistle to the Philadelphians, 3:2-4:1, 110 A.D.)

The present age is rich not in ascetical feats of piety and confession of faith, but in cheating, lies, and deceits. It is noteworthy that several hierarchs and their flocks, for the most part Russians, have already fallen away from Ecumenical unity, and to the question: "What dost thou believe?", reply with references to self-proclaimed heads of all sorts of schisms in Moscow, America, and Western Europe. It is clear that they have ceased to believe in the unity of the Church throughout the whole world and do not wish to admit it, attempting to bear calmly the refusal of the true Church to have relations with them, and imagining that one can supposedly save ones should even without communion with Her... Those who have cut themselves off from Her deprive themselves of the hope of salvation, as the Fathers of the Sixth Ecumenical Council teach concerning this, having recognized the renegades as being totally devoid of grace , according to the word of Christ: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." Unfortunately, some Orthodox laymen, even, alas, many priests (and hierarchs) have subjected themselves to this state of gracelessness, although still retaining the outward appearance of the church services and the apparent performance of the Mysteries. (From the 1934 paschal encyclical of Metropolitan Anthony Khrapovitsky)

And the Lord said to Moses and Aaron: This is the law of the Passover: no stranger shall eat of it. And every slave or servant bought with money - him thou shalt circumcise, and then shall he eat of it. A sojourner or hireling shall not eat of it. In one house shall it be eaten." (Exodus 12:43-46.)

We shall not escape sharing in that punishment which, in the world to come, awaits heretics, if we defile Orthodoxy and the holy Faith by adulterous communion with heretics. (St. John the Merciful)

All the teachers of the Church, all the Councils, and all the Divine Scriptures, exhort us to flee those who uphold other doctrines and to separate from communion with them. (St. mark of Ephesus, Confession of Faith, XII, 304)

As we walk the unerring and life-bringing path, let us pluck out the eye that scandalizes us-not the physical eye, but the noetic one. For example, if a bishop or presbyter-who are the eyes of the Church-conduct themselves in an evil manner and scandalize the people, they must be plucked out. For it is more profitable to gather without them in a house of prayer, than to be cast together with them into the Gehenna of fire together with Annas and Caiaphas (St. Athanasius the Great, PG 26:1257c)

I adjure all the people in Cyprus who are true children of the Catholic Church to flee as fast as their feet can carry them from those priests who have fallen and submitted to the Latins; neither assemble in church with them, nor receive any blessing from their hands. For it is better for you to pray to God in your homes alone than to gather together in churches with the Latin-minded (Germanos II, Patriarch of Constantinople, PG 140:620a)

The dearest thing of all for the Christian is the Truth, for the sake of witnessing to which the Lord Jesus Christ came to earth, as He Himself said to Pilate (Jn 18:37). And for the true Christian there can be only one desirable unity--unity in the Truth of Christ--the pure, undistorted, uncorrupted Truth, without any admixture of diabolic falsehood, not envenomed by any compromise with it. From this point of view, all these appeals for "peace" and "unity" are unacceptable, for they come from people who encroach on our principal treasure--the pure and undefiled truth of the teaching of Christ that has been preserved by us, and who wish to substitute for it a lie which is of the devil. The "unity" which is now envisaged by the enemies of the pure truth of Christ is not unity in Christ. It is that unity which the Antichrist, who wishes to subject all to himself and to found his kingdom on earth, is striving to create. ("On the Situation of the Orthodox Christian in the Contemporary World" by Archbishop Averky of Syracuse)

The following statement proves that not all hierarchs of the Moscow patriarch were cut off from the church. God judges individuals (though never in isolation), not "jurisdictions." If the Orthodox faith is lived and followed, then the Holy Spirit must be present. None of us can stand in judgment of Patriarch Sergius of the Soviet Union. Few of us would have done anything differently. One of the great bishops of the church, however, was John of Petrograd who, despite the evils of his "jurisdiction" maintained a life in Christ. His words and acts could have not existed without the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. He writes,

Hiding behind the 'high-minded' aim of 'removing inter-religious discord' and 'the reunion of believers in one fraternal family', the theorists of ecumenism forget to mention one thing. This is that in such a reunion, the greatest and most precious thing of all will be lost - that is the truth of the Law of God, buried underneath the burden of false human reasoning. Like all heresies, ecumenism lies when it offers the fraternal union of Truth with the lie, cunningly pretending that it does not understand the unnatural nature of such a union, hoping that people bewitched by high-minded slogans will not notice the dreadful forgery. (Metropolitan John of St

Petersburg (+ 1995)

\*\*\*\*\*

Hence, what is the logical and canonical conclusion? The New Orthodox elites are aware of Freemasonry and its cult of Lucifer/Prometheus, they are aware of the canons against relations with the heretics, they are aware that the canons decree that the heterodox are graceless, they are aware that fleeing from their bishops is legitimate according to the canons themselves. Hence, they are willing apostates, aware of their apostasy, but their main passions, pride and a desire for mainstream acceptance, has destroyed them. Now, this does not affect their people. The people, often totally ignorant of their bishops' actions, cannot be judged according to their errors. This is especially the case today, when the True Orthodox have failed utterly and miserably to offer a compelling alternative to the "New Church." Since the True Orthodox bishops have synodically proclaimed the New Greek Church schismatic, those who remain orthodox are forced to conclude, despite our feelings to the contrary, that the New Orthodox do not have grace, and that they are worse than the papists.

The Abomination of Desolation has entered into the very altar of the church, and the True Orthodox must flee from it, not make excuses, as I did for so many years. The struggle is to build our house chapels, engage in intense proselytization, and above all, fear nothing. In this day and age, the internet has made our position crystal clear for all to see. The information is there for all; those who refuse to act on it, even though they know it is correct from a canonical point of view, are culpable, and have lost eternal life and the immortality of their soul. Orthodoxy is not an "establishment" religion, and when it does become part of an "establishment," it loses its soul, it becomes complacent and, slowly, becomes obsessed with worldly power and prestige.

St. John Chrysostom saw this fact, the Old Believers saw it, the catacomb Orthodox saw it, and we are seeing it again. The New Orthodox have learned nothing, they have forgotten everything. However, since the Old Calendarists have created dozens of churches mutually anathematizing one another, there is no moral blame put on those who will not move to the True Orthodox faith. This sin lies in the ambitious hierarchs of the True Orthodox. God is just. Condemning one to a graceless life due to a) the failures and fear of their ruling hierarch and b) the failure and greed of the True Orthodox, is unjust. Therefore, God does not do this. God, as St. Gregory the Great stated, provides all the graces one needs for salvation when the local bishop has abandoned them.

The New Orthodox are basically decent, secular people who have a respect for the "rich tradition" of the church, but see it as little more than a part of the "rich fabric" of American diversity. The church is a social institution, a vaguely "conservative" presence, but nothing more. They have inserted themselves into America life, its media and its prejudices, and, as a result, exist solely as a superficial "Christian" body.

The Orthodox tradition, however, is very different. Our life is one of struggle and persecution. The New Orthodox bishops are not persecuted and do not suffer. Yet, the Apostle Paul says the opposite. The New Orthodox life is one of relative ease. The True orthodox mission is to flee, to build alternative communities and an alternative economy. The Old Believers have proven that this can be done, and that their settlements were more literate, more pious and more prosperous than that of the mainline Orthodox. For one to claim the Orthodox mantle, yet be completely satisfied with the modern global economy and political system, is an apostate on that account alone.

We are revolutionaries and separatists. At no level, not from the prophets, nor apostles or our saints, have we been anything else. We are outcasts. We are hated and persecuted. Yet, Christ and his apostles said that this is our lot. How few wonder why this is apparently not the lot of world Orthodoxy, a group that does not suffer at all, and is accepted by the world that Christ ordered his people to flee. World Orthodoxy is not, but rather an integral part of the world, and, as a result, partakes of its sins, its power relations and its money. The True Orthodox have the mantle of the prophets, while the “ecumenical Christians” have that of the temple prophets, the well paid lackeys of the corrupted Israelite power structure. Nothing has changed in 3000 years. We have no reason to expect it ever will. For our part, we struggle and suffer.