



**A HISTORY OF THE
RUSSIAN CHURCH ABROAD
1917-1970**



**A HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH ABROAD
AND THE EVENTS LEADING TO THE AMERICAN METROPOLIA'S
AUTOCEPHALY**

Original Title: The History of the Russian Orthodox
Church in the United States

Published By: St. Nectarios Press, 9223-20th Ave.
N.E., Seattle, WA 98115

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 72-79507

ISBN 0-913026-04-2

[http://rocorhistoryhtm.blogspot.ca/2011/03/chapter-
v-ought-metropolia-to-have.html](http://rocorhistoryhtm.blogspot.ca/2011/03/chapter-v-ought-metropolia-to-have.html)

PREFACE OF THE EDITORS

Our Saviour told us that the tree shall be known by its fruit, whether it be healthy or not. Fifty-five years have passed since the ungodly Bolshevist revolution overran the Russian land and many Russian people were found abroad as refugees. Although in the beginning this was essentially a political emigration, i.e., fleeing from the Bolsheviks, today, with the passage of time, it has shown forth to be a religious emigration. Now after fifty-five years, one is in a better position to taste of the fruit and discern whether the tree be healthy indeed.

We, as non-Russians, came to the Russian Church Abroad as spiritual refugees, fleeing the heresy of Ecumenism. We have come to love the Russian Synod Abroad and to appreciate her pastoral care for our spiritual growth and salvation. Notwithstanding this, of late especially, many half-truths and untruths have been printed concerning the Russian Orthodox communities in the diaspora. Since there are claims made by at least four distinct groups -- the Synod Abroad, the Metropolia, the Paris group, and the Soviet church -- it is difficult for those who neither read nor speak Russian to be able to assess who is right and who is wrong. For a long time now, there has been a need for a chronicle in English of events and developments in Russian Church affairs outside Russia, so that students of Church History and individuals concerned might be able to make a true assessment of the state of affairs in this sphere.

We of the Holy Transfiguration Monastery have always contended that the differences between the various Russian groups were not personality conflicts, but primarily matters of faith and order. Today, after fifty-five years, one is better able to discern and to verify the spiritual witness and strength of the Russian Synod Abroad, and the laxity and spiritual poverty in those groups which have chosen to be separated from her.

For the early part of this history, much information was taken from Michel D'Herbigny and Alexandre Deubner, Les Eveques Russes en Exile, Rome 1932. Both these authors were extremely ultra-conservative Roman Catholics of a breed now virtually extinct, and the purpose of their book was to demonstrate to the Orthodox peoples and to all students of Church History, that without a central, supreme authority such as the Papacy it was inevitable that one should come to the state of affairs of the Russian Church at that time: a state of confusion, divisions, claims and counterclaims. Yet their account is an excellent and objective work of scholarship, full of interesting and enlightening information not found elsewhere. We have used this source, therefore, because the authors were completely disinterested in the Russian Church groups [actually the book was written against them all to show up the "organizational weaknesses" of Orthodoxy. They have merely recorded events and statements in an objective and scholarly manner. Yet, the conclusion of their book is that if anyone has a sound foundation and claim, it is the Synod. We are fortunate in having a copy of this book in our library; should anyone wish to have a copy, we can make a Xerox copy.

At times, original source material has not been available to us and so, when using quotations, we were forced to translate into English from other translations because we were not able to find a copy of the original Russian text. We ask the readers to forgive this unavoidable shortcoming.

It is evident from the scope of this present work that no one individual could have written it, but rather a group of dedicated Orthodox scholars and laymen have laboured, translating from the Russian, French, Greek, German, and from other sources. We are indebted to all who have contributed: the authors, the typist and the publisher. Such a work in English has been long overdue.

Glory to God for all things

The Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Boston (1972)

CHAPTER I

**A BRIEF HISTORY OF ORTHODOXY IN AMERICA BEFORE THE
BOLSHEVIST REVOLUTION OF 1917**

The undistorted faith of our savior Jesus Christ and His Apostles reached the American continent in 1794, when eight missionary monks from Valaam monastery in Russia came to Kodiak Island and established an Orthodox Church there. 1 For the next century Holy Orthodoxy grew slowly but steadily on the new continent. During the mission's early years two radiant saints appeared in her ranks. In 1815 an Aleut named Peter suffered martyrdom at the hands of Roman Catholic Franciscans in California for refusing to renounce his faith, and twenty-two years later the holy Herman reposed in Alaska.

In 1872 the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church founded the diocese of Aleutia and Alaska with its cathedral in San Francisco. The transfer of the cathedral from Sitka, Alaska, to San Francisco was indicative of the growth of the Orthodox population on the West Coast. Two years previously [1870] the first Russian parish was organized in New York City under the direction of Fr. Nicholas Berring, a convert from Roman Catholicism. The parish was even able to publish a journal in English, the Oriental Church Magazine.

The so-called "San Francisco period" [1870-1905], named for the location of the diocesan cathedral, was a time of considerable growth. As Basil Bensin puts it, "During the San Francisco period great progress was made by Russian Orthodoxy in America. The center of Orthodoxy was gradually moving from the Pacific to the Atlantic States with an increasing number of churches and parishes." 2

1. Most of the information in this section is taken from Basil M. Bensin, History of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America, New York, 1941.

2. Ibid., pp. 10-11.

These were years of heavy immigration to America. Many emigrants from western regions of the Russian Empire came to make a living in the "land of opportunity." There also came a large number of Carpatho-Rusyn Uniates from Austro-Hungary. In 1891, led by the dynamic Fr. Alexis Toth, himself an immigrant from Austro-Hungary, the latter began to throw off the yoke of the Unia. Fr. Toth and his large Minneapolis parish were accepted into the Orthodox Church by Bishop Vladimir of San Francisco. Under Bishop Nicholas [1891-98], Vladimir's successor, nine Uniate parishes were received into the Church, and a "missionary school" for the training of clergy was established in Minneapolis. Two Orthodox journals, The Russian-American Orthodox Messenger and Svit, began to be published in Russian. From 1896 on the Messenger also included sections in English.

Under Bishop Tikhon [1898-1907], later to become Patriarch of All Russia and a confessor of Orthodoxy under the Bolsheviks, "the Orthodox movement grew among the Uniate parishes and immigration from Russia to America increased many-fold." 1 Under Tikhon, more than twenty new parishes - many of them sizable - were founded in America, and for in Canada. Bishop Tikhon soon acquired two suffragan bishops: Bishop Innocent was placed in charge of Alaska, and Bishop Raphael, an Arab, given charge over the Syro-Arabian Mission in America, which had been founded in 1895.

In 1903 Tikhon was elevated by the Russian Holy Synod to the title of Archbishop of Alaska and North America. Two years later the see was transferred from San Francisco to New York, in order to meet the

1. Ibid., p. 13.

exigencies of the population shift in American Orthodoxy. In 1905 a rudimentary seminary was founded in Minneapolis, and in 1906, St. Tikhon's Monastery, "the first Russian monastery in the United States," was opened by Hieromonk Arseny Chagovetz at South Canaan, Pennsylvania.

Under Archbishop Platon [1907-14], who after the Revolution became Metropolitan of North America and subsequently led his flock into a disastrous schism, Orthodoxy continued to grow. Forty new parishes were organized in the United States and ten in Canada. Among them were formerly Uniate parishes." 1 In 1912 the seminary was transferred from Minneapolis to Tenafly, New Jersey.

Under Archbishop Evdokim [1914-17], who after the Revolution also disgraced himself by joining the "Living Church," thirty-five new parishes were organized in the United States and two in Canada. Thus in the ten years [1907-17] of Platon's and Evdokim's administration seventy-five new parishes were founded in America, a truly extraordinary rate of growth which was the result of mass conversion from the Unia and large-scale immigration. By 1916 Evdokim had four suffragan bishops to assist him-- Alexander [Nemolovsky] of Canada, consecrated in 1908; Phillip of Alaska, consecrated in 1916; Eftimios, Syro-Arabian Bishop of Brooklyn, consecrated in 1916; and Stephen, Bishop of Pittsburg, consecrated in 1916 "chiefly for work among Pennsylvania parishes consisting of Carpatho-Rusyns from Hungary." 2

A word about the Greek parishes in America is in order at this point. Before the 1890's the parishes of the Greek Church were "naturally and

1. Ibid., p. 16

2. Ibid., p. 17

canonically under the protection and care of the Orthodox Catholic jurisdiction established by the Russian Holy Synod for all American residents." 1 There may have been exceptions, as the American Greek Archdiocese now claims, but, generally speaking, adherence to the Russian Church was the rule for Greek parishes in America.

Beginning with the 1890's, however, priests began to be sent to America by both the Holy Synod of Greece and the Œcumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople. In 1907 Constantinople agreed to allow all Greeks in America to be under the Holy Synod of Greece. Thus from 1908-1918 the Greek parishes were directed by the Church of Greece, although no bishop came to take charge of the flock. The existence of a jurisdiction [even without a bishop] apart from the Russian diocese obviously boded ill for Church unity in America. This was soon realized by those who had the interests of the Church rather than of themselves at heart.

In 1912 Patriarch Joachim III of Constantinople "realizing that the Russians had already established a diocese in North America, suggested that the Russian bishop in America, through the Holy Synod of Russia, recommend to the Holy Synod of Greece that 'a Greek bishop be appointed for America who had studied in a Russian theological academy.'" 2

"This statement by Patriarch Joachim III, "Alexander Doumouras comments, "together with his expressed wish that the Orthodox in America would live in harmony, matched the program which had already been inaugurated in America by the Russian Church. This plan called for the establishment of

1. Alexander Doumouras, "Greek Orthodox Communities in America before World War I," St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, vol. XI no. 4, p. 188.

2. Doumouras, op. cit., p. 19

an American Orthodox exarchate which was to be governed by a synod of the bishops of various racial or national groups. It was begun in 1904 with the consecration of Bishop Raphael to head the Syrian Orthodox Mission and, at the same time, to be a vicar of the Russian Archdiocese. This plan was formulated by Archbishop Tikhon [who later became Patriarch of Moscow]." 1

The vision bequeathed to the Church by Patriarch Tikhon was thus that a strong American Orthodox Church should emerge under the watchful guidance of the Russian Church, to whom the American mission had been entrusted by Divine Providence. No Russian "dictatorship" was envisaged. Rather, full-scale and influential participation by the Greeks, Syrians, and other immigrant groups was to be encouraged, and each group was to have its own bishops. Surely here was the guarantee of a missionary Church against which the enemy of mankind could not have prevailed! All too soon, however, the blessed unity provided for by Archbishop Tikhon and other far-sighted archpastors was to be shattered on the rock of ecclesiastical greed and ambition.

Looking back at American Orthodoxy as it was before 1917, the following features stand out as particularly relevant to the ensuing developments:

1. Before the latter part of the XIX century the Orthodox mission in America was very small. One cannot contest the statement of a Protestant student of American Orthodoxy that, "the real growth of the Orthodox diocese in the United States began with the mass return of the Uniates to Orthodoxy, and the increase of Greek, Slavic, and Syrian immigration. This occurred around the end of the nineteenth century."

1. Ibid.

2.

2. The remarkable growth of Orthodoxy in America at the turn of the century gave, great grounds for optimism. It is therefore no wonder that Archbishop Tikhon, riding the crest of this movement, we led to foresee the day when an independent American Orthodox Church would evolve.

3. It is equally evident that prodigious efforts were required to educate this heterogeneous Orthodox population in the faith. The newly-converted Uniates, who made up a considerable part of the flock, had yet to be thoroughly divested of Uniate customs and habits of mind. The newly-arrived immigrants, for the most part uncultured and with a tendency towards unruliness, presented a problem to be handled with great wisdom and skill. By 1917 only the initial steps had been taken to solve these and other problems. The American mission, so full of potential, was in dire need of the wisdom and guidance of a Church steeped in a thousand years of Orthodoxy. It was definitely not prepared to set out on its own, and such venture could lead to nothing but disaster.

4. The importance of the control exercised by the Russian Church over Orthodox America is also demonstrated by the subsequent fate of a number of bishops who served in the United States and Canada before the Revolution of 1917. Archbishop Platon became a schismatic. Archbishop Evdokim, who governed the American Church at the time of the Revolution, entered the "Living Church." Of his four suffragans three followed similar paths. Alexander of Canada, who succeeded Evdokim, had to leave America.

1. M.L.J. Schrank, "Problems of Orthodoxy in America: the Russian Church," St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, vol. VI, no. 4, 1962, p. 186.

because of his financial irresponsibility and eventually ended up in the Moscow Patriarchate. Eftimios of Brooklyn eventually abandoned the episcopacy for marriage. And Stephen of Pittsburg became a Roman Catholic.

5. Finally, all Orthodox in America, with the partial [and unjustifiable] exception of the Greeks, came under the ecclesiastical supervision of the Russian Church before the Revolution. If Archbishop Tikhon's plans had been followed, a strong American Orthodoxy encompassing all Orthodox ethnic groups could have resulted. Unfortunately this was not to be.

CHAPTER II

**THE RUSSIAN CHURCH ABROAD AFTER THE REVOLUTION OF
1917**

One cannot hope to understand the ecclesiastical situation in America after the Revolution of 1917 without being well-acquainted with the history of the Russian Church at home and abroad after that period. This chapter will explore the circumstances that led to the schism of Metropolitan Evlogy and the Western European diocese from the Church Abroad, and the relations of both these groups to Moscow and the autocephalous Eastern Orthodox patriarchates. Much of the information to be presented is taken from Michel D'Herbigny and Alexandre Deubner, Les Eveques Russes en Exil, Rome, 1932. This book, though written by extremely ultramontane Roman Catholics of a breed now virtually extinct, is - despite its obvious ideological shortcomings - an excellent and objective work of scholarship. It traces with meticulous care the events in the Russian Church following the Revolution.

In 1917 under the Provisional Government a great Sobor [Council] of the Russian Orthodox Church was convoked. This Council, which continued its sessions until after the Bolsheviks seized power, was the last free manifestation of the "catholic" spirit of the Russian Church in this century. A number of important changes were introduced by the Sobor, the most important being [a] the restoration of the Patriarchate, which had been abolished two centuries before by Peter the Great; and [b] the reestablishment of the conciliar principles of the Church. In the final vote for patriarch a considerable majority of the votes went to Metropolitan Antony of Kharkov, later to become the first bishop of the Church Abroad until his death in 1936. 101 votes were cast for Antony, 27 for Archbishop Arseny, and 23 for Tikhon. This vote, held in conditions of absolute political freedom, shows what confidence was put in him by the bishops, clergy, and laity of the Russian Church, all of whom were represented at the Council. In drawing of lots, however,

the choice fell upon Archbishop Tikhon, formerly of America, and this meek and eminently worthy man was enthroned as Patriarch. The members of the Holy Synod elected by the Sobor were Metropolitans Vladimir, Arseny, Antony, Sergy, and Platon, and Archbishops Anastasy and Evlogy. The first was to be a martyr and the second a confessor under the Bolsheviks. Antony and Anastasy were successively to direct the difficult life of the Church Abroad until the repose of the latter in 1965. Sergy was later to submit the Russian Church to the Communists in his shameful "Declaration" of 1927. And Platon and Evlogy were to rend the holy unity of the Church Abroad with their soul-destroying schisms.

The Bolsheviks, led by Vladimir Ulyanov-Lenin, a baptized Orthodox Christian, moved against the Russian Church almost immediately after seizing power. They stripped the Church of all her property, including churches and monasteries, asserting that all property now belonged to the State. This was soon followed by the legalizing of civil marriage, and the government began to make plans to separate the Church from the state and from the educational system. In a government professing a fanatical atheism and materialism these moves had, of course, much more ominous implications than they would have had in a country such as the United States. Realizing that the Church was in mortal danger, Patriarch Tikhon "without waiting for the publication of the law [on the separation of Church and State] or for the reconvening of the Sobor [which was recessed for the Christmas holidays] went into action." 1

1. Matthew Spinka, The Church in Soviet Russia, New York, 1956, p. 15.

On January 19, 1918, Tikhon issued "a strongly worded condemnation of the acts already passed by the Soviets, such as the secularization of marriage and the nationalization of schools, the confiscation of Church property, and various acts of desecration of churches and monasteries. He called it 'a Satanic act, for which you [i.e., the Bolsheviks] shall suffer curses of posterity in this present, earthly life.' He thereupon forbade those guilty of such deeds to come 'to the sacraments of Christ' and summarily anathematized them. Furthermore, he abjured the faithful 'not to commune with such outcasts of the human race in any manner whatsoever.'" 1

When the Sobor reconvened, "it wholeheartedly approved the Patriarch's declaration and added to it some harsh and uncompromising statements of its own." 2 When the decree on the separation of the Church from the State was published by the Bolsheviks the Sobor declared that "any participation, either in the printing of the legislation which is at enmity with the Church, or in attempts to put it into effect, is incompatible with membership in the Orthodox Church, and will bring down upon the guilty parties punishments p to and including excommunication from the Church." 3

Thus in the final closing moments of ecclesiastical freedom in Russia both Patriarch Tikhon and the entire All-Russian Sobor of 1917-18 took an uncompromising stand against the Bolsheviks, the majority of whom, like Lenin, were baptized Orthodox who had repudiated the faith of their fathers.

1. Ibid., p. 15 [The full text in English appears in M. Spinka, The Church and the Russian Revolution, N.Y., 1927, p. 118-122.]

2. Ibid., p. 16

3. Archpriest George Grabbe, The Truth About the Russian Church At Home and Abroad, Jordanville, 1961, p. 30 [in Russian].

Soon the Bolsheviks were to rise up against the Church of Christ with a ferocity matched only by the persecutions of the first centuries of the Christian era.

When the Civil War broke out, all possibility for Church unity in Russia was lost. On November 7/20. therefore, Patriarch Tikhon issued ukaz No. 362 which stated that, "If a diocese should find itself cut off from the Highest Church Administration, or if the Highest Church Administration itself, headed by the holy Patriarch, should for any reason cease its activity, then the diocesan bishop should immediately enter into relations with the bishops of the neighboring dioceses with the aim of organizing a body to serve as a supreme authority. . . In case this should prove impossible, the diocesan bishop takes on himself the totality of authority." 1

This ukaz, of which more will be said later in this chapter, was in the circumstances so logical a decision that a group of bishops had anticipated it on May 6, 1919, when at Stavropol in the Caucasus they formed a Temporary Highest Church Administration for South-Eastern Russia. This organization, which united several vast dioceses, began its functions immediately. The decisions of the Temporary Highest Church Administration were later confirmed by patriarch Tikhon, who of course, found its actions completely in accord with his ukaz No. 362. According to Michael D'Herbigny, the Temporary Highest Church Administration was "recognized by all the episcopate of the region" and "had in obedience to it more than thirty bishops and was in direct relations with the heads of autocephalous Churches." 2

1. Quoted in I.M. Andreev, A Short History of the Russian Church from the Revolution to our Time, Jordanville, 1952, p. 90 [in Russian].

2. Ibid.

At a council of the Temporary Highest Church Administration held on October 1, 1920, at Simferopol, and presided over by Metropolitan Antony of Kiev [formerly of Kharkov], Archbishop Anastasy of Kishinev was designated as the Administration's representative to Constantinople and the Ecumenical Patriarch. Thus the Administration early "extended its jurisdiction beyond the frontiers of Russia." 1

At the same session of October 1, the Administration assigned Archbishop Evlogy of Volhynia, at his own request, to take charge of the dioceses in Western Europe. The administration showed itself to be the Highest Church Administration of South-East Russia in many ways. Two bishops were consecrated, one was removed from his post, one was retired, etc. 2

The changing course of the Civil War, however, began to force large numbers of believers and their clergy to flee their homeland. On November 1, 1920, in Constantinople, a group of Russian bishops-- metropolitans Antony and Platon, Archbishops Anastasy and Theophan and Bishop Benjamin -- "profiting from the hospitality of the Greek Patriarch, "held a council and created "a central organ of the Russian Church Abroad," which they named the Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad. 3 Thus, because of political developments, the Temporary Church Administration (Southern Russia) ceased to exist and was replaced by the Church Administration Abroad.

1. Michel D'Herbigny, Les Eveques Russes en Exil, Rome, 1932, p. 14.

2. Andreev, op. cit., p. 90.

3. D'Herbigny, op. cit., pp.15-16.

In May, 1921, another council of the Russian episcopacy abroad was held in Constantinople. Here a more definite form was given to the Administration Abroad founded the previous November. metropolitan Antony of Kiev and Platon of Odessa and four other Russian bishops were present. 1 It is important to note, in view of what followed, that the two formative councils of the Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad were held with the blessing of the patriarch of Constantinople. Further, it should be observed that Platon of Odessa, later to come to America, was one of the founding fathers of the administration.

The Administration, into which all the Russian bishops abroad soon entered, began to act for the immediate care of its flock, which was literally scattered over the face of the earth. On July 22, 1921, showing that its jurisdiction extended to North America, the Administration made Alaska a separate diocese. 2 Although Archbishop Alexander of America protested this action, he was forced to accept it as a coming from the Highest Church Administration abroad. On August 31, 1921, the Administration conferred the spiritual stewardship of the Russian parishes in Bulgaria upon Bishop Seraphim of Loubny. 3 On September 21, it put Metropolitan Antony of Kiev in charge of the Russian communities in Serbia. Previously, on August 20, it issued a call for assistance to relieve the famine of the Russian people in an appeal to its flock in Western Europe, Constantinople, Bulgaria, North America, China, and Japan. 4

1. Ibid., p. 17

2. D'Herbigny, op cit., p. 18

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid. pp. 18-19.

Thus the Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad, as D'Herbigny says, "had an immediate jurisdiction" over all rectors of Russian parishes abroad. It's authority was recognized by Antony of Kiev, Platon of Odessa, Evlogy of Volhynia, and all other Russian bishops abroad, as well as by the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Serbia. In addition it established contacts with the autocephalous Churches of Greece and Bulgaria. 1 "On the eve of the Council of Carlovtsy in 1921 the Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad incontestably exercised the prerogatives of an imperative authority over the Russian emigration.² Its jurisdiction extended both to Western Europe and America.

The Carlovtsy Conference was held in November-December, 1921, in Carlovtsy, Yugoslavia, to which seat the Highest Church Administration had transferred itself at the invitation of the Serbian Church. The Council was greeted by Patriarch Dimitri of Serbia and received his blessing. Two Serbian bishops, Hilarion and Maximilian, as well as Stefan, Metropolitan of Sofia, Bulgaria, were present at the Council. Consisting of 13 bishops, 23 clergy, and 67 laymen, the Council was patterned after the 1917-18 Moscow Sobor. As at Moscow, the bishops had the right to veto any of the Council's decisions. In addition to those present almost all bishops abroad acknowledged the Council in writing. Among them were Antony, Bishop of Alaska; Alexander, Archbishop of North America; and Stephen, Bishop of Pittsburg. 3

1. Ibid., p. 19.

2. Ibid.

3. Andreev, op.cit., p. 91.

The avowed purpose of the Council of 1921 was to "unite, regularize, and vivify the activity of the Russian Church abroad." 1 Some of its aims were [1] to avert the disorganization of the Russian Church outside the U.S.S.R.; [2] to prevent the inroads of Masonry, Theosophy, and spiritualism among the faithful; [3] to offset the activity of certain sects such as Adventism and Anabaptism; and [4] to halt the influence of socialism and communism among believers. The Highest Church Administration was solemnly commended to the protection of the Blessed Lady Theotokos and Holy Archangel Michael.

The existing form and structure of the Administration was confirmed by the Council. Archbishop Anastasy made an appeal for world attention to be directed to the starving peoples of Russia. Steps were taken to allay the spiritual demoralization of millions of emigré's who had been abruptly wrenched from their homeland.

In addition to attending to these matters, the Council also issued two open letters. The first was called "An Epistle to the Children of the Russian Orthodox Church in Exile and the Diaspora." The second was an "Epistle to the World Conference" in Genoa.

The former letter affirmed that "the duty of those of us abroad, who have preserved our lives in the dispersion and have not known the flames which are destroying our land and its people, is to be united in Christian spirit, gathered under the sign of the Cross of the Lord, under the protection of the Orthodox Faith. . . ." 2 The epistle called for a return of the monarchy to Russia and specified that the new monarch should come from the House of the Romanoffs. The "Epistle to the World Conference" called for a world struggle

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 22.

2. Andreev, op.cit., p. 97.

against the communists. "People of Europe!" it appealed, "Peoples of the world! Have pity on our good, frank, and noble-hearted Russian people, who have fallen into the hands of evil men. Do not support them [i.e., the Bolsheviks]. Do not strengthen them against your children and grandchildren!" 1

The action of the Council in issuing these letters caused no small controversy at the time and has continued to create disagreement up to the present. Fr. John Meyendorff of the American Metropolia, for example, recently attacked the Council of 1921 in violent terms, although he mistakenly places it in 1922. 2

It should be pointed out at the outset that all the representatives to the Council, including Evlogy, were monarchists. As D'Herbigny writes, "This principle [i.e., that of re-establishing the monarchy in Russia] was admitted by everyone. . . ." Commentators such as Fr. Meyendorff, who play upon the noted intolerance of Americans [including American Orthodox] towards political systems other than their own, neglect to inform their flock of this. They could have pointed out that monarchy had as a longer and closer connexion with Orthodoxy than has democracy. Fr. John of Kronstadt and Bishop Theophan the Recluse, God-bearers of the XIX century, were theoretical monarchists, as were such highly-respected intellectuals as Fydor Dostoevsky and Alexis Khomyakov. it is no wonder, then, that in 1921, only four years after the Revolution, for the Russian people the question of restoring the monarchy was no minor one.

1. Ibid., pp. 97-8.

2. In The Orthodox Church, February, 1970, p. 4.

The only point debated at the Council was whether it was the Romanoff dynasty that should be restored. Six bishops were for and six against restoration. Those such as Metropolitan Antony, who were for the proposal, felt that the regicide perpetrated by the Bolsheviks should not be construed as a legal action that permitted a change of dynasty. Those such as Anastasy and Evlogy who voted against the measure felt that the new dynasty should not be specified. 1 By a slight majority of those present at the Council Antony's party carried the measure. After the Council, Anastasy stated that he had come to realize that while the Church was "not bound to any form of government and that "no form of government can be made a dogma by the Church," nevertheless, she cannot remain silent as to the preferability of one form of government to another. 2

Thus the Council of 1921 condemned the regicide committed by the Bolsheviks and censured, in accordance with the last free actions of Patriarch Tikhon and the Council of 1917-18, the Bolshevik persecution of the faith. The warning which the Council addressed to the Genoa World Conference has, in fact, been justified by history. Not only did the Bolsheviks descend on their homeland like the legions of hell, slaughtering some twenty million of their countrymen in the process of forced collectivization and purges, but they successfully exported their anti-Christian philosophy of venom and destruction to the rest of the world.

The Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. has never forgiven the Church Abroad for the Council of 1921. Recently Izvestiya, the Soviet Union's second-

1. D'Herbigny, p. 39.

2. Ibid., pp. 42-3.

ranking newspaper, published an article entitled "Not by Prayers Alone" in which is slanderously attacked the Church Abroad. The beginning of the "Carlovtsky schism," Izvestiya declares, "goes back to 1921 when, as a result of the defeat of the White Guard bands by the Red Army, the reactionary emigré clerics and laity convoked in the city of Sremski Carlovtsky [Yugoslavia] a council of the Russian Orthodox Church abroad. At its head stood the ardent monarchist Metropolitan Antony [Khrapovitsky]. The Karlovcane did not submit to the demand of the Moscow Patriarchate that they occupy a loyal position in relation to the Soviet government, and thereby placed themselves outside the Russian Orthodox Church." 1 The demand for loyalty actually did not come until after the Council, but we can forgive the communist authors of the article for not being too conversant with ecclesiastical fact. In any case their intentions are perfectly clear.

After the Council of 1921 the Highest Church Administration continued to extend its activity abroad. On December 5, 1921, it named personnel to the Russian Mission in Jerusalem. 2 On January 17, 1922, it made Archmandrite Simon suffragan bishop of Shanghai, China, at the request of the Archbishop of Peking. On the same day it permitted Bishop Damian of Tsaritsyn to open a pastoral school in Bulgaria, on condition that its budget and structure be approved by the Administration. On March 24 it named Archbishop Methodius as bishop of Harbin, China. 3 On April 4 it declared that the following should have the rights of granting divorces in the Church Abroad: Evlogy in Western Europe, Antony in Yugoslavia, and Alexander in North America. Rights were also given to the Bishop of Alaska. 4

1. Cited from Golos Rodiny, September, 1969, p. 5 [our italics].

2. D'Herbigny, op cit., p. 43.

3. Ibid., pp. 44-5.

4. Ibid., p. 48

On April 27 it named Appolinary of Belgorod its representative to Jerusalem. On May 30, on obtaining the consent of the Archbishop of Athens, it sent Bishop Hermogen of Ekaterinslav to Greece where he was put in charge of the Russian community in Athens. 1 Metropolitan Antony, head of the Administration, wrote to the Patriarch of Constantinople concerning his plans to grant autocephaly to the churches of Georgia, the Ukraine, Finland, and Poland.

When Patriarch Tikhon was arrested on March 15, 1922, for condemning the actions of the Bolsheviks, the Highest Church Administration appointed special prayers to be said for him. Also letters were sent to all Orthodox bishops throughout the world warning them against entering into communion with the Russian "Living Church" schism.

Then unexpectedly, on September 2, 1922, the Administration received a copy of Patriarch Tikhon's ukaz of May 5, 1922, in which its closing was ordered. Some, such as Fr. Meyendorff in his above-mentioned article The Orthodox Church, feel this ukaz should have been obeyed. Most do not. Before this ukaz is discussed, however, one would do well to follow D'Herbigny in summing up the activities of the Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad before its receipt of the ukaz.

In Orthodox countries the Administration had, with the consent of the ruling bishops of these nations, erected a Russian diocese in Constantinople [under Anastasy], Bulgaria, Greece, and Serbia.

"According to the Highest Russian

1. Ibid.

Church Administration Abroad the bishop of these Russian dioceses which had been created received all his jurisdiction from it, i.e., the Administration, but the exercise of this jurisdiction could be limited by the Bishop of the locality. Thus in Constantinople the Greek patriarch decided that all matrimonial questions among the emigrés were to be regularized by his patriarchal authority." 1

In non-Orthodox countries the jurisdiction of the Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad "extended to Western Europe, where Archbishop Evlogy recognized it, and to North America, where it was accepted without question by the Bishop of Alaska, Antony. In Europe, as in America, the Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad created a diocese, that of Western Europe and of Alaska, and both of these acts were recognized by Patriarch Tikhon."

In the Far East the Administration "established two suffragan bishops in China at the request of Archbishop Innocent of Peking, and a veritable archdiocese in Manchuria - despite the local bishop's protest removing a whole territory from the diocese of Vladivostok." 2

The Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad, D'Herbigny correctly concludes, had thus the same authority vis-vis the Church Abroad as the Patriarch of Moscow had for the Russian Church in the confines of the U.S.S.R.

Then came the ukaz of May 5, 1922. According to this ukaz, [1] the Encyclical of the Council of Carlovtsky to the Emigrés and the Letter to the Genoa Conference could not be considered as the official thought of the Church;

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

[2] the Administration Abroad must be suppressed "because it had dared to engage in politics in the name of the Church"; and [3] the emigré bishops who had engaged in "politics" were to be subject to ecclesiastical judgment. 1 The ukaz also stated that the Western European parishes were to be "temporarily" placed under the control of Metropolitan Evlogy.

When this ukaz was received nobody believed that it was a free expression of the will of Patriarch Tikhon. Metropolitan Evlogy, who was later to make great use of the document, wrote to Metropolitan Antony, "This ukaz surprised me by its suddenness. I was stunned at the thought of the terrible trouble it could introduce into our ecclesiastical life. Without any doubt, it was written under pressure from the Bolsheviks." 2 As late as April 24, 1925, Evlogy was of the same opinion. Writing in Vechernee Vremya he observes, "I did not attribute any obligatory value to this document even if it were in reality composed and signed by the Patriarch. It is political and not ecclesiastical. it concerns neither dogmas, nor canons, nor rites, but treats of the attitude one should have towards the Soviets within the limits of the Soviet state. Beyond those limits, therefore, it has no value." 3

By August 19, 1926, Evlogy, now in schism from the Church Abroad, had changed his mind. In an Encyclical Letter to the Faithful he writes, "To wish to reject this clear and precise ukaz from the authority of Moscow because it happens to displease one is an act of insubordination

1. Ibid., p. 54.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 55.

contrary to the canons." 1 Evlogy was thus eventually led into temptation by the fact that the ukaz recognized his authority in his own diocese. The communists, for reasons which will be indicated later, had concluded as early as 1922 that Evlogy would be the best means to employ for sundering the unity of the Church Abroad; hence the conferring of powers on him by the Bolshevik-dictated ukaz.

The ukaz ordering the closing of the Highest Church Administration Abroad presented the episcopate abroad with a new and very difficult problem. What should it do about a ukaz from Moscow which was clearly political in intent and clearly dictated by the Soviet government, the persecutor of Russian Christians?

Before the Bishop's Council met, Metropolitan Antony pointed out that, although Patriarch Tikhon had never explicitly confirmed the Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad as such, he had nevertheless sanctioned several of its decisions - for example, the erection of the diocese of Alaska in 1921, and the establishment of the archdiocese of Harbin, which had been removed by the Administration Abroad out of "filial obedience," but because of "the obscurity of the ukaz, the impossibility of suppressing even for one instant all supreme authority in the Russian Church abroad, the disorganization of the central ecclesiastical government of Moscow, the arrest of the Patriarch, and finally the evident fact of Bolshevik influence in the ukaz," it decided that, until such a time as the Patriarch should be liberated and could

1. Ibid.

freely explain his decree, the Highest Church Administration should continue to function abroad.¹ On September 2, 1922, the Bishop's Council resolved to suppress the "Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad" and to convoke a council of the episcopate, clergy, and laity of the Russian Church Abroad to organize a "Temporary Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad," which should have highest jurisdiction.² The proposal for the formation of the Temporary Episcopal Synod came from none other than Metropolitan Evlogy of Western Europe, and was unanimously agreed upon by all bishops present. All present, including Evlogy, signed the Council's decisions.

Thus the Church Abroad reacted cautiously but wisely to the first patriarchal ukaz evidently influenced by the Bolsheviks. The temporary Holy Episcopal Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad inherited the powers of the Highest Russian Church Administration Abroad, and the Church Abroad avoided capitulating to the first attempt by the communists to bring its existence to an end. The Temporary Episcopal Synod began to function immediately. It removed Archbishop Alexander from administering the North American diocese and replaced him with Metropolitan Platon of Odessa.³ On September 15, 1922, it upheld the judgment of Metropolitan Evlogy versus the priest V. Znosko who has been deposed by the Metropolitan.⁴ On September 29, 1922, it authorized the bishops of the Far East to hold a council to organize a central administration of the

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., pp. 58-9.

2. Ibid., p. 59

3. Ibid., p. 60

4. Ibid.

churches of the Far East on condition that the administration should depend on the Temporary Episcopal Synod and, through it, on the Patriarch. 1 On December 2, 1922, it conferred the Russian mission of Korea upon Archbishop Sergius of Japan. On December 15, it registered the act by which the bishops of Harbin, China, joined in condemning the erection of an autocephaly in Poland. 2 On January 4, 1923, "as the supreme authority over three million Russian emigrés and the Russian dioceses of America, Japan, China and Finland, i.e., of fifteen Russian dioceses" it joined other Orthodox Churches in condemning the humiliations inflicted upon the Patriarch of Constantinople by the followers of Mustapha Kemal [later Atatirk]. 3

On March 29, 1923, it sent a letter to Patriarch Meletius of Constantinople and the other autocephalous Orthodox Churches asking that they not send representatives to a synod of the "Living Church." 4

The jurisdiction of the Temporary Episcopal Synod, in the words of D'Herbigny, "was recognized unanimously by the Russian episcopate abroad." 5 It was expressly acknowledged by Metropolitans Antony, Evlogy, and Platon, Archbishops Methodius of Harbin, Innocent of Peking, Seraphim of Finland, Elevation of Lithuania, Anastasy of Kishinev, Theophan of Poltava, Eftimios of Brooklyn, Bishops Antony of Alaska, Sergius of Belsk, Vladimir of Belostok, Adam [of America], Meletius of Zabaikal, Nestor of Kamchatka, Simon of Shanghai, Jonas of Tien-Tsin, Appollinary of Belgorod, Daniel of Okhotsk, Sergius of Novorssysk, Gabriel of Cheliabinks, Hermogen of Ekaterinslav, Theophan of Kursk,

1. Ibid., pp. 60-1

2. Ibid., p.62

3. Ibid.

4. D'Herbigny, op cit., p. 63

5. Ibid.

Michael of Alexandrovsk, Seraphim of Lubny, Benjamin of Sebastopol, Michael of Vladivostok, Damian of Tsaritsyn, Panteleimon of Pinsk, Marllia, Stephen of Pittsburg, Alexander of North America, John of Latvia, Sergius of Tokyo - in all, thirty-five bishops. 1 It ought to be remarked that, although many of the above bishops are listed by their Russian sees, they were either ruling bishops or members of the Holy Synod of the Church Abroad.

Then jurisdiction of the Temporary Episcopal Synod extended over the following dioceses: In Europe: over the Western European diocese and those of Finland, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, and Turkey. In Asia: over the dioceses of Peking, Harbin, Vladivosto, Tokyo, Zabaikal, and Kamchatka. In America: over the diocese of North America, Aleutia [Alaska], and Chicago. In all, its jurisdiction comprised fifteen dioceses. 2

At the Bishops' Council of 1923 the bishops confirmed the canonical organization of the Temporary Holy Episcopal Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. Metropolitan Antony announced that he would like to surrender his duties and retire to Mt. Athos to devote the remaining years of his life to prayer [he had previously spent a short while on the Holy Mountain after the Civil War, but had been summoned to care for the flock of the emigration]. metropolitan Evlogy was asked temporarily to take over the leadership of the Episcopal Synod. When, however, Antony was prevented by circumstances from entering the Holy Mountain, a plea from a considerable part of the emigration forced him to renounce his intentions and remain at the helm of the Synod. The incident does indicate, however, how little Antony relished his position of power and how he yearned for the monastic life.

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid

At the Bishops' Council of May-June, 1923, attended by Antony, Evlogy, Anastasy, and ten others, it was resolved that the Church Abroad should have a yearly episcopal council and a permanent synod of bishops located at Carlovtsy. The first Synod was composed of Antony [chairman], Evlogy, Archbishop Theophan, and Bishops Sergius, Michael, Gabriel, and Hermogen.

1 At the session of June 1, 1923, the Bishops' Council elevated Metropolitan Evlogy's diocese to the rank of an autonomous diocese in a charitable attempt to appease his growing ecclesiastical ambitions. Such matters as the court of highest appeal, the confirmation of bishops, and other clearly defined matters remained, however, in the hands of the Temporary Episcopal Synod. 2

On April 11-12, 1924, at the request of Evlogy, the Temporary Episcopal Synod elevated archimandrite Tikhon to the episcopal rank, naming him as Evlogy's suffragan bishop of Berlin.

At the Bishops' Council of October 16, fourteen bishops were present, including Antony [chairman], Metropolitans Evlogy and Platon [of America], and Archbishops Anastasy and Antony of Alaska. 3 Sixteen other bishops sent letters in which they answered forty questions which had been put to them by the standing Synod.

At this council Metropolitan Evlogy began to exhibit sensibilities which would soon lead him into schism. When the question of the wisdom of the relative autonomy of his diocese was raised, he immediately became

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 69

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 7

angered and threatened to leave the council. Such behavior was soon to become his trademark.

Nevertheless, he continued to use the Temporary Episcopal Synod for his own purposes. At the session of October 24, 1924, his request for a second suffragan bishop located in Prague was granted. Later, on April 9, 1925, he petitioned for another suffragan bishop in central France, with Archbishop Vladimir of Belostok as a titular bishop.

The year 1925 was also the year of Patriarch Tikhon's repose. On November 12, 1925, the Temporary Episcopal Synod recognized Peter of Krutitsk as guardian of the Patriarchal throne in conformity with the will of the Russian episcopate in the U.S.S.R. 1

During 1925 the pernicious winds of schism also began to blow stronger. Professor A. Kartashev of the Western European diocese charged that the Temporary Episcopal Synod was planning a schism from the Patriarchate, a charge refuted by the Synod at Carlovtsy.

At the annual Bishops' Council held in Carlovtsy June 12-25, 1926, and attended by both Metropolitans Evlogy and Platon, matters came to a head. The opening days of the council went quite smoothly. Matters concerning parish life, divorce, and "the situation of the Russian Church in America" were regulated by the council. 2 When the matter of Evlogy's relative autonomy was raised, however, the Metropolitan demanded as immediate and full discussion of the question. The council agreed to do so only when the official agenda had been covered. To show his displeasure, Evlogy

1. D'Herbigny, op cit., p. 75.

2. Ibid., p. 80

immediately left the council and retired to the Khopovo monastery in Yugoslavia, where he remained until the council ended. The council, seeking to avert a schism and to pacify the emotionally volatile Metropolitan, granted Evlogy a fourth suffragan bishop, but resolved that he "and his suffragans must declare in writing that they attribute to the councils and the Synod of Bishops [of the Church Abroad] more than moral authority, but rather a true canonical right of jurisdiction, the right to judge and administer the Russian Church Abroad."¹ This was precisely what Evlogy would not do. Although he was willing to use the Temporary Episcopal Synod for his own purposes, such as obtaining bishops, he was not willing to allow it any authority over him.

The Council of Bishops, now fully aware of Evlogy's duplicity, presented him with a number of questions, including the following: [1] Why had he composed a special rule concerning suffragan bishops? [2] Why had he refused in writing to put into practice the rule elaborated and confirmed by the Synod of Bishops [of the Church Abroad] in keeping with the decrees of the Moscow Council of 1917-8 on the subject of suffragan bishops? [3] Why had he opened, without the previous consent of the Synod, the Theological Academy of Paris, and why had he not presented its rule for the approval of the Synod? [4] Why had he for five years administered his diocese by means of a diocesan council which had not been elected by a diocesan congress and had been approved by the Synod for only a temporary period of time? [5] Why had he named priests for Australia, which was not in his jurisdiction? 2

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 84.

2. Ibid., p. 85.

Later on, when a copy of Evlogy's correspondence with Patriarch Tikhon fell into the hands of the Synod, it became clear that since 1922 "Metropolitan Evlogy had been acting against Metropolitan Antony and the episcopate of Carlovtsy." 1 In 1926 the Synod discovered that Evlogy had been intriguing to have the Synod of Bishops Abroad dissolved by the Patriarch, and himself confirmed in his rights with his jurisdiction extended to include the Russian Mission of Jerusalem. Patriarch Tikhon, however, wisely refrained from granting Evlogy's requests. 2

The 1926 Bishop's Council also dealt a blow to the theological and spiritual modernism which had begun to undermine the life of the Western European diocese. It refused, for example, to approve the Russian Student Christian Movement, centered in Evlogy's diocese, which stubbornly refused to call itself "Orthodox Christian" and opened its ranks wide to the heterodox. At the fourth general congress of the Russian Student Christian Movement held September 1-5, 1926, the Synod's negative judgment of the Movement received confirmation.

At this council P.S. Lopukhin attempted to speak out as a voice of traditional Orthodoxy. "The goal of the Movement," he said, "is to attract the youth to the Orthodox faith and the Orthodox Church. Thus its work cannot be foreign to that of the Church and the bishops who

1. Ibid., p. 255.

2. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 95.

are the responsible guardians of the Church. The Movement must act essentially in concert with the hierarchy. 1 It must, he added, "become Orthodox, even in name, and call itself the 'Orthodox Christian Movement'"; for, "how," he asked, "can an organization which fears to call itself Orthodox attract members to Orthodoxy?" 2

P.S. Lopukhin's speech "displeased the assembly." 3 Nicholas Berdyaev, the free-thinking philosopher, objected that, "One must distinguish two conceptions of the Church: [1] that of the visible Church, i.e., the material temples, the parishes, the hierarchy, and hierarchial dependence; and [2] that of the invisible Church, the mystical body of Christ. The Movement, he said, is a movement belonging to the invisible Church. It is thus autonomous in regard to episcopal directives and the Orthodox hierarchy." 4 Archpriest Sergius Bulgakov added that, "One must not be ashamed of the word 'Christian.'" 5 The assembly decided that "the name of Christian corresponds more to reality because the Movement possesses circles who do not call themselves Orthodox." 6

The Russian Christian Student Movement thus reacted to the strictures of the 1926 Bishops' Council by affirming its independence of the hierarchy and by proclaiming a "branch theory" form of ecclesiology.

1. Ibid., p. 115.
2. Ibid., pp. 115-16.
3. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 116.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., p. 117.
6. Ibid.

As far as the Parish Theological Institute is concerned, as early as April 9, 1925, the Synod at Carlovtsy had refused to approve it before examining its statutes. On June 30, 1926, the Bishops' Council decided that the Institute "must be directly submitted to the authority of the Synod, which alone could confirm the statutes and the list of the professorial staff; that the Institute could not be recognized until after approval of its statutes, which must be presented to the Synod by Metropolitan Evlogy; that professors should not be admitted until after an attentive examination of their writings; that the Institute should be free of all Masonic subsidy; that Metropolitan Evlogy should present to the Synod both the old and the new statutes of the 'Brotherhood of Sophia.'" 1

At an early date the Western European diocese also moved into the now-fashionable field of ecumenical concelebrations. Metropolitan Evlogy, for example, caused a sensation by holding a service for the Roman Catholic Cardinal Mercier. 2

In view of Evlogy's continued refusal to submit to the judgment of a council of his brother bishops, the Church Abroad, January 25-26, 1927, suspended him and informed Evlogy's clergy and all heads of Orthodox Churches of this fact. On February 1, Evlogy replied by stating that he considered the Synod's decisions "anticanonical." 3

On February 4, the Synod addressed an encyclical letter to the flock of the Western European diocese exhorting them not to communicate with their suspended Metropolitan. 4 The same day Metropolitan Evlogy announced

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 146.

2. Ibid., [. 96.

3. Ibid., p. 139.

4. Ibid.

that his diocese would be henceforth independent like the American Church under Metropolitan Platon. Evlogy was unfortunately supported by most of his flock, particularly its modernist elements. Nicholas Berdyaev even saw him as an outstanding instrument of God. "Metropolitan Evlogy," he wrote, "is the man charged by Providence with renewing the Church on the conciliar principle of the free accord of believers with the episcopate."

1

On March 31, 1927, the Synod of the Church Abroad published a pastoral letter directed against the "modernism" of the Theological Institute of Paris. The letter conveyed the results of a thorough investigation of the academy, its staff, and their writings, that had been carried out by Archbishop Theophan of the Standing Synod.

According to this letter, "The Theological Institute of Paris was founded by Metropolitan Evlogy without the authorization of the Council and Synod of the Church Abroad, without the approval of its programs or its professors, of whom some have not received higher theological education and others are of an Orthodoxy which is at least suspect." 2

The letter paid particular attention to the neo-Gnosticism preached by Fr. Sergius Bulgakov and his disciples under the name of "Sophiology." "Up to now, in full accord with the Apostle Paul and the Fathers of the Church, we have known only Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, unto the Greeks foolishness. . . Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God [I Cor. 1. 23-4]. They, on the contrary, profess a new doctrine of 'Sophia,' the feminine principle in God. For them, this

1. Ibid., p. 143.

2. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 147.

feminine principle is at times an individual substance, an hypostasis which, while not being consubstantial with the Holy Trinity, is nevertheless not alien to it. At times for them this feminine principle appears as an 'hypostatic' aptitude to a hypostasis. 1

The letter concludes: "Metropolitan Evlogy hears and sees all this, and yet not only has he not condemned the innovators, not only has he not taken any measures against the modernism which is infiltrating the Church Abroad, but he chooses as collaborators men who profess this doctrine and confers upon them the task of raising future pastors of the Church." 2

On July 3, 1927, a conference of the Western European Diocese was held. There Evlogy attempted to counter the Synod's charges. He had not submitted the matter of approving the Institute to the Synod Abroad, he said, because, with the exception of Metropolitan Antony, the members of the Synod were not "friendly" toward it. He had, nevertheless, brought the statues of the Institute to the 1926 Bishops' Council, but his own sudden departure had prevented his offering them for inspection. He countered the charge that he was fostering modernism by claiming that Orthodoxy was more precious to him than life. At his request Professor A.V. Kartashev denied the Synod's claim that he was recommending a "reformation" in the Church, and Professor Bulgakov affirmed that his doctrine of "Sophia" was "traditional." 3 Furthermore, Evlogy stated that, "The new ideas preached by the two professors are in conformity with Tradition in every respect. The Church is not opposed to the development of theological thought." 4

1. Ibid., 148.

2. Ibid., 148-9.

3. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 154.

4. Ibid.

At the same conference of the Western European Diocese, Professor Bulgakov read a report on the Theological Institute of Paris, after which "the Assembly [i.e., the conference] declared that the Theological Institute was doing its job, and that the written explanations of professors S. Bulgakov and A.V. Kartashev established the perfect Orthodoxy of the professorial body." 1

Bulgakov then read yet another report on the "Brotherhood of Sophia," after which the conference recognized the organization as perfectly "Orthodox."

Finally, after a report by Nicholas Zernov, the conference offered its full support to the Russian Student Christian Movement.

Thus, on the question of the theological modernism of the Western European diocese, the Synod Abroad and the diocese took totally opposed positions. Forced to choose, two bishops [Archbishop Seraphim of London and Bishop Tikhon of Berlin] and six priests left the Western European diocese in 1927 for the Church Abroad.

Once Evlogy cut himself off from the Church Abroad, he immediately fell prey to the Soviet Communists, who in the same year [1927] had finally established full control over the Moscow Patriarchate - a control which they have maintained up to this day. In 1926, Metropolitan Sergius of Nizhni-Novgorod succeeded Peter of Krutitsk as temporary guardian of the Patriarchal throne after Peter's arrest by the Bolsheviks. On being reached by a person who wished him to mediate the dispute between Evlogy and the Church Abroad, he replied with his letter of May 28/June 10, 1926, in which though promising not to engage in political actions against the Soviet Union, he nevertheless stated,

1. Ibid. p. 159

But let us be sincere to the end. We cannot pass over in silence the contradictions which exist between our Orthodox [people] and the communists who govern our Union. The latter struggle against God and His rule in the hearts of the people, while we see the significance and aim of our entire existence in the confession of faith in God as well as in the widest dissemination and affirmation of that faith in people's hearts. They accept exclusively the materialistic conception of history, while we believe in divine Providence, in miracles, etc. Far from promising the reconciliation of that which is irreconcilable, and from pretending to adapt or faith to communism, we will remain, from the religious point of view, what we are, i.e., members of the Traditional Church.

Passing from this statement of belief to consideration of the emigré plight, Sergius writes:

To inflict ecclesiastical punishment on clerical emigrés guilty of unfaithfulness toward the Soviet Union would not produce the desired effect, and might offer new proof of the allegations that such decisions had been forced on us by the Soviet government. The only thing that appears to us desirable and perfectly feasible is to assert our complete disavowal of such political clergy, and to repudiate in advance all responsibility for their political action. To that end it suffices to establish the rule that all members of the clergy who do not acknowledge their civil obligation towards the Soviet Union ought to be excluded from the ecclesiastical community of the Moscow Patriarchate, and ought to place themselves under the jurisdiction of the Orthodox Churches in the countries where they reside. The same obligations ought to condition the existence abroad of administrative organs such as the Holy Synod and diocesan councils. 2

1. M. Spinka, The Church in the Soviet Union, New York, 1956, p. 158.
2. Spinka, op. cit., p. 160

Metropolitan Sergius wrote in a similar vein to the bishops at Carlovtsy on October 12, 1926, when they asked him to mediate between themselves and Metropolitan Evlogy. "He declined to serve as a judge and specifically asserted that since there was no actual contact between the Moscow supreme administration and the churches abroad, there could be no supervision of governing of these churches by Moscow. Consequently he concludes that 'in non-Orthodox countries independent congregations or churches may be organized, members of which may be even non-Russians.... Think it over, please. For such a solution of the problem obviously corresponds better to the existing circumstances even of our Church.'" 1

Thus Metropolitan Sergius, while seeking what was soon shown to be impossible - namely, a modus vivendi with atheist communists, - gave very responsible advice to the Russian Church Abroad. Those foreign clergy who did not wish to fulfill the obligations of the Soviet government should separate themselves from the Moscow Patriarchate. When in countries ruled by autocephalous Orthodox Churches they should function with the approval of these Churches. The Holy Synod of the Church Abroad and its diocesan councils should function independently of the Patriarchate. In effect, therefore, Sergius was simply expanding the force of Patriarch Tikhon's ukaz No. 362 of 1920 to cover the life of the Church Abroad more explicitly. In addition to the disorganization of the Church mentioned in Tikhon's ukaz, now the complication of political loyalty to an atheist regime is cited by Metropolitan Sergius as another reason for the temporary self-government of the Church Abroad.

This letter of Metropolitan Sergius did not please the Bolsheviks. He was summoned to Moscow and ordered, among other things, to excommunicate

1. Ibid., p. 63.

all the Russian bishops abroad. The Metropolitan replied with a "categorical refusal." 1 On December 13, 1926, he was arrested. Sergius spent three-and-a-half months in prison, and then, "contrary to all expectations, "was released on March 30, 1927. For reasons and because of threats which may never be known, while in prison he decided to "comply with the demands of the government," and agreed to the terms later made public in the now-famous "Declaration" of 1927. This "Declaration" issued on July 16/29, 1927, altered the whole course of the Moscow Patriarchate. 2 Its central passage stated that the Russian Orthodox believers,

need to show not in words, but in deeds, that not only people indifferent to Orthodoxy, or those who reject it, may be faithful citizens of the Soviet Union, loyal to the Soviet government, but likewise the most fervent adherents of Orthodoxy, to whom it is as precious with all its canonical and liturgical treasures as truth and life. We wish to remain Orthodox and at the same time recognize the Soviet Union as our civil father-land whose joys and successes are our joys and successes, and whose misfortunes are our misfortunes. Every blow directed against the Union. . . we acknowledge as a blow directed against us. Remaining Orthodox, we regard it our duty to be citizens of the Union 'not from fear, but from conscience,' as the Apostle has taught us [Romans 13:5]. And we are hopeful that with God's help, by our mutual cooperation and support, we shall accomplish that task. 3

Turning its attention to the Church Abroad, the "Declaration" stated:

The problem of the emigré clergy under these circumstances is especially poignant. The openly anti-Soviet actions of some archpastors and pastors, greatly detrimental to the relations between the government and the Church,

1. D'Herbigny, *op.cit.*, p. 112.
2. Text in Spinka, *op.cit.*, pp. 161-65
- 3, *Ibid.*, p. 163.

have forced the late Patriarch, as is known, to depose the Synod Abroad [April 23/May 5,1922]. Nevertheless, the Synod has continued to exist hitherto, and has not changed its politics. Moreover, by its pretensions to rule, it has lately divided the ecclesiastical community abroad into two camps. In order to put an end to this state of affairs, we demanded from the clergy abroad a written promise of the incomplete loyalty to the Soviet government in all their public activities. Those who fail to make such a promise, or to observe it, shall be expelled from the ranks of the clergy subject to the Moscow Patriarchate. We think that having set up such limits, we shall be secure against all unexpected happenings abroad. On the other hand, our demand may perhaps cause many to pause and consider whether the time has not come to revise their attitude toward the Soviet regime, so as not to be cut off from their native Church and land. 1

With Sergius' 1927 "Declaration" the now-familiar voice of the Moscow Patriarchate is heard for the first time. That this 1927 document completely contradicts Sergius' freely expressed sentiments of the year before is obvious. The "Declaration" was vehemently opposed by many of the best-known and most respected archpastors of the Russian Church. Peter of Krutitsk, still legally Guardian of the Patriarchal Throne, wrote from Siberian exile on September 27, 1927: "For the first bishop, such a declaration is not permissible. I furthermore do not understand why the Synod was organized from such unhopeful individuals who, as I notice from the signatures appended to the declaration, compose it. Thus, for instance, Bishop Filipp is a formal heretic. I was asked, in more fitting terms, to sign the Declaration, but I did not consent, and was for that reason exiled. I trusted Metropolitan Sergius, and now see that I was mistaken." 2

1. Spinka., op. cit., p. 164.
2. Ibid., pp. 70-1.

The eldest of the Metropolitans of the Russian Church, Cyril of Kazan, who perished in exile in 1936, "declared himself opposed to the 'Declaration.'" 1 So did Metropolitans Agathangel, Joseph, and Archbishop Seraphim, all three of whom had been designated deputies by Peter of Krutitsk. Bishop Varlaam of Perm and Evgeny of Rostov protested, as did the bishops exiled to the Solovki Islands in their "Open Letter" of September 27, 1927. Metropolitan Antony of the Church Abroad protested vehemently. The contemporary martyr of the Russian Church Boris Talantov, who recently died in a forced-labor camp in the Soviet Union, has pointed out the fatal results of this "Declaration." 2

Thus at home and abroad, in 1927 and the 1960's, those who have represented the true conscience of the Russian Church have protested against this death-sentence leveled at Holy Orthodoxy.

Shortly after issuing his "Declaration," Sergius wrote to Metropolitan Evlogy demanding that the Metropolitan and, through him, all the bishops and priests of the Church Abroad sign the following pledge: "I, the undersigned, promise that, in view of my actual dependence on Moscow, I will not permit myself either in my social activity or, above all, in my work for the Church, any action which could be suspected of showing a lack of loyalty towards the Soviet regime." 3 Those who refused to sign were to be removed from the lists of clergy of the Moscow Patriarchate.

On September 12, 1927, Evlogy wrote Sergius informing him that he could not

1. Spinka, op. cit., p. 71.

2. See Michael Bourdeaux, Patriarch and Prophets, New York, 1970, pp. 330-31.

3. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p.145.

take a loyalty oath since his diocese was not subject to the political control of the U.S.S.R. Sergius responded by saying that "the word 'loyalty' does not signify submission to Soviet laws but abstention from all politics." 1 Each of Evlogy's bishops and priests was to be free to formulate his loyalty oath as he saw fit.

Sergius [or rather, his Bolshevik masters] was thus attempting to ensure that the West European diocese would neither criticize communism nor the communist persecution of religion in the U.S.S.R. In one of the most disgraceful acts ever performed by an Orthodox clergyman, Evlogy agreed to sign the oath as interpreted by Sergius. He then sent copies of Sergius' two ukazes to his clergy with a request that they too sign the oath. Upon receiving such a demand from his Metropolitan, Archpriest Orlov and his entire Geneva parish immediately separated from Evlogy and re-entered the Church Abroad. 2 Others soon followed.

Seeing that for the sake of legitimizing his authority Evlogy was willing to submit to the most humiliating demands, on October 21, 1927, Sergius issued ukaz No. 549, in which he ordered that the Soviet regime was to be commemorated during Divine services. On June 21, 1928, Sergius issued another ukaz in which "Metropolitan Evlogy, Archbishop Vladimir of Belostok, Bishop Benjamin of Sebastopol, and all the clergy who, after them, have signed the promises required by Metropolitan Sergius, are to continue to remain a part of the Moscow Patriarchate." 3 The council of Carlovtsy, which refused to submit, was "deprived of all Jurisdiction abroad." 4

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 166.

2. Ibid., p. 167.

3. Ibid., p. 168.

4. Ibid.

The ukaz of June 21 instructed Evlogy, as being the Moscow Patriarchate's representative, to present the following conditions to the Church Abroad: "[1] Those who should make a promise of loyalty to the Soviet regime would continue to be inscribed in the list of clergy of the Moscow Patriarchate; [2] Those who, while submitting to the order to suppress the Synod and Council of Carlovtsy, refused to sign the promises asked for would be removed from the lists of the clergy of the Patriarchate, and Metropolitan Evlogy was to remove them from their post; [3] Finally, those who should stubbornly support the Synod and Council. . . were to be given over to a synodal court and judged as rebels against legitimate authority, and as the guilty parties in a schism. . . " 2

In his pastoral letter of June 25, 1928, Evlogy invited the Carlovtsy bishops to submit. "It is impossible to be in union with the universal Church if one disobeys a legitimate authority," he said. 3

On June 8, 1928, the Moscow Patriarch formally expelled the Church Abroad from its ranks. The admitted reason for this expulsion was that "the Carlovtsy group refused to sign a promise of loyalty to the Soviets. . . " 4

Angered by Evlogy's servile attitude towards an obviously unfree ukaz of Metropolitan Sergius, Archimandrite Chariton, the rector of the Vienna parish, together with a part of his parish, broke with Evlogy. Shortly thereafter Fr. Boris Molchanov, who had been secretary of the diocesan

2. D'Herbigny, op cit., pp. 168-9

3. Ibid., p. 169

4. Ibid.

education committee, followed suit. 1 The situation, in fact, greatly resembled what took place when in 1969-70 the American Metropolia decided to enter into communion with an obviously unfree Moscow Patriarchate. In 1928 as in 1970 the most alert members of the clergy and laity re-entered the Church Abroad.

Alarmed, Evlogy issued an official notice on August 26, 1928, in which he maintained that, "Metropolitan Sergius has never renounced the faith. He has only recognized the authority of the Soviets as the first Christians recognized that of the pagan emperors. The Russian Church abroad is only subject to the Moscow Patriarchate in questions of dogma, morals, sacraments, liturgy, discipline, sanctions, and ecclesiastical organizations. If the bishops and clergy of the Church Abroad must abstain from all politics, the lay faithful are free to engage in it." 2

D'Herbigny, whose account we have been following, correctly sees the Evlogy-Sergius pact as having been ruinous both for Paris and Moscow. Evlogy and his followers were led by Sergius to sign loyalty oaths to the Soviet government, while Sergius gave tacit approval to the theological modernism of the Paris theologians. 3

It was obvious that Evlogy's flock, which was far from sympathetic to the Bolsheviks, would soon grow restive under Sergius' yoke. When on February 2, 1930, the Pope of Rome, Pius XI, invited the whole world to pray for those believers persecuted by the "impious" Soviet government, Evlogy, "after a certain hesitation, openly joined his voice to that of the Pope, in spite of the counter-declarations of Metropolitan Sergius,

1. Ibid., p. 170.

2. D'Herbigny, op. cit., pp. 170-1.

3. Ibid., p. 174.

in spite of the counter-declarations of Metropolitan Sergius, who denied any persecution by the Soviet regime in the U.S.S.R." 1 As a result of this action, on June 10, 1930, Evlogy was relieved of his duties by ukaz No. 108 of Metropolitan Sergius. Archbishop Vladimir was appointed as Evlogy's temporary successor.

On June 23, Evlogy convoked a diocesan congress which declared that, "for the good of the Church, the Metropolitan did not in good conscience have the right to obey Sergius' order." 2 Sergius persisted. On October 28, 1930, he demanded that Evlogy completely retract his anti-Bolshevist activity. Evlogy refused, and in late January, 1931, he and his bishops were suspended by Sergius. 3 At the session of January 28, 1931, the congress decided that Evlogy should once again direct his activity independently of both Moscow and the Church Abroad, and that he should follow ukaz No. 362 of Patriarch Tikhon. 4

Almost immediately afterwards, however, Evlogy tried new tactics. Appealing to the ever-growing ecclesiastical ambitions of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, Evlogy asked Patriarch Photius to take the Western European diocese under his wing. This proved agreeable to Photius, and on February 17, 1931, he announced the formation of a "Temporary Patriarchal Russian Orthodox Exarchate in Europe." 5 This was done over sharp protest of the Church Abroad.

1. Ibid., p. 175.
2. D'Herbigny, op cit., p. 175.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 177.
5. Andreev, op. cit., p.146.

It is both interesting and instructive to see how Fr. John Meyendorff of the American Metropolia describes Evlogy's relations with the Moscow Patriarchate: "When the ecclesiastical authorities in Moscow finally asked him [Evlogy] to submit a written statement of loyalty to the Soviet state, Eulogios appealed, in 1931, to the Ecumenical Patriarch, and became the latter's exarch for the Russian parishes in Europe." 1 Has Fr. John told the whole story?

In 1935 Evlogy accepted an invitation from Patriarch Varnava of Serbia, who heeding our Savior's words, blessed are the peacemakers," had summoned Evlogy and Metropolitan Theophilus of America to Yugoslavia so that they might reconcile their differences with the Church Abroad. At the conference's sessions Metropolitan Evlogy expressed a "willingness to unite with all parts of the Church Abroad if the Ecumenical Patriarch should give his blessing. The Serbian Patriarch offered to intercede in this, and Metropolitan Evlogy accepted the offer with thanks." 2 Evlogy and Theophilus both signed the "Temporary States" which were to govern the life of the Church Abroad henceforward. Both were thus reconciled to the Church Abroad. Almost immediately after returning to Paris, however, Evlogy submitted to the "mob rule" of his constituency and repudiated his signature. In February, 1936, he requested the Ecumenical Patriarch "not to release him from his jurisdiction," 3 thus completely nullifying the assurances he had given in Yugoslavia.

Evlogy's zig-zag jurisdiction-hopping, however, was not at an end. In the fall of 1944, enthusiastic over the Soviet Union's predictable defeat

1. J. Meyendorff, The Orthodox Church, New York, 1962, p. 187.

2. Andreev, op cit., p. 148.

3. Ibid.

of Germany, Evlogy entered into correspondence with the Moscow Patriarchate through the Soviet ambassador in Paris and expressed "his readiness to be immediately united [with Moscow]." 1 When in 1945 Alexis was "elected" Patriarch of Moscow, Evlogy immediately ordered all his parishes to commemorate Alexis in the liturgy as the "lawful head of the Church." Strange behavior for a supposed Constantinopolitan exarch!

On August 29, 1945, an "informal meeting" of the clergy of the Western European diocese gathered to hear a speech by Metropolitan Nikolai of Krutitsk, Moscow's representative. When a number of those present boldly challenged the wisdom of submitting to Moscow, Evlogy "dictatorily broke off the sessions and decisively announced his submission" to Moscow. 2 The following day he sent a telegram to the Patriarch of Constantinople asking his blessing for the return of his diocese to the Russian Church. Upon receiving assurances from Metropolitan Nikolai that the Ecumenical Patriarch had "as it were already given his consent," a solemn liturgy was concelebrated on September 2 to seal the union. 3

On October 3 Evlogy issued an encyclical letter informing his flock that the exarchate had been taken into the Moscow Patriarchate. However, he added, he was to continue to be commemorated as "exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarch" until the receipt of a canonical release from Constantinople. 4 Thus the Exarchate was solemnly proclaimed to belong to two Churches simultaneously.

1. Ibid.

2. Andreev, op. cit., pp. 148-9

3. Ibid., p. 149

4. Ibid.

The uncertainty of the exarchate's status was allowed to continue until, on August 8, 1946, Evlogy unexpectedly died. Moscow, understandably unnerved by this event, sent a telegram the following day to Constantinople stating that she had decided "to consider the temporary jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Throne over the Western European parishes at an end." 1

On August 12, 1946, Metropolitan Grigory arrived from Moscow to serve a funeral service for Evlogy together with all the hierarchs of the Exarchate. Two days later Grigory announced that Archbishop Vladimir had been replaced by Metropolitan Seraphim [Lukyanov] - a hierarch who had been pressured 2 into joining the Patriarchate by Nikolai of Krutitsk - as head of the exarchate. This high-handed action so angered the exarchate faithful that at a diocesan meeting on October 16, 1946, they voted to stay under the Ecumenical Patriarchate with Archbishop Vladimir as their head. Thus the exarchate's second flirtation with Moscow came to an end.

Under Vladimir and his successor, Georgy, the exarchate was to remain under Constantinople until 1965, when it was ejected from the Ecumenical Patriarchate by Patriarch Athenagoras under intense pressure from Moscow. Currently the exarchate exists as a self-governing "archbishopric" with only two bishops. A third submission to Moscow would appear to be a distinct possibility.

Such are the bitter fruits of Evlogy's 1926 schism from the Church Abroad, Torn away from its canonical and moral foundations, the Western European diocese was rendered defenseless before the modernizing theology

1. Ibid.

2. William C. Fletcher, in Nikolai, New York, 1968, p. 75, suggests simple blackmail.

of Fr. Bulgakov and a host of lesser heresiarchs. Such dubious organizations as the Brotherhood of Sophia and the Student Christian Movement were encouraged rather than suppressed. And, finally the exarchate became a helpless prey to the ecclesiastical intrigues of Moscow and Constantinople.

The Relations of the Church Abroad with Other Orthodox Churches

When the Church Abroad first came into existence, nearly all the autocephalous Orthodox Churches extended her the hospitality due to representatives of an Orthodox nation which had been seized by an apostate and militantly anit-Christian government.

The autocephalous Church of Antioch, ruled by Patriarch Gregory IV until his death in 1928, was one of the best friends of the Church Abroad, recognizing her without qualification. Metropolitan Antony, the head of the Church Abroad, was in fact so popular in Antioch that his name was seriously considered as a successor to Patriarch Gregory when rival factions were unable to settle upon a candidate in 1931. 1

The Church Abroad received full recognition from the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Archbishop of Cyprus, and the autocephalous Church of Sinai. The Rumanian Church extended recognition, and in 1925 Patriarch Myron of Romania acclaimed the Church Abroad "as the hope of the Russian Church." 2 The Bulgarian Church also recognized the Church Abroad. The Serbian Church extended hospitality to the Carlovtsy Synod, and relations with Patriarch Dimitri [died 1930] and his successor, Patriarch Varnava,

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 214.

2. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 21

were extremely cordial. 1 Relations were strained in the formative years of the Church Abroad's existence only with three autocephalous Churches, those of Constantinople, Greece, and [after 1925] Alexandria. A brief examination of the causes for these conflicts is in order.

Constantinople: As has been shown at the beginning of this chapter, initially Constantinople was very friendly to the Church Abroad. On November 1, 1920, a "central organ" of the Church Abroad was created in Constantinople with the blessing of the Ecumenical Patriarch. In May, 1921, a more definite form was given to the organization at a council of the Russian episcopacy presided over by a representative of the Patriarch of Constantinople. 2

Soon, however, relations soured. Under Patriarch Meletius IV Metaxakis of Constantinople, whose calendar "reform" still divides the Orthodox Churches, the Ecumenical Patriarch undertook a vast expansion scheme designed to profit from the weakness of the Russian Church after the Revolution. On April 5, 1922, Meletius named an exarch for all of Western and Central Europe, claiming that "all the Orthodox in the barbarian lands depend on the Patriarch of Constantinople" 3 On March 7, 1923, he created an Orthodox archdiocese in Czechoslovakia, and on March 28 by letter No. 1336 he denied Metropolitan Evlogy any jurisdiction over the Russian Orthodox in Western Europe and Czechoslovakia. 4 When Evlogy protested and a conflict arose between Evlogy and Meletius' appointed

1. Ibid

2. See D'Herbigny, op. cit., pp. 15-17.

3. Ibid., p. 194.

4. D'Herbigny, op. cit., pp. 194-5.

exarch, SaLaty, Patriarch Tikhon in 1924 requested through an intermediary that Metropolitan Antony solve the matter.

In 1924, Meletius' successor Gregory VII founded a new metropolitan district of Central Europe with Budapest as the bishop's place of residence. ¹ By the time of Gregory VII's death in November, 1924, Constantinople had already carved out an empire in Western Europe. Six dioceses were submitted to the Ecumenical Patriarch; the autonomous Archbishopric of Finland under Germanos Aava, the autonomous Metropolia of Estonia under Metropolitan Alexander, the Archbishopric of Prague and Czechoslovakia under SaLaty, the Exarchate of Central Europe under Metropolitan Germanos of Berlin, the Exarchate of Western Europe under Metropolitan Germanos of Thyatira, residing in London, and finally, the diocese of Bishop Gregory of Paris. ²

This astonishing thrust for power was, of course, bound to meet with opposition from the Church Abroad, which legitimately claimed to represent the enslaved Russian Orthodox Church in her foreign dealings. Constantinople's desire to be sole master of Europe and Great Britain could scarcely go unopposed. Furthermore, by extending her influence into Finland, Estonia, and Czechoslovakia, regions which unquestionably belonged to the Church Abroad and which had originally submitted to her before national ambition and governmental pressure combined to induce them to turn to Constantinople, and by granting these countries a wide autonomy for which they were not prepared, the Ecumenical Patriarchate dealt a serious blow to the soundness of Orthodoxy in Europe.

1. Ibid., p. 195.

2. Ibid., p. 196.

Another serious bone of contention between the Church Abroad and Constantinople was the latter's persistent recognition of the schismatic Russian "Living Church." Despite the "repeated warnings of the Synod," Meletius IV, Gregory VII, Constantine VI, and Basil III who ruled Constantinople until 1929, all recognized the "Living Church." 1

To show the extent to which Constantinople became affiliated with the "Living Church" one need only look at the actions of Patriarch Gregory VII. In 1924 Gregory asked Patriarch Tikhon of Moscow, then literally battling for his life against the "Living Church" and the Bolsheviks, to "sacrifice himself for the unity of the Church and the benefit of the faithful by immediately renouncing the government of the Church." 2 This stab in the back by the Ecumenical Patriarch, who correctly supposed that the "Living Church" would prove more amenable to Constantinople's ambitions and emerging modernism, was answered by Tikhon with a firm refusal to step down. Gregory VII, however, continued to support Archbishop Evdokim [previously of America] and his Living Church "synod" against Patriarch Tikhon. This action by Constantinople pleased the Soviets greatly. Before co-operating with Constantinople, however, they decided to impose the condition that, "Gregory VII should forbid Archbishops Anastasy and Alexander, who were residing in Constantinople, from committing any action or making any publicity against the Soviets." 3 Like Metropolitan Evlogy in later years, Constantinople hastened to obey the dictates of the Bolsheviks. Anastasy and Alexander were ordered to break with the Church Abroad and "expressions of political opinion were absolutely prohibited." 4 Constantinople's connections with the

1. D'Herbigny, *op cit.*, p. 197

2. *Ibid.*, p. 184.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 186.

4. D'Herbigny, *op. cit.*, p 188

"Living Church" ended only when the schismatic organization lost all influence due to lack of support by Russian believers.

Perhaps the most serious case of conflict between the Church Abroad and Constantinople, however, was the Church Abroad's reaction to the Pan-Orthodox Council [eventually termed a "commission" because several Orthodox Churches refused to attend] convoked by Meletius IV May 10-June 8, 1923. Antioch and Jerusalem refused to attend, and Alexandria did not even respond to the invitation from such a well-known modernist and Mason as Meletius was. There were many Metropolitans of the Ecumenical throne which did not even recognize Meletius Metaxakis as canonical Patriarch, since he was a political appointee, and not duly elected. Therefore, they refused to attend his councils and were awaiting the outcome of the Greco-Turkish war in order to voice their protest and take action. 1 Fr. Ephraim of the Holy Transfiguration Monastery in Boston writes concerning Meletius, "What Metaxakis wanted was an Anglican Church with an eastern tint, and the faithful people knew it, and they distrusted everything he did. While in Athens, he even forbade the chanting of vigil services because he considered them out of date and a source of embarrassment when heterodox - especially Anglicans - visited Athens. . . Besides advocating the new calendar at Constantinople, Metaxakis also wanted shaven clergy, no rassa, marriage after ordination for both priests and bishops, shorter services, etc." 2

Meletius' council was attended by Serbia, Rumania, Greece, Cyprus, and the Russian Church, represented by Anastasy and Alexander of the Church Abroad.

1. See Spyridon Loberdos, The Metropolitan of Smyrna Chrysostom, Athens, 1929, pp. 191-193 [in Greek].

2. Fr. Ephraim, "Letter on the Calendar Issue," St. Nectarios Education Series, No. 2, p. 3.

The council soon set about examining the following questions: "calendar reform, impediments to marriage, the second marriage of priests, the episcopal ordination of married priests, the shortening of the Liturgy, the question of the fasts." 1

When on June 4, 1923, Archbishop Anastasy made his report to the Carlovtsy episcopate on the "commission's" activities, the Bishops' Council of Carlovtsy "rejected the calendar reform completely, as contrary to the canons, and likewise rejected the second marriage of priests." 2 When on June 25, 1923, Meletius informed the Synod Abroad in writing of the "decrees" of the "Pan-Orthodox Congress," the Synod decided on August 7, that "all the decisions of the Congress are unacceptable because they are contrary to the holy canons." 3 It also pointed out that, since Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria had been absent, the Council's decisions were not binding. Only an Ecumenical Council, the Synod declared, could deal with the questions touched upon by Meletius' council. This was also the view of the Patriarch of Alexandria, Photius. The council's actions were protested by Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Cyprus. 4

One tragic result of Meletius' "congress" was to destroy the centuries-old liturgical unity of the Orthodox Church. In spirit it resembled the interpolation of the Creed by the Roman Church. From 1923 on, some Orthodox would be on the 'new' calendar, a fact leading to great demoralization among the Orthodox faithful. The new calendar sponsored by

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 198

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Fr. Ephraim, loc. cit., pp. 1-2

Meletius was demonstrably inferior to the "old" one; its purpose was to facilitate union with the heterodox.

The opposition of the Church Abroad to Constantinople's modernism earned it the permanent resentment of the Oecumenical Patriarchate. The firm opposition of Archbishop Anastasy to Meletius' modernism was not appreciated by those who were rushing to transform the Orthodox Church into "this world."

Constantinople did not abandon her dreams of a modernist Oecumenical Council (a kind of Vatican II avant le mot). On June 3, 1924, Patriarch Gregory VII invited the "sister Churches" to an Oecumenical Council to be held in 1925 on Mt. Athos. On October 30, 1924, the Carlovtsy Synod "declared that the convocation of an Oecumenical Council was inopportune because the Russian Patriarchate could not be represented there." 1 The Serbian Church also cited the incapacity of the Russian Church to be properly represented as a reason for not holding the Council. A number of Greeks argued that Oecumenical Councils were to be held only to combat heresies. The combined efforts of the Church Abroad, Serbia, and these Greeks staved off the council.

In 1926, Basil III of Constantinople again raised the spectre. On March 30, 1926, Metropolitan Antony protested sharply against Basil's having invited the "Living Church" and the "autocephalous Ukrainian Church of the U.S.S.R." to attend. 2 Once again the council did not take place.

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 199.

2. Ibid., p. 203.

It is instructive to observe that now in 1970 when Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople, acting very much like a Metaxakis reincarnate, is hurrying towards the same longed-for Oecumenical Council with the same "reforms" in view (married bishops, second marriage of priests, shorter services, abolition of the fasts, etc.), it is again the Church Abroad, in the person of its courageous and meek first-hierarch, Metropolitan Philaret (who succeeded the righteous Anastasy as Metropolitan upon the latter's death in 1965), which is, together with tradition-minded Greeks, opposing Constantinople's modernism and rallying the faithful.

Thus Constantinople's quarrels with the Church Abroad reflect very favorably on the Church Abroad. By opposing Constantinople's irresponsible expansionism, her shameful recognition of the "Living Church" and the Ukrainian "autocephaly," as well as her espousal of theological and canonical modernism, the Church Abroad has borne witness to the Orthodox faith. Alexandria: As long as Patriarch Photius was Patriarch of Alexandria relations with the Church Abroad were "more than courteous." 1 When Photius reposed on August 22, 1925, the worst enemy of the Synod Abroad ascended the throne, Meletius Metaxakis. This time he was Meletius II. "With him the attitude of the Patriarchate of Alexandria became hostile." 2 According to Meletius, the Church Abroad was "an illegal institution, contrary to the canons and the tradition of the Church." 3 These are, of course, the words of a notorious despiser of the canons and traditions of the Church. One is not astonished to discover that Meletius sided with Evlogy in his quarrel with the Church Abroad. Meletius was, apparently, particularly venomous

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 212.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 213.

because Metropolitan Antony of the Synod had qualified him as a "heretic" on account of his pronounced sympathies for immediate union with the Anglicans. 1 At both Constantinople and Alexandria, therefore, the Church Abroad's first and most violent enemy was Meletius Metaxakis. Greece: Relations with the Church of Greece were strained due to the hostile attitude of Archbishop Chrysostom Papadopoulos, a modernist who was even willing to lie consciously to his own Synod in order to assist Metaxakis' program. 2 His refusal to allow a bishop of the Church Abroad onto Greek soil to care for the Russian faithful in Greece was hardly motivated by love for the emigré faithful who were thus deprived of needed pastoral care. 3 Later a bishop was allowed to come.

The Canonical Position of the Church Abroad

There is a considerable literature on the canonical position of the Church Abroad. Able and convincing presentations of the canonical and moral (for canons cannot be isolated from the Christian life) correctness of the Synod's position have been written by the late Protopresbyter M. Polsky (The Canonical Position of the Highest Church Authority U.S.S.R. and Abroad, Jordanville, 1948) and Protopresbyter George Grabbe (The Truth About the Russian Church At Home and Abroad, Jordanville, 1961). Both these books are in Russian. In them one may find convincing refutations of the various arguments conjured up by the followers of Metropolitan Evlogy in Paris and then seized upon by such diverse enemies of the Church Abroad as Meletius Metaxakis and Alexander Bogolepov of the American Metropolia.

1. Ibid.

2. See Fr. Ephraim, loc. cit., p. 3

3. D'Herbigny, op. cit., ~ p. 214.

In approaching the question of the Synod Abroad one should not overlook an obvious fact, viz. , that Church history had never before witnessed a phenomenon comparable to the emigration of the Russian Orthodox faithful after the Revolution. Several million refugees were literally scattered over the face of the earth. In addition, immigrants to America and elsewhere who were of Russian descent were left without adequate ecclesiastical guidance. Physically, many emigrés were in a state of semi-starvation; spiritually, many were utterly demoralized. It was imperative that this vast and widely-disseminated flock be immediately attended to, especially since it became prey to sectarianism, spiritualism, socialism, and other corrupting "-isms" of the time. In unity is strength, in division, weakness.

It was evident that a centralized emigre ecclesiastical organization was needed for the spiritual survival of the new dispersion. As early as 1920 such an organization was founded with the blessing of the Oecumenical Patriarch. The Russian episcopate abroad immediately saw the wisdom of and the necessity for the existence of the Church Abroad. This group included Evlogy and Platon. The need for the Church Abroad was also recognized by almost all Orthodox Churches, many of whom, as true Orthodox brothers in Christ, offered her all the assistance they could. Those such as Meletius Metaxakis and Chrysostomus Papadopoulos who refused assistance or persecuted the Church Abroad stand condemned by their own words and actions regarding other matters as clear enemies of Christ.

The possibility of the existence of the Church Abroad is recognized even by Professor Bogolepov of the American Metropolis. According to him, the Russian dioceses in Western Europe, the Far East, and America, i.e.,

those Russians not in lands clearly belonging to autocephalous Churches, would have been justified in forming a superior ecclesiastical organization in accordance with Patriarch Tikhon's ukaz No. 362 of November 20, 1920, and Metropolitan Sergius' proposal of September 12, 1926. 1 What Bogolepov objects to is the fact that Russian Orthodox in Orthodox countries such as Serbia and Bulgaria also joined the Church Abroad.

Reflection on the spirit of canons 37 and 39 of Trullo, 13 and 18 of Antioch, and 17 of Sardica will show, however, that the autocephalous Orthodox Churches were bound to shelter and recognize as bishops those who had fled persecution by an apostate government. Owing to the disorganization of the Russian Church and the controls exerted by an atheist government, the bishops abroad were forced to be temporarily independent of the Patriarch of Moscow. This "temporary" state would obviously continue until the Russian Church should again be free to function abroad as an Orthodox Church and not the vehicle of communist intrigue.

There is no reason why the Russian parishes located in Orthodox countries could not adhere to the Church Abroad as long as they received permission from the autocephalous Churches of those countries. Thus, before the revolution, the Russian Orthodox Church had holdings on Mt. Athos in Greece and in Jerusalem with the permission of the Church of Greece and Church of Jerusalem. The logical nature of the position of the Church Abroad was appreciated by all Orthodox Churches except those whose ambitions or modernism ran athwart the Church Abroad's unyielding devotion to Orthodoxy.

1. Alexander Bogolepov, Toward an American Orthodox Church, New York, 1963, p. 63.

Furthermore, if an autocephalous Church did decide to impose restrictions on Russian Orthodox in her bounds, she had to be able to justify her actions canonically. Thus Archbishop Theophan of the Synod Abroad protested sharply against Constantinople's attempt to restrict archbishops Anastasy and Alexander. He showed that Constantinople's action contradicted the canons of the Church (i.e., canon 6 of the Second Council, 21 of Trullo, 128 and 129 of Carthage, and 74 of the Apostles). 1

Opponents of the Church Abroad such as Professor Bogolepov always try to show that she has violated the territorial principle of the Orthodox Church. Such objections always rest on a misunderstanding. The Church Abroad does not claim to be an autocephalous Church in the sense that the established patriarchates are. Nor does she claim to be an autonomous Church in the sense that, for example, the Church of Finland is. Rather she claims to represent the autocephalous Russian Orthodox Church abroad; she claims those dioceses and missions of the Russian Church not behind the Iron Curtain.

Following the spirit of Patriarch Tikhon's 1920 ukaz and Metropolitan Sergius' freely-given counsel of 1926, the Church Abroad is the temporary administrator of the foreign dioceses of the Russian Church. Were the communists to be ejected from the Soviet Union and the enslavement of the Moscow Patriarchate brought to an end, the Church Abroad, after carefully ascertaining that the Russian Church was in fact free, would integrate herself again with the Patriarchal Russian Orthodox Church.

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit. p. 189.

Even enemies of the Church Abroad agree that she faithfully keeps the traditions of the Russian Church. She contrasts sharply in this respect with the Moscow Patriarchate, which is rapidly casting off all vestiges of traditional Russian Orthodoxy. Yet her adherence to Russian tradition is not blind. Thus in the matter of the "limits of the Church," where the main current of Russian theology felt the effects of Roman Catholic influence in the XVIII and XIX centuries, the Church Abroad has followed such men as St. John of Kronstadt, Alexis Khomyakov, and Bishop Ignaty Bryanchaninov, who professed the correct view. Metropolitan Antony and Fr. George Grabbe of the Church Abroad have been influential in restoring awareness of the Biblical and Patristic attitude respecting this point.

Hence, in the final analysis, the validity of the position taken by the Church Abroad depends on whether or not she was and is justified in not maintaining relations with the Moscow Patriarchate. As has been shown, at first the Church Abroad was compelled to separate herself from Moscow because of the disorganization of the Russian Church. Later, especially after Sergius' "Declaration" of 1927, when the disorganization of the Church was "repaired" in its own way by the Soviet regime, the sole reason for not dealing with Moscow was the Patriarch's total subservience to an atheist government. This last-mentioned fact, as has been shown, prompted Sergius in 1926 to ask the Russian bishops abroad to break relations with the Moscow Patriarchate if they did not wish to be subservient to the Soviet government. Those such as Evlogy who were foolish enough to deal with Moscow soon found themselves caught in a spider's web of political "loyalty" to the Soviets .

The Church Abroad refused and refuses to deal with the Moscow Patriarchate, knowing that the Patriarchate in its foreign relations is directed not by a free episcopate or even a relatively free episcopate (as was the case of the Greek Church under the Turks) but by atheist communists manipulating docile puppets for purposes aimed directly at the destruction of the Church.

The Western European diocese under Evlogy, as has been shown, at times professed a "legalistic" view of the situation. The fact that they were dealing with puppets was declared unimportant until the pressures for political obedience and subservience grew to be intolerable. The American Metropolia has had the same ambivalent attitude towards Moscow. At times she has declared the Moscow Patriarchate an entirely legitimate organization even in her foreign dealings. Then, when Moscow would suspend her for lack of political obedience, she would join the Church Abroad and declare that the demand for political subservience to communism allowed - or rather, demanded - disobedience to the ukazes of the Moscow Patriarchate. Occasionally the Metropolia has tried to steer a course between these two views, declaring that suspensions for political disloyalty to the Soviet government are invalid, whereas actions such as the granting of autocephaly (which are obviously just as much politically motivated by the communist overseers of the Patriarchate's foreign policy) are valid. In one thing, however, the Metropolia has been quite consistent--in claiming that when Moscow's ukazes are directed against the Church Abroad (even when they have explicit political motives behind them, as did, for instance, Tikhon's ukaz of 1922), they are valid and have to be obeyed. Thus Fr. Meyendorff of the Metropolia, basing himself on this ukaz of '1922, states,

"Since 1922 the 'Synod of Carlovtsy' has no independent canonical existence." 1 Fr. Meyendorff then concludes that since 1922 the Church Abroad has been in schism from her Mother Church, the Moscow Patriarchate. At the same time Professor Bogolepov can write concerning an action by Metropolitan Platon of the American Metropolia, "In 1933 Metropolitan Platon rejected the demands of the Moscow Patriarchate for submission of the American Metropolia and a declaration of loyalty to the Soviet Government on the part of the American clergy." 2 If, as Fr. Meyendorff asserts, the Church Abroad was bound to obey a ukaz from Moscow, even one with a clear political motive behind it, why did not the Metropolia also have to obey a similar ukaz from her "Mother Church"? Obviously we have here an untenable double standard.

Furthermore, the free actions of the leaders of the Moscow Patriarchate before Sergius' submission in 1927 show what value it ascribed to the ukazes extracted from it by the communists. Thus after the ukaz of 1922, when Mr. Colton of the Y.M.C.A. approached Tikhon on the matter of confirming Metropolitan Platon, the Patriarch directed him to take the matter to the Synod of Bishops of the Church Abroad, showing that, unlike Fr. Meyendorff in 1970, he ascribed no significance to the ukaz of 1926 issued over his name, 3 Metropolitan Sergius' advice to the Church Abroad in 1926 showed that he too ascribed no importance to the ukaz. Archbishop Seraphim of Finland, who served as a go-between or Patriarch Tikhon and the Church Abroad, gives the following testimony: "I used all my influence so that the Patriarch should

1. In The Orthodox Church, February, 1970, p. 4.
2. Ibid., March 1970, p. 5
3. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 133

not suppress the Synod (Abroad) and he wished to follow my advice. When in January, 1924, Evlogy requested the suppression of the Synod by the Patriarch, the latter refused. A similar refusal came from Metropolitan Peter (of Krutitsk, Guardian of the Patriarchal Throne after Tikhon's death in 1925), to whom Evlogy addressed himself in 1925." 1 The Bolsheviks would, of course, have been delighted if Tikhon had done as Evlogy wished. He incurred their dis"pleasure by not doing so. The fact, already discussed, that Patriarch Tikhon sanctioned such actions of the Church Abroad as the creation of new dioceses, shows that he considered it his legitimate representative abroad.

One last matter remains to be mentioned. Professor Bogolepov has attacked the Church Abroad's claim to be a part of the Russian Church. "Being part of the Russian Church means belonging to it, being in administrative contact with it and, above all, recognizing its supreme authority." 2 He asks, "How can canonical communion endure after the Church Abroad has interrupted all relationships with the Moscow Patriarchate, and after Patriarchs Sergius and Alexis have suspended the bishops of the Synod Abroad? It follows that only spiritual communion remains. . . . In any case such communion has no canonical significance." 3 The history of the Church shows many cases when relations between bishops and the administrative center have been broken. It is especially prevalent during times of Persecution. In all such instances, including the early years of Patriarch Tikhon, when the Bolsheviks were supporting the "Living Church," only "spiritual communion" with the center was possible.

1. Ibid., p. 255.

2. Bogolepov, Towards, p. 73.

3. Bogolepov, Towards, p. 74.

If the Moscow Patriarchate's political servitude to an atheist government is a justifiable reason for not having relations with her, as the Church Abroad asserts and the American Metropolia alternately asserts or denies as she finds expedient, then such "spiritual communion" with the Church of Russia is indeed possible. To show that such communion does exist, here is a letter from the Soviet Union addressed to Metropolitan Philaret and Archbishop Antony of Geneva of the Church Abroad: "***Spiritually we are united. Our divisions are external and therefore temporary.*** We Russian Orthodox people remain at one with you in our hearts, we pray for you and beg your holy prayers and blessings. With great joy we have heard your words of brotherly love and compassion broadcast to us. We were glad to hear that our fellow-countrymen of the dispersion are zealously preserving our true Orthodox faith ..." 1 Is such communion, as Professor Bogolepov asserts, really "of no canonical significance"?

1. In Michael Bourdeaux, Patriarch and Prophets, New York, 1970, p. 162.

CHAPTER III
THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN AMERICA SINCE THE BOLSHEVIST
REVOLUTION

In his forward an American Orthodox Church, Alexander Bogolepov, canonist of the American Metropolia and the ideological architect of its recently received "autocephaly" from Moscow, writes: "In determining the canonical status of the American Metropolitanate two periods must be distinguished: (1) from the arrival of the Russian Orthodox Mission in Alaska in 1794 to the Fourth All American Sobor in Detroit in 1924; (2) from 1924 to the present. During the first period the Russian parishes in America existed as part of the Russian Church. In the course of the second period the Archdiocese of North America became an independent Local Church." 1 Thus for Bogolepov the Metropolia was already an autocephalous (local-autocephalous) Church, that is, in 1963. As we shall see, Bogolepov actually dates the Metropolia's autocephaly from 1924. What Moscow did in 1970 was merely to recognize forty-six years of autocephalous existence.

A man who can make such claims deserves closer inspection. In a recent issue of St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, published by the Metropolia's principal seminary, we find an article on Bogolepov entitled "Role of Honor," written by Fr. Alexander Schmemmann, dean of the seminary. According to Fr. Alexander, Bogolepov was born in Russia in 1886 in the family of a priest, and was graduated from a theological seminary in 1906 at the age of twenty. He did not continue his theological education at the academy, however. "Instead of continuing in an ecclesiastical career he enrolled at St. Peterburg's School of Law. It is as if the Church were losing to secular culture its best sons only to recover them much later . . . 2

1. Towards an American Orthodox Church, New York, 1963, p. 78

2. St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly (hereafter S.V.S.Q.), 1966, vol. X, no. 1-2, p. 7.

Bogolepov was graduated in 1910 from the school of law and in 1915, after receiving his Master's degree in law, he was appointed a Privat-Dozent, and in 1921 a full professor of law, at St. Petersburg University. In 1922 he emigrated and moved to Berlin where he became an instructor in Russian.

When he came to the United States in 1951, he was invited (because of his legal training, no doubt) to teach canon law as well as the Russian and Slavonic languages at St. Vladimir's. Thus Bogolepov found himself a canonist and theologian at the age of 65. His first publication on canon law followed two years later, in 1953, when he was sixty-seven.¹ His previous publications concerned law, politics, Russian grammar, and Church hymns.

We have dwelt on Bogolepov's biography to point out certain facts. After an elementary theological education he entered the field of law, and then after the Revolution, that of secular culture. He returned to theology in his mid-sixties. It is obvious that one should be able to expect of Bogolepov, a former professor of law, the ability to handle words and construct logical arguments. It is also evident that one should be wary, lest the professor's desire to "win his case" and his excessively "juridicial" (i.e., external) approach should lead him to by-pass the truth.

That Professor Bogolepov has been effective in winning supporters of his point of view is evidenced by the recent article of Katherine Valone, a

1. See S.V.S.Q., 1966, vol. 10, no. 1-2, pp. 9-11 for a list.

Greek-American columnist, in the magazine Logos. In her "Requirements for Autocephality of a Church," she writes, "An excellent book on the issue of the autocephalous status of the Orthodox Church in America was published in 1963 by Alexander A. Bogolepov, Professor of Canon Law at St. Vladimir's Seminary." 1 She then reconstructs Bogolepov's arguments and concludes, "The Church in America has all the necessary requirements for autocephality. . . . The time may in fact be overripe." 2 If Bogolepov's argument is wrong, then he has led Katherine Valone and countless others into temptation.

To return to the history of Orthodoxy in America. When Archbishop Evdokim (Meschersky) went back to Russia for the Moscow Council of 1917-18 and then chose to remain there as a leader of the "Living Church" schism, his American flock, whose status at that time has been described in Chapter I, was left without a ruling bishop.

On February 25, 1919, Bishop Alexander (Nemolovsky), Evdokim's suffragan, was elected by the Second All-American Sobor in Cleveland to be Archbishop of North America.³

As has been shown, immediately after the Church Abroad was organized, the American archdiocese came under its jurisdiction. On July 22, 1921, the Administration Abroad made Alaska a separate diocese of the American Church 4 in an action later approved by Patriarch Tikhon. 5

1. Logos, May, 1970, p. 10.

2. Logos, May, 1970, p. 11.

3. M.L.J. Schrank, "Problems of Orthodoxy in America: The Russian Church," S.V.S.Q., vol. VI, no. 4, p. 187.

4. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 18.

The Carlovtsy Council of November–December, 1921, was recognized in writing by Archbishop Alexander and Bishops Antony of Alaska and Stephen of Pittsburg.¹ On April 4, 1922, the Administration Abroad conferred the right to grant divorce on Alexander of North America and Antony of Alaska.² Thus the Church Abroad clearly had jurisdiction over America in the early 'twenties.

Archbishop Alexander, unfortunately, proved to be incapable of administering his diocese. After he had become enmeshed in acute financial difficulties, Bishop Antony of Alaska undertook an investigation of his affairs. This prompted Alexander to leave America for Europe.³

Late in 1922 the Church Abroad, in one of its first actions after Patriarch Tikhon's ukaz of 1922, relieved Alexander of his position as administrator of the American diocese, and replaced him with Metropolitan Platon of Odessa.⁴ Metropolitan Platon thus received his appointment to America from the Church Abroad.

At the Third All-American Sobor held November 25–27, 1922, in Pittsburg, Metropolitan Platon was formally asked to rule the diocese.⁵ It was a great tragedy for American Orthodoxy that Platon, like Alexander, proved to be an unworthy man. Shrewdly sizing up the mood of the disorganized but ecclesiastically ambitious American archdiocese, Platon had already begun intriguing to have Patriarch Tikhon recognize him in his rights.

1. Andreev, op. cit., p. 91.

2. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 48.

3. The Russian Orthodox Church in America (An Historical Inquiry), Jordanville, 1955, (hereafter to be abbreviated Russian), p. 7.

4. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 60.

5. Schrank,, loc. cit., p. 188

When, however, as was shown in Chapter II, Platon's representative, Mr. Ethan Colton of the Y.M.C.A., approached the Patriarch in 1922 (accompanied by Fr. Theodore Pashkovsky of the Metropolia, who later became Metropolitan Theophilus and who testified concerning this meeting with Tikhon in an American court.),¹ Tikhon gave Colton a "recommendation for the Council of emigré bishops who direct the affairs of the Russian Church Abroad."² Up to the present it was thought by all parties, including the Synod Abroad, that this was a written recommendation signed by the Patriarch. But in the Sea Cliff Parish trial of the Spring of 1971, the very cablegram sent by Colton while at sea returning to the United States from Europe was procured from the files of the Metropolia for use in the court. The exact wording of the text had been guarded all these years by the Metropolia and was unknown even to the Synod Abroad. The cablegram reads as follows:

On board SS Olympic May 4, 1922
 W. W. Bouimistrow Esq.
 350 W. 87th St.
 N. Y., N. Y.

Dear Sir,

Just before leaving Russia I received your earnest cables. I was able to present them in person to the Patriarch, and received his favorable reply. It was not regarded prudent by either of us for him to send a written communication. This proved correct, for my papers were searched at the border. The Patriarch expressed it as his wish and recommendation that the Supreme Church Administration Outside of Russia request the Metropolitan

1. Russian, p. 7.
2. D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 133.

Platon to remain in America with the full authority asked for, detailing to the Administration in Canada Archbishop Alexander and to the U.S. Anthony. He chose to make this in the form of a recommendation. Since the matter was already in the hands of the Administration, that he did not wish to go over their heads. He asked me to convey his answer to the Metropolitan Evlogius in Berlin, and this I did last Sunday morning. In reply to my inquiry when as answer might be expected to you in New York, he replied that he would at once communicate with the Administration with headquarters in the Balkans, believing the final word would not be long delayed.

I shall look forward to seeing you as soon as my engagements admit of staying in New York. Information is at hand, however, making clear that this will not be the case for at least a week after my arrival on May 10.

With kind personal regards,
yours sincerely,

E.T. Colton

This document shows most clearly that Patriarch Tikhon considered the Church Abroad ecclesiastically responsible for America.

Checked in his plans, Platon soon resorted to plain forgery. Not long afterwards there appeared a "ukaz" by Patriarch Tikhon dated September 29, 1923, confirming Platon as head of the American Church. This document, however, was drawn up not by Patriarch Tikhon but by Platon himself, and was recognized as a forgery by an American court: "Platon Rojdstvensky, except for the alleged forged letter of 29 September, 1923, has no right to administer the trust in the real property herein involved."¹

1. Russian, p. 8

This false ukaz was used by Platon in the litigation he had with Kedrovsky of the Living Church over the Cathedral of St. Nicholas in 1925. It was the sole document which Platon could produce to support the legitimacy of his rights to the North American Diocese. Not wishing to recognize the authority of the Synod Abroad and to use documents issued by it, he had only one avenue left open: to present to the American Court the false letter of Patriarch Tikhon.

This was a desperate step for Metropolitan Platon, forever disgracing himself and his followers. Experts from the forces of Kedrovsky and the court proved irrefutably that the ukaz was an "unmitigated falsehood," and at the same time fabricated clumsily, very poorly, and thoughtlessly. It is enough to say that the ukaz did not even bear the Patriarchal seal although other less important documents of the time bear the seal of the Patriarch. This false appointment of Platon was concocted in New York and written in the new orthography (the V. Rev. Leonid Turkevich at first printed it in the old orthography, and then redid it photographically in the new) on paper which showed American water marks, easily proved by experts. The ukaz was supposedly issued and signed by Patriarch Tikhon on September 29, 1923, and on the next day, September 30, it was printed in New York in the old orthography. The editor of the "American Orthodox Messenger," the then Fr. Leonid Turkevich and later Metropolitan of Metropolia, never explained by what secret method this historic document could have flown from Moscow to New York in one day, been composed in the printery and printed in such a short time.

Furthermore, this imaginary "Edict" of Patriarch Tikhon about the appointment of Metropolitan Platon to America bears the number 41. Is

it possible that by the end of September 1923, the Patriarchal office could have been using such a small number? Patriarch Tikhon was freed from prison July 1, 1923. Until September 29 (the date of the ukaz), three months passed. Still, on November 8 of the same year, the Edict of Patriarch Tikhon concerning the change of the calendar¹ bears the number 422. This means that the Patriarch had issued just 41 documents in three months, and within the following five weeks, the number had reached 422!

American professors in universities who teach criminal law, unfailingly point out to their classes "the Patriarchal edict" No. 41 of September 29, 1923, "by which Metropolitan Platon was seemingly appointed to a diocese."² It is truly astounding that Fr. Meyendorff of the Metropolia, writing in 1970, does not know all this, and says, "After his liberation the Patriarch also appointed Metropolitan Platon as head of the Church of North America (Sept. 29, 1923)."³ When Platon appeared at the Bishop's Council in Carlovtsy on October 16, 1924, it was as a bearer of the forged ukaz. The other bishops present, naturally enough, took Platon at his word and did not question the authenticity of the ukaz.

In the early months of 1924, according to the Protestant M.L.J. Schrank, "the situation of the Russian Churches in the United States became chaotic."⁴ A certain John Kedrovsky of the "Living Church" began agitating among the American flock; he also attempted to seize St. Nicholas cathedral in New York. Worse still, on January 16, 1924, a ukaz "of Patriarch Tikhon, duly promulgated jointly with the Sacred Synod"

1. Church News, 1923, no. 23-24.

2. See P.J. Michajlov, Candid Talks, Philadelphia, 1948 (in Russian).

3. In The Orthodox Church, February, 1970, p. 4.

4. Schrank, loc. cit., p. 188.

was issued. According to Bogolepov, "By virtue of that ukaz, Metropolitan Platon was dismissed for having engaged in public acts of counter-revolution directed against the Soviet government."¹ In Bogolepov's words, Platon "had" to obey the ukaz of the Patriarch or find a way out.

Platon reacted by summoning the Detroit Sobor of April, 1924. Here it was decided "that it would be impossible for the American diocese to be directly dependent upon the Highest Church Authority on Moscow, as the Patriarch, in their estimation, did not have the freedom to communicate with the outside world."² The Sobor "proclaimed the Russian Orthodox Church in America to be temporarily autonomous until the convocation of a new All Russian Council. The head of the Church in America was to be an elected Archbishop. Also, there was to be a council of Bishops, a council made up of representatives from the clergy and laity, and periodic All-American Sobors were to be held. The Detroit Sobor confirmed the election of Metropolitan Platon, and asked him to work out a system of rules with which to administer the American Church in accordance with Orthodox tradition."³

Although the Sobor merely declared itself "temporarily autonomous," it was in fact making a bid for autocephaly. For the desire for the Sobor was to be fully independent both of Moscow and of the Church Abroad. The question of "autocephaly" was hotly debated at the Sobor. Fr. Joseph Pishtey, now chancellor of the Metropolia, opposed the move. The majority approved.⁴ At the Sobor the "Russian Orthodox Church in North America" became the "American Orthodox Church." In the future her only

1. Bogolepov, Towards, pp. 79-80.
2. Schrank, loc. cit., p. 188.
3. Loc. cit.
4. Russian, pp. 11-15

connection with the Russian Church was to be "spiritual ties and communion."¹

In Bogolepov's view this Sobor founded a new autocephalous Church:

If we study the actions of the American Metropolitanate in 1924 we realize that it meets all the necessary requirements for the establishment of an independent Autocephalous Church:

(a) Its canonical origin is beyond any cavil since it was founded by the Russian Church as its foreign diocese, while its bishops were appointed by the Central Authority of the Russian Church of which it was an integral part.

(b) By 1924 North American Metropolitanate had sufficiently matured for self-government. It had over 300 parishes, supported a theological seminary for the training of clergy, and had a number of affiliated organizations. It comprised three canonically appointed bishops, Bishop Stephan of Pittsburg (appointed in 1916), Bishop Theophilus of Chicago (appointed in 1922) and Metropolitan Platon.²

In his book Bogolepov compares the Detroit Sobor to the Russian Church's declaration of autocephaly in 1448 (which was recognized by Constantinople in 1589 - a parallel, Bogolepov would now add, to Moscow's recognition of the Metropolia's autocephaly in 1970).

But was the American Church actually ready for autocephaly (i.e., total self-government) in 1924? No, it was not. The 1924 bid came at a time when the Metropolia more than ever needed firm direction from the Church Abroad. According to Michael Lopukhin, writing in St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, the period of the early 'twenties marked a low ebb in the life of American Orthodoxy: "By 1922, local priests were saying that 90% of the Russians in

1. Ibid., pp. 14-15.

2. Bogolepov, Towards, pp. 81-2

their community were untouched by the Church."1 He continues, "The 1926 U.S. Census reported only 95,134 members of the (Russian) Church, with 199 Churches. This represents a dramatic drop from a report of 212 churches and 200,000 members in 1921."2 This period, in fact, represents the dark ages of the American Church.

Bogolepov's estimate of "over 300 parishes" in 1924 would appear to be wide of the mark if Lopukhin's U.S. Census figures are correct (there would have been somewhere between 212 and 199 churches in 1924). Even wider of the mark is the thriving "theological seminary" that he claims existed in 1924. According to the article "St. Vladimir's Seminary 1938-58," which appeared in the Summer, 1958, issue of the Quarterly, a very rudimentary seminary for the training of clergy existed in Minneapolis from 1905 to 1912 and at Tenafly, New Jersey, from 1913 to 1923. "This Seminary was not conceived nor did it function as a school of theology in the full sense of the word, that is, as a center of a theological scholarship and thinking, as well as instruction. Its pattern was that of a pre-revolutionary Russian 'Seminary,' or even a missionary School..."3

It is highly doubtful that such an institution could have adequately served the needs of an autocephalous Church. In any case, according to the Quarterly, the Seminary "collapsed" in 1923 for lack of funds.4 No new seminary was opened until 1937. Thus the "seminary" referred to by Bogolepov as existing in 1924 is a mere fiction. From 1923 to 1937 the American Metropolia had no seminary whatever.

1. M. Lopukhin "The Russian Orthodox Church in America, A Psycho-Social View," S.V.S.Q., vol. VIII, no. 3, 1964, p. 135.

2. Lopukhin, loc. cit.

3. S.V.S.Q., Summer, 1958, p. 3.

4. S.V.S.Q., Summer, 1958, p. 3.

A demoralized and unchurched flock, no seminary for the training of clergy – these were the conditions under which the Metropolia made the first of her four bids for autocephaly.

Metropolitan Platon, the head of the new "temporary autonomous" autocephalous Church, soon encountered new difficulties which sent him to the Church Abroad for assistance.

When, for example, Bishop Adam denied Platon's jurisdiction over the North American diocese, the Synod Abroad saved Platon by deciding in his favor.¹ Without the help of the Synod Abroad Platon could not have survived the attacks of Adam and the "Living Church."

It was not long, however, before the Church Abroad realized that Platon, like Metropolitan Evlogy, was playing a double game, using it for his own purposes but not ascribing any authority to it.

When Platon arrived at the Bishops' Council of the Church Abroad convened in Yugoslavia in 1926 (which we have already discussed), he asked for a letter recommending him to the Eastern Patriarchs and his own flock. At the session held on June 27 Platon stated that, "for his part he firmly bore witness that he was a decisive enemy of the autocephaly of the American Church, and affirmed his full canonical submission to the Guardian of the Patriarchal Throne, Metropolitan Peter (of Krutitsk), to the Council of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, and the Bishops' Synod elected by it."² When asked to sign this statement, however, he refused and quit the council. As with Evlogy, his true intentions were made plain for all to see.

1. D'Herbigny, op. cit., footnote on p. 132.

2. Russian, p. 19.

At the session of July 1, the Council of Bishops decided "to recognize as beyond doubt that Metropolitan Platon, despite his oral and written declarations, is striving toward the organization of an autocephalous administration for the North American Church."¹ The Council condemned the decisions of the Detroit Sobor as "extremely dangerous and harmful for the interests of the Russian Church in America."²

The reply of the North American episcopate was that the Church Abroad "had no canonical significance."³ Soon Platon was to declare the Synod Abroad "uncanonical."⁴

Bishop Apollinary (Koshevoy), who came to America in 1924 at Metropolitan Platon's request, was invited by Platon to attend the Bishops' Council of the American archdiocese held on January 31, 1927, in which an "appeal" was addressed to the American flock declaring the Church Abroad "uncanonical." The letter of the four other American suffragan bishops of September, 1926, to the Church Abroad (which according to Apollinary was "crude in form and insolent in content") was confirmed.⁵

Apollinary reports, "All the hierarchs approved this 'appeal' to the American flock. I alone did not agree with them. I declared that I did acknowledge and do acknowledge the Synod of Bishops as canonical, both in origin and in its present form; that I did submit and do submit to it as a judicial-administrative authority, that I deny the right of the American diocese to 'ecclesiastical self-determination.'"⁶

1. Ibid., p. 20

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 21

4. Ibid., pp. 28-29

5. In "Archbishop Apollinary," The Orthodox Word, Jan.-Feb., 1970, p. 43.

6. Loc. vit.

When Apollinary proved "firm and unbending," he was ("on the spot, in some five minutes") deprived of his suffraganship, removed from his position as rector of the church in San Francisco, and relieved of all duties.¹ After this had been done, Apollinary turned to his judges and meekly stated, "Forgive me for having led you into such temptation." The other bishops, however, shouted "Go away!" and, although the table was set for dinner, drove Apollinary out with the words, "We do not want to share even a slice of bread with you."² With Bishop Apollinary, the truth of Christ also departed from Metropolitan Platon's jurisdiction.

In late April, 1927, the Church Abroad suspended Platon and appointed Apollinary head of the American Diocese. The Platonite schism now in full force, Apollinary began to collect such of the flock as remained loyal to the Church Abroad.

Once Apollinary had been suspended, Platon set to work on a new plan for the attainment of autocephaly, since no autocephalous Church had recognized the North American diocese as a sister Church after the Detroit Sobor of 1924. As Basil Bensin writes in St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, "Metropolitan Platon, after the proclamation of the autonomy of the Russian Orthodox Church (in America) of 1924, made a special agreement with the Syrian Archbishop Eftimios to proclaim and independently establish 'The Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church in North America.' This was eventually chartered by Archbishop Eftimios on February 1, 1928, in the state of Massachusetts. However, this attempt was not realized due to the opposition of the Russian clergy and the Greek

1. Loc. cit.

2. Russian, p. 29.

Orthodox Church." ¹

Realizing that the autocephalous Orthodox Churches would not recognize his Russian American archdiocese as an autocephalous Church, Platon decided to let Eftimios form an "American Orthodox Church" under his control, calculating that such an organization, embracing all Orthodox nationalities in America, would be more likely to win recognition. Fr. Leonid Turkevich, the future Metropolitan Leonty, was to be ordained bishop and become Eftimios' Chief assistant. ² If Eftimios failed, Platon reasoned, he could put all the blame on the Arab and himself remain head of the Russian Archdiocese of America.

This second bid for autocephaly also failed because of opposition from the Greek Archdiocese of America (formed in 1922) and many of the Russian clergy. Bogolepov, of course, chooses to ignore this incident in his Toward an American Orthodox Church. After all, he has no need of two declarations of autocephaly. It is an indisputable fact, however, that on December 19, 1927, the "Holy Synod of the American Orthodox Catholic Church" sent a letter to all autocephalous Orthodox Churches informing them of the existence of a new autocephalous sister Church. ³

Eftimios, briefly head of the "American Orthodox Church," soon tired of such games, married, and dropped out of Church affairs. ⁴

In December, 1929, Platon formed the American Metropolitan district, and what is known as the "Metropolia" came into existence.

At about the same time Platon informed Bishop Tikhon of the Church

1. S.V.S.Q., Summer, 1958, p. 15.

2. Russian, p. 35.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 42.

Abroad, who had come to America to assist Apollinary, that he was prepared to "make peace" with the Church Abroad if he could retain the title "Metropolitan of All America and Canada."¹ Evidently Platon's attitude towards the canonicity of the Church Abroad was nothing if not flexible. The Synod Abroad, however, having learned that Platon was involved in serious financial difficulties as a result of his own irresponsibility, refused the offer.² And fortunately so. Almost immediately Platon went to court to try to drive the Church Abroad out of North America. He lost the cases he started, however, and certain embarrassing details, such as his forged "ukaz of Patriarch Tikhon," were brought to light. To mention only one case, the Superior Court of Connecticut ruled against Platon and for the Church Abroad in 1931.³

In 1933 the righteous Apollinary reposed. He was replaced by Archbishop Tikhon as head of the Synod parishes in America.

In the same year (1933), Archbishop Benjamin (Fedchenkov) arrived in America as the official representative of the Moscow Patriarchate. He demanded "a written pledge of loyalty to the Soviet power" from Platon and his clergy.⁴ According to Bogolepov, when Platon and his clergy refused the loyalty oath and once again declared the Metropolia "temporarily autonomous,"⁵ "the Acting Patriarchal Locum Tenens, Metropolitan Sergius, and his Sacred Synod declared the proclamation of the autonomy of the North American Diocese null and void, since it was made without

1. Russian, p. 52.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Schrank, loc. cit., p. 191.

5. Towards, p. 80.

the consent of the Moscow Patriarchate. The group around Metropolitan Platon was declared schismatic, and Metropolitan Platon himself, as the initiator of the schism, was suspended." ¹

Thus, in Bogolepov's words, "the Moscow Patriarchate continued to consider the American Archdiocese's proclamation that it was a 'self-governing' Church a schism and an arbitrary secession of a diocese from the Central Authority of the entire Russian Church and so suspended its hierarchy." ²

He continues: "It follows, in this connection, that the essential problem in determining the canonical position of the American Metropolitanate is the problem of deciding whether the proclamation of its independence constituted a schismatic secession of a diocese from the entire Church or the establishment of a new self-governing Church." ³

We shall pass over Bogolepov's indecision as to whether the American archdiocese became autocephalous in 1924 or 1933 and take up another aspect of his thought. According to Bogolepov, any action of the Moscow Patriarch must be obeyed, since Moscow is a legal "canonical" administration. Moscow's political servitude to the communists does not, for him, affect the canonicity of her activities abroad, even if this should consist in demanding a loyalty oath to the Soviet regime. Writing in the March, 1970, issue of The Orthodox Church, for example, he remarks concerning the Metropolia's bid for autocephaly from Moscow, "The question is asked: how can the American Metropolia accept the proclamation of its autocephaly from the Moscow Patriarchate, which is dependent upon the Soviet Govern-

1. Ibid., pp. 80-1.

2. Ibid., p. 81.

3. Ibid.

ment and always supports Soviet and external politics. . . . ?"¹ He answers, "When the question is presented in such a manner, a confusion of ecclesiastical-canonical and political problems result. Canons are rules (having the force of law) concerning the organization and government which have been established by the Church itself. The canonicity of each Local Church is defined, in conformance with the Canons, by the consecration of the hierarchs according to the order of the apostolic succession of authority and by recognition of all other Sister-Churches."² Thus political servitude (though it inevitably leads to an infringement of canons on the election of bishops, etc.) is not seen by Bogolepov as a factor affecting the canonicity and, therefore, the moral correctness (for what is "canonical" is morally correct) of the Moscow Patriarchate's actions abroad. The Metropolia in 1924 and 1933 had to obey the politically dictated ukazes of the Patriarchate. Or, like the Russian Church when Constantinople fell under the Turks, she could use the political servitude of the Mother Church as an additional reason for declaring an autocephaly for which she was already prepared. Either schism or autocephaly in 1924 (1933 being merely a repeat performance of the suspension by Moscow in 1924) - this is the only choice Bogolepov leaves. "Temporary autonomy" necessitated by the enslavement of one's Mother Church is not recognized by Attorney Bogolepov as a permissible state of ecclesiastical existence.

Fr. Meyendorff in his statement on the Church Abroad in the February, 1970, issue of the Orthodox Church uses a similar kind of reasoning when he claims that the ukaz of Patriarch Tikhon in 1922, dictated though

1. In The Orthodox Church, March, 1970.

2. The Orthodox Church, March, 1970.

it was by the Bolsheviks and later de facto repudiated by the Patriarch himself, was binding on the Church Abroad.¹ Here, too, political enslavement does not affect canonicity.

Thus the Metropolia must choose: either she became autocephalous in 1924 (which, considering her state at the time, is clearly ridiculous), or she was legitimately suspended by Moscow in 1924 (and 1933). Such is the result of refusing to admit political servitude as a factor justifying temporary autonomy.

Furthermore, if we accept Bogolepov's fiction that the Metropolia became autocephalous in 1924, then we have to admit that it became autocephalous unconsciously. Otherwise it would not have made another bid for autocephaly in 1927 by way of Archbishop Eftimios' "American Orthodox Church."

Metropolitan Platon died on April 20, 1934. In November, 1934, the Fifth All-American Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America was held in Cleveland, Ohio. The Sobor elected Bishop Theophilus (Pashkovsky) of San Francisco as Metropolitan. On January 5, 1935, Theophilus was suspended by the Moscow Patriarchate.²

Platon's death gave the Church Abroad great hopes that the American Metropolia's tragic schism could be healed. On May 18, 1934, Metropolitan Antony, head of the Synod Abroad, addressed an appeal to "all Russian people in North America and Canada" in which he said, "The Lord commanded Christians that they should always dwell in the union of love and prayed that we should be one as the Holy Trinity is one (John XVII.21).

1. Ibid., February, 1970, p. 4.

2. Schrank, loc. cit., p. 192.

But instead of such union we see only the emergence of new groups and jurisdictions at mutual enmity with one another. The commandments of the Lord, the good of Holy Church, and, finally, even our duty to the Russian people, suffering from persecutions — all this demands of us that the divisions in the North American diocese cease and that she take her proper place in a united Russian Church Abroad." ¹

The Church Abroad also decided to send one of its pillars, Archimandrite Vitaly of the Pochaev Lavra, to America as a peacemaker. Vitaly, who had been a confessor of Holy Orthodoxy both under the Roman Catholics and the communists, and had been twice sentenced to death only to be providentially rescued each time, was consecrated Bishop of Detroit in Belgrade.

At his consecration Vitaly realized very clearly that it was his task "to go and establish peace and Church unity in America. I feel this duty with all my being, although I have not yet decided how to do it." ²

Upon arriving in America, Vitaly was horrified to discover the extent to which American Orthodoxy was demoralized and corrupted. Everywhere "business" was king.

According to Vitaly, the flock with which he entered into relations consisted 80% of Carpatho-russians and Galitians and 20% of Russian immigrants from the western provinces of Russia. ³ His long-time affiliation with Carpathian Russia as archimandrite of the Pochaev Lavra assisted him in finding a common basis of communication with these people. The older clergy were, he found, on the whole for union with the Church Abroad and for "discipline." The younger clergy constituted a greater

1. Russian, pp. 64-5.

2. Russian, p. 64.

3. Archbishop Vitaly. Motives of My Life. Jordanville, 1955. p. 132

problem: "The younger American clergy know neither Russia, nor Orthodoxy. Its ecclesiastical training is weak. . . . For them the priestly calling means 'business.'" ¹ This element considered its leader to be Bishop Leonty (Turkevich). Of the Russian population in America Vitaly estimated that "not more than 15-20% attend Church." ²

To the Russian population of America Vitaly issued a series of fiery calls to union, such as the following of March 19, 1935: -

"How many years has our Church division continued? Eight, perhaps ten years. During that time, fathers and brothers, our hair has not even had time to turn grey. And, look, the Serbs had a Church division which lasted more than 300 years, through ten generations! Who divided us? I don't know. I think it was Russian stupidity. But in order to divide the Serbs it took the work of the Turks, the Greeks, and especially of the Germans. . . . But after the Great War, Serbian bishops came together from Turkey, from Greece, from the Kingdom of Serbia, from Montenegro, from the Carlovtsy patriarchate, from the Bosno-Herzegovinian autocephaly and the Dalmatian autonomous churches. . . . Seven jurisdictions, seven schools, seven ordos and forms of Church life. And through all these impediments and obstacles which had been carefully erected by enemies the Serbian bishops extended a hand to one another and said: Let us overcome the three hundred year division and let us be one Serbian Church. And then as a sign of unity they elected the eldest of their number, Kyr Dimitry, as Patriarch. . . . And now there is one Serbian Church, consolidated in its parts which had been sundered apart. Let us believe that this

1. Ibid., p. 134.

2. Vitaly, op. cit., p. 135.

experience of our Serbian brethren will inspire us also and that it will help us to come to the unity, organization, and discipline of the Russian Church Abroad." ¹

On July 26, 1934, Bishop Tikhon and Metropolitan Theophilus had a meeting. Bishops Arseny, Alexy, and Metropolitan Theophilus of the Metropolia declared themselves for union. The most ardent opponent appeared to be Bishop Leonty. ²

On September 13, 1934, as a gesture of reconciliation the Church Abroad removed the ban which had been placed on the American Metropolia. ³

At this hopeful stage Patriarch Varnava of Serbia intervened with his invitation that the various parts of the Church Abroad come to Yugoslavia in 1935 to heal their differences and reestablish unity.

In addition to Patriarch Varnava, this conference was attended by Antony, Anastasy (who had succeeded Antony as acting head of the Church Abroad because of the latter's advanced age and poor health), Evlogy, Theophilus, and Dimitry of the Far East (who was in union with the Church Abroad). A "temporary Statute of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad" was drawn up and signed by all those present, including Evlogy and Theophilus. The "temporary" aspect of the Statute referred to the fact that it was to remain in effect until the Russian Church should become free. According to the new Statute, "The Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, consisting of the dioceses, missions, and churches located outside the borders of Russia is an inseparable part of the Russian Orthodox Church,

1. Ibid., pp. 59-60.

2. Russian, p. 65.

3. Ibid.

temporarily existing on autonomous principles." ¹

It continues:

"The highest legislative, judicial, and administrative organ of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad is the Council of Bishops who gather yearly, and its executive organ is the Holy Bishops' Synod." ²

"The Holy Bishops' Synod consists of the four member-representatives of each of the four Metropolitan districts (Near Eastern, Far Eastern, West European and North American) under the presidency of Blessed Antony, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia." ³

Antony's successor was to be elected by the Bishops' Council.

According to the Statute the "first judicial instance with authority over bishops was the district council (of bishops). For bishops not belonging to the district and for the metropolitans of districts, it was the Episcopal Synod (of Carlovtsy)." ⁴

Complaints against the decisions of a court of the first instance were to be submitted, not later than two months after the trial, "to a general Bishops' Council (of the Church Abroad) in written form." ⁵

On November 19, 1935, the signers of the Statute sent an epistle to "Our Beloved in Christ Russian Orthodox Flock of the Dispersion." It stated that, "after a series of sessions in the work of which His Holiness the Patriarch (Varnava) took a most lively and active part, they (i. e., the signers) had worked out a Statute concerning the structure of the Russian Church Abroad, constructed on the principle of its division into four Met-

1. Russian, p. 70.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 79

5. Russian, p. 79.

ropolitan districts, solidly united in a common center—the Council of Russian Hierarchs Abroad and its executive Organ, the Holy Synod. . . .”¹

Consider the fruits of the great humility and love of Patriarch Varnava and Metropolitans Antony and Anastasy, true archpastors of the Saviour's flock. No demands for political "loyalty," no humiliating requirements were imposed on the schismatic jurisdictions of Evlogy and Theophilus. Rather they were welcomed into the Church Abroad on equal terms with the Balkan (or Near Eastern) and Far Eastern districts. All that was asked of Evlogy and Theophilus was that they join the holy catholicity of the Church Abroad, in unity overcoming the weakness and sin of division.

Evlogy soon repudiated his signature, but Theophilus remained true to his. He declared, "The position of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad has been strengthened by the unity and peace which have been obtained. Now we have one center of Church administration in the Bishops' Synod in Sremsky Carlovtsy, where the American Metropolitan district will be represented by our elected representative."²

On November 28-30, 1935, the bishops of the Church Abroad and Metropolia met at St. Tikhon's Monastery in Pennsylvania, and, after hearing Metropolitan Theophilus' report on his trip to Serbia, they decided to put the agreement—i.e., the Statute—into effect.³

In March, 1936, the Russian American Orthodox Messenger, which had long been extinct, was revived. In its first issue (March, 1936) it declared, "Through the efforts of His Holiness the Patriarch of Serbia,

1. Ibid., p. 71.

2. Russian, p. 72.

3. Ibid. p. 73

Varnava, and the new head of our North American Metropolia, His Eminence Metropolitan Theophilus, peace between the jurisdictions was at last obtained at the end of last year, and it has affected our Church like the breath of a Grace-filled spring."¹

On May 14-17, 1936, a council of the bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America was held in Pittsburg. It issued the following encyclical letter to the faithful: "With great joy we inform you, beloved, that at our Bishops' Sobor in Pittsburg the 'Temporary Statute of the Russian Church Abroad,' worked out in November of 1935 by our hierarchs at the conference held under the presidency of His Holiness the Patriarch of Serbia, Kyr Varnava, was unanimously accepted by all of us, with the preservation of the existing autonomy."²

It continues, "All of our Archpastors, headed by their Metropolitan, enter into the make-up of the Bishops' Council of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, which is the highest ecclesiastical organ for our whole Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, and which remains, at the same time, an inseparable part of the All-Russian Church."³

This encyclical letter was signed by Metropolitan Theophilus, Archbishops Adam, Tikhon, and Vitaly, and Bishops Arseny, Leonty, Benjamin, Jerome, Makary, and Leonty — i. e., by all the bishops of the two jurisdictions.

The decisions of the Pittsburg Bishops' Sobor were then submitted for approval to the Bishops' Council held in Carlovtsy on September 19,

1. Messenger, March, 1936, no. 1, p. 1.
2. Messenger, May, 1936, no. 3, p. 33.
3. Ibid., pp. 33-34.

1936, and approved. Thus the requirement of the Temporary Statute that the decisions of the bishops' councils of the four Metropolitan districts be approved by the Bishops' Council of the whole Church Abroad was adhered to by the American bishops. Bishop Makary represented the American Metropolia at the session of September 19. On September 20, the Council elected Anastasy as head of the Church Abroad to replace Metropolitan Antony, who had reposed on August 10, 1936.¹

In October, 1937, an All-American Sobor was held in New York, at which the "Temporary Statute" was accepted.²

Alexander Bogolepov, as will be shown later, does not think very highly of this sobor. The author of the article "St. Vladimir's Seminary 1938-58," however, is of a different opinion. He writes, "The 1937 Sobor was a turning point in the history of our Church. Here it manifested a readiness for a constructive planning of our own future. Among other vital decisions, the Sobor acknowledged the urgent need for a theological school."³ Besides opening the seminary, which had been closed since 1923, the Sobor founded a clergy home, guaranteed the further existence of the Russian American Orthodox Messenger, and instituted financial reforms.⁴ According to the testimony of her own members, when she became an integral part of the Church Abroad, the American Metropolia received a new lease on life.

The two jurisdictions, the Church Abroad and the Metropolia, were thus fused to form one Metropolitan District under Metropolitan Theophilus.

1. Russian, p. 76

2. Ibid., p. 81.

3. S. V. S. Q., Summer, 1958, p. 4.

4. Basil Bensin, History of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America, N. Y., 1941, pp. 25-6.

A group of dedicated men undertook the task of making the newly-resurrected St. Vladimir's Seminary a respectable institution of theological learning. According to St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, Archbishop Vitaly "took an active part in the preparation of the seminary's transformation into a graduate school." ¹

The advantage of the Metropolia's new canonical position soon became evident. When Archbishop Adam again rebelled, the documents of his trial were forwarded to the Synod Abroad, and it, as a court of second instance, settled the case on June 1, 1939. ²

At the Second All Church Abroad Sobor held in 1938 in Carlovtsy, Bishop Benjamin of America represented the Metropolia and participated in the sessions of the Bishops' Synod. ³

Between 1938 and 1940, the Bishops' Council of the Church Abroad raised Bishop Arseny of America to the title of Archbishop, made Archpriest Ioann Nedzelnitsky a protopresbyter, and performed numerous similar actions. ⁴

In the Russian American Orthodox Messenger of January, 1940, Metropolitan Theophilus stated, "I consider it my duty to testify of my thankfulness toward the chairman of the Synod Abroad, Metropolitan Anastasy, for his benevolent attitude toward us. He has kept his promise to support us in the task of bringing peace to our Church. . . . By his influence and elevated authority Metropolitan Anastasy is able to contain

1. S.V.S.Q., Summer, 1958, p. 7.

2. Russian, p. 84.

3. Ibid., p. 83.

4. Ibid.

the passions of certain restless persons. . .to influence and direct Church life along a more peaceful, normal path." ¹

Summing up the years 1935-46, when the Metropolia was in union with the Church Abroad, Archbishop Vitaly writes:

"The years from 1935 to 1946 were years of the peaceful and fruitful construction of Church life in America. In those years sobors and episcopal conferences were convoked. New parishes were formed and old ones strengthened. Church life became ordered and piety grew. An excellent building for the central cathedral was obtained in New York. The theological seminary was reestablished in New York and a pastoral school founded at St. Tikhon's monastery. The orphanage received a large dwelling. Statutes were worked out concerning the central and parish administration. Celebrations of the 950th anniversary of the Baptism of Russia and the 150th anniversary of the Russian Orthodox Church in America were organized and conducted. The St. Vladimir Church (memorial for the Baptism of Russia) was founded and the celebration of St. Vladimir's day was instituted. The youth organization named the Federated Russian Orthodox Clubs flourished. Friendly coöperation was established with old and new Russian social organizations. The establishment of an Orthodox Theological Academy was being prepared. Attention was given to the question of financial security for clergy in case of old age or sickness." ²

Although a second Metropolia schism occurred only in 1946, its roots reach back to the early 'forties. Two factors contributed to the dissension which was to sunder the unity of the Church Abroad once more.

1. Ibid., p. 85.

2. Vitaly, op. cit., p. 119.

First, the outbreak of World War II soon forced Metropolitan Anastasy in Yugoslavia to lose contact with the American Church for most of the war. Second, Stalin, who had decimated the official Russian Church to the point of virtual non-existence (at one point only four bishops and a handful of parishes were functioning), suddenly decided to use the cooperative Metropolitan Sergius to whip up patriotism and gain control over the Orthodox of the Baltic provinces. Metropolitan Sergius was duly "elected" patriarch, and the Moscow Patriarchate became an international force. The Metropolia, impressed with Moscow's new ecclesiastical power and even more by Russia's military successes, soon succumbed to temptation.

When on September 8, 1943, Sergius was elected patriarch by eighteen hand-picked bishops,¹ the American bishops decided to recognize him. "Meeting in late October of 1943, the Metropolitanate bishops decided to commemorate the name of the new Patriarch at divine services. They still, though, questioned his freedom in relation to the State, and were uncertain as to whether to accept his jurisdiction in administrative matters over the American diocese."²

This decision, which Bishops loyal to the Synod in the Metropolia, being a minority, could not prevent, was an infringement of the Temporary Statute. Such a decision could only have been made by a Bishops' Council of the entire Church Abroad. Furthermore, according to the Statute the decisions of the bishops' councils of the Metropolia had to be approved by the Bishops' Council of the Church Abroad. This did not take place.

When in 1945 Alexis was "elected" Patriarch of Moscow (Sergius

1. Russian, p. 94.
2. Schrank, loc.cit., p. 193.

having died in May, 1944), the Metropolia decided to send representatives to the enthronement ceremonies. Bishop Alexis of Alaska, two archpriests, and a legal expert were dispatched to Moscow. On his return, Bishop Alexis brought back the following ukaz from Moscow:

"His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, and the Holy Synod, having examined the report of Bishop Alexis, arrived from America, concerning the desire of the American dioceses to unite with the Russian Mother Church and concerning the projected structure of the American Church after such a uniting, consider the following decisions to accord with the good of the Church and to be canonically feasible:

1. All the dioceses of North and South America and also of Canada are to comprise one Metropolitan district-exarchate of the Moscow Patriarchate. The Metropolitan of this district besides the title of his diocesan city should bear the title of Patriarchal Exarch of all America and Canada.

2. Not later than the day of Mid-Pentecost, 1945, an All-American Orthodox Church Sobor should be convoked in America, consisting of all bishops and representatives of the clergy and laity of both our Exarchate, headed by Metropolitan Benjamin, and of the Metropolitan district, headed by Metropolitan Theophilus.

The Sobor shall be presided over by Archbishop Alexis of Yaroslavl and Rostov, who is delegated to America by His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.

3. The Sobor (a) is to express the decision of the American Orthodox dioceses to unite with the Russian Mother Church;

b) is, in the name of the American Orthodox Church, to make an official repudiation of any political declarations that have been made against the U.S.S.R., and is to inform all parishes of this;

c) is to elect according to the existing order in America, by not less than a two-thirds vote, a Metropolitan — head of the Metropolitan District — and to present the elected candidate for confirmation by the Moscow Patriarchate.

Addition I: The Moscow Patriarchate for its part recommends to the Sobor as candidates for Metropolitan the Exarch of All America and Canada,

Metropolitan Benjamin, and Archbishop Alexis, but will not hinder the Sobor in its right to put forward and elect its own candidate to this post.

Addition II: The Moscow Patriarchate has the canonical right to reject the elected candidate if he is judged by the Patriarchate to be inappropriate for any reasons whatever. . . ."¹

Point 4 stated that "the right of confirming candidates for the episcopate, the right of rewarding clergy with the highest decorations, and the right of the highest court of appeal in relation to bishops and clerics" was to remain in the hands of the Moscow Patriarchate.

Point 5 stated that, if the terms of the ukaz were accepted by the American Council of Bishops, then, even before the All-American Sobor met, Moscow's ban of January 4, 1935, would be lifted from the American Church.²

The ukaz was dated February 14, 1945, and signed by "the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, Alexis."

If the Metropolia needed any proof that politically Moscow was still under complete communist control, this ukaz furnished it. The Council of American Bishops, held May 22-25, 1945, decided not to accept the ukaz and declared that the Temporary Statute "was still in effect."³

The Metropolia's flock, however, was quite impressed by Alexis' ukaz. At a council of the New Jersey-district priests on August 3, 1945, the ukaz was approved; and it was "unanimously" recommended to the forthcoming All-American Sobor that it agree to the Patriarch's request to "refrain from political statements against the U.S.S.R."⁴

1. Russian, pp. 98-9.
2. Ibid., p. 99.
3. Ibid., p. 100.
4. Russian, p. 101.

In that same month (August, 1945) Metropolitan Anastasy was finally able to reestablish contact with Metropolitan Theophilus. The resolution of the Chicago Council of Bishops reaffirming support for the Temporary Statute was approved by the Church Abroad.

On September 17, 1945, Archbishop Alexis of Yaroslavl and Rostov arrived in America. He was met at the airport by the Metropolia bishops Alexis of Alaska and Makary of Brooklyn, and by a number of clergy and laity.¹

In his meetings with Metropolitan Theophilus, Archbishop Alexis demanded "that the Metropolia sever all relations with the Church Abroad and cease commemorating Metropolitan Anastasy, and that an All-American Sobor be convoked to be presided over by Archbishop Alexis."²

Theophilus capitulated. He wrote to Metropolitan Anastasy, saying that there was no longer any necessity for the presence of the Church Abroad in America and that the Metropolia planned "to recognize the Patriarch (of Moscow) as its spiritual head with only the following privileges: the blessing of myrrh, the hearing of complaints between bishops, the right to have relations with other Patriarchs, and the right of veto over the future elections of metropolitans of North America, but only on moral or canonical grounds."³

Such an "autonomy" would, of course, place the Metropolia directly under the control of the communists. The Patriarchate could and would have used its right to settle disputes between bishops, for example, to

1. Ibid., pp. 103-4.

2. Ibid., p. 107.

3. Ibid., p. 108.

maximum advantage.

On December 11, 1945, Anastasy telegraphed back to Theophilus: "Your proposed union with the Patriarchate has not only a spiritual but a canonical character and binds you with its consequences. Such a union would be possible only if the Mother Church were completely free, and, moreover, only after a careful discussion of the matter at a general Sobor (of the entire Church Abroad), which at the present time cannot be convoked."

Anastasy concluded, "The overwhelming majority of the bishops, clergy, and believers who have been evacuated to Europe are decidedly against union with the Patriarchate, which is unfree. The existence of the Synod is necessary to support the unity of Russian Orthodox parishes abroad and to avoid anarchy."²

Four American bishops — Archbishops Tikhon and Vitaly, and Bishops Ioasaph and Jerome — strongly opposed union. Two others, Makary and Alexis, decided to anticipate union and went over to the Moscow Patriarchate.³

Metropolitan Theophilus, now playing a double game, in January, 1946, asked the Synod Abroad to confirm the election of Ioann Zlobin to the episcopate. At his ordination Ioann swore loyalty to the Synod Abroad and Metropolitan Anastasy.

On December 22, 1945, Archbishop Leonty (Turkevich) of the Metropolia, writing in the newspaper Rossiya, decided to challenge Archbishop Alexis of Yaroslavl's demand that the Metropolia break with the Church

1. Russian, p. 109.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 111.

Abroad. He claimed that this could be done only by an All-American Sobor, since the All-American Sobor of 1937 had formed the union. He continued, "To speak as if the Synod Abroad does not exist is wrong, because it really does exist and nourishes Russian Orthodox people in Europe and outside of it. . . . How ethical would it be to abandon these bishops, headed by Metropolitan Anastasy, when they are now in such great need of our moral and financial support? In their time they helped us obtain peace with a part of the American Orthodox flock and up to the present time have done nothing bad to us." ¹

At the Great Bishops' Council held in Detroit, May 22-24, 1946, it was decided (1) "after an exchange of opinions to recognize the necessity of coöperation with the Synod Abroad on the basis of brotherly union, taking into consideration the existing autonomy in America of our North American District; (2) to deem it both beneficial and necessary to send our representatives to the Synod Abroad in the future." ² Bishop Jerome of Detroit was then appointed the Metropolia's representative to the Synod for the term of one year. The Council also resolved to write the State Department in Washington asking approval for the arrival in America of Bishop Seraphim (Ivanov) and thirteen Russian monks for church work in the United States. ³

Soon the enemies of the Church Abroad began to move with renewed vigor. On October 27, 1946, five emigré intellectuals of the "Paris"

1. Russian, p. 113.

2. Ibid., p. 116.

3. Russian, p. 116.

orientation, M. Karpovich, N. Timashev, G. Fedotov, P. Zubov, and G. Novitsky published an appeal in the Novoye Russkoye Slovo, a New York Russian daily, asking that the decisions of the 1937 Sobor be abandoned and that the Metropolia go under Moscow on the basis of a broad autonomy. Thus the essentially sound reasoning of the majority of the Metropolia episcopacy was opposed by influential laymen. That one of the intellectuals, G. Fedotov, had even been a professor at the Paris Theological Institute is hardly surprising.

On November 15, 1946, shortly before the gathering of the All-American Sobor, Theophilus wrote Anastasy: "It is my opinion that all bishops abroad should be in charge of the local administration of their districts, but should unite for mutual assistance and cooperation under the leadership of one who is the most worthy and the eldest, either by length or ordination or rank, and who is elected by them. I am deeply convinced that the coming Sobor will obtain positive results and will assist many to understand the inner power of Catholicity in the Church, and that it (i. e., the Sobor) will repudiate a dictatorship stemming from Moscow." ¹

In his "pre-sobor address," printed in the Russian American Orthodox Messenger (November, 1946, no. 11) Theophilus said, "A particular interest is now being shown in Orthodox Americans by Moscow, by the so-called Patriarchal Church, which in reality does not exist - since, after the blessed repose of His Holiness Patriarch Tikhon, the election of his successors by All-Russian Church councils were conducted not according to the canons of the Church but by the ruling (ukaz) of the atheist civil

1. Russian, pp. 120-1.

authorities. For this reason, the Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union has become not a 'Patriarchal' but, on the contrary, a 'Patriarch-less' Church. For us members of the Orthodox Church in America, it is especially necessary that we heed the words of the holy Apostle Paul, 'see then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil. Wherefore be ye not unwise. . . .' (Ephesians 5:15-16)."

Excellent advice which unfortunately Theophilus himself was soon to discard! And here is a newspaper-statement of Archbishop Leonty made after the Sobor had actually begun: "My conscience does not permit me to submit to the Patriarch. In the future the synod of Carlovtsy will come to America, and therefore it is not necessary for us to break ties with it." ¹

Once the All-American Sobor began in Cleveland, on November 26, 1946, however, the advice of the episcopate was thrown to the winds. In reporting this important Sobor we cite the official report given in the Metropolia's own Messenger (December, 1946, no. 12), which was written by the secretary of the Sobor, A. E. Bezsmertny.

It begins: "Behind the episcopal table sat: in the center Blessed Metropolitan Theophilus; to the right of him, the Archbishop of Western America, Tikhon, the Archbishop of Canada, Ioasaph, the Bishop of Pittsburg, Benjamin, and the Bishop of Alaska, Ioann, and to the left, the Archbishop of Eastern America Vitaly, the Archbishop of Chicago Leonty, the Bishop of Detroit Jerome, and, as a guest, Bishop Seraphim who had arrived only a few days previously." ²

1. Ibid., p. 122.

2. Messenger, December, 1946, no. 12, p. 184.

At three o'clock in the afternoon on November 26, the first session of the Sobor began: "It was given over to a hearing of the speeches of (1) the Bishop of Detroit Jerome 'Concerning the situation of the Russian Church Abroad'; (2) Professor N. S. Timashev 'Concerning the Church in the Soviet Union'; and (3) the speech of I. Kozitsky about our Metropolitan District during the time between the Sixth and Seventh All-American Sobors."¹

Then: "The Sobor proceeded to a hearing of the instructions of the delegates from their places and their wishes concerning the question of the mutual relations of our North American Metropolia with the Moscow Patriarchate and the Synod Abroad. In view of the special interest manifested in this question, the Presidium declared that all who wished to state their opinion on this question could do so. Seventy-five persons signed up. The time for each speaker was limited to from five to ten minutes. The hearing of their speeches took almost two full sessions. But, notwithstanding the great number of speakers, it was possible to divide them into two groups: (a) the minority who stated that, in view of the fact that the Moscow Patriarchate was still not free and that the Patriarch could not act without the control of the Soviet regime, it was necessary to wait on the matter of recognition (of Moscow) and in no way change the existing order in America. (b) The other group of speakers insisted on the immediate recognition by our Metropolia of the Patriarch of Moscow as our Spiritual Head, on the confirmation by him of our existing autonomy or self-government in America. All the speakers strongly

1. Ibid.

declared that the Head of our church in America must be Metropolitan Theophilus. There were persons who spoke of the necessity of establishing in America our own Patriarchate, independent of both Moscow and any foreign powers whatever. The majority of the speakers insisted on the immediate cessation of administrative ties with the Synod Abroad, headed by Metropolitan Anastasy." ¹

Then, Metropolitan Theophilus, carried away by the mood of the meeting, gave a speech in which he contradicted his own counsel of the previous month. He declared: "Being autonomous in relation to the Moscow Patriarchate we must also be autonomous in relation to the Synod Abroad, with which, as with the other parts of the Russian Church, we shall have only a prayerful and brotherly relation." ²

The report continues:

"After the end of the speech of His Eminence the Metropolitan, the Sobor sang him a 'Many years.' After this the speech of His Eminence the Metropolitan was translated in abbreviated form into English by Archpriest I. Pishtey. The Sobor was then presented four resolutions. First was the resolution of the Pittsburg clergy which was presented and then accepted by secret ballot. Here is its text:

"The Seventh All-American Church Sobor of the Orthodox Church in America, which has gathered in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, on November 26-29, 1946, after having affirmed our indestructible faith in and loyalty to our elected Eminence Metropolitan Theophilus and after a thorough

1. Messenger, December, 1946, no. 12, p. 184.

2. Ibid., p. 185.

discussion of our relation to our Mother Church the Moscow Patriarchate, asks His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow to unite us to his bosom and to remain our spiritual father, on condition that we shall keep our full autonomy existing at the present time.

"Our highest legal instance must remain our periodic American Church Sobors. At them we elect our metropolitans, select our rules (ustavy) and fully direct our life.

"Since the Moscow Patriarchate is incompatible with the Synod Abroad of the Russian Orthodox Church, the American Church ceases any administrative submission whatever to the Synod Abroad, although it will dwell in brotherly and prayerful communion with all Churches in the dispersion.

"In case His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow should find our conditions unacceptable, our American Orthodox Church will remain in the future self-governing until such time as the Moscow Patriarchate will find them acceptable and grant what we have asked."¹

The vote was 187 for and 61 against this resolution. It was protested by four of the eight voting bishops present (Vitaly, Tikhon, Ioasaph, and Jerome), twenty-six priests, and thirty-one laymen.² After the vote was tabulated, elections took place for the Metropolitan Council and the Revision Commission. All undecided questions were given over to the Metropolitan Council for decision.³

The Orthodox Church is, of course, not a Protestant assembly where

1. Messenger, December, 1946, no. 12, p. 185.

2. Russian, p. 125.

3. Messenger, p. 186.

the simple majority rules. The bishops of the Metropolia, in conformity with the canons of the Orthodox Church, the Temporary Statute, and the rules under which the Metropolia was operating when the Sobor was convoked, were required to ratify the decisions of the Sobor before they could take effect. Since four of the eight bishops present staunchly opposed the Sobor's decisions, and the other four, as evidenced by their pre-Sobor statements, were hardly 100% in favor of them, chances were very slim that such a ratification would take place. Realizing this, Archbishop Leonty and Bishop Benjamin decided to "hurry their departure" before the bishops could meet. Metropolitan Theophilus then seized upon the absence of the two hierarchs to declare that the meeting could not take place "in view of the departure of the two bishops."¹ Thus the Sobor's decisions were not confirmed and remained without any canonical significance.

The Sobor's request that Patriarch Alexis accept the Metropolia with "full autonomy" drew the following answer from the Patriarch in Moscow: "In principle I do not have any objections to autonomy for our Orthodox Church in America. The Metropolitan of Leningrad, Grigory, will in the near future come to America to discuss with your Eminence (i. e., Theophilus) all questions in a peace-loving spirit. May the blessing of God be upon you and your flock. From now on I consider Your Eminence to be in prayerful communion with us. Concelebrate with Metropolitan Benjamin (of the Patriarchal Exarchate in America) as a sign of this communion."²

1. Russian, p. 126.

2. Russian, pp. 126-7.

On January 28, 1947, Archbishop Leonty, suffering a remorse of conscience, wrote the following to Metropolitan Anastasy, "I am deeply ashamed that my former students of the seminary, now pastors of the Russian Orthodox Church, should have been so in favor, following after the masses, (massa) of recognizing His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow while not taking into consideration the clear indications of his more than submissive position in the U.S.S.R. But the masses were in a mood strongly opposed to our connections with the Synod Abroad. . . . The only way out was to preserve an autonomous existence both as regarding the Patriarch and the Synod." ¹

It is unbelievable that a bishop of the Orthodox Church could write such a letter. Leonty himself bears witness that the Sobor was run by "mob rule." But since when do archpastors of the Church feel that they have to submit, even against their consciences, to the "mob" dictates of their flock? Had Leonty not fled the Sobor, he could have joined Vitaly, Tikhon, Ioasaph, and Jerome in vetoing the Sobor's decisions. What Leonty obviously feared was that such a move would lead to an exodus of rebellious parishes from the Metropolia. A number of wealthy and influential Carpatho-russian parishes had threatened to leave the Metropolia if it did not follow their will. ²

On May 22, 1947, Archbishop Vitaly, who together with Tikhon, Jerome, and Ioasaph had been excluded from the Metropolia without a canonical trial (and such a trial would have been difficult to hold, since they made up half of the Metropolia episcopate, not counting Bishop Seraphim

1. Ibid., p. 133.

2. Russian, p. 129.

who was also of their opinion), wrote: "the abnormality of the matter of the resolutions of the Cleveland Sobor is evident first of all from the fact that, notwithstanding the fact that six months have passed, these decisions have been nowhere officially announced, have not been communicated to the bishops and signed by them, have not been presented to the Synod Abroad. One hears of them only from unofficial sources."

He continues: "In accordance with paragraph 37 of the Instruction (Nakaz) to the Sobor (in the 1946, no. 1 Russian American Orthodox Messenger) all decisions of the Sobor can take legal effect only when they are approved by a conference of bishops. The Instruction is in full accordance with the canonical rules and the practice of the entire Orthodox Church, with the order of handling matters at the great Moscow Church Sobor of 1917-18, and with the order established by the North American Metropolitan District, following the decisions of the Chicago Sobor of 1936."¹

Vitaly concludes: "Such an ordering of ecclesiastical life, in which the highest legal power is vested in Church sobors composed in the main of lower clergy and laymen, with the bishops having only a single vote, is already completely non-Orthodox."²

Vitaly's statement was signed by Tikhon, Ioasaph, Jerome, and Seraphim.

On July 17, 1947, Metropolitan Grigory of Leningrad arrived in the United States. He was met at the airport by Archbishop Leonty and a group

1. Ibid., p. 138.

2. Russian, p. 140.

of clergy.¹ Then he was taken to the Metropolia's Second Street Cathedral where he was honored. Almost immediately, however, Leonty and Metropolitan Theophilus cooled towards their new guest. Writing in the Metropolia's Messenger, Leonty heatedly rejected Grigory's request for a loyalty oath to the Soviet government.² In the August 8, 1947, issue of Novoye Russkoye Slovo Theophilus accused Grigory of trying to destroy the peace of the Church.³

In October, 1947, according to Bishop Ioann (Shahovskoy) (a newly-ordained Metropolia bishop and violent enemy of the Church Abroad, who had played no small role at the Cleveland Sobor), Metropolitan Grigory let it be known he was willing to "soften" his loyalty demands. All that was necessary was for the Metropolia to submit to Moscow as an autonomous Church.⁴

A council of the bishops of the Metropolia held in San Francisco November 12-14, 1947 (Vitaly and his four like-minded brother-bishops were, of course, not invited), decided the following: (1) To put off the formation of canonical ties with Moscow to a more opportune time; (2) To continue to commemorate the suffering Church of Russia in the person of its First-hierarchy, His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia; (3) To live on the former basis, carrying out full autonomy in Church life in accordance with the decisions of the Seventh All-American Church Sobor.

This decision was signed by Theophilus, Leonty, Ioann of Alaska, and the new bishops Nikon of Philadelphia and Ioann (Shahovskoy) of

1. Ibid., p. 144.
2. Ibid., p. 149.
3. Ibid., p. 151.
4. Ibid., p. 152.

Brooklyn.

On December 14, 1947, Archbishop Vitaly convoked a council of those hierarchs who had remained faithful to the Church Abroad. Concerning the decisions of the Metropolia bishops' conference in San Francisco, it was said, "The participants of the recent Bishops' Council in San Francisco are consciously and intentionally concealing the truth and leading their flock into temptation by stating that they are now declaring not the autocephaly but the autonomy of the Russian Orthodox Metropolia in America. For anyone even slightly acquainted with the canons of the Church, it is obvious that if the American Metropolia does not have ties and relations with the Moscow Patriarchate or with any other Highest Church centers but decides all ecclesiastical matters by herself, in complete independence, without being judicially dependent on anyone, then this is not ecclesiastical autonomy but autocephaly."¹

Professor Bogolepov has recently admitted that Vitaly was right. In discussing the draft which the Metropolia submitted to Metropolitan Grigory of Leningrad, he remarks, "Criticizing this draft, Metropolitan Grigory correctly noted that, while recognizing the Patriarch as 'spiritual father,' the plan 'establishes an imaginary, nominal bond' with him and in essence 'already proposes not an autonomous but an autocephalous government. . . .'"²

Upon learning of the Metropolia's refusal, Patriarch Alexis, or rather his masters, decided that Metropolitan Grigory had done "all that

1. Russian, p. 154.

2. In The Orthodox Church, March, 1970, p. 5.

was possible to halt the division caused by that part of the Russian Orthodox Church which had gone into schism from the Mother Russian Church."¹ Archbishop Makary, formerly of the Metropolia, was named Patriarchal Exarch, and Archbishop Adam, also formerly of the Metropolia, was named his deputy.²

Metropolitan Theophilus, Leonty of Chicago, Ioann of Alaska, Ioann of Brooklyn, and Bishop Nikon were subjected to an ecclesiastical trial "for stubborn opposition to the calls of the Mother Church to communion, for having drawn their flock into schism against the wish of the flock itself as expressed in the decisions of the Cleveland Sobor, and, above all, for the illegal 'anathema' (proklyatie) placed on Archbishop Makary for having united with the Moscow Patriarchate."³ The ban which had been placed on Theophilus on January 5, 1935, by Metropolitan Sergius and "conditionally removed" in January, 1947, by Patriarch Alexis was declared to be once more in effect. The ban was also extended to cover all the Metropolia bishops who had followed Theophilus into "schism."⁴

Was this not, one might ask Professor Bogolepov and Fr. Meyendorff, a "canonical" action of the "Mother Church"? If so, then the Metropolia was ejected from the Church and her sacraments rendered null and void for the next twenty-three years.

In February, 1948, the Moscow Patriarchate seized St. Nicholas Cathedral in New York from the Metropolia by a court action.⁵

1. Russian, p. 155.

2. Ibid.

3. Russian, p. 155.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p. 156.

The Metropolia's recognition of Patriarch Alexis as its "spiritual head" left it no defence against the Patriarchate, which was to seize a number of Metropolia parishes through the courts in the years which followed.

In September, 1948, the Metropolia lost an even more important legal case to the Church Abroad in the Superior Court of Los Angeles. The trial lasted twenty days. The Metropolia was represented by Metropolitan Theophilus, who was questioned for five entire days, Protopresbyter G. Lomako, Archpriest A. Kukulevsky, two lawyers, the Episcopalian scholar O. Harris, and a Mr. Vysheslavitsev. The Church Abroad was represented by Archpriest Michael Polsky and two lawyers. Archbishop Tikhon was questioned for half an hour.¹

"Everyone had the 'Book of Canons' in English. The Metropolia's lawyer had up to thirty books in English and Russian, and he gave them and translations from them to the judge to read. The canons were checked against the original Greek and dictionaries were used."²

The representatives for the Metropolia actually bore witness against themselves. When, for example, Fr. Lomako was questioned on a certain canon, he said: "That canon refers to an autocephalous Church. What autocephaly does this Church (i. e., the Metropolia) have?" When asked if the canons spoke of the laity's right to govern the Church (as happened at the Cleveland Sobor), Fr. Lomako said they did not.³

Thus by the mercy of God, the truth about the Church Abroad triumphed over the lawlessness of the Metropolia in a Los Angeles civil

1. Russian, p. 160.

2. Ibid., p. 161.

3. Ibid.

court.¹

The Court decided: "The Bishops' council and the Holy Synod of the Church Abroad constitute the supreme judicial tribunals of the Church organization upon matters of faith, discipline, general policy, and tenets of the Church."²

Concerning the Cleveland Sobor of 1946 which led the Metropolia into schism from the Church Abroad, the court stated, "The defendants (viz., the Metropolia) have cited no canon to support their contention that supreme power is lodged in a general sobor composed of bishops, clergy, and laity. As was previously stated in this opinion, a study of the canons has convinced the court that the control of the Church and its maintenance has been placed in the bishops themselves. Unless it is necessary for all matters acted upon by a general Sobor, affecting the whole Church, to be submitted to the conference of bishops, it would be possible for the control of the Church to be almost completely in the hands of the laity."³

Thus a purely objective law court saw what the Metropolia would not and still refuses to see — that the Cleveland Sobor of 1946 was "Robber Council" without canonical significance, and that by separating itself from the Church Abroad in 1946 the Metropolia went into schism and left the unity of the Church of Christ.

1. Anyone concerned with the canonical status and moral position of the Metropolia should read this decision, which was reprinted in the original English by Jordanville Monastery in 1949 under the title In the Superior Court of the State of California.
2. In the Superior, p. 15.
3. Ibid., p. 18.

From 1946 until 1970 the Metropolia continually aggravated her state of schism. Metropolitan Leonty, who in 1950 succeeded the deceased Theophilus, often intimated to Metropolitan Anastasy that union was still possible; yet when in 1963 he was approached by the notorious enemy of Christ, Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad, Leonty started the negotiations which were to lead to the receipt of autocephaly in 1970 under his successor Metropolitan Ireney. Thus, after the fiascoes of 1924, 1927, and 1946, the Metropolia finally received a nominal "autocephaly" on her fourth attempt.

To conclude this treatment of the Metropolia's tragic history, we will deal briefly with the attempts of Professor Bogolepov to rationalize the unjustifiable and explain the inexplicable.

Bogolepov, trying desperately to challenge the 1948 decisions of the California Superior Court in favor of the Synod, first aims his legal arrows against the Temporary Statute, — an embarrassing document for a Church which he asserts to have been autocephalous since 1924. He claims that the Statute was not accepted "in the wording accepted by the Bishops' Sobor at Carlovtsy in 1935."¹

"The American Metropolitanate could not be united with the Russian dioceses abroad without the approval of the Statute of the All-American Sobor. The Sixth All-American Sobor of 1937 adopted the 1935 Provisional Statute subject to certain adjustments to local conditions of the (American Metropolitan) district."²

1. Bogolepov, Towards, p. 64.

2. Ibid.

He continues: "The most important change of the Provisional Statute was the preservation of the All-American Sobor, vested with the power to resolve the problems of Church organization by virtue of its own authority."¹

At the 1937 Sobor, according to Bogolepov, "the bishops appointed by the Bishops' Synod Abroad requested that the amendments adopted by the Sobor be submitted to the Bishops' Sobor Abroad for approval, but the All-American Sobor rejected this suggestion."² Finally the Sobor agreed to submit its decisions to the Bishops' Sobor Abroad "for its 'information' only and not for 'approval.'"³

Unlike Professor Bogolepov, we can scarcely applaud this action on the part of the 1937 Sobor. While confirming the "Temporary Statute," according to which the highest administrative and judicial organ of the entire Church Abroad was the yearly Bishops' Council of the representatives of the four metropolitan districts, the Sobor sought to keep the All-American Sobor itself out of the control of the Bishops' Councils. Thus, while all decisions of the bishops' councils of the American Metropolia had to be approved by the Bishops' Councils in Carlovtsy,⁴ the All-American Sobors themselves were supposed to be free of such controls. It would appear, therefore, that even when entering the Church Abroad the Metropolia engaged in duplicity. However, one wonders if Bogolepov's attempt to circumvent the clear implications of the 1937 decision actually succeeds. If under the new arrangement the councils of the Church Abroad could veto

1. Ibid., p. 67.

2. Ibid., pp. 67-8.

3. Bogolepov, Towards, p. 68.

4. Ibid., pp. 68-9.

decisions of the Metropolia bishops' councils, could they not also veto the decisions of these councils to convoke an All-American Sobor? Surely the decision of the American bishops was necessary to call the Sobors.

In any case, the Church Abroad, knowing by painful experience what the intentions of the Metropolia were, decided to apply extreme "economy" at this point, hoping that once the Metropolia had entered the unity of the Church Abroad, she would gradually lose her harmful "autocephalous" yearnings.

Bogolepov also tries to cast doubts on the 1937 Sobor by stating that its decisions are suspect because bishops, clergy, and laity of the Church Abroad participated in the voting, and because the vote to accept the Temporary Statute was only 105 for, 9 against, with 122 abstentions.¹ Thus the great spontaneous thrust for union of the Church Abroad and Metropolia is considered by Attorney Bogolepov as an "evil," and the fact that 122 individuals were afraid to express their opinion a legal factor. There is no question (here one can agree with Bogolepov) that the union of the Metropolia and the Synod in America was carried out by Patriarch Varnava of Serbia, the Church Abroad, and a responsible minority of the Metropolia. The "masses," to use Archbishop Leonty's phrase, were always desirous of autocephaly.

When Bogolepov comes to the Cleveland Sobor of 1946, which dissolved the union of the Metropolia with the Church Abroad, he again manifests his ultra-juridical mentality: "The question arises. . . . as to why the decision of the Seventh All-American Sobor to end its relationship with the Church

1. Ibid., pp. 71-2.

Abroad was not submitted for approval to the bishops who attended the Sobor, although a rule to that effect was promulgated by Metropolitan Theophilus in his 'Instruction' prior to the holding of the Sobor. During the course of the sessions this provision was changed by the Sobor, which resolved that its decisions not be submitted for the approval of the Bishops' Conference." ¹

Bogolepov admits that this action "violated the rules of procedure" (to say nothing of the Holy Canons), but hastens to add, in what is surely one of the finest pieces of pettifoggery ever: "But a violation of the rules of procedure may invalidate a resolution only if such violation substantially leads to the adoption of the resolution. In this case, however, the resolution of the Sobor – accepted without submitting it to the Bishops' Conference for approval – would have been approved unchanged if it had been submitted to that Conference. The All-American Sobor of 1946 was attended by nine bishops only. One of them, Bishop Seraphim, was there only as a guest and had no right to vote. Four bishops belonged to the Carlovtsi group and were against the resolution of the Sobor, while the other four, headed by Metropolitan Theophilus, supported it. In the case of a tie the deciding vote is usually (!) cast by the president." ²

This last statement did not satisfy even Bogolepov's own colleague at St. Vladimir's Seminary, Professor Nicholas Arseniev, who wrote in his review of Bogolepov's Toward an American Orthodox Church, "In one passage (pp. 69-70) where, referring to the fact that the decisions

1. Ibid., p. 69.

2. Ibid., pp. 69-70.

of the All-American Sobor held in 1946 have not been submitted for approval to a conference of bishops of the Sobor, the author emits the opinion that no importance has to be attached to these circumstances. He seems to abandon here his usual strongly juridical way of approach and his argument appears to me here less impressive than in other cases."¹

Professor Arseniev is too kind. Alexander Bogolepov's attempt to explain away a shocking infringement of the canons should cause those (such as Katherine Valone of the Logos) who were impressed by his juridical argumentation to take another look at Toward an American Orthodox Church. Consider how Bogolepov, in speaking of the Cleveland Sobor invents a new canonical body – the conditional council of Bishops which would have done such-and-such if it had met. Just as he constructs a fictitious "autocephaly" in 1924, so he has a hypothetical Metropolia Bishops' Council hypothetically approve the Cleveland Sobor's actions. For the Orthodox Church, however, a council not held is no council at all. The Cleveland Sobor remains what it is, a Robber Council, and the beginning of a new Metropolia schism.

We conclude this chapter with an appeal to the American Metropolia issued by Archbishop Vitaly after the 1946 schism, and which is particularly relevant today:

"Brethren, Orthodox people of America and Canada! It has long been time for us to cease our vacillations, to accept Church discipline, to bring ourselves to order, to abandon our wilfulness and arbitrariness, to stand on the path of legality and the Church canons. We cannot continually cast

1. S.V.S.Q., vol. VIII, no. 1, 1964, p. 50.

ourselves from one side to the other, extract autonomy and at times autocephaly as well by illicit means, as if there were some dire need for getting around the law. There can be no Divine blessing on such acts. There is no other way before God, conscience, and law for the whole Russian Church Abroad, separated as she is from the Mother Church by a theomachistic, false, and hypocritical regime of deceivers, than to unite under the authority of a council of all the Russian Bishops abroad and its permanent organ, the Bishops' Synod." ¹

1. Vitaly, op. cit., p. 50.

Chapter IV: Is The Metropolia Ready For Autocephaly?

The preceding chapters have demonstrated that since 1946 the American Metropolia has been in a state of schism from the Church Abroad. Being in such a state, she could of course in no way be considered "ready" for autocephaly.

Moreover, in other respects as well the Metropolia is demonstrably unprepared for autocephaly. This has been pointed out recently by the Church Abroad in a whole series of letters and articles appearing in the Russian daily Novoye Ruskoye Slovo, the Synod's bi-monthly Russian publication Orthodox Russia, and in its English publications The Orthodox Word, Orthodox Life, Orthodoxy, and The Orthodox Christian Witness. A typical statement on the question is the letter of Hierodeacon John [Melander] of Holy Trinity Monastery, Jordanville, New York, to the magazine Logos: "As for Orthodoxy in America in general, it is not ready for such a move [as autocephaly]. Namely, **it has not yet shown the fruits of piety in this new land**, in the words of Metropolitan Philaret [of the Synod]. When a regional Church is prepared to receive independence, it must demonstrate that it has matured sufficiently for such a move, that Orthodoxy has become firmly rooted in that region, that its spiritual life is flourishing in the highest degree, and that it is able to look after its own self. Until such a time, it is like a child which must live under the guidance and protection of its mother. But what do we see in America? Can one really say that Orthodoxy is flourishing here? **On the contrary, one can say that there is a falling away.** [Logos, May, 1970, p. 2]

Fr. Melander's comments will no doubt prove unimpressive to Metropolia adherents, who will probably protest that Orthodoxy is flourishing in America, that a "new era" has arrived. To back up Fr. Melander's statement, therefore, we shall call on Fr. Alexander Schmemmann, dean of St. Vladimir's Seminary and leading Metropolia spokesman. In a series of articles entitled "Problems of Orthodoxy in America," published in St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, Fr. Alexander drew on his long experience with the life of the Metropolia to show the terrible state of affairs the jurisdiction is actually in. Throughout these articles one hears a muted cry of despair over a disintegrating Orthodoxy.

In his article devoted to "The Spiritual Problem," Fr. Alexander affirms that, "**Orthodoxy in America is in the midst of a serious spiritual crisis which endangers its very existence as Orthodoxy.**" [S.V.S.Q., vol. IX, no. 4, 1965, p. 171]

He continues:

"Nothing probably reveals better the nature of the crisis than the impressive amount of doctrines, rules, teachings, and customs which, although taken for granted for centuries as essential for Orthodoxy, are by a wide consensus declared to be 'impossible' here in America. Speak to a Bishop, then to a priest, be he old or young, speak finally to an active and dedicated layman

and you will discover that in spite of all the differences between their respective points of view they all agree on the same 'impossibilities.' Thus you will learn that **it is impossible to enforce here the canonical norms of the Church**, impossible to preserve from the wonderfully rich liturgical traditions of the Church anything except Sunday morning worship and a few 'days of obligation' common in fact to all 'denominations,' impossible to interest people in anything but social activities, impossible. . . But when you add up all these and many other 'impossibilities' **you must conclude, if you are logical and consistent, that for some reason it is impossible for the Orthodox Church in America to be Orthodox**, at least in the meaning given this term 'always, everywhere by all.'" [S.V.S.Q., vol. IX, no. 4, 1965, pp. 171-2]

He goes on: "There have always been minimalistic attitudes among clergy and laity. But they were always recognized as such, never accepted as the **norm**. A Christian could think it impossible **for him** to live by Christian standards, but it never entered his mind to minimize the demands of the Church." [Ibid., p. 172]

The Metropolia and other jurisdictions in America, according to Fr. Alexander, have done just that -- tacitly agreed to accept the minimal as the norm. If, one is tempted to ask, there is a "consensus" that traditional Orthodoxy is "impossible" in America and that minimalism must be the norm in Church life, then how can it be that the Metropolia is "ready" for autocephaly, i.e., total self-government and the complete management of her own affairs?

Fr. Alexander continues his indictment:

"The spiritual crisis of Orthodoxy in America consists, therefore, in the fact that in spite of. . . absolute incompatibility, **Orthodoxy is in the process of a progressive surrender to secularism**, and this surrender is all the more tragic because it is unconscious." [S.V.S.Q., vol. IX, no. 4, 1965, p. 175]

nominations, 'impossible to interest people in anything but social activities, impossible. . . . But when you add up all these and many other 'impossibilities' you must conclude, if you are logical and consistent, that for some reason it is impossible for the Orthodox Church in America to be Orthodox, at least in the meaning given this term 'always, everywhere by all.'¹

He goes on: "There have always been minimalistic attitudes among clergy and laity. But they were always recognized as such, never accepted as the norm. A Christian could think it impossible for him to live by Christian standards, but it never entered his mind to minimize the demands of the Church."²

The Metropolia and other jurisdictions in America, according to Fr. Alexander, have done just that - tacitly agreed to accept the minimal as the norm. If, one is tempted to ask, there is a "consensus" that traditional Orthodoxy is "impossible" in America and that minimalism must be the norm in Church life, then how can it be that the Metropolia is "ready" for autocephaly, i. e., total self-government and the complete management of her own affairs?

Fr. Alexander continues his indictment:

"The spiritual crisis of Orthodoxy in America consists, therefore, in the fact that in spite of. . . . absolute incompatibility, Orthodoxy is in the process of a progressive surrender to secularism, and this surrender is all the more tragic because it is unconscious."³

1. S.V.S.Q., vol. IX, no. 4, 1965, pp. 171-2.

2. Ibid., p. 172.

3. S.V.S.Q., vol. IX, no. 4, 1965, p. 175.

Fr. Alexander then moves on to a discussion of various aspects of Church life in the Metropolia. Thus he has the following to say about her bishops:

"An old Bishop, himself a holy and lovable man, once told me the story of his pastoral visit to one of the big parishes. Everything 'went fine' — the solemn service, the banquet in the best hotel, the visit with the Mayor, Congressman, and other local powers. But then, he said, something strange happened. A young woman asked him for an appointment and wanted him to tell her about spiritual life. The old bishop was deeply astonished. So obviously this incident was out of pattern, out of touch with his whole experience as pastor, administrator, and bishop."¹

Concerning the Metropolia parishes he states:

"The parish constitutes the main battlefield of the war between Orthodoxy and the growing secularization of the American Orthodox. It is here that the spiritual crisis is made obvious by the progressive lack of communication and understanding between clergy and laity, on the one hand, and by the impoverishment of the liturgical and spiritual content of Orthodoxy on the other hand."²

Of the Metropolia laity Fr. Alexander has this to say:

"A recent survey shows that more than seventy-five percent of parishioners in 'good standing' have never read the Gospel — except what they hear in Church on Sunday — not to speak of the Old Testament."³

In another article, "The Task of Orthodox Theology in America Today,"

1. Ibid., p. 181.

2. Ibid., p. 182.

3. S.V.S.Q., vol. IX, no. 4, 1965, p. 190.

Fr. Alexander asks, "How long shall we leave unnoticed the quick decay in liturgy, spirituality, and monasticism - the traditional sources of Orthodox piety and continuity?"¹

A jurisdiction rapidly succumbing to secularism, whose bishops, clergy, and laity have virtually abandoned traditional Orthodoxy, a jurisdiction where "liturgy, spirituality, and monasticism" are in a state of "quick decay" - is such a jurisdiction "overripe" for autocephaly as the Metropolia leadership and its Logos fellow-travellers now claim? In any case, the Fr. Alexander Schmemmann of 1965-66 witnesses strongly and convincingly to the contrary.

It ought also to be mentioned that Fr. Alexander omitted certain problems - for example, the very heavy inroads being made by Masonry into the membership of the Metropolia. He also overlooked the woeful shortage of clergy in the Metropolia. In her recent wild and reckless dash for autocephaly the Metropolia boasted that she had over 400 parishes. This was a typical Metropolia half-truth. According to an article by Fr. Kallistos Timothy Ware of Oxford, which appeared recently in the Eastern Churches Review under the title "Orthodoxy in America: Some Statistics," 174 of the 411 parishes claimed by the Metropolia are without a priest.² In Alaska and Canada, where priestly vocations are low, the situation is desperate. As a point of comparison one might take the American Greek Archdiocese, which, according to Fr. Ware, claims 420 parishes. Of these only 41 are without a priest. According to the statistics presented by Fr. Ware, the Metropolia's priestless parish percentage is

1. Ibid., vol. X, no. 4, 1966, p. 188.

2. Eastern Churches Review, vol. II, no. 1, Spring, 1968, pp. 73-4.

by far the worst of any jurisdiction in America.

The spiritual life of the American Metropolia is, furthermore, being rapidly undermined by another force which Fr. Schmemmann ignores because this time he is one of its foremost representatives. We are speaking of theological modernism.

In Chapter II of this study it was shown that theological modernism was one of the principal causes leading to the schism of Metropolitan Evlogy's diocese from the Church Abroad. Fr. Schmemmann, Fr. Meyendorff, and a number of other emigré Metropolia leaders who received their theological training at the Theological Institute in Paris inevitably brought the "Paris spirit" with them to America. They do not conceal but rather boast of their love for the Theological Institute. Thus, for example, Fr. Meyendorff writes in his book The Orthodox Church, "Paris quickly became the chief intellectual center for the Russian emigration. Nicholas Berdiaev, Sergius Bulgakov, and many other leading thinkers helped to acquaint the West with the thought, spirituality, and traditions of the Christian East. The Theological Institute of St. Sergius in Paris, under the guidance of Metropolitan Eulogios and a group of capable and talented professors, has trained more than 150 Orthodox priests and has taken a very active part in promoting ecumenical discussions over the years."¹

Fr. Meyendorff to the contrary, the thought of Nicholas Berdiaev had precious little to do with the "thought, spirituality, and traditions of the Christian East." According to his own admission, Berdiaev was most profoundly affected by the wildly heretical Western Gnostic and spiritualist

1. The Orthodox Church, New York, 1962, pp. 187-8.

Jacob Boehme and a host of Western free-thinkers. As for Fr. Sergius Bulgakov, Dean of the Theological Institute until his death in 1944, words fail even to describe the attacks he mounted against the Orthodox faith. Condemned as a heresiarch by both the Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate (through the efforts of Vladimir Lossky) for his blasphemous neo-Gnostic doctrine of "Sophiology," Bulgakov was sheltered by Metropolitan Evlogy and the staff of the Institute.

In our treatment of the Institute staff we shall concentrate not on their neo-Gnosticism (which is obviously un-Orthodox for anyone with even the slightest insight into the faith), but rather on their ecclesiology, for it is here that St. Vladimir's in New York is the direct heir of St. Sergius' in Paris.

The question concerns the "limits of the Church." The traditional Orthodox doctrine, as taught unanimously by Scripture and the Holy Fathers of the Eastern Church, is that the limits of the Church on earth correspond exactly to the canonical limits of the Orthodox Church. No grace is communicated through the Mysteries (sacraments) of those outside the one holy, catholic, and apostolic Orthodox Church. This teaching, illustrated and defended with brilliant lucidity by the holy martyr St. Cyprian of Carthage, has always been maintained by the Orthodox Church, with the qualification that (as formulated in St. Basil the Great's first holy canon) some heterodox may at times through "economy" be accepted without the repetition of the rites of baptism. Thus for "the salvation of the greater number" the Church is prepared under certain conditions to relax her canonical strictness (akribeia), and give life to the dead ceremonial forms

of certain heretics upon their being admitted to the Orthodox Church.

This practice received confirmation with Canon VII of the Second Oecumenical Council and in subsequent Councils of the Orthodox Church. Outside the canonical limits of the Orthodox Church, however, the sacraments of heterodox are null and void, conveying no Grace. Further, although by the infinite mercy of our Saviour any man may be saved, the Orthodox Church has always taught the necessity of being in her ranks for certainty of salvation. Outside the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church of Christ the likelihood of salvation is infinitely less than in her Grace-filled Body which unites heaven and earth.

The Western Church fell away from this correct Orthodox teaching at an early date. Augustine of Hippo in his De Baptismo and elsewhere elaborated a theory according to which true sacraments, or at least their "character" or "stamp," can be administered even in heresy. St. Cyprian's doctrine was rejected. The Western scholastics seized upon Augustine's mistaken formulations and developed an entire system in which true Mysteries, including the Saviour himself in the Holy Eucharist, can belong to those outside the one Church. This doctrine infiltrated Russia in the XVIII and XIX centuries and was even held by Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow. At all times, however, there could be found men in Russia who voiced the correct Orthodox teaching, which was held unswervingly by the Greek Churches of the time. Thus Alexis Khomyakov, the great lay theologian, insisted on the uniqueness of the Orthodox Church and denied that true Mysteries could exist outside her. Similar declarations were made by God-bearers such as Bishop Ignaty Bryanchanninov, Bishop Theophan the

Recluse, Staretz Amvrossy of Optina, and Father John of Kronstadt. In the XX century the doctrine was taught by Metropolitan Antony of Kiev and Archbishop Hilarion (Troitsky). Had the Revolution not occurred, it is quite certain that the traditional Orthodox teaching would have prevailed.

The "Paris theologians," sheltered by Metropolitan Evlogy, elected to take the Scholastic doctrine of the "limits of the Church" to its logical conclusion. Here is a typical statement of Fr. Bulgakov's: "The efficacy of the Sacraments is mutually recognized by the divided Churches, at least by Orthodoxy and Rome. The sacrament of the Eucharist is also regarded as effective: it is valid, but not effective¹ beyond the limits of one's own Church for the members of the divided Churches. Of course if we absolutely deny the validity of the sacraments outside a particular confession (as is the case still with certain Orthodox theologians who are of this opinion, viz., the Metropolitan Anthony (of Kiev) and others), then the very question of any union in the sacrament falls to the ground. But if we recognize the validity of the sacrament, which is in fact the case both with the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Churches, then the question arises, may not this efficacy of the sacrament become real in actual Intercommunion..."²

Consistently following his blasphemous and completely indefensible sophistries to the end, Bulgakov advocated intercommunion — at least for a certain "elect" between Orthodoxy and Anglicanism and Orthodoxy and Rome — before the attainment of doctrinal unity.

Having given true sacraments to the heterodox, Bulgakov and his

1. A quibble invented by Augustine and put to great use by the Western Scholastics.
2. Sobornost, June 1935, p. 9.

followers then turned on all those such as Metropolitan Antony, head of the Church Abroad, who defended the uniqueness of the Orthodox Church.

Thus, Nicholas Zernov, a former secretary of the Russian Student Christian Movement, writes: "It is not heretics and schismatics, but zealous Christians, who have inflicted the greatest harm upon the Church, by cutting off from their fellowship all who would not follow their form of worship, by persecuting those who do not accept their interpretation of the Incarnation. . . . The task before the Christian Church today, therefore, is not reunion — the Church has always been and always will be one — but reconciliation among its disunited members. . . ." ¹

Consider how Zernov blasphemes the decisions of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Oecumenical Councils of the Orthodox Church ("their interpretation of the Incarnation"), and mocks the very idea that heretics could have left the oneness of the Church.

Since all heterodox are granted membership in the one Church through their possession of its sacraments and are therefore "Christians," the belief that they should be converted to Orthodoxy was attacked by the leaders of the Paris diocese. Metropolitan Evlogy openly condemned the principle of proselytism: "The principle of proselytizing among Christians belonging to a different Church is incompatible with the Spirit of Christ's teaching and has little in common with apostolic zeal." ² Showing that he has inherited the principle of non-proselytism, Fr. Meyendorff of the Metropolia writes in his The Orthodox Church, "Owing to the presence of Russian emigrés, but without any efforts at proselytism on their

1. The Reintegration of the Church, London, 1952, pp. 33-4.
2. In L.A. Zander, Vision and Action, London, 1953, p. 158.

part, a number of Western Orthodox communities began to be formed in France and Germany. . . ." ¹

Fr. Meyendorff seems to be implying that any attempt to persuade heretics to return to the unity of the Church is at least in bad taste and probably morally wrong. He is fully in accord with Metropolitan Evlogy on this point.

This irresponsible attitude is set forth most clearly in a book by Professor L. A. Zander of the Theological Institute, entitled Vision and Action. Zander, who died in 1964, asks: "What is a heretic for us if we consider him sine ire et studio? In the first instance a brother, a brother in Christ, for only a Christian can be called a heretic." ²

One must in all seriousness ask whether Professor Zander has ever read the pronouncements of the Church Fathers on heretics. Certainly he presents a totally new and wholly un-Orthodox view of those who have left the Church of the Apostles.

Zander relates the following story as an illustration of his maxim. In May, 1927, Fr. Sergius Bulgakov, "who combined keen confessional consciousness with profound ecumenical conviction," returned from an interconfessional conference at Lausanne. He was "grieved and disappointed." "When he had raised his voice to defend the veneration of Our Lady. . . . the chairman of the meeting would not allow him to speak, and Fr. Sergius felt this as an act of hostility towards the most intimate truth of Orthodoxy. Talking about Protestants (whom he viewed, in general,

1. The Orthodox Church, New York, 1962, p. 188.

2. Vision and Action, London, 1953, p. 101.

with certain severity) I asked him: 'But you love them, don't you? Why?' His answer may sound like a truism, but he put into it such power of conviction and vision that it seemed to me, as it were, the solution of the whole problem of ecumenism. 'Because they are Christians,' he said, 'And can one fail to love a Christian?'"¹

Bulgakov and Zander exhibit here a strange disregard for those decisions of the Third and Fifth Ecumenical Councils which explicitly anathematize all who will not venerate the Mother of our blessed Saviour.

Evlogy's principle of non-proselytism elicits the following comment from Zander: "In practice it means that, although I see that my brother is erring, I make no attempt to disabuse him of his errors and to set him in the way of truth. The first conclusion to be drawn from this is that those errors are not an absolute obstacle to salvation, and that heretics can be saved."²

What can we say to this? Yes, it is possible that by the infinite mercy of God some heretics may be saved. But it is sheer madness to conclude, as Zander does, that false beliefs have little or no bearing on salvation. Here again Zander shows his complete blindness to the entire Orthodox tradition.

What are we to think of an episcopate which permitted the dissemination of such dangerous ideas? And why did not the other members of the faculty at the Paris Theological Institute condemn the book? On the contrary, it seems that Prof. Zander's former colleagues and students—

1. Vision and Action, p. 99.

2. Ibid., p. 113.

Fr. Alexander Schmemmann among them — retain the most positive impression of Zander.

In an article dedicated to the memory of the recently-deceased Zander, Fr. Schmemmann writes: "Professor Zander died in a train while returning to Paris after a lecturing tour in Germany; this death was indeed symbolical: for the last forty years he was constantly 'on the go,' a real itinerant apostle of Orthodoxy."¹ Zander's Vision and Action from which we have quoted is proclaimed by Fr. Schmemmann "an important book on the ecumenical movement."² The testimonial continues: "To us L. A. remains an inspiring image of a layman totally devoted to the Church, truly and fully living her life, the example of a wonderful apostolic zeal, and, last but not least, of genuine Christianity." Although Fr. Schmemmann concedes frequent disagreement between himself and Zander on a number of issues, he concludes as follows: "no disagreement (with Zander), however radical, could have any impact on personal friendship and mutual respect."³

Fr. Schmemmann in the Parisian tradition refuses to criticize the disastrous doctrines of Zander. "Friendship" — sentimentally interpreted — is here made an ultimate value. The contrast with the attitude of the saintly Fathers of the Church could not be more striking. Could we for a minute imagine St. Athanasius, for example, calling Arius "an inspiring image," an "example of genuine Christianity"?

Let us not forget that both Zander and Fr. Schmemmann lay claim to

1. S.V.S.Q., vol. IX, no. 1, 1965, p. 40.
2. Loc. cit.
3. Loc. cit.

being theologians. As such, their function is to illuminate the faith for the faithful, to search for means of expressing the eternal truths of Orthodoxy, to build within the living tradition. The intellectual content of the faith cannot, by definition, be unimportant to them. And yet we see Zander unflinchingly and unequivocally jettisoning large and essential parts of traditional Orthodox doctrine, while Fr. Schmemmann assumes a laissez-faire attitude towards him.

It is unfortunate that the whole atmosphere of the Paris Theological Institute was conducive to just such episodes. Where theological innovation was the norm and episcopal control was lax or non-existent, a disciplined commitment to traditional Orthodoxy could not but give way to unbridled speculations and theological license.

Bulgakov, Zernov, and Zander were the more prominent exponents of the Paris Theological Institute. At present the faculty can boast of at least two members who are continuing the traditions of Bulgakov, Zernov, and Zander. They are the arch-ecumenist Paul Evdokimov,¹ and Oliver Clement, whose recent 500-page "saint's life" of the apostate Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople has drawn rave reviews from ecumenists the world over.

Another member of the Theological Institute, recently deceased, was Fr. Nicholas Afanasiev (1893-1966). This man, though perhaps less well-known than the others we have mentioned, had perhaps the most dangerous theories of all. He is considered to have been Fr. Schmemmann's main theological mentor.²

1. See his "Communicatio in Sacris: a Possibility," Diakonia, vol. II, no. 4, 1967.
2. On this see Rev. B. Schultze in Diakonia, 1969, no. 2, p. 125.

In his teaching of "eucharistic ecclesiology," Afanasiev accepts in toto the validity of the sacraments of heretics and sneers at those doctrinal differences which "attempt" to keep the "Churches" apart. Afanasiev rejects the ecclesiology of St. Cyprian of Carthage and the whole canonical structure formulated by the Seven Oecumenical Councils as corruptions of the original teaching of the Church. Like a latter-day Martin Luther, he claims to have discovered this true and undistorted doctrine.¹

According to Afanasiev, Orthodox and Roman Catholics are one, since both have Christ in the Eucharist: ". . . Everywhere and always one sole and the same Eucharist is accomplished: Christ is 'the same, yesterday, today and forever'. . . We should not forget that our separation (i. e., of the Orthodox and Roman Catholics), even if it has been caused by dogmatic divergences has, nevertheless, a canonical character. This separation remains always on the surface of ecclesiastical life and does not reach its depths. . . . These divergences have not touched the very essence of the Eucharist, for we always celebrate one sole and the same Holy ecclesiological Chalice of Christ, after his commandment: do this in remembrance of me."²

In his summa, entitled "Una Sancta" and dedicated to the memory of "John XXIII, the Pope of Love" Afanasiev derides the very notion that Roman Catholics should become Orthodox. For him this would constitute unacceptable and impractical "ecclesiological suicide" on the part of Roman Catholics. He writes "For eucharistic ecclesiology the Orthodox and the Catholic Church are both Churches or, to be more exact, each

1. The most complete exposition of Afanasiev's thought can be found in "Una Sancta", Irenikon, 1963, no. 4.
2. Irenikon, 1965, no. 3, p. 339.

local church (i. e., parish) of each of these two groups is a Church, whether one speaks of before or after the 'separation.' I have put 'separation' in quotes because in reality there was not and is not any separation. The Church of God remained and remains always one and unique. The rupture of communion could not cause a division in the Church which, by its nature, cannot be divided into parties." ¹

He continues, "The reëstablishment of fraternal communion between the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church in the present state of affairs would not be a negation of an actual division, which would thus be considered nonexistent, but would be a victory over this division by the power of Love, i. e., by the Church. . . ." ² Thus, taking the Patristic maxim that "where the Eucharist is, there is the Church," and granting the precious Body and Blood of our Saviour to Roman Catholics (and, one would assume, monophysites and Anglicans as well), Afanasiev totally demolishes the doctrine of the unity of the Holy Church. It is not surprising that Professor Trembelas, official theological representative of the Church of Jerusalem, should have condemned this teaching as heresy. ³

What is Fr. Schmemmann's attitude to Afanasiev's new doctrine of "eucharistic ecclesiology"? In his article "The Idea of Primacy in Orthodox Ecclesiology" in The Primacy of Peter, edited by Fr. John Meyendorff (London, 1963), he openly declares himself an adherent of Afanasiev's theology. Like Afanasiev he repudiates the ecclesiology of St. Cyprian and

1. Ibid., 1963, no. 4, p. 465.

2. Ibid., p. 474.

3. See the 1969, no. 4 issue of Diakonia.

the entire structure of the Church contained in the canons of the Oecumenical Councils. In this article and elsewhere Fr. Schmemmann presents a distorted view of the unity of the Church. Worst of all, however, is that as a true disciple of Afanasiev, Schmemmann must hold that Roman Catholics have a true Eucharist, and, therefore, are in the Church.

When Fr. Afanasiev died in 1966, Fr. Schmemmann wrote the following "In Memoriam":

"Father Nicholas leaves no heavy volumes. His opus magnum, The Church of the Holy Spirit, for which, in 1948, he received his doctoral degree, remains unpublished. He was at his best in short and scholarly essays, a collection of which, I hope, will soon appear in English. In some ways Fr. Nicholas was a man of one idea, or, it may be better to say, one vision. It is this vision that he described and communicated in what appeared sometimes as 'dry' and technical discussions. A careful reader, however, never failed to detect behind this appearance a hidden fire, a truly consuming love for the Church. For it was the Church that stood at the center of that vision, and Fr. Afanasiev, when his message is understood and deciphered, will remain for future generations a renovator of ecclesiology."¹

Father Schmemmann's admiration for this more than dubious figure is clear. He even "hopes" that a collection of Afanasiev's essays will appear in English. It is safe to predict that Dean Schmemmann would warmly recommend such a collection to his students at the Metropolia seminary.

Fr. Schmemmann concludes his obituary with this heartfelt tribute:

1. S.V.S.Q., 1966, vol. X, no. 4, p. 209.

"As I write this, on the day of his funeral, and remember years of friendship, communion in theological interests, sharp debates sometimes, I want to express again that gratitude which I have had to feel and express so many times in these last years – as we lost one after another of our teachers of that unique and glorious generation, the gratitude for having known Fr. Afanasiev and shared his friendship and been given so much by him."¹

But apart from the specific question of ecclesiology, Fr. Schmemmann evidences at every step the pernicious influence of "religious modernism," which was the hallmark of the Paris Theological Institute.

Fr. Schmemmann has also recently published a collection entitled Ultimate Questions, An Anthology of Modern Russian Religious Thought (New York, 1965). Although this volume contains a fine selection from Khomiakov, it focusses predominantly on some of the most aberrant and misleading works of the so-called "Russian Religious Renaissance" of the late XIX and early XX centuries. Included with other writings are Solovyov's "Beauty, Sexuality, and Love," Florensky's "On the Holy Spirit," Fyodorov's "The Restoration of Kinship Among Mankind," Rozanov's "Sweet Jesus and the Sour Fruits of the World," Berdyaev's "The Ethics of Creativity" and Bulgakov's "Meditations on the Joy of the Resurrection." Here truly is a chef's salad of sensuality, "Sophiology," and Gnosticism, appealing directly to the religious adventurer and decadent, whatever his confessional background.

What was the purpose of producing this volume? In his introduction,

1. Loc. cit.

Fr. Schmemmann tells us that the anthology was conceived as "a kind of invitation" to Russian religious philosophy.¹ It is difficult to imagine a less healthy way to attract interest. We shudder to think that these murky gropings, so distant from true Orthodoxy, really represent "ultimate questions" for Fr. Schmemmann. While he does insert a mild disclaimer to the effect that the essays may not necessarily be "the official teaching of the Orthodox Church,"² the tone of the introduction is positive and even enthusiastic. The unsuspecting reader is hardly prepared for the poison in this book.

We have concentrated our attention on Fr. Schmemmann because he is the most visible and vocal representative of the Metropolia and because his connection to the Paris Theological Institute is so direct and evident. But it would be unfair to imply that other prominent members of the Metropolia do not share his views.

We return again to the problem of ecclesiology which has served as an indicator of deeply-held theological convictions.

Let us hear the words of Fr. Leonid Turkevich, later to become Metropolitan Leonty of the Metropolia. Addressing the heterodox in 1920, he wrote: "What shall be our starting points in our search for unity in Christ, the one Teacher of humanity? Shall we take the long road of theological investigation, or rather, begin with the simple fact of brotherhood in the common life? Should we assemble in interchurch congresses, or choose the more beautiful and reasonable method of joining together in

1. P. 8-9.

2. P. 4.

religious ceremonies? . . . Christianity is divided into many different denominations. But its nature is the same, whether it be preached by Paul or Apollos or Cephas. . . . We are Christians, not because we bear the name of some denomination, but because we are Christians. I do not mean to say that the idea of the Church as the foundation of the Truth is not needed because each of us belongs to a radius. The denominations offer their members an atmosphere suited to develop and strengthen their belief in Christ and bring them into communion with Him. Individuals are under the protection of the forms of their particular denominations as those most convenient for them by reason of historical, geographical and national circumstance. But the essence of their Christianity is not to be found in these varying forms, it is in something more inward." ¹

Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople might well envy these words! Given Fr. Turkevich's views on Orthodoxy — merely one "denomination" among many others — it is not surprising that he later turned away from the Church Abroad, where the life-giving uniqueness of the One Church was proclaimed with reverence and gratitude.

In more recent times we can find similar sentiments expressed in an article of Georges Barrois, a professor at St. Vladimir's Seminary and a recent convert from Protestantism. Professor Barrois writes: "There are actually no doctrinal grounds which might preclude inter-communion between Orthodox Churches and the Church of Rome. They have received their hierarchic priesthood by unquestioned Apostolic succession; they profess the faith of the Seven Councils; the variety of their

1. The Constructive Quarterly, vol. VIII, 1920, pp. 194-200.

organization, the proper character of their liturgies, the distinctive flavor of their theological developments do not substantially affect their basic unity. 'We rejoice,' declared Paul VI addressing the Orthodox in the Encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*, 'when we consider your faith concerning the Eucharist, which is of our faith.'¹

Thus for Professor Barrois the Filioque, the Papacy, Papal Infallibility, Merits, Purgatory, the Immaculate Conception, Created Grace, and other Roman heresies become merely a "distinctive flavor," presumably to be appreciated for its richness and certainly not to be attacked by the Orthodox. Professor Barrois neglects to mention in his arguments the fact that Orthodox Saints have chosen martyrdom rather than submit to this "flavor."

The same spirit of ecclesiological irresponsibility is characteristic of many other Metropolia spokesmen. We could name, for example, Fr. Thomas Hopko, listed in the St. Vladimir's Seminary Catalogue as an instructor in doctrine at that institution. His report on an interdenominational "Spiritual Life Institute" leaves no doubts that he has completely abandoned the central and fundamental faith in the Orthodox Church as the true Church of Christ.²

These examples, which could easily be multiplied, demonstrate the extent to which the corrosive forces of theological modernism have penetrated into the Metropolia. The unwholesome traditions deriving from the Paris Theological Institute and the lack of strict episcopal control

1. Georges A. Barrois, "Closed Communion, Open Communion, Intercommunion," S.V.S.Q., 1968, no. 3-4, pp. 152-3.
2. S.V.S.Q., 1965, vol. IX, no. 4. See especially p. 194.

have both significantly contributed to this sad state of affairs. But whatever the cause of this theological disarray, it is strong evidence that the Metropolia is most certainly not ready for autocephaly.

Our critics will perhaps challenge such a conclusion. Why, they will say, should internal difficulties affect a decision concerning autocephaly, provided the basic requirements are met? Prof. Bogolepov puts it as follows: "If such small churches as those of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Albania, with their less-developed ecclesiastical life have been recognized as autocephalous, then why cannot the existing Church in America, providing it meets all the canonical requirements for the recognition of autocephaly, be recognized as such?"¹

If Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Albania could do it, so can we - this is Bogolepov's answer to charges that the Metropolia is unready for autocephaly.

What about these autocephalies?

In his book The Orthodox Church Fr. Meyendorff has this to say about the Albanian Church:

"In 1944 the Albanian population consisted of 688,000 Moslems, 210,000 Orthodox, and 104,184 Roman Catholics. Only after political pressure had been brought to bear, did the ecumenical patriarch finally consent to recognize the autocephalous status of the Albanian Orthodox Church in 1937, a minority in the country, practically without schools or traditions of its own."²

1. The Orthodox Church, March, 1970.
2. J. Meyendorff, The Orthodox Church, New York, 1962, p. 178.

As for Poland, according to Fr. Meyendorff, in 1924 the four million Orthodox of various backgrounds in Poland were given autocephaly by Constantinople (a move, by the way, protested by the Church Abroad, which correctly considered Poland not ready for autocephaly). Then, "In 1939 the Soviet Union occupied the part of Poland inhabited by the majority of the Orthodox and gained still further territory as a result of World War II. Canonically, these regions were again attached to the Patriarchate of Moscow, while only some 350,000 Orthodox remained on Polish soil. . . . In 1948 . . . three Polish bishops, including the Metropolitan Dionysius, had to do penance before Patriarch Alexis and receive a new autocephalous act from him. . . . The independence of the Polish Church with respect to Moscow is of a very relative nature."¹

The Czech Orthodox Church, according to Fr. Meyendorff, consists of native Czech Orthodox, former Czech Uniates (converted from 1925 on), former Carpatho-Russian Uniates (converted from 1930 on) and a small number of Russian émigré parishes. "These four groups were united by the Patriarch of Moscow in 1947 to form one Church. . . . Its first head, Eleutherios (who resigned in 1958) and its present head, Metropolitan John, are both Russian bishops."²

What then, after the information supplied by Fr. Meyendorff, are we to think of Professor Bogolepov's assertion that the American Metropolia was justified in following the examples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Albania? Nothing complimentary to the Metropolia, surely.

1. Ibid., pp. 179-80.

2. Ibid., p. 181.

In their war for power, a war which is rending and mutilating the twentieth-century Orthodox Church, the communist masters of the Moscow Patriarchate and the ambitious and theologically irresponsible hierarchs of Constantinople are seeking to create more and more autocephalous Churches to vote with them in "pan-Orthodox" Synods and the prestigious Ecumenical Movement. Moscow, currently trailing the "Greek" cluster of Churches, has of late been moving swiftly to make up the difference. Unhindered by any effective opposition at home (which is quickly silenced by the Soviet secret police), Moscow is able to move more rapidly than Constantinople, which still has to make feeble attempts to justify its actions to its flock. Having autocephalized Poland and Czechoslovakia, both of them totally unprepared for ecclesiastical self-direction, Moscow moved on to autocephalize the American Metropolia. Furthermore, in her agreement with the Metropolia, Moscow received Japan as an "autonomous" Church. We shall quite likely soon see the emergence of a woefully weak autocephalous Japanese Church. Moscow's recent creation of a Ukrainian "filial" was probably the first step toward the creation of an autocephalous Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Perhaps a Belorussian Orthodox Church will also appear. The recent formation of a Macedonian Orthodox Church in Yugoslavia under direct pressure from the communists brings another "autocephalous" Church into the Moscow orbit.

Constantinople and her Hellenic allies may be expected to retaliate. One may thus expect the emergence of an autocephalous Finnish (or Scandinavian) Church, although the Finnish Orthodox have almost completely capitulated to heterodox customs and even celebrate Easter with the West.

Alexandria may be led to proclaim an African Orthodox Church. Moscow and Constantinople will probably race one another to proclaim a South American Orthodox Church. Moscow has currently leapt into the lead there with the creation of an Exarchate of Central and South America under the "politically reliable" Archbishop Nikodim, a Soviet citizen.

The American Metropolia is thus merely a pawn in a reckless scramble for power involving the communist controllers of the Moscow Patriarchate and the thoroughly de-Orthodoxed hierarchs of Constantinople. A disease which one could in all seriousness call "autocephalitis" has struck the Orthodox Church. In this perspective, why Moscow decided to agree with the Metropolia's claims of readiness for autocephaly becomes all too clear.

Another important factor which seriously undercuts the Metropolia's claims is the fact that she represents a considerable minority of the Orthodox on the North American continent. Even her highly-inflated figure of 800,000 believers (100,000 of them supposedly in Alaska) leaves her with only half the numbers of the Greek Archdiocese. When one adds to this the Syrians, Serbs, and Bulgarians, not to mention the Church Abroad, the Metropolia's percentage of the American Orthodox populace is rendered quite small.

In her recent polemical literature, which is directed chiefly against the Church Abroad ~~but also~~ (more politely, of course) against the Greek Archdiocese, the Metropolia flatly refused to accept this fact as an argument against autocephaly. She argues thus: Before the Revolution of 1917, all Orthodox in America were under the Russian Church. Hence only the

Russian Mother Church can grant autocephaly to an American Orthodox Church. The other jurisdictions acquired a doubtful canonical existence from the day of the granting of autocephaly to the Metropolia. Nevertheless, the Metropolia will not sever ties with these jurisdictions but out of true charity will tolerate their existence, hoping that eventually they all will elect to join her ranks with the permission of their mother Churches.

Indeed, one can agree with the Metropolia that before the Revolution all Orthodox did or at least should have belonged (for, as has been shown, from the 1890's on many Greeks did not) to the Russian Orthodox missionary diocese of America. The Metropolia is also right in maintaining that to the Russian Church belongs the prerogative of granting autocephaly to an American Orthodox Church. She is, however, wrong in maintaining that the Moscow Patriarchate, absolutely subservient to an atheist regime which has caused the Russian land to run red with the blood of new Orthodox martyrs, has it in her power to grant such an autocephaly. And she is wrong in assuming that she could secretly negotiate for autocephaly without consulting her fellow-Orthodox in America. Even if one ignores the case of the Greeks, who founded their own Archdiocese in 1922, there is that of the Serbs and Syrians.

What do the leaders of the Metropolia say to the fact that His Holiness Patriarch Tikhon, on January 30, 1922, gave express permission to the Syrians in America to form their own Archdiocese under the Patriarch of Antioch? Or to the fact that as early as October, 1917, Archbishop Alexander of America gave the Serbs in America wide autonomy?

These two groups unquestionably have, from the Metropolia's own

point of view, a separate canonical existence from the Metropolia. Their consent to the formation of an American autocephalous Church was clearly necessary. But the Metropolia, engrossed in secret negotiations with Moscow as she was, did not take the trouble to prepare the ground at all carefully for such an agreement. Instead, she presented the Serbs and Syrians with a fait accompli, and thereby dealt them a grave and undeserved injustice. Such irresponsibility is not characteristic of a mature religious organism which is ready to embark on its own path. Rather, it bespeaks a body badly in need of sound discipline and firm guidance.

We shall not here discuss in detail the dissent and ferment within the ranks of the Metropolia itself which was brought on by the news of the impending autocephaly. Clearly this symptom stems from the same cause. The Metropolia had simply not prepared its people for autocephaly, and many were shocked and overwhelmed by the rapid pace of events. How could this be the case in a Church supposedly "overripe" for autocephaly?

Finally, we will point to several other facts which bear upon the readiness of the Metropolia to become the autocephalous American Orthodox Church: Only two of the bishops who signed the Metropolia's 1970 agreement with Moscow are American-born (Bishop Theodosius of Alaska and Bishop Dimitry of Berkeley). Metropolitan Ireney and certain of the other bishops know English extremely badly; the meetings of the episcopate are therefore conducted primarily in Russian. The chief spokesmen of the Metropolia, including Fr. Schmemmann, Fr. Meyendorff, Professor Bogolepov, and most of the faculty at St. Vladimir's Seminary, are emigrés, born in Russia or in Western Europe. Thus the Metropolia is at present

headed, administered, represented, and taught largely by "imported" emigrés. It follows that the native-born American sector of the Metropolia — the people proper — is still in a formative stage, and, though perhaps possessed of great potential, is nevertheless unready to assume the burden of leadership.

This is in no way meant to disparage the vast majority of the people in the Metropolia, who are native-born Americans of Carpatho-Russian descent. Many of them have dedicated their lives and energies to productive and useful church work. Their efforts are very much to their credit. But it is also a fact there are serious gaps in the spiritual achievements of the Metropolia as a whole. Such a fundamental area of Church life as monasticism — traditionally, Orthodoxy's cornerstone and source of strength — remains woefully undeveloped, virtually a terra incognita. The blame must fall on the episcopate and the academic spokesmen of the Metropolia, who have failed to provide the patient guidance necessary to establish and to nurture a viable indigenous monastic tradition. No doubt the modernist tendencies within the Metropolia have had a part in discouraging monasticism. But the problem remains, and it is a grave one: only a vigorous monastic tradition can produce the staunchly Orthodox and forceful episcopate which the Church requires. How will qualified men be found to replace the current emigré episcopate as time goes on? The prospects are gloomy indeed, and it may not be accidental that there have recently been heard muted voices within the Metropolia suggesting a married episcopate. The whole problem (and even more such a suggested solution!) reveals an abysmal lack of foresight on the part of the Metropolia

leadership, together with an irresponsible absence of preparation for self-rule.

It seems to us, in sum, that the Metropolia is in very dire straits. Plagued by rising secularism among her people, poisoned by the spread of theological modernism among her spokesmen, unequipped with the experience or "spiritual capital" which is accumulated only by generations of true adherence to the living Orthodox tradition, heavily dependent on "foreign" talent in her leadership, the Metropolia vividly demonstrates by her actions her immaturity as a religious organism. Her headlong plunge into autocephaly is the final proof of this immaturity.

The next chapter is devoted to the consequences of the negotiations and the agreement with Moscow. We pray that clear-minded members of the Metropolia will read it carefully and will recognize the agreement with Moscow for the error and temptation it is. We pray also that these readers may once again discover the path of life which leads to the Church Abroad, the confessor of true Orthodoxy in an age of self-delusion and betrayal.

**Chapter V: Ought the Metropolia to have Dealt
with The Moscow Patriarchate?**

In 1950 the American Metropolia solemnly resolved, "Our temporarily independent Metropolia cannot place itself in any canonical administrative relationship with the Moscow Patriarchate because the latter is unable to express the voice of the Church of Christ freely."¹

In 1970 the Metropolia entered into a full "canonical and administrative relationship" with the Moscow Patriarchate and thereby was recognized by Moscow as an autocephalous Church. One would assume therefore that the Metropolia had changed its mind and now in 1970 believed that Moscow could "express the voice of the Church of Christ freely." Recent testimonies of the Metropolia leadership, however, would lead one to believe that such was not the case.

When, for example, in 1963 Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad, director of the Foreign Affairs Department of the Moscow Patriarchate, attempted to deny the charges of the meeting of spiritual solidarity held by eminent Orthodox and Roman Catholics in Paris to protest the persecution of believers in the U.S.S.R., Father Alexander Schmemmann of the Metropolia wrote the following in his "Notes and Comments:

Religious Persecution in Russia":

"To help smooth the deep impression made by the meeting of solidarity the communists chose no one else but the official spokesman of the Moscow Patriarchate itself — Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad. On March 14, the Communist paper (L'Humanité) carried an interview with him in which Metropolitan Nikodim flatly denied the fact of perse-

1. Cited in M. L. J. Schrank, "Problems of Orthodoxy in America: the Russian Church," S.V.S.Q., 1962, vol. VI, no. 4, p. 198.

cutions, and this, in spite of Ilyichev's article in Kommunist and the anti-religious instructions in Pravda. 'There is no religious repression in our country,' said the Metropolitan. 'I know that recently there were rumors about the trial of two bishops. . . . It is unpleasant to speak of this, but I must say that these bishops were indicted for actual crimes having nothing to do with their ecclesiastical activity. . . .' This interview took place at a moment when, according to the most reliable information, the number of open churches decreased almost by one-half, five out of eight seminaries were closed and administrative measures against churches are being intensified. Not only the Church is persecuted, but its hierarchs are forced to deny the persecution!"

Fr. Alexander concludes his statement by correctly terming the state of the Russian Church under the communists a "truly demonic situation."²

It was, of course, the same Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad who in the period 1968-70 was the chief negotiator for Moscow in the agreement worked out with Fr. Alexander and other leaders of the Metropolia. It should also be pointed out that the two bishops (Iov and Andrey), who Nikodim termed "criminals," have both been recently reactivated by the Patriarchate after serving prison terms of three and eight years respectively for protesting the persecution of the Russian Church by the communists during the early 1960's.

Two years after Fr. Alexander's article, an editorial by Fr. John

1. S.V.S.Q., 1964, vol. VIII, no. 1, p. 49.
2. Loc. cit.

Meyendorff entitled "The Church in Russia" appeared in St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly. The purpose of this editorial was to discuss the Open Letters of the now-suspended Russian priests Frs. Eshliman and Yakunin. These letters dealt with the persecution of the Russian Church by the communists and the collaboration in this persecution of the leadership of the Moscow Patriarchate. Fr. John writes:

"That the authors of the letter to the Patriarch (i. e., Frs. Eshliman and Yakunin) lack sympathy for the candidacy of the young chairman of the Department of Foreign Relations of the Patriarchate, Metropolitan Nikodim (for the position of Patriarch as Alexis' successor) is clear from their reference to that Department as the main channel of the government's control over the Church."¹

Fr. John in no way contests the statement that the communists' "main channel" of control over the Russian Church is the Foreign Department headed by Metropolitan Nikodim.

Fr. John then passes to a discussion of the situation of the Church in Russia. The two priests' assertion "that no ordination is performed in Russia without the permission of the Soviet for the Affairs of the Church, and that the clergy is being infiltrated by 'well known' government agents, of which one, bishop Ignatius of Chernigov, is named, is indeed frightful."²

A situation which Fr. Schmemmann calls "demonic" is termed "frightful" by Fr. Meyendorff.

He continues, "The world knows about the struggle for freedom

1. S.V.S.Q., 1966, vol. X, no. 1-2, p. 5.
2. Loc. cit.

undertaken in Russia by poets, writers, and intellectuals. It must learn that the Orthodox Church also participates in this struggle. . . . That the high officials of the Patriarchate would not stand themselves on this frontline is understandable, especially according to the principles elaborated during the 'Sergius period,' but a direct co-operation on their part in silencing the true expression of Church consciousness would close every possibility of considering them, even partially, as spokesmen for the Church of God."¹

Fr. Schmemmann has already given us one example of how Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad "cooperated" with the communists in "silencing the true expression of Church consciousness."

Here are the words of Anatoly Levitin, a layman of the Russian Church, now imprisoned for protesting communist persecution in the U.S.S.R. Speaking of the late Patriarch Alexis, nominal head of the Patriarchate, whom he knew personally, Levitin writes, "He is covering up unlawful actions by remaining silent, bewildering or confusing people by his lying refutations (see, for instance, the Patriarch's interview published in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, no. 4, 1966), upsetting all attempts to rectify mistakes and punishing honest priests who defend the Church. He it is who is protecting with his authority anonymous characters who, by making use of their shady connections, have pushed themselves forward into senior bishoprics. It is he who is betraying the Church to the godless."²

1. S.V.S.Q., 1966, vol. X, no. 1-2, p. 6.

2. In Michael Bourdeaux, Patriarch and Prophets, New York, 1970, p. 294.

Consider also the words of Feodosiya Varavva (a fearless confessor of Orthodoxy who has been singled out for attack by Science and Religion, the official Soviet atheist journal) and of three other laywomen, "In Izvestiya (28 April 1964) our red-cassocked metropolitans and members of the Holy Synod, Nikodim and Pimen, say that no arrests are being made among the clergy. Why, then, do they say nothing about the Pochaev monks who have been imprisoned for the third time?"¹

They continue, "We are spiritual orphans who have no pastors. Most of our pastors have bowed to the godless communists and serve their will, not apostolic traditions and the decrees of the ecumenical councils. The true pastors, of whom there remain so few, are themselves harassed by state officials and by those pastors who have submitted to the godless communists."²

Boris Talantov, a sixty-eight year old layman in poor health sentenced to two years of forced labor for his bold defence of the Russian Church, and who died a martyr's death while serving this sentence, has indicted three of the four permanent members of the Holy Synod – Nikodim, Pimen, and Metropolitan Alexis – as betrayers of the faith.³ Anatoly Levitin testifies that Metropolitan Philaret of Kiev, the fourth permanent member, was forced upon the Patriarch by the communists without the views of the Ukrainian bishops being even heard.⁴

As for Metropolitan Nikodim, one of the vilest and most dangerous enemies of the Orthodox Church alive today, he has been the apple of the

1. Ibid., p. 173.

2. Ibid., p. 177.

3. Ibid., pp. 140-1.

4. Ibid., p. 279.

Soviet's eye since he began his rapid rise to power in the 1950's. In 1956 he was assigned to the Russian "Mission" of Jerusalem by the Patriarchate, and in 1957 at the age of twenty-eight became its head. In his Opium of the People, Michael Bourdeaux, an Anglican clergyman, recalls, "I have talked to both Christians and Jews in Jerusalem who still remember with anger the proud way in which he (Nikodim) used to be driven around in a luxury car provided by the Soviet Embassy." ¹ Continuing his account of Nikodim's career, Bourdeaux writes, "In March 1959 he was recalled (from Jerusalem) to become the administrator of the Patriarch's office. . . . Nikodim was consecrated Bishop of Podolsk in July 1960, being at thirty-one the youngest bishop in Christendom. Yet almost immediately he succeeded Metropolitan Nikolai as head of the Foreign Relations Department of the Moscow Patriarchate. Just a year after his consecration he was elevated to the office of Archbishop of Yaroslavl and Rostov, nominally holding the title of the diocese. . . though in fact continuing with the work he was already doing in Moscow. In August 1963 a further promotion made him Metropolitan of Leningrad and Ladoga. He had attained supreme power in the Russian Orthodox Church (the Patriarch has for long been a mere figurehead) at an age when most English clergy are just settling into their first living." ²

Metropolitan Nikodim's biography is ominous in itself. Who rises rapidly to power in a Church controlled by atheist communists but one totally deserving of their trust?

Here is what Levitin, long close to the center of power of the Patri-

1. Michael Bourdeaux, Opium of the People, London, 1965, p. 221.
2. Bourdeaux, Opium, p. 222.

archate, writes concerning Nikodim's rise. Addressing the late Patriarch Alexis, he asks: "When your assistant, Metropolitan Nikodim (he was foisted on you and you well know what he is worth), made lying statements about persecutions of the Church, did you refute him by as much as a single word? No. You more than once made similar declarations."¹ Who "foisted" Nikodim on the Patriarch if not the communists?

Elsewhere Levitin writes: "Metropolitan Nikolai. . . was replaced by the complaisant Metropolitan Nikodim who accomodated himself to everything. The new metropolitan organized a foreign department consisting of a few dozen parasites who compile card-index records that nobody needs and reply to unnecessary letters. He holds splendid banquets and receptions on a very pretentious scale. . . . Metropolitan Nikodim travels around in first-class compartments, flies all over the world in the company of his hangers-on and reads out his typewritten speeches roughly and clumsily composed as they are; he engages in intrigues, plays at being a diplomat-and no one at all pays him the slightest attention. . . . He has become a target for malicious pranks and an international laughing-stock. The question arises: has the state gained anything by placing at the head of the Church government such an odious personality as Metropolitan Nikodim?"²

The unfortunate answer to this question is - Yes. For although "insiders" like Levitin recognize Nikodim for the pernicious charlatan he is, the State most certainly makes good use of his talents. Among other things the Soviet State gained the cooperation of Frs. Schmemann

1. Bourdeaux, Patriarch, p. 277.
2. Bourdeaux, Patriarch, pp. 283-4.

and Meyendorff and the Metropolia leadership with the "odious" Nikodim.

Here are the words of the imprisoned Boris Talantov: "Metropolitan Nikodim's assertion that this letter (of the Kirov believers) was anonymous and did not deserve credence is a shameless lie calculated to prevent those who signed the letter from having the opportunity of exposing this falsehood abroad. . . . Instead of defending the truth, the faith, and his fellow Christians, Metropolitan Nikodim is lying and slandering his brothers. . . . Metropolitan Nikodim is not worthy to bear the high office of Metropolitan of the Orthodox Church." ¹

Elsewhere Talantov writes: "The activity of the Moscow Patriarchate abroad is a conscious betrayal of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Christian faith. The Patriarchate appears on the world platform as a secret agent combating world Christianity. Metropolitan Nikodim is betraying the Church not out of fear but out of conscience; a full unmasking of what he and the Patriarchate are doing would mean the end of his undercover enterprise. The time has come to unmask the betrayal by the Moscow Patriarchate abroad; Metropolitan Nikodim's hour has struck. . . ." ²

Let us once again return to Fr. Meyendorff's statement of 1966 which was cited earlier. Speaking about the leadership of the Moscow Patriarchate, he affirmed: "a direct co-operation on their part in silencing the true expression of Church consciousness would close every possibility of considering them, even partially, as spokesmen for the Church of God." ³

That Metropolitan Nikodim and his colleagues who direct the activities of the Patriarchate have "cooperated" with an atheist state in "silencing

1. Bourdeaux, Patriarch, p. 154.

2. Ibid., pp. 331-2.

3. S.V.S.Q., 1966, vol. X, no. 1-2, p. 6.

the true expression" of Russian "Church consciousness" is, as has been shown, beyond any shadow of doubt. Therefore, according to the Fr. Meyendorff of 1966, they cannot be considered "even partially" as "spokesmen for the Church of God."

It was, however, precisely with Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad that the Metropolia entered into negotiations to procure her autocephaly. Three important meetings of representatives from the Metropolia (led by Frs. Schmemmann and Meyendorff) with Nikodim were held in 1968-69 in Europe, America, and Japan. Then, after all difficulties had been ironed out, Metropolitan Nikodim arrived in America to sign the agreement.

According to One Church, the official English-language publication of the Moscow Patriarchate's exarchate in America:

"His Eminence Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad and Novgorod, member of the Sacred Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate and universally-known and respected Orthodox leader, spent fifteen eventful days in America from March 18 to April 2, 1970. Several historic matters were dealt with by His Eminence including the finalization of discussions with representatives of the Russian Metropolia concerning the granting of the status of autocephaly to the Orthodox Church of America. . . ."

In the section "Activities of March 20 to March 22" we read:

"The next day, Metropolitan Nikodim met with Mr. Jacob A. Malik at the United Nations center. He then journeyed to Syosset, Long Island where he visited with Metropolitan Ireney and other representatives of the Metropolia including Archpriests Schmemmann and Meyendorff who had

1. One Church, 1970, no. 3, p. 118.

been prominent in the negotiations earlier." ¹

One Church neglects to inform its readers that Mr. Jacob A. Malik is the official U.S.S.R. representative to the U.N., a Soviet citizen and a communist. One may suspect that Mr. Malik's counsel may not have been immaterial in the Metropolitan's subsequent actions regarding his negotiations with the Metropolia.

Furthermore, after his chat with Mr. Malik, Nikodim had yet another chance to keep in touch with his homeland and receive needed counsel. "While in Washington he (Nikodim) also called upon the Soviet Ambassador Dobrinin at the Soviet Embassy for a brief visit." ²

This visit was a veritable triumph for the visiting Metropolitan. Tuesday, March 31, was undoubtedly the culminating point of the trip. "Tuesday, March 31, a reception and dinner honoring the Metropolitan was held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on Park Avenue. It was attended by many prominent ecclesiastics representing almost all of the Orthodox jurisdictions in America, officials of the National and World Councils of Churches, and other friends of the Russian Orthodox Church." ³

As the picture on p. 124 of One Church indicates, the Metropolia was represented at this dinner given in honor of the foremost betrayer of the Russian Church by Bishop Theodosius of Alaska.

After the dinner an even greater triumph occurred for the Metropolitan of Leningrad:

"Later that same evening at the residence of Metropolitan Ireney

1. One Church, 1970, no. 3, p. 119.
2. Ibid., p. 120.
3. One Church, 1970, no. 3, p. 125.

in Syosset, Long Island, Metropolitan Nikodim and representatives of the Metropolia signed the documents of agreement to the conditions for the granting of autocephaly – Following this historic event, a Te Deum was celebrated in the chapel of the Metropolitan's residence by Arch-priest Alexander Schmemmann in the presence of the distinguished hierarchs and clergy who had witnessed the signing of the agreement." ¹

The evening of March 31, 1970, was truly an "historic" day in the life of Orthodoxy in America – it was a day of infamy and betrayal.

The question arises as to why the Metropolia leadership, ignoring God and conscience, elected to enter into canonical relationships with those who are termed betrayers by the confessing Russian Church.

Two reasons appear to be paramount: Fear and ambition.

Fear because the Metropolia was losing court case after court case (and, therefore, parish after parish) to the Moscow Patriarchate. Her very existence, according to a statement of her own Archbishop Sylvester of Montreal, was in danger.

And fear because, being under ban from Moscow, she was greatly hindered in her ecumenical and pan-Orthodox dealings. She thus felt herself under great pressure to regularize her relations with the "Mother Church," especially with plans being made for the forthcoming "Eighth" Ecumenical Council sponsored by Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople.

Ambition because the Metropolia has since 1924 dreamed of becoming an autocephalous American Orthodox Church with her own patriarch. This dream seemed endangered by the plan afoot, favored by Archbishop Iakovos

1. Loc. cit.

of the Greek Archdiocese and others, gradually to turn the Standing Conference of Orthodox Bishops in America into the governing Synod of an American Orthodox Church. Outnumbered over 2 to 1 by the Greeks, the Metropolia would clearly be able to play only a secondary role in such an American Church. Her swift agreement with Moscow represented an ecclesiastical coup, designed to negate Iakovos's plan.

Fear and ambition, therefore, were the principal factors behind the Metropolia's move.

It is not surprising, however, that the Metropolia has made numerous attempts to justify her actions. The remainder of this chapter will deal with her apologia.

According to apologists of the Metropolia such as Professor Bogolepov and Father Meyendorff, the Moscow Patriarchate, although admittedly politically subject to the Soviet State, is nevertheless a legitimate canonical ecclesiastical body with which the Metropolia had every right to deal. Thus the Moscow Patriarchate represents for the Metropolia the legitimate continuation of the pre-revolutionary Russian Orthodox Church, and only she could canonically grant autocephaly to the American Church, since the American mission had been entrusted to Russia by Divine Providence.

Here again we see at work the Metropolia's extreme legalistic mentality, which is Western and scholastic rather than Orthodox. The political servitude of the Moscow Patriarchate (total servitude as far as its foreign dealings are concerned) is not regarded as a factor that vitiates the legitimacy of Moscow's actions. The Metropolia leaders ask, "What about the situation of the Greek Orthodox under the Turks? Was not the Oecu-

menical Patriarchate subservient to the Turks? And yet who would say that the Church of Constantinople was not a legitimate Orthodox Church body even under Turkish occupation?"

This is an extremely crucial point. Here many quite sincere Metropolia adherents have been led into serious temptation. Was the situation of the Church of Constantinople under the Turks comparable to that of the Russian Church under the communists?

The answer is no. Consider how Fr. Meyendorff himself describes the position of the Greek Church under the Turks: "Under Turkish rule. . . the Church preserved its canonical organization intact and was even able to strengthen itself as a result of certain privileges granted to the ecumenical patriarch by the conquerer."¹

Could one say such a thing about the Russian Church today? Anyone who has read the writings of Frs. Eshliman and Yakunin, Archbishop Yermogen, Boris Talantov or Anatoly Levitin dealing with the situation of the Moscow Patriarchate in the 1960's knows to what extent the Russian Church has been forced into a totally uncanonical position by the atheist authorities.² Furthermore, the degree of her subservience to the State is incomparably greater than was that of the Greek Church under the Turks. The limit of interference which the Orthodox Church can tolerate from a state is the following: when a state demands that the Church sacrifice Orthodoxy itself, then the Church has no choice but martyrdom. In the 1960's the Soviet State, having decided to use the

1. John Meyendorff, The Orthodox Church, New York, 1962, p. 86.
2. These writings have been collected in Michael Bourdeaux, Patriarch and Prophets, New York, 1970.

Moscow Patriarchate as a powerful weapon of foreign policy, demanded that the Russian Church sacrifice Orthodoxy itself. One clear indication of this was the Patriarchate's recent decision to offer all Sacraments to Roman Catholics and Old Believers, a decision which came before the Metropolia signed its agreement with Metropolitan Nikodim.

In no way, therefore, can the Moscow Patriarchate be considered a legitimate canonical body. Not only have her hierarchs been uncanonically ordained, a fact which even Professor Bogolepov and Fr. Meyendorff admit, but by concelebrating with and even communicating the mysteries to those outside the one holy catholic and apostolic Church of Christ they have subjected themselves to canonical suspension.

Where, therefore, is the legitimacy of the Moscow Patriarchate as claimed by the Metropolia? What is the value of a piece of paper (tomos) signed by Metropolitan Nikodim — who must be suspended and excommunicated many times over according to the canons, and who the confessing Russian Orthodox Church terms a betrayer of Christ?

The Metropolia replies to such arguments by asking: Is then the Moscow Patriarchate deprived of Grace and no Church at all? Do the simple believers have to suffer in the eyes of God for the betrayal of their leadership?

This is another canonical question on which, once again, many sincere people have fallen into temptation. For what Professor Bogolepov and Fr. Meyendorff and their colleagues are trying to do here is simplify a question which is by nature extraordinarily complex. They say: The Moscow Patriarchate is a legitimate ecclesiastical organization, despite

its egregious canonical lapses, because its parishes are attended by the faithful. Therefore, they say, we can deal with the leadership of the Patriarchate as the legitimate representatives of these faithful.

The fact that Metropolitan Nikodim and his fellow members of the Holy Synod represent the faithful only "on paper" and de facto work directly against their interests is considered unimportant by the legalistic theologians of the Metropolia.

The correct attitude toward the Church in Russia is that of the Russian Church Abroad, which, "not wishing to have any communion with hierarchs whom there is every basis to consider in complete obedience to the Soviet atheists, none the less never brought forth specific judgments over all the clergy in the U.S.S.R., as is unfoundedly claimed by Archbishop John and Fr. Joseph Pishtey (of the American Metropolia), basing themselves entirely on the articles of individual persons expressing their private opinions. We know, however, that strict control over ecclesiastical appointments creates an artificially-selected group and that with every year in the Moscow Patriarchate there should be less clergy maintaining their independence. Thus, only Archbishop Yermogen alone out of the few who disagreed with the anti-canonical changes introduced by order of the civil authorities into the Statute on Administration of the Patriarchate, remained faithful to his position and to this day is deprived of a see."¹

In 1927 a split occurred in the Russian Church over Metropolitan

1. Archpriest George Grabbe, "An Answer to Archbishop John and Fr. Joseph Pishtey," Orthodox Life, 1970, no. 1, pp. 31-2.

Sergius' famous "Declaration" which subjected the Russian Church to the communists. Those hierarchs in the U.S.S.R. such as Joseph of Leningrad and Cyrill of Kazan and many others who broke with Sergius on this matter, correctly felt that the "Declaration" would enable the State eventually to gain complete control over the Church. Others, such as Archbishop Hilarion (Troitsky), felt that the Church could survive by making the State adhere firmly to its decree on the separation of Church and State.

Since 1927 the so-called Catacomb or "underground" Church has maintained the position of Metropolitan Joseph and the other hierarchs who broke with Sergius over his "Declaration." Terribly persecuted by the totalitarian State, often forced to live in the forests, the clergy and laity of the catacomb Church have refused to have communion with the leadership of the Patriarchate, knowing that it has betrayed the Russian Church. The American Metropolia has often treated this confessional Church with brutal contempt, considering it "sectarian" for having broken with the Moscow Patriarchate. The Russian Church Abroad, on the other hand, feels that the Catacomb Church has most clearly discerned the truth of Christ, and that it is correct in not agreeing to have relations with a State composed of communist apostates from the Church and dedicated to the destruction of Christianity. The Catacomb Church clearly exists, despite the efforts of the world's most efficient secret police force to extinguish it. Information about it can be found in such official Soviet publications as The Atheists' Dictionary (Slovar' Ateista).

The literature which reached the West in the 1960's from those in the "official" Russian Church who are seeking to retain their Orthodoxy

reveals the depth and agony of their position. Like Archbishop Hilarion Troitsky in the 'twenties, some of them, such as Archbishop Yermogen and Frs. Eshliman and Yakunin, feel that the State should merely be forced to adhere to its own laws on the separation of Church and State and the regulation of religious associations. Unfortunately, however, as these writers bear witness, the Soviet State has no intention of abiding by its own laws on Church-State relations, laws which are designed primarily to deceive foreign public opinion. Those like Archbishop Yermogen and the two Moscow priests, who attempt to hold the State to its own laws, are soon retired (Yermogen) or suspended (Frs. Eshliman and Yakunin). The "Hilarion" approach thus fails because it has incorrectly gauged the metaphysical evil at the bottom of the communist state. The Soviet government is increasingly intolerant toward any hierarchs or clergy who resist becoming tools of its policy.

In the writings of Boris Talantov we find an ever-increasing awareness of this fact. Whereas at first he seeks to hold the Soviet government to its own laws on religious associations, his later writings, such as "Sergievschina" and "Soviet Society,"¹ reveal a realization that the inner spiritual laws of the communist party of the U.S.S.R. require it to persecute the Church. Likewise, he comes to an awareness that the Sergius "Declaration" of 1927 led inevitably to the collapse of the Russian Church in the 1960's. In his "Sergievschina" Talantov defends those hierarchs who broke with Sergius in 1927 and attacks Nikita Struve of

1. See a discussion of these works in John Dunlop, The Recent Activities of the Moscow Patriarchate, Seattle, 1970. See also Michael Bourdeaux, Patriarch and Prophets, New York, 1970.

the Paris exarchate for defending Sergius's actions in his book Christians in Contemporary Russia.

Archbishop Yermogen, Frs. Eshliman and Yakunin, are all in agreement on one matter - the "official" Russian Church is in terrible danger and is on the verge of spiritual death. They all agree that the reason for this is the "Sergius" philosophy of the Patriarchate. Their cry for the Church to purge itself of unworthy hierarchs and clergy (Nikodim and the other permanent members of the governing Holy Synod are either implicitly or explicitly mentioned), however, went unheard. They rather than Nikodim were purged.

The fate of these courageous and devout Orthodox shows better than anything else that the State after the 1943-1960 period of relative toleration will now brook no opposition to its policies, even when the opposition bases itself on Soviet legislation. With the total enslavement of the Russian Church at home fast becoming a reality, one may expect that virtually the entire Russian Church will as in the 1930's take refuge in the catacombs.¹ Now as in the 'thirties the boundaries between the "official" and "catacomb" Churches are fluid.

To conclude, by dealing with Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad the American Metropolia has in no way dealt with a legitimate Russian Church authority. Rather it has entered into relations with an odious hireling of the Church's communist persecutors.

1. The author of the recent "Open Letter to Fr. Vladimir of the B.B.C." asserts that only the Church catacombs saved the Russian Orthodox during the 1930's. See text in Bourdeaux Patriarch, pp. 230-36.

The Metropolia spokesmen also wrongly claim that their agreement entails no dangers for the American Church or the Orthodox faith. How could Moscow gain any control over us, they ask, when we are in a country politically independent of the U.S.S.R.? Here again the Metropolia leaders have led many into temptation. Under the clever leadership of Metropolitan Nikodim, the Patriarchate and her masters have abandoned the coarse demand for "loyalty oaths" and the like which characterized her activities in the 'thirties, 'forties and 'fifties. They have realized that more subtle pressures will bring greater results. Thus "all" she apparently got from the agreement with the Metropolia was (1) the Japanese Church as an autonomous Church under her authority, (2) the right to enter into full canonical relations with Metropolia clergy, to concelebrate, etc., (3) the right to have "friendly" exchanges of professors, seminarians, clergy and laity between the U.S. and U.S.S.R., (4) the Metropolia's support versus the "Greeks" in pan-Orthodox synods and activities.

The Metropolia's surrender of the Japanese Church to Moscow was a gross act of betrayal by which an immature and small body was delivered into the hands of Metropolitan Nikodim and his colleagues. The reason that the Metropolia herself always refused autonomy under Moscow was that she knew well what that meant. (See Chapter III above.) The fact that the Japanese Church was ~~tricked~~ by Moscow into believing that autonomy would be desirable does not justify the Metropolia. She alone is responsible before God for delivering the Japanese into the hands of the enemies of the Holy Church. She was the mother responsible for the infant Japanese mission.

The establishment of full communion with the Metropolia helps Moscow greatly both at home and abroad. At home pictures of Metropolia hierarchs and clergy concelebrating with Nikodim or Bishop Juvenaly of Tula (this has already occurred at the Metropolia's St. Tikhon's Monastery in Pennsylvania and elsewhere) will serve to demoralize the confessing Church. "See," Moscow will say to her opposition at home, "the American Metropolia freely recognizes us as legitimate rulers of the Church. How dare you challenge our authority and actions?" Furthermore, it will lead other Orthodox and heterodox into temptation. Seeing that the Metropolia, headed by such well-known emigrés as Frs. Schmemmann and Meyendorff and by a majority of emigré bishops, recognizes the validity of Moscow's actions, they will be led to dismiss their own anxieties about Moscow's canonical and political misdeeds. "Surely," they will say, "Russian emigrés know the situation of the Russian Church better than we do. If they deal with Nikodim, then we should also." Finally, Moscow will not ignore the propaganda benefits of a direct contact with the Metropolia faithful in Metropolia Churches. The parishioners will be invited to come to Russia to see the flourishing state of the Mother Church, asked to support the Mother Church in her struggle for world peace, etc.

The exchanges between Moscow and the Metropolia will be maximally exploited by the Patriarchate's masters. On the buses taking Metropolia parishioners to St. Tikhon's Monastery to witness Metropolitan Ireney's recent solemn concelebration with Bishop Juvenaly of Tula, for example, leaflets were distributed inviting the faithful to come to the Soviet Union and see the religious life of the Russian people. As John

Dunlop has demonstrated in his The Recent Activities of the Moscow Patriarchate, the Moscow Patriarchate has turned the religious "tourist" trade into a lucrative business for the atheist Soviet State. These tourists are, of course, shown carefully-selected sights and religious personnel and are prevented from coming into any contact with the persecuted Church. After such guided tours many foreigners have become enthusiastic defenders of the Soviet Union's religious policies. "All talk of persecution," they say, "is untrue. For we have seen with our own eyes that the Church is flourishing in Russia."

Exchanges of clergy and seminarians will serve a similar purpose. Unlike the emigré leadership of the Metropolia, which knows full well what the situation in the Soviet Union is like, their American protégés have no compunction about travelling to the Soviet Union and concelebrating with Patriarchate leaders. Thus, while Metropolitan Ireney and Frs. Schmemmann and Meyendorff decided to forego the pleasures of a trip to the Soviet Union to pick up the tomos of autocephaly, young Bishop Theodosius of Alaska and a group of American clergy and laity (none of them particularly well known outside the Metropolia) enthusiastically traveled to the U.S.S.R. Once there, as is indicated in the newspaper The Orthodox Church, May, 1970, they entered fully into the liturgical life of the Moscow Patriarchate. Bishop Theodosius was even permitted to ordain several candidates to the priesthood. It did not, of course, occur to Bishop Theodosius to ask himself questions which would have arisen in the mind of any emigré - namely: "Who am I ordaining? Is this man a servant of the Church or an agent of the State being infiltrated

into the Church to destroy her from within?"

Moscow has shrewdly realized that the bulk of the Metropolia clergy and her future American episcopate (which will soon replace the aging emigrés at her helm) do not share the emigrés' aversion to the Soviet Union. Bishop Theodosius and his fellows will prove much more cooperative than the grudgingly cooperative Metropolitan Ireney. By encouraging the future leaders of the Metropolia to come to the Soviet Union and by showering them with gifts and honors, Moscow will seek gradually to pull the Metropolia ever more closely into her orbit.

As far as Moscow's hope that the Metropolia will support her against the "Greeks" is concerned, here she can be quite certain of success. Since the Metropolia's "autocephaly" has been recognized so far only by Moscow and several other Iron Curtain Orthodox countries, it is obvious that the Metropolia must curry Moscow's favor or risk being refused admittance to Pan-Orthodox activities. The Greeks have so far even to consider the possibility of recognizing the legitimacy of the Metropolia's new status; the chances are that they will continue this policy in future. The Metropolia will thus be accepted as an autocephalous Church by the Greeks only if Moscow employs the same heavy-handed tactics she used to pry recognition of the Polish and Czech autocephalies out of the Greeks. The Metropolia's criticism of Moscow will therefore have to be quite muted, although Moscow in her increased sophistication may permit the Metropolia occasional tepid articles on religious restrictions in the U.S.S.R. as a sop to her conscience. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that when the Metropolia episcopate decided to condemn

Moscow's new practice of administering sacraments to Roman Catholics (this being after her receipt of autocephaly, of course), she chose not to mention Moscow by name and merely condemned the practice.¹ Such extreme caution is in the Metropolia tradition. When, for instance, in 1969 she chose to react to Archbishop Iakovos' frequent concelebrations with heterodox, she again merely condemned the practice (or rather she only condemned concelebrations in liturgical vestments) and said nothing about Iakovos.² Given the Metropolia's time-honored timidity, Moscow has little to fear from her new "daughter" Church.

To conclude, the Metropolia had no right to enter into canonical relations with a Church enslaved by atheist communists. In dealing with the present leaders of the Moscow Patriarchate, she dealt not with the Russian Church, but with chosen hirelings of the Soviet State such as Metropolitan Nikodim, a man condemned as a traitor to the Church by men such as Boris Talantov, who has been recognized by the Metropolia itself as a confessor of Orthodoxy.³

The fact, frequently cited by Metropolia apologists, that the other Orthodox Churches throughout the world also recognize the leaders of the Moscow Patriarchate, is no excuse. Nearly half of these Churches are behind the Iron Curtain and are no freer than the Moscow Patriarchate itself. Others, such as Alexandria and Antioch, are also under heavy pressure in the matter of recognizing Moscow because of the political course followed by the nations in which they are located. It is worthy of

1. See The Orthodox Church, April, 1970, p. 1.

2. The Orthodox Church, 1969.

3. See the article on him and Levitin in The Orthodox Church, April, 1970.

note, however, that the Church of Greece recently refused to admit Metropolitan Nikodim to Mt. Athos because of his attempts to intrigue there and export "monks" from the Soviet Union to the Holy Mountain.

Recognition by itself means little. Did not the Church of Constantinople and others recognize the Russian Living Church and even invite her to a projected Ecumenical Council which never occurred? The only valid criterion for recognition is truth. And the Moscow Patriarchate stands convicted by the Holy Canons as a thoroughly uncanonical organization. The leaders of the Metropolia, being fully informed of the ecclesiastical situation in Russia (the letters of Frs. Eshliman and Yakunin and Archbishop Yermogen were even printed in the St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly), committed a blatantly criminal action when they entered into dealings with Metropolitan Nikodim and his colleagues.

Furthermore, the Metropolia did not merely receive recognition from Moscow; it had to negotiate recognition, as the recently published tomos indicates.¹ Among other concessions it surrendered Japan to the jurisdiction of Moscow, permitted forty-three Patriarchate parishes to remain under Moscow in the United States, and entered into full liturgical communion with hand-picked hierarchs of the Soviet government. It also moved into de facto dependence upon Moscow in pan-Orthodox dealings.

The disastrous moral and spiritual consequences of this agreement are only beginning to be realized by attentive observers. With time the terrible sin committed on March 31, 1970, when the Metropolia signed the agreement with Moscow will become evident to all.

1. Published in The Orthodox Church, May, 1970.

Chapter VI: The Fruits Of The Autocephaly

A Brief Chronicle of the Moscow-Metropolia
Autocephaly Agreement

1. December, 1961--Initial contact made between Moscow's Archbishop Nikodim (Rostov) and the American Metropolia's Archbishop John (Shakhovskoy) at the New Delhi Assembly of the World Council of Churches. Nikodim suggests future meetings.
2. 1963--An important meeting (unofficial) held between Metropolitan Nikodim and Metropolia representatives, including Metropolitan Leonty, in the United States. Nikodim had come to the U.S. at the invitation of the National Council of Churches.
3. 1967--Another "unofficial" meeting in the United States between Metropolitan Nikodim and Metropolia representatives.
4. May, 1968--The Holy Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate decides officially to recognize marriages between Orthodox and Catholics even when they are performed by a Catholic priest.
5. August, 1968--An "unofficial" meeting held between Metropolitan Nikodim and Metropolia delegates to the General Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Uppsala, Sweden. Definite steps are taken. A "platform and a procedure for negotiations" are elaborated. Negotiations enter a new phase.
6. January 21, 1969--An "unofficial" meeting held between Metropolitan Nikodim and Metropolia representatives at Nikodim's hotel in New York.
7. February 3, 1969--A second important "unofficial" meeting between Metropolitan Nikodim and Metropolia leaders at Metropolitan Ireney's residence in Syosset, Long Island.

8. March 11, 1969--A Great Council of Bishops of the American Metropolia "accepts and confirms" the report of Bishop Kiprian concerning the meeting of February 3. It is resolved to enter into official negotiations with the Moscow Patriarchate.
9. March 20, 1969--Metropolitan Ireney, first primate of the Metropolia, writes Patriarch Alexis of Moscow informing him of the decision of the Great Council of Bishops on March 11.
10. August 5, 1969--The Holy Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate "after a discussion of the correspondence with Metropolitan Ireney" and of the "correspondence and earlier contacts between Metropolitan Nikodim and Bishop Kiprian concerning the question of normalizing the relationship between the Moscow Patriarchate and the North American Metropolia," authorizes Metropolitan Nikodim to "continue negotiations," and gives him "appropriate instructions."
11. August 24-25, 1969--Metropolitan Nikodim meets with Frs. Schmemmann, Meyendorff, Pishtey, and Skvir of the Metropolia in Geneva, Switzerland. Basic agreement is reached. It is decided to hold a special meeting in Tokyo, Japan, to treat the question of the Japanese Orthodox Church.
12. September, 1969--The Metropolia Council of Bishops approves the "basic content" of the Tokyo agreement. Diocesan conventions are informed and express "unanimous approval" (Fr. Pishtey).
13. October 12, 1969--Metropolitan Nikodim serves a liturgy at the chapel of the Russicum in Rome and communicates a number of Roman Catholics present.

14. November 17, 1969--The Holy Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate approves the results of the August meeting in Geneva and "authorizes" Metropolitan Nikodim to continue negotiations.
15. November 28, 1969--A crucial "four-sided" meeting occurs in Tokyo, Japan, between Metropolitan Nikodim, representatives of the American Metropolia, and representatives of the two Japanese Missions (i.e., that canonically under the Metropolia and that under Moscow). At this meeting Moscow agrees to found an "autonomous" Japanese Orthodox Church and the Metropolia relinquishes all canonical rights over the Japanese Mission. "A final draft of agreement" between Moscow and the Metropolia is prepared and an agreement signed between Moscow and those Japanese Orthodox formerly under the Metropolia.
16. November, 1969-- The Russian Church Abroad's Archbishop Vitaly of Montreal hears of the impending Moscow-Metropolia agreement and asks his laity not to visit the churches of the American Metropolia or to have communion in prayer with it.
17. December 6, 1969--An article by the Metropolia's Chancellor, Fr. Joseph Pishtey, in the emigré daily Novoe Russkoe Slovo announces that agreement has almost been concluded between Moscow and the Metropolia. This is the first public announcement of the negotiations.
18. December 8, 1969-- Protopresbyter George Grabbe, Director of the Russian Church Abroad's Public and Foreign Relations Department, pens a reflective protest against the impending "autocephaly."

19. December 9, 1969--The Russian Church Abroad's Archbishop Nikon of Washington and Florida issues a "warning" to the American Metropolia, showing the terrible dangers inherent in the "autocephaly" agreement. The warning is printed in Novoe Russkoe Slovo.
20. December 12, 1969--A meeting of the episcopate of the American Metropolia ratifies the agreement reached in Tokyo, Japan. Outside, more than 200 persons gather to protest the ratification and to pray for the enlightenment of the bishops.
21. December 16, 1969--The Holy Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate makes an official decision to permit Roman Catholics and Old Believers in the Soviet Union to partake of Orthodox sacraments, including Holy Communion.
22. December 19, 1969--A council of the former Metropolia Japanese diocese holds a council which "unanimously" decides to ask Patriarch Alexis to grant "autonomy" to the Japanese Church.
23. January 8, 1970--Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople informs Patriarch Alexis of Moscow that he will not recognize the proposed autocephaly and that he considers it uncanonical.
24. February 21, 1970--The New York Times (p. 23) announces the December 16 decision of the Moscow Holy Synod under the heading "Russian Priests May Minister to Roman Catholics."
25. December-March, 1970--The "autocephaly" controversy rages on the pages of Novoe Russkoe Slovo and various ecclesiastical publications. Official warnings against concluding the agreement are issued by the Synod of Bishops of the Russian Church Abroad and by Metropolitan Philaret. Individual clergy and laity and some whole parishes

- prepare to leave the American Metropolia for the Church Abroad.
26. March 15, 1970--On the day of Orthodox Sunday, Holy Transfiguration Monastery in Boston issues "An Appeal to the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Russian American Metropolia" urging them to reject the autocephaly agreement. Great stress is put on the fact that Moscow has officially decided to grant sacraments to non-Orthodox and to engage in common prayer with them.
 27. March 31, 1970--The autocephaly agreement is signed by Metropolitan Nikodim and Metropolitan Ireney of the Metropolia in New York.
 28. April 3, 1970--The Holy Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate decides to remove the canonical suspension "burdening" that section of the Japanese Church formerly under the Metropolia.
 29. April 9, 1970--The Holy Synod of Moscow resolves to remove the suspension placed on the hierarchy of the North American Metropolia on December 12, 1947.
 30. April 10, 1970--An enlarged session of the Moscow Holy Synod decides to grant autocephaly to the American Metropolia and autonomy to the Church of Japan.
 31. April 17, 1970--Patriarch Alexis of Moscow dies at the age of ninety-three.
 32. April 21, 1970--The American Metropolia's Bishop Theodosius of Alaska flies to Moscow to participate in Patriarch Alexis' funeral service. Numerous heterodox, including the Armenian Catholicos Vazgen I and Cardinal Jan Willebrands of the Vatican Secretariat, participate in the service.

33. May 18, 1970-- Bishop Theodosius again comes to Moscow, this time to receive the tomos of autocephaly, which is solemnly handed to him by Metropolitan Pimen of Krutitsk, Guardian of the Patriarchal throne.
34. May 26, 1970--Bishop Theodosius of Alaska participates in the forty-day memorial service for Patriarch Alexis. He also ordains a Soviet seminarian to the diaconate.
35. May 30, 1970--Bishop Juvenaly of Tula, Nikodim's first substitute as Head of the Moscow Patriarchate Foreign Department, visits the Metropolia's St. Tikhon's Monastery in South Canaan, Pennsylvania, for a solemn liturgical concelebration with Metropolitan Ireney, Archbishop Kiprian of Philadelphia, and Bishop Theodosius of Alaska.
36. October 20, 1970--A Council (Sobor) of the Metropolia episcopate, clergy, and laity is held at St. Tikhon's Monastery. The tomos of autocephaly is read. By a vote of 301 to 7 (with 2 abstentions) the delegates present resolve to change the name of the Metropolia to "The Orthodox Church in America." A delegation from the Russian Church Abroad (Bishop Lavr of Manhattan and Fr. George Grabbe) is refused permission to address the council.

Notes to the Chronicle:

Much of the information employed in the Chronicle comes from the December 14, 1969, "Communiqué" of the Moscow Patriarchate (see Diakonia, vol. V, no. 2, 1970, pp. 144-7, and from Dmitry Grigorieff, "The Orthodox Church In America from the Alaska Mission to Autocephaly", St.

Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, 1970, no. 4, pp. 216-17, and Proto-presbyter Joseph J. Pishtey, "Official Notification" of December 6, 1969, in Diakonia, vol. V, no. 2, 1970, pp. 142-4.

A glance at the "Brief Chronicle" introducing this Chapter shows that the initial contact between the Moscow Patriarchate and the Metropolia was made at the 1961 Assembly of the World Council of Churches in New Dehli, India. In its initial announcement of the impending autocephaly in Novoe Russkoe Slovo, December 6, 1969, the Metropolia avoided reference to this contact.¹ In a later "adjusted" version, written after the granting of autocephaly, the year 1961 is admitted as the "unofficial" beginning of the events which were in time to bring the "Orthodox Church in America" into existence.²

Newsweek magazine, which interested itself in the Moscow Patriarchate's activities at New Dehli, reports that initially relations between the Patriarchate and Metropolia at the Assembly were hardly congenial: "Outraged at a Russian (Moscow Patriarchate) statement that their Church was free, a section of American Orthodoxy (i. e., the Metropolia) began quietly distributing mimeographed accounts of Church oppression by the Soviets."³

This proved to be embarrassing for Archbishop Nikodim (Rostov), the thirty-two year old leader of Moscow's delegation, and he acted quickly to do something about it. Newsweek in a subsequent article on the Assembly observes, "Relations between the Moscow prelates and an American Orthodox group (the Metropolia) were still a bit scratchy as a result of an argument about religious freedom in the Soviet Union. Hoping to smooth things over, Nikodim suggested a visit to the U.S. might help

1. See Diakonia, vol. V, no. 2, 1970, p. 143.
2. See St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, vol. IV, 1970, p. 216.
3. Newsweek, Dec. 4, 1961, p. 82.

clear things up. The idea shocked Archbishop John of San Francisco, delegate of a Russian Orthodox body which does not recognize the authority of the Moscow Patriarchate. Perhaps, he said, an unofficial meeting could be arranged in a few years but outside the U.S. 'Why outside?' asked the Russians. An aide of John explained: 'The press in America would kill us.' The Russians blinked. 'So who is more free--you or us.'"¹

One might wonder how a visit to the U.S. could "clear up" the matter of religious persecution in the Soviet Union. What Nikodim had in mind, of course, was something else, something which Archbishop John Shakhovskoy, who is not naïve, instantly perceived--namely, the possible recognition by Moscow of the legitimacy of the Metropolia's position. As for Nikodim, he evidently felt that the bait of an escape from "uncanonicity" would serve to blunt the sharpness of future Metropolia statements on the persecution of religion in Russia and would prompt the Metropolia to take a less harsh view of the activities of the Moscow Patriarchate.

Such were the "unofficial" beginnings of the autocephaly process. Two years later a new development occurred. "In 1963 during an unofficial encounter between our late Primate Metropolitan Leonty with representatives of the Moscow Patriarchate it became clear that the latter does no longer insist on canonical dependence and is ready to discuss the question of 'autocephaly.'"² According to the Metropolia's "Official Notification" of December 6, 1969, the death of Metropolitan Leonty in 1965 "delayed for a time the solution of the question, but in the beginning

1. Newsweek, December 11, 1961, p. 56.

2. Diakonia, vol. V, no. 2, 1970, p. 143.

of 1969 negotiations were resumed."¹ Fr. Grigorieff's post-autocephaly version reveals that negotiations were actually resumed in 1967, "during a visit of Metropolitan Nikodim to the United States."²

The Moscow Patriarchate's decision of May, 1968, to recognize marriages between Orthodox and Catholics even when performed by a Catholic priest apparently caused no alarm among the leaders of the Metropolia, despite its clearly un-Orthodox nature. And no wonder. "Autocephaly" was now in sight.

The meeting between Nikodim and the Metropolia delegates to the Uppsala Assembly of the World Council of Churches in the summer of 1968 proved to be highly significant. A "procedure for negotiations" was worked out, and the drive for autocephaly began in earnest. After two "unofficial" meetings with Nikodim in New York on January 21, 1969, and February 3, 1969, the Metropolia's Great Council of Bishops resolved to enter into "official negotiations" with Moscow. On August 24 and 25, 1969, Nikodim met with Frs. Schmemmann, Meyendorff, Pishtey, and Skvir of the Metropolia in Geneva, Switzerland. Basic agreement was reached. The only two troublesome points turned out to be (1) what to do with those Moscow Patriarchate parishes in America that did not wish to enter the autocephaly, and (2) what to do with the Japanese Orthodox, the great majority of whom were canonically submitted to the Metropolia. It was decided to have another meeting in Tokyo to resolve these problems.

Before this meeting could take place, however, Metropolitan Nikodim

1. Loc. cit.

2. St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, no. 4, 1970, p. 216.

had already visited Rome, where on October 12, 1969, he served a liturgy in the chapel of the Russicum, an institution the express purpose of which is the conversion of Russia to Roman Catholicism, and gave communion to a number of Latins there present. This ecumenical "first," part of the Moscow-Vatican rapprochement of the 'sixties, soon became known to the leaders of the Metropolia, where it no doubt caused some anxiety. "Will Moscow retain its vestiges of Orthodoxy long enough to grant autocephaly?" is a question which may well have been on some Metropolia minds. Moreover, there was the danger that Nikodim's act might be negatively received by the Metropolia faithful, the majority of whom were ex-Uniates with a distaste for the Papal See. In fact, it apparently did not become generally known.

With her goal in sight, the Metropolia chose to ignore this obvious warning signal. By November 28, 1969, Nikodim had succeeded in persuading the Metropolia's Japanese diocese to accept "autonomy" under Moscow. On that day in Tokyo the finishing touches were put on the autocephaly agreement by Nikodim and the Metropolia delegates. It was decided that Patriarchal parishes in America could remain under Moscow on a temporary basis; "autonomy" was to be granted to the Japanese Church.

According to Chancellor Pishtey of the Metropolia, "The basic content of the (autocephaly) agreement was approved by our Sobor of Bishops" in September, 1969, "and then reported to the Diocesan conventions of all our Dioceses, where it met with unanimous approval."¹ One cannot help

1. Diakonia, vol. V, no. 2, 1970, p. 143.

wondering about the accuracy of Fr. Pishty's last statement. In the uproar following the appearance of his "notification" of December 6, 1969, it turned out that a large number of Metropolia priests and virtually all of her laymen were taken totally by surprise. In any case, it is a fact that a good percentage of the Metropolia clergy and a staggering majority of her laity knew absolutely nothing about the preparations for autocephaly being concluded in Tokyo on November 28.

Less than three weeks after the Tokyo agreement, the Holy Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate announced an official decision to admit Roman Catholics and Old Believers to Orthodox sacraments in the Soviet Union. This decision of December 16, 1969, became widely known in the United States after it was published by The New York Times of February 21, 1970 (p. 23), under the heading, "Russian Priests May Minister to Roman Catholics."

With this announcement our most merciful God gave the Metropolia a last providential chance to reconsider what exactly it was that she was doing. If the learned leaders of the Metropolia could not grasp the wrongfulness of dealing with a hierarchy manifestly unfree to perform its Orthodox duty, then, one would have thought, they would have at least scrupled at the impropriety of receiving autocephaly from a body that had officially granted Orthodox sacraments to non-Orthodox.

Ignoring whatever prickings of conscience they may have had, the leaders of the Metropolia decided to overlook this last awesome misstep by the Moscow Patriarchate, and, on March 31, 1970, Metropolitan Nikodim and Ireney signed the agreement for autocephaly. The process begun in 1961 had come to an end.

Immediately following the conclusion of the agreement of March 31, full canonical communion was established between Moscow and the Metropolia. The Metropolia's young Bishop Theodosius of Alaska flew twice to Moscow, where he participated in both the funeral service for Patriarch Alexis and the forty-day memorial service. The active participation of such heterodox luminaries as the Armenian Catholicos Vazgen I and Cardinal Jan Willebrands of the Vatican Secretariat at the patriarch's funeral forced Theodosius strategically to disregard the Metropolia's own prohibition against common liturgical prayer with non-Orthodox.

On May 30, 1970, Bishop Juvenaly of Tula, Nikodim's first-substitute as chairman of Moscow's Foreign Affairs Department, was a "surprise guest" at a much-publicized liturgy at St. Tikhon's Monastery in South Canaan, Pennsylvania. With great solemnity Juvenaly concelebrated with Metropolitan Ireney, Archbishop Kiprian, and Bishop Theodosius of Alaska of the Metropolia.

Five months later at the same St. Tikhon's Monastery the First Sobor of the new "autocephalous" Church was held. On October 20, the first day of the Sobor, Chancellor Pishtey read aloud the tomos of autocephaly, and by a vote of 301 to 7, with 2 abstentions, the Sobor resolved to change its name to "the Orthodox Church in America."

There has been considerable confusion about what this Sobor actually did. Did it give final approval to the autocephaly? Or had this already been done on March 31, when Metropolitan Ireney signed his agreement with Metropolitan Nikodim? A recent issue of the Metropolia's monthly publication The Orthodox Church provides the answer. In a

letter to the editor of the publication, Fr. John Meyendorff, a certain Fr. Paul Kucynda of Wayne, New Jersey, a delegate to the Sobor, writes, "I do not believe that any delegate voted to accept or reject autocephaly, for this is out of our competency. What we did do was vote overwhelmingly to change the name of our Church. This, I agree, can be and should be taken as nearly full support of the previous action of our Bishops' Council in whose full competency lies the matter of autocephaly. . . ." ¹

Fr. Meyendorff answers Fr. Kucynda by agreeing with him: "Your interpretation of the Council's (i.e., Sobor's) action is correct. The autocephaly was requested and accepted by the Council of Bishops as the supreme canonical authority of our Church." ²

This interesting friendly exchange of views tells us that the October Sobor in fact had absolutely nothing to do with the autocephaly, which was fully obtained on March 31. Fr. Meyendorff's statement that the Council of Bishops is the supreme authority in the Metropolia is puzzling when one reads in the Metropolia statutes that it is the All-American Sobor which is the supreme authority. True, according to the Metropolia's statutes the decisions of the Sobor must be approved by the Council of Bishops (although this was not done in 1946 at the Cleveland Sobor), but this does not alter the case. Obviously what the Metropolia should have done was to hold an All-American Sobor before Metropolitan Ireney signed the agreement, not afterwards. In the past the Metropolia always left it to her Sobors to make such crucial decisions.

1. The Orthodox Church, January, 1971, p. 4.
2. Loc. cit.

The fact of the matter is that the Metropolia, for all its rhetorics about "sobornost" (i.e., "catholicity"), did not even consult the broad mass of its clergy and laity before concluding negotiations for autocephaly on March 31. The October Sobor could not have reversed the autocephaly had it wished to do so; the most it could have done was to reject a proposed change of name.

It may be argued that this objection is only academic, since, as it turned out, the overwhelming majority of the delegates to the Sobor did support the autocephaly. Such an argument, however, in no way excuses the fact that a serious procedural mistake was (intentionally) made—viz., that the Sobor followed rather than preceded the ratification, as (according to the Metropolia's own statutes) it should have done. It also ignores the fact that there was considerable opposition to the autocephaly within the Metropolia itself. Once this opposition realized that it had no opportunity to fight against the autocephaly, it simply left the Metropolia for the Russian Church Abroad, since it is difficult to rebut a fait accompli.

It is more than obvious that the leaders of the Metropolia feared that a Sobor held before ratification might give rise to some serious dispute. They therefore decided to present the Sobor with an agreement which had already been concluded.

After the appearance of Fr. Pishtey's announcement in the Novoe Russkoe Slovo of December 6, the "autocephaly controversy" began. In defending the Metropolia's position her apologists usually resorted to arguments which asserted or maintained the following: (1) The "readiness" of the American Metropolia for autocephaly; (2) The "necessity" of this

autocephaly for the health and prosperity of Orthodoxy in America; (3) The "full canonical legitimacy" of the Moscow Patriarchate; (4) The "utter impossibility" that the Moscow Patriarchate could gain any influence over the Metropolia; and (5) The "correctness" of the canonical surrender of the Metropolia's Japanese Diocese to Moscow.

As far as the "readiness" of the Metropolia for autocephaly is concerned, enough has been said in the preceding Chapters of this study. As was shown, even Fr. Schmemmann in his moments of candor has been willing to admit in print the woeful state of the Metropolia's Orthodoxy.

As for the "necessity" of autocephaly for the health and well-being of American Orthodoxy, it should be observed at once that this argument is a favorite one with Metropolia apologists, and has had considerable success among the Orthodox of other jurisdictions in America. "Ought not there to be one Orthodox Church in America?" the Metropolia apologists shrilly cry. This emotional argument finds considerable favor among the more idealistic elements of the Greek, Syrian, Rumanian, et al. jurisdictions, who recently have become vocally critical of the disunity of the American Orthodox flock.

Obviously the fact that there is little unity among Orthodox in America is wrong and a sin against God. But to conclude from this that the evil of disunity justifies a nominal unity at any cost, including the surrender of the Japanese Church to Moscow and the entering into communion with hierarchs clearly subservient to atheist dictates (and who are, in addition, in sacramental communion with Roman Catholics), is even a worse wrong and a greater sin. The ends in this case clearly do not

justify the means. If true unity among the Orthodox in America is to come about, it must be as the result of a change of heart, of a renewed dedication on the part of the faithful, their pastors, and archpastors, to our merciful Saviour and His Holy Church, the ark of salvation. The Metropolia's "autocephaly" represents a cynical and mechanically legalistic attempt to impose unity by means of an ecclesiastical coup. As Metropolitan Philaret of the Russian Church Abroad has observed, the Grace of God cannot rest on such an action.

The Metropolia, as we have seen, now unequivocally recognizes the canonicity of the Moscow Patriarchate: "We recognize, and we have always done so, the canonicity and holiness of the Russian Church. . . ." ¹

"We have always believed in the full presence of grace in the Russian Church, this presence being once more so clearly shown in the matter of recognizing the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in America." ²

A study of the Metropolia's past, however, shows that this passionate defence of the legitimacy of the Moscow Patriarchate has had an uneven history. When it seemed that ecclesiastical independence might be extracted from Moscow, then she became the holy "Mother Church." But when Moscow pronounced various threats and suspensions, as she did under Platon and Theophilus, then the Patriarchate became an institution "subservient to the communists."

Fr. Schmemmann, for example, is currently a passionate apologist for Moscow's legitimacy. Not so long ago, as a member of the Parisian

1. Fr. Pishtey, Diakonia, vol. V, no. 2, 1970, p. 202.
2. Fr. G. Benigsen in Logos, January, 1971.

Russian Exarchate canonically under Constantinople, he was an equally passionate defender of the prerogatives of Constantinople against those of Moscow.

And indeed the Metropolia's conviction that only Moscow could grant autocephaly to American Orthodoxy has had some weak moments in the recent past. At the Sobor of October, 1970 (to cite only one instance), the Metropolia's Archbishop John of San Francisco made a startling admission:

Archbishop John of San Francisco stated in the sessions (of the Sobor) that he had been in Constantinople and had personally offered to Patriarch Athenagoras that he take under his omophor the Orthodox Church in America on the basis of a uniting, in the first place, of the Greek parishes subject to him and our parishes with the aim of uniting other ethnic parishes in the future. The Patriarch categorically refused.¹

And if he had not refused? Then there would have emerged an "Orthodox Church in America" proclaimed by Constantinople, not Moscow. It is obvious that what the Metropolia wanted was autocephaly. How she obtained it was really a matter of secondary importance. When Athenagoras balked at John's offer, the Metropolia turned once and for all to the more agreeable Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad.

Clearly, the cynical pragmatism of the Metropolia stands revealed.

The Metropolia admits that there is one group of believers which does have the right to judge the activities of the Moscow Patriarchate — the martyric Russian Church. Thus Fr. Pishtey writes: "We do not take

1. Sobor report of the Parish News of Sts. Peter and Paul Cathedral in Montreal, December-January, 1970-1, p. 11.

upon ourselves the right to judge in a blasphemous way the Russian Church or any of its hierarchs. If such judgment is necessary, then he alone is entitled to make it who has traversed along the road of the martyred Russian Church. He who has thus endured has the right to judge concerning its deeds and actions."¹

An interesting admission when considered in connection with some of the recent statements of the martyric Russian Church on the Moscow Patriarchate leadership! Here is the testimony of Boris Talantov, Orthodox confessor and martyr who perished in a prison hospital in Kirov on January 4, 1971:

The activity of the Moscow Patriarchate abroad is a conscious betrayal of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Christian faith. . . . Metropolitan Nikodim is betraying the Church not out of fear but out of conscience. . . . The time has come to unmask the betrayal by the Moscow Patriarchate abroad; Metropolitan Nikodim's hour has struck. . . .²

Or there is this statement by the confessor Feodisiya Varavva, terribly persecuted by the Soviet state for her bold confession of the Orthodox faith and, especially, for her attempt to bring her children up as Christians:

We are spiritual orphans who have no pastors. Most of our pastors have bowed to the godless communists and serve their will, not apostolic traditions and the decrees of the ecumenical councils. The true pastors, of whom there remain so few, are themselves harassed by state officials and by those pastors who have submitted to the godless communists.³

1. Diakonia, vol. 5, no. 2, 1970, p. 202.
2. From Michael Bourdeaux (ed.), Patriarch and Prophets, New York, 1970, pp. 331-2.
3. Ibid., p. 177

Varavva specifically names Metropolitans Nikodim of Leningrad and Pimen of Krutitsk as betrayers of the Russian Church.¹

Finally, a statement from the Moscow priests, Frs. Nikolay Eshliman and Gleb Yakunin, who were suspended by the Patriarchate for their courageous defense of the persecuted Church:

Neither the cunning of the Department of Foreign Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate, nor any interviews and authoritative statements, nor any participation of Russian hierarchs in international movements are capable of proving something that does not exist - the freedom of the Russian Church.²

Fr. Pishtey! Has the martyric Russian Church not spoken?

Has it not convincingly unmasked the betrayal of the Church by the leaders of the Patriarchate, and especially by Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad, the Metropolia's negotiating partner?

That the leaders of the Metropolia knew the testimony of the martyric Russian Church is unquestionable; several documents were even published in Metropolia publications. One must, therefore, assume that it rationalized its dealings with betrayers by saying something like this: "They may be weak sinful men, even 'betrayers,' but they are still lawful, 'canonical' representatives of the Russian Church." This argument, of course, could never be based on the New Testament or Church Fathers. And when the Moscow leaders' betrayal of their flock is considered together with their official decision to grant Orthodox sacraments to Roman Catholics and Old Believers, a decision made considerably before autocephaly was signed, it is clear that the Metropolia made a

1. Ibid., pp. 173-5.

2. From St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, vol. X, 1966, nos., 1-2, p. 105.

morally despicable move. One can only assume a total cynicism as regards the real interests of the Church.

The Metropolia's frequent heated assertions that the autocephaly agreement led to absolutely no expansion of Soviet influence over her flock are unable to bear the test of an examination of what has actually happened since autocephaly. As the younger, American-born Metropolia clergy have entered into concelebrations with Moscow clergy and have begun to lead "pilgrimages" to the Soviet Union, a considerable growth in sympathy towards the Soviet Union, and particularly, towards the Moscow Patriarchate, has become very noticeable.

Young Bishop Theodosius of Alaska, after having been wined and dined on his two important visits to Moscow, conveyed a positively glowing impression of Soviet life to his chancellor, Fr. Michael Irvin, who then remarked in an interview with an Alaskan newspaper:

Bishop Theodosius. . .has been to the Soviet Union twice within the last six weeks. He says he expected to see people poorly dressed, the cities drab, etc., but that these aren't true. He said the stores are filled with items, the cities are clean; life is not uncomfortable and people are not unhappy. They don't like a lot of things about their government but neither do Americans. As Americans we have to reassess our ideas of life in the Soviet Union. The bishop feels we will see a great change there within 20 years.¹

Shortly afterwards, an account appeared by a Metropolia priest, Fr. Gerald Sudik of Endicott, New York, who had recently returned along with sixteen of his parishioners from a three-week visit to the Soviet Union. Fr. Sudik enthusiastically reported that they had been treated like kings

1. Alaska Empire, July 2, 1970.

as representatives of a Church just granted autocephaly by Moscow. The churches, they reported, are overflowing (this, Fr. Sudik should have known, is because so few are left open); ancient churches are being restored by the State. Since 1968 the Soviet Union, fearing a war with China, has adopted a benign attitude toward the Russian Church.¹

Meanwhile, on September 5-6, 1970, a conference of the Russian Orthodox Youth Clubs of America, an organization affiliated with the Metropolia, was held in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. At the last moment it was announced that Bishop Makary Svistun, the recently-appointed permanent director of Moscow Patriarchate parishes in America and Canada and a Soviet citizen, would participate in the conference. At the liturgy on September 6 Makary concelebrated with Metropolitan Ireney. According to an eyewitness, the "leit-motif" of Makary's sermon was, "What a joy it is to observe that the Orthodox faith is flourishing on the American continent, but one must remember our great homeland, Russia, and her great efforts for peace over the whole world."²

Finally, one should not pass over the appreciation of Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad given by Fr. John Nehrebecki of the Metropolia's church in Paramus, New Jersey. He was a member of Bishop Theodosius' delegation to Moscow, and reports: "I have been asked constantly since my return about my impression of Metropolitan Nikodim of the Russian Church's Department of External Affairs with whom the Metropolia had so much contact during the negotiations. I learned that he was raised in

1. Report in Orthodox Russia, September 14, 1970.

2. Report of Georgy Nevsky, Novoe Russkoe Slovo, September 16, 1970.

the Church by devout parents - particularly his mother who died only last year. He wrote an Akathist to Sts. Boris and Gleb, the first saints of Russia, when he was only 14. He was ordained deacon at 17 and accepted monastic vows. He was ordained a priest at 20 and his theological education continued up to a master's degree of sacred theology. He was consecrated bishop at 30. He speaks fluent English. A personal impression - He brilliantly interprets the world's religious situation, In every situation - liturgically, doctrinally, historically, and on contemporary issues, he was excellent. My opinion of him is that this dynamic churchman is one of the world's greatest religious leaders."¹

This impression, gratefully republished by the Moscow Patriarchate's English-language journal One Church, contrasts starkly with the opinion of the late Russian Orthodox martyr Boris Talantov: "Instead of defending the truth, the faith and his fellow Christians, Metropolitan Nikodim is lying and slandering his brothers. . . . Metropolitan Nikodim is not worthy to bear the high office of Metropolitan of the Orthodox Church. . . ."²

To conclude, it is more than evident that Moscow has succeeded in influencing the future leaders of the Metropolia in the direction she wishes. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that the Metropolia is hardly free to criticize any actions of the Patriarchate since her autocephaly is recognized only by Moscow and Orthodox Churches such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria, which are clearly in Moscow's sphere.

1. From the Russian-Orthodox Journal, July-August, 1970.
2. Michael Bourdeaux, (ed.) Patriarch and Prophets, N. Y., 1970, p. 154.

Much to the Metropolia's disappointment none of the Greek patriarchates and local Churches, nor the Antiochian, Rumanian, and Serbian patriarchates have recognized her autocephaly. At her much-publicized canonization services for St. Herman of Alaska, held in the summer of 1970, Archbishop Paavli of the Autonomous Church of Finland and Metropolitan Audrey of the Bulgarian Patriarchate were the only high-ranking non-Metropolia hierarchs present. This also represented a considerable disappointment. The lack of recognition of the Metropolia's autocephaly by the great majority of the Orthodox Churches places the new "Orthodox Church in America" in a position of awkward dependence upon Moscow for recognition.

Perhaps the blackest aspect of the Metropolia's autocephaly agreement was its decision to turn over its small Japanese missionary diocese to the Moscow Patriarchate. Metropolia apologists are sensitive on this point and have repeatedly denied that there was any "betrayal" of the interests of the Japanese flock in the Moscow-Metropolia agreement. Thus Chancellor Pishtey writes: "As to the Japanese Church: It received full freedom to live according to its own constitution, to direct its affairs by its own synod, to choose and elevate its own hierarchy."¹ The decision of the Japanese Church to accept "autonomy" from Moscow was "freely taken by the Japanese Church itself in its synod of bishops, clerics and laity."² Anyone who knew Metropolitan Vladimir, the American bishop

1. Statement of May 12, 1970 in Diakonia, vol. V, no. 2, 1970, p. 202.

2. Loc. cit.

selected as the first head of the Japanese Church "could only smile at the thought he would enter upon any intrigues with the 'Bolsheviks.'" ¹

Fr. Pishtey's arguments, repeated by other Metropolia apologists, were accepted on faith by the Metropolia flock and by many autocephaly enthusiasts outside the Metropolia. This is indeed unfortunate, since these arguments cannot withstand even the most elementary criticism. First, Fr. Pishtey's assertion, so convincing to many, that the Japanese Church "freely" decided to accept "autonomy" from Moscow does not in the least excuse the Metropolia from moral responsibility for giving the Japanese a canonical release. Just as a mother has a moral obligation to care for the health of her young child, so too does a Mother Church (in this case the Metropolia) have a similar moral obligation to care for her young missionary dioceses. Even the most cursory study of the Metropolia's history since the 1917 Revolution convinces one that she scrupulously avoided accepting "autonomy" under Moscow. Why? Because she well knew the worth of such seeming "independence." What she always avoided for herself, however, she did not hesitate to advocate for her small, immature Japanese Mission. How can one but conclude that the Metropolia cynically elected to purchase her own "freedom" with the servitude of her Japanese Mission?

That the Moscow-Japan agreement, concluded while the Japanese Church was still canonically under the Metropolia, does in fact represent a state of servitude for the new Autonomous Church of Japan may be demonstrated by an examination of the text of the agreement, published in

1. Loc. cit.

The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, 1970, no. 5, pp. 9-10. Some selected sections from the tomos of agreement:

1. The Metropolitan of Japan, the Head of the Japanese Autonomous Church, is elected by a Local Council of the Japanese Church and is then "confirmed" by "the Head of the Autocephalous Mother Church, His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow. . . ."
2. "If he who is elected (metropolitan) does not have the rank of bishop, then his ordination is performed by His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia or by his representatives in Tokyo, together, naturally, with the other (Japanese) bishops."
3. "In case the candidate elected Head by the Holy Orthodox Autonomous Japanese Church should not possess and confess the Orthodox faith or if his life and activity should contradict the holy canons, he need not be confirmed by His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow" and the Japanese Church must select another candidate.
4. The Metropolitan of Japan "shall inform His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow. . . of the opening of new dioceses as well as of the election of new bishops together with biographical information on them."
5. "In the event His Eminence the Archbishop of Tokyo, Metropolitan of All Japan, should be accused of having infringed the dogmas of the Orthodox faith or the holy canons, the investigation of his case shall take place at a Local Council of the Holy Orthodox Autonomous Japanese Church in the presence of a representative or representatives of the Head of the Autocephalous Mother Church, the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. He, i. e., the Patriarch, will then confirm or not confirm the decision of the Local Council on this matter. . . ."
6. "The highest court of appeals (verkhovnoe pravo appelyatsii) belongs to His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, and the bishops, clerics and laity of the Holy Orthodox Autonomous Japanese Church must address him as a court of final instance (kak k posledney instantsii)."
7. "The Holy Chrism of the Holy Orthodox Autonomous Japanese Church must be received from His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia."

8. The Patriarchal podvor'e (i. e., methochion or embassy church) in Japan shall be outside the jurisdiction of the Autonomous Japanese Church. "The head and clergy of the podvor'e shall be assigned by His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. If it shall be necessary, His Eminence the Archbishop of Tokyo, Metropolitan of All Japan, shall assist as much as is possible the arrival in Japan of clerics of the Patriarchal podvor'e assigned by His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia."

9. "The decisions of the Local Councils of the Holy Orthodox Autonomous Japanese Church are sent to His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia for his knowledge."

10. "His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia can address the Holy Orthodox Autonomous Japanese Church with pastoral epistles."

Is not Fr. Pishtey, one concludes after an examination of the above-cited stipulations, somewhat exaggerating when he claims that the Japanese Church "received full freedom to live according to its own constitution. . . ."? It is more than clear that the Moscow Patriarchate, by using its right "to confirm or not to confirm" the election of the Metropolitan of Japan and its right to have final say when the metropolitan is brought to trial, has a significant voice in the life of the Japanese Church. When, in addition to this, one realizes that Moscow is the "court of final instance" for every bishop, cleric, and layman of the Japanese Church — i. e., that any bishop, cleric, or layman may appeal to Moscow for a final decision over the head of the Japanese episcopate — one becomes aware of the awesome controls exercised by Moscow over the fledgling Church. Furthermore, it should also be realized that it is up to Moscow to decide what constitutes an infringement of the faith or canons. At home in the Soviet Union, for example, the Moscow Patriarchate has since 1927 considered criticisms

of the politics of the U.S.S.R., including the persecution of religion by the State, as a sphere not open to clerics of the Orthodox Church. By her recent decision to grant Orthodox sacraments to Roman Catholics and Old Believers and by her frequent "ecumenical" common prayer with non-Orthodox the Patriarchate has shown how much it really respects the canons, which, of course, flatly prohibit such actions.

That the American Metropolia permitted its small, immature Japanese Mission to come under Moscow is, to conclude, perhaps the most shameful aspect of its generally shameful "autocephaly." One can hardly help concluding that the Metropolia's leaders consciously decided to purchase the independence for which they hungered at the cost of sacrificing the Japanese Church.

A few words are also in order concerning the "new mythology" which has been developed by the Metropolia since its reception of autocephaly.

In a lengthy, effusive speech delivered to the Sobor in October, 1970, at St. Tikhon's Monastery, Metropolitan Ireney proclaimed: "In truth, inscrutable are the ways of God! Since at that very moment when the catholic consciousness of our Church sensed the necessity of a decisive step for the attaining of canonical clarity and ecclesiastical freedom, we met with understanding on the part of the leaders of the Russian Church."¹ For Metropolitan Ireney the chief proof that the autocephaly was "the work of the Holy Spirit" is "that readiness, which was immediately manifested by both sides (i.e., Moscow and the Metropolia) to speak not about the past but about the present and the future, to cover over this past with love,

1. From a translation in the Newsletter of the Orthodox Christian Witness, December, 1970, p. 5.

to seek not the victory of this or that side but only the benefit of the Church. . . ." ¹

According to the "new mythology" articulated by Metropolitan Ireney, the "catholic consciousness" of the Metropolia mystically sensed that the sacred hour for autocephaly had come in the late 1960's, while at the same time, through the marvellous workings of the Holy Spirit, the leadership of the Moscow Patriarchate became suddenly and unexpectedly fired with a "love" which sought only the "benefit of the Church." The result was the emergence of a new autocephalous Church, "the Orthodox Church in America." As for the Metropolia's earlier frustrated attempts to attain autocephaly in 1924, 1927, and 1946 - these attempts have now been dismissed from memory. They are not needed by the "new Mythology." Neither is Metropolitan Leonty's declaration in 1950 that the Metropolia was fully ready for independence. Now it is necessary to assert that only in the late 'sixties did the Metropolia realize she had grown into an autocephalous Church.

This bold rewriting of the Metropolia's history, however, pales before the Metropolia's new assertion of the holiness of Moscow's intentions in granting autocephaly. Here we enter such a world of naked fantasy that one can hardly imagine how sane men could entertain such thoughts. The Patriarchate's sudden willingness to grant autocephaly is taken as proof of the action of the Holy Spirit.

To those who would express doubts Metropolitan Ireney utters the following terrible threat: "To the righteous and impartial judgment of

1. Ibid.

God we give over those who, held captive by human and political passions, are blinded by enmity and find it possible to blaspheme the work of God."¹

The autocephaly is the work of the Holy Spirit. Those who oppose it blaspheme against the Holy Spirit, a sin for which, as is well known, there will be no forgiveness in this world or the next.

One is dumbfounded by the simplistic criterion which Metropolitan Ireney and other Metropolia defenders employ for determining what is and what is not the work of the Holy Spirit. Certainly they know that the Orthodox delegates to the Council of Florence, with a few exceptions, also believed that the Holy Spirit had been arranging circumstances for union with the Latin (Roman Catholic) Church. They should know that God often allows the evil designs conceived in the hearts of men to come to fruit. This He does for His own holy purpose and so that evil may be clearly revealed.

To what should one ascribe the unwillingness of Metropolia apologists to see such obvious negative features of the "autocephaly" as the surrender of the Japanese Church and Moscow's decision, adopted before the autocephaly, to grant sacraments to Roman Catholics and Old Believers? Is this cynicism or self-deceit? Most probably, it is both.

Fr. Dimitry Grigorieff's "The Orthodox Church in America from the Alaska Mission to the Autocephaly," which appears in the 1970, no. 4 issue of St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, represents the first sustained attempt by a Metropolia spokesman to give expression to the "new mythology" which has emerged since the granting of autocephaly. As in Metropolitan

1. From a translation in the December, 1970, Newsletter of the Orthodox Christian Witness, p. 6.

Ireney's speech to the October Sobor, Fr. Grigorieff significantly de-emphasizes all occurrences before 1969. The Detroit Sobor of 1924, which Professor Bogolepov saw as a veiled declaration of autocephaly, now becomes simply a delicious foretaste of things to come: "This reorganization (i. e., that which was carried out by the Detroit Sobor), as we can see now, actually paved the way for the Autocephalous Orthodox Church in America, to be established forty-six years later."¹

Gone is the boldness which Professor Bogolepov manifested in seeing the Metropolia ripe for autocephaly in 1924. For Fr. Grigorieff the years since 1924 represent "years of natural growth and development," in which the Metropolia "acquired the prerequisites of a new Church."

For Bogolepov, the Metropolia was justified in resisting Moscow's demands for canonical submission only because she herself had de facto "become" a local autocephalous Church. For Grigorieff, the issue is ecclesiastical freedom: "Metropolitan Platon categorically refused to give any pledge of loyalty to the Soviet State. Furthermore, in his epistle to the faithful of America, June 3, 1933, he reaffirmed the principles accepted in Detroit in 1924, rejecting administrative submission to the Moscow Patriarchate as long as it was dependent upon a communist anti-religious government. . . ."²

Fr. Grigorieff and the editors of St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly do not seem to see the logical fallacy in proclaiming that the Moscow Patriarchate's suspensions, as placed upon the Metropolia, were not binding,

1. St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, 1970, no. 4, p. 208.

2. Ibid., p. 211.

whereas her recognitions of "autocephaly" and "autonomy" are. Furthermore, is it morally correct to surrender one's Japanese missionary diocese to a Church which is, in Fr. Grigorieff's own words, "dependent upon a communist anti-religious government"? Bogolepov's claim that the Metropolia became de facto autocephalous in 1924 is ridiculous when one considers the condition the Metropolia was in at the time, but it is at least more logical than Grigorieff's totally illogical claims. The Metropolia's "new mythology" is no more viable than its old one.

C O N C L U S I O N

In 1946 at the Cleveland Sobor, in a move not even approved by its own Council of Bishops, the American Metropolia went into schism from the body of which it was a canonical part, the Russian Church Abroad. This spiritual crime undid the holy work of reconciliation which had been carried out a decade before by the two great Orthodox hierarchs Patriarch Varnava of Serbia and Metropolitan Antony of the Russian Church Abroad. With the arrival in America during and after World War II of "Evlogian" theologians and intellectuals, the ambitions of the Metropolia's leaders met with men capable of bringing them to fruit. The result was the "autocephaly" of 1970.

There is little or no likelihood that the Metropolia will return to its proper canonical source, as occurred in 1935. Puffed up with pride, and even entertaining visions of an American Patriarchate, the leaders of the Metropolia would hardly consent to such a step. What return there is will occur, as it did during the "autocephaly controversy" of 1969-70, when

individual clergy and laity after a crisis of conscience turn to the light of Christ. In the Russian emigré community in America the autocephaly controversy served quite clearly to separate the wheat from the chaff. Unable to bear the moral compromise accepted by the Metropolia's leaders, individuals and in some cases practically whole parishes left the "autocephaly" for the Russian Church Abroad. In the emigré daily Novoe Russkoe Slovo and in numerous other publications the emigrés living in America were able to become very well informed about the "autocephaly." This was not the case, on the whole, for the American flock of the Metropolia, and one hopes that with time a similar winnowing-out of the faithful may take place. May God grant it!

The tragedy of the Metropolia's present situation is that she wishes to remain lukewarm in an age of apostasy (Rev. iii. 16). Her clergy and laity want very much to be accepted in an American society which is rapidly abandoning its last vestiges of Christian morality (the proliferation of "legal abortion" on a near-genocidal scale is but one example of this). The Metropolia wishes to be accepted in a "Christian" ecumenical movement which is rapidly opening its doors to Jews, Muslims, and Buddhists, and sees as its sacred duty the financial assistance of certain revolutionary groups throughout the world. The Metropolia thirsts to be recognized by all local Orthodox Churches at a time when one of them (Moscow) is already officially granting sacraments to non-Orthodox, another (Constantinople) is doing so unofficially, and when a number of others cannot but fulfill the dictates of their communist controllers.

Further, a subtle modernizing process, which is all the more dan-

gerous for being subtle, is being carried out by the Metropolia's Paris-educated theologians. ¹ Deprived of a vital monasticism and crippled by a weak episcopate, the Metropolia has few defences indeed with which to withstand the ravages of modernism. When the current emigré leadership, which was at least formed in the traditions of Russian Orthodoxy, gives way to the younger American-born clergy, one may expect the process of modernism to mushroom.

Let us pray our Merciful Lord and God through the supplications of His Most Holy Mother, the righteous St. Herman of Alaska, the holy martyr Peter the Aleut, and all the Saints, will cause the best sons and daughters of the American Metropolia to turn aside from this terrible temptation of "autocephaly," so recently sown by the enemy of our salvation. May they return to the Russian Church Abroad, in whose Orthodox bosom are the seeds of a genuine American Orthodoxy, and, having returned, may they join with the episcopate, clergy, monks, and laity of the Synod in bearing witness to the unique, saving faith of our Lord, God and Savior Jesus Christ and His Holy Apostles. Amen.

1. See Fr. Michael Azkoul's "Answer to Fr. Schmemmann" in the May-June, 1970 Orthodox Word (Reprinted as item no.53 in the St. Nectarios Educational Series.); Protopresbyter Michael Pomazansky's "The Liturgical Theology of Fr. A. Schmemman in the November-December, 1970, issue of the same journal, and the same author's "Is this Orthodoxy?" in the March-April, 1971, issue of Orthodox Life.

FOR FURTHER READING

- Rev. Michael Bourdeaux, Patriarch and Prophets: Persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church Today, Praeger, New York, 1970.
- John B. Dunlop, The Recent Activities of the Moscow Patriarchate Abroad and in the U.S.S.R., St. Nectarios Educational Series No. 46, Seattle, Washington, 2nd printing 1972.
- Archpriest Michael Polsky, The New Martyrs of Russia, Monastery Press, Montreal, 1971.
- G.M. Shimanov, Notes from the Red House, Monastery Press, Montreal, 1971.

PERIODICALS

- The Orthodox Word. Bi-monthly publication of the St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, Platina, Ca., 96076. Frequently has moving accounts of the life of the catacomb church within the Soviet Union.
- The Orthodox Christian Witness. Weekly publication of St. Nectarios American Orthodox Church, Seattle, Washington. Contains monthly newsletter which comments on events within the Orthodox world.
- The True Vine. Official publication of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia. Published quarterly. Subscriptions are \$2.50 per year and may be sent to: The True Vine, 8011 Champgneur Ave., Montreal 303, P.Q., Canada

PUBLICATIONS OF ST. NECTARIOS AMERICAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

The Recent Activities of the Moscow Patriarchate. John B. Dunlop.	\$1.50
Little Supplicatory Canon to the Most Holy Mother of God.	\$1.50
A Lenten Cookbook for Orthodox Christians.	Loose-leaf \$3.50
	Loose-leaf binder \$4.50

PUBLICATIONS DISTRIBUTED BY
ST. NECTARIOS AMERICAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

Against False Union. Dr. Alexander Kalomoiros.	\$1.50
The History of the Council of Florence. Ostroumoff.	\$2.00

ST. NECTARIOS EDUCATIONAL SERIES

St. Nectarios Educational Series is a collection of highly informative Orthodox writings for the layman. The articles are distributed at no cost by St. Nectarios Church. It is through donations, however, that the materials and other costs are absorbed. Write to: St. Nectarios Church, 9223-20th Avenue N.E., Seattle, Wash. 98115.

ITEMS IN THE ST. NECTARIOS EDUCATIONAL SERIES OF INTEREST
TO THE READERS OF THIS BOOK

- No. 1. First Open Letter to the Logos. Holy Transfiguration Monastery.
- No. 32. The Synod and the "official, canonical jurisdictions". Fr. Neketas.
- No. 33. On the Russian Synod. Fr. Michael Azkoul.
- Nos. 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49 and 53. All relating to the American "autocephaly" and the condition of Orthodox in the U. S. S. R.