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When communism goes on the attack, it is said to be defending itself; when democracy defends itself, it is charged with aggression.
Jean-François Revel (1985).

Losing you is not a loss, and keeping you is no specific gain.
Official slogan in Democratic Kampuchea (1970s).

That which is called democracy is always in fact plutocracy. The only alternative to the rule of the rich is to have a ruler who is deliberately made more powerful even than the rich. It is to have a ruler who is secure of his place, instead of rulers who are fighting for their place.
G.K. Chesterton.

The main mark of modern governments is that we do not know who governs, de facto any more than de jure. We see the politician and not his backer; still less the backer of the backer; or, what is most important of all, the banker of the backer.
J.R.R. Tolkien.

We, the Rockefeller Foundation, supported and funded the Women’s Liberation Movement. Why do you think we did it? There were two primary reasons for this: One was that before women’s right to work, we could only tax HALF of the population. The other was so that with women going out to work it would break up families. Women would have to spend all day at work away from the family. The children would begin to see the state and teachers as their family and this would make it easier to indoctrinate and control them.
Nick Rockefeller to Aaron Russo.

When ethnos becomes demos, the initial result is polemos or war.
Bogdan Denitch.

What is this “mutation,” the “new man”? He is the rootless man, discontinuous with a past that Nihilism has destroyed, the raw material of every demagogue’s dream; the “free-thinker” and skeptic, closed only to the truth but “open” to each new intellectual fashion because he himself has no intellectual foundation; the “seeker” after some “new revelation,” ready to believe anything new because true faith has been annihilated in him; the planner and experimenter, worshipping “fact” because he has abandoned truth, seeing the world as a vast laboratory in which he is free to determine what is “possible”; the autonomous man, pretending to the humility of only asking his “rights,” yet full of the pride that expects everything to be given him in a world where nothing is authoritatively forbidden; the man of the moment, without conscience or values and thus at the mercy of the strongest “stimulus”; the “rebel,” hating all restraint and authority because he himself is his own and only god; the “mass man,” this new barbarian, thoroughly “reduced” and “simplified” and capable of only the most elementary ideas, yet scornful of anyone who presumes to point out the higher things or the real complexity of life.

Fr. Seraphim Rose, Nihilism.
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III. CAPITALISM WAVERS (1973-1982)
“The history of the twenty years after 1973,” writes Eric Hobsbawm, “is that of a world which lost its bearings and slid into instability and crisis. And yet, until the 1980s it was not clear how irretrievably the foundations of the Golden Age [1953-73] had crumbled. Until one part of the world – the USSR and the Eastern Europe of ‘real socialism’ – had collapsed entirely, the global nature of the crisis was not recognized, let alone admitted in the developed non-communist regions. Even so, for many years economic troubles were still ‘recessions’. The half-century’s taboo on the use of the terms ‘depression’ or ‘slump’, that reminder of the Age of Catastrophe, was not completely broken. Simply to use the word might conjure up the thing, even if the ‘recessions’ of the 1980s were ‘the most serious for fifty years’ – a phrase which carefully avoided specifying the actual period, the 1930s. The civilization that had elevated the word-magic of the advertisers into a basic principle of the economy, was caught in its own mechanism of delusion. Not until the early 1990s do we find admissions – as, for instance, in Finland – that the economic troubles of the present were actually worse than those of the 1930s.

“In many ways this was puzzling. Why should the world economy have become less stable? As economists observed, the elements stabilizing the economy were now actually stronger than before, even though free-market governments, like those of Presidents Reagan and Bush in the USA, Mrs Thatcher and her successor in Britain, tried to weaken some of them. Computerized inventory control, better communications and quicker transport reduced the importance of the volatile ‘inventory cycle’ of the old mass production which produced enormous stocks ‘just in case’ they were needed at times of expansion, and then stopped dead while stocks were sold off in times of contraction. The new method, pioneered by the Japanese, and made possible by the technologies of the 1970s was to carry far smaller inventories, produce enough to supply dealers ‘just in time’, and in any case with a far greater capacity to vary output at short notice to meet changing demands. This was the age not of Henry Ford but of Benetton. At the same time the sheer weight of government consumption and of that part of private income which came from government (‘transfer payments’ such as social security and welfare) also stabilized the economy. Between them they amounted to about a third of GDP. If anything both increased in the crisis era, if only because the cost of unemployment, pensions and health care rose. As this era was still continuing at the end of the Short Twentieth Century [1914-1991], we may have to wait for some years before the economists are able to use the historians’ ultimate weapon, hindsight, to find a persuasive explanation.

“Of course the comparison of the economic troubles of the 1970s-90s with those between the wars is flawed, even though the fear of another Great Slump haunted these decades. ‘Can it happen again?’ was a question asked by many, especially after a new, dramatic American (and global) stock exchange crash in 1987 and a major international exchange crisis in 1992. The
Crisis Decades after 1973 were no more a ‘Great Depression’ in the sense of the 1930s than the decades after 1873 had been, even though they were also given that name at the time. The global economy did not break down, even momentarily, although the Golden Age ended in 1973-75 with something very like a classical cyclical slump, which reduced industrial production in the ‘developed market economies’ by 10 per cent in one year and international trade by 13 per cent. Economic growth in the developed capitalist world continued, though at a distinctly slower pace than during the Golden Age, except for some of the (mainly Asian) ‘newly industrializing countries’ or NICs, whose industrial revolutions had only begun in the 1960s. The growth of the collective GDP of the advanced economies until 1991 was barely interrupted by short periods of stagnation in the recession years 1973-75 and 1981-83. International trade in the products of industry, the motor of world growth, continued, and in the boom years of the 1980s even accelerated to a rate comparable with the Golden Age. At the end of the Short Twentieth Century the countries of the developed capitalist world were, taken as a whole, far richer and more productive than in the early 1970s, and the global economy of which they still formed the central element was vastly more dynamic.

“On the other hand, the situations in particular regions of the globe was considerably less rosy. In Africa, in Western Asia and in Latin America the growth of GDP per capita ceased. Most people actually became poorer in the 1980s and output fell for most years of the decade in the first two of these regions, for some years in the last. Nobody seriously doubted that for these parts of the world the 1980s were an era of severe depression. As for the former area of Western ‘real socialism’, after 1989 their economies, which had continued in modest growth during the 1980s, collapsed utterly. In this region the comparison of the crisis after 1989, with the Great Slump was perfectly apposite, although it underestimated the devastation of the early 1990s. Russia’s GDP fell by 17 per cent in 1990-91, by 19 per cent in 1991-92 and by 11 per cent in 1992-93. Though some stabilization began in the early 1990s, Poland had lost over 21 per cent of its GDP in 1988-92, Czechoslovakia almost 20 per cent, Romania and Bulgaria 30 per cent or more. Their industrial production in mid-1992 was between half and two thirds that of 1992.

“This was not the case in the East. Nothing was more striking than the contrast between the disintegration of the economies of the Soviet region and the spectacular growth of the Chinese economy in the same period. In that country, and indeed in much of South-East and East Asia, which emerged in the 1970s as the most dynamic region of the world economy, the term ‘Depression’ had no meaning – except, curiously enough, in the Japan of the early 1990s. However, though the capitalist world economy flourished, it was not at ease. The problems which had dominated the critique of capitalism before the war, and which the Golden Age had largely eliminated for a generation – ‘poverty, mass unemployment, squalor, instability’ – reappeared after 1973. Growth was, once again, interrupted by severe slumps, as distinct from ‘minor recessions’, in 1974-75, 1980-82 and at the end of the 1980s.
Unemployment in Western Europe rose from an average of 1.5 per cent in the 1960s to 4.2 per cent in the 1970s. At the peak of the boom in the late 1980s it averaged 9.2 per cent in the European Community, in 1993, 11 per cent. Half of the unemployed (1986-87) had been out of work for more than a year, one third for more than two years. Since the potential working population was no longer being swelled, as in the Golden Age, by the flood of growing post-war babies, and since young people, in good times and bad, tended to have much higher unemployment ratios than older workers, one would have expected permanent unemployment to shrink, if anything…”¹

* 

Hobsbawm said that the economists would have to wait several years to find a persuasive explanation of the global crisis of the twenty years after 1973. They had to wait quite a long time, until the early 2000s. Let us consider two such explanations.

First by Mark Blyth: “At the end of World War II, the United States and its allies decided that sustained mass unemployment was an existential threat to capitalism and had to be avoided at all costs. In response, governments everywhere targeted full employment as the master policy variable—trying to get to, and sustain, an unemployment rate of roughly four percent. The problem with doing so, over time, is that targeting any variable long enough undermines the value of the variable itself—a phenomenon known as Goodhart’s law.

“Long before Goodhart, an economist named Michal Kalecki had already worked this out. Back in 1943, he argued that once you target and sustain full employment over time, it basically becomes costless for labor to move from job to job. Wages in such a world will have to continually rise to hold onto labor, and the only way business can accommodate that is to push up prices. This mechanism, cost-push inflation, where wages and prices chase each other up, emerged in the 1970s and coincided with the end of the Bretton Woods regime and the subsequent oil shocks to produce high inflation in the rich countries of the West in the 1970s. In short, the system undermined itself, as both Goodhart and Kalecki predicted. As countries tried harder and harder to target full employment, the more inflation shot up while profits fell. The 1970s became a kind of “debtor’s paradise.” As inflation rose, debts fell in real terms, and labor’s share of national income rose to an all-time high, while corporate profits remained low and were pummeled by inflation. Unions were powerful and inequality plummeted.

“But if it was a great time to be a debtor, it was a lousy time to be a creditor. Inflation acts as a tax on the returns on investment and lending. Unsurprisingly in response, employers and creditors mobilized and funded a market-friendly revolution where the goal of full employment was

jettisoned for a new target—price stability, aka inflation—to restore the value of debt and discipline labor through unemployment. And it worked. The new order was called neoliberalism.

“Over the next thirty years the world was transformed from a debtor’s paradise into a creditor’s paradise where capital’s share of national income rose to an all-time high as labor’s share fell as wages stagnated. Productivity rose, but the returns all went to capital. Unions were crushed while labor’s ability to push up wages collapsed due to the twin shocks of restrictive legislation and the globalization of production. Parliaments in turn were reduced to tweet-generating talking shops as central banks and policy technocrats wrested control of the economy away from those elected to govern.”

Another explanation comes from Yanis Varoufakis, who brilliantly explains how the financial pressures created in the 1960s by the Vietnam War, on the one hand, and Lyndon Johnson’s educational and anti-poverty programmes, on the other, threatened to undermine the solvency of the USA and therefore of the whole world. This led to an economic revolution that replaced the “Global Plan” of the first post-war decades with the “Global Minotaur” of the post-1971 era:-

“Ho Chi Minh’s stubborn refusal to lose the Vietnam War, and Lyndon Johnson’s almost manic commitment to do anything to win it, were crucial not only in creating a new capitalist region in the Far East, but also in derailing the Global Plan. The escalation of the financial costs of that war was to be a key factor in the Plan’s demise.

“Setting aside the appalling human suffering, the war cost the US government around $113 billion and the US economy another $220 million. Real US corporate profits declined by 17 per cent, while, in the period 1965-70, the war-induced increases in average prices forced the real average income of American blue-collar workers to fall by about 2 per cent. The war took its toll not only ethically and politically, as a whole generation of American youngsters were marked by fear and loathing of Vietnam, but also in terms of tangible loss of working-class income, which fuelled social tensions. Arguably, President Johnson’s Great Society social programmes were largely aimed at relieving these strains.

“As the combined costs of the Vietnam War and the Great Society began to mount, the government was forced to generate mountains of US government debt. By the end of the 1960s, many governments began to worry that their own positions (which were interlocked with the dollar in the context of the Bretton Woods system), were being undermined. By early 1971, liabilities exceeded $70 billion, while the US government possessed only $12 billion of gold with which to back them up.

“The increasing quantity of dollars was flooding world markets, giving rise to inflationary pressures in places like France and Britain. European governments were forced to increase the volume of their own currencies in order to keep their exchange rate constant against the dollar, as was stipulated by the Bretton Woods system. This is the basis for the European charge against the United States that, by pursuing the Vietnam War, it was exporting inflation to the rest of the world.

“Beyond mere inflationary concerns, the Europeans and the Japanese feared that the build-up of dollars, against the background of a constant US gold stock, might spark a run on the dollar, which might then force the United States to drop its standing commitment to swapping an ounce of gold for $35, in which case their stored dollars would lose their value, eating into their national ‘savings’.

“The flaw in the Global Plan was intimately connected to what Valéry d’Estaing, President de Gaulle’s finance minister at the time, called the dollar’s ‘exorbitant privilege’: the United States’ unique privilege to print money at will without any global institutionalized constraints. De Gaulle and other European allies (plus various governments of oil-producing countries whose oil exports were denominated in dollars) accused the United States of building its imperial reach on borrowed money that undermined their countries’ prospects. What they failed to add was that the whole point of the Global Plan was that it should revolve around a surplus-generating United States. When America turned into a deficit nation, the Global Plan could not avoid going into a vicious tailspin.

“On 29 November 1967, the British government devalued the pound sterling by 14 per cent, well outside the Bretton Woods 1 per cent limit, triggering a crisis and forcing the United States government to use up to 20 per cent of its entire gold reserves to defend the $35 per ounce of gold peg. On 16 March 1968, representatives of the central banks of the seven nations that were later to form the G7 met to hammer out a compromise. They came to a curious agreement which, on the one hand, retained the official peg of $35 an ounce while, on the other hand, leaving room for speculators to trade gold at market prices.

“In 1970 President Richard Nixon appointed Paul Volcker as under-secretary of the treasury for international monetary affairs. His brief was to report to the National Security Council, headed by Henry Kissinger, who was to become a most influential secretary of state in 1973. In May 1971, the taskforce headed by Volcker at the US Treasury presented Kissinger with a contingency plan, which toyed with the idea of ‘suspension of gold convertibility’. It is now clear that, on both sides of the Atlantic, policy makers were jostling for position, anticipating a major change in the Global Plan.
“In August 1971, the French government decided to make a very public statement of its annoyance over US policy: President Georges Pompidou ordered a destroyer to sail to New Jersey to redeem US dollars for gold held at Fort Knox, as was his right under Bretton Woods! A few days later, the British government of Edward Heath issued a similar request (though without employing the British Navy), demanding gold equivalent to £4 billion held by the Bank of England. Poor, luckless Pompidou and Heath: they had rushed in where angels fear to tread!

“President Nixon was absolutely livid. Four days later, on 15 August 1971, he announced the effective end of Bretton Woods: the dollar would no longer be convertible to gold. Thus, the Global Plan unravelled.

“Soon after, Nixon dispatched his secretary of the treasury (a no-nonsense Texan called John Connally) to Europe with a sharp message. According to what Connally told reporters, what he said to the Europeans was mild and affabled: ‘We told them that we were here as a nation that had given much of our resources and our material resources and otherwise to the World to the point where frankly we were now running a deficit and have been for twenty years and it had drained our reserves and drained our resources to the point where we could no longer do it and frankly we were in trouble and we were coming to our friends to ask for help as they have so many times in the past come to us to ask for help when they were in trouble. That is in essence what we told them.’

“His real message is still ringing in European ears: It’s our currency but it’s your problem! What Connally meant was that, as the dollar was the reserve currency (i.e. the only truly global means of exchange), the end of Bretton Woods was not America’s problem. The Global Plan was, of course, designed and implemented to be in the interests of the United States. But once the pressures on it (caused by Vietnam and internal US tensions that required an increase in domestic government spending) became such that the system reached breaking point, the greatest loser would not be the United States, but Europe and Japan – the two economic zones that had benefited most from the Global Plan.

“It was not a message either the Europeans or Japan wanted to hear. Lacking an alternative to the dollar, they knew that their economies would hit a major bump as soon as the dollar started devaluing. Not only would their dollar assets lose value, but their exports would also become dearer. The only alternative was for them to devalue their currencies, too, but that would then cause their energy costs to skyrocket (given that oil was denominated in dollars). In short, Japan and the Europeans found themselves between a rock and a hard place.

“Toward the end of 1971, in December, Presidents Nixon and Pompidou met in the Azores. Pompidou, eating humble pie over his destroyer antics, pleaded with Nixon to reconstitute the Bretton Woods system, on the basis of
fresh fixed exchange rates that would reflect the new ‘realities’. Nixon was unmoved. The Global Plan was dead and buried, and a new unruly beast, the Global Minotaur, was to fill its place.

“Once the fixed exchange rates of the Bretton Woods system collapsed, all prices and rates broke loose. Gold was the first: it jumped from $35 to $38 per ounce, then $42, and then off it floated into the ether. By May 1973 it was trading at more than $90, and before the decade was out, in 1979, it had reached a fabulous $455 per ounce – a twelvefold increase in less than a decade.

“Meanwhile, within two years of Nixon’s bold August 1971 move, the dollar had lost 30 per cent of its value against the Deutschmark and 20 per cent against the yen and the franc. Oil producers suddenly found that their black gold, when denominated in yellow gold, was worth a fraction of what it used to be. Members of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), which regulated the price of oil through agreed cutbacks on aggregate oil output, were soon clamouring for coordinated cation (i.e. reductions in production) to boost the black liquid’s gold value.

“At the time of Nixon’s announcement, the price of oil was less than $3 a barrel. In 1973, with the Yom Kippur War between Israel and its Arab neighbours apace, the price jumped to between $8 and $9, thereafter hovering in the $12 to $15 range until 1979. In 1979 a new upward surge began that saw oil trade above $30 well into the 1980s. And it was not just the price of oil that scaled unprecedented heights. All primary commodities shot up in price simultaneously: bauxite (165 per cent), lead (170 per cent), tin (220 per cent) and silver (1065 per cent) are just a few examples. In short, the termination of the Global Plan signalled a mighty rise in the costs of production across the world. Inflation soared, as did unemployment – a rare combination of stagnation with inflation that came to known as stagflation.

“... Why did the United States not oppose with any degree of real commitment the large increases in oil prices? The simple reason is that, just as the Nixon administration did not mourn the end of Bretton Woods, neither did it care to prevent OPEC from pushing the price of oil higher. For these hikes were not inconsistent with the administration’s very own plans for a substantial increase in the global prices of energy and primary commodities! Indeed, the Saudis have consistently claimed that Henry Kissinger, keener to manage the flow of petrodollars to America than to prevent the rise in energy prices, was encouraging them all the way to push the price of oil up by a factor of between two and four. So long as oil sales were denominated in dollars, the US administration had no quarrel with the oil princes increases.

“Recalling that the new aim was to find ways of financing the US twin deficits without cutting US government spending, or increasing taxes, or reducing US world dominance, American policy makers understood that they had a simple task: to entice the rest of the world to finance the USA’s deficits.
But this meant a redistribution of global surpluses in favour of the United States and at the expense of the two economic zones it had built around Germany and Japan. There were two prerequisites for the planned reversal of global capital flows, which would see the world’s capital stream into Wall Street for the purpose of financing the expanding US twin deficits: (a) improved competitiveness of US firms in relation to their German and Japanese competitors, and (b) interest rates that attracted large capital flows into the United States.

“The first prerequisite could be achieved in one of two ways: either by boosting productivity in the United States or by boosting the relative unit costs of the competition. For good measure, the US administration decided to aim for both. Labour costs were squeezed with enthusiasm and, at the same time, oil prices were ‘encouraged’ to rise. The drop in US labour costs not only boosted the competitiveness of American companies, but also acted as a magnet for foreign capital that was searching for profitable ventures. Meanwhile, as oil prices rose, every part of the capitalist world was adversely affected. However, Japan and Western Europe (largely lacking their own oil) were burdened much more than the United States.

“Meanwhile, the rise in oil prices led to mountainous rents piling up in bank accounts from Saudi Arabia to Indonesia, as well as huge receipts for US oil companies. All these petro-dollars soon found their way to Wall Street’s hospitable bosom. The Fed’s interest rate policy was to prove particularly helpful in this respect.

“Turning to the second prerequisite, money (or nominal) interest rates jumped from 6 per cent, where the Global Plan’s final years had left them in 1971, to 6.44 per cent in 1973 and to 7.83 per cent the following year. By 1979, President Carter’s administration had begun to attack US inflation with panache. It appointed Paul Volcker as Fed chairman, with instructions to deal decisively with inflation. His first move was to push average interest rates to 11 per cent.

“In June 1981, Volcker raised interest rates to a lofty 20 per cent, and then again to 21.5 per cent. While his brutal monetary policy did tame inflation (pushing it from 13.5 per cent in 1981 to 3.2 per cent two years later), its harmful effects on employment and capital accumulation were profound, both domestically and internationally. Nevertheless, the two prerequisites had been met even before Ronald Reagan settled in properly at the White House.

“A new phase thus began. The United States could now run an increasing trade deficit with impunity, while the new Reagan administration could also finance its hugely expanded defence budget and its gigantic tax cuts for the richest Americans. The 1980s ideology of supply-side economics, the fabled trickle-down effect, the reckless tax cuts, the dominance of greed as a form of virtue, etc. – all these were just manifestations of America’s new ‘exorbitant
privilege’: the opportunity to expand its twin deficits almost without limit, courtesy of the capital inflows from the rest of the world. American hegemony had taken a new turn. The reign of the Global Minotaur had dawned.”

*

Between 1973 and 1975 the American economy contracted by 6 per cent. Initially, however, as Hobsbawm writes, “the change in the economic climate was not much noticed by the players in the power game, except for the sudden jump in energy prices brought about by the successful coup of the oil-producers cartel, OPEC, one of several developments which seemed to suggest a weakening of the international domination of the USA. Both superpowers were reasonably happy about the soundness of their economies. The USA was plainly less affected by the economic slow-down than Europe; the USSR – whom the gods wish to destroy they first make complacent – felt that everything was going its way. Leonid Brezhnev, Khrushev’s successor, who presided over the twenty years of what Soviet reformers were to call ‘the era of stagnation’, seemed to have some cause for optimism, not least because the oil crisis of 1973 had just quadrupled the international market value of the gigantic new deposits of oil and natural gas which had been discovered in the USSR since the middle 1960s...”

Seventies America was a depressing place. “Politics fell into paralysis,” writes Norman Stone, “and foreign policy for a time became mouthings. Congress was now cutting the powers of the presidency. In November 1973, even before he fell, Nixon had faced a Resolution preventing him from sending troops overseas for any length of time if Congress did not formally give support, and the Jackson-Vanik amendment of 1973-74 put an obstacle in the way of his policies towards the Soviet Union, by cancelling favourable trade arrangements if Moscow did not cease harassing Jewish would-be emigrants. In July-August 1974 Congress again paralysed US handling of another strategic headache, on Cyprus, where first Greeks and then Turks had intervened. Both were in NATO, and each had treaty rights to invoke; Cyprus mattered because there were British bases there, and the island was on the very edge of the Middle East. One set of Greeks attacked another set of Greeks, and there was a Turkish minority with paper rights, which the Turkish army then invoked, occupying a third of the island. The enraged Greek lobby intervened, against the advice of Kissinger, who felt that it was giving up the chance of a long-term solution in order to vent short-term steam, a judgement proven correct. That autumn Congress restricted the CIA, and in 1975 frustrated any positive policy towards Angola, where a civil war killed off a fifth of the population. Endless new committees in both Houses now supervised aspects of foreign affairs, and the old congressional committees which had been notorious for insider dealings, with long-term chairmen who

---

knew which levers to pull, were replaced by an allegedly open system in which nothing worked at all. The staff monitoring the White House rose to 3,000.

“The seventies were a period when the formula of fifties America appeared to be failing, and there was a symbol of this. The very capital of capitalism was in trouble... The crisis of 1973 wrecked the city’s finances, as stock exchange dealings fell, whereas welfare costs remained fixed. New York City was only narrowly saved from collapse in 1974, though [Mayor] Lindsay himself had by then given up, and in the later 1970s ordinary city services often came apart – snow not shifted; in 1977 a power failure that lasted for almost thirty hours, during which there was a great deal of looting. As was said, the cheerful city of Breakfast at Tiffany's turned into the bleak battleground of Midnight Cowboy. Around this time, too, came a further extraordinary flouting of ancient rules: the release of mental patients onto the streets, as asylums were closed. Progressive-minded specialists had urged this, and New York acquired a sort of black-humour chorus to its problems. And so any American big city had the horrible sight of mentally ill people roaming the streets and combing through the rubbish. Much of this went back to sixties best-sellers, whether Michel Foucault’s Madness and Civilization (1965) or Thomas Szasz’s book of 1961, The Myth of Mental Illness, and it was the judges who ruled that this had something to do with human rights. The overall sense of these works – Laing’s the best known – was to the effect that madness was, in this world, a sane response, and there was something to be said for this view. Much the same happened as regards crime. Progressive-minded criminologists had been arguing quite successfully for non-use of prison, but crime rates doubled in the 1960s whereas the numbers in prison actually fell, from 210,000 to 195,000 (by 1990 they had risen again, to one million), in accordance with modish behaviouralist ideas, and in the later 1970s, although there were 40 million serious crimes every year, only 142,000 criminals were imprisoned. The National Rifle Association membership grew from 600,000 in 1964 to 2 million in 1981. If the police and the courts could not defend Americans, what else were they supposed to do?

“Contempt for ordinary Americans also showed in the interpretation of the desegregation laws. The worst cases happened over school segregation. Boston schools that served poor districts were dictated to by judges who unashamedly sent their own children to private schools. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 had expressly stated that there would be no enforced bussing of children from one district to another to keep racial quotas. But the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare issued regulations in defiance of this. The argument was that if there were not sufficient white children, then segregation must be occurring. The courts backed this in 1972. Almost no-one wanted the bussing, but it went ahead, with riots and mayhem, and there was a move out of town, and a rise in private-school enrolment (from one-ninth to one-eighth). In the north-east racial isolation became worse than before – 67 per cent of black pupils were in black-majority schools in 1968 and 80 per cent in 1980 (more than even in
1954). There were horrible stories at South Boston High, where black children were exempted from fire drills out of fear for their safety if they left the building…

“Where was American democracy? Law was passed by an apparent ‘Iron Triangle’ of lobbyists, bureaucrats and tiny subcommittees. The Democrats (now essentially enrolled from the north-east) reformed the House in such a way as to remove the old men from committee chairmanships, as from October 1974, when one of them became involved in a sex scandal involving a whore. The old system had been able to deliver votes, for instance for the Marshall Plan, but it could also be used to stop left-Democrat aims because experienced chairmen knew how to do it. A San Francisco congressman, Phil Burton – he supported Pol Pot in Cambodia, in 1976 – was backed by labour, but the result with many now open committees, was that lobbyists flourished, and the small print of enormous legislative documents contained provisions to satisfy them, quite often unnoticed by scrutineers. It became impossible to get the budget in on time, and there had to be endless ‘Continuing Resolutions’ which simply enabled the government to go on spending as before: in 1974, $30 bn more; between 1974 and 1980 spending (beyond defence) rose from $174 bn to $444 bn.

“It was not surprising that so many Americans felt hostile to the whole process, and a radical, Christopher Lasch, wrote powerfully as to how a bureaucracy-dominating elite had taken power from people to run their own lives. He particularly despised the endless fuss made about cigarette-smoking – it started with a ban in Arizona, in 1973, on smoking in public buildings – but this was a frivolous period, the landmarks down. What Leszek Kołakowski called the politics of infantilism went ahead. Alvin Toffler pronounced in 1970 that the future would amount to endless leisure. For some, it did. In 1970, 1.5 million drew a disability pension, but 3 million in 1980; one tenth of the nation’s families were headed by a single woman, living on welfare. Paul Ehrlich in 1968 looked at *The Population Bomb* and asserted that there would be famine in the 1970s, and thought that pets should be killed, to save resources. One man made his name in the seventies with the claim that there would be a new Ice Age, and made his name again twenty years later with a further claim that global warming would mean apocalyptic floods. The wilder shores of the sexual revolution were explored, Niall Ferguson remarking that the only people who wanted to join the army were women, and the only people who wanted to get married were gays. Feminism, a cause that went back to hesitant beginnings under Kennedy, was vigorously promoted through the courts, and quotes for ‘positive discrimination’ were allowed – although Congress had never voted for this. Equality was applied, with many absurdities resulting (Edward Luttwak got himself off guest lists when he pointed out that heavy military lorries, driven by women, might crash because the driver’s legs were not strong enough for the controls). In Ohio women were at last ‘allowed’ to lift weights heavier than 25 pounds; in February 1972 the ghastly little word ‘Ms’ was allowed in government documents; women were ‘allowed’ to enter sports teams’ locker rooms; in
New York women were permitted to become firemen; and in 1978 women were allowed to serve on naval vessels, ten of the first fifty-five becoming pregnant. Here was America at its witches-of-Salem weirdest.”

* 

“The overall Atlantic crisis,” continues Stone, “was displayed at its worst in England, where the entire civilization had – with a Dutch contribution – started.” Of course, Britain was now far less important than America from the military and economic points of view. However, she was still America’s only dependable ally in the UN and NATO, and her “soft power” could soften the annoyingly brash image that American “hard power” conveyed abroad.

“Her worldwide troubles in 1947 had led to the creation of an Atlantic system; now, her domestic ones revealed its central weaknesses. The great British economist John Maynard Keynes had somehow lent his name to the Pursuit of Happiness: he could reconcile welfare with progress. Government waved its wand, the poor had money transferred to them from the rich, spenders were encouraged rather than savers, the economy grew accordingly, and unemployment was kept low. ‘Keynesianism’, though no-one could quite pin down the Master, reigned, and dissident economists were unfashionable, or even slightly ridiculous. Their chief argument against Keynesianism was that it would promote inflation: if governments overtaxed then money would go abroad, and an overhang of paper money would translate into higher prices; in the end, when workers, through trade unions, wanted higher wages to defend themselves against a rising of basic prices, then they would expect inflation in the future, and want even higher wages. That would in turn add to the paper money and to the inflation. There were a few bright sparks who suggested that there was a relationship between the amount of paper money and pyramids of credit on one side, and rising prices on the other. This was called ‘monetarism’. Such bright sparks were not fashionable. In the sixties, the Keynesians made the running, had the answers, were constantly in the newspapers and on television, and then, in the seventies, ran into very choppy waters.

“The oil crisis had its worst effects here, and the quadrupling of energy prices pushed England into a trouble that called in question the whole post-war order. Strikes in the seventies meant that the average worker was not working for nearly a fortnight every year (‘average’ is not the right word: large unions alone were involved, and not all of them) whereas in the fifties the figure had been three days. The Prime Minister, Edward Heath, who had the face of a large and angry baby, would harangue the nation on a television that was switched off after 10 p.m. In 1974 he launched an election distinguished by the abstention of 2 million of his natural supporters, lost, and was replaced by a man who pandered to the unions. The Stock Exchange sank to a pitiful level and banks went under. The country was about one-third

---

as well-off as Germany, and in parts of the North there were areas that even resembled Communist Poland. In 1970 a rising figure in the political media of London, Ferdinand Mount, remembered that, from the capital, ‘the main railway line to the north passed through great swathes of devastation – industrial wastelands with rows of roofless workshops – the roofs had been removed in order to avoid taxes.’ Why had this decline come about, in a country which, after the war, had been the second greatest exporter in the world? It was partly that the pound had become a very strong currency, and latterly because there was oil in the North Sea, but the fall of exports was really to do with ‘poor quality, late delivery, trade union restrictions, timed and defeatist management’. In fact Keynes himself, towards the end of the war, had bitterly hoped that the Germans would still have enough bombing power to obliterate some of the worst-managed industries. As things were, obliteration happened painfully a generation later...

“Intelligent people did not need statistics to learn about the decline of the country; they only needed to take the boat train to France. By this time, British problems seemed to be falling into a vicious circle, of inflation, of problems with the pound, of problems with the balance of payments, of problems regarding unions and management alike. In 1971 unemployment began to rise, reaching not far from one million, while at the same time inflation stood at 9 per cent – not what was supposed to happen. Heath saw the answer in three directions. After a few weeks of pretending that he would ‘free’ the market, he was soon (February 1972) into the business of subsidizing collapsing industries, and then imposing controls on wages and prices (November: ‘U Turn’). But he would make up for this. First of all would be government spending. Then would come attempts to deal with the union problem, whether by agreement, or by law. Finally, there was ‘Europe’: the magic that had worked in France and Germany would work in England as well.

“The first two tacks ran into headwinds. Money was splashed around, interest rates were reduced from 7 to 5 per cent, and bank lending was less controlled; taxation was cut by £500m and post-war credits were repaid. At the same time public works were undertaken, particularly in the north – famously, an elaborate concrete bridge with hardly any traffic on it. There was an explosion of bank lending - £1.32bn in 1970, £1.8bn in 1971 and almost £7bn by 1973. Another expansionary budget followed in 1972, with tax cuts of £1.2bn. In 1972 the floating of the pound allowed inflows from abroad, and new credit-giving institutions were allowed to emerge, offering and taking loans in conditions no longer subject to the controls of the past. For a time, this seemed to work. Unemployment did indeed fall to 500,000, but this was classic fool’s gold. The ‘fringe banks’ for time did well out of property prices, which had a dangerously more important role in England than elsewhere, and unlovely concrete spread and spread and spread.

“But then came the oil shock. Even food prices trebled by 1974 as against 1971, and the bubble burst in November 1973, when the minimum lending
rate was pushed up to 13 per cent while public spending was cut back by £12bn. One of the new banks could not obtain credit, and the other banks had to set up a ‘lifeboat’. It was not enough. The Bank of England itself had to move in, in the winter of 1974-5, and a well-connected bucket shop concern, Slater Walker Securities, had to be rescued in 1975. The Stock Exchange collapsed. Heath’s effort to spend his way through the strange ‘stagflation’ had thus come to grief, and inflation by 1976 reached 25 per cent.

“In this dismal tale came a damp squib: since the later 1950s the importance of the European recovery had been plain for all to see. Germany boomed, and so, despite 1968, did France. Italy was also picking herself up in a remarkable way, and by 1970 any Englishman could see for himself how far his country was lagging behind. By 1960 British governments appreciated that their might-have-been alternative, the former imperial lands and some of the smaller European countries such as Finland and Austria, did not give them quite the same weight as would membership of the European Economic Community. Besides, the Americans were very keen to have Great Britain as a member, for the obvious reason that she could act as an Atlantic bridge for them, in a hostile view, to walk upon. The British tried in 1962-3 and were told ‘no’ rudely and in public by de Gaulle, who wanted to build up Europe as a sort of ‘third force’. He did it again in 1967. After his resignation, and after the shock of 1968, there were more realistic French governments and de Gaulle’s successor, Pompidou, could see, with the shocks of the world’s financial system in the early seventies, and the American disaster in Vietnam, that the Atlantic system needed buttressing. On the British side the various mishaps of that period caused a good part of opinion to wish that, like Italy, England could be governed by foreign-made rules, since the domestic ones were so demonstrably not working. Besides, on both sides of the political divide, senior politicians believed in big government, erecting concrete blocks of some hideousness in celebration of it. The Europe of Brussels did much the same... In 1972-3 the Heath government pushed British membership, and did so in some desperation. It signed away British fishing rights, condemning picturesque fishing villages to decline as floating fishing factories vacuumed the fish out of the sea. It also had to accept the Common Agricultural Policy, which put up food costs for the poor by £25 per week, and deprived former colonial territories of an appropriate market, all the while getting the ordinary taxpayer to pay. Still, ‘Britain in Europe’ appeared to be the only way out of the troubles of the Heath-Wilson period, and in 1975 a referendum confirmed British membership. Italians had constantly voted with enthusiasm for not being governed by Italians. Now the British did the same. Heath had not quite unwittingly done that service to the cause he most believed in. But Europe offered no immediate relief, quite the contrary...”

In the second half of the seventies the situation went from bad to worse. In February, 1974 a Labour government under Harold Wilson came to power. It was even less able to tame the militant unions than the Conservatives had

---

been. As inflation climbed and the public debt rose, a Prices and Incomes Policy (a very socialist kind of measure) was imposed. Then a sterling crisis broke out. In 1976 Wilson resigned, Callaghan took his place and the IMF was called in – a deep humiliation for the nation.

“In 1976-7 the world economy did pick up, as the oil-shock money was recycled back to the industrial and exporting countries (which grew overall at 5 per cent). But the British economy was by now too fragile to gain much more than a respite, and inflation still ran high – 25 per cent in 1975, 16 per cent in 1976 and in 1977 (earnings keeping apace until 1977). As the pound was now a petrol currency, it naturally rose; keeping it down meant selling it, and that made for inflationary pressures, compounded by the inrush of Arab money. Still, there was a respite, unemployment not much above a million, and inflation down below 8 per cent in 1978. The respite did not last long.

“Seventies England finally fell apart over an absurd wrangle about Scotland. The vagaries of the electoral system had made the government dependent upon a few Scottish Nationalists. Theirs was a cause not worth discussion: careerist soft-profession mediocrities with no sense of their own country’s considerable history. They had to be placated, and a referendum was staged as to independence. It failed, and, without the votes of the few Nationalists, the Labour government collapsed. It did so as the economic strategy also collapsed: the comic arithmetic of the pay policy anyway fell apart because in far-away Teheran the Shah lost his Peacock Throne, and in the ensuing panic oil prices doubled. Iran was the second-largest oil producer, and revolution there affected 5 million barrels per day. Production was suspended for ten weeks after 27 December 1978, and then recovered only to 2 million. By June 1979 the price of Saudi Light Crude had risen from $12.98 to $35.40, and there was a very harsh winter in the USA and Europe; the spot price affected marginal, non-contracted oil, and some crude-oil prices – Nigeria’s for instance – even reached $40 per barrel. In Britain, with inflation rising, the barriers broke. The TUC wanted 22 per cent, not the 5 per cent they were supposed to accept, and various strikes began in the winter of 1978-9. Callaghan, who himself said that if he were younger he would emigrate, confessed that there was a strange new tide a-flowing, and he was right.

“By this time, the government’s policies were spreading havoc. The headmaster of an infants’ school in a small Berkshire town wrote to parents whose children usually had school dinners that they would have to go home because of a strike. He added: ‘we cannot allow you to provide packed meals instead, as this could be regarded as a form of strike breaking.’ The heart of the whole wretched problem was expounded by a valiant economist of the Right, Walter Ellis, who said that if at Oxford in 1965 the question had been asked as to whether an absence of growth, inflation, unemployment and a balance of payments crisis could coexist, the answer would have been yes, but only in an underdeveloped country. The Bank of England noted in 1975-6 that the real return on investment was now zero. By then taxation of salaries had reached 83 per cent and on interest or dividends, 98 per cent. The government
was in no condition to face trouble from the unions again, and there was more panic; the City refused to buy government stock, mistrusting it; interest rates rose above 10 per cent again, to 14 per cent by May 1979, when the next election happened. The annual debt - ‘public sector borrowing requirement’ - almost doubled, to some £10bn, but even then some effort had to be made to control public sector wages at a time when the government was taking three fifths of the entire national income for itself. In the summer of 1978 the unions rebelled against the system, the Ford workers leading the way, and by the winter there were surreal strikes, including dustmen and even body-buriers. But England, messy as it was, was not without creativity, or even tissue regeneration. There was to be a reaction against all of this. Edward Heath had been dismissed as leader of the Conservative Party, to his own and his supporters’ great surprise. Margaret Thatcher replaced him, to his disbelief. She meant business, at last…”

* 

The economic decline of the Anglo-Saxon world symbolized a deeper moral decline. After the “Swinging Sixties”, the looming defeat in Vietnam, and Nixon’s pseudo-triumph but in reality craven treachery in Peking, the Anglo-Saxon world degenerated sharply from a moral point of view. “Free love”, abortion and drug-consumption became normal - and the traditional institutions of society seemed incapable of holding the line against them. Particularly significant was the legalization of homosexuality, and its redefinition by the psychiatrists. In 1973 the Board of Directors of the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM). Some psychiatrists who fiercely opposed this action subsequently circulated a petition calling for a vote on the issue by the Association's membership. That vote was held in 1974, and the Board's decision was ratified. Now the door was open for the spread of the vice throughout the western world...

As Hobsbawm writes, “The world was now tacitly assumed to consist of several billion beings defined by their pursuit of individual desire, including desires hitherto prohibited or frowned on, but now permitted – not because they had now become morally acceptable but because so many egos had them. Thus until the 1990s official liberalization stopped short of legalizing drugs. These continued to be prohibited with varying degrees of severity and a high degree of inefficacy. For from the later 1960s an enormous market for cocaine developed with great rapidity, primarily among the prosperous middle classes of North America and, a little later, Western Europe. This, like the somewhat earlier and more plebeian growth in the market for heroin (also primarily North American) turned crime for the first time into genuinely big business.

---

“The cultural revolution of the later twentieth century can thus best be understood as the triumph of the individual over society, or rather, the breaking of the threads which in the past had woven human beings into social textures. For such textures had consisted not only of the actual relations between human beings and their forms of organization but also of the general models of such relations and the expected patterns of people’s behaviour towards each other; their roles were prescribed, though not always written. Hence the often traumatic insecurity when older conventions of behaviour were either overturned or lost their rationale, or the incomprehension between those who felt this loss and those too young to have known anything but anomie society...

“Over most of the world the old social textures and conventions, though undermined by a quarter of a century of unparalleled social and economic transformation, were strained, but not yet in disintegration. This was fortunate for most of humanity, especially the poor, since the network of kin, community and neighbourhood was essential to economic survival and especially to success in a changing world. In much of the Third World it functioned as a combination of information service, labour exchange, a pool of labour and capital, a savings mechanism and a social security system. Indeed, without cohesive families the economic successes of some parts of the world – e.g. the Far East - are difficult to explain.

“In the more traditional societies the strains would show chiefly inasmuch as the triumph of the business economy undermined the legitimacy of the hitherto accepted social order based on inequality, both because aspirations became more egalitarian and because the functional justifications of inequality were eroded. Thus the wealth and profligacy of Indian rajahs (like the known immunity to taxation of the British family’s royal wealth, which was not challenged until the 1990s), had not been envied or resented by their subjects, as a neighbour’s might have been. They belonged to, and were marks of, their special role in the social – perhaps even in the cosmic – order, which in some sense was believed to maintain, stabilize and certainly to symbolize, their realm. In a somewhat different mode, the considerable privileges and luxuries of Japanese business tycoons were less unacceptable, so long as they were seen not as individually appropriated wealth, but essentially as adjuncts to their official positions in the economy, rather like the luxuries of British cabinet ministers – limousines, official residences, etc. – which are withdrawn within hours of their ceasing to occupy the post to which they are attached. The actual distribution of incomes in Japan, as we know, was considerably less unequal than in Western business societies. Yet anyone who observed the Japanese situation in the 1980s, even from afar, could hardly avoid the impression that during this boom decade the sheer accumulation of personal wealth and its public display made the contrast between the conditions under which the ordinary Japanese lived at home – so much more modestly than their Western homologues – and the condition of the Japanese rich far more visible. Perhaps for the first time they were no long
sufficiently protected by what had been seen as the legitimate privileges that go with service to state and society.

“In the West, the decades of social revolution had created far greater havoc. The extremes of such breakdown are more easily visible in the public ideological discourse of the occidental fin de siècle, especially in the kind of public statements which, while laying no claim to analytical depth, were formulated in terms of widely held beliefs. One thinks of the argument, at one time common in some feminist circles, that women’s domestic work should be calculated (and, where necessary, paid) at a market rate, or the justification of abortion reform in terms of an abstract and unlimited ‘right to choose’ of the individual (woman). The pervasive influence of neo-classical economics, which in Western societies increasingly took the place of theology, and (via the cultural hegemony of the USA) the influence of the ultra-individualist American jurisprudence, encouraged such rhetoric. It found political expression in the British premier Margaret Thatcher’s: ‘There is no society, only individuals.’

“Yet, whatever the excesses of theory, practice was often equally extreme. Sometime in the 1970s, social reformers in the Anglo-Saxon countries, rightly shocked (as enquirers periodically were) by the effects of institutionalization on the mentally ill or impaired, successfully campaigned to have as many of them as possible let out of confinement ‘to be cared for in the community’. But in the cities of the West there no longer was a community to care for them. There was no kin. Nobody knew them. There were only streets of cities like New York filled with homeless beggars with plastic bags who gestured and talked to themselves. If they were lucky or unlucky (it depended on the point of view) they eventually moved from the hospitals that had expelled them to the jails which, in the USA, became the main receptacle of the social problems of American society, especially its black part. In 1991 15 per cent of what was proportionately the largest prison population in the world – 426 prisoners per 100,000 population – were said to be mentally ill.

“The institutions most severely undermined by the new moral individualism were the traditional family and traditional organized churches in the West, which collapsed dramatically in the last third of the century. The cement that had held the communities of Roman Catholics together crumbled with astonishing speed. In the course of the 1960s attendance at Mass in Quebec (Canada) fell from 80 to 20 per cent and the traditionally high French-Canadian birth-rate fell below the Canadian average. Women’s liberation, or more precisely women’s demand for birth-control, including abortion and the right to divorce, drove perhaps the deepest wedge between the Church and what had in the nineteenth century become the basic stock of the faithful, as became increasingly evident in notoriously Catholic countries like Ireland and the Pope’s own Italy, and even – after the fall of communism – in Poland. Vocations for the priesthood and other forms of religious life fell steeply, as did the willingness to live lives of celibacy, real or official. In short,… the Church’s moral authority over the faithful disappeared into the black hole
that opened between its rules of life and morality and the reality of late-twentieth-century behaviour. Western Churches with a less compelling hold over their members, including even some of the older Protestant sects, declined even more steeply.

“The material consequences of the loosening of traditional family ties were perhaps even more serious. For, as we have seen, the family was not only what it had always been, a device for reproducing itself, but also a device for social cooperation. As such it had been essential for maintaining both the agrarian and the early industrial economies, the local and the global. This was partly because no adequate impersonal capitalist business structure had been developed before the concentration of capital and the rise of big business began to generate the modern corporate organization at the end of the nineteenth century, that ‘visible hand’ which was to supplement Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hand’ of the market. But an even stronger reason was that the market by itself makes no provision for that central element in any system of private profit-seeking, namely trust, or, its legal equivalent, the performance of contracts. This required either state power (as the seventeenth-century political theorists of individualism knew well) or the ties of kin or community. Thus international trading, banking and finance, fields of sometimes physically remote activities, large rewards and great insecurity, had been most successfully conducted by kin-related bodies of entrepreneurs, preferably from groups with special religious solidarities like Jews, Quakers, or Huguenots. Indeed, even in the late twentieth century, such links were still indispensable in criminal business, which was not only against the law but outside its protection. In a situation where nothing else guaranteed contracts, only kin and the threat of death could do so. The most successful Calabrian mafia families therefore consisted of a substantial group of brothers.

“Yet just these non-economic group bonds and solidarities were now being undermined, as were the moral systems that went with them. These had also been older than modern bourgeois industrial society, but they had also been adapted to form an essential part of it. The old moral vocabulary of rights and duties, mutual obligations, sin and virtue, sacrifice, conscience, rewards and penalties, could no longer be translated into the new language of desired gratification. Once such practices and institutions were no longer accepted as part of a way of ordering society that linked people to each other and ensured social cooperation and reproduction, most of their capacity to structure human social life vanished. They were reduced simply to expressions of individuals’ preferences, and claims that the law should recognize the supremacy of preferences. Uncertainty and unpredictability impended. Compass needles no longer had a North, maps became useless. This is what became increasingly evident in the most developed countries from the 1960s on. It found ideological expression in a variety of theories, which tried to sidestep the problem of judgement and values altogether, or rather to reduce them to the single denominator of the unrestricted freedom of the individual.
“Initially, of course, the advantages of wholesale social liberalization had seemed enormous to all except ingrained reactionaries, and its costs minimal, nor did it seem to imply economic liberalization. The great tide of prosperity washing across the populations of the favoured regions of the world, reinforced by the increasingly comprehensive and generous public social security systems, appeared to remove the debris of social disintegration. Being a single parent (i.e. overwhelmingly a single mother) was still by far the best guarantee of a life of poverty, but in modern welfare states it also guaranteed a minimum of livelihood and shelter. Pensions, welfare services and, in the end, geriatric wards took care of the isolated old, whose sons and daughters could not, or no longer felt the obligation to, look after parents in their decline. It seemed natural to deal with other contingencies that had once been part of the family order in the same way, for instance by shifting the burden of caring for infants from mothers to public crèches and nurseries, as socialists, concerned with the needs of wage-earning mothers, had long demanded.

“Both rational calculation and historical development seemed to point in the same direction as various kinds of progressive ideology, including all those which criticized the traditional family because it perpetuated the subordination of women or of children and adolescents, or on more general libertarian grounds. Materially, public provision was obviously superior to that which most families could provide for themselves, either because of poverty or for other reasons. That the children in democratic states emerged from the world wars actually healthier and better fed than before, proved the point. That welfare states survived in the richest countries at the end of the century, in spite of systematic attacks on them by free-market governments and ideologists, confirmed it. Moreover, it was a commonplace among sociologists and social anthropologists that in general the rule of kinship ‘diminishes with the importance of governmental institutions’. For better or worse, it declined with ‘the growth of economic and social individualism in industrial societies’. In short, as had long been predicted, Gemeinschaft was giving way to Gesellschaft, communities to individuals linked in anonymous societies.

“The material advantages of a life in the world in which community and family declined were, and remain, undeniable. What few realized was how much of modern industrial society up to the mid-twentieth century had relied on a symbiosis between old community and family values and the new society, and therefore how dramatic the effects of their spectacularly rapid disintegration were likely to be. This became evident in the era of neo-liberal ideology, where the macabre term ‘the underclass’ entered, or re-entered the socio-political vocabulary around 1980. These were the people who, in developed market societies after the end of full employment, could not manage or did not want to make a living for themselves and their families in the economy of the market (supplemented by the social security system), which seemed to work well enough for most of the inhabitants of such countries, at all events until the 1990s…
“The drama of collapsed traditions and values lay not so much in the material disadvantages of doing without the social and personal services once supplied by family and community. These could be replaced in the prosperous welfare states, although not in the poor parts of the world, where the great majority of humanity still had little to rely on except kin, patronage and mutual aid… It lay in the disintegration both of the old value systems and the customs and conventions which controlled human behaviour. This loss was felt. It was reflected in the rise of what came to be called (again in the USA, where the phenomenon became noticeable from the end of the 1960s) ‘identity politics’, generally ethnic/national or religious, and of militantly nostalgic movements seeking to recover a hypothetical past age of unproblematic order and security. Such movements were cries for help rather than carriers of programmes – calls for some ‘community’ to belong to in an anomic world; some family to belong to in a world of social isolates; some refuge in the jungle. Every realistic observer and most governments knew that crime was not diminished or even controlled by executing criminals or by deterrence through long penal sentences, but every politician knew the enormous, emotionally loaded strength, rational or not, of the mass demand of ordinary citizens to punish the anti-social.

“These were the political dangers of the fraying and snapping of the old social textures and value systems. However, as the 1980s advanced, generally under the banner of pure market sovereignty, it became increasingly obvious that it also constituted a danger to the triumphant capitalist economy.

“For the capitalist system, even while built on the operations of the market, had relied on a number of proclivities which had no intrinsic connection with that pursuit of the individual’s advantage which, according to Adam Smith, fuelled its engine. It relied on ‘the habit of labour’, which Adam Smith assumed to be one of the fundamental motives of human behaviour, on the willingness of human beings to postpone immediate gratification for a long period, i.e. to save and invest for future rewards, on pride in achievement, on customs of mutual trust, and on other attitudes which were not implicit in the rational maximisation of anyone’s utilities. The family became an integral part of early capitalism because it supplied it with a number of these motivations. So did ‘the habit of labour’, the habits of obedience and loyalty, including the loyalty of executives to their firm, and other forms of behaviour which could not readily be fitted into rational choice theory based on maximisation. Capitalism could function in the absence of these, but, when it did, it became strange and problematic even for businessmen themselves. This happened during the fashion for piratical ‘take-overs’ of business corporations and other financial speculations which swept the financial districts of ultra-free-market states like the USA and Britain in the 1980s, and which virtually broke all links between the pursuit of profit and the economy as a system of production. That is why capitalist countries which had not forgotten that growth is not achieved by profit maximisation alone (Germany, Japan, France), made such raiding difficult or impossible.
“Karl Polanyi, surveying the ruins of nineteenth-century civilization during the Second World War, pointed out how extraordinary and unprecedented were the assumptions on which it had been constructed: those of the self-regulating and universal system of markets. He argued that Adam Smith’s ‘propensity to barter, truck and exchange one thing for another’ had inspired ‘an industrial system,... which practically and theoretically implied that the human race was swayed in all its economic activities, if not also in its political, intellectual and spiritual pursuits, by that one particular propensity’. Yet Polanyi exaggerated the logic of capitalism in his time, just as Adam Smith had exaggerated the extent to which, taken by itself, the pursuit by all men of their economic advantage would automatically maximize the wealth of nations.

“As we take for granted the air we breathe, and which makes possible all our activities, so capitalism took for granted the atmosphere in which it operated, and which it had inherited form the past. It only discovered how essential it had been, when the air became thin. In other words, capitalism had succeeded because it was not just capitalist. Profit maximisation and accumulation were necessary conditions for its success, but not sufficient ones. It was the cultural revolution of the last third of the century which began to erode the inherited historical assets of capitalism and to demonstrate the difficulties of operating without them. It was the historic irony of neoliberalsm that became fashionable in the 1970s and 1980s, and looked down on the ruins of the communist regimes, that it triumphed at the very moment when it ceased to be as plausible as it had once seemed. The market claimed to triumph as its nakedness and inadequacy could no longer be concealed...”

42. THE AMERICAN RELIGIOUS RIGHT

The citizens of a great country cannot look with equanimity on the moral collapse of their people - and America is a great country. So there was bound to be a reaction to the Atlantic crisis – at least on the American side of the Atlantic. The conservative reaction against what was perceived to be America’s fall into immoral liberalism centred on two issues: abortion and the feminist revolution.

*Roe v. Wade* was a Supreme Court ruling overturning the State of Texas’s anti-abortion laws. As David Reynolds writes, “By seven to two the justices – all male – upheld the appeal of Jane Roe and declared the Texas anti-abortion statute unconstitutional. This they did by reaffirming the constitutional ‘right to privacy’ they had already discerned and developed in judgements over the previous decade. But the court also went much further, setting out a framework for abortion by dividing pregnancies into three equal ‘trimesters’. In the first third of a pregnancy, a woman needed only the consent of her doctor but in the later two-thirds the state’s interests in the potential life allowed it to impose ever tighter regulation over abortion.10

“The decision on *Roe v. Wade* proved doubly controversial – the Court was adjudicating on an issue of enormous moral and religious sensitivity, and it was doing so via very arguable legal reasoning…

“Two justices dissented from both the decision and the reasoning – Byron White and William Rehnquist. They were not against some kinds of abortion, particularly where the health of the mother or of the foetus was in doubt, but were opposed to what seemed to them abortion on demand. As White put it in a fierce dissent in a related abortion case, ‘At the heart of the controversy in these cases are those recurring pregnancies that pose no danger whatsoever to the life or health of the mother but are, nevertheless, unwanted for any one or more of a variety of reasons – convenience, family planning, economics, dislike of children, the embarrassment of illegitimacy, etc.’ His colleagues, White said, had in effect stated that ‘during the period prior to the time the fetus becomes viable, the Constitution of the United States values the convenience, whim, or caprice of the putative mother more than the life or potential life of the fetus.’

“White was also sure that the Court had far exceeded its authority by offering such a broad reading of the Fourteenth Amendment of 1868, which had been intended to secure civil rights for former slaves: ‘I find nothing in the language or history of the Constitution to support the Court’s judgement. The Court simply fashions and announces a new constitutional right for

---

10 In the American presidential campaign of 2016 Hillary Clinton was arguing for abortions in the last trimester. See [http://www.elijahlist.com/words/display_word.html?ID=16830](http://www.elijahlist.com/words/display_word.html?ID=16830) (V.M.).
pregnant mothers and, with scarcely any reason or authority for its action, invests that right with sufficient substance to override most existing state abortion statutes. The upshot is that the people and the legislatures of the fifty States are constitutionally disentitled to weigh the relative importance of the continued existence and development of the fetus, on the one hand, against a spectrum of possible impacts on the mother, on the other hand.’ White condemned the judgement as ‘an improvident and extravagant exercise of the power of judicial review that the Constitution extends to this Court.’

“Roe v. Wade in 1973 cast a long shadow. The Supreme Court’s decision became a fault line in American society, around which the arguments for and against abortion would polarize – pro-choice versus pro-life. Roe v. Wade also became a litmus test in American politics, an identifying mark of whether one was liberal or conservative. Finally, the decision and the way it was written became a landmark in American constitutional law. The angry dissent from Byron White – about how the Court was exceeding its authority, stretching the Constitution, even acting as the maker of law rather than its interpreter – set out claims around which conservatives would rally as their backlash against the rights revolution gathered momentum. So although millions of Americans applauded Roe v. Wade for making abortion constitutional, for millions more it seemed like a constitutional abortion.”

Abortion was not the only moral issue around which conservative opinion – which Nixon called “the Silent Majority” - began to crystallize. The other was feminism… “The backlash against feminism,” writes Reynolds, “took the form of a defence of family values. One traditionalist, Connie Marshner, depicted the campaign for women’s rights as ‘a drab, macho-feminism of hard-faced women’ who were ‘determined to secure their places in the world, no matter whose bodies they have to climb over’. Their position, she said, was utterly selfish: ‘A relationship that proves burdensome? Drop it! A husband whose needs cannot be conveniently met? Forget him! Children who may wake up in the middle of the night? No way!’ In reality, Marshner claimed, women were innately ‘other-oriented… ordained by nature to spend themselves in meeting the needs of others. And women, far more than men, will transmit culture and values to the next generation.’ As that last sentence suggests, the defence of traditionalism often had an undercurrent of feminine superiority – women as the glue holding family and therefore society together.

‘in the 1970s the campaign to save the American family centred on blocking the proposed Equal Rights Amendment, or ERA. The idea for such an amendment to the US Constitution, affirming that equal rights should not be denied or abridged on grounds of sex, had been around since the end of the First World War – to complete the campaign for women’s suffrage. But although the ERA was introduced in every session of Congress from 1923 it got nowhere until the 1970s; then the fresh wind of women’s liberation helped it sail through the House and the Senate in 1971-2. All the ERA needed to

become part of the Constitution was ratification by three-quarters of the state legislatures, thirty-eight out of the total of fifty. Twenty-two states had approved the ERA by the end of 1972 and it appeared to be coasting, until Phyllis Schlafly came along.

"On one level, Schlafly seemed like the archetypal homemaker. The wife of a successful lawyer in Alton, Illinois, just across the river from St. Louis, she spent most of the fifties and sixties raising her six children. But she did so in unconventional ways, feeding them porridge for breakfast and sending them to school with healthy lunches of organic peanut butter sandwiches on wholewheat bread. Yet that did not make her a counter-culture mom, for Schlafly and her husband were committed Catholics and fervent anti-communists. She threw herself into various activities for conservative and Republican causes, including running for Congress, but always emphasized the role that could be played by grass-roots activists. One of her standard speeches was entitled ‘The Big Things Are Done By Little People, starting with Christ choosing his disciples.

"Schlafly was the counter-example to Betty Friedan’s ‘concentration camp’ homemaker in The Feminine Mystique – a suburban mother who felt fulfilled and who engaged in community life yet was angered by national politics. She spoke for thousands of similar women who had been mobilized by Barry Goldwater’s presidential campaign in 1964 in grass-roots organizations like ‘Mothers for a Moral America’, insisting that ‘the time is past when women of the Republican Party are merely doorbell pushers’.

"So, although many feminists regarded Schlafly with near hatred as a cynical opportunist – ’I’d like to burn you at the stake,’ Friedan exploded during a debate in 1973 – she tapped deep into American society. Her campaign against the ERA did not deny continued discrimination against women, especially in employment, but argued that this could be addressed through existing legislation. Passing the ERA, Schlafly claimed, would deprive women of their freedom to be women, and the laws that guaranteed this. Instead, the ERA would impose ‘a doctrinaire equality under which women must be treated the same as men’. Schlafly asserted it would ‘take away from girls their exemption from the draft and their legal protection against predatory males. It will take away from wives and mothers their right to be provided with a home and financial support from their husbands. It will take away from senior women their extra social security benefits. It will take away a woman’s present freedom of choice to take a job – or to be a full-time wife and mother. In short, it will take away the right to be a woman.’

"ERA supporters strenuously contested Schlafly’s interpretation of what the amendment would do to women’s right, but they were slow to organize against her campaign. Schlafly’s STOP ERA – where STOP cleverly stood for ‘Stop Taking Our Privileges’ – did indeed halt the momentum for ratification in the mid-1970s. Time magazine described Schlafly as ‘feminine but forceful… a very liberated women’. When she campaigned against the ERA in
Illinois in June 1978 she looked ‘crisp and composed in a red shirtwaist dress, red-white-and-blue scarf and frosted hair’. She and 500 supporters brought legislators trademark loaves of home-baked bread – gifts from the bread makers, she liked to say, for the breadwinners. But, noted *Time*, ‘as she climbed onto a kitchen stool to address the cheering crowd, Schlafly the demure house-wife turned into Schlafly the aggressive polemist, warning that passage of the ERA would mean “Government-funded abortions, homosexual schoolteachers, women forced into military combat and men refusing to support their wives.’

“By 1978 thirty-five states had approved the ERA, but that was three short of the threshold for ratification. Although Congress extended the deadline for ratification to June 1982, no more states followed suit. In fact, five legislatures voted to rescind their original approval.”

Schlafly was a Catholic. But the right was galvanized more by Evangelical Protestants such as the Revd Jerry Falwell. “Falwell and thousands of other American evangelical Protestants were mobilized politically by what they saw as the godless drift of American life. It was a gathering storm, brewing since the early 1960s. Many liberals were surprised by its vehemence but that was because they had failed to appreciate that evangelical Protestantism had not been killed off by the modern secular society.

‘Evangelicals slipped off the national radar after the Scopes trial of 1925, about the teaching of Darwinism in schools. Since that ill-fated campaign by William Jennings Bryan, Protestants who took a literalistic view of the Bible had kept out of the political limelight, but they remained a potent force in the American heartland. One sign of this was the growth of Bible colleges, which placed the teaching of Christian fundamentals ahead of all else – there were 144 of these by 1950, almost triple the figure twenty years before. Even more important were Christian radio ministers like Charles E. Fuller, whose nationwide *Old Testament Revival Hour* ran for more than thirty years from 1937.

“The pastor who really brought evangelicalism into the national mainstream was Billy Graham, from North Carolina, who developed a revivalist movement known as Youth for Christ. With slogans like ‘Geared to the Times but Anchored to the Rock’, Graham’s rallies used the razzmatazz of popular culture – music, celebrities, quizzes, even magicians – but all building up to preaching by Graham himself…

“Younger evangelicals saw the story of the 1960s and 1970s as a series of attempts to push God out of the American way of life. A major affront was the Supreme Court decisions in 1962 and 1963 to outlaw officially sponsored prayers, Bible reading and the recitation of the Lord’s Prayer in schools. The cases had been brought by the American Jewish Congress as a violation of the

---

First Amendment upholding the separation of church and state, but evangelicals were appalled...

“By the late 1970s Falwell had become a nationally renowned figure, pushing the still-revered Billy Graham to the edge of the spotlight. His pastorate had mushroomed with a mega-church, a vast youth programme and a TV ministry whose title, the Old Times Gospel Hour, echoed Fullers’ pioneering radio broadcasts; his Bible college, up and running, was grandly named Liberty University. Like many evangelicals, Falwell was particularly concerned by the growing public profile of homosexuals – reflected in many sex-education courses in schools and in the test cases being put to the courts. October 1979 saw the first national gay rights rally in Washington, DC. In one mailing, Falwell told supporters that ‘gays were recently given permission to lay a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington Cemetery to honor any sexual deviants who served in the military. That’s right,’ he added incredulously, ‘the gays were allowed to turn our Tomb of the Unknown Soldier into: THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SODOMITE.’

“So, by the later 1970s there was a slate of moral issues that offended significant sections of conservative Christian opinion in the American heartland. Washington-based groups like the Heritage Foundation and the Conservative Caucus saw an opportunity to mobilize the grass-roots Christians as a nationwide force…”

Depending on how we define Evangelical Protestantism, there are between 70 and 100 million evangelicals in the United States today. A 2008 study showed that in the year 2000 about nine percent of Americans attended an evangelical service on any given Sunday. The movement is also powerful in many other countries, especially Brazil and South Korea, where by the year 2000 about twenty percent of the population was evangelical. By any standards, this is an important religious movement which we would expect to have a significant impact on the foreign policy of the states in which its numbers are large.

The evangelicals also had (and have) a foreign-policy aspect to their work, as it were. This is what we may call American Protestant Zionism, whose connection with the land of Israel goes back a long way – to at least before the First World War – and played an important role in the foundation of the State of Israel in 1948. However, it was only after the Israeli victories over the Arab states in 1967 and 1973 that the relationship between America and Israel became virtually symbiotic. It is generally accepted that there is a close link between the steady rise of Evangelical Protestantism in the United States in recent decades, the evangelicals’ ‘Christian Zionist’ understanding of the destiny of the Jews and the State of Israel, and American foreign policy in the Middle East.

---

Philip Giraldi writes: “The connection between America’s wars in the Middle East—and its wars more generally—with the more fundamentalist forms of Christianity in the United States is striking. Opinion polls suggest that the more religiously conservative one is, the more one will support overseas wars.” Evangelicals are particularly numerous and influential in the United States armed forces.”

Christian Zionists like Jerry Falwell believe that America’s security depends on her support for Israel; God will protect America only so long as she defends Israel. Moreover, this support, according to many of them, should be expressed in a particularly extreme manner: in helping Israel to annex the West Bank (which Israel occupied after the 1967 war, trapping one million Palestinians within the Zionist state) and even in extending its borders “from the river of Egypt to the Euphrates”; in securing Jerusalem as the “united” (that is, exclusively Israeli) capital of the state of Israel; and in fighting wars against Israel’s Arab and Iranian enemies. This places them to the right even of some Christian Zionist American presidents, such as Ronald Reagan or George W. Bush, who, while committed to defending Israel against its Arab and Iranian enemies, also sought to protect the rights of the Palestinians in a two-state strategy.

Walter Russell Mead writes: “U.S. evangelical theology takes a unique view of the role of the Jewish people in the modern world. On the one hand, evangelicals share the widespread Christian view that Christians represent the new and true children of Israel, inheritors of God’s promises to the ancient Hebrews. Yet unlike many other Christians, evangelicals also believe that the Jewish people have a continuing role in God’s plan. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, close study of biblical prophecies convinced evangelical scholars and believers that the Jews would return to the Holy Land before the triumphant return of Christ. Moreover, while the tumultuous years before Jesus’ return are expected to bring many Jews to Christ, many evangelicals believe that until that time, most Jews will continue to reject him. This belief significantly reduces potential tensions between evangelicals and Jews, since evangelicals do not, as Martin Luther did, expect that once exposed to the true faith, Jews will convert in large numbers. Luther’s fury when his expectation was not met led to a more anti-Semitic approach on his part; that is unlikely to happen with contemporary evangelicals.

“Evangelicals also find the continued existence of the Jewish people to be a strong argument both for the existence of God and for his power in history. The book of Genesis relates that God told Abraham, ‘And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee... And I will bless them that bless thee,"

---

16 “If this nation wants her fields to remain white with grain, her scientific achievements to remain notable, and her freedom to remain intact, America must continue to stand with Israel” (Listen America; New York, 1980, p. 98).
and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee all families of the earth be blessed.’ For evangelicals, the fact that the Jewish people have survived through millennia and that they have returned to their ancient home is proof that God is real, that the Bible is inspired, and that the Christian religion is true. Many believe that the promise of Genesis still stands and that the God of Abraham will literally bless the United States if the United States blesses Israel. They see in the weakness, defeats, and poverty of the Arab world as ample evidence that God curses those who curse Israel.

“Criticism of Israel and of the United States for supporting it leaves evangelicals unmoved. If anything, it only strengthens their conviction that the world hates Israel because ‘fallen man’ naturally hates God and his ‘chosen people’. In standing by Israel, evangelicals feel that they are standing by God – something they are ready to do against the whole world. Thus John Hagee – senior pastor of an 18,000-member evangelical megachurch in San Antonio, Texas, and author of several New York Times bestsellers – writes that if Iran moves to attack Israel, Americans must be prepared ‘to stop this evil enemy in its tracks’. ‘God’s policy toward the Jewish people,’ Hagee writes, ‘is found in Genesis 12.3’ and he goes on to quote the passage about blessings and curses. ‘America is at the crossroads!’ Hagee warns. ‘Will we believe and obey the Word of God concerning Israel, or will we continue to equivocate and sympathize with Israel’s enemies?’

“The return of the Jews to the Holy Land, their extraordinary victories over larger Arab armies, and even the rising tide of hatred that threatens Jews in Israel and abroad strengthen not only the evangelical commitment to Israel but also the position of evangelical religion in American life. The story of modern Jewry reads like a book in the Bible. The Holocaust is reminiscent of the genocidal efforts of Pharaoh in the book of Exodus and of Haman in the book of Esther; the subsequent establishment of a Jewish state reminds one of many similar victories and deliverances of the Jews in the Hebrew Scriptures. The extraordinary events of modern Jewish history are held up by evangelicals as proof that God exists and acts in history. Add to this the psychological consequences of nuclear weapons, and many evangelicals begin to feel that they are living in a world like the world of the Bible. That U.S. foreign policy now centers on defending the country against the threat of mass terrorism involving, potentially, weapons of apocalyptic horror wielded by anti-Christian fanatics waging a religious war motivated by hatred of Israel only reinforces the claims of evangelical religion.

“Liberal Christians in the United States (like liberal secularists) have also traditionally supported Zionism, but from a different perspective. For liberal Christians, the Jews are a people like any other, and so liberal Christians have supported Zionism in the same way that they have supported the national movements of other oppressed groups. In recent decades, however, liberal Christians have increasingly come to sympathize with the Palestinian national movement on the same basis. In 2004, the Presbyterian Church passed a resolution calling for limited divestment from companies doing business with
Israel (the resolution was essentially rescinded in 2006 after a bitter battle). One study found that 37 percent of the statements made by mainline Protestant churches on human rights abuses between 2000 and 2004 focused on Israel. No other country came in for such frequent criticism.

“Conspiracy theorists and secular scholars and journalists in the United States and abroad have looked to a Jewish conspiracy or, more euphemistically, to a ‘Jewish lobby’ to explain how U.S. support for Israel can grow while sympathy for Israel wanes among what was once the religious and intellectual establishment. A better answer lies in the dynamics of U.S. religion. Evangelicals have been gaining social and political power, while liberal Christians and secular intellectuals have been losing it…”  

43. SOLZHENITSYN, DÉTENTE AND APPEASEMENT

In 1973 the Soviet dissident Andrei Sakharov, inventor of the Soviet H-bomb, hailed Allende’s overthrow in Chile, and called for democratization in the Soviet Union. He was then put forward for the Nobel Peace Prize in the West German press - to the fury of the Soviets. In 1975 Elena Bonner, Sakharov’s wife, received the Nobel Prize on behalf of her husband in Oslo (he had been refused a visa to travel abroad).

The other famous Soviet dissident was Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who was exiled to the West in 1974, settling in America. As a proven campaigner for human rights in the Soviet Union, he was expected to confirm the West’s image of itself as the upholder and defender of human rights and democratic freedoms. And so he was given a hero’s welcome.

However, admiration quickly turned to disillusion when he proceeded, not only to attack the Soviet Union for its lack of freedom, but also to criticize the West for its feeble resistance to Communism and abuse of its freedom. Very soon he was being labeled, even by some of his compatriots, as an antidemocrat and Great Russian chauvinist, although both charges are demonstrably false; and by the 1980s his voice was hardly heard any more. Nevertheless, his ideas were valuable, timely and powerfully expressed...

The first point that needs to be made is that, for all his criticisms of the West, Solzhenitsyn draws no sign of equality between the capitalist West and the communist East. The West is distinctly superior, in his view, because (a) it is free as opposed to the East's tyranny, and (b) it has a framework of law as opposed to the East's essential lawlessness. Censorship is condemned by Solzhenitsyn; he values the traditional freedoms guaranteed by a stable and enforced code of laws no less than a western liberal. Moreover, he is grateful to the West for the support it offered him and other dissidents. And if he criticizes the West, it is the criticism of a friend offered with a constructive aim - that of the strengthening of the West against its deadly rival in the East.

At the same time, clear philosophical differences emerge between Solzhenitsyn and his western interlocutors, and first of all in relation to the supreme value of the West - freedom.

For Solzhenitsyn, freedom is valuable and indeed necessary, but not as an end in itself. Rather, he sees it as a means to a higher end - moral perfection. And when he sees freedom being used to undermine rather than to support that higher end, he waxes eloquently scornful, as in his 1976 speech on receiving the "Freedom Fund" prize: "Freedom! - to forcibly defile postboxes

18 Andrei Sinyavsky, "Solzhenitsyn kak ustroitel' novogo edinomyslia" ("Solzhenitsyn as a Constructor of the New Unanimity"), Sintaksis, 1985, pp. 16-32.
19 Dora Shturman, Gorodu i Miru (To the City and the World), New York: Tretia Vol'na, 1988.
and the eyes, ears and brains of people with commercial rubbish, and television programmes in which it is impossible to see any coherent sense. Freedom! - to impose information on people without taking into account their right not to receive it, their right to mental relaxation. Freedom! - to spit in the eyes and souls of those passing by advertisements. Freedom! - of publishers and cinema producers to poison the young generation with corrupt abominations. Freedom! - for adolescents between the ages of 14 and 18 to get drunk on leisure and pleasure instead of concentrated study and spiritual growth. Freedom! - for young adults to seek idleness and live at the expense of society. Freedom! - for strikers, to the extent of allowing them to deprive all the other citizens of a normal life, work, movement, water and food. Freedom! - for justifying speeches, when the lawyer himself knows that the accused is guilty. Freedom! - to raise the juridical right of insurance to such a degree that even charity could be reduced to extortion. Freedom! - for casual, trite pens to irresponsibly slide along the surface of any question in their haste to form public opinion. Freedom! - for the collection of gossip, when a journalist in his own interests spares neither his father nor his Fatherland. Freedom! - to publicize the defence secrets of one's country for personal political ends. Freedom! - for a businessman to make any deal, however many people it may reduce to misery or even if it would betray his own country. Freedom! - for political leaders to lightmindedly carry out what the voter wants today, and not what from a longer-term perspective will protect him from evil and danger. Freedom! - for terrorists to escape punishment, pity for them as a death sentence for the whole of the rest of society. Freedom! - for whole states to parasitically extort help from others, and not to work to build their own economy. Freedom! - as indifference to the trampling of the freedom of others far from us. Freedom! - even not to defend one's own freedom, as long as someone else risks his life.

The only real defence of freedom against its own worst consequences - including, as in Russia in 1917 and Germany in 1933, a descent into a tyranny far worse than that of any hereditary monarch - is a good set of laws and an effective system for enforcing them. However, democracy guarantees neither the one nor the other. For a good set of laws depends on the wisdom and morality of the lawmakers - and democratic lawmakers are elected to follow the will of their constituents, not the objective good of the country. And effective enforcement presupposes a generally high respect for the law in the population as a whole - a condition that is notably lacking in most democratic societies today.

In any case, according to Solzhenitsyn, western democratic legalism has become, to a dangerous and debilitating degree, an end in itself. Every conflict is solved according to the letter of the law, and voluntary self-restraint is considered out of the question. It is not enough to have a wonderful system of laws and every democratic freedom. If the people are selfish, then life will still be hell.

Solzhenitsyn, in Shturman, op. cit., p. 156.
Pluralism, freedom of speech and the press and democratic elections are all fine, says Solzhenitsyn, but they only make the choice possible: they do not tell us what to choose. The decision of the majority is no guarantee against "misdirection"; fascists, communists, nationalists and unprincipled demagogues are frequently voted in by majorities. Even in an established democracy major decisions can be swung by the vote of a small but determined and extremely selfish minority which holds the balance of power and can therefore impose its will on the majority.

In an article entitled "The Pluralists", Solzhenitsyn writes: "They [the pluralists] seem to regard pluralism as somehow the supreme attainment of history, the supreme intellectual good, the supreme value of modern Western life. This principle is often formulated as follows: 'the more different opinions, the better' - the important thing being that no one should seriously insist on the truth of his own.

"But can pluralism claim to be a principle valuable in itself, and indeed one of the loftiest? It is strange that mere plurality should be elevated to such a high status... The Washington Post once published a letter from an American, responding to my Harvard speech. 'It is difficult to believe,' he wrote, 'that diversity for its own sake is the highest aim of mankind. Respect for diversity makes no sense unless diversity helps us attain some higher goal.'

"Of course, variety adds colour to life. We yearn for it. We cannot imagine life without it. But if diversity becomes the highest principle, then there can be no universal human values, and making one's own values the yardstick of another person's opinions is ignorant and brutal. If there is no right and wrong, what restraints remain? If there is no universal basis for it there can be no morality. 'Pluralism' as a principle degenerates into indifference, superficiality, it spills over into relativism, into tolerance of the absurd, into a pluralism of errors and lies. You may show off your ideas, but must say nothing with conviction. To be too sure that you are right is indecent. So people wander like babes in the wood. That is why the Western world today is defenceless; paralysed by its inability any longer to distinguish between true and false positions, between manifest Good and manifest Evil, by the centrifugal chaos of ideas, by the entropy of thought. 'Let's have as many views as possible - just as long as they're all different!' But if a hundred mules all pull different ways the result is no movement at all.

"In the whole universal flux there is one truth - God's truth, and, consciously or not, we all long to draw near to this truth and touch it. A great diversity of opinions has some sense if we make it our first concern to compare them so as to discover and renounce our mistakes. To discover the true way of looking at things, come as close as we can to God's truth, and not just collect as many 'different' views as we can."\(^{21}\)

Thus just as Western democratic pluralism would not save the West from Soviet totalitarianism, so Russia would not be delivered from the same totalitarianism by simply trying to make it more democratic. Solzhenitsyn did not believe that there was any realistic path of transition to a democratic republic in the Soviet Union without creating a number of nationalist wars - a judgement that we can now see to have been prophetically true. A multiparty democracy in Russia would be "merely be a melancholy repetition of 1917". For the failure of Russian democracy in 1917 was not the result simply of the immaturity of Russian democratic institutions, but rather of a fundamental flaw in the basic theory and spirit of democracy. Communism itself springs, not from traditional authoritarian systems, which, for all their faults, still recognized the authority of God above them, but from "the crisis of democracy, from the failure of irreligious humanism".

There are, of course, defects and dangers in the traditional systems, but "authoritarian regimes as such are not frightening - only those which are answerable to no one and nothing. The autocrats of earlier, religious ages, though their power was ostensibly unlimited, felt themselves responsible before God and their own consciences. The autocrats of our own time are dangerous precisely because it is difficult to find higher values which would bind them."[22]

All these ideas are developed with great power in Solzhenitsyn's vast novel about the revolution, The Red Wheel, which may be described as the War and Peace of the twentieth-century novel. In it all levels of pre-revolutionary Russian society, from the Tsar and his ministers to the politicians, the soldiers and the peasants are warmly but penetratingly described. And if no-one emerges without blame, it is clearly on the westernizing liberals and revolutionaries, who acted in the name of democracy, that the main guilt falls.

In this way does Solzhenitsyn describe the defects of modern democracy - the licence to which its liberty leads, its cowardice in defence of its own values, its tendency to anarchy and hence, ultimately, to despotism. Democracy is in essence "a mechanism for the satisfaction of the demands of the consumer-voter". [23] The problem is, that in the absence of a higher religious or national ideal - and very few democracies, whether ancient or modern, have had any such ideal - the demands of the consumer-voter are bound to be multiple, contradictory, changeable, fallen, materialistic and egoistical. Thus the tendency to atomization and self-destruction is built into the very base of democracy like a relentlessly ticking time-bomb.

*  

---

Now Solzhenitsyn (in the West) and Sakharov (inside the Union) presented an untamed duo of Soviet dissident Nobel Prize winners whose influence, in spite of the best efforts of KGB disinformation and “active measures” against them, presented a real and growing threat to the prestige, and therefore ultimately the survival, of the Soviet Union. For in a democratic age, prestige and popularity are everything. And while the Soviet Union was not a democracy in any normal sense, since the death of Stalin it had chosen not to become a hermetically sealed kingdom on the model of North Korea and Albania – which laid it open to “ideological subversion” from the dominant western philosophy of human rights.

And so “on August 1 1975,” write Christopher Andrew and Vasily Mitrokhin, “the Soviet leadership committed what turned out to be a strategic blunder in its war against the dissidents. As part of the Helsinki Accords on Security and Co-operation in Europe, the United States, Canada and all European states save Albania and Andorra agreed to protect a series of basic human rights. Though Andropov [head of the KGB] warned against the consequences, a majority of the Politburo shared Gromyko’s confident view that ‘We are masters in our house’ – that the Soviet Union would be free to interpret the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accords as it saw fit. In fact, as Zbigniew Brzezinski predicted, the accords ‘put the Soviet Union on the ideological defensive’. Henceforth its human rights critics both at home and abroad could justly claim that it was in breach of an international agreement it had freely entered into…”

Helsinki was the climax of the process known as détente, a supposed relaxation of tension between East and West. Détente began in the early 1970s with German Ost-Politik initiated by the Social Democrat Chancellors Willy Brandt and Helmut Schmidt. In exchange for more visas allowing East Germans to come to the West, Bonn laid itself dangerously open to espionage (Brandt’s secretary turned out to be a spy) and the possibility of being blackmailed in the economic and energy spheres by the Russians, who got much needed credits to import Western technology, develop their gas fields and build pipes to the West, which thereby became more dependent on Soviet energy.

Thus Schmidt “offered Russia favourable trade terms for a series of developments, including the provision by German firms of nine thousand ‘heavy-duty’ trucks, and the construction, by German firms, of a number of chemical plants throughout the Soviet Union. The Russians agreed to increase the existing supply of natural gas. Schmidt also offered the German construction of a nuclear reactor at Kaliningrad.”

---

The German example was continued by the Americans, though more cautiously. The West’s motivation was threefold: a desire to spend less money on armaments as the oil crisis began to bite into western pockets; a desire to get a deal to import Soviet gas; and, probably most important, a gradual loss of faith – caused particularly by the defeat in Vietnam – in the importance and righteousness of the struggle against Communism. Thus détente in the West began to resemble the West’s appeasement of Nazi Germany in the 1930s, especially after the last real “hawk” in the American administration, President Nixon, was forced to resign in the wake of the Watergate scandal.

On the Soviet side, the “targets of détente” were also threefold. “First,” as Revel writes, “international recognition of Soviet territorial gains resulting from the Second World War and from the 1945-50 period in which the Sovietization of Central Europe was completed.

“Second, through negotiations on arms limitation, to profit from American goodwill to increase the USSR’s military potential.

“Third, to obtain financial, industrial, and trade contributions from the capitalist countries that would relieve or at least attenuate the shortcomings of socialist economics.

“What concessions or promises did the Soviets have to make to the West in exchange for these benefits?

“First, they promised to allow the Americans to conduct on-site inspections to verify that their military strength did not exceed the levels set by the agreements on strategic arms limitations.

“Next, they vowed they would adopt a general policy of restraint throughout the world, or so they led the West, especially Nixon and Kissinger, to believe in 1972-73. This was the notion of ‘linkage’ or ‘attachment – the indissoluble nature of all aspects of détente’, as Sakharov put it. Washington and Moscow specifically agreed to use their influence to prevent their respective allies and the countries with which they enjoyed special relationships from undertaking offensive actions, especially military.

“Finally, in the most sensational part of the Helsinki agreement, the Soviet Union had to sign a guarantee that it would respect human rights and basic freedoms in the USSR itself and throughout the Soviet sphere of influence. Concretely, the agreement was supposed to remove obstacles to the ‘free circulation of persons and ideas’ in both directions between East and West. Including these incredible promises in a treaty that was otherwise so advantageous for the Communists could reasonably be seen by the Soviets as a necessary concession. Their object was to reassure people who, in the West, needed a moral justification that would consecrate the philosophy of détente.
“A quick glance at these two lists shows that, for the Soviets, the credit column in this balance sheet is incomparably more substantial than the debit column.

“It was soon obvious that the ‘third basket’ as it was called in Helsinki, the one dealing with human rights, was riddled with holes. French President Giscard d’Estaing, who had functioned, at Brezhnev’s urging, as the catalyst for the Helsinki conference, persuaded the reluctant Americans to attend. He was poorly rewarded for his zeal. At his first dinner during an official visit to Moscow shortly after the conference ended, he naively proposed a toast to human rights and freedom and to the improvements his hosts had promised concerning them. Furious, the Soviet leadership froze Giscard out the next morning. By a deplorable coincidence, all the members of the Politburo were suddenly as indisposed as they were unavailable: one felt a chill, another had a headache, Brezhnev sneezed nonstop, and all of them vanished. The world watched the humiliating spectacle of a French head of state wandering alone through a deserted Moscow for two long days. Instead of returning at once to Paris, he waited until, at dawn on the third day, he was received by a resuscitated Brezhnev, jovial and patronizing and delighted to have taught a lesson to the insolent greenhorn whose lack of resistance he had correctly gauged.

“We know what happened next: the leaders of the ‘social groups for application of the Helsinki agreement’ in the Soviet Union and its satellites were arrested, imprisoned, sent to strict detention camps; permission to emigrate, to travel abroad, to marry someone outside the East bloc became harder than ever to obtain; the movement of ideas and information was as sharply curtailed as that of people, and, after a brief interlude, Western radio programs were jammed more intensively than ever, in defiance of all the promises Moscow had made. And as an edifying crown to this triumph of liberalization and open dialogue, the USSR huffily withdrew from the human rights commission at the 1978 Belgrade conference, the first of the periodical meeting scheduled for ‘verification of application of the Helsinki pact’. The subsequent assembly, in Madrid in 1980, was just as much of a success for the Soviets, who had stuck to their tactic of flatly refusing to discuss the subject of the conference.

“Even after martial law was declared in Poland, Westerners broken to the saddle returned to Madrid in 1982 to go through their paces, chewing over the rotten hay of human rights under the mocking gaze of the Soviet delegation. Not only were the years following the signing of the Helsinki pact marked by tighter repression in the Communist countries, but the Soviet government was ingenious enough even to plead détente to demand – and win – agreement from Western governments and some Western newspapers to stop encouraging East-bloc dissidents. President Ford refused to see Andre Amalrik. Dissidents were simply people calling for respect of the Helsinki agreement, which the West had signed. In a paradox that will not surprise connoisseurs, the Soviet Union made fewer concessions in the field of human
rights during the years of détente that it had during the previous period, when, for example, Nixon and Kissinger had negotiated a considerable increase in the number of exit visas and emigration permits granted by Moscow. In the most ironic switch in this struggle for human rights, President Carter, anxious to be as stern toward the right as toward the ‘left’, made it his duty to impose democracy or, failing this, sanctions on such non-Communist dictatorships as those in Iran, Afghanistan and Chile; since the Soviet Union remained inflexible, they became the only targets of this campaign for international morality…”26

* 

Now let us turn to the longer-term results of the Helsinki agreements… Groups were formed in several countries to monitor the degree to which the Helsinki accords on human rights were being observed. A prominent dissident, Vladimir Maximov, established a journal, Kontinent, published in several languages, to record violations in the Soviet Union. “Doubtless to the intense irritation of the Centre [of the KGB], Kontinent was able to publicize the formation during 1976 and 1977 of ‘Helsinki Watch Groups’ in Moscow, Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia and Armenia to monitor Soviet compliance with the terms of the Helsinki Accords.”27

However, the importance of the Helsinki Watch Groups in the Soviet Union can be exaggerated. First, they were exploited by only a tiny percentage of the Soviet population, mainly Jewish dissidents in the big cities. As Gromyko had predicted, the Soviets remained the masters in their own house. For, as Revel pointed out, totalitarian regimes can snuff out such anti-systemic viruses much more effectively than democratic ones – or at any rate, keep them at bay for much longer periods. For “police repression is seamless, the compartmentalization of people and regions is effective in nipping organized protest in the bud, the great mass of the population, deprived of any basis of comparison, is largely unaware of other standards and styles of living. Because of these factors,” continued Revel, writing in 1985, “it is hard to see what could force the Soviet state in the short run to replace its military and imperialistic priorities with an intensive program of internal economic developments and social progress.”28 In fact, it was not any grass-roots movement that forced the Soviet leadership to change course in the later 1980s, but the wholly unexpected and unpredictable rise of Gorbachev to the post of General Secretary of the Communist Party.

“In essence,” writes Revel, “the [Helsinki] agreement provided for a swap. The West presented the U.S.S.R. with two lavish gifts: we recognized the legitimacy of the Soviet empire over Central Europe, which it had illegally grabbed at the end of World War II, and we offered massive and almost
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interest-free economic and technological aid. In return, the Soviet Union promised a more moderate foreign policy and respect for human rights within its empire.

"Only an unfathomable lack of comprehension of communism’s real nature could have made Western statesmen take that second proviso seriously; in any case, it quickly became clear that the promise was merely a joke designed to liven up dull Politburo meetings. But the topper was that Western governments, ever prompt to anticipate the KGB’s wishes, were the first to proclaim that insisting on enforcement of the article was a provocation of the Soviet Union. President Carter’s obstinacy in promoting a human-rights policy throughout the world was soon assailed as interference in other countries’ internal affairs and a threat to peace – except, of course, in Chile and Saudi Arabia.

"Humiliation followed for the West at the 1978 Belgrade conference, which had theoretically been called to verify that the Helsinki agreement was being applied. Without any superfluous hesitation or temporizing, the Soviets simply refused to take part in the work of the human-rights commission. Nevertheless, in 1980 we rushed merrily to a follow-up conference in Madrid, to go once again through the same vain farce that, for the democracies, remained as pointless as ever. Doubly pointless, in fact: since the Belgrade conference, the Soviets had invaded Afghanistan and colonized vast segments of Africa, thus shattering the credibility of the other Soviet promise at Helsinki, for moderation in foreign policy. So all that remained of that celebrated pact was the Western contribution: economic aid to the U.S.S.R. and recognition of its empire. By their concrete actions after the reestablishment of real and total socialism in Poland, the West Europeans staunchly affirmed their unshakable determination to live up unilaterally to their Helsinki commitments without as much as pretending to ask anything in return. Even the few concessions made by East Germany to ease restrictions on travel between the two Germanies were revoked at the end of 1980…"²⁹

The main exception to the complete Soviet exploitation of the détente process was Jewish emigration. As Martin Gilbert writes, when American President Gerald Ford went to Vladivostok in November, 1974, he “insisted that the Russian search for closer trade relations with the United States would depend on a more liberal Soviet attitude to Jewish emigration, which had fallen from 34,000 to 20,000 in the two previous years. Pravda denounced this linkage as having been forced on the President by the ‘enemies of détente’. Ford’s insistence on this linkage arose as a result of a Congressional vote, the Jackson-Vanik amendment of the previous year. The content and success of this binding legislation was an example of the efforts of an effective American pressure group, the National Conference of Soviet Jewry, which urged that the United States Trade Reform Act of 1972 be amended to include the
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linkage of emigration with trade. A strong armoury of support had been enlisted. In an open letter to the United States Congress, sent on 14 September 1973 Andrei Sakharov, the Soviet Union’s best-known human rights activist – not a Jew, although married to one – had urged support for the amendment on behalf of ‘tens of thousands of citizens in the Soviet Union’. These citizens included Jews ‘who want to leave the country and who have been working to exercise that right for years and for decades at the cost of endless difficulty and humiliation’.

“The Jackson-Vanik amendment had been passed on 11 December 1973. A year later it was an integral part of the Vladivostok negotiations. The Soviet authorities bowed to the pressure, and Jewish emigration grew annually, reaching a peak of 50,000 in 1979…”

It was not only governments, but NGOs and a variety of other organizations and individuals, that the Soviets wrapped around in the cotton wool of disinformation, yielding the fruits of completely one-sided détente. Thus Revel mentions “the Nonaligned Countries Movement, the Socialist International, the ecologists, the pacifists, the UN (where the capitalist powers pay almost all the costs) and, above all, UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). Add to this the perversion of revolutions and nationalist movements in the Third World; of the Interparliamentary Union (where so-called deputies from the East sit on an equal basis with others elected by genuine popular vote); of the World Council of Churches, which, in opening its doors to Eastern Orthodox churches, was invaded by a heavy brigade of Orthodox popes from the KGB. For communism can also borrow the voice of God to preach unilateral Western disarmament.”

All this infiltration and perversion was made easier and more effective by the atmosphere created by détente in the 1970s. Détente was a terrible failure, and terribly costly in terms of lives lost to Communist aggression around the globe. But its promoters displayed the psychological phenomena of cognitive dissonance and denial in refusing to face the facts and even justifying them. As Revel writes, “Disclosures long after the fact are often more irritating than enlightening. The men responsible for détente in 1970-80 resented having to admit its failure afterward. So they did not alter their thinking, they clung to it even harder. The diplomats, politicians and political scientists who had made a heavy intellectual investment in détente over a period of ten or fifteen years and who remained in positions of power or influence after it failed were incapable of fostering a stern public reappraisal of their policy.”

Perhaps the best example simultaneously of successful Soviet deception and of western appeasement in the modern era came in the Soviet campaign
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against the deployment of the neutron bomb by NATO in Western Europe. “The neutron bomb is the only weapon that would have made up for our inferiority in conventional forces. A tactical nuclear weapon, it is the only one that can stop an armoured invasion with pinpoint accuracy, killing tank crews without destroying cities and buildings, without harming the civilian population (which, in the circumstances, is by definition friendly) or contaminating the air over an area larger than the target. Propaganda by the Kremlin’s friends in the West, campaigning against adoption of the neutron bomb, represents it as a ‘capitalist’ weapon because it kills men without obliterating equipment and property, which can be salvaged when the holocaust is over. Salvaged by whom? By the multinationals, I suppose. Clearly a plan, say the partisans of Western unilateral disarmament, framed by the military-industrial complex to wipe out the populations of Italy, West Germany and Holland so that it can lay hands of those countries’ factories, homes, night-clubs, stadiums, sentry boxes, airports, churches, beehives, triumphal arches, tunnels, restaurants, and prisons. In other words, offering neutron bombs to NATO was part of a diabolical American plot to slaughter the Europeans and take over their property.

“Everyone knows that the most intelligent creatures on earth live in the Western part of Eurasia. Surely they will not fall into so crude a capitalist trap. With laudable consistency, President Carter [in 1978] canceled plans to arm NATO with neutron bombs...”

“President Ronald Reagan restarted production in 1981. The Soviet Union began a propaganda campaign against the US’s neutron bomb in 1981 following Reagan’s announcement. In 1983 Reagan then announced the Strategic Defense Initiative [“Star Wars”], which surpassed neutron bomb production in ambition and vision and with that the neutron bomb quickly faded from the center of the public's attention.”

Soviet manipulation did not let up as other weapons were invented. “In 1982,” writes Norman Stone, “there was a great fight over the placing of intermediate-range ultra-modern missiles on European soil, and vital countries, Germany especially, saw enormous demonstrations against this, a matter in part of KGB manipulation, which Bukovsky, from Politburo documents, was able to demonstrate. In this atmosphere of the ‘Second Cold War’, as commentators called it, the transatlantic link [with Margaret Thatcher] became all-important...”

---
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44. THE COMMUNISTS ADVANCE ON ALL FRONTS

As if Divine Providence was taking revenge on the West for its spineless surrender at Helsinki, Communism appeared to gather strength from that moment. Although the Brezhnev years were called “the era of stagnation”, beneath the surface of stability great changes were taking place: internally and ideologically; the empire was rotting, while externally and militarily it was expanding. And yet this latter fact was no real change, but rather a manifestation of the unchanging law that Jean-François Revel called “the worldwide insatiability of Communist imperialism”.

“The great empires of the past grew to a point of equilibrium, at which they stopped growing in exchange for implicit recognition of their dominion by the other powers. With time, they even tolerated decentralization of power, progressive autonomy of local authorities in distant provinces. The Roman, Arabian, Ottoman, Spanish and British empires all moved, by various ways and guided by their particular political customs, along these parallel routes towards final consolidation of their frontiers and dispersion of internal authority; with these came a growing right of each part of the empire to develop its distinctive personality.

“The Soviet empire is the first in history that can neither be substantially decentralized without risking immediate disintegration nor halt its expansion. For communism, incapable of engendering a viable society, cannot tolerate the continued existence of other societies to bear witness against it; each such society would by its very existence be an indictment of socialism, a point of comparison by which to judge its unrelieved failure in terms of human happiness.

“As for a balance of power, beginning with a ‘concert of Europe’ democratic diplomacy’s error has been precisely its trust in patterns inherited from the nineteenth century, its belief that the Soviet Union too could be persuaded to halt its expansion in exchange for concessions that are a little costly, perhaps, but seem to be final. The most recent of these errors – and the most ingenious, since it codified this belief in an elaborate theory – was committed by Henry Kissinger. His theory was wrong because it failed to
take account of the specificity of communism, as that of naziism had been ignored before World War II: that they are systems whose survival depends at every second on a plan for world domination, both as fantasm and as realpolitik. Concessions do not appease the gluttony of such systems, they stimulate it…”

Let us look at the Soviet advance on its four main fronts: (1) Latin America, (2) Asia, (3) Africa, and (4) Europe.

1. Latin America. “It takes a profound ignorance of history,” writes Revel, “to blame American imperialism alone for the long Latin American tradition of coups d’état, military dictatorships, civil wars, corruption, revolution, bloody terror, and repression; this goes back to the very founding of independent states there nearly two centuries ago.” And while it is true that the United States, leaning on the “Monroe Doctrine” and its perception of Latin America as “our backyard”, has at times interfered too readily in the affairs of Latin American states, the region is no exception to the general rule that a country’s woes are first of all to be blamed on its own people and not outsiders. But the Soviet Union and its legions of supporters throughout the world see the matter differently. “The United States is held directly responsible for the poverty of every Latin American peasant, whereas no direct responsibility is ascribed to the Soviet Union for the poverty in Vietnam. The liberal left, backed up by many ‘conservatives’, long believed that there was only one kind of imperialism: American imperialism. When it finally had to resign itself to recognizing the existence of Soviet imperialism, it immediately developed a purification ritual: calling a plague on both their houses…”

Having said that, the Americans made a definite mistake when in 1954 they overthrew the regime of General Arbenz Guzman, President of Guatemala, because he threatened the interests of United Fruit, the American company that dominated the political and economic life of the country. This coup demonstrated that the relationship between the United States and Guatemala was indeed, as Revel admits, “semicolonial”. However, at a conference in Caracas in 1978 no less an authority than the founder of Venezuelan democracy and Socialist President of Venezuela Romolo Betancourt put into perspective this mistake, as well as the similarly unfortunate intervention when the Americans’ overthrew the Dominican Republic’s Juan Bosch in 1963:

---

36 Revel, op. cit., pp. 91-92. Revel’s remark that “there is no communist culture” may seem severe in view of the existence of such great Soviet artists as Akhmatova and Pasternak, Prokofiev and Shostakovich. But, first, it may well be argued that the real soil of this great art was Russian, not Soviet culture. And secondly, the specifically Soviet culture of “Socialist Realism” is indeed of a very low quality. Even by comparison with the most tyrannical regimes of the past, the totalitarian regimes of the twentieth century made a significant breakthrough - in baseness of all kinds, moral, religious, economic, artistic and cultural...
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“There is no doubt that the very mysterious and shadowy CIA has contributed to the overthrow of a number of governments in Latin America, including governments elected through popular suffrage, and that its operations were sometimes carried out directly by the United States embassies. This was established and illustrated in the detailed report to the Senate by the Church Committee in the United States. But what emerges as most dangerous for the stability of democratic governments in Latin America is that every time a government is overthrown, we can say the CIA overthrew it, the State Department overthrew it. Carlos Rangel wrote a book with which I basically agree and which aroused broad international debate, since it was not only a bestseller in Spanish, but was also translated into English and French. He warns us against the convenient tendency of Latin American governments, when they are overthrown because they were incompetent, because they were corrupt, because they did not show a sense of responsibility toward the obligation the electorate placed in their hands, to explain these difficulties and falls as being due uniquely to external maneuvers.

“Goodwin cited to us the case of General Arbenz, who was overthrown in 1954 by an insurrectional movement wholly fabricated by the CIA. But General Arbenz, who had been placed in power by a popular vote, surrounded himself with a communist staff as soon as he took over the government. Guatemala became a rallying point for communists of various origins, European and Asian as well as Latin American. Arbenz bought arms from Czechoslovakia. When Stalin died, he asked the Guatemalan Parliament to stand in silence for two minutes to show its grief. When Lombardo Toledano, the Mexican communist labor leader, went to Guatemala, General Arbenz, surrounded by his entire cabinet, went in person to the airport to greet him. Yet all this was combined with extraordinary corruption on the part of the team in power. These defenders of the proletariat were unbridled in enriching themselves while in office. I have precise information on all that and when we Venezuelan socialists learned of the situation in Guatemala, we sent an emissary to President José Figueres of Costa Rica with a letter explaining what was happening. Arbenz was overthrown and Arbenz left for the Eastern countries. Then he went to Cuba. I do not wish to be cruel, because he is dead, but I must be frank: since he was not a very useful imbecile, the communists dropped him and [he] disappeared.

“In the case of Juan Bosch, to whom Goodwin also referred, there is usually some confusion. President Bosch was really overthrown by a military government that he saw coming and did nothing to oppose. Throughout his term in office, he did not once call a meeting of his government. One fine day he suddenly decided to dissolve his own party, the party that had brought him to power, the Dominican Revolutionary Party. He distanced himself widely and aggressively from his democratic companions, took it on himself to tighten relations with Fidel Castro’s Cuba, and was overthrown by the military. It was really not until a year later that the United States intervened,
when the Caamaño movement arose, which does not alter the fact that the United States’s intervention in the Dominican Republic was one of the gravest and most reprehensible mistakes that government ever made. But there would have been no occasion for making that mistake if Juan Bosch had not begun by totally denaturing the mandate entrusted to him by the Dominican Republic.”

The most important struggle for influence between the Soviets and the Americans took place in Chile. In 1970 the Marxist Salvador Allende was elected president in a democratic election. The CIA tried to topple him in a coup that failed. In fact, no exterior force was necessary to remove him. For Allende’s disastrous socialist policies aroused such great discontent among the people that in September, 1973 the military had no difficulty in deposing him – contrary to the generally accepted opinion, without any help from the CIA this time - while he himself committed suicide. As Revel writes, “When the military coup got under way, Allende, who was already guilty of a number of illegalities and who was opposed by the majority of Chileans, could only hang on to power by suspending the Chilean constitution and modeling his regime on Castro’ – something he had long since been heading toward. Had he succeeded, Chile would have entered the Soviet orbit while the West looked on impotently as its sphere of influence shrank. When he lost the West was blamed for his fall. And because the Army won the final shoot-out when it took Allende’s Castroists by surprise, the West lost on different grounds: it was charged with having assassinated a democracy and its President, which discredits its alleged fight against totalitarianism.”

Allende’s fall, which was followed by a strong recovery in the Chilean economy, was a major blow for the Soviets. But they were fortunate: instead of stepping aside after the coup and arranging for elections, the right-wing army leader, Augusto Pinochet, chose to remain in power as dictator (until 1990), killing 2,528 Chileans in the following months. This was a tremendous propaganda coup for the Soviets because, as Revel continues, “a dictatorship like Pinochet’s is infinitely more useful to the Soviet Union than a bland, Western-style democracy. It is the most valuable of allies because the Communists’ bête noire, their worst enemy, is capitalistic, welfare democracy that works reasonably well. A rightist dictatorship is a redoubtable weapon for the Soviets to wield in subverting the democracies everywhere in the world: if they succeed in their subversion, they rack up another satellite; it they fail, they have at least created the conditions for a rightist dictatorship that, for years afterward, their propagandists can throw in the West’s face. What makes this weapon so effective is that these dictatorships really are evil; the Soviet Union has only to insist that they exist by the will and design of the free world…”
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So in Chile the Soviets snatched victory out of the jaws of defeat. But they were not in general successful in Latin America. Only with the Sandanistas in Nicaragua, who were supported by Castro, and also in El Salvador...

2. Asia. In October, 1973, in what came to be known as the Yom Kippur war, the Soviet clients Egypt and Syria again attacked Israel and were again soundly defeated. Soviet influence never really recovered in Egypt, although under the cruel regime of Assad Bashar it did in Syria. “Following the ceasefire,” as Gilbert writes, “the Soviet Union lost its enthusiasm for the Egyptian and Syrian cause (at one point Brezhnev had urged the Algerians to ‘take all necessary steps’ to help Egypt and Syria). On October 26, speaking in Moscow to the Communist-sponsored and -inspired World Peace Conference, Brezhnev avoided any praise for the Egyptian and Syrian armies, which were being much applauded by the fraternal delegates.” That delegates at a conference for World Peace should applaud the aggressors in this (and other) wars shows the real nature of these Soviet front organizations – completely hypocritical attempts to promote Soviet aggression and conquest by pretending to be peace-makers.

However, there was better news for the Communists in Indo-China. Jean-Louis Margolin writes that the fall of the South Vietnamese regime on April 30, 1975 “was not in fact followed by the bloodbath that so many feared and that did take place in neighbouring Cambodia. But the Vietnamese prisoners of the Communist forces – including ‘traitors’ from their own ranks – were severely abused and often simply liquidated rather than moved...

“For a few brief weeks, the approximately 1 million officials and soldiers in the Saigon regime could even believe that the much-vaunted ‘policy of clemency’ of President Ho was more than simple political rhetoric. As a result, these officials began to cooperate and register with the new authorities. Then, in early June, people were suddenly called in for re-education, which officially lasted three days for simple foot-soldiers and an entire month for officers and civil servants. In fact three days often became three years, and the month became seven or eight years. The last survivors of the re-education programs did not return home until 1986. Pham Van Dong, the prime minister at the time, admitted in 1980 that 200,000 had been re-educated in the South. Serious estimates range from 500,000 to 1 million out of a population of 20 million. The victims included a large number of students, intellectuals, monks (both Buddhist and Catholic), and political militants (including Communists). Many of these people had been in sympathy with the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, which revealed itself to be no more than a cover for Northern Communists and which almost immediately broke all its promises to respect the wishes of the people of the South. As in 1954-56, onetime comrades-in-arms were soon suffering in the rectification campaigns. To the number of prisoners who were trapped in special camps must be
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added an indeterminate but large number of ‘minor’ re-education cases who were locked up for several weeks in their place of work or study. By comparison, during the worst periods of the anti-Communist regime in the South, enemies on the left claimed that some 200,000 people were locked up in camps.

“Conditions of detention under Communist rule varied considerably. Some camps near towns did not even have barbed-wire fences, and the regime there was more one of constraint than of actual punishment. The more difficult cases were sent further north, to the more unhealthy, distant areas, to camps originally built for French prisoners. Isolation was total, and there was almost no medical care. Survival in these camps [as in the Soviet Gulag] often depended on parcels sent by the families of prisoners. Undernourishment was as bad as it was in the prisons; detainees were fed only 200 grams of poor-quality rice filled with stones per day. As elsewhere, hunger was often used as a weapon by the authorities against those awaiting trial. Doan Van Toai has left a gripping account of life in one such prison, which shows that this universe shared many of the characteristics of the Chinese prison camps, but was somewhat worse in terms of overcrowding, sanitary conditions, the prevalence of violent and often fatal punishments such as whipping, and long delays before trial. There were sometimes seventy to eighty prisoners in a cell built for twenty, and walks were often impossible because of construction inside the prison yard. The cells of this colonial period were seen as havens of peace and tranquillity in comparison. The tropical climate and the lack of air made breathing very difficult. All day long, people took turns standing by the one small airhole. The smells were unbearable, and skin complaints were rife. Even water was severely rationed. The hardest punishment was undoubtedly solitary confinement, sometimes for years on end, with no contact allowed with family. Torture was hidden but ever-present, as were executions. In prison, the tiniest infringement of regulations was punished harshly, and rations were so small that death often came within weeks...

“To this strange tableau of ‘liberation’ should be added the spectacle of hundreds of thousands of boat people, who fled misery and repression, many of whom drowned or were killed by pirates. The first real sign of relaxation in repression came only in 1986, when the new secretary general of the Vietnamese Communist Party, Nguyen Van Linh, freed a large number of political prisoners and closed the killing camps of the northern region. A new penal code is at last going to be promulgated...”

We have dwelt on Vietnam after the American War to show, not only that the end of the war did not bring an end to suffering, but also that the War was indeed just and necessary from a Christian and humanitarian point of view – which is why ROCOR always supported it. Moreover, a direct result of the

---

Communist victory in the Vietnam War was the devastation of neighbouring Laos, where, after the abdication of the king in favour of the Laotian Communists on December 3, 1975, hundreds of thousands of refugees fled, many thousands were killed, and some 30,000 were forcibly “reeducated”.

Many times worse was the situation in Cambodia, where the regime of the Khmer Rouge under Pol Pot presented perhaps the most evil and murderous “government” in history, relatively speaking, if we take into account the relative smallness of the country and the shortness of the time (1975-1979) that it had in which to carry out its atrocities. Margolin writes: “The lineage from Mao Zedong to Pol Pot is obvious. This is one of the paradoxes that make the Khmer Rouge revolution so difficult to analyse and understand. The Cambodian tyrant was incontestably mediocre and a pale copy of the imaginative and cultivated Beijing autocrat who with no outside help established a regime that continues to thrive in the world’s most populous country. Yet despite Pol Pot’s limitations, it is the Cultural Revolution and the Great Leap Forward that look like mere trial runs or preparatory sketches for what was perhaps the most radical social transformation of all: the attempt to implement total Communism in one fell swoop, without the long transitional period that seemed to be one of the tenets of Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy. Money was abolished in a week; total collectivization was achieved in less than two years; social distinctions were suppressed by the elimination of entire classes of property owners, intellectuals, and businessmen; and the ancient antagonism between urban and rural areas was solved by emptying the cities in a single week. It seemed that the only thing needed was sufficient willpower, and heaven would be found on Earth, Pol Pot believed that he would be enthroned higher than his glorious ancestors – Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Zedong – and that the revolution of the twenty-first century would be conducted in Khmer, just as the revolution of the twentieth century had been in Russian and then Chinese...

“The Khmer kingdom, which had been a French protectorate since 1863, escaped the Indochinese war of 1946-54 more or less unharmed. At the moment when resistance groups linked to the Viet Minh began to form in 1953, Prince Sihanouk began a peaceful ‘crusade for independence’. Facilitated by excellent diplomatic relations between Sihanouk and Paris, this ‘crusade’ met with considerable success and undercut his adversaries on the left. But in the face of the ensuing confrontation between the Vietnamese Communists and the United States, the subtle balancing act by which he attempted to preserve Cambodian neutrality earned him only the mistrust of all parties and growing incomprehension inside the country.

“In March 1970 the prince was ousted by his own government and by the Assembly, with the blessing (but apparently not the active participation) of the US Central Intelligence Agency. The country was thrown into disarray, and terrible pogroms against the Vietnamese minority began. Of the roughly

---
450,000 Vietnamese in the country, two-thirds were forced to flee to South Vietnam. Communist Vietnamese embassy buildings were burned down, and an ultimatum was issued for all foreign troops to leave the country immediately. The ultimatum was of course ignored. Hanoi, which found itself with no ally except the Khmer Rouge inside the country, decided to back them to the hilt, applying arms and military advisers and providing access to training camps inside Vietnam. Vietnam eventually occupied the greater part of the country in the name of the Khmer Rouge, or rather in the name of Sihanouk, who was so furious at his earlier humiliation that he joined with the local Communists, until then his worst enemies. On the advice of Beijing and Hanoi, the Communists rolled out the red carpet for him but gave him no actual political power. Thus the internal conflict became one of royalist Communists versus the Khmer Republic, with the latter led by General (soon Marshal) Lon Nol. The forces of the Khmer Republic were considerably weaker than those of the North Vietnamese and seemed unable to capitalize on Sihanouk’s unpopularity among intellectuals and the middle classes in the cities and towns. They were soon forced to ask for American aid in the form of bombing raids, arms, and military advisers; they also accepted a futile intervention from the South Vietnamese.

“After the catastrophic failure of operation Chenla-II in early 1972, when the best republican troops were decimated, the war became a long agony as the Khmer Rouge tightened the screws around the main urban areas, which eventually could be supplied only by air. But this rear-guard action was murderously destructive, and it destabilized the population, who, unlike the Vietnamese, had never experienced anything like it. American bombing raids were massive: more than 540,000 tons of explosives were dropped on the combat zones, mostly in the six months before the US Congress cut off funding for such raids in August 1973. The bombing slowed the progress of the Khmer Rouge, but it also ensured that there would never be a shortage of recruits in a countryside now filled with hatred for the Americans. It also further destabilized the republic by causing a tremendous influx of refugees into the cities, probably one-third of a total population of 8 million. This build-up of refugees facilitated the evacuation of urban areas after the Khmer Rouge’s victory and enabled the Khmers to claim repeatedly in their propaganda: ‘We have defeated the world’s greatest superpower and will therefore triumph over all opposition - nature, the Vietnamese, and all others.’”

Phnom Penh fell on April 17, 1975, and then the whole of the city’s population of between 2 and 3 million was forced to evacuate into the countryside within twenty-four hours, where millions died from starvation, beating, torture and shooting.

Martin Gilbert writes: “In the Tuol Sleng prison registry, in Phnom Penh, the notation ‘smashed’ appears against the names of 107 prisoners during the two days March 17 and 18 [1977]. Such numbers were an almost daily occurrence. The registry for July 1 records the execution of 114 women: their sole ‘crime’ was to have been the wives of prisoners who had been executed earlier. On the following day thirty-one sons and forty-three daughters of prisoners were executed. Four days after the killing of these children, the prison registry records a further 126 prisoners ‘smashed’. By the end of the year, 6,330 prisoners had been ‘smashed’ in Tuol Sleng. A chilling indication of the scale of the killings is found in the words of the historian Ben Kiernan. ‘I first visited Cambodia in early 1975,’ he writes. ‘None of the Cambodians I knew then survived the next four years.’”

“Marek Sliwinski, in a recent innovative study using demographic techniques (rendered less reliable by the lack of any census from the late 1960s to 1993), speaks of a little more than 2 million dead, or 26 per cent of the population, not including deaths from natural causes, which he estimates at 7 percent. Sliwinski’s is the only study that tries to break down the 1975-1979 figures by age and gender. He concludes that 33.9 percent of men and 15.7 percent of women died. A difference of that size is strong evidence that most of the deaths were from assassinations. The death rate is horrendous for all ages, but especially high for young males (24 percent of men aged twenty to thirty, 40 percent of men aged thirty to forty, and 54 percent of people of both sexes over age sixty)... No other country in the world seems to have suffered so much since 1945...”

One contender for that honour is North Korea, where the worst kind of Stalinist repression and torture has continued to this day. Massive famines are frequent in a country that cannot feed itself but which prides itself on its nuclear weapons. As Jieun Baek writes, “the power of juche, North Korean’s official ideology,... emphasizes the country’s self-sufficiency and venerates the rulers of the Kim dynasty as quasi deities whose judgment and wisdom may never be questioned. In 1974, Kim Jong Il sought to systematize juche by issuing a list called ‘Ten Principles for the Establishment of the One-Ideology System’; most of the principles involved acknowledging the absolute authority of the supreme leader and pledging total obedience to the state. Kim demanded that all North Korean citizens memorize the principles and adhere to them in their daily lives, an order enforced through weekly “self-criticism” sessions and peer surveillance. This practice continues today. During weekly meetings in classrooms, offices, and factories, citizens recite the ten principles and are called on to criticize themselves and one another for failing to live in perfect accordance with juche. North Koreans begin participating in these sessions around the time they enter first grade.

48 Gilbert, _op. cit._, pp. 513-514.
“Having inculcated *juche* into its citizens from a very young age, the state does everything it can to ensure that as they grow older, they are exposed to as little contradictory information as possible. One of the most serious crimes that a North Korean can commit is to consume banned media. According to Freedom House, ‘listening to unauthorized foreign broadcasts and possessing dissident publications are considered “crimes against the state”’ in North Korea and ‘carry serious punishments, including hard labor, prison sentences, and the death penalty.’ On a single day in 2013, according to *JoongAng Ilbo*, a major South Korean newspaper, the government executed 80 people in seven cities for violating such laws…”

3. Africa. The other main location of Communist activity at this time was Africa, the poorest continent, which was already suffering particularly from drought conditions and the steep rise in the price of oil.

On April 25, 1974, in the “Carnatian Revolution” (so called because it was almost without violence), the authoritarian government of Portugal was overthrown and a left-wing regime came to power in its place. The new government was opposed to Portugal’s colonial inheritance, and soon all Portugal’s African colonies, especially Portuguese Guinea, Angola and Mozambique, together with East Timor in Indonesia, were liberated. The result for most of them was anything but real liberation…

Angola, writes Martin Gilbert, “had become independent from Portugal on November 11, 1975. It did so in the midst of a civil war between the factions that had hitherto focused their struggle against the Portuguese. The victorious group, the Marxist-Leninist Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) was given military help by both the Soviet Union, which sent arms and military advisers, and Cuba, which sent five thousand combat troops. The rival group, the National Union for Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), fought on, but the Soviet weaponry of the MPLA was decisive. On November 24 President Ford warned the Soviet Union that the dispatch of weapons, and also of Soviet military advisers, had introduced the rivalry of Great Powers to Africa for the first time since the collapse of European colonial rule fifteen years earlier.” In March, 1976, the communists triumphed in the civil war. But in June, at the UN Security Council, the US “vetoed the admission of Angola [into the UN] for as long as Cuban troops remained there. Only after the United States agreed, five months later, to abstain rather than cast its veto, was Angola admitted. The Cuban troops – 20,000 in all by the summer – had by then completed their mission of helping secure, together with Soviet arms, the victory of the Marxist-led Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola. That the civil war would cease became clear when the United States Senate banned any further American aid to the anti-Marxist groupings.”

---

UNITA continued to fight. However, most of their ideas were derived from Maoism; so the Angolans truly found themselves between the devil and the deep blue sea... The MPLA state produced the anticipated tragic results for the Angolan population: a crumbling economy, famine (tens of thousands of children died in 1986), forced conscription and massive population transfer.

An indigenous force that contended with the Marxists in Southern Africa was the white supremacist movement in South Africa and Rhodesia, which had proclaimed its independence from Britain some years ago. In Rhodesia in 1977, writes Gilbert, “even as the White government of Ian Smith was being pressed strongly by the United States and Britain to honour its pledge of majority rule, a ‘war of liberation’ was being fought by those who preferred to seize power rather than wait for it to be transferred. It was the thirteenth year of illegal independence, and the two main guerilla groups, the Zimbabwe African People’s Union (ZAPU), under Joshua Nkomo, and the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), under Robert Mugabe, had united to form a single political and fighting force, the Patriotic Front. Rejecting negotiations, it carried out continual attacks on Rhodesian military installations, operating from bases in both Mozambique and Zambia. AZPU was able to call upon arms and ammunition from the Soviet Union; ZANU from China...

“The Smith regime carried out a series of military raids into the countries in which the Rhodesian guerillas were based. In May, President Kaunda of Zambia declared that this country was ‘in a state of war’ with Rhodesia. During a Rhodesian army attack into Mozambique in November, 1,200 members of the Patriotic Front were killed. There was widespread international condemnation of this cross-border raid. Inside Rhodesia the killings mounted. In February three Jesuit priests and four Dominican nuns were murdered at the Musanu mission station forty-three miles east of the capital, Salisbury, bringing the number of murdered missionaries to thirteen in nine months. The death toll during the year was 1,759 ZANU and ZAPU guerillas killed, a thousand Black Rhodesians, 244 members of the Rhodesian security forces and fifty-six White Rhodesians. In measures designed to cut off the guerillas from local support, the Smith government resettled more than a quarter of a million Africans in ‘protected villages’.”

It should be pointed out that Mugabe’s ZANU party is still in power today, in 2016, demonstrating the tenacity of most Communist regimes.

On December 25, 1974 the Portuguese entrusted Mozambique to Frelimo, a Marxist-Leninist party founded in 1962 by Eduardo Chivambo Mondiane, who managed to get the support both of the West and of the Soviet Union. On receiving power, Frelimo decided to extend a process called “villagization” throughout the country.

54 Gilbert, op. cit., pp. 514-515.
As Yves Santamaria writes, “All peasants (80 percent of the population) were expected to abandon their traditional homes and to regroup in new villages. In the initial enthusiasm of independence, the population responded quite favorably to the government’s requests, creating collective farms and sometimes cooperating in the construction of communal buildings, although they generally refused to inhabit them and soon abandoned the communal fields. On paper it appear that the country was under the careful control of a hierarchical administration through a network of Communist cells.

“In 1977 the Frelimo leaders had openly proclaimed their allegiance to the Bolshevik ideal, calling for extended collectivization and closer links with the international Communist movement. Various treaties were signed with the countries of the Soviet bloc, which provided arms and military instructors in exchange for close support of the Rhodesian nationalists of the Zimbabwe African National Front (ZANU).”55

An opposition movement called Renamo arose, which was supported at first by the Rhodesian secret services until the foundation of Marxist Zimbabwe in 1980, and then by South Africa.

“To the surprise of numerous observers, the population of the villages rallied to the resistance movement despite the barbarism of Renamo’s methods... [However,] the actions of Renamo, on the whole, were considerably less systematic than the state violence perpetrated by Frelimo, and the support that Renamo received demonstrated just how hated the regime had become. Frelimo justified its actions in terms of a struggle against tribalism, against antiquated and outdated religious practices, and against the deep-seated belief in lineage and ancestral fiefdom, which the Front had rejected at independence, disparaging it as ‘feudalism’...

“According to Human Rights Watch, in the period 1975-1985 food shortages caused more deaths than did armed violence. This view is shared by UNICEF, which calculated that 600,000 died of hunger in this period, a loss of life comparable to that caused by famine in Ethiopia...”56

Ethiopia’s Emperor Haile Selassie was overthrown on September 12, 1974 by a Provisional Military Administrative Committee, or Dergue, led by Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam. A year later the emperor died in mysterious circumstances... “The ensuing regime,” we read in Wikopedia, “suffered several coups, uprisings, wide-scale drought, and a huge refugee problem. In 1977, Somalia, which had been receiving assistance and arms from the USSR invaded Ethiopia in the Ogaden War, capturing part of the Ogaden region. Ethiopia recovered it after it began receiving massive military aid from the USSR, Cuba, Yemen, East Germany and North Korea. This included around

55 Santamaria, op. cit., pp. 701-702.
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15,000 Cuban combat troops. Up to 500,000 were killed as a result of the Red Terror, from forced deportations, or from the use of hunger as a weapon under Mengistu's rule. The Red Terror was carried out in response to what the government termed the "White Terror", a supposed chain of violent events, assassinations and killings attributed to the opposition."\(^{57}\)

Spanish Guinea became independent in 1968 as the Equatorial Republic of Guinea. “In July 1970, Macias Nguema created a single-party state and made himself president for life in 1972. He broke off ties with Spain and the West. In spite of his condemnation of Marxism, which he deemed "neo-colonialist", Equatorial Guinea maintained very special relations with socialist countries, notably China, Cuba, and the USSR. He signed a preferential trade agreement and a shipping treaty with the Soviet Union. The Soviets also granted loans to Equatorial Guinea.

“The shipping agreement granted the Soviets permission to establish a pilot project of fishery development and a naval base at Luba. The USSR was in return to supply fish to Equatorial Guinea. China and Cuba also gave different forms on financial, military, and technical assistance to Equatorial Guinea, which gave them a measure of influence in Equatorial Guinea. For the USSR, despite the unsavoury background of Macias Nguema, there was an advantage to be gained in the War in Angola by having access to Luba base and later on to Malabo International Airport.

“Towards the middle 1970s the Macias regime came under grave accusations of being guilty of mass killings. In 1974 the World Council of Churches affirmed that large numbers of people had been murdered since 1968 in a 'reign of terror' which continued. The same body claimed that a quarter of the whole population had fled abroad, while 'the prisons are overflowing and to all intents and purposes form one vast concentration camp'. On Christmas 1975, Macías Nguema had 150 alleged coup plotters executed. Out of a population of 300,000, an estimated 80,000 were killed. Apart from allegedly committing genocide against the ethnic minority Bubi people, he ordered the deaths of thousands of suspected opponents, closed down churches and presided over the economy's collapse as skilled citizens and foreigners left the country…”\(^{58}\)

Nguema was executed in 1979. Gilbert writes: “He was charged with ‘genocide, treason, embezzlement and systematic violation of human rights’. He had reduced his country to little more than a prison camp, and ordered the deaths of thousands of people. He was found guilty and executed. The firing squad that carried out the execution had been brought specially from Morocco, because local people were afraid that Nguema's spirit was too strong for bullets, and that he would return as a tiger.”\(^{59}\)


\(^{59}\) Gilbert, op. cit., p. 551.
Communist (SWAPO) guerillas also invaded Namibia from bases in Zambia and Angola.\textsuperscript{60} And there were Soviet bases in Mozambique.\textsuperscript{61} Then in 1979 the French “landed in Zaire to repel a Katangan attack organized by Cubans based in Angola.”\textsuperscript{62}

4. Europe. Outside the Third World the Communists made few seizures of territory in this decade. However, if we count terrorism as a form of war, then the Soviets must certainly be counted responsible for waging physical war against Europe even while it preached peace and détente. Revel writes: “Because it is an old trick for governments to blame their internal difficulties on foreign plots, prudent commentators and political figures long made a habit of skepticism about the exact extent of Soviet responsibility for the spread of terrorism in Europe since 1970 and in Latin America since 1960 and earlier. As time went on, however, enough circumstantial evidence was amassed to narrow the gap between the opinions these observers expressed in private and those they voiced in public. In private, they had long believed Moscow was supporting terrorism, but they did not abandon their reserve in public until 1980. Then Italian President Alessandro Pertini openly linked the Soviet Union to the Red Brigades and, in Portugal, Socialist leader Mario Soares implicated the Soviets in the terrorist marauding of the Basque ETA in Spain. In 1977, \textit{Le Monde} had opened its pages to defenders of the Baader-Meinhof group with a generosity that indicated some sympathy with terrorism in West Germany; in 1982, however, in reporting on the investigation into the attempted assassination of Pope John Paul II on May 13, 1981, the paper almost unreservedly approved the charge that the shooting had been ordered by the Soviet Union through its Bulgarian vassals. And in a column in the French magazine \textit{Le Point}, the very sober Olivier Chevrillon, discussing a series of terrorist killings in Paris, declared: ‘The flood of comment... neglects one aspect of terrorism today that nevertheless seems as glaringly obvious as Poe’s purloined letter. Terrorism, of course, is still what it has always been – a form of madness – but hasn’t it also become a reckless auxiliary to [one country’s] diplomacy? By showering every kind of pistolero with arms and rubles, the Soviets are surely giving themselves an added means of pressure and blackmail against the European democracies.’…

“Terrorism must, however, have local roots to be exploitable. And there is no denying that the Soviet Union and Cuba, its agent in Latin America, have infiltrated \textit{homegrown} terrorist movements, amplified their natural strength, supplied equipment and advisers; when necessary, terrorist leaders have been trained in Eastern Europe camps that the West has known about for years. The range of possibilities offered has been vast, from Mideastern terrorism through Irish and Spanish separatism and the bloody paranioacs in West Germany and Italy to the Latin American guerrilla movements. On their own

\textsuperscript{60} Gilbert, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 536.
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manpower and resources, none of these movements except the Arab terrorists could have gone very far or lasted long. But with so many screens to hide behind, the Soviet Union and its vassals, without ever showing themselves, can maintain a permanent state of insecurity in the Western countries that admirably suits Communist purposes...

“... Terrorism has nothing do with the indignation and spontaneous insurrection of the masses. Its roots are elsewhere. It is based on psychological conditioning, indoctrination, and military organization into small, secret and fanaticized groups that have no need whatsoever of support from a general population whose hostility towards them, in Italy as in Germany, is ferocious and virtually unanimous.

“Terrorists in such countries are not fighting for freedom. The Communists are not fighting for the national independence of the people in the Third World or against neocolonialism. The proof of this is that they have grabbed power in countries that had long been independent and nonaligned: Ethiopia, for example, and Afghanistan. It is a lie that the Communists are fighting for democracy: the proof of this is that they have tried to overturn democratic regimes in such countries as Venezuela and Portugal, that they methodically try to topple democracy wherever it exists. It is true that in Cuba in 1959 and in Nicaragua in 1979 the guerrileros overturned dictatorships, but only to replace fascist dictatorships with Communist dictatorships...”

And so international Communism continued to make enormous strides while the West slept: China, North Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Yemen, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Guinea, Afghanistan, Angola, Cuba, Nicaragua all fell in the thirty-year period from 1949 to 1979... After the American defeat in Vietnam, the West's determination to fight Communism, already weak, collapsed almost entirely.

As Revel put it, with his usual acerbic clarity: “In 1975, the Vietnam debacle and the removal from office of President Richard M. Nixon left the United States cataleptic. Western Europe, sprawled on the sofa of détente, ecstatic over America's humiliation and over the Helsinki agreement, was determined to see nothing reprehensible in anything the Soviet Union might undertake. In less than five years, the USSR.... became a world superpower, spreading stout branches and promising shoots into Southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Central America.”

In spite of the overwhelming evidence that wherever Communism goes rivers of blood flow, friendship between communists and capitalists flourished, just as George Orwell had prophesied in his novel 1984. The Queen of England gave a state banquet for Ceausescu; the Soviets gained ideological control even over such bodies as the World Council of Churches;

---
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and at Red China's insistence democratic Taiwan was thrown out of the United Nations. As late as the early 1980s, when the Soviet Union was intensifying its repression of Christians and dissidents, President Reagan's accurate description of it as "the evil empire" was met with widespread scorn by western intellectuals.

Nor was this simply the result of the fear of nuclear war. Democratic socialism was, and is, deeply embedded in the ideological consciousness of the West, and had penetrated into the churches and political parties, the media, schools and institutes of higher education. In accordance with this ideology, the communist states were considered to be pursuing essentially the same ideals as the West. And if these ideals were not always attained, this was not considered the fault of socialism as such, but rather of the relics of Russia's pre-communist, Tsarist past - or to the innate servility of the Russian people.

It is important to understand the reasons for the western blindness to the full evil of communism - even now, long after its evils have been fully exposed. One reason undoubtedly lies in a besetting weakness of almost all men: even when we have seen through the falseness of our former beliefs, we nevertheless seek excuses for ourselves, excuses that make our errors "understandable" and perhaps not really that bad after all. And yet former Nazis or Nazi sympathizers are never given this grace: their views remain inexcusable and unforgiveable, and the hounding of Nazis, even minor ones, continues without mercy and without end.

On the other hand, it is an extraordinary fact that no equivalent of the Nuremberg trials has ever taken place in the East, and the Soviet Communist Party itself was “acquitted” in what was a new kind of “show trial” in 1992. And so, while nobody, in East or West, would ever boast of having been a Nazi, Vladimir Putin, for example, can boast of his membership of the KGB, saying that “once a chekist, always a chekist” - and still gets to have tea with the Queen of England, whose relative, Tsar Nicholas II, was murdered by the Cheka...

A deeper reason lies in the fact that Communism and Liberalism are closely related ideologies, being both derived, in their modern forms, from the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. They both offer a utopian vision for mankind based on rationalism, science and education, in which religious belief has no place. Liberalism is relatively more individualistic than Communism, gives more place to individual initiative in economic and social life, and is more tolerant of individual differences and idiosyncracies, such as religion. But the similarities between them are more striking than their differences. And from the point of view of traditional Christianity, the main difference is that while the one destroys faith slowly and painlessly, the other does it violently and relatively quickly.

---
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Thus Stuart Reed writes: “In the Cold War, an unworkable revolutionary creed, communism, yielded to a workable revolutionary creed, liberal capitalism. Now liberal capitalism has replaced communism as the chief threat to the customs, traditions and decencies of Christendom…”

In view of the inner spiritual kinship between Liberalism and Communism, western liberal intellectuals feel compelled to be not too hard on the sister ideology – “no enemies to the left,” as they used to say in the Russian Duma. It is a different matter with anti-Enlightenment political ideologies such as Nazism or Orthodox Christian Autocracy, in spite of the fact that, as Jonathan Glover writes, “opponents of the Enlightenment can seem to grasp truths which elude its followers, and repudiation of the Enlightenment is now fashionable among philosophers”. And so Soviet Communism, whatever its horrors, is felt to be justified at any rate to this extent: that the “evil” autocracy of “Bloody” Nicholas had to be replaced - after all, as Lenin said, you can’t make an omelette without breaking eggs. Of course, it was regrettable that the revolution could not have been stopped during its liberal phase, between February and October, 1917. But the intention was good: it was the execution that was poor.

Daniel Pipes confirms this analysis: “The Soviet Union appeared less bad than the Third Reich. The Nazis rose and fell in spectacular fashion; the communist trajectory was a more gentle one. The Third Reich lasted only twelve years and ended in a blaze of gun smoke and fire; the Soviet Union endured for three-quarters of a century and expired with a whimper. These differences have important consequences. While the results of Nazi conspiracism are the subjects of innumerable studies and artistic works, the comparable Soviet actions remain relatively obscure. Auschwitz, Birkenau, and the other death camps are known by name, but who knows their Soviet equivalents? German archives were captured in a fell swoop. Soviet ones are slowly unveiled.

“The same distinction applies to the two dictators. Hitler left behind a far more terrible reputation than Stalin. One ranted; the other calculated. Hitler made no discernible attempt to disguise his wickedness. In contrast, Stalin hid his evil with such diligence and success that his crimes became known only three years after his death and were then widely received with shock. Because the facts about Stalin came out in so disjointed a way, his crimes to this day lack the notoriety of Hitler’s murderousness. Hitler so discredited himself that

---


to find any virtues in him implies a kind of insanity. Not so Stalin. If Hitler’s apologists are beyond the pale, Stalin’s remain within it...

“Analysts sympathize more with the Left. The liberal orientation of most scholars and journalists means that they treat comparable phenomena in different ways. They do not hide the Left’s turpitude, but they present it less harshly, in isolation, and usually as the idiosyncracies of an individual rather than faults intrinsic to the system. Leninism would have been more humane if only Stalin had not highjacked the revolution…”68

---

45. THE THIRD ALL-EMIGRATION COUNCIL

In 1974 the Third All-Emigration Council of ROCOR took place in the monastery of the Holy Trinity in Jordanville, New York. Just as the First Council, held at Karlovtsy in 1921, had defined the relationship of ROCOR to the Bolshevik regime and the Romanov dynasty; and the Second Council, held in Belgrade in 1938, defined her relationship to the Church inside Russia; so the Third Council tried to define her relationship to the ecumenical and dissident movements. As Metropolitan Philaret, president of the Council, said in his keynote address: “First of all, the Council must declare not only for the Russian flock, but for the entire Church, its concept of the Church; to reveal the dogma of the Church…. The Council must determine the place our Church Abroad holds within contemporary Orthodoxy, among the other ‘so-called’ churches. We say ‘so-called’ for though now people often speak of many ‘churches’, the Church of Christ is single and One.”

There was much to discuss. In the last decade the apostatic influence of the ecumenical movement had broadened and deepened, and Metropolitan Philaret, had assumed a leading role in the struggle against it through his “Sorrowful Epistles”. Under the influence of his leadership, many non-Russians, such as the Greek American Monastery of the Holy Transfiguration in Boston, had sought refuge in ROCOR, and this movement had been strengthened by the application of the two Greek Old Calendarist Synods to enter into communion with her. ROCOR was no longer an exclusively Russian jurisdiction in the make-up of her members, and she could no longer be seen as simply an outpost of Russian Orthodox anti-communism. She was a multi-ethnic, missionary Church fighting the main heresies of the age on a number of fronts throughout the world. However, such a vision of ROCOR was shared by only a minority of her hierarchs, among whom Archbishop Averky of Jordanville was the most prominent.

ROCOR was now isolated from almost all other Orthodox Churches; and the question arose how to justify this. Some saw the isolation of ROCOR as necessitated, not so much by the struggle against ecumenism, as by the need to preserve Russianness among the Russian émigrés. This created a problem for a Church that was rapidly filling up with non-Russian converts. It was not that the preservation of Russianness as such was not an undoubted good. The problem arose when it hindered the missionary witness of the Church to non-Russian believers. Such phyletistic tendencies inevitably led to a loss of Church consciousness in relation to ecumenism, and to a feeling that ROCOR was closer to Russians of the MP, ecumenist though they might be, than to True Orthodox Christians of Greek or French or American origin.

69 Third All-Diaspora Council, 1974, Protocol 1, August 26 / September 8, Synodal Archives, p. 2; quoted in Nun Vassa (Larin) “’Glory be to God, Who did not Abandon His Church’, The Self-Awareness of ROCOR at the Third All-Diaspora Council of 1974”, http://www.russianorthodoxchurch.ws/01newstructure/pagesen/articles/svassasobor.htm.

Another cause of division was the stricter attitude that ROCOR was now being forced to adopt towards “World Orthodoxy”, the Local Orthodox Churches that participated in the ecumenical movement. Most of the hierarchs had passively acquiesced in Metropolitan Philaret’s “Sorrowful Epistles”, and in the union with the Greek Old Calendarists. But they began to stir when the consequences of this were spelled out by the zealots in ROCOR: no further communion with the new calendarists, the Serbs and Jerusalem. The unofficial leader of this group of bishops was Archbishop Anthony of Geneva, who was supported by Bishop Laurus of Manhattan, Archbishop Philotheus of Hamburg and Bishop Paul of Stuttgart.  

His main opponents were Metropolitan Philaret, Archbishops Anthony of Los Angeles and Averky of Syracuse, Bishop Gregory (Grabbe) and, especially, the Greek-American Monastery of the Holy Transfiguration in Boston.

Archbishop Anthony of Geneva was a powerful hierarch who had already once apostasized to the Moscow Patriarchate. He continually proclaimed that the MP was a true Church. Moreover, he concelebrated frequently with the heretics of “World Orthodoxy”, and even, in 1986, ordered his Paris clergy to concelebrate with the new calendarists in Greece, and not with the Old Calendarists. He was a thorn in the side of Metropolitan Philaret until the latter’s death in 1985...

In his address to the Council, entitled “Our Church in the Modern World”, he declared: “By the example of our First Hierarchs [Anthony and Anastasy] we must carefully preserve those fine threads which bind us with the Orthodox world. Under no circumstances must we isolate ourselves, seeing around us often imagined heretics and schismatics. Through gradual self-isolation we will fall into the extremism which our metropolitans wisely avoided, we will reject that middle, royal path which until now our Church has travelled... By isolating ourselves, we will embark upon the path of sectarianism, fearing everyone and everything, we will become possessed with paranoia.”

71 Nun Vassa, op. cit.
72 “In his report to Metropolitan Philaret on 7 December of 1972, Archpriest George Grabbe, who then headed the Synod’s External Affairs Department, protested against Bishops Nikon and Laurus having united in prayer with Archbishop Iakovos during the visit of the relics of St. Nicholas to the Greek Church in Flushing, NY. His protest was motivated on the basis of determinations of the ROCOR Councils of Bishops of 1967 and 1971 that its clergy must by all means avoid prayerful communion with hierarchs who were ecumenists, and even more so because ROCOR had accepted clerics who had left these other churches for ‘dogmatic reasons’.” (Psarev, op. cit., p. 4).
73 “In 1945, being in Serbia, he went over to the MP and waited for a Soviet passport so as to go to the USSR, but the Soviet authorities took their time with the passport, bestowing on him in the meantime the rank of archimandrite [through Patriarch Alexis I]. But, fed up with waiting for permission to return, [in 1949] the future bishop left for Switzerland to his brother Bishop Leontius, where he was reunited with ROCOR, having received a penance for his joining the MP.” (Vladimir Kirillov, May 15, 2006 http://elmager.livejournal.com/66190.html?thread=283278; Bernard le Caro, “A Short Biography of Archbishop Antony (Bartoshevich) of Geneva and Western Europe (+1993)”, http://www.orthodoxengland.org.uk/vl_antony_b.pdf).
74 He said as much to the present writer in October, 1976.
This somewhat hysterical appeal not to separate from the World Orthodox at just the point when they were embarking upon “super-ecumenism” was criticised by Fr. George Grabbe: “The report does not mention to the degree necessary, maybe, that life goes on, and the sickness of ecumenism deepens and widens more and more. Condescension, oikonomia, must under different circumstances be applied differently, and to different degrees. In doses too great it can betray the Truth.” Archbishop Anthony of Los Angeles also opposed him, recalling that “we have many Greek [Old Calendarist] parishes. Our concelebration with the new calendarists was very bitter for them.”

The leader of one of the Greek Old Calendarist parishes within ROCOR, Fr. Panagiotes Carras, sent an appeal to the Synod of Bishops on August 24, 1974 on behalf of all “non-Russian monasteries, parishes, and laity of ROCOR”, in which he called on the ecumenists to be labelled as heretics who had lost the Holy Spirit and who should be subjected to the canonical sanctions that apply to heretics and schismatics.

Metropolitan Philaret was sympathetic to this appeal, and moved for an official statement that the MP was graceless. According to the witness of a seminarian present at the Council, the majority of bishops and delegates would have supported such a motion. However, at the last minute the metropolitan was persuaded not to proceed with the motion on the grounds that it would have caused a schism. Nine years later, the ROCOR Council of Bishops did anathematize ecumenism.

Voices were heard at the 1974 Council arguing for union between ROCOR and the schismatic Paris and American Metropolia jurisdictions. Love, they said, should unite us, and we should not emphasize our differences. Metropolitan Philaret, however, pointed out that love which does not wish to disturb our neighbour by pointing out his errors is not love but hatred!

---
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76 Fr. Basil Yakimov, “Re: Fundamental Question”, orthodox-synod@yahoo.groups.com, 4 June, 2003. And the following is an extract from Protocol № 3 of the ROCOR Sobor, dated October 8/21, 1974: “Bishop Gregory says that to the question of the existence (of grace) it is not always possible to give a final reply immediately. The loss of grace is the consequence of spiritual death, which sometimes does not come immediately. Thus plants sometimes die gradually. In relation to the loss of grace in the Moscow Patriarchate, it would be interesting to make the comparison with the position of the iconoclasts, although the sin of the Patriarchate is deeper. The President [Metropolitan Philaret] says that we cannot now issue a resolution on grace in the Moscow Patriarchate, but we can be certain that grace lives only in the true Church, but the Moscow hierarchs have gone directly against Christ and His work. How can there be grace among them? The metropolitan personally considers that the Moscow Patriarchate is graceless.” (Tserkovnie Novosti (Church News), № 4 (95), June-July, 2001, p. 9).
The divisions that were beginning to emerge between Metropolitan Philaret and the majority of other hierarchs were expressed by him in a letter to one of his few allies, Protopresbyter George Grabbe, the Secretary of the Synod. Describing a meeting with the hierarchs, he wrote: “I saw how truly alone I am among our hierarchs with my views on matters of principle (although on a personal level I am on good terms with everyone). And I am in earnest when I say that I am considering retiring. Of course, I won’t leave all of a sudden, unexpectedly. But at the next Sobor I intend to point out that too many things that are taking place in our church life do not sit well with me. And if the majority of the episcopacy agrees with me than I will not raise the matter of retiring. But if I see that I am alone or see myself in the minority then I will announce that I am retiring. For I cannot head, nor, therefore bear the responsibility for that with which I am not in agreement in principle. In particular, I do not agree with our practice of halfway relations with the American and Parisian schismatics. The Holy Fathers insistently state that long and obdurately continuing schism is close to being heresy, and that it is necessary to relate to stubborn schismatics as to heretics, not allowing any communion with them whatsoever (how Vladyka Anthony’s hair would stand on end at such a pronouncement! But I remain unyielding)...”

With regard to the new calendarist schism, on September 12/25 the Council took the following decision: “Concerning the question of the presence or absence of Grace among the new calendarists, ROCOR does not consider itself or any other Local Church as having the authority to make a final decision.” This was, of course, a very “liberal” decision, which went against the official position of the Greek Old Calendarist Churches (both Matthewite and Florinite) with whom ROCOR had entered into official communion in 1969-71. Six days later, the Council passed another resolution calling on the Old Calendarists to unity, but emphasizing that “ROCOR has no canonical power over the church jurisdictions in Greece and there cannot interfere in their life with decisions that would be obligatory in controversial questions.”

* 

Also discussed at the Council was the dissident movement in the Soviet Union. As we have seen, détente affected both the political and cultural spheres (the works of such figures as Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn), and also the religious sphere (Solzhenitsyn again, Bishop Hermogen of Kaluga, the priests Yeshliman, Yakunin and Dudko, the layman Boris Talantov).

Those hierarchs of ROCOR, such as Anthony of Geneva, whose attitude to events in Russia was dictated as much by political as by spiritual or ecclesiological considerations, were inclined to raise the dissidents to the status of true Church confessors. For on the one hand, they were sincere anti-communists

---

79 http://sinod.ruschurchabroad.org/Arh%20Sobor%201974.
80 Many West European members of ROCOR belonged to the NTS, a secret anti-communist political party which was infiltrated by both the KGB and the CIA.
and despised the kow-towing of the MP hierarchs to communism. On the other hand, they would not have dreamed of denying that the MP was a true Church.

The position of these hierarchs was threatened by the anti-ecumenist zeal of Metropolitan Philaret, Archbishop Averky and the Boston monastery. But the expulsion of Solzhenitsyn to the West in 1974 presented them with an opportunity. Archbishop Anthony brought Solzhenitsyn to the Council, where he created a sensation by his rejection of the zealot view. Then Anthony himself read a report calling on ROCOR to support the dissidents, in spite of the fact that they were ecumenists and in the MP. He was countered by Archbishop Anthony of Los Angeles, who, while respecting the courage of the dissidents, objected to a recognition that would devalue the witness of the true catacomb confessors.

One of the most important Soviet dissidents was the Moscow priest Fr. Dmitri Dudko, who conducted open meetings in his church that attracted many and influenced many more. Unlike Solzhenitsyn, he knew of the Catacomb Church, and wrote of it in relatively flattering terms: “We all recognize Patriarch Tikhon and we look on Patriarch Sergius’ [acts] as a betrayal of the Church’s interests to please the authorities. The following (Patriarchs) – Alexis and the present Pimen – only go on the road already opened. We have no other hierarchy. The Catacomb Church would be good – but where is it? The True Orthodox Church – these are good people, morally steadfast; but they have almost no priesthood, and you simply can’t find them, while there are many who are thirsting. And one has to be ministered to by the hierarchy we do have. Immediately the question arises: are they ministering to us? Basically, they are the puppets of the atheists. And another question: at least, are they believers? Who will answer this question? I fear to answer…”

These sentiments elicited sympathy from members of ROCOR. Less well-known – because edited out of his books as published in the West – was Fr. Dmitri’s ecumenism… The right attitude to him would have been to applaud his courage and the correct opinions he expressed, while gently seeking to correct his liberalism and ecumenism. In no way was it right to treat him as if he were a true priest in the True Church, and an example to be followed that was no less praiseworthy than those of the true confessors in the catacombs. But that is precisely what many in ROCOR now began to do.

Even the 1974 Council was tempted, declaring: “The boundary between preservation of the Church and seductive self-preservation was drawn by his Holiness Patriarch Tikhon, his lawful locum tenens Metropolitan Peter, Metropolitan Cyril of Kazan, Metropolitan Joseph of Petrograd and the Solovki confessors headed by Archbishop Hilarion (Troitsky). In recent years, this boundary has again been clearly drawn by Archbishop Hermogenes, several priests, among them Nicholas Gainov and Dmitri Dudko, the laypeople of Vyatka led by Boris Talantov, the defenders of the Pochaev Lavra such as…

81 Posev, translated in The Orthodox Word, September-October, 1979.
Theodosia Kuzminichna Varavva, and many others. This boundary has also been
drawn by Solzhenitsyn in his appeal ‘Do not live by the lie!’ Not to live by the lie
and to honour the memory of the holy martyrs and confessors of our Church –
this is the boundary separating the true Tikhonites from ‘the sergianist leaven of
Herod’, as wrote Boris Talantov, the rebukers of the present leaders of the
patriarchate who died in prison. In our unceasing prayers for each other, in our
love for the Lord Jesus, in our faithfulness to the ideal of the past and future
Orthodox Russia, the faithful archpastors, pastors, monks and laymen on both
sides of the iron curtain are united. Together they constitute the Holy Church of
Russia, which is indivisible just as the seamless robe of Christ is indivisible.”\(^{83}\)

This was a serious distortion: to place the confessors of the Catacomb Church
on the same level as sergianist dissidents. A case could be made for considering
that Boris Talantov was a true martyr, since he denounced the MP in terms
identical to those employed by the Catacomb Church and may well have died out
of communion with the MP. But Dudko and Solzhenitsyn did not share the faith
of the True Church, and did not join it even after the fall of communism...

Fr. Seraphim Rose criticized Solzhenitsyn as follows: “Let us return to the
belief of Solzhenitsyn and all the defenders of the Moscow Patriarchate that the
betrayal of her hierarchs does not affect the Church’s faithful. This view is based
on an entirely false view of the nature of the Church which artificially separates
the hierarchs from the believing people and allows ‘church life as normal’ to go
on no matter what happens to the Church leaders. On the contrary, the whole
history of the Church of Christ persuades us of the exact opposite. Who else was
it but the Bishops of Rome who led the Church of the West into apostasy and
schism and heresy? Is it the fault of ordinary believing Roman Catholics that they,
the largest group of ‘Christians’ in the world, are today outside the Church of
Christ, and that in order to return to the true Church they must not only reject
the false doctrines of Rome, but also completely reform their religious mentality
and unlearn the false piety which has been transmitted to them precisely by their
bishops? Today, it is true, the Moscow Patriarchate allows Roman Catholics to
receive its Sacraments and implicitly already teaches the ecumenist doctrine that
these Catholics too are ‘part of the Church’. But this fact only shows how far the
Moscow Patriarchate has departed from the universal Orthodox tradition of the
Church into an erroneous ecclesiology, and how correct the True Orthodox
Church is in refusing to have communion with an ecclesiastical body which not
only allows its policies to be dictated by atheists, but openly preaches the
modern heresies of ecumenism and chiliasm.”\(^{84}\)

In 1976 the ROCOR Synod issued an Epistle to the Russian people which, after
declaring unity with the Catacomb Church, went on to say to MP dissidents: “We
also kiss the cross that you have taken upon yourselves, O pastors who have

\(^{83}\) Poslanie Tret’ego Vsezarubezhnogo Sobora Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi Zagranitsej Pravoslavnomy
russkomu narodu na rodine (Epistle of the Third All-Emigration Council of the Russian Orthodox
Church Abroad to the Russian People in the Homeland), September 8/21, 1974.

found in yourselves the courage and strength of spirit to be open reproachers of the weakness of spirit of your hierarchs, who have surrendered before the atheists... We know of your exploit, we pray for you and ask your prayers for our flock that is in the diaspora. Christ is in our midst! He is and shall be!"\(^{85}\)

"Christ is in our midst! He is and shall be!" are words that Orthodox priests exchange in the altar after the ordination of the Holy Gifts. Their use here implies the recognition of the dissidents as co-celebrants with ROCOR, members of the same Church. Clearly the influence of the dissidents was having a corrosive effect on the ecclesiology of ROCOR.

* *

In February, 1976 the Matthewites broke communion with the Russians, claiming that the Russians had broken their promise to give them a written confession that the new calendarists were graceless\(^{86}\), and that Archbishop Anthony of Geneva was continuing to have communion with the new calendarists\(^{87}\). This was true; and his ecumenist activities continued even after the break with the Matthewites. Thus at Pascha, 1976, he asked permission for pastoral reasons to serve with Russian clerics of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in Europe.\(^{88}\) In October he again concelebrated with several heretics at the funeral of Archbishop Nikodem of Great Britain. And in May, 1977 he travelled to Birmingham, England to concelebrate with the local Serbs.

Archbishop Anthony’s ecumenist actions caused several priests and parishes to leave him for the Matthewites, including those of Fr. Basile Sakkas in Switzerland and of Hieromonk Cassian (Braun) in France, and a parish in England. Metropolitan Philaret expressed disapproval of Archbishop Anthony’s

\(^{85}\) *Pravoslavnaia Rus’* (Orthodox Russia), 1976, № 20.

\(^{86}\) Although ROCOR officially refused to call the new calendarists graceless, there is evidence that Metropolitan Philaret’s personal views were stricter and closer to those of the Greeks. Thus on September 20, 1975, he wrote to Metropolitan Epiphanius of Kition, the leader of the Old Calendarist Church of Cyprus, with whom he continued to have friendly relations even after the Matthewite Synod to which Epiphanius belonged had broken communion with ROCOR: “From the beginning our Russian Church has known that the calendar innovation was unacceptable, and has not dared to move this boundary set by patristic tradition, for the Ecclesiastical Calendar is a support of the life of the Church and as such is fortified by decrees of Holy Tradition.

“However, it is obvious to all that the calendar innovation caused a schism in the Greek Church in 1924, and the responsibility for the schism weighs exclusively on the innovators. This is the conclusion that will be reached by anyone studying the Patriarchal *Tomoi* (as that of 1583) and taking into account the wretched and self-evident fact of the schism and the frightful punishments, persecutions and blasphemies which those who have cleaved to the patristic piety of Holy Tradition have undergone.

“Thinking in this way, our Holy Synod has decreed that we ‘flee’ concelebrations with the new calendarist modernists. We do not concelebrate with them, nor do we give permission or a blessing to our clergy for such a concelebration. In order to assure you of the truth of what we say, we inform you that whenever a community in the diaspora is received into our Church, they are required to follow the patristic Calendar of the Orthodox Church...” (from the archives of the True Orthodox Church of Greece)

\(^{87}\) *Kyrix Gnision Orthodoxon* (Herald of the True Orthodox Christians), February, 1976, pp. 5-12.

\(^{88}\) Psarev, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
canonical transgressions, but he was not in sufficient control of his Synod to obtain his repentance.\(^{89}\)

In the same critical year of 1976 the well-known Brotherhood of St. Herman of Alaska in Platina, California began to turn away from its previously zealot course to a markedly softer line in relation to the MP and World Orthodoxy.\(^{90}\) They were influenced in this direction partly by the “dissident fever” that was now raging through most of the Russian part of ROCOR, and partly by the “moderate” ecclesiology of the Greek Old Calendarist Metropolitan Cyprian of Fili. However, a still more important influence may have been a series of controversies – on evolution, on the soul after death, on Blessed Augustine of Hippo – conducted exclusively in the “convert” part of ROCOR between the Platina Brotherhood and the Greek-American monastery in Boston. In all these controversies, in the present writer’s opinion, Platina was right as against Boston. But the negative impression that the Platina monks formed of Boston as a result led them to error in the one area of controversy in which the Boston monastery was right – the canonical status of World Orthodoxy and the MP. Arguing that the Boston monastery’s “super-correctness” was leading them to abandon the “Royal Way” as regards the status of the World Orthodox, Platina came out strongly on the side of the liberal wing of ROCOR led by Archbishop Anthony and his idolisation of Fr. Dimitri and the other dissidents.

Another important issue was relations with the Serbian Church. The Serbs, as we have seen, had joined the WCC in 1965, their ecumenism extended to official acceptance of the canonicity of the Anglican Church\(^ {91}\), and they were as fully under the thumb of the communists as the MP. In spite of this, Archbishop Anthony continued to serve with the Serbs, citing the pre-war hospitality of the Serbs to ROCOR in his justification.

In this connection Metropolitan Philaret wrote to him: “I consider it my duty to point out to you, Vladyka, that your assertion that we must thank the Serbian

---

\(^{89}\) As he told the present writer in January, 1977, he had a gun at his head. However, he was able to remove Britain, where Archbishop Anthony’s ecumenism had elicited protests from the English Orthodox Parish of St. Michael, Guildford, to his own jurisdiction later that year.

\(^{90}\) See especially Fr. Seraphim Rose’s article, “The Royal Path” (The Orthodox Word, № 70, 1976), in which he wrote: “The Russian Church Outside of Russia has been placed, by God’s Providence, in a very favourable position for preserving the ‘royal path’ amidst the confusion of so much of 20th century Orthodoxy. Living in exile and poverty in a world that has not understood the suffering of her people, she has focused her attention on preserving unchanged the faith which unites her people, she has focused her attention on preserving unchanged the faith which unites her people, and so quite naturally she finds herself a stranger to the whole ecumenical mentality, which is based on religious indifference and self-satisfaction, material affluence, and soulless internationalism. On the other hand, she has been preserved from falling into extremism on the ‘right side’ (such as might be a declaration that the Mysteries of the Moscow Patriarchate are without grace)... If there seems to be a ‘logical contradiction’ here... it is a problem only for rationalists; those who approach church questions with the heart as well as the head have no trouble accepting this position...”

\(^{91}\) Thus George Deretich writes: “In Waukegan, Illinois (Feb. 7, 1980),... the pro-Belgrade Bishop Firmilian stated openly in court under oath that Episcopalian clergy are canonical priests recognized by his Orthodox Church” (Treacherous Unity, Acel Officeworks, 1998, p. 68).
Church for her treatment of us, I fully accept, but only as regards her past – the glorious past of the Serbian Church. Yes, of course, we must keep the names of their Holinesses Patriarchs Demetrius and Barnabas in grateful memory for their precious support of the Church Abroad at that time when she had no place to lay her head.

“There is no denying that a certain honour is due the Serbian Church for her refusing to condemn our Church Abroad at the parasynagogue in Moscow in 1971, and also on later occasions when Moscow again raised the matter. But then, on the other hand, she did participate in the aforementioned parasynagogue, when it elected Pimen, and the Serbian hierarchs did not protest against this absolutely anti-canonical election, when he who had already been chosen and appointed by the God-hating regime was elected. Our Sobor of 1971 did not, and could not, recognize Pimen, whereas the Serbian Patriarchate recognized and does recognize him, addressing him as Patriarch, and is in full communion with him. And thus she opposes us directly, for we attempt at all times to explain to the “Free World” that the Soviet Patriarchate is not the genuine representative and head of the much-suffering Russian Church. But the Serbian Church recognizes her as such, and by so doing commits a grave sin against the Russian Church and the Russian Orthodox people.

“How can there be any talk here of a special gratitude to her? Oh, if the Serbian Church would, while recognizing our righteousness, likewise directly and openly, boldly recognize the unrighteousness of the Soviets! Well – then there would truly be something for us to thank her for! But now, as it is, while extending one hand to us, she extends her other hand to our opponents and the enemies of God and the Church. If it pleases you, having shut your eyes to this sad reality, to thank the Serbs for such ‘podvigs’ of theirs, then that is your affair, but I am not a participant in this expression of gratitude.

“How dangerous are compromises in matters of principle! They render people powerless in defence of the Truth. Why is it that the Serbian Patriarchate cannot resolve to sever communion with the Soviet hierarchy? Because she herself is travelling along the same dark and dangerous path of compromise with the God-hating communists. True, she has not progressed along that path to the extent that the Soviet hierarchy has, and she attempts to preach and defend the faith, but if the shades and nuances here are quite different, yet, in principle, the matter stands on one and the same level.”

In 1979, in response to a series of protests by Fr. Dmitri against what he saw as excessive strictness on the part of ROCOR towards the MP, Archbishop Anthony of Geneva, breaking the rule imposed by Metropolitan Anastasy (and reasserted by Metropolitan Philaret) that ROCOR members should have no contact, “even of an everyday nature”, with Soviet church clergy, wrote to Dudko: “I hasten to console you that the part of the Russian Church which lives in freedom beyond the bounds of the homeland, has never officially considered the Moscow

---

Patriarchate, which is recognised in the USSR, as graceless.... We have never dared to deny the grace-filled nature of the official church, for we believe that the sacraments carried out by her clergy are sacraments. Therefore our bishops received your clergy into the Church Abroad in their existing rank... On the other hand, the representatives of the Catacomb Church in Russia accuse us of not wanting to recognise the Moscow Patriarchate as graceless.”

However, in 1980, Fr. Dmitri was arrested, which was closely followed by the arrest of his disciples Victor Kapitanchuk and Lev Regelson. Then Dudko issued a recantation on Soviet television in which he confessed that his “so-called struggle with godlessness” was in fact “a struggle with Soviet power”. Kapitanchuk and Regelson confessed to having “criminal ties” with foreign correspondents and of mixing religious activity with politics, while Kapitanchuk said that he had “inflicted damage on the Soviet state for which I am very sorry”. Both men implicated others in their “crimes”.

Metropolitan Philaret had been proved right – although many continued to justify Dudko and denounced those who “judged” him. But it was not a question of “judging”, but of the correct discerning of the boundaries of the Church and the correct attitude to those outside it.

The metropolitan wrote that the tragedy had overtaken Dudko because his activity had taken place from within the MP – that is, “outside the True Church”. And he continued: “What is the ‘Soviet church’? Fr. Archimandrite Constantine has said often and insistently that the most terrible thing that the God-fighting authorities have done to Russia is the appearance of the ‘Soviet church’, which the Bolsheviks offered up to the people as the True Church, having driven the real Orthodox Church into the catacombs or the concentration camps. This false church has been twice anathematized. His Holiness Patriarch Tikhon and the All-Russian Church Council anathematized the communists and all their co-workers. This terrible anathema has not been lifted to this day and preserves its power, since it can be lifted only by an All-Russian Church Council, as being the canonically higher Church authority. And a terrible thing happened in 1927, when the leader of the Church, Metropolitan Sergius, by his shameful apostate declaration submitted the Russian Church to the Bolsheviks and declared that he was cooperating with them. In the most exact sense the expression of the prayer before confession was fulfilled: ‘fallen under his own anathema’! For in 1918 the Church anathematised all the co-workers of communism, and in 1927 she herself

93 Vestnik Zapadno-Europejskoj Eparkhii (Herald of the Western European Diocese), 1979, № 14; Posev (Sowing), 1979, № 12.

94 In fact, before his death in 2004 Dudko became an open advocate of Stalinism and Putin’s neo-Stalinism: “I hope so much for Vladimir Putin now. It seems to me that he is like Joseph Stalin. I treat Stalin with respect, and I think that he was a very wise leader. It is Stalin who established such a powerful country. Russia has never been that powerful since, and there was no tsar in Russia who was able to accomplish the things that Stalin did. He managed to overcome and sacrifice so much for the sake of the country’s greatness. I hope that Putin will follow in Stalin’s path...” (http://english.pravda.ru/politics/2002/11/13/39433; quoted by Nicholas Candela, “[paradosis] the wisdom of an MP priest”, orthodox-tradition@yahoo.com, January 22, 2004).
entered into the company of these co-workers and began to praise the red God-fighting authorities – to praise the red beast of which the Apocalypse speaks. And this is not all. When Metropolitan Sergius published his criminal declaration, the faithful children of the Church immediately separated from the Soviet church, and the Catacomb Church was created. And she in her turn anathematised the official church for her betrayal of Christ...

“We receive clergymen from Moscow not as ones possessing grace, but as ones receiving it by the very act of union. But to recognize the church of the evil-doers as the bearer and repository of grace – that we, of course, cannot do. For outside of Orthodoxy there is no grace; and the Soviet church has deprived itself of grace.”\

Dudko’s vulnerability consisted, not so much in the fear of physical torture, as in the KGB’s ability to induce in him a feeling of false guilt, guilt that he had objectively harmed the Soviet State. This tragedy exposed an inescapable dilemma facing all the dissidents: that action aimed to restore the freedom of the Church was necessarily anti-soviet, insofar as the Soviet State and the Orthodox Church represented incompatible aims and ideologies. Therefore every committed campaigner for Church freedom sooner or later had to admit that he was working against Soviet power – if not by physical, at any rate by spiritual, means, and that he had to work outside the political and ecclesiastical institutions of Soviet power. So the failure of the dissidents was the natural consequence of the refusal to obey the Apostle’s command: “Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers” (II Corinthians 6.14). They refused to obey Patriarch Tikhon’s adjuration to the faithful to have no communion at all with the communists, “the outcasts of humanity”. They tried to do good from within an accursed evil - the pact between Metropolitan Sergius and the Communists which, in the words of a samizdat document dating from the early 1970s, “tied the Church hand and foot by imposing on her a loyalty not only to the State, but mainly to the communist ideology.”

*\

The breaking of Dudko elicited the inevitable question: to what extent was the dissident movement infiltrated by the KGB? And still more important: to what extent was ROCOR, the main enemy of Sovietism abroad, infiltrated by the KGB? Such a question would arise with particular urgency in the 1990s and 2000s as ROCOR collapsed into union with the MP; but an incident in 1979 involving a layman of ROCOR, Mark Arndt, the future ROCOR Archbishop of Berlin, showed how relevant the question was to Church life already at that time.

95 “A Letter from Metropolitan Philaret (Voznesensky) to a Priest of the Church Abroad concerning Father Dmitry Dudko and the Moscow Patriarchate”, Vertograd-Inform, № 4, February, 1999, pp. 16-20. A few years earlier, on August 14/27, 1977, Metropolitan Philaret had told the present writer: “I advise you always to remain faithful to the anathema of the Catacomb Church against the Moscow Patriarchate.”

96 Keston College Archives 12/92, № 8926 March 29, 1972, in Orthodox Life, September-October, 1974.
Mark was arrested at Leningrad airport for importing anti-Soviet material and then released. The former KGB lieutenant-colonel, now church subdeacon, Konstantin Preobrazhensky, writes:-

“In 1979 the future Archbishop Mark [of Berlin] was arrested at the Soviet border for importing anti-Soviet literature. Nobody knows on what date. Nor does anybody know how long Mark was detained by the KGB, whether for one day or several…

“At that time Mark Arndt was an activist of NTS, the People’s Labour Union, which had once been a warlike anti-Soviet organisation but was then properly crammed with KGB agents.

“Some Russian émigrés today say: ‘What if the KGB simply frightened Mark and then let him go with God’s blessing?’

“I assure you as a retired lieutenant-colonel of the KGB: this could not have happened. Because the import of anti-Soviet literature came under article 70 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR, “Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda”. It was considered an especially dangerous state crime and promised a considerable jail sentence.

“And how then, after arresting Mark, would the chekists have given an account of their work? Explained that they had let him go? And where would the concrete result so valued by the KGB be? Or, as they say there, ‘the dry remains’?

“But nobody would have allowed him to be released!

“After all, every foreigner who fell for righteousness’ or unrighteousness’ sake into the hands of the KGB was considered to be a fat, tasty chicken. He could have been exchanged for a Soviet spy who had fallen into captivity, or used for communist propaganda.

“All this would have been considered to be a great success and promised rewards for the chekists. But if they released him, there would have been no bonus. After all, the KGB is a military system. Every step there has to be agreed with tens of bosses.

“The chekists could have released him only in exchange for a still greater bonus. And they give that for the recruitment of a foreigner. It is considered the greatest achievement in the work of a chekist. His career would have been on the up.

“They teach how to recruit foreigners who are arrested by them in the Minsk KGB school…

“They worked on Mark. He would even have had to spend the night in the
“Sergius Grigoryants [the founder of Glasnost] told me the following: ‘... The fact that the KGB let Mark go in such a “humane” fashion shows that a love match may have been set up between them.’...

“There are agents of influence, who act on the politics of their country in a spirit that is useful for Russia. But as a rule they do not break its laws.

“If Archbishop Mark is truly an agent of the KGB, then he belongs to this category. Does his activity correspond to the external political aims of the Putin administration? Undoubtedly yes. It helps submit the Church Abroad to Moscow, so as to take the Russian emigration under the control of the FSB [the new name for the KGB]...”

Archbishop Mark immediately and sharply responded to Preobrazhensky’s accusations: “I have never and nowhere been arrested, and I will not comment on every absurdity”.

More recently, Preobrazhensky has returned to the attack on Archbishop Mark, citing the witness of Bishop Irenaeus of Verney and Semirechiye of the Russian True Orthodox Church, who in 1990, as Protopriest Vladimir Klipenshtein, was appointed rector of the church of St. Symeon of the Wonderful Mountain in Dresden by Archbishop Mark. To his surprise he discovered that this church had formerly been in the MP, but that in that year the government of United Germany had decided to return all the Russian churches to ROCOR – and were prepared to enforce that decision by force if necessary. Fr. Vladimir joyfully phoned Archbishop Mark to tell him about this, but received the unexpected reply:

“I’m ready hang myself because of your actions!”

“But where then am I to serve?” said Fr. Vladimir in amazement.

“Rent a flat and serve at home!” shouted Archbishop Mark.

“It was strange: it was he who had appointed Fr. Vladimir as rector of the church, but now he was not allowing him to serve in it! Where was the logic in that?”

Fr. Vladimir later learned that, over ten years before ROCOR was engulfed by the MP, Archbishop Mark served with his patriarchal “double”, Archbishop Theophan of Berlin and Germany. Moreover, although he visited the Dresden parish and served with its patriarchal rector, Fr. George Davidov, he never took the church from him. Then Fr. Vladimir found out from the German counter-espionage service that all the patriarchal priests in Germany were KGB agents!

---

Fr. Vladimir’s inquiries were extremely displeasing to Archbishop Mark, who recalled him to his monastery of St. Job in Munich, and then told him that he would not be serving in Germany, whereupon he returned to his homeland.

“Bishop Irenaeus noted in a conversation with me that if at that time, in 1999, Mark’s work on the cadres in favour of Moscow had become widely known, this would have elicited such a scandal that last year’s ‘union of the Churches’ could not have taken place. The more so in that at that time the leader of the Church Abroad was Metropolitan Vitaly, who was known for his categorical rejection of the Bolsheviks, the chekists and ‘the Soviet patriarchate’.

“‘I am convinced that it was precisely Mark who led the conspiracy to remove Metropolitan Vitaly in 2000,’ noted Bishop Irenaeus.”  

---

The Georgian Church, like the Russian, suffered from the anti-religious policies of Khrushchev in 1959-64. And again, like the Russian, it was completely under the control of the KGB. Thus declassified documents from the KGB archives contain the following assessment for 1982: "Through the work of our agents the Russian Orthodox, Georgian and Armenian churches maintain staunchly loyal positions".

Patriarch Ephraim II may have been nominated by the KGB in 1960, and bowed to their pressure. As Zviad Gamsakhurdia, the future president of independent Georgia, wrote: “From 1965 I became much more active in church affairs... Between 1965 and 1969 I and my friends drew many young people towards an interest in religion. We gave them spiritual literature, explained the basic doctrines of religion, argued with atheists until gradually we attracted a significant number of Georgian young people to the Church. This was especially noticeable at Eastertide when all the churches overflowed. The income of the Church greatly increased, its bank balance grew, and so did the number of those applying to enter the seminary.

“All this aroused a great deal of concern in government circles. As is well known, the Soviet government tries by all means to deflect young people from religion. This happened in Georgia too.

“The authorities began by blackmailing and pressurizing Ephraim II. Georgia was filled with damaging rumours about him. I shall not repeat any of them, but will only report what I know definitely and what I am personally convinced is the truth.

“The pressure from the authorities alarmed Ephraim II. He was not like those strong and high principled Patriarchs, Ambrosy Kalaya or Kalistrat Lintsadze. All this slowly affected the style and content of his preaching and his relationship with us, the young flock of the Georgian Church. If before Ephraim had spoken boldly, expressing covert opposition to the Soviet regime (the newspapers even used to criticize his sermons), in his later years his preaching became empty, his appeals merely patriotic, so that it was hard to believe that it was a Christian pastor who spoke. The only bold appeal he made was to believing women to have large families. ‘Be fruitful and multiply!’ was the chief theme of his preaching at that time. Naturally all this had a bad effect on the young laity, who expected much from a Patriarch. (In addition, a number of priests unworthy of the name caused abuses in the Church which repelled and disillusioned young people ...)
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“Ephraim made no secret of the fact that it was the KGB who forbade him to lend books to the young believers. Once he even joked about it: ‘You know that when Moscow calls the tune, we must dance to it, or it will go ill with us.’”

One of the senior bishops in the Georgian Church at this time was Metropolitan Ilia (Shiolashvili) of Sukhumi, who from 1963 to 1972 was Rector of the Georgian Orthodox Theological Seminary. In 1962 he had been recruited by the Georgian KGB Unit V with the codename “Iverieli”. And when the future Georgian president Edward Shevardnadze became Georgian party First Secretary in 1972, there began a long, “symphonic” relationship between the two men which lasted until Shevardnadze’s fall from power in 2003.

Ilia proved his worth to his employers when, as Metropolitan of Sukhumi in the 1970s, he betrayed the Catacomb Bishop Gennady (Sekach) to the authorities. And he was an ardent ecumenist, travelling to many ecumenist forums in many countries as the representative of the patriarchate of Georgia. Ilia set his face firmly against the dissident movement among Georgian Orthodox Christians, which combined concern for human rights with a campaign against Church servility and corruption with a strong emphasis on Georgian nationalism. In 1975-77, the leaders of this movement – Zviad Gamsakhurdia, Valentina Pailodze and Merab Kostava – were all arrested and given sentences in the camps. Gamsakhurdia, however, recanted on Soviet central television; and the reduction in his sentence to two years’ exile suggested that he had made a “deal” with the authorities.

On November 9, 1979, “Catholicos-Patriarch David V of Georgia died. Religion in Communist Lands reports that, upon the death of Patriarch David V, Metropolitan Ilia was appointed Patriarchal locum tenens of the Georgian Orthodox Church by the Holy Synod. Leading the delegation dispatched by Patriarch Pimen of Moscow to the funeral of Patriarch David was Metropolitan Alexis (Ridiger) of Tallinn and Estonia, the present Patriarch of Russia, and Pimen’s direct successor. The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate notes that ‘during his stay in Tbilisi, the head of the delegation from the Russian Orthodox Church, Metropolitan Alexis, paid a visit to T. D. Onopridshvili, representative of the Council for Religious Affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers in the Georgian SSR’ (JMP, No. 3, 1978, p. 43)…

“…the most likely candidate for the patriarchal throne seemed to be Metropolitan Gaioz (Kepatishvili) of Tsilkani, on whose side were the majority of the bishops and clergy. Another contender was Metropolitan Ilia of Sukhumi and Abkhazia, who also had a sizable following. Metropolitan Gaioz and his

supporters forcibly occupied the Patriarchal headquarters, having ejected the watchman and lone nun, supporters of Ilia, who had been guarding it. Thereupon telegrams were sent to all the heads of the Local Orthodox Churches, announcing that Metropolitan Gaioz had been ‘elected’ Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal throne. Oddly enough, these telegrams got no further than the local post office. It seems that the appropriate ‘competent organs’ of state had by this time already reached a decision. (More on this below.) Then the militia burst into the headquarters of the Patriarchate, in turn forcibly expelled the followers of Metropolitan Gaioz, and ushered in those of Metropolitan Ilia, who was then declared locum tenens. And, of course, this time his telegrams reached their destination. The new locum tenens hastily ordained several bishops from among his supporters in the clergy, thus ‘packing the court’.

“Metropolitan Gaioz was forced, for appearance sake, to participate in the election and enthronement of Catholicos-Patriarch Ilia II. He was made to place the Patriarchal panagias and cross around the neck of the new Primate -- a bitter pill to swallow indeed! Soon thereafter Metropolitan Gaioz was arrested and charged with various crimes, including theft of church property, speculation in foreign currency, and moral depravity. The public prosecutor asked for the maximum sentence permitted by the law code then in force, which was fifteen years imprisonment. However, the plaintiff on behalf of the Church, Archimandrite Nicholas Makharadze, demanded the death penalty! Metropolitan Gaioz was eventually sentenced to fifteen years in prison...

“... In 1979 Patriarch Ilia II was... elected one of the six presidents of the World Council of Churches... He then inserted the new title into the text of his official commemoration during the church services: ‘For our Great Lord and Father, Catholicos-Patriarch of All Georgia, Archbishop of Mtskheta and Tbilisi, President of the World Council of Churches, Ilia II’! He likewise used the title when issuing his annual Paschal and Christmas encyclicals, and in all published accounts of his ecumenical activities abroad (e.g.: Grapevine Cross, No. 2, 1981, p. 3)...”

Patriarch Ilia remains in power to this day, 2016 – probably the longest-serving KGB patriarch in history.

From the 1970s we see the ascendancy in the MP of a school of thought devoted to the interests both of the Soviet State and of the ecumenical movement which was called “Nikodemovschina” from its first leader and originator, Metropolitan Nikodem (Rotov), KGB Agent “Sviatoslav”.

Nikodem’s activity was soon bearing fruit. “The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia recorded that by 1972 the WCC had been converted from a ‘pro-Western’ to a ‘progressive’ orientation in its policies on peace, disarmament and related matters. Assiduous advocacy by the Christian Peace Conference and others of the view that Christianity and communism were natural allies in support of the national liberation movement induced the WCC to provide funds for African guerilla movements, including the Rhodesian Patriotic Front, believed to be responsible for a massacre of British missionaries in 1978.”

Ever since writing his master’s thesis on Pope John XXIII, the man who led the Catholic Church onto the ecumenical scene, Metropolitan Nikodem had been trying to do the same for the MP.

Igumen Theophan (Areskin) writes: “Metropolitan Nikodem begins his exposition of his ecumenist faith with an Orthodox thesis on the unity of the whole human race in Adam: ‘Mankind, the whole Adam (in the expression of St. Macarius the Great) is united by means of the Incarnation, Cross and Resurrection of the last Adam (I Corinthians 14.45), the second Man, the Lord Who “for us men” came down from the heavens (I Corinthians 15.47), and, having tasted “death for us all by the grace of God” (Hebrews 2.9), “is the Saviour of all men” (I Timothy 4.10)… We all, in accordance with the ineffable wisdom of God, have been bound from the beginning with the bonds of unity and brotherhood’. But further on Metropolitan Nikodem reveals his understanding of this unity: ‘Christ died for all men, and, as the new Adam, he laid the beginning for a new humanity… The fullness of the grace-filled gifts is communicated to people by the Holy Spirit in the Church of Christ. However, it would be a dangerous error to consider that Christ, the Redeemer of the whole world, does not extend His saving influence on the whole of humanity.’ This saving influence consists, according to Metropolitan Nikodem, ‘in faith in Christ Jesus, acting through love in each separate person, as in the whole of humanity, with which we are united by our common human nature. God redeemed us into an undivided, indivisible, unchanging and unconfused union with this nature through the incarnation of the Only-Begotten Son.’ ‘By taking on and deifying our nature in the Divine Incarnation the Chief and Accomplisher of our faith (Hebrews 12.2) and of eternal salvation (Hebrews 5.9), our Lord Jesus Christ reconciled, united and related the whole of humanity with God, and all people with each other’. ‘The Church as the Kingdom of God is likened to leaven which

penetrates into all the parts of the whole that is humanity, into the whole world, and acts with that measure of power which corresponds to the moral level of the bearers of Christ’s truth. And although far from all people actively and consciously abide in the Church, *the Church abides in all through the love of Christ*, for this love is not limited by any part of humanity, but is distributed to all people.’ Hence ‘the activity of the Spirit of God is not limited by confessional limits. His manifestation is completely and, above all, unconditionally revealed in the Church, but the traces of His presence are evident everywhere where there are the fruits of spiritual life: love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness…’ Therefore all people, the whole Body of humanity (Adam), are invisibly united with God and is a certain ‘invisible Church’. The organization of the Church is understood by Nikodem as ‘the visible Church’, in which ‘baptism defines the visible belonging to Christ’. Metropolitan Nikodem consciously confesses the ‘baptism’ of Protestants to be true, turning to his ‘brothers in Christ’, the Protestants, the members of the WCC: ‘Through the mystery of holy Baptism we are engrained onto the saving Divine Vine…’ But the visible Church ‘is called to realize the fruits of the Incarnation and Redemption in the life of her immediate members.’

“... according to Metropolitan Nikodem, all people are ‘Christians’. It is true that the Church of Christ, the Body of Christ, the New Adam, is one, but it is not yet united into one ecclesiastical organization under one leader. The aim of the ecumenists is to create this *mediation*, that is, one single visible ecclesiastical organization for all. In this way the ecumenical Church and the world become indistinguishable from each other. It is not difficult to find the primary source of this faith. It is *sergianism* – a heretical teaching that the Church, the Body of Christ, is a simple ecclesiastical organization, just like ordinary secular organizations, political parties, communities, commercial structures, etc.”

The death of Nikodem in 1978 in Rome at the feet of Pope John-Paul I, was a graphic symbol of the true direction of Orthodox-Catholic ecumenism – aided and abetted by the KGB – in a distinctly pro-Soviet direction. As Lev Regelson writes, “after Pope John-Paul I said of him ‘This is a person from whom I can learn how one must love the Church’, it was almost guaranteed that the following Pope would be pro-Soviet... [Fr. Gleb Yakunin] sat down to write a letter to the Vatican in which he exposed the antichristian activity of Metropolitan Nikodem... I know all this at first hand because I helped him work on this letter. Finally, it was read out at the Conclave for the election of the new Pope, and produced such a powerful impression – in the words of one of the cardinals passed on to Fr. Gleb – that the Polish cardinal Woitila was elected as Pope. He was a convinced ‘anticommunist’, who knew of the methods of the Soviet secret...
service from personal experience. Many investigators had supposed, with good reason, that the 27-year pontificate of John-Paul II played a decisive role in the beginning of the weakening of Soviet global expansion, and thereby in the fall of the USSR, which without this expansion lost ‘the meaning of its existence’…”

* *

Nikodem’s place both as chief ideologist of the MP, Metropolitan of Leningrad and leader of the “Nikodemovshina” school of theology, was taken by his pupil, the future “Patriarch” Alexis II (Ridiger). And when Pope John-Paul died a few days after Nikodem, Alexis celebrated a festive service for the repose of his soul in the Moscow Cathedral of the Epiphany, while another of Nikodem’s disciples, Cyril (Gundyaev), celebrated a similar service in the Alexander Nevsky Lavra in Leningrad. In 2016, Gundyaev, now Patriarch of Moscow, met Pope Francis I in Castro’s Cuba – another powerful symbol of how Orthodoxy, Catholicism and a resurrected Communism still planned to share the world between them…

Alexis, an Estonian by birth (he was bishop in Tallin before his transfer to Leningrad), had been a KGB agent with codename “Drozdov” since 1958 and an active ecumenist for almost as long as his mentor. Already from 1966 he made it clear that he considered heretics to be members of the Church.

Following the directions of the KGB, Alexis was sent as a delegate to the Third General Assembly of the WCC in New Delhi in 1961, (with Metropolitans Nicodemus and Anthony (Bloom)). He became a member of the Central Committee of the WCC from 1961 to 1968, president of the World Conference, “The Church and Society” in Geneva in 1966, and a member of the Commission “Faith and Order” of the WCC from 1961 to 1968.

In the 1974 Furov report to the Central Committee of the USSR Alexis (together with his predecessor Patriarch Pimen) was placed in the category of those bishops who “affirm both in words and deeds not only loyalty but also patriotism towards the socialist society; strictly observe the laws on cults, and educate the parish clergy and believers in the same spirit; realistically understand that our state is not interested in proclaiming the role of religion and the church in society; and, realizing this, do not display any particular activeness in extending the influence of Orthodoxy among the population.” According to a KGB document of 1988, “An order was drafted by the USSR KGB chairman to award an honorary citation to agent DROZDOV” [i.e. Alexis] for unspecified services to state security.

---
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48. SUPER-ECUMENISM (1)

Since the KGB’s aim was world domination, it had no particular desire to limit ecumenism to inter-Christian ecumenism. Nor were western ecumenists satisfied by their attempts to unify Christian confessions: they now plunged into the much broader sphere of inter-religious relations – that is, into “Super-Ecumenism.

For this was the supposed “age of the Spirit”, when, ignoring the voice of the Holy Spirit: “Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers, for... what concord hath Christ with Belial?” (II Corinthians 6.14-15), the ecumenists invited to union not only Christians of all denominations but also members of all the other religions. Thus in 1970 the Pentecostal Pope Paul VI spoke of “the Hebrew and Islamic peoples, and Christians... these three expressions of an identical [my italics - V.M.] monotheism”, and confessed that “we are all sons of the same Father, and,... therefore, all brothers”.

Evidently he did not know the words of the Apostle John: “Whosoever denieth the Son [and both Jews and Mohammedans deny the Son], the same hath not the Father” (I John 2.23). Nor those of the Lord Himself: “No man cometh unto the Father but by Me” (John 14.6).

Another important influence, paradoxically, on Catholic ecumenism was the ecumenism of the Russian religious philosophers such as Soloviev and Berdiaev. Thus Patriarch Athenagoras noted the influence of Berdiaev on one of the architects of the Second Vatican Council, Cardinal Jean Daniélou, as well as on himself. And in a speech made on December 12, 1992, Pope John-Paul II said: “I confess the same Christian faith as was the faith of Soloviev.”

Catholic Super-Ecumenism was set in motion by the Second Vatican Council’s decree, Nostra Aetate (Declaration on the Relations of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, October 28, 1965): "Even though the Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead pressed for the death of Christ, neither all Jews indiscriminately at that time, nor Jews today, can be charged with the crimes committed during his passion." And yet the Jewish religion to this day justifies the killing of Christ, saying in the Talmud that He was a magician and His Mother a prostitute!

The Orthodox were not far behind the Catholics, especially in relation to the Mohammedans. Thus in 1970, “the WCC sponsored a conference in Ajaltoun, Lebanon, between Hindus, Buddhists, Christians and Moslems, and a follow-up conference of 23 WCC ‘theologians’ in Zurich in June declared the need for ‘dialogue’ with the non-Christian religions. At the meeting of the Central Committee of the WCC at Addis Ababa in January of this year, Metropolitan

---
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Georges Khodre of Beirut (Orthodox Church of Antioch) shocked even many Protestant delegates when he not merely called for ‘dialogue’ with these religions, but left the Church of Christ far behind and trampled on 19 centuries of Christian tradition when he called on Christians to ‘investigate the authentically spiritual life of the unbaptized’ and enrich their own experience with the ‘riches of a universal religious community’ (Religious New Service), for ‘it is Christ alone who is received as light when grace visits a Brahmin, a Buddhist, or a Moslem reading his own scriptures’ (Christian Century, February 10, 1971).”

In 1975 the Orthodox delegates at the WCC General Assembly in Nairobi declared: “The Orthodox do not expect the other Christians to be converted to Orthodoxy in its historic and cultural reality of the past and the present and to become members of the Orthodox Church.”

In May, 1975 the WCC published an agreed statement of the Faith and Order Commission entitled One Baptism, One Eucharist and a Mutually Recognised Ministry, proclaiming a thoroughly Protestant doctrine of ecclesial and sacramental unity. As the title suggests, this document was aimed at the mutual recognition by the churches of each other’s sacraments. For example: “Our baptismal unity in Jesus Christ constitutes a call to the churches to overcome their divisions and achieve full visible union” (p. 10). And “the full recognition by churches of each other’s baptisms as the one baptism into Christ should be possible for all when Jesus Christ has been confessed as Lord by the candidate… and when baptism has been performed with water ‘in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit’” (p. 16). It should be remembered that the WCC includes sects which deny the Divinity of Christ, and that none of the member-churches except the Orthodox (and not even all of them) baptised in the apostolic manner with full threefold immersion.

The document also included a theologically incoherent doctrine of the transformation of the bread and the wine in the Eucharist, and the extraordinary statement that “the churches should test their liturgies in the light of the eucharistic agreement recently obtained” (p. 27) – as if the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom needed revision in the light of Protestant theology!

The Orthodox could hardly claim not to be committed to this document’s doctrines, for one of its chief architects was the Russian Protopresbyter Vitaly Borovoy, and none of the Churches disowned him. Moreover, it was a revision of previous statements “in the light of responses received from the churches” – including, presumably, from the Orthodox churches.

In the same year of 1975, Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira and Great Britain published, with the explicit blessing and authorisation of Patriarch Demetrius, his Thyateira Confession, which expressed the novel idea that the

---

Church is a house without walls that anyone can enter freely. And he wrote: “Orthodox Christians believe that the following Churches have valid and true Priesthood or Orders. The Orthodox, the Roman Catholic, the Ethiopian, the Copto-Armenian and the Anglican. The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, the Patriarchate of Romania and the Church of Cyprus half a century ago declared officially that the Anglican Church has valid Orders by dispensation and that means that Anglican Bishops, Priests and Deacons can perform valid sacraments as can those of the Roman Catholic Church.” Athenagoras also asserted that “the idea that Masonry is a religion is mistaken”... 

When Metropolitan Philaret criticized The Thyateira Confession, Athenagoras responded with a fierce attack on ROCOR, declaring: “Of course the door of the Church is Holy Baptism which the Orthodox Church has recognised as being validly administered by Roman Catholics, the Copts, the Armenians, the Old Catholics and Anglicans, the Lutherans, the Methodists and some other Christian groups.”

Again, at the WCC’s General Assembly at Nairobi in 1975, the Orthodox delegates, having signed an agreement to recognize the sacraments of the non-Orthodox delegates, had declared that “the Orthodox do not expect the other Christians to be converted to Orthodoxy in its historic and cultural reality of the past and the present and to become members of the Orthodox Church” – which gave the lie to their excuse that they were participating in the ecumenical movement “to witness to the non-Orthodox”.

Some residual opposition to ecumenism remained in some of the Local Churches – especially in Greece, where the well-known opposition of Esphigmenou Monastery kept the issue high on the agenda. Thus, as Archimandrite (later Metropolitan) Callistus (Ware) reported, “during May, 1978, after visiting the Ecumenical Patriarch, Dr. Potter and Archbishop Scott, the Chairman of the Central Committee of the WCC, went to Athens for discussions there with the Synodical Commission on Inter-Orthodox and Inter-Christian Relations. It seems that the explanations offered from the side of the WCC totally failed to meet the Greek Orthodox objections. In an interview with the New York Times, Archbishop Seraphim of Athens stated that the Church of Greece was now considering withdrawal from membership in the WCC...
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“In April, 1980 another warning against ecumenism was issued by the Fathers of Mount Athos, who since the return of Vatopedi in 1975 were now all solidly Old Calendar, though most remained in communion with the Ecumenical Patriarch. And yet high-level negotiations between Orthodox and Catholics went ahead on the islands of Patmos and Rhodes in May and June of 1980. During these talks, news came – hastily denied by the Vatican – that Pope John-Paul II had pronounced papal infallibility to be ‘not negotiable’. And on June 5, the day after the ending of the talks in Rhodes, the Pope declared that papal infallibility was “the key itself for certainty in professing and proclaiming the faith…”

As the 1970s and 1980s progressed talk of unity was succeeded by action, and communal services not only between Christians of different denominations, but also between Christians and non-Christians, became common. Thus on June 29, 1980, in Atlanta, Georgia, the Greek Archbishop James of New York served an “unprecedented” ecumenical service with various Catholics, Protestants and even Jews... Even clergy of Serbian Patriarchate were conducting ecumenical services with the participation of heterodox clerics and even rabbis and women. On January 22, 1981, the Ecumenical Press Service reported that the WCC was working on plans to unify all the Christian denominations into a single new religion which, the ecumenists hoped, would be generally accepted. To this end, a “preliminary plateau” was to be formed which would consolidate existing agreements between the churches. This would then lead to the formation of a universal council which would become a single body with sufficient authority to formulate a new confession of the apostolic faith!

Also clear by this time was the politicisation of the WCC along the lines of the Moscow-inspired “movement for peace”, as we can see from a cursory reading of the titles of the public statements of the 33rd and 34th sessions of the Central Committee of the WCC in 1981 and 1982: “The Churches and the Refugee Crisis”, “Statement on Namibia”, “Increased Threats to Peace and the Task of the Churches”, “Statement on South African Government Raids on Squatter Camps”, “On Northern Ireland”, “Statement on the Second Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Disarmament”, “Statement on Lebanon”, “Statement on Extrajudicial Executions”.

In 1982 the MP convened a conference entitled “Religious workers for saving the sacred gift of life from nuclear catastrophe” in Moscow. It disclaimed any attempt “to produce some common syncretistic religion”. Nevertheless, the message implicit in its gathering of representatives of all the world’s religions under the chairmanship of the MP was that material prosperity is more important than truth.

---
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Again, Fr. Lev Gillet highlighted the so-called “ecumenism of the concentration camps”. “For it was in such places as Buchenwald, Dachau and Auschwitz (not to mention the camps of the Stalinist world)”, writes Fr. Sergius Hackel, “That ‘Christians belonging to different Churches discovered through their common sufferings and their burning charity a deep unity at the foot of the cross’. Furthermore, ‘this ecumenism had its witnesses, its martyrs’. And Fr. Lev mentions three to represent them all: the Protestant pastor Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906-45), the Catholic priest Josef Metzger (1887-1944), and the Orthodox nun Maria Skobtsova (1891-1945). ‘All three were killed for Christ, all three were witnesses for the ecumenical fellowship of blood which is expressed in this sentence from the [1943] testament of Metzger: ‘I feel myself as closely united to my believing and conscientious Protestant brothers in Christ Jesus through Baptism and our common experience in the same Lord, as to the brethren with whom I share the fellowship of the Holy Sacrament’. The symbolic lighting of candles in the chapel of the twentieth-century martyrs in Canterbury Cathedral at the outset of Pope John Paul’s visit to Great Britain (in 1982) was, among other things, a reminder of what such ecumenism can mean.”

But if Orthodox, Catholics and Protestants who suffered at the hands of the Nazis were all martyrs, what about the victims of the Jewish holocaust? Soon the industry of the holocaust would be compelling Christian leaders to pay homage also to these “martyrs”, whose religion of the Talmud breathes the most extreme hatred of Christ and Christians!

In proof of this, persecution of Christians in Israel has continued. Thus in November, 1979 Archimandrite Philoumenos, guardian of Jacob’s Well for the Jerusalem Patriarchate took shelter when a group of people, believed to be fanatical Zionists, broke into the monastery and attacked him with hatchets. His face was cloven in two, his eyes plucked out and the fingers of his right hand, used to make the sign of the cross, were chopped into pieces. No one was ever arrested for the murder, which took place a week after a Zionist group had come to the monastery claiming that it was a Jewish holy place and demanding that all the crosses and other religious iconography be removed. His body was later found to be incorrupt.

In fact, the concept of martyrdom exposes ecumenism for the lie that it is. For if all religions are holy and equal, then so are their martyrs. But this is impossible. For then Jews who are killed by Muslims are as “holy” as Muslim suicide bombers. And Jews who suffer at the hands of Christians are as holy as Christians who suffer at the hands of Jews. And Catholics who suffer at the hands of Nazis and Stalinists are as holy as Orthodox who suffer at the hands of Catholics. And Orthodox who die for Sovietism and the Soviet church (i.e. in the MP) are as holy as Orthodox who die against Sovietism and against the Soviet church...

The absurdity of ecumenism exposes the shallowness and falsehood of twentieth-century “spirituality” in general. As the American Hieromonk Seraphim (Rose) put it: “Never has there been such an age of false teachers as this pitiful twentieth century, so rich in material gadgets and so poor in mind and soul. Every conceivable opinion, even the most absurd, even those hitherto rejected by the universal consent of all civilized peoples — now has its platform and its own ‘teacher.’ A few of these teachers come with demonstration or promise of ‘spiritual power’ and false miracles, as do some occultists and ‘charismatics’; but most of the contemporary teachers offer no more than a weak concoction of undigested ideas which they receive ‘out of the air,’ as it were, or from some modern self-appointed ‘wise man’ (Or woman) who knows more than all the ancients merely by living in our ‘enlightened’ modern times. As a result, philosophy has a thousand schools, and ‘Christianity’ a thousand sects. Where is the truth to be found in all this, if indeed it is to found at all in our most misguided times?

“In only one place is there to be found the fount of true teaching, coming from God Himself, not diminished over the centuries but ever fresh, being one and the same in all those who truly teach it, leading those who follow it to eternal salvation. This place is the Orthodox Church of Christ, the fount is the grace of the All-Holy Spirit, and the true teachers of the Divine doctrine that issues from this fount are the Holy Fathers of the Orthodox Church.”
At about this time a third major force entered the struggle for global dominion, complicating the Capitalist/Communist standoff: Islamic fundamentalism. Although Islam had always been a powerful force in the Middle East, secular and nationalist ideologies had managed to place it in the background in most of the region (except Saudi Arabia). However, beginning with the Iranian revolution of 1979, as Eric Hobsbawm writes, the Islamic fundamentalists became a powerful force, “as the secularized and modernizing elite minorities who had led their countries into the modern world were marginalized.” They were popular because they were hostile “to the Western civilization which was the agent of social disruption, and to the rich and godless countries that looked, more than ever, like the exploiters of the poor world’s poverty. That the local targets of such movements were the Westernized rich with their Mercedes and emancipated women, added a tinge of class struggle to such movements... Such movements looked back... to some simpler and stabler and more comprehensible age of the imagined past...”

Peter Mansfield writes: “Among the Arabs who most fiercely resisted Western domination there were some who saw nothing of value outside Islam. These were Muslim nationalists rather than Arab nationalists; today they are called fundamentalists. They had, and have, a utopian view that if Muslims were to set up an Islamic order in which the holy sharia would be the only authority, all the internal problems of government and society and the external problems of un-Islamic domination and influence would be solved. While their dedication and readiness for martyrdom made them formidable, they remained a minority in the Arab struggle for full independence from the West. Their refusal to compromise and their willingness to use violence against anyone who did not wholly share their views alienated potential allies. Whenever there seemed a chance that they might gain power, they deeply alarmed the majority...

“After the Arab catastrophe in 1967, volatile world opinion seized on the possibility of an Islamic fundamentalist revolution sweeping through the Arab countries. In the heyday of pan-Arab nationalism in the 1950s and 1960s, the importance of Islam as a political force was grossly underestimated by the majority of Western journalists and academics – and, indeed, by much of the Arab intelligentsia. A common view was that the Arabs were determined to catch up with the West’s material and technical progress, and for this Islam had nothing to contribute. After 1967 there was a sudden reversal of this opinion. Secular Arab nationalism had been proved a failure and was dead, the masses would reject Western progress and turn to fundamentalist Islam as their only hope.
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“Both views were misleading. Islam had never ceased to be a supremely powerful underlying force; it was only reasserting itself more openly in the wake of the Arab defeat. On the other hand, nationalism was far from dead, even if it had to modify its form. All the regimes of the Arab states – even in Saudi Arabia – still subscribed to the notion that the Arabs form a single nation which should be more closely united. There was no question of breaking up the League of Arab States. At the same time, it was apparent that there had been a strengthening of territorial nationalism – the local patriotism that had grown up around the flag and capital of the individual Arab states (however artificial their creation by the West may have been) and that supported their particular interests. There was no likelihood that an Islamic revolution would be able to sweep all this away.

“The Islamic revolution which did occur took place not in the predominantly Sunni Muslim lands but in Shiite Iran. All but a very few of the closest observers were taken by surprise.

“Since the overthrow of Mossadegh in 1953129, Iran had come to be seen as an example of the progress and development which were widely held in the West to be synonymous with westernization. In the 1950s, elections to the Majlis were carefully controlled to ensure that acceptable candidates were elected. The National Front cease to function as an organized political force and the communist Tudeh Party was proscribed. Power was increasingly concentrated in the hands of the shah. However, the task of the shah’s loyalist government was not easy. Their hope was that economic growth would dampen opposition to the control of political life but, although oil revenues expanded, the large-scale projects to develop the infrastructure took time to mature and there was widespread corruption and inefficiency. Anti-Western nationalist feelings, inflamed during the Mossadegh crisis, were by no means extinguished. They gained strength from the regime’s close identification with the Western camp, symbolized by Iran’s adherence to the anti-Soviet Baghdad Pact in 1955.

“In 1961 the unrest obliged the shah to appoint as prime minister Ali Amini, a wealthy aristocrat with a reputation as a liberal reformer. He tackled government extravagance and corruption and relaxed controls on the National Front and left-wing opposition. He brought into the cabinet as minister of agriculture Hassan Arsanjami, a radical political committed to land reform and the break-up of the large estates consisting of scores of villages. Amini persuaded the shah to allow him to dissolve the Majlis and rule by decree to push through his reforms. But his reformist experiment was short-lived. He aroused opposition on all sides – from the land-owners and the army, as well as the politicians who demanded the restoration of the Majlis. Within a year he had been forced to resign and the shah reasserted his authority.

“The shah nevertheless pursued and even intensified some of the reform measures – notably land reform, which was extended to the Islamic *waqf* properties (whose revenues were used for the upkeep of mosques or charitable works), while the large land-owners were limited to the holding of one village. Female suffrage was introduced, and women’s rights were legally extended. A Literacy Corps was founded to enable high-school students to teach in village schools as an alternative to military service. In this way the shah’s government retained the initiative. The National Front declared that it favoured the reforms but said that they were ‘unconstitutional’, while the mullahs, whose most effective spokesman was Ayatollah Khomeini of Qum, denounced them as ‘un-Islamic’ as well as unconstitutional. In 1963 the National Front was disbanded by the government and then disintegrated. Khomeini and other religious leaders were arrested, and a year later Khomeini was sent into exile and took up residence in the Shiite region of southern Iraq. The religious opposition resorted increasingly to underground activity and violence, but this was ineffective and the government was able to denounce both the nationalists and mullahs as reactionary opponents of reform.

“For more than a decade the shah could rule without serious opposition pressure. He reconvened the Majlis and allowed it to function with officially sponsored political parties and an opposition which consistently voted for government bills. Outside parliament the ubiquitous SAVAK secret police relentlessly suppressed dissent.

“The shah showed increasing self-confidence and a vaulting ambition to make his country the indisputably dominant regional power. The West was always ready to provide him with the most sophisticated modern weapons. Although remaining in the Western camp, however, he improved relations with the Soviet-bloc countries and signed with them a series of large-scale industrial agreements. He secured greatly improved terms from the oil companies, which amounted to the National Iranian Oil Company taking control of operations. In 1967 he amended the constitution so that the queen would automatically become regent in the event of his death before the crown prince reached his majority, and in the twenty-sixth year of his reign he and the queen were crowned in a wholly un-Islamic ceremony. In 1971 he celebrated the two-thousand-five-hundredth anniversary of the Persian monarchy with colossal extravagance at the ancient capital of Persepolis.

“The huge increase in Iran’s oil revenues in 1973-4 drove the shah’s ambitions to the border of megalomania. He began to proclaim that his country would be among the six most advanced industrial countries of the world by the end of the century. In fact – in spite of the real industrial progress, the extension of education and literacy, and the growth of the professional and business class – many of the standards of Iranian society remained those of the Third World. With hindsight it is possible to discern that the sudden vast increase in government revenues was the nemesis of the
regime. The huge growth in spending which followed placed intolerable strains on the country’s social and economic fabric. When overspending led to retrenchment and recession combined with continuing inflation, even the members of the new middle class who had benefited most from the shah’s policies became disaffected, while the mass of the population tended to see the heavy westernization and un-Islamic modernization of the country as the source of all evil.

“The shah, in common with most Western observers (including ambassadors), still underrated the opposition. He saw only an opportunistic alliance between the extreme left and the mullahs, and referred contemptuously to ‘Islamic Marxists’. In fact it was the mullahs who were best able to articulate the discontent of the majority.

“As the tide of unrest gathered momentum, it became apparent that popular opposition was massive and deep-seated. The huge coalition of discontent found its voice in Ayatollah Khomeini. After being ousted from his Iraqi exile by an embarrassed Iraqi government (which wanted stable relations with Iran), he took refuge in Paris, from where he issued uncompromising demands for the shah’s abdication. As strikes and demonstrations spread, the shah attempted a series of measures, mixing concessions with firmness, in an effort to secure his power. But these were ineffective. The armed forces remained apparently loyal, but the shah had lost the will and determination to hold on to power through the massive repression which would have been necessary – his arrogant demeanour had always concealed a certain lack of decision. He was also suffering from the cancer which was to kill him two years later. Without the will to retain his throne, neither his loyal followers nor his US allies could help him. On 16 January 1979 he left Iran with his queen ostensibly on holiday but never to return. His departure from Tehran was cheered by two million supporters of Ayatollah Khomeini. Twenty-five centuries of the Persian monarchy had ended.

“This momentous event was soon to be compared in importance with the French Revolution of 1789 and the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. For the comparison to be sustained it was necessary for the Iranian Revolution’s influence to spread far beyond Iran’s borders, and especially to the Muslim peoples of the Middle East. Khomeini and his clerical associates left no doubt that this was their intention. They proclaimed that all the regimes of Muslim countries in the region were corrupt, unworthy and un-Islamic and therefore deserved to be overthrown. They also denounced these regimes’ association with the West. Khomeini declared that a true Muslim country should have no truck with either East or West, but his special hatred was directed towards the United States – ‘the great Satan’, the former ally of the shah. Anti-American rage swept Iran and, when President Carter allowed the shah to travel from his retreat in the Bahamas to the United States for medical treatment, a crowd of militants stormed the US embassy at Tehran, seizing some fifty US hostages and all the embassy documents. This outrage against all the norms
of diplomacy, which even the most radical and revolutionary regimes usually accepted, provoked the United States, with the support its allies to declare Iran an international outlaw. Khomeini was not displeased. His uncompromising defiance of the West provoked admiration among all the Muslim masses to whom he wished to appeal. This was reinforced by his adoption of the cause of Palestine. He reversed the shah’s de facto alliance with Israel and invited [Palestinian leader] Arafat to Tehran, where he was greeted as a hero.

“At home, Ayatollah Khomeini set about consolidating clerical rule under his leadership. His authoritarianism provoked the opposition of the secular nationalist and left-wing elements who had supported his revolution, but they were no match for the hold he had obtained over the Iranian people. In fact the most serious opposition to his rule came from more senior Islamic clerics who challenged his religious authority. But even this he was able to contain. He had political genius, which they lacked. He based his rule on the doctrine of velayat-e faqih – that is, ‘government of the Islamic jurist’ – which he had expounded in lectures in exile. This holds that the true Islamic state must be based on the Koran and be modelled after the Prophet’s Islamic community in the seventh century, and that it should be administered by the clerical class as the Prophet’s heirs. As the self-appointed governing Islamic jurist, Khomeini was able to hold supreme power above that of the president, prime minister and elected parliament, which were all provided for in the new Islamic constitution. Under his authority, mass trials of the shah’s former supporters were organized, leading to many executions. The educational system was purged of non-Islamic influences. Squads of young Muslim militiamen enforced a strict Islamic code of conduct. Educated Iranian women, who had reached an advanced stage of emancipation before the revolution, had their role in public life sharply reduced and all had to envelop their heads and bodies in Islamic dress in public.

“The success of the Iranian Revolution and its declared desire to export itself caused serious alarm among Iran’s Arab neighbours, but nowhere more than in Iraq. With its secular pan-Arab ideology and its large Shiite population with little share in political power, Iraq was a vulnerable target. Tehran Arabic broadcasts poured hatred and contempt on the Iraq regime and called on the Iraqi people to overthrow it.

“Iraq’s president, Saddam Hussein, decided to act first. Although Iran has immense resources and three times Iraq’s population, he believed that the Khomeini Revolution could be overthrown by a swift blow. The Iranian regular armed forces were demoralized. Iran’s large minorities – the Kurds in the north-west, the Turkomans of the Caspian plain and the Arabs of Khuzestan in the south-west – saw their religious and cultural identities threatened by the Shiite fundamentalist policies of the Revolution and were demanding autonomy and threatening revolt. The economy, facing a Western boycott, was in dire condition. Almost certainly, exiled royalist Iranian officers helped to convince President Saddam that it was time to move. On 17
September 1980 Iraq, alleging various minor acts of Iranian aggression, denounced the 1975 agreement with the former shah and invaded Iran.

“The eight-year war which ensued was on an epic scale, with colossal casualties, massive material destruction and mutual rocket attacks on Baghdad and Tehran in ‘the war of the cities’. Iraq initially advanced deep into Iranian territory, but its invasion soon proved the danger of attacking a revolution. Iranian morale was higher than expected, and the Arab Iranians of the south-west did not rise to support the invaders. Within a year Iraq had been forced back, and by May 1982 Iran had recaptured nearly all its territory. All Iraq’s outlets to the sea were cut off. A prolonged stalemate ensued, interspersed by large-scale offensives which, as in the First World War, left many dead but the battle lines scarcely changed. Iraq, which could obtain arms from both East and West, had the advantage in weapons – especially tanks and artillery. Iran, lacking fresh supplies of its American weapons, was forced to turn to sources such as North Korea or the international black markets in arms. It used its numerical superiority to launch human-wave assaults which often involved thousands of teenage youths imbued with the characteristically Shiite readiness for martyrdom…”

* 

In December, 1979 the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, supposedly in order to defend the country “from Western intervention by the American Zionists” (Pravda, August 1, 1981). This was nonsense, of course, because, as Revel writes, the invasion “had been preceded by years of a political and economic stranglehold on the country”.

The real reason was for the invasion was that a new kind of Sunni fundamentalism threatened the Soviet position in Afghanistan – and therefore within the Union itself, in Central Asia. As Martin Gilbert writes, “A pro-Soviet regime, headed by Nur Muhammad Taraki, which had seized power the previous April, had imprisoned many Islamic religious leaders, who were demanding – as were the Iranian mullahs across Afghanistan’s western borders – a more religious, Islamic orientation in the government and laws of the State. One source of inspiration for the Islamic fundamentalists was Pakistan, to the east, whose new ruler, Zia al-Haq, insisted that the teaching and tenets of Islam should be a central feature of the national school curriculum. Islamic fervor in the region was deeply disturbing to the Soviet leaders, whose own Central Asian republics, while firmly under the control of secular, atheistic Moscow, were made up almost entirely – other than by a minority of Russian settlers and officials – of Muslims. The cities of Bukhara, Samarkand, Khiva and Ashkhabad, Soviet cities for almost half a century, had all been centres of Islam for centuries before that.
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“On February 14 the American ambassador to Afghanistan, Adolph Dubs, was kidnapped by Afghan Islamic fundamentalists who said they would release him only if the Muslim religious leaders imprisoned by President Taraki were released. The American government began negotiations with the kidnappers, who were holding Dubs captive in a hotel in Kabul. Even while the negotiations were continuing, Taraki, at the suggestion of his senior Soviet advisers, sent Afghan police against the kidnappers. In the resultant gun battle Dubs was killed. The United States protested to the Soviet Union about the role of its advisers in ordering the assault while the Americans were still negotiating with the kidnappers.

“The struggle between the pro-Soviet and Islamic movements in Afghanistan was also being fought in the countryside: five thousand Islamic fighters were being held in check in the Konar province, north-east of Kabul, by 12,000 Afghan troops loyal to President Taraki. The government’s struggle was intensified in March, when four thousand Iranian fundamentalists entered Afghanistan together with seven thousand Afghan fundamentalists who had earlier sought sanctuary in Iran. Pakistan also gave tacit encouragement to the Islamic movement in Afghanistan.

“The Afghan army was riddled with disaffection; desertions to the Islamic guerrilla forces increased during the summer. On August 12 a group of thirty Russians who were visiting a Muslim shrine at Kandahar were murdered by Afghan fundamentalists. There was indignation in the Soviet Union, and fear among the Soviet advisers in Afghanistan that the power of the central government was waning. On September 16 President Taraki was overthrown by Hafizullah Amin. In the gun battle around the presidential palace, Taraki was killed. More Soviet advisers arrived to prop up the Kabul government. But Hafizullah Amin’s promise to restore Kabul’s authority throughout the country within thirty days was beyond fulfilment – even 300 days would not have sufficed.

“The Soviet Union decided to take unilateral action. On Christmas Day – a day recognized as special neither by Soviet Communists nor by Afghan Muslims – Brezhnev ordered a two-day military airlift of Soviet troops into Kabul. It was the largest Soviet troop movement outside Russia’s borders since the invasion of Czechoslovakia eleven years earlier. With the arrival of Soviet troops in force, Hafizullah Amin’s government was overthrown, and Amin killed. He was replaced by a Soviet nominee, Babrak Karmal. Pravda welcomed the new government with enthusiasm, telling its readers: ‘True to the treaty of friendship, good-neighbourliness and cooperation with the USSR, which guaranteed lasting peace and security in the region, the Afghan people and State would support and develop their unbreakable fraternal relations with the Soviet Union.’

“The word ‘unbreakable’ echoed the national anthem of the Soviet Union itself – the ‘unbreakable union of free republics’. Yet it was by the invasion of
Afghanistan that the Soviet leaders lit the slow, and at first unsuspected fuse that was to lead to the break-up of the Soviet Union...”

For Afghanistan was not to prove your usual Soviet walkover. “Two and a half years after the Soviets marched in, according to an eyewitness who went there as a reporter in 1982, the Afghan Communist government and the Soviet troops had yet to gain control of the countryside, where 85 percent of the population lives. Western media were retailing the cliché about a ‘Soviet Vietnam’, the ‘mire’ in which the USSR would ‘bog down’.”

Under Taraki and Amin, 40,000 people had perished in purges, which was appalling enough. But in the nine years of war after the Soviets took full control in December, 1979, far more died, in spite of the fact that at no point in that period did they control more than 20 percent of the country. Terrible atrocities were committed by both sides, but especially by the Communists, who also used chemical weapons. As Sylvain Boulouque writes, “In the 1960s the country was on the road to prosperity, modernization, and democracy; Daoud’s coup [in 1973], which was supported by the Communists, ended economic development and plunged Afghanistan deep into civil war. The country was forced to make do with a war economy, which was oriented heavily in favor of the Soviet Union. Smuggling (of drugs, guns, and other goods) became common, and the economy rapidly fell into ruins. The scale of the disaster is still hard to measure today. Out of a population of approximately 15.5 million, more than 5 million inhabitants have left for Pakistan and Iran, where they now live in miserable conditions. The number of dead is extremely hard to determine, but most observers agree that the war took between 1.5 million and 2 million lives, 90 percent of whom were civilians. Between 2 million and 4 million were wounded. The direct and indirect role played by Communism in the growth of extremist Islamic movements, and in the reawakening of tension between different ethnic groups, is undeniable, although it may be hard to quantify...”

The terrible facts about Communism were slow to become publicly known and acknowledged. Nevertheless, anyone living in the West who wanted to know the truth would be able to find it – and this proved a vital weapon in the life-and-death struggle against the totalitarian enemy. For, as Jean-François Revel pointed out, “Democracy’s only superiority in the ideological war is the truth, even if it is often too unsure of itself to use that superiority. The Communists are addicted to disinformation because Communist propaganda in its raw state is not trusted. This is why, in spreading tales and exciting prejudices that will enlist people in support of Communist policy, they prefer to exploit the bourgeois trustworthiness of Western information sources.”

---
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"The banner of Islam may lead into the struggle for liberation," declared Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) on February 23, 1981.

Christian Gomez continues: "When Brezhnev said these words in his ‘Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union’ at the Kremlin, he had just finished exalting the recent Islamic Revolution in Iran as being "essentially an anti-imperialist revolution," and as a successful example of the many national liberation movements supported by the Soviet Union in its two-fold global objectives of building world communism and defeating Western ‘colonialism and imperialism.’ Brezhnev’s Soviet policy of building communism under the guise of Islam eventually culminated in the Soviet creation of the USSR Islamic Revival Parties in the late 1980s.

"In 1990, the inaugural congress of the Islamic Revival Party was hosted in Astrakhan, an oblast, or administrative division, in the lower Volga region of Russia bordering Kazakhstan. Around the same time, the USSR also authorized the establishment of Islamic Revival Parties in the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic (Tajik SSR, now Tajikistan) and Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic (Uzbek SSR, now Uzbekistan). Rather than Marxism-Leninism, like the CPSU, which authorized the establishment of the Islamic Revival Parties, the Islamic Revival Parties proclaim a fundamental Islamist ideology.

"In the book Islam v Astrakhanskom Regione (2008), which contains many copies of official documents issued by the Islamic Revival Party Congress, one particular Islamic Revival Party activist is quoted as saying, ‘We are labeled extremists. But this is not true; we simply support the purity of Islam and its precepts. We will have to revive our own religion throughout the whole world.’

"With the Soviet authorization of the Islamic Revival Parties in the Muslim-populated areas of the USSR, the CPSU had provided the more radicalized Muslims of the USSR with a political home from which to further voice their message at home and abroad throughout the Muslim world.

"One of the early founders of the USSR Islamic Revival Party was the late Chechen terrorist and Wahhabist ideologue Supyan Abdullayev, originally born in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. According to the daily Moscow-based newspaper Moskovskij Komsomolets, formerly the periodical organ of the Moscow City Committee of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League, ‘Abdullayev stood on the positions of radicalism well before the collapse of the USSR and the organization of the “Islamic Revival Party”’. The Moskovskij Komsomolets further reported: ‘According to some reports, back in the 1980s Abdullayev was recruited by the KGB. Since 1991, he actively participated the rebellions in Chechnya starting with the first Chechen campaign fought against federal troops. By 1996, he was appointed
deputy commander of the famous "Islamic battalion." In August of the same year he participated in the attack on Grozny. Then Aslan Maskhadov appointed Supyan Abdullayev to the position of deputy head of the Ministry of State Security Sharia (the equivalent of our FSB).’ [Translated from Russian.]

“Aslan Maskhadov was the third president of the self-declared Chechen Republic of Ichkeria, until his death on March 8, 2005. And like Abdullayev, Maskhadov was also born in the Kazakh SSR. It was during Maskhadov’s reign that Abdullayev rose to the rank of brigadier general. Abdullayev remained loyal to Maskhadov until his death.

“Abdullayev then joined the Caucasian Emirate, where he again quickly rose through the ranks serving as one of their leading field commanders and chief ideologist for its leader Dokka Umarov. Originally organized as the Caucus Front or Caucasian Mujahadeen, the Caucasian Emirate is a separatist militant Salafist Jihadist terrorist organization allied with al-Qaeda, the Taliban, the al-Nusra Front in Syria, and ISIS. In fact, Abu Omar al-Shishani, one of ISIS' top field commanders, admitted in an interview with the jihadist Russian-language website Beladusham.com that he arrived to fight in Syria ‘on the orders of Amir Abu Uthman (Dokka Umarov) and for a certain amount of time he has supported us financially.’ [Translated from Russian.]

“In an interview with DELFI, a daily news website servicing Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Ukraine, former Chechen Prime Minister Akhmed Zakayev admitted that Umarov was in fact an asset of Russian security services, the FSB and GRU (Russian military intelligence): ‘We announced it many times. In 2007, Umarov declared war to America, Great Britain and Israel. Before this statement, Dokka was in the radar of Russian secret services, but was released by some miracle, and announced this statement. Umarov is under full command of Russian special services. To this day he was (and will be, I’m sure) performing the tasks assigned to him by these structures.’ If this admission holds accurate, it would further corroborate that Russia is behind the very Islamic terrorism while ostensibly opposing it. Umarov’s 2007 declaration of war against not only America and Great Britain, but also the Jewish state of Israel, would also be consistent with the KGB’s historic role in fermenting Islamic terrorism under the guise of Muslim fears and hatred toward Israel.

“In his book Disinformation (2013), former high-ranking Soviet-bloc defector Lieutenant General Ion Mihai Pacepa — who served as chief of the Securitate, the Department of State Security for Communist Romania — revealed Moscow and the KGB’s role in exploiting and radicalizing Islamic anti-Semitism and terrorism against Israel in particular: ‘By 1972, Andropov’s disinformation machinery was working around the clock to persuade the Islamic world that Israel and the United States intended to transform the rest of the world into a Zionist fiefdom. According to Andropov, the Islamic world was a petri dish in which the KGB community could nurture a virulent strain of American-hatred, grown from the bacterium of Marxism-Leninism.
thought. Islamic anti-Semitism ran deep. The message was simple: The Muslims had a taste for nationalism, jingoism, and victimology.’

“Yuri Vladimirovich Andropov was the longest serving chairman of the KGB, from 1967 to 1982, and briefly held the position of general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (GS-CPSU) from 1982 until his unexpected death in 1984. In Disinformation, Pacepa elaborated on how Andropov’s KGB accomplished its anti-Semitic exploitation and radicalization of Muslims: ‘The Securitate’s first major dezinformatsiya task in the new World War III was to help Moscow reignite anti-Semitism in Western Europe by spreading thousands of copies of an old Russian forgery, The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, in that part of the world. It had to be done secretly, so no one would know the publications came from the Soviet bloc.’”

From 1979, in the successful revolutions of Muslims against European powers in Shia Iran and Sunni Afghanistan, we see the beginnings of a phenomenon that has become increasingly widespread today: the replacement of Marxism by Islam as the chief denouncer and scourge of the West. As Max Hastings writes in 2016: ‘Islam is today the cult of repressed people in many nations, as was Marxism in the 20th century. Jihadist recruiting videos skilfully weave together a narrative that suggests to second and third-generation Muslims in Europe that their experiences of alienation and exclusion are part of the same phenomenon as Israeli repression of the Palestinians, and the Western invasion of Iraq.’

But if the revolution in its crude, coercive aspect was handing the baton to the Jihadists, in its subtle, softer, “cultural” aspect it was handing over to a still more successful successor – the Humanrightists...
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50. FROM MARXISM TO HUMANRIGHTISM

In 1981 the Socialist François Mitterand became President of France. This seemed to portend a Left-wing revanche, the opposite of the Right-wing Thatcherite correction just beginning in Britain. But in fact Mitterand only dallied for a year or two with Socialist measures, and he proceeded to preside over a modest, but important move to the right.

The French had always seen themselves in the vanguard of the revolution. And they had indeed been the teachers of many revolutionaries, especially in their former colonies. Thus Ho Chi Minh had studied in Paris, and many of the Khmer Rouge leadership had studied under Jean Paul Sartre. Therefore it is not surprising that they should have been probably the West’s most gullible absorbers of Soviet propaganda, fuelled by their visceral anti-Americanism. They were therefore especially vulnerable to what Garry Kasparov has called “whataboutism”, “a term coined to describe how Soviet leaders would respond to criticism of Soviet massacres, forced deportations, and gulags with ‘What about how you Americans treated the Native Americans and the slaves?’ or something similar.”138 However, from the 1970s a philosophical change began to take place in the country’s intelligentsia, who had always seen themselves as at the forefront of the Revolution.

Tony Judt sees this change as really beginning in 1973, when faith in the Marxist revolution, already shaken by the Soviet invasion of Prague in 1968, received a further blow in the publication in French of Alexander Solzhenitsyn’s Gulag Archipelago. “The Communist daily newspaper L’Humanité dismissed it, reminding readers that since ‘everyone’ already knows all about Stalin, anyone rehashing all that could only be motivated by ‘anti-Sovietism’. But the accusation of ‘anti-Sovietism’ was losing its force. In the wake of the Soviet invasion of Prague and its repressive aftermath, and of reports filtering out of China about the Cultural Revolution, Solzhenitsyn’s root and branch condemnation of the whole Communist project rang true – even and perhaps especially to erstwhile sympathizers.

“Communism, it was becoming clear, had defiled and despoiled its radical heritage. And was continuing to do so, as the genocide in Cambodia and the widely-publicized trauma of the Vietnamese ‘boat people’ would soon reveal. Even those in Western Europe – and there were many – who held the United States largely responsible for the disasters in Vietnam and Cambodia, and whose anti-Americanism was further fuelled by the [supposedly] American-engineered killing of Chile’s Salvador Allende just three months before the publication of The Gulag Archipelago, were increasingly reluctant to conclude as they had once done that the Socialist camp had the moral upper hand. American imperialism was indeed bad – but the other side was worse, perhaps far worse.

“At this point the traditional ‘progressive’ insistence on treating attacks on Communism as implicit threats to all socially-ameliorative goals – i.e. the claim that Communism, Socialism, Social Democracy, nationalization, central planning and progressive social engineering were part of a common political project – began to work against itself. If Lenin and his heirs had poisoned the well of social justice, the argument ran, we are all damaged. In the light of twentieth-century history the state was beginning to look less like the solution than the problem, and not only or even primarily for economic reasons. What begins with centralized planning ends with centralized killing…

“France in the Seventies and Eighties was no longer Arthur Koestler’s ‘burning lens of Western civilization’, but French thinkers were still unusually predisposed to engage universal questions. Writers and commentators in Spain or West Germany or Italy in these years were much taken up with local challenges – though the terrorist threat that preoccupied them carried implications of its own for the discrediting of radical utopianism. Intellectuals in the UK, never deeply touched by the appeal of Communism, were largely indifferent to its decline and thus kept their distance from the new continental mood. In France, by contrast, there had been widespread and longstanding local sympathy for the Communist project. As anti-Communism gathered pace in French public discussion, abetted by the steady decline in the Communist Party’s vote and influence, it was thus fuelled by local recollection and example. A new generation of French intellectuals transited with striking alacrity out of Marxism, driven by a sometimes unseemly haste to adjure their own previous engagement…

“In 1978 Karl Popper’s The Logic of Scientific Discovery appeared in French for the first time, the harbinger of a steady absorption into the French mainstream of a whole corpus of ‘Anglo-American’ scholarship in philosophy and the social sciences of which the local intellectual culture had for decades remained in near ignorance. In the same year the historian François Furet published his path-breaking Penser la Révolution Française, in which he systematically dismantled the ‘revolutionary catechism’ through which the French had for many decades been taught to understand their country and its past.

“In this ‘catechism’ as Furet dissected it, the French Revolution had been the ur-moment of modernity: the confrontation that triggered France’s division into opposing political cultures of Left and Right, ostensibly determined by the class identities of the antagonists. That story, which rested upon the twin pillars of early-nineteenth century liberal optimism and a Marxist vision of radical social transformation, had now, in Furet’s account, run into the ground – not least because Soviet Communism, the revolutionary heir presumptive in this morality tale of purposeful radical transformation, had retroactively polluted the whole inheritance. The French Revolution, in Furet’s words, was ‘dead’.
“The political implications of Furet’s thesis were momentous, as its author well understood. The failings of Marxism as a politics were one thing, which could always be excused under the category of misfortune or circumstance. But if Marxism was discredited as a Grand Narrative – if neither reason nor necessity were at work in History – then all Stalin’s crimes, all the lives he lost and resources wasted in transforming societies under state direction, all the mistakes and failures of the twentieth century’s radical experiments in introducing Utopia by diklat, ceased to be ‘dialectically’ explicable as false moves along a true path. They became instead just what their critics had always said they were: loss, waste, failure and crime.

“Furet and his younger contemporaries rejected the resort to History that had so coloured intellectual engagement in Europe since the beginning of the 1930s. There is, they insisted, no ‘Master Narrative’ governing the course of human actions, and thus no way to justify public policies or actions that cause real suffering today in the name of speculative benefits tomorrow. Broken eggs make good omelettes. But you cannot build a better society on broken men…

“Intellectual self-abnegation before History was once described by Isaiah Berlin as ‘the terrible German way out of the burden of moral choice’. This is a little hard on Germans, who were hardly the only Europeans to abase themselves on the altar of historical necessity, though it is true that the idea had its roots in German romantic philosophy. But it points to an emerging vacuum in European political ideas: if there was no ‘great cause’ left; if the progressive legacy had run into the ground; if History, or necessity, could no longer be credibly invoked in defense of an act, a policy or a programme; then how should men decide the great dilemmas of the age?

“This was not a problem for Thatcherite radicals, who treated public policy as an extension of private interests and for whom the marketplace was a necessity and sufficient adjudicator of values and outcomes. Nor were the times unusually troubling for Europe’s traditional conservatives, for whom the measure of good and evil in human affairs remained anchored in religious norms and social conventions, bruised but not yet altogether displaced by the cultural tsunami of the Sixties. It was the progressive Left, still the dominant presence in European political and cultural exchanges, which was urgently in need of a different script.

“What it found, to its collective surprise, was a new political vernacular – or, rather, a very old one, freshly rediscovered. The language of rights, or liberties, was firmly inscribed in every European constitution, not least those of the People’s Democracies. But as a way of thinking about politics, ‘rights talk’ had been altogether unfashionable in Europe for many years. After the First World War rights – notably the right to self-determination – had played a pivotal role in international debate over a post-war settlement, and most of the interested parties at the Versailles Peace Conference had invoked their
rights quite vociferously when pressing their case upon the Great Powers. But these were collective rights – the rights of nations, peoples, minorities.

“Moreover, the record of collectively-asserted rights was an unhappy one. Where the rights of more than one ethnic or religious community had clashed, usually over a conflicting territorial claim, it had been depressingly obvious that force, not law, was the only effective way to establish precedence. Minority rights could not be protected within states, nor the right of weak states secured against the claims of their more powerful neighbors. The victors of 1945, looking back on the dashed hopes of Versailles, concluded as we have seen that collective interests were better served by the painful but effective solution of territorial regrouping (ethnic cleansing as it would later be known). As for stateless persons, they would no longer be treated as a judicial anomaly in a world of states and nations, but as individual victims of persecution or injustice.

“Post-1945 rights talk thus concentrated on individuals. This too was a lesson of the war. Even though men and women were persecuted in the name of their common identity (Jews, gypsies, Poles, etc.) they suffered as individuals, and it was as individuals with individual rights that the new United Nations sought to protect them. The various Conventions on Human Rights, Genocide or Social and Economic Rights that were incorporated into international law and treaties had a cumulative impact upon public sensibilities: they combined an eighteenth-century, Anglo-American concern for individual liberties with a very mid-twentieth-century emphasis upon the obligations of the state to ensure that a growing spectrum of greater and lesser claims were met – from the right to life to the ‘right’ to ‘truth in advertising’ and beyond.

“What propelled this legal rhetoric of individual rights into the realm of real politics was the coincidence of the retreat of Marxism with the International Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which had opened in Helsinki the same year that The Gulag Archipelago was published in Paris. Until then, talk of ‘rights’ had long been disfavored among left-leaning European intellectuals, echoing Marx’s famous dismissal of ‘the so-called rights of man’ as egoistical and ‘bourgeois’. In progressive circles, terms such as ‘Freedoms’ or ‘Liberty’ or ‘Rights’, and other abstractions associated with ‘man in general’, were taken seriously only when preceded by an adjectival modifier: ‘bourgeois’, or ‘proletarian’ or ‘Socialist’…

“… From the mid-seventies it became increasingly common to find speeches and writings from all across the political spectrum in Western Europe unrestrainedly invoking ‘human rights’ and ‘personal liberties’. As one Italian observer remarked in 1977, the idea and ideal of ‘undivided’ freedom was being openly discussed on the Left ‘without mystification or demagogy’ for the first time since the war. This did not necessarily translate immediately into politics – for much of the Eighties West European Labour and Socialist parties floundered quite helplessly, resorting in many cases to
the illicit appropriation of their opponents’ programmes to cover their own nakedness. But their new openness to the vocabulary of rights and liberties did give Western European scholars and intellectuals access to the changing language of political opposition in Eastern Europe and a way of communicating across the divide – just in time, for it was east of the Iron Curtain that truly original and significant change was now under way…”  

* 

It is only natural to see the decay of Marxism, first in the East and then in the West, as an important historical advance. And of course the decline in influence of the most destructive ideology in modern history must be counted as a gain. However, it was not an *unqualified* gain, especially in the West, where its replacement, the philosophy of human rights, served rather as a double-edged sword which undermined the unity of western governments even more than communist ones. For, as Revel wrote: “The omnipotence based on consensus that Tocqueville forecast [in Democracy in America] is only one side of the coin of modern government. The other is an equally general impotence to deal with the conflicting daily claims made on it by constituents eager for aid but less and less willing to assume obligations. By invading every area of life, the democratic state has stuffed itself with more responsibilities than powers. The very contradictions among special interests that are as legitimate as they are incompatible, all expecting to be treated with equal goodwill, show that the state’s duties are expanding faster than its means of performing them. There is no denying how burdensome a tutelary government is on society – provided we add that its expansion makes it vulnerable, often paralyzing it in its relations with client groups that are quicker to hurry it than to obey it.

“This sort of behavior splinters democratic societies into separate groups, each battling for advantage and caring little for the interests of others or society as a whole. Public opinion, instead of being united by uniform thinking, is fragmented into a variety of cultures that can be so different in tastes, ways of living, attitudes and language that they understand each other only dimly, if at all. They coexist but do not mingle. Public opinion in today’s democracies forms an archipelago, not a continent. Each island in the chain ranks its own distinctiveness above membership in a national group and even higher than its association with a group of democratic nations.

“In one sense, we do live in a mass era as residents of a ‘planetary village’ where manners and fashions blend. But, paradoxically, we also live in an age of the triumph of minorities, of a juxtaposition of widely different attitudes. While it is obvious that the passion for equality, identified by Tocqueville as the drive wheel of democracy, generates uniformity, let’s not forget that democracy also rests on a passion for liberty, which fosters diversity, fragmentation, unorthodoxy. Plato, democracy’s shrewdest enemy, saw this

---

when he compared it to a motley cloak splashed with many colors. In a democracy, he said, everyone claims the right to live as he chooses, so that ways of living multiply and jostle each other. To Aristotle, too, liberty was the basic principle of democracy. He broke this down into two tenets: ‘for all to rule and be ruled in turn’ and ‘a man should live as he likes’. To American democracy, the right to do one’s own thing is as much or more cherished than equality.

“The ideological and cultural wars among the islands in the archipelago now take precedence over defense of the archipelago itself. In Holland in 1981, a considerable share of public opinion, questioned about its feelings on Poland and Afghanistan, declared that the Dutch lacked a moral right to criticize Communist repression or Soviet imperialism ‘as long as housing conditions in Amsterdam fail to meet the highest standards of modern comfort, as long as women remain exploited and the legal rights of heterosexual married couples are denied to homosexual married couples.’”

This egoistic mentality translated into a lack of interest in, or compassion for, those living in the Gulag archipelago of the Soviet Union, and in an increasing willingness to ignore the sufferings even of those living much closer – in Communist Central and Eastern Europe. Hence the betrayal of the interests of the East Europeans in the Helsinki Accords. But more serious still in the long run was the undermining of the family and other social ties that no society can live without, whose devastating effects have become much clearer in the first decades of the twenty-first century.

---

IV. COMMUNISM IMPLODES (1982-91)
The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 had spelled the end of Communism as a living faith in occupied Eastern Europe (even while it was becoming more popular in the Third World). This fact guaranteed that the Soviets would not use the same methods in suppressing dissent again. But could they really keep the tottering system upright?

“In Eastern Europe,” writes Gilbert, “the attempt to assert human rights dominated the agenda. In Czechoslovakia the Communist authorities continued their attempts to destroy the influence of the Charter 77 human rights movement. Václav Havel and five other leaders were convicted of subversion and sentenced to five years in prison. Even the condemnation of the sentences by every Western European Communist Party had no effect. One result, however, was the even more rapid spread of underground pamphlets denouncing human rights abuses, and the proliferation of illegal lectures and theatrical performances. Hundreds of Czechs also found asylum in the West.”

However, the decisive events took place in Poland. Providentially, they coincided with the election in 1978 of the first Polish Pope, Karol Wojtyla, John-Paul II. “The new Pope’s Christian vision,” writes Tony Judt, “was rooted in the peculiarly messianic style of Polish Catholicism. In modern Poland he saw not only the embattled eastern frontier of the True Faith, but also a land and people chosen to serve as the example and sword of the Church in the struggle against Eastern atheism and Western materialism alike. Together with his long service in Craków, isolated from Western theological and political currents, this probably explained his tendency to embrace a parochial and sometimes troubling Polish-Christian vision.

“But it also explains the unprecedented enthusiasm for him in the country of his birth. From the outset, the pope broke with his predecessors’ cosmopolitan Roman acquiescence in modernity, secularism, and compromise. His campaign of international appearances – complete with carefully staged performances in huge open arenas, accompanied by oversized crucifixes and a paraphernalia of light, sound, and theatrical timing – was not undertaken without design. This was a Big Pope, taking himself and his Faith to the world: to Brazil, Mexico, the US, and the Philippines; to Italy, France, and Spain; but above all to Poland itself.

“Abandoning the cautious ‘Ostpolitik’ of his predecessors, John Paul II arrived in Warsaw on June 2nd 1979 for the first of three dramatic ‘pilgrimages’ to Communist Poland. He was met with huge, adoring crowds. His presence affirmed and reinforced the influence of the Catholic Church in Poland; but the Pope was not interested in merely endorsing Christianity’s passive survival under Communism. To the occasional discomfort of his own bishops.
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he began explicitly discouraging Catholics in Poland and everywhere else in Eastern Europe from any compromise with Marxism, and offered his Church not merely as a silent sanctuary but as an alternative pole of moral and social authority.

"As Poland’s Communists well understood, such a change in the position of the Catholic Church – from compromise to resistance – could have a destabilizing local impact, posing an open challenge to the Party’s monopoly of authority. In part this was because Poles remained overwhelmingly and enthusiastically Catholic; in large measure it was because of the man himself. But there was very little they could do – to forbid the Pope to visit Poland or to speak there would only have strengthened his appeal and further alienated millions of his admirers. Even after the imposition of martial law, when the Pope returned to Poland in June 1983 and spoke to his ‘compatriots’ in St. John’s Cathedral in Warsaw of their ‘disappointment and humiliation, their suffering and loss of freedom’, the Communist leaders could only stand and listen. ‘Poland’, he told an uncomfortable General Jaruzelski in a televised speech, ‘must take her proper place among the nations of Europe, between East and West.’

“The Pope, as Stalin once observed, has no division. But God is not always on the side of the big battalions: what John Paul II lacked in soldiers he made up in visibility – and timing. Poland in 1978 was already on the edge of social upheaval. Ever since the workers’ revolts of 1970, and again in 1976, both prompted by sharp increases in the price of food, First Secretary Edvard Gierek had tried hard to avert domestic discontent – mostly by borrowing heavily abroad and using the loans to supply Poles with subsidized food and other consumer goods. But the strategy was failing.”

“In Poland, workers were demanding the right to strike. Catholic, peasant and students groups each called for an end to Communist rigidity. Fifty leading intellectuals, including several Party members, called in a public manifesto for ‘a radical change in the politico-social system’. When Pope John Paul paid his first visit to Poland as Pope, crowds estimated at a total of thirteen million turned out to see him. In a speech in Warsaw on June 2 [1979], he declared: ‘Christ cannot be kept out of the history of man in any part of the globe, certainly not in Poland.’ Another blow had been struck against the perpetuation of the system established in Eastern Europe with the arrival of the Soviet army – as liberators – in 1944 and 1945. In September a new opposition group, calling itself the Confederation of Independent Poland, was formed as a political Party, with a secret membership, pledged to secure ‘full freedom and independence’ for Poland…”

But was such a goal possible while the Soviet Union still existed? Probably not – but who was to say that the Soviets would last forever? President Reagan didn’t believe that: their “last few pages are even now being written”.

he said in 1981. Moreover, it was precisely Poland that might be the catalyst of the final fall. For, as Gilbert continues the story: “Deeply embroiled militarily in Afghanistan, the Soviet Union watched with grave alarm the political developments inside Poland, its western neighbour and hitherto loyal – or largely loyal – Communist partner. The Catholic Church, buoyed up by the moral and personal support of the ‘Polish Pope’, criticized in January [1980] the divisiveness of Communism in the social structure of Poland, and stated that every society had a right to form independent organizations in search of economic development. There was mockery in the streets when, at the parliamentary elections in March, 99.52 per cent of the votes went to the single Communist-dominated list of candidates. In June, 151 Polish intellectuals – leading writers, scientists and university professors – warned of ‘negative changes’ that would grow and reach ‘avalanche stage, which would threaten open social conflict’ unless reforms were instituted. University students, turning their backs on the Party-controlled youth organization, demanded a student association that would not be ‘imposing any ideology’.

“ Strikes began on July 1, with workers demanding free trade unions and better wages. No day passed without a strike in one or other of the shipbuilding yards of the Baltic coast or the mining regions of Silesia. The strikes reached a climax in August, when half a million shipyard workers in Gdansk, Szczecin and other Polish Baltic ports downed tools. They were joined by 200,000 coalminers in Silesia. Catholicism was a strong force in the workers’ movement, which had been as affected as a sector of Polish society by the Pope’s visit. In Gdansk, open-air Masses were held under a large portrait of the Pope.

“On August 16 a strike committee linking all the striking factories was set up under the leadership of a shipyard worker, Lech Walesa. Quickly the strikers’ demands, which at first had been limited to censorship, the release of political prisoners and the establishment of free, independent trade unions. Under the banner of Solidarity, these unions sprang up despite the frown of the authorities. Students and workers found themselves gathering under the same Solidarity banner. Factories declared themselves for Solidarity, and took over the management. In many cases they were helped in organizing their independent activities by Catholic intellectuals…”

Solidarity soon acquired 10 million members – almost half of Poland’s working-age population. This was an astonishing number, and constituted a far greater threat to Moscow’s empire than any it had encountered before. Nor was it just the numbers that terrified them; for these were not small groups of Jewish dissident intellectuals, but working men, proletarians – precisely the kind of people who created the revolution and were supposed to be its prime beneficiaries.
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Olga Chetverikova tells us more (albeit from a pro-Soviet and anti-western perspective) about how Catholics both inside and outside Poland prepared the counter-revolution: “In August, 1980 the notable ‘Gdansk Agreement’ was signed ratifying the creation of ‘Solidarity’, the first independent trade union behind the ‘iron curtain’, led by Lech Walesa, who became the main object of the attention of the Holy See. As John-Paul II said, ‘Walesa was sent by Divine Providence’. The Vatican thought that if the trade union triumphed, an explosive wave would roll towards the Ukraine, the Baltic region and the Balkans and, possibly, Czechoslovakia, which would finally result in the complete collapse of the socialist camp.

“In connection with this, the head of the Holy Alliance [the Vatican’s secret service] Poggi was ordered by the Pope to infiltrate his agents into ‘Solidarity’ and make the organization more open, so as to attract into it pro-Catholic representatives of the intelligentsia. The best agent of the HA was the Polish Jesuit priest Casimir Przydatek, who had a wide net of informers in the Polish unions. Among them there stood out Father Jankowski, who led the church of St. Brigitta in Gdansk, one of whose members was Lech Walesa. Under the influence of Przydatek, Walesa in the end brought into the leadership of the union the editor of the Catholic newspaper Wiez Mazowiecki and the Catholic historian B. Geremek, after which the strike movement in Poland passed under the control of the Church. ‘Solidarity’, supported by the Vatican and having received financial resources via the HA through the ‘Ambrosiano’ bank, began to spread throughout the whole territory of the country… In all, about 500 million dollars were transferred to ‘Solidarity’ illegally.

“After the election of Ronald Reagan relations of a strategic nature were established between him and Pope John-Paul II. As the investigator E. Lebecq wrote, ‘In the first years of Reagan’s administration one could see the appearance of convinced Catholic in the top posts, which had never happened before in the history of the United States.’ Active roles in cooperation with the Vatican were played by the director of the CIA William Casey (Reagan’s former election campaign manager), his deputy Vernon Walter, the State Secretary Al Haig and the National Security adviser Richard Allen – all Catholics and (except for Allen) knights of the Maltese Order…

“On June 7, 1982 there took place in the Vatican the first meeting between John-Paul II and R. Reagan, as a result of which an agreement was concluded on carrying out a joint campaign in Poland whose aim was the destruction of ‘the communist empire’. This agreement, which was called a ‘holy alliance’, was made public by the journalist Carl Bernstein in Time magazine. He received his information from the higher reaches of the Vatican and leading people in the American establishment. As D. Kalaich writes, the revelation of this pact ‘to the whole world village’ was aimed at showing to all Catholics that the Vatican was on the side of the new world order, and of suggesting that they follow the pontifex.
“As Richard Allen confirmed, ‘the relationship with the Vatican represented one of the biggest secret unions in the whole of history’. It was after this meeting that Reagan gave a policy statement in London in which he proclaimed a ‘crusade’ against ‘the empire of evil’. He declared 1983 to be ‘the year of the Bible’, which was confirmed on April 18 of the same year by the Pope in a meeting with members of the Trilateral Commission, which took place in the Vatican with almost all members present. And in 1984 relations were established between the Vatican and Washington…

“The actions of Reagan and the Pope in relation to Poland were completely coordinated. Reagan told Clark and Casey: ‘We must not invade the country and overthrow the government in the name of the people. The only thing we must do is use ‘Solidarity’ to achieve success.’ In sum, as the American journalist Carl Bernstein witnessed, ‘the American embassy in Warsaw was turned into the leading centre of the CIA in the socialist world, while Casey became the ‘chief architect’ in working out policy in Poland.’ Z. Brzezinski occupied the post of link between the White House and the Vatican’s Holy Alliance, acting as the main expert and coordinator of the actions of the western secret services in the countries of Eastern Europe in the carrying out of secret operations…”

In November, 50,000 Soviet troops were massed on the Polish border. During the following year, however, the Soviets hesitated over whether to invade or not, while Jaruzelski, the Polish leader, tried in vain to get assurances from them that they would invade if his plan to introduce martial law failed. Finally, on December 13, 1981, he imposed martial law – by this time it had become clear that the Soviets would not invade in any case.

Walesa, writes Norman Stone, “was put in a comfortable villa with his wife (seventh time pregnant) and [by?] apologetic generals. It had been Gomulka’s and he was there for seven months. There was no European reaction – quite the contrary, as Claude Cheysson even said, ‘socialist renewal’ was at stake. There were problems as soldiers took over the mines and the Sejm produced a huge reform package that meant decentralization, etc.; but it led nowhere. There were over 10,000 internments, and over 150,000 ‘prophylactic discussions’ but the overtones were farcical. If you lifted the hotel telephone, you were told ‘Rozmowa kontrolowana’, meaning that someone was listening. That the tape was old and wheezing did not inspire fear, and conversations with the Polish intelligentsia anyway consisted of funny stories.

“At any rate, Moscow was having considerable difficulty in digesting Poland…”
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52. THE REAGAN-THATCHER ALLIANCE

We have seen how successful social democracy was in the post-war western world. 1945-75, “the glorious thirty”, as the French called them, or “the economic miracle”, as the Germans called it, brought unprecedented peace and prosperity. True, there was more emphasis on the “social” in Europe, and more on the “democracy” in the Anglo-Saxon world. For, as John Mickelthwait and Adrian Wooldridge write, “The United States was too individualistic, too decentralized and too business obsessed to embrace European-style social democracy. Still, during the mid-twentieth-century, even the United States laid the foundations of a welfare state: Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid…

“But Leviathan overreached. By the 1970s, the US government seemed to be spoiling everything it touched: grinding war in Vietnam, an economy hobbled by stagflation, cities wrecked by drugs and crime. Around the world, the decade brought labor strikes and energy crises. Those on the political left found themselves ‘mugged by reality’, in the words of the neoconservative critic Irving Kristol – as did those in the West who still considered the Soviet Union a kind of noble experiment in collectivism. As the whole Soviet Union came to seem like one giant Potemkin village, it became painfully clear that there was nothing noble about Russian communism.

“Surveying the wreckage of the era, the economist Milton Friedman must have sometimes thought to himself, ‘I told you so’. Born in Brooklyn in 1912 to poor Jewish immigrants from Hungary, Friedman... arrived at the University of Chicago in 1932 as a supporter of Norman Thomas, the perennial socialist candidate for US president. After earning a master’s degree, Friedman worked first as a US government economist. Among his major contributions was helping devise one of the most powerful (and least loved) tools of big government, the payroll withholding tax. But during the Great Depression and World War II, Friedman’s views changed dramatically, and when he returned to teach at the University of Chicago in 1946, he began to forge a very different course.

“The state, Friedman had come to believe, consistently failed to provide services as efficiently as the private sector. He adopted the pro-market, libertarian ideas of the so-called Austrian school of economists, notably Friedrich Hayek, and welded them to American populism to contrive a novel form of small government conservatism. During the 1960s and 1970s, Friedman became an intellectual celebrity, touring the United States to denounce everything that the American left, and, indeed, most of the center, held dear: government-provided health care, public housing, student grants, foreign aid. All of these, Friedman argued, were at best a waste of money and at worst an abuse of power on the part of an out-of-control, incompetent government. ‘If you put the federal government in charge of the Saharan desert,’ he once said, ‘in five years there’d be a shortage of sand.’
"In the 1980s, Reagan and Thatcher tried to put Friedman’s philosophy into practice. Reagan cut taxes and eliminated regulations. Thatcher faced down the United Kingdom’s labor unions and privatized three-quarters of its state-owned companies, including such behemoths as British Airways and British Telecom. The Reagan-Thatcher model soon spread around the world, just as the social-democratic model had done earlier. From 1985 to 2000, western European governments sold off some $100 billion worth of state assets, including such well-known state-owned companies as Lufthansa, Volkswagen, and Renault. After the fall of the Soviet Union, post-communist countries embraced the so-called Washington consensus with gusto: by 1996, Russia had privatized some 18,000 industrial enterprises. Leszek Balcerowicz, Poland’s first postcommunist finance minister, regarded Thatcher as his hero. In the 1990s, US President Bill Clinton proclaimed an end to ‘the era of big government’, and British Prime Minister Tony Blair argued that ‘the presumption should be that economic activity is best left to the private sector’.

“So Reagan and Thatcher – and, by extension, Friedman – won their battle: today, almost nobody speaks up for big government. But they did not win the war. Leviathan hardly withered away. In her 11 momentous years in office, from 1979 to 1990, Thatcher succeeded in reducing public expenditure from 22.9 percent of GDP to 22.2 percent.147 Reagan failed to persuade the Democratic-controlled US Congress to enact the spending cuts that were supposed to accompany his tax cuts and as a result ended up triggering an explosion in the US deficit. For all the talk of the rise of neoliberalism and the ‘shredding of the safety net’, the state remained far bigger under Reagan and Thatcher than anything that Webb could have imagined, and it has only continued to grow in the decades since they left office.”148

Because of this partial nature of their victory, the Reagan-Thatcher “revolution” should rather be called a “correction”; that is, it corrected the socialist over-reliance on the state that characterized not only the Communist states, but also the European Union. Moreover, even when we see (as we shall see shortly) the evil effects of Friedman’s economics, it remains true that when it came to the communist economies of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, some degree of dismantling and destruction had to take place. For the experience of Communism showed that if the state takes over everything, it also corrupts everything. It makes everybody supposedly equal (although some are definitely more equal than others) - but equal in misery rather than in any really worthwhile goods. So if privatization as practiced in the 80s in the West, or in the East in the 90s, was a deeply flawed, cruelly and unnecessarily violent process, it only highlighted the real lesson to be learned: never allow the State to become so overblown in the first place.
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Indeed, this is the reason why Thatcher lost office in 1990: her opposition to the collectivist tendencies of the West Europeans finally came up against the Europhile and socialist sympathies of her more powerful colleagues. But the State marched on. And the reason was: there was nothing to replace or complement or check it, nothing capable of playing the role assumed by, for example, the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages.

For unbridled individualism was also no alternative. The contemporary world was too complicated, and the individual too vulnerable, to live in a completely unregulated world in which the traditional supports of family and Church were being steadily undermined. This important point was developed by Tony Judt. He began by pointing out that: “Starting with the tax and employment reforms of the Thatcher-Reagan years, and followed in short order by deregulation of the financial sector, inequality has once again become an issue in Western society. After notably diminishing from the 1910s through the 1960s, the inequality index has steadily grown over the course of the past decades.”

After comparing Clinton’s 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act to the New Poor Law of 1834, which Dickens satirized in Oliver Twist, Judt asks why the new rich are idolized and the poor stigmatized. His answer comes from an unexpected, distinctly unsocialist source: “This ‘disposition to admire, and almost to worship, the rich and the powerful, and to despise, or, at least, to neglect persons of poor and mean condition… is… the great and most universal cause of the corruption of our moral sentiments.’ Those are not my words. They were written by Adam Smith, who regarded the likelihood that we would come to admire wealth and despise poverty, admire success and scorn failure, as the greatest risk facing us in the commercial society whose advent he predicted. It is now upon us.”

However, this is a vice that, as Smith implies, is common to all ages; it was certainly not removed, or even significantly reduced, by the advent of the welfare state in the 1910s or after 1945. Moreover, welfarism has its own vices, which Judt underestimates or completely ignores: the tendency to think that the world owes us a living as a right, that the state is there to satisfy all our needs (and not merely material ones), and consequently that if all our needs are not satisfied (and they never are) it is politics and politicians that must be to blame – not our own laziness or greediness or envy, let alone original sin. The reduction of inequality is a noble aim; and in an unbelieving age when churches cannot take the place of the state in welfare provision, it is inevitable that politicians have to take some of the responsibilities of welfare provision and resource redistribution upon themselves. But even that great Lover of the poor, the Lord Jesus Christ, said: “The poor you have with you always” (Matthew 26.11), implying that complete equality is an unrealizable aim.
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Besides, there are spheres in which welfarism cannot take the place of the traditional supports. The clearest example is the care of the elderly, who, when having to rely on the State alone, usually eke out a miserable and lonely existence. “That is why,” writes Sarah Vine, “health minister David Mowat is right to call for a radical change in the way we look after our aged.

“His argument, that responsibility likes with families, not the state, should be listened to by all of us. And not just because of the soaring cost of social care – it’s a moral duty.

“I grew up in Italy, where multi-generational living was – and largely still is – the norm. Children often live with their parents well into their 30s and 40s, and sometimes even after marriage and babies.

“As for the elderly, they remain part of the family. Most Italians would no more pack off granny to a care home than they would send their children to an orphanage.

“It’s not just tradition that drives this way of life. There are countless advantages. Not only is contact with grandparents hugely beneficial to children. It also takes the pressure off parents, especially if both work.

“It means that when the inevitable decline comes, middle-aged children don’t find themselves suddenly helicoptered into a crisis situation, but are already on hand to take control.

“Of course, it doesn’t work for everyone. Some families can’t live under the same roof without open warfare.

“A lot depends on circumstances, especially financial, and having enough space for some privacy and independence. But it’s not impossible. If only more people had the will…”

* 

Judt is on firmer ground when he points to the failures of the Reagan-Thatcher years and in particular that slogan of the era, privatization: “The most revealing instance of the kind of problem we face in comes in a form that may strike many as a mere technicality: the process of privatization. In the last thirty years, a cult of privatization has mesmerized Western (and many non-Western) governments. Why? The shortest response is that, in an age of budgetary constraints, privatization appears to save money. If the state owns an inefficient public program or an expensive public service – a waterworks, a car factory, a railway – it seeks to offload it onto private buyers.

---

“The sale duly earns money for the state. Meanwhile, by entering the private sector, the service or operation in question becomes more efficient thanks to the working of the profit motive. Everyone benefits: the service improves, the state rids itself of an inappropriate and poorly managed responsibility, investors profit, and the public sector makes a one-time gain from the sale.

“So much for the theory. The practice is very different. What we have been watching these past decades is the steady shifting of public responsibility onto the private sector to no discernible collective advantage. In the first place, privatization is inefficient. Most of the things that governments have seen fit to pass into the private sector were operating at a loss: whether they were railway companies, coal mines, postal services, or energy utilities, they cost more to provide and maintain than they could ever hope to attract in revenue.

“For just this reason, such public goods were inherently unattractive to private buyers unless offered at a steep discount. But when the state sells cheap, the public takes a loss. It has been calculated that, in the course of the Thatcher era UK privatizations, the deliberately low price at which long-standing public assets were marketed to the private sector resulted in a net transfer of £14 billion from the taxpaying public to stockholders and other investors.

“To this loss should be added a further £3 billion in fees to the banks that transacted the privatizations. Thus the state in effect paid the private sector some £17 billion ($30 billion) to facilitate the sale of assets for which there would otherwise have been no takers. These are significant sums of money – approximating the endowment of Harvard University, for example, or the annual gross domestic product of Paraguay or Bosnia-Herzegovina. This can hardly be construed as an efficient use of public resources.

“In the second place, there arises the question of moral hazard. The only reason that private investors are willing to purchase apparently inefficient public goods is because the state eliminates or reduces their exposure to risk. In the case of the London Underground, for example, the purchasing companies were assured that whatever happened they would be protected against serious loss – thereby undermining the classic economic case for privatization that the profit motive encourages efficiency. The ‘hazard’ in question is that the private sector, under such privileged conditions, will prove at least as inefficient as its public counterpart – while creaming off such profits as are to be made and charging losses to the state.

“The third and perhaps most telling case against privatization is this. There can be no doubt that many of the goods and services that the state seeks to divest have been badly run: incompetently managed, underinvested, etc. Nevertheless, however badly run, postal services, railway networks, retirement homes, prisons, and other provisions targeted for privatization
remain the responsibility of the public authorities. Even after they are sold, they cannot be left entirely to the vagaries of the market. They are inherently the sort of activity that someone has to regulate...”152

“‘Thatcherism,’ writes Judt, “stood for various things: reduced taxes, the free market, free enterprise, privatization of industries and services, 'Victorian values', patriotism, ‘the individual’."153 But the essential contrast was between what Thatcherism meant for the economy and for society. “As an economy, then, Thatcherized Britain was a more efficient place. But as a society it suffered meltdown, with catastrophic long-term consequences. By disdaining and dismantling all collectively-held resources, by vociferously insisting upon an individualistic ethic that discounted any unquantifiable assets, Margaret Thatcher did serious harm to the fabric of British public life. Citizens were transmuted into shareholders, or ‘stakeholders’, their relationship to one another and to the collectivity measured in assets and claims rather than in services or obligations. With everything from bus companies to electric supply in the hands of competing private companies, the public space became a market place.

“If – as Mrs. Thatcher asserted – there is ‘no such thing as Society’, then in due course people must lose respect for socially-defined goods. And so they did, as late-Thatcherite Britain began to take on some of the more unappealing characteristics of the American model that the Iron Lady so admired. Services that remained in public hands were starved of resources, while significant wealth accumulated in the ‘emancipated’ sectors of the economy – notably the City of London, where investment bankers and stockbrokers benefited greatly from the ‘Big Bang’ of 1986, when Britain’s financial markets were deregulated and opened to international competition. Public spaces fell into neglect. Petty crime and delinquency rose in line with the growing share of the population caught in permanent poverty. Private affluence was accompanied, as so often, by public squalor.”154

* 

And yet the real problems surrounding Friedman’s economics go deeper than that, and only became clear later in the century as their consequences came to be applied in countries such as Poland, South Africa, Russia, Sri Lanka and Iraq. For since its first experimental application in Pinochet’s Chile in 1973, as Naomi Klein points out, it has become clear that Friedman’s three main principles – “privatization, deregulation of government spending and deep cuts to social spending”155 - have tended to be applied when a special opportunity arises – that is, when a country has just been through a major shock (a war, a tsunami, a stock market crash, etc.), - and then have
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154 Judt, Postwar, pp. 543-544. And yet it must not be forgotten that the real squalor of British public life had begun with the prodigal, socialist “Swinging” Sixties...
proceeded to take advantage of the dazed state of the people after this shock, in order to apply still more – and, as often as not quite unnecessary shocks. It is not that “all forms of market systems are inherently violent”, writes Klein – “markets need not be fundamentalist”.¹⁵⁶ But Friedman’s economics, as applied by neoconservative politicians of “the Washington consensus” is fundamentalist – indeed, revolutionary. For on the “clean slate” created by the initial disaster it forces the already deeply traumatized society through a process of massive economic and social engineering that literally tear it to pieces. Thus “its main characteristics are huge transfers of public wealth to private hands, often accompanied by exploding debt, an ever-widening chasm between the dazzling rich and the disposable poor and an aggressive nationalism that justifies bottomless spending on security. But because of the obvious drawbacks for the vast majority of the population left outside the bubble, other features of the corporatist state tend to include aggressive surveillance (once again, with government and large corporations trading favors and contracts), mass incarceration, shrinking civil liberties and often, though not always, torture.”¹⁵⁷

Klein summarizes her main accusation thus: “This fundamentalist form of capitalism has consistently been midwifed by the most brutal forms of coercion, inflicted on the collective body politic as well as on countless individual bodies.”¹⁵⁸

While she may have somewhat overstated her thesis with regard to torture, Klein has undoubtedly built up a powerful case that Friedman’s “shock doctrine” has indeed been a shock and torture for many people in many countries where it has been applied. Indeed, she draws powerful analogies between Friedman’s “shock doctrine” in economics and Cameron’s behaviourist psychotherapy that we looked at in chapter 18, which employed electric shock among other tortures. Both sciences coercively reduce their subjects to a primitive “tabula rasa” before restructuring them “from scratch”.

“Thus Friedman’s mission, like Cameron’s, rested on a dream of reaching back to a state of ‘natural health’, when all was in balance, before human interferences created distorting patterns. Where Cameron dreamed of returning the human mind to that pristine state, Friedman dreamed of depatterning societies, of returning them to a state of pure capitalism, cleansed of all interruptions – government regulations, trade barriers and entrenched interests. Also like Cameron, Friedman believed that when the economy is highly distorted, the only way to reach that prelapsarian state was to deliberately inflict painful shocks: only ‘bitter medicine’ could clear these distortions and bad patterns out of the way. Cameron used electricity to inflict his shocks, Friedman’s tool of choice was policy – the shock treatment approach he urged on bold politicians for countries in decline. Unlike

---
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Cameron, however, who was able to instantly apply his pet theories on his unwitting patients, Friedman would need two decades and several twists and turns of history before he too got the chance to put his dream of radical erasure and creation into action in the real world...

“A large part of the appeal of Chicago School economics was that, at a time when radical left ideas about workers’ power were gaining ground around the world, it provided a way to defend the interests of owners that was just as radical and was infused with its own claims to idealism [and scientism]. To hear Friedman tell it, his ideas were not about defending the right of factory owners to pay low wages but, rather, all about a quest for the purest possible form of ‘participatory democracy’ because in the free market, ‘each man can vote, as it were, for the color of the tie he wants’. Where leftists promised freedom for workers from bosses, citizens from dictatorship, countries from colonialism, Friedman promised ‘individual freedom’, a project that elevated atomized citizens above any collective enterprise and liberated them to express their absolute free will through their consumer choices. ‘What was particularly exciting were the same qualities that made Marxism so appealing to many other young people at the time,’ recalled the economist Daon Patinkin, who studied at Chicago in the forties – ‘simplicity together with apparent logical completeness, idealism combined with radicalism’. The Marxists had their workers’ utopia, and the Chicagoans had their entrepreneurs’ utopia, both claiming that if they got their way, perfection and balance would follow.

“The question, as always, was how to get to that wondrous place from here. The Marxists were clear: revolution – get rid of the current system, replace it with socialism. For the Chicagoans, the answer was not as straightforward. The United States was already a capitalist country, but as far as they were concerned, just barely. In the U.S., and in all supposedly capitalist economies, the Chicagoans saw interference everywhere. To make products more affordable, politicians fixed price; to make workers less exploited, they set minimum wages; to make sure everyone had access to education, they kept it in the hands of the state. These measures often seemed to help people, but Friedman and his colleagues were convinced – and the ‘proved’ it with their models – that they were actually doing untold harm to the equilibrium of the market and the ability of various signals to communicate with each other. The mission of the Chicago School was thus one of purification – stripping the market of these interruptions so that the free market could sing.

“For this reason, Chicagoans did not see Marxism as their true enemy. The real source of the trouble was to be found in the ideas of the Keynesians in the United States, the social democrats in Europe and the developmentalists in what was then called the Third World. These were believers not in a utopia but in a mixed economy, to Chicago eyes an ugly hodgepodge of capitalism for the manufacture and distribution of consumer products, socialism in education, state ownership for essentials like water services, and all kinds of laws designed to temper the extremes of capitalism. Like the religious
fundamentalist who has a grudging respect for fundamentalists of other faiths and for avowed atheists but disdain the casual believer, the Chicagoleans declared war on these mix-and-match economist. What they wanted was not a revolution exactly but a capitalist Reformation: a return to uncontaminated capitalism...

“Though always clothed in the language of math and science, Friedman’s vision coincided precisely with the interests of large multinationals, which by nature hunger for vast new unregulated markets. In the first state of capitalist expansion, that kind of ravenous growth was provided by colonialism – by ‘discovering’ new territories and grabbing land without compensating local populations. Friedman’s war on the ‘welfare state’ and ‘big government’ held out the promise of a new font of rapid riches – only this time, rather than conquering new territory, the state itself would be the new frontier, its public services and assets auctioned off for far less than they were worth...”\footnote{Klein, op. cit., pp. 50, 52-53, 59.}
Leaving aside the economic arguments, we can see in the relatively mild variety of Friedman’s economics that we have called the Reagan-Thatcher “correction” some important positive side-effects. Thus it gave Western Democracy a much-needed psychological fillip in its struggle with its totalitarian opponent, renewing its faith in the righteousness of the struggle against Communism, which had been badly shaken during the 1970s. Indeed, the moral capitulation of the West at Helsinki was, if not wiped out, at any rate on the way to being reversed and redeemed. For now the two Anglo-Saxon politicians together with the Polish Pope not only succeeded in “containing” Soviet expansionism (the aim of western leaders since the late 1940s): they went onto the offensive, showing themselves – unlike their predecessors in the Hungarian revolution of 1956 and the Prague Spring of 1968 – as being not ashamed to “interfere” in Eastern Europe for the sake of the freedom of its peoples from Communism.

The two leaders did not immediately hit it off. When Argentina invaded the Falklands in 1982, and Thatcher sent in a naval force to recapture them, Reagan hesitated, not wishing to break his ties with the important Latin American country (which was also supported by his ally the Pope, who sent exocet missiles to Argentina), but eventually provided important logistical and intelligence support. Again, in October, 1983, when Marxists overthrew the lawful government of the former British colony of Grenada, and the Americans, in response to an appeal from the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, invaded the island in order to restore order, Thatcher protested: “If you are going to announce a new law, that wherever Communism reigns against the will of the people the United States shall enter, then we are going to have terrible war in the world.”

However, the essential identity of aims and ideology between the two leaders proved more important than initial disagreements. Thatcher was converted to a more aggressive stance against Communism, becoming “the Iron Lady”, as Pravda called her. Meanwhile Reagan, faced with numerous opponents in Congress and in the Vietnam-war-weary American public, came to appreciate her support.

On March 8, 1983 in a speech to the American Association of Evangelicals, Reagan “told the assembled clergymen that ‘simple-minded appeasement of wishful thinking about our adversaries is folly’. He went on to warn them to beware ‘the temptations of blithely declaring yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire’. The Soviet Union, he added, was ‘the focus of evil in the modern world’…

---
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“On March 23, fifteen days after his ‘evil empire’ speech, Reagan spoke on television to the American people. He illustrated his remarks with graphs showing the dimensions of the Soviet build-up, and with aerial photographs which had been classified as secret until a few days earlier. These showed Soviet fighter aircraft and a Soviet Intelligence headquarters in Cuba, Soviet aircraft in Nicaragua, and the building of an airfield with a ten-thousand-foot runway in Grenada.

“Reagan then spoke of the future defence of the United States by means of laser weaponry in space. This ‘Star Wars address’, as it was called, while appearing to be bellicose and war-enhancing, gave the Soviet leaders cause to hesitate. Their expensive, much-vaunted nuclear weaponry would, if this space-laser technology could be developed, become obsolete and useless. Yet the Soviet Union did not have the technology or the economic resources to challenge the United States in this innovative and expensive sphere.

“More than any single American initiative, ‘Star Wars’ – although it would clearly take up to a decade to develop – spelt the end of the Soviet-American balance of power, and would tilt it significantly to the American side. As a sign of its seriousness, the American Department of Defense, headed by Caspar Weinberger, announced their prototype laser weapons had already been tested against both incoming missiles and ‘attacking’ unmanned aircraft. Among those who understood the meaning of Star Wars, and the inevitable Soviet fall form Super Power equality as a result of it, was the recently appointed Communist Party Secretary responsible for Agriculture, Mikhail Gorbachev, a relatively young (fifty-two-year-old) political leader who was being spoken of in Moscow that year as a possible successor to the clearly ailing Andropov. Gorbachev had come to the attention of Western observers in March, when he encouraged small groups of peasants to take a more responsible attitude towards agricultural production by increasing their material self-interest through group contracts which gave them a direct stake in the profits of their collective labour. Under the contracts, they would be paid by results. Not pre-selected and rigidly enforced norms, but production targets profitable to the individual – through his group contract – would provide the incentive which collectivization, the Stalinist panacea so long adhered to, had failed to provide.”161

Arms control talks now acquired a new relevance and urgency, as both countries, but especially the USSR, felt the financial strains of the arms race. In 1985 the Soviets had reached their peak in nuclear warheads, considerably higher than the United State’s stockpile. But from then on, largely through the Gorbachev-Reagan talks, absolute numbers declined in both countries, especially in the USSR, and by 2000 approximate parity had been reached.162
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“Speaking in New York on September 26, at the United Nations General Assembly, Reagan set out in public some of the strategic arms reduction proposals that the United States had made earlier in the year to the Soviet Union, at the talks in Geneva. The principal American proposal was that if the Soviet Union would agree to an equal number of Soviet and American nuclear warheads worldwide, and would reduce the number of its existing land-based medium-range nuclear weapons, then for its part the United States, while retaining the right to deploy its nuclear warheads anywhere in the world, would not in fact redeploy in Europe the nuclear warheads to which, under the equality scheme, it was entitled globally. Reagan also agreed, in his speech of September 26, to an earlier Soviet proposal that the NATO and Warsaw Pact intermediate-range bomber forces should be included in the calculations of the arms reduction talks.

“The arms reduction talks continued. The main Soviet counter-proposal was that NATO cancel its plans to deploy Pershing and Cruise missiles in Europe. Were NATO to do so, Andropov announced, the Soviet Union would reduce its number SS-20 missiles in Europe by one hundred, to 140. This the United States rejected on the ground that it would leave the Soviet Union with a monopoly of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe. The United States then proposed that both sides should have an equal number of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe. The Soviet Union rejected this because it would involve the United States introducing Pershing and Cruise missiles to Europe. On November 14, the day of the Soviet rejection, the first American Cruise missiles in Europe arrived at the United States air base at Greenham Common, in southern England. A week later the first Pershing missiles reached American air bases in West Germany. When the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks adjourned in December, the Soviet Union refused to agree to a date when they would be resumed…”163

America eventually won the arms race, and the Soviets’ failure to keep up was one of the causes of the fall of the Union. However, the cost to America was also huge. “The U.S. National Debt was already standing at $2.3 trillion in April 1987, but in July 1992 it stood at $4 trillion, which means that each American family in effect owes something like $50,000. Just over 40% of all personal income tax goes into servicing this gigantic debt.”164
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54. FRIEDMAN ECONOMICS AND THE THIRD WORLD

While Friedman’s economics influenced Reagan and Thatcher, it was not in the UK and the USA that his policies were carried out in a more than a very partial manner. The reason was obvious: it was politically unfeasible. The necessary consensus was lacking, as was a disaster so great that it could silence opposition to radical change.

But the necessary disaster had overtaken, for example, Bolivia, where in 1985 inflation had reached 14,000 percent and the interest on its debt was greater than the entire national budget. To “normalize” the situation, a doctor prepared to administer shock therapy, the Harvard economist Jeffrey Sachs, was found. Though not an “orthodox” Friedmanite, he would provide perhaps the clearest example so far of what Friedmanism really meant; for, as he said to the Bolivian-American Chamber of Commerce, with a policy jolt, “an economy can be reoriented from a dead end, a dead end of socialism or a dead end of mass corruption or a dead end of central planning, to a normal market economy”.

When Victor Paz Esterissoro, a former nationalist, became President of Bolivia he adopted Sachs’ plan for the economy, and within seventeen days of furious – and top secret – activity his planning minister had the draft, as Klein writes, “of a textbook shock therapy program. It called for the elimination of food subsidies, the cancelling of almost price controls and a 300 percent hike in the price of oil. Despite the fact that life was about to get a lot more expensive in an already desperately poor country, the plan froze government wages at their already low levels for a year. It also called for deep cuts to government spending, flung open Bolivia’s borders to unrestricted imports and called for a downsizing of state companies, the precursor to privatization. Bolivia had missed the neoliberal revolution imposed on the rest of the Southern Cone in the seventies; now it was going to make up for lost time.

“When the members of the emergency team had finished drafting the new laws, they still weren’t ready to share them with Bolivia’s elected representatives, let alone the voters, who had never cast their ballots for such a plan. They had one more task to complete. As a group, they drove over to the office of the International Monetary Fund’s representative in Bolivia and told him what they were planning to do. His response was at once encouraging and harrowing. ‘This is what every official at the IMF has dreamed about. But if it doesn’t work, luckily I have diplomatic immunity and I can catch a plane and flee.’

“The Bolivians preparing the plan had no such escape hatch, and several were terrified of how the public was going to react. ‘They are going to kill us,’ predicted Fernando Prado, the youngest member of the group. Bedregal, the plan’s main author, attempted to stiffen spirits by comparing the team to fighter pilots attacking an enemy. ‘We have to be like the pilot of Hiroshima.
When he dropped the atomic bomb, he didn’t know what he was doing, but when he saw the smoke he said: “Oops, sorry!” And that’s exactly what we have to do, launch the measures and then: “Oops, sorry!”

“The idea that policy change should be like launching a surprise military attack is a recurring theme for economic shock therapists. In *Shock and Awe: Achieving Rapid Dominance*, the U.S. military doctrine published in 1996 that eventually formed the basis of the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the authors state that the invading force should ‘seize control of the environment and paralyze or so overload an adversary’s perceptions and understanding of events so that the enemy would be incapable of resistance.’ Economic shock works according to a similar theory: the premise is that people can develop responses to gradual change – a slashed health program here, a trade deal there – but if dozens of changes come from all directions at once, a feeling of futility sets in, and populations go limp.

“Hoping to induce that sense of hopelessness, the Bolivian planners required all their radical measures to be adopted at the same time, and all within the first hundred days of the new government. Rather than presenting each section of the plan as its own individual law (the new tax code, the new pricing law and so on), Paz’s team insisting on bundling the entire revolution into a single executive decree, D.S. 21060. It contained 220 separated laws and covered every aspect of economic life in the country, making it the equivalent, in scope and ambition, to ‘The Brick’, the hefty blueprint written by the Chicago Boys in preparation for Pinochet’s coup. According to its authors, the entire program had to be accepted or rejected, it couldn’t be amended. It was the economic equivalent of Shock and Awe.

“When the document was complete, the team made five copies: one for Paz, one for Goni [head of the emergency team] and one for the treasury minister. The destination of the other two copies revealed how certain Paz and his team were that many Bolivians would regard the plan as an act of war: one was for the head of the army, and the other was for the chief of police. Paz’s cabinet, however, was still in the dark. They continued to be under the mistaken impression that they were working for the same man who had nationalized the mines and distributed land all those years ago.

“Three weeks after being sworn in as president, Paz finally called his cabinet together to let them in on the surprise he had in store. He ordered the doors closed to the governing chambers and ‘instructed the secretaries to hold all of the ministers’ telephone calls’. Bedregal read the full sixty pages to the stunned audience. He was so nervous, he confessed, that he ‘even got a nosebleed only minutes later’. Paz informed his cabinet members that the decree was not up for debate; in yet another backroom deal, he had already secured support from Banzer’s right-wing opposition party. If they disagreed, he said, they could resign.

“‘I don’t agree,’ announced the minister of industry.
“‘Please leave,’ Paz replied. The minister stayed. With inflation still soaring and strong hints that a shock therapy approach would be rewarded with significant financial aid from Washington, no one dared leave. Two days later, in a televised presidential address titled ‘Bolivia is Dying’, Paz dropped Bolivia’s ‘Brick’ on a completely unsuspecting public.

“Sachs was correct in predicting that prince increases would end hyperinflation. Within two years, inflation was down to 10 percent, impressive by any standard. The broader legacy of Bolivia’s neoliberal revolution is far more contentious. All economists agree that rapid inflation is enormously damaging, unsustainable and must be controlled – a process that imposes significant pain during the adjustment. The debate is over how a credible program can be achieved, as well as who, in any given society, is forced to bear the brunt of that pain. Ricardo Grinspun, a professor of economics specializing in Latin America in York University, that an approach in the Keynesian or developmentalist tradition seeks to mobilize support and share the burden through ‘a negotiated process involving key stakeholders – government, employees, farmers, unions and so on. In this way, the parties come to agreements over income policies, like wages and prices, at the same time that stabilization measures are implemented.’ In sharp contrast, says Grinspun, ‘the orthodox approach is to shift all the social cost onto the poor through shock therapy.’ That, he told me, is precisely what happened in Bolivia...

“Just as Friedman had promised in Chile, free trade was supposed to create jobs for the newly jobless. It didn’t, and the unemployment rate increased from 20 percent at the time of the elections to between 25 and 50 percent two years later. The state mining corporation alone – the same one that Paz had nationalized in the 1950s – was downsized from twenty-eight thousand employees to just six thousand.

“The minimum wage never recovered its value, and two years into the program, real wages were down 40 percent, at one point they would drop 70 percent. In 1985, the years of shock therapy, the per person capital average income in Bolivia was $845; two years later it had fallen to $789. This is the measure used by Sachs and the government, and despite the lack of progress it conveys, it does not begin to capture the degradation of daily life for many Bolivians. Average income is derived by adding up the country’s total income and dividing it by the number of people in the country; it glosses over the fact that shock therapy in Bolivia had the same effects that it had in the rest of the region: a small elite grew far wealthier while large portions of what had been the working class were discarded from the economy altogether and turned into surplus people. In 1987, Bolivian peasants, known as campesinos, were earning, on average, just $140 a year, less than one-fifth of the ‘average income’. That is the problem with measuring only the ‘average’: it effectively erases those sharp divisions.
“A leader of the peasants’ union explained that ‘the government’s statistics don’t reflect the growing number of families forced to live in tents; the thousands of malnourished kids who get only a piece of bread and a cup of tea a day, the hundreds of campesinos who have come to the capital in search of work and end up begging on the streets.’ That was the hidden story of Bolivia’s shock therapy: hundreds of thousands of full-time jobs with pensions were eliminated, replaced with precarious ones with no protection at all. Between 1983 and 1988, the number of Bolivians eligible for social security dropped by 61 percent.

“Sachs, who returned to Bolivia as an adviser in the midst of the transition, opposed raising salaries to keep up with the price of food and gasoline and instead favoured an emergency fund to help the hardest hit – a Band-Aid on what had become a gaping wound. Sachs returned to Bolivia as Paz Estenssoro’s request and was working directly for the president. He is remembered as an unyielding presence. According to Goni (who would later become president of Bolivia), Sachs helped to stiffen the resolve of policy makers when public pressure was building against the human cost of shock therapy. ‘In his visits [Sachs] said, “Look, all this gradualist stuff, it just doesn’t work. When it really gets out of control, you’ve got to stop it, like a medicine. You’ve got to take some radical steps, otherwise your patient is going to die.”’

“One immediate result of this resolve was that many of Bolivia’s desperately poor were pushed to become coca growers, because it paid roughly ten times as much as other crops (somewhat of an irony since the original economic crisis was set off by the U.S.-funded siege on the coca farmers). By 1989, an estimated one in ten workers were turning to work in some aspect of the coca or cocaine industries. These workers would include the family of Exo Morales, future president of Bolivia and a former leader of the militant coca growers’ union.

“The coca industry played a significant role in resuscitating Bolivia’s economy and beating inflation (a fact now recognized by historians but never mentioned by Sachs in explanation of how his reforms triumphed over inflation). Just two years after the ‘atomic bomb’, illegal drug exports were generating more income for Bolivia than all its legal exports combined, and an estimate 350,000 people were earning a living in some facet of the drug trade. ‘For now,’ a foreign banker observed, ‘the Bolivian economy is hooked on cocaine.’”

* 

In this period, several Latin American countries were emerging from under the yoke of military dictatorships. However, they now exchanged political oppression for economic slavery. And the cause was: - *debt*.
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There were two main causes for the huge escalation in debt. The first was that the dictators had borrowed heavily to spend on armaments and the latest techniques of a modern security apparatus. And the second was what came to be known as “the Volcker Shock”. Klein writes: “Economists used this term to describe the impact of the decision made by Federal Reserve chairman Paul Volcker when he dramatically increased interest rates in the United States, letting them rise as high as 21 percent, reaching a peak in 1981 and lasting through the mid-eighties. In the U.S., rising interest rates led to a wave of bankruptcies, and in 1983 the number of people who defaulted on their mortgages tripled.

“The deepest pain, however, was felt outside the U.S. In developing countries carrying heavy debt loads, the Volcker shock – also known as the ‘debt shock’ or the ‘debt crisis’ – was like a giant Taser gun fired from Washington, sending the developing world into convulsions. Soaring interest rates meant higher interest payments on foreign debts, and often the higher payments could only be met by taking on more loans. The debt spiral was born. In Argentina, the already huge debt of $45 billion passed on by the junta grew rapidly until it reached $65 billion in 1989, a situation reproduced in poor countries around the world. It was after the Volcker Shock that Brazil’s debt exploded, doubling from $50 billion to $100 billion in six years. Many African countries, having borrowed heavily in the seventies, found themselves in similar straits. Nigeria’s debt in the same short time period went from $9 billion to $20 billion.

“These were not the only economic shocks zapping the developing world in the eighties. A ‘price shock’ occurs every time the price of an export commodity like coffee or tin drops by 10 percent or more. According to the IMF, developing countries experienced 25 such shocks between 1981 and 1983; between 1984 and 1987, the height of the debt crisis, they experienced 140 such shocks, pushing them deeper into debt. One hit Bolivia in 1986, the years after it had swallowed Jeffrey Sachs’s bitter medicine and submitted to a capitalist makeover. The price of tin, Bolivia’s major export other than coca, dropped by 85 percent, devastating the country’s economy through no fault of its own. (This was precisely the kind of dependence on raw resource exports that developmentalist economics had been trying to transcend in the fifties and sixties – an idea dismissed as ‘fuzzy’ by the Northern economic establishment.)

“This is where Friedman’s crisis theory became self-reinforcing. The more the global economy followed his prescriptions, with floating interest rates, deregulated prices and export-oriented economies, the more crisis-prone the region became, producing more and more of precisely the type of meltdowns he had identified as the only circumstances under which governments would take more of his radical advice.
"In this way, crisis is built into the Chicago School model. When limitless sums of money are free to travel the globe at great speed, and speculators are able to bet on the value of everything from cocoa to currencies, the result is enormous volatility. And, since free-trade policies encourage poor countries to continue to rely on the export of raw resources such as coffee, copper, oil or wheat, they are particularly vulnerable to getting trapped in a vicious circle of continuing crisis. A sudden drop in the price of coffee sends entire economies into depression, which is then deepened by currency traders who, seeing a country’s financial downturn, respond by betting against its currency, causing its value to plummet. When soaring interest rates are added, and national debts balloon overnight, you have a recipe for potential economic mayhem.

“Chicago School believers tend to portray the mid-eighties onward as a smooth and triumphant victory march for their ideology: at the same time that countries were joining the democratic wave, they had the collective epiphany that free people and unfettered free markets go hand in hand. That epiphany was always fictional. What actually happened is that just as citizens were finally winning their long-denied freedoms, escaping the shock of the torture chambers under the likes of the Philippines’ Ferdinand Marcos and Uruguay’s Juan Maria Bordaberry, they were hit with a perfect storm of financial shocks – debt shocks, price shocks and currency shocks - created by the increasingly volatile, deregulated global economy.

“Argentina’s experience of how the debt crisis was compounded by their other shocks was, unfortunately, typical. Raul Alfonsin took office in 1983, in the midst of the Volcker Shock, which placed the new government in crisis mode from day one. In 1985, inflation was so bad that Alfonsin was forced to unveil a brand-new currency, the austral, gambling that fresh start would allow him to regain control. Within four years, prices had soared so high that massive food riots broke out, and Argentine restaurants were selling the currency as wallpaper because it was cheaper than paper. In June 1989, with inflation up 203 percent that month alone, and five months before his term was about to expire, Alfonsin gave up: he resigned and called early elections.

“Other options were available to politicians in Alfonsin’s position. He could have defaulted on Argentina’s huge debt. He could have joined with neighbouring governments in the same crisis and formed a debtors’ cartel. These governments could have created a common market based on developmentalist principles, a process that had begun when the region was torn apart by sadistic military regimes. But part of the challenge at the time had to do with the legacy of state terror faced by new democracies. In the eighties and nineties, much of the developing world was in the grip of a kind of terror hangover, free on paper but still cautious and wary. Having finally escaped the darkness of dictatorship, few elected politicians were willing to risk inviting another round of U.S.-supported coups d’état by pushing the very policies that had provoked the coups of the seventies – especially when the military officials who had staged them were, for the most part, not in prison but, having negotiated immunity, in their barracks, watching.
“Understandably unwilling to go to war with the Washington institutions that owned their debts, crisis-struck new democracies had little choice but to play by Washington’s rules. And then, in the early eighties, Washington’s rules got a great deal stricter. That’s because the debt shock coincided precisely, and not coincidentally, with a new era in North-South relations, one that would make military dictatorships largely unnecessary. It was the dawn of the era of ‘structural adjustment’ – otherwise known as the dictatorship of debt.”

*  

The change was made possible by a distortion of the original purpose of the two institutions created at the Bretton Wood Conference to help countries in financial difficulties – the IMF and the World Bank. The original idea was explained by Klein: “The World Bank would make long-term investments to development to pull countries out of poverty, while the IMF would act as a kind of global shock absorber, promoting economic policies that reduced financial speculation and market volatility. When a country looked as though it was falling into crisis, the IMF would leap in with stabilizing rants and loans, thereby preventing crises before they occurred. The two institutions, located across the street from each other in Washington, would coordinate their responses.

“John Maynard Keynes, who head the U.K. delegation, was convinced that the world had finally recognized the political perils of leaving the market to regulate itself. ‘Few believed it possible,’ Keynes said at the conference’s end. But if the institutions stayed true to their founding principles, ‘the brotherhood of man will have become more than a phrase’.

“The IMF and the World Bank did not live up to that universal vision: from the start they allocated power not on the basis of ‘one country, one vote’, like the UN General Assembly, but rather on the state of each country’s economy – an arrangement that gave the United States an effective veto over all major decisions, with Europe and Japan controlling most of the rest. That meant that when Reagan and Thatcher came to powr in the eighties, their highly ideological administrations were essentially able to harness the two institutions for their own ends, increasing their power and turning them into the primary vehicles for the advancement of the corporatists crusade.

“The colonization of the World Bank and the IMF by the Chicago School was a largely unspoken process, but it became official in 1989 when John Williamson unveiled what he called ‘the Washington Consensus’. It was a list of economic policies that he and both institutions now considered the bare minimum for economic health – ‘the common core of wisdom embraced by all serious economists’. These policies, masquerading as technical and

---

166 Klein, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-161.
uncontentious, included such bald ideological claims as all ‘state enterprises should be privatized’ and ‘barriers impeding the entry of foreign firms should be abolished’. When the list was complete, it made up nothing less than Friedman’s neoliberal triumvirate of privatization, deregulation/free trad and drastic cuts in government spending. These were the policies, Williamson said, ‘that were being urged on Latin America by the powers-that-be in Washington’. Joseph Stiglitz, former chief economist of the World Bank and one of the last holdouts against the new orthodoxy, wrote that ‘Keynes would be rolling over in his grave were he to see what has happened to his child.’

“Officials with the World Bank and the IMF had always made policy recommendations when they handed out loans, but in the early eighties, emboldened by the desperation of developing countries, those recommendations morphed into radical free-market demands. When crisis-struck countries came to the IMF seeking debt relief and emergency loans, the fund responded with sweeping shock therapy programs, equivalent in scope to ‘The Brick’ drafted by the Chicago Boys for Pinochet and the 220-law decree cooked up in Goni’s living room in Bolivia.

“The IMF issued its first full-fledged ‘structural adjustment’ program in 1983. For the next two decades, every country that came to the fund for a major loan was informed that it needed to revamp its economy from top to bottom. Davison Budhoo, an IMF senior economist who designed structural adjustment programs in Latin America and Africa throughout the eighties, admitted later that ‘everything we did from 1983 onward was based on our new sense of mission to have the south “privatized” or die; towards this end we ignominiously created economic bedlam in Latin America and Africa in 1983-88.’…”

Ecumenism was the religious equivalent to the Chicago economists’ shock therapy and free-market economics; and from the early eighties onwards it began to effect a radical revamping of the world’s religions. Two ecumenical events combined to elicit a powerful response from the True Orthodox Church. The first took place in 1982, when an inter-denominational eucharist service was composed at a conference in Lima, Peru, in which the Protestant and Orthodox representatives to the WCC agreed that the baptism, eucharist and ordinations of all denominations were valid and acceptable.\(^{168}\) The second came in 1983, at the Vancouver General Assembly of the WCC, which began with a pagan rite performed by local Indians and contained prayer services in which Orthodox hierarchs as well as representatives of many non-Christian religions took part. These events indicated that ecumenism had gone well beyond the bounds of inter-Christian friendship and was now into inter-religious merging.

The Vancouver Assembly unanimously approved a statement entitled “My Neighbor's Faith and Mine, Theological Discoveries Through Interfaith Dialogue: A Study Guide” (Geneva: WCC, 1986). After claiming the need "a more adequate theology of religions," the statement declared “that in Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word, the entire human family has been united to God in an irrevocable bond and covenant. The saving presence of God's activity in all creation and human history comes to its focal point in the event of Christ... because we have seen and experienced goodness, truth, and holiness among followers of other paths and ways than that of Jesus Christ... we find ourselves recognizing a need to move beyond a theology which confines salvation to the explicit personal commitment to Jesus Christ.”

When the Greek Old Calendarist Metropolitan Gabriel of the Cyclades attempted to address the Vancouver Assembly, he was not allowed to speak by the ecumenists. The New York Times, however, published his report, which included the following words: “Modern ecumenism is the reflection of the latest radical, atheistic and anti-Christian anthropomorphism which has as its principle that God is as necessary to man as man is to God. This radical anthropomorphism continues to struggle through the WCC to make the salvific message of Christ simply a servile element of the socio-political and earthly needs of man Thus it struggles for the actualisation of the unity of the Christian world without Christ, who is ‘the Way, the Truth and the Life’ of the Church and the faithful. Dogmatic and ethical minimalism, spiritual nihilism, humanistic pacifism and horizontal social activism lead to a union of the Christian world without Christ. So these attempts of the WCC constitute the modern blasphemy of the Holy Spirit par excellence and declare a deep crisis of faith in the Western Christian world...”\(^{169}\)

---


\(^{169}\) Metropolitan Gabriel, “Orthodox Reactions to the Aims of the World Council of Churches”, The New York Times, August 16, 1983. Minor changes have been made in the wording of the article, which was obviously translated from the Greek by a non-native English speaker.
The Synod of ROCOR, also meeting in Canada, condemned this latest and most extreme manifestation of ecumenism as follows: “In its decision of 28 July / 10 August, our Council explained that the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia does not participate in the World Council of Churches insofar as the latter attempts to represent those assembled in it, representatives of religions differing in their opinions, as though they had some sort of unity in faith. In reality, though, this very position is a lie, inasmuch as they, members of various confessions and sects, have not given up their points of disagreement with each other, much less with the Orthodox Church, in dogmas and in fundamental attitudes. In the name of unifying formulas, these differences of opinion are not destroyed, but are just set aside. Instead of the unshakable truths of the faith, they try to see only opinions, not obligatory for anyone. In reply to the confession of the one Orthodox Faith, they say together with Pilate: ‘What is truth?’ And the nominally Orthodox members of the Ecumenical Movement more and more deserve the reproach of the Angel of the Church of Laodicea: ‘I know your works: you are neither hot nor cold: O if only you were hot or cold’ (Revelation 3.15). A clear manifestation of such false union was the serving of the so-called Lima Liturgy…”

Then the Synod anathematised ecumenism, declaring: “To those who attack the Church of Christ by teaching that Christ’s Church is divided into so-called ‘branches’ which differ in doctrine and way of life, or that the Church does not exist visibly, but will be formed in the future when all ‘branches’ or sects or denominations, and even religions will be united in one body; and who do not distinguish the priesthood and mysteries of the Church from those of the heretics, but say that the baptism and eucharist of heretics is effectual for salvation; therefore to those who knowingly have communion with these aforementioned heretics or advocate, disseminate, or defend their new heresy of Ecumenism under the pretext of brotherly love or the supposed unification of separated Christians, Anathema.”

The Anathema against Ecumenism was welcomed with joy by the True Orthodox not only in ROCOR, but also in Greece and on Mount Athos, and may be considered the single most important ecclesiastical act of the True Orthodox Church in the second half of the twentieth century. For many who had been worried that ROCOR was not being firm and clear enough in her dealings with the ecumenists, it put an end to their doubts for the time being, and reaffirmed their faith in her at a time when the Greek Old Calendarist Church was going through a very difficult period with multiple schisms. Even at the present time, adherence to this decree remains one of the touchstones of True Christianity. Most schisms from the True Church since 1983 have been aimed at undermining its validity in one way or another...

Some criticized the anathema for not spelling out precisely which bodies fell under it and were therefore outside the True Church. Nevertheless, the implication of this anathema was clear: all Orthodox Churches that were fully participating members of the WCC fell under it.

As I.M. writes: “There is no heresy without heretics and their practical activity. The WCC in its declarations says: The Church confesses, the Church teaches, the Church does this, the Church does that. In this way the WCC witnesses that it does not recognize itself to be simply a council of churches, but the one church. And all who are members of the WCC are members of this one false church, this synagogue of Satan. And by this participation in the WCC all the local Orthodox churches fall under the ROCOR anathema of 1983 and fall away from the True Church. In their number is the Moscow Patriarchate…”

One ROCOR hierarch rejected the anathema – Archbishop Anthony of Geneva. Since 1974, as we have seen, he had been opposing any hardening of ROCOR’s attitude towards “World Orthodoxy”. Now he ordered the Paris Mission of ROCOR, led by Archimandrite Ambroise Frontier, to concelebrate with new calendarists, and not with Old Calendarists, when in Greece – which caused the whole mission to leave ROCOR and join the Greek Old Calendarists (see next chapter). He was even accused of concelebrating with Roman Catholics. After the Paris mission left him, Archbishop Anthony began to distribute epistles and “explanations” written by him with the aim of justifying the concelebrations with clergy of the “official churches” that were taking place in his diocese.

Unfortunately, the ROCOR Synod was by now too weak to check his harmful influence… Metropolitan Philaret was the only hierarch willing and able to fight for the True Orthodox confession against Archbishop Anthony. However, he had very few allies in the Synod. Even a conservative such as Bishop Gregory (Grabbe) would not go so far as him. As Bishop Gregory’s daughter, Matushka Anastasia Shatilova, recalls: “[Metropolitan Philaret] had especially many quarrels with Archbishop Anthony of Geneva… mainly on ecumenist questions… with the Serbs, the Antiochians and all kinds… Unfortunately, Archbishop Anthony was distinguished for his very sharp character and wrote several very boorish letters, to which the Metropolitan replied a little sharply… Vladyka Gregory was distinguished by somewhat greater diplomacy and was afraid that to speak in this way could create too great problems… [and] restrained the declarations of the Holy Hierarch Philaret concerning the lack of grace in the MP. For example, he used to say: ‘… tell 60 million Russian people that they are not chrismated, and have been baptized only according to the laymen’s rite…’ The Metropolitan was prepared to say this, but Vladyka Gregory thought that for the sake of Church construction it would be more correct not to put it so sharply…”

171 See “Epi Enos Anathematos” (On An Anathema), Kirix Gnision Orthodoxon (Herald of the True Orthodox Christians), February, 1984, pp. 47-56.
172 “Iskazhenie dogmata ‘O edinstve Tserkvi’ v ispovedaniakh very Sinodom i Soborom Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi Zagranitsej” (Distortion of the Dogma ‘On the Unity of the Church’ in the Confessions of Faith of the Synod and Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad) (MS).
173 Quoted by Fr. Roman Pavlov.
56. **CHAOS AMONG THE GREEK OLD CALENDARISTS**

In the early 1970s the Greek Florinit Synod under Archbishop Auxentius, appeared to be in a strong position as a result of its union with ROCOR. At this point, however, Auxentius began ordaining unworthy men and receiving priests from the new calendarists whose reputation was already besmirched. As a result, in 1974, following the commandment: “Be not partakers of other men’s sins” (I Timothy 5.2)), Metropolitans Acacius of Diauleia, Gabriel of the Cyclades and Chrysostom (Kiouis) of Thessalonica stopped attending meetings of the Synod. Chrysostom left because Auxentius wanted to consecrate a bishop for Germany, Marcian, who had been caught red-handed without a rasa in the “red light” district of Athens. These three bishops were joined by Bishop Peter of Astoria, and on September 9, 1976 all four bishops wrote a letter to the ROCOR Synod in which they criticized Auxentius for his receiving priests from the new calendarists who had been defrocked for immorality.

Sadly, the process of disintegration did not stop there. In June, 1977, Metropolitan Callistus of Corinth, being unhappy with the Matthewites’ break with the Russians and the Matthewites’ rejection of the kheirothesia of 1971 (he was one of the two bishops who had secured the union with the Russians in 1971), broke communion with the Matthewites and joined the Holy Synod. However, he was soon to rue his association with Auxentius. In 1978, a Portuguese priest of ROCOR, Joao Rocha, unhappy with Archbishop Anthony of Geneva’s refusal to create a diocese in Portugal, applied to join the True Orthodox Church of Greece. To the fury of Archbishop Anthony, Archbishop Auxentius baptised and reordained him on the grounds that he was a convert who had never had Orthodox baptism before consecrating him as Bishop Gabriel of Lisbon together with Metropolitan Callistus, who later claimed that he had been deceived.

---

175 Bishop Photius of Marathon, personal communication, June 28, 2003. After failing to receive ordination from Auxentius, Marcian left him and joined the Synod of Maximus Valianatos.
176 In June, 1974, Bishop Petro of America for the Auxentiite Synod by a majority vote “without any decision being made that would forbid us serving with him.” (Letter of Metropolitans Chrysostom and Gabriel in *I Phoni tis Orthdoxias* (The Voice of Orthodoxy)). He then joined the three independent bishops, an act that was contested by Fr. Simon of Simonopetra monastery, Mount Athos, in view of Peter’s refusal to sign the encyclical of 1974. All this time Bishop Peter claimed to be still in communion with ROCOR. However, in 1976 ROCOR decided to cease communion with Bishop Peter “because of Bishop Peters’ questionable canonical position with Archbishop Auxenios” (*Bulletin of the Foreign Relations Department*, 4, 1976). Bishop Petro protested that he had rejected the Auxentiite Encyclical of 1974 precisely in order to remain loyal to ROCOR’s position on the question of grace in the new calendarist churches. Finally, in 1995, the ROCOR Synod re-entered communion with Bishop Petro (Anastasios Hudson, *Metropolitan Petros of Asioria*, USA, 2014, chapter 5).
177 Hudson, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
178 According to Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Boston, he acted thus “in protest over what he considered the Matthewite Synod’s lack of good faith in the effort at reconciliation with the Holy Synod of Archbishop Auxentius” (*The Struggle against Ecumenism*, p. 103).
179 According to Lardas (*op. cit.*, p. 20), he had received chrismation in ROCOR.
Profoundly disillusioned with Auxentius, from February 20 to 23, 1979, Metropolitan Callistus, together with Metropolitan Anthony of Megara, ordained eight archimandrites to the episcopate, who were, in order of ordination: Cyprian (Koutsoubas) of Fili and Orope, Maximus (Tsitsibakos) of Magnesia, Callinicus (Sarantopoulos) of Achaia, Matthew (Langis) of Oinoe, Germanus (Athanasiou) of Aiolia, Calliopius (Giannakouloupolous) of Pentapolis, Mercurius (Kaloskamis) of Knossos and Callinicus (Karaphyllakis) of the Twelve Islands. During the services, Archbishop Auxentius was commemorated; but they had not informed him! It was only on February 27 that they called Auxentius and asked for his approval. The “Callistites” claimed that this was only a “temporary and curable deviation from the canonical order” whose aim was the cleansing of the Church from moral vices, especially sodomy, since “men have been raised to the priesthood who are both unworthy and incapable.”

However, on March 21, 1980 the Callistite Synod consecrated Holy Chrism. This was bold, hardly the act of a Synod that considered itself a “temporary and curable deviation from the canonical order”.

Moreover, it now entered into communion with another Local Church. Thus in 1979 it received Bishop Silvestru as emissary of the True Orthodox Church of Romania, and decided, having examined both the circumstances of the case and the historical/canonical basis, synodically to recognise the validity of the consecration performed by Galaction alone, as of those that followed. In April, 1980 the Callistites entered into official communion with the True Orthodox Church of Romania under the presidency of Metropolitan Glycerius.

Archbishop Kallinikos of Athens, a member of the Callistite Synod at that time, later claimed that in 1981 Metropolitan Callistus, together with Metropolitan Callinicus of Achaia and Metropolitan Cyprian of Fili went to Romania and performed the act of cheirothesia on the Romanian bishops in order to regularize their position. This was officially denied by the Romanian Synod in 2010, as also by the translator for the two sides, Bishop (then Hieromnonk) Ambrose.


181 For two antithetical accounts of this Synod, see Phylakes Orthodoxias (Guardians of Orthodoxy), vol. 1, March, 1979, pp. 1-2 and Agios Kyprianos (St. Cyprian), № 122, February, 1979, p. 240, on the one hand, and "Latest developments in the Church of the Genuine Orthodox Christians of Greece", special supplement to Orthodox Christian Witness, November, 1984, vol. XVIII, № 12 (St. Nectarios Educational Series № 93), Priest-Monk Haralampus (Book Review in The True Vine, № 21, vol. 6, № 1, 1994, pp. 56-63), and Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Boston, The Struggle against Ecumenism, pp. 102-112, on the other.

182 "Panigyrikon Sulleitourgon Ellinon kai Roumanon G.O.X." (Festive Concelebration of Greek and Romanians of the True Orthodox Christians), Phylakes Orthodoxias (Guardians of Orthodoxy), № 9, November, 1979, pp. 72-74; Bishop Ambrose of Methone, personal communication, December 24, 2009.

183 http://mitropoliaslatioara.ro/stire.php?id=91
At 6 p.m. on February 27, the same day he was informed of the Callistite ordinations, Archbishop Auxentius met Metropolitans Gerontius and Callinicus “in order to formulate a position on the sedition brought about by its members, Callistus of Corinth and Anthony of Megara, who illegally severed themselves from the body [of the Holy Synod] and high-handedly undertook to consecrate bishops. Upon discussing this matter at length, on the basis of the holy canons of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of Christ, [the Holy Synod] unanimously decreed and imposed upon the two seditious Metropolitans the punishment of deposition, as the holy canons themselves enjoin. [The Holy Synod decrees] that this decision be released and published straightway in the Athenian press. Since there was no time to convocate the assembly of the clergy, upon deliberation, because of the gravity of the event, it decided this very day to consecrate new bishops for [the Holy Synod’s] restoration and replenishment. Various points of view were exchanged and proposed by all the holy hierarchs…”

Then, according to the minutes of the meeting, no less than ten new bishops were elected and ordained in the following order: Euthymius (Orphanos) of Stavropolis (later Thessalonica), Paisius (Loulourgas) of Gardikion (later of America), Theophilus (Tsirbas) of Christianoupolis (later Patras), Athanasius (Postalas) of Platamon (later Larissa), Maximus (Vallianatos) of the Seven Islands, Stephen (Tsikouras) of Kardamila (later Chios), Paisius (Phinikaliotis) of Aegina, Gerasimus (Vrakas) of Talantion (later Thebes), Athanasius (Haralambidis) of Grevena (later Acharnæ) and Justin (Kouloutouros) of Marathon (later Euripus).

Some days later, the newly augmented Auxentiite Synod met in order to confirm the invalidity of the Callistite ordinations and the deposition of the Callistites as “conspirators, factionalists, establishers of unlawful assemblies and schismatics”\(^\text{185}\). Strangely, according to the minutes, while 13 bishops were present, only 8 signed the conciliar encyclical. The bishops who were present but apparently did not sign were Gerontius, Callinicus, Stephen, Paisius of Gardikion and Paisius of Aegina. Another curious feature of the minutes of this meeting is that some of bishops had changed their titles from the list of those present to the list of those who signed the encyclical.\(^\text{186}\)

But the strangest aspect of this Auxentiite “counter-coup” was the extraordinary speed with which it was accomplished. Three senior bishops on one and the same day (February 14 or 27): (1) heard of the Callistite ordinations, (2) met in order to condemn them and depose the Callistites, (3) drew up a list of 10 candidates for the episcopate, (4) assembled the 10 candidates (were they all waiting in the next room?), (5) obtained the permission of the two other members of the Synod, Paisius of Euripus and Acacius of Canada (this is not mentioned in

\(^{184}\) There is some confusion about the exact dates here. In The Struggle against Ecumenism, it is said that this meeting took place on February 14, and that the Callistites informed Auxentius of the ordinations in a letter also dated February 14 (but received on March 3. However, according to other sources, the Callistite ordinations took place between February 20 and 23, and that Auxentius was informed on February 27.

\(^{185}\) I Phoni tis Orthodoxias (The Voice of Orthodoxy), № 759, March 2, 1979.

\(^{186}\) The Struggle against Ecumenism, pp. 105-109.
the minutes, but Bishop Macarius assures us it happened), and (6) ordained them. Another source says that two of the new bishops (Athanasius of Larissa and Stephen of Chios) were ordained on one and the same day in different churches by different bishops.\textsuperscript{187}

Even the extremely pro-Auxentiite Bishop (now Archbishop) Macarius admits, with almost British understatement, “that Archbishop Auxentius did act in a rather hurried manner…”\textsuperscript{188}

And indeed, the scale and uncanonicity of the Callistite coup was exceeded, if that were possible, by the still greater scale uncanonicity - and extraordinary speed - of the Auxentiite counter-coup! The explanation Bishop Macarius gives for this extraordinary speed - “things were in such a wild and unexpected state” - is weak, to say the least. A more likely explanation is that the Auxentiite coup was not a wild reaction to a totally unexpected event, but a carefully planned reaction to an already foreseen event: the Auxentiites knew of the Callistite coup well in advance, and were therefore able to plan their own counter-coup well in advance, putting it into effect immediately they heard about the Callistite ordinations. In fact, there are some indications that Auxentius was not totally opposed to the Callistite coup, in that it “freed his hands”\textsuperscript{189} to consecrate those whom he wanted as bishops - and of whom he knew that several of his bishops, the future Callistites, would not approve.

On the other hand, one of those newly ordained by Callistus, Callinicus of the Twelve Islands, claimed that the whole venture was planned by one of the newly-ordained bishops and his own spiritual father, Metropolitan Cyprian of Fili, without Auxentius’ knowledge. Metropolitan Callinicus writes: “I was urgently summoned to Athens, knowing nothing about what was going on, and to my great surprise heard my Elder Cyprian tell me to prepare to be ordained to the episcopate during the vigil service that would begin in a short time. To the appropriate question of the writer why he himself (Fr. Cyprian) or this or that hieromonk (I mentioned a few names) should not be ordained, I learned that Fr. Cyprian as well as the other hieromonks I mentioned had already been ordained, and that Archbishop Auxentius was aware of the ordinations!”\textsuperscript{190}

However, when all the bishops were in the sanctuary taking off their vestments, Cyprian said to one of them, "Now, how are we going to explain all this to Archbishop Auxentios?" Callinicus overheard this and realised that his spiritual father had lied to him. He believed that the whole venture was planned by Cyprian, and that he had deceived Callistus and Anthony into believing that Auxentius had given his permission.\textsuperscript{191}

\textsuperscript{188} Bishop Macarius, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{189} Bishop Photius, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{190} Metropolitan Callinicus of the Twelve Islands, in Bishop Macarius, op. cit. The Cyprianites continued to maintain that Archbishop Auxentius knew of and blessed the ordinations.
\textsuperscript{191} Bishop Gregory of Denver, Re: Re[2]: [paradosis] Kallistos Metropolitan of Korinthos, orthodoxtradition@yahoogroups.com, 31/07/02.
However, the Cyprianite Bishop Ambrose of Methone disagrees: “Having followed personally all the events in question, I can assure you that Metropolitan Cyprian had absolutely nothing to do with the planning of the ordinations; indeed, though he had very friendly relations with Metropolitan Callistus, he had up to that time never met Metropolitan Anthony. He consulted the brotherhood, and his confessor, Archimandrite Ambroise Frontier, before accepting the proposition of the two metropolitans. He was in fact opposed to some of the candidates proposed, but was not in a position to veto them.”\(^{192}\)

While it seems very unlikely that Auxentius gave his permission (here we agree with Bishop Macarius), it is equally unlikely, for the reasons given above, that Auxentius did not know what was going to happen. Probably both sides knew already, before their split, that the candidates to the episcopate of the one side would not be acceptable to the other; so both sides prepared coups.

The Callistite Synod approached ROCOR, but the Russians refused to get involved in Greek quarrels…

The independent Metropolitans Acacius and Chrysostom disapproved of both the coup and the counter-coup, but were especially scathing about Auxentius’ new ordinations. As they wrote: “The ‘three hierarchs’ (the archbishop and the metropolitans of Piraeus and Phthiotis) blatantly and scandalously nourished for years the ground for the creation of suitable conditions for the ordination… of people who do not have a good external or internal image… You removed Synodal hierarchs for no other reason than that they sought moral and legal order in the Church administration and the cleansing of the clergy… You displayed unbelievable vengefulness against those hierarchs who rebuked your iniquities… You ordained without any examination the uneducated, the elderly and paralysed and other who were weighed down by accusations concerning moral and other crimes of which they had been officially charged in the Holy Synod… We judge your act to be worse than the uncanonical act of Bishops Anthony and Callistus…”

The words about “moral crimes” were probably aimed especially at Bishop Euthymius, who was accused by many of being a homosexual…

Notwithstanding this fierce rebuke, the Auxentiite Synod made several approaches to Metropolitans Acacius and Chrysostom. But the latter resisted these blandishments, believing that their concerns for the cleansing of the Church had not been addressed.

However, on January 28, 1980, the two metropolitans addressed a letter to Auxentius entitled “The Correct Road that will lead out of the Dead-End”, in which they suggested that ROCOR be asked to act as mediators between the “Callistites” and “Auxentiites”. And they put forward a second suggestion in

\(^{192}\) Bishop Ambrose, personal communication, November 10, 2005.
case this first one was rejected: “that all the bishops should abdicate. We shall all live private lives from now on... Three hieromonks known for their morality, decency and faith, preferably from Mount Athos, should be ordained as bishops to feed and administer the Church by those bishops who took no part in the coups. In this way all the divisions, personality struggles and counter-accusations will cease, and the troubled people of the True Orthodox Christians will be united... We personally, for the sake of the Church and the spiritual unity of the flock, will be the first to give our places over to the new spiritual leaders and live private lives. We pray that all the others will follow us...”

It is a pity that neither of these suggestions was acted upon. Instead, on September 16, the Auxentiite Synod removed Metropolitan Chrysostom from his see in Thessalonica and on October 23 raised Bishop Euthymius to the rank of metropolitan to take his place. However, the majority of the flock in Northern Greece continued to remain faithful to Metropolitan Chrysostom; and on November 23 tens of priests from Katerini to Messoropi to Sidirokastron left the Auxentiites and joined Metropolitan Chrysostom.

In 1981 the Auxentiite Synod removed the penalties it had imposed on Metropolitans Acacius and Chrysostom. Then, in the next year, it reimposed them. Then the Synod itself split, with one part remaining with Auxentius and the other following Metropolitan Gerontius of Piraeus. Bishop Macarius, who likes to dwell in detail on all the other divisions, passes this one over very hastily: “In the meantime a division broke out, the Lord alone knows for what reason He allowed it, in the canonical [according to Macarius: Auxentiite] Holy Synod. I don’t think it is necessary to spend any more time on this short division...”

However, this “short division” related to an issue that was to become increasingly important – that of the legal corporations. This issue was important because Churches as such are not registered in Greece with the exception of the new calendarist State Church. So the only way any religious community can acquire legal status and some legal protection (apart from the general protection provided by freedom of worship) is through registering as an association, corporation or foundation. Bishop Photius writes: “In the beginning, there existed the corporation ‘The General Fund of the Church of the True Orthodox Christians of Greece’, which had control of about 25 churches. It was under the control of the Auxentiite-Gerontians, who in the period 1971-1976 had removed from the board the four hierarchs – Acacius, Auxentius, Peter and Gabriel – who disagreed with them. In 1979, with the coup, the Auxentiite-Gerontians removed from the ‘General Fund’ all those who had taken part in the coup. Thus Callistus of Corinth, Anthony of Megara, Cyprian of Orose, Maximus of Magnesia, Callinicus of Achaia, Matthew of Oinoe, Germanus of Aiolia, Calliope of Pentapolis, Mercurius of Knossus and Callinicus of the Twelve Islands were removed from the board of the ‘General Fund’ and founded the corporation ‘the

---

193 Metropolitans Acacius and Chrysostom, in Bishop Macarius, op. cit.
194 Bishop Macarius, op. cit.
195 Bishop Photius, personal communication, October 20, 2005.
Greek Church of the True Orthodox Christians’. More accurately: they were inscribed into an already existing corporation having the same name, which had been founded by Calliopius in 1961.

“In June, 1983, the hierarchs Maximus of Magnesia (from now on ‘of Demetrias’) and Callinicus of the Twelve Islands left the Antonio-Callistites and joined the Auxentiites. They were received through cheirothesia (whose content must have been a simple prayer of forgiveness). The same happened later with Germanus of Aiolia. These three were removed from the corporation ‘The Greek Church of the True Orthodox Christians’. The Auxentiite-Gerontians did not inscribe them into the ‘General Fund’.

“In the same year a struggle broke out between the Auxentiites and Gerontius for control of the ‘General Fund’. Gerontius emerged as winner from the struggle.”

The Callistites also began to split up - over the old question whether the new calendarists had valid sacraments or not. As we have seen, in 1983 three metropolitans – Maximus, Germanus and Callinicus of the Twelve Islands – joined Auxentius. In 1984 four other metropolitans – Anthony, Callinicus of Achaia, Matthew and Calliopius – joined the Gerontians. Meanwhile, Metropolitan Cyprian was giving communion to new calendarists on the grounds that the new calendarist church was “not yet condemned” and therefore still the “Mother Church” of the Old Calendarists. And he rejected Metropolitan Callistus’ ecclesiology, saying that it was “without witness, unproven, anti-patristic, and hence un-Orthodox”. In other words, he regarded Callistus’ views to be heretical – even if he did not use the word “heretical” for diplomatic reasons. This disillusioned Metropolitan Callistus, who had always maintained the official view of the True Orthodox Church of Greece since 1935 that the new calendarists had no sacraments. So he retired to his monastery, where he died in isolation in 1986…

* 

196 This I heard from the two hierarchs Maximus and Callinicus themselves (Bishop Photius).
197 Bishop Photius, op. cit.
198 The evidence is in The Struggle against Ecumenism, pp. 111-112.
200 However, the Cyprianite Bishop Ambrose of Methone writes: “The retirement of Metropolitan Callistus had nothing to do with our position on the admission of new calendarists to the Mysteries (in a much less liberal way than that of many others, e.g. Metropolitan Anthony). It was in fact occasioned by (a) the behaviour of Metropolitan Callinicus of Achaia, who refused to leave the convent in Athikia and go to his own diocese, despite repeated promises, and finally more or less expelled Metropolitan Callistus from the Convent he had himself founded, and (b) the unanimous outrage of all the members of the Synod over a pamphlet expressing the most extreme ‘Matthaist’ positions, which Callistus published and distributed without their knowledge. Having been expelled from his own home, he was taken in by his brother, Archimandrite Nicodemus, and lived the rest of his days as a guest at the convent of Agia Marini, Sofikon” (personal communication, November 10, 2005).
As we have seen, in 1978 Archbishop Auxentius took a man from ROCOR’s West European diocese, baptized him and ordained him as Bishop Gabriel of Lisbon. In June, 1984, he ordained a second Portuguese bishop, James, without the knowledge of part of his Synod. “Auxentius had promised his clergy that he would call them and listen to their opinions before any episcopal ordination. Therefore, in order to bring about this ordination, he summoned a few of them (those whom he wanted) and decided, in spite of the reasonable objections of two or three clerics, that Hieromonk James should be elected as assistant bishop to Bishop Gabriel of Lisbon.”

Not content with this uncanonicity, Auxentius proceeded to another. “Both Auxentius and Gabriel had promised before God, the hierarchs and the priests present at that time that James would remain as Gabriel’s assistant, so that he would not be able to take part in the ordination of another bishop with Gabriel. However, in October, 1984, we were informed to our astonishment that the two Portuguese ‘bishops’ had ordained yet another Portuguese bishop and two Italians, with the blessings and prayers of Auxentius,” and the participation of Metropolitans Gerasimus, Maximus, Germanus and Athanasius of Larissa. One of the new bishops, the Italian Gabriel of Aquileia, turned out to be a fervent supporter, if not worshipper, of the fascist dictator Mussolini!

Moreover, Auxentius - acting completely on his own this time, now gave this new group a “Tome of Autonomy”!

In 1987 this newly “autonomous” Church split up, with the Metropolitan Eulogius of Milan being received into the Polish Orthodox Church.

In 1990 Metropolitan Gabriel followed, claiming that he had not known that Auxentius confessed that the new calendarists had no grace, which, he said, was a “heretical opinion”. He took with him two bishops, 60 parishes and about 80,000 laity. Soon this Portuguese church was practising a particularly strange form of ecumenism.

---

201 Orthodoxos Khristianikos Agon (Orthodox Christian Struggle), № 3, November, 1985, p. 4.

202 Orthodoxos Khristianikos Agon (Orthodox Christian Struggle), № 3, November, 1985, p. 4.

203 Orthodoxos Khristianikos Agon (Orthodox Christian Struggle), № 3, November, 1985, p. 3; February, 1987, p. 8. It appears that the “Tome of Autonomy” was signed by Auxentius alone, who wrote: “I, Auxentius, by God’s grace Archbishop of Athens and all Greece, acting within the boundaries of our territory of Western Europe (which I created on June 7, 1978) have decided to give permission to the Metropolis of Portugal, Spain and Western Europe to govern itself, having as their principal headquarters the God-protected metropolitan city of Lisbon… This metropolis will be under the direction of the GOC of Greece… P.S. The above Metropolitan with his vicar bishops is obliged to present himself to the Hierarchical Synod each October.”

204 Ivan Moody (“Scandal for Orthodoxy in Portugal”, ORTHODOX@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU (Orthodox Christianity) (01.02.2000)) tells us to what depths this new Portuguese Church has fallen: “Tomorrow, Wednesday 2nd January 2000, there will be inaugurated a new basilica in Torres Novas, north of Lisbon. In attendance will be, according the information we have received, bishops from the Churches of Russia, Romania, Bulgaria, Poland and from OCA…. The true leader of this sect is a lady known as “A Santa da Ladeira”, who was excommunicated from the Roman Catholic Church many years ago and subjected in the early 1970s to psychological examination which found her to be profoundly schizophrenic. Charges of fraud were also to be
After Gabriel’s death, Bishop Joao was elected metropolitan and confirmed by the Polish Synod. Subsequently, the Polish Church, alarmed by the eccentric practices of the Portuguese diocese, excised it from their communion.\[205\]

In 1993 the “Synod of Milan” joined the “Patriarchate of Kiev”, which was led by the KGB agent Philaret Denisenko, and was given yet another “Tome of Autonomy” by them…\[206\]

*  

By this time the Greek True Orthodox Church was disintegrating so fast that the Auxentiite and Gerontian Synods (which now included most of the defunct Callistite Synod) decided to cast aside their differences and unite. And so on January 4/17, 1985, they came together and agreed: (1) to recognise the ordinations of 1979 on both sides, (2) to remove the penalties they had placed on each other, and (3) remove the accusations they had cast against each other. The reunited Synod was composed of 17 bishops.\[207\]

It should be noted that the original “rebels” against the Auxentiite Synod, Metropolitan Acacius, Chrysostom, Gabriel and Peter, still refrained from joining this union, fearing that it simply covered up crimes, and would soon disintegrate.

More surprising, even Bishop Macarius criticised the union, saying: “Immeasurable grief takes hold of my heart”. Why? Because the recognition of the ordinations on both sides meant that the small group of formerly Callistite

brought against her but this did not happen with the chaos of the 1974 Revolution. She was subsequently adopted by Joao Gabriel and later elevated to be an "abbess", though she is married, with results that may be seen in a series of photographs I have in my possession and which have been forwarded to various competent authorities. They show: 1. This lady seated on a special throne in the church; 2. An "Orthodox" bishop holding up a RC host in a monstrance, this being adored by the "Santa" and the other clergy; 3. The "Santa", in the regalia of an abess, with her husband and an "Orthodox" bishop in the church; 4. An earlier photograph showing her as the "reincarnation" of the Mother of God; 5. The "Santa" kissing a RC host, behind which appears a strange stain on the photograph, apparently not present on the film, which is claimed to be the bread of the Orthodox Eucharist and therefore to represent the union of the Roman and Orthodox Churches, of which the new basilica is symbolic; 6. Earlier photographs of her with stigmata - this was the time at which she was held for fraud and psychological examination. On the front of the basilica is an engraved colour picture of the "Santa" and her husband. There can be no doubt as to the link between these "Orthodox" and this offensive phenomenon. All this will be widely covered in the newspapers and on the television. Whatever political or other factors have prevented the hierarchies of the various churches from realizing the gravity of this situation, it seems to us, the Greek Orthodox here, that we have been abandoned. My priest, having spent the whole of yesterday telephoning to the Embassies of the various countries, is exhausted and depressed. Is this, he is asking, the Orthodoxy I have spent my life here trying to protect and promote?"

\[205\] Bishop Ambrose of Methone (personal communication, November 10, 2005).
\[206\] See Kirix Gnision Orthodoxon (Herald of the True Orthodox), 42, № 236, September, 1997, p. 228.
\[207\] “Enkyklios” (Encyclical), Ekklesiastiki Paradosis (Ecclesiastical Tradition), January-February, 1985, № 20, pp. 262-263.
bishops whom he blames for subsequent events – especially Callinicus of Achaia and Calliopius of Pentapolis – and who had not, unlike the other penitent Callistite bishops, received cheirothesia from Auxentius, were not forced to repent of having been schismatics and receive cheirothesia. But Bishop Macarius fails to see that if Auxentius was essentially blameless and all those who broke communion from him thereby became schismatics, then the group of Gerontian bishops to which he belonged (and belongs) – Callinicus of Phthiotis and Euthymius of Thessalonica – also became schismatics when they broke away from Auxentius in 1983, and should also have received cheirothesia. In fact, it could be argued that insofar as the Gerontians broke away from Auxentius over the question of who controlled certain church buildings – in other words, over “filthy lucre” (I Peter 5.2), their motivation was worse than that of the Callistites, and they deserved a more severe penalty. So, as the English proverb goes: “Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones…”

In the opinion of the present writer, however, all the factions were guilty in different ways and to different degrees, and so union between them was possible without hypocrisy only on the basis of mutual forgiveness of sins and removal of all bans. Or if, as Bishop Macarius asserts, this was impossible on canonical grounds, then the only solution was for all 17 bishops to retire...

In any case, the union collapsed when it emerged that Auxentius had secretly ordained Dorotheus Tsakos, a former new calendarist priest who had been defrocked in 1968 for homosexuality. Tsakos had then twice been ordained “metropolitan” by Old Calendarist episcopi vagantes. In July, 1985 he began to show priests an ordination certificate purporting to prove that he had been ordained “Metropolitan of Sparta and all the Peloponnese”. The priests were troubled to see that the signatures of Archbishop Auxentius and Metropolitan Gerasimus of Thebes were on this document. Tsakos claimed that he had been ordained by Metropolitans Gerasimus of Thebes and Maximus of Cephalonia on the orders of Archbishop Auxentius; but he refused to reveal (by covering the relevant part of the ordination certificate with his hand) on what date the ordination had taken place.

On July 6/19, 1985, at a meeting of the Holy Synod, the three metropolitans involved denied that the ordination had taken place. Auxentius admitted that his signature might be genuine because he did sometimes sign blank ordination certificates to be filled in later (a revealing confession in itself!). But he denied – and always continued to deny – that he knew anything at all about the ordination of Tsakos. However, immediately after this meeting of the Synod, Gerasimus of Thebes confessed that the ordination had taken place as Tsakos had stated, and signed a written affidavit to that effect in the presence of eight other bishops.

Fr. Basil of Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Boston, tried to minimise the significance of this confession by pointing out that Gerasimus twice confessed that he had participated in the ordination and twice denied it. Moreover, Gerasimus and the other witnesses were inconsistent in the date they ascribe to the event. Therefore, wrote Fr. Basil, “what is the value of such depositions, made
by false witnesses who contradict and refute themselves?... Which one of all these written depositions says the truth? When did the ordination take place? In 1983? In 1984? In 1985? We admit that we see no possibility of finding any clue.” 208 “What is the validity of such depositions, made by witnesses who contradict and refute themselves?” 209

However, is it not usual for a criminal caught red-handed in a criminal act to lie and then to change his testimony when his lie is exposed? In any case, why should Gerasimus have admitted to the crime even once if he was in fact innocent? Moreover, there were other eyewitness testimonies confirming Gerasimus’ guilt. One of these was the Reader Pericles Tsakiris, whom the translator of Fr. Basil’s letter rather furtively and obliquely sought to blacken in a footnote.

As a result of their inquiries the committee came to the following conclusions, which any unprejudiced observer must agree with: (a) the ordination of Dorotheus Tsakos did take place, at the hands of Metropolitans Maximus and Gerasimus, and on the orders of Archbishop Auxentius; (b) the date was probably after Pascha, 1985 (in his last deposition, in January, 1986, he confirmed under oath that the ordination had taken place on July 5, 1985); and (c) the participants in the event, having been sworn to secrecy by Auxentius, lied to the Holy Synod and for fairly obvious reasons tried to obscure the date of the event.

Fr. Basil went on to claim that before the investigative committee could complete its work, the seventeen bishops who eventually defrocked Auxentius had created a schism. Therefore, he said, even if the ordination did take place, it is not Auxentius but his accusers who are the guilty ones!

This was the exact opposite of the truth! The fact of the matter was that in September, while the investigating committee was still carrying out its work and interrogating witnesses (as far as they could, for Auxentius and Maximus refused to cooperate in any way), a group of Auxentiite bishops decided to declare the affair of Dorotheus Tsakos “closed”, regarding “every attempt to revive it as anticanonical and an attack on the Church”. They also declared that the invitation to the metropolitans to give evidence to the investigating committee the next day was “anticanonical”, “parasynagogical” and “counter to the will of the Holy Synod” - although the Holy Synod had appointed the investigating committee only two months before!

It is interesting to note which bishops signed this astonishing attempt to silence the work of the investigating committee: the oath-breaking and Mussolini-loving Portuguese and Italians Gabriel, James, Eulogius, Theodore and Gregory, who were not even members of the Holy Synod; Auxentius, Athanasius, Maximus and Germanus, who had participated in the uncanonical ordinations of the Portuguese and

---

208 “Excerpts from a Response by Fr. Basil of Holy Transfiguration Monastery to a Bishop of the Kiousis group, Kallinikos of the Dodecanese, concerning the ‘ordination’ of Dorotheos Tsakos” (MS), pp. 1, 2.
209 The Struggle against Ecumenism, p. 121, footnote.
Italians and (in the cases of Auxentius and Maximus) Tsakos; and the Americans Paisius and Vincent, who had been closely associated with Auxentius in the early 1980s (for example, in the Auxentiite union with the Free Serbs in 1982) and later joined the new calendarists. In other words, these bishops who were now trying to stop the work of the investigating committee were in essence the same group of bishops who had been associates of Auxentius before the union of January, 1985, and had caused such damage to the Church before that date.

In spite of this provocation, the investigating bishops patiently continued their work. They invited Auxentius to appear before the Synod three times, but he refused. Then Auxentius, anticipating the announcement of his deposition, formed an “anti-Synod” and called on the president of the Synodical Court, Metropolitan Gerontius, to appear before a five-member pseudo-Synod to answer a false charge of having married two persons of the same sex in 1981! Gerontius convincingly refuted this charge (which has never, to our knowledge, been brought up again). Finally, on October 22, Auxentius, Maximus, Gerasimus, Athanasius and Germanus were deposed for “consecrating” Tsakos, for lying to the Synod and for creating a schism.210

Even Archbishop Macarius admitted that Auxentius’s actions in this period were indefensible, but characteristically chose not to go into detail on a matter that clearly embarrassed him, writing that Auxentius and the bishops that still remained loyal to him “undertook a series of hurried and uncanonical defrocks of many of our hierarchs.”211 He was reticent because one of the hierarchs defrocked by Auxentius was Macarius’ fellow-worker, Metropolitan Euthymius of Thessalonica, whom Auxentius accused of initiating his trial and deposition in order to avoid investigation of moral charges against himself: “while an order was given that a judicial examination should be put into operation in order to elucidate the accusations against the moral situation of Metropolitan Euthymius Orphanos, they turned round and incompetently initiated an examination against us to see whether we had indeed proceeded to nominate and consecrate Archimandrite Dorotheus Tsakos as Metropolitan of Patras…” Auxentius defrocked Euthymius on October 31, 1985 (№ 2137/18) for “factionalism, conspiracy and rebellion”. Also defrocked was his elder, Iakovos Papadelis, “on the basis of accusations of moral falls against him by Athonites”.212

And yet in spite of this Archbishop Macarius vehemently rejected the validity of Auxentius’ defrocking by – among others – his own party of Gerontius, Callinicus and Euthymius! And some years later, in 1997, his Synod (headed at that time by Callinicus of Phthiotis and now, in 2005, by Macarius himself) declared that “the altercations during the year 1985 between the blessedly reposed hierarchs Auxentius and Gerontius arose from the plots of third parties


211 Bishop Macarius, op. cit.

212 I Phoni tis Orthodoxias (The Voice of Orthodoxy), № 921, March-April, 2003, p. 15.
and... the verdicts of both are uncanonical and invalid... It is understood that we recognize and also bless all the priestly services and other sacred ecclesiastical actions of the aforementioned Archbishop and Metropolitans, except the ordinations which they performed after 1985 to the present, which we reserve the right to examine upon the petition of the ordinands. ”

However, this made no sense. If, as Archbishop Macarius asserted time and time again, Auxentius was the last true archbishop of the True Orthodox Christians (before himself), and his defrocking in 1985 was uncanonical, then he (Macarius) condemned himself and his own party on at least three counts: (1) for breaking with Auxentius over the issue of the legal corporation in 1983, (2) for unjustly defrocking Auxentius for the ordination of Tsakos, and (3) for remaining in communion with Euthymius after Auxentius defrocked him and his elder. But Macarius wishes to exonerate both Auxentius (although he admits that his actions in 1985 were wrong) and himself and his party – while laying all the blame on mysterious “plots of third parties”.

Auxentius’ defenders sought to demonstrate that Orthodox Christians are not allowed to break communion with their lawful ecclesiastical authority unless that authority has proclaimed heresy, and even if that authority has committed flagrant crimes. This is true – so long as the possibility of bringing the sinning archbishop to trial exists. But Fr. Basil appeared to reject the possibility that metropolitans can bring their archbishop to trial for any other charge than heresy. In this opinion he was mistaken. There have been many occasions in Church history when archbishops have been defrocked by their fellow bishops in accordance with the Holy Canons for transgressions other than heresy. If such were not the case, then as long as the archbishop did not proclaim heresy he could commit murder and adultery and remain first-hierarch of the Church – which is halfway to Papism...

In March, 2014, when the True Orthodox Church of Greece under Archbishop Kallinikos entered into a union with the Cyprianites, they secretly removed all bans on Archbishop Auxentius (this was probably a demand of the Cyprianites). However, none of his episcopal ordinations were accepted as valid...

* 

In November, 1985, Metropolitan Gerontius approached Metropolitan Chrysostom (Kiousis) and invited him to the join the Synod that had been purged of Auxentius and his supporters. Chrysostom replied in a conciliatory manner, thanked Gerontius “for your recognition of the righteousness of our (four bishops’) break of relations with the Synod”, but insisted on the fulfilment of two conditions before he could join: “the removal of Bishop Euthymius from my diocese” and the seeking of the written opinion of theologians on the degree to

---

213 Protocol № 73, decision of April 1/14, 1997, in Orthodoxon Paterikon Salpisma (Orthodox Patristic Trumpet Call), March-April, 1997).
214 Bishop Photius of Marathon, private communication, 2014.
which “economy” (condescension) could be employed with regard to the earlier canonical questions that had not yet been resolved. This was necessary “in view of the extremely detailed deadlock into which our Holy Struggle has come…”

The opinions of six theologians (three priests and three laymen) were duly sought. They said that the four bishops – Acacius, Chrysostom, Gabriel and Peter – could join the Synod led by Gerontius provided that the new president of the Synod should not be any bishop who had been involved in the Callistite coup or Auxentiite counter-coup of 1979. This was an eminently reasonable condition, since all of the participants in the coup and counter-coup of 1979, not to mention the Gerontian schism of 1983, had besmirched their reputations, and would not have had the authority to unite the Church for long. The new archbishop could only come from one of the four bishops – Acacius, Chrysostom, Gabriel and Peter – who had taken no part in these events, but who had pointed out the need for a cleansing of the Church from the tares sown by Auxentius. This need was now, belatedly, recognised by all.

Of these four bishops, Metropolitan Peter, as living in America and as having rejected the encyclical of 1974, was clearly not a candidate. Therefore he created another problem for the new archbishop, whoever he might be, in that he would have to see that Metropolitan Peter conformed to the 1974 encyclical…

Finally, in January, 1986, Metropolitan Chrysostom joined, and was elected archbishop by ten votes to six. It will be remembered that Chrysostom had been elected as second candidate for the episcopate (after Acacius Pappas) as far back as the pan-clerical congress in April, 1957. So there was a certain historical justice in his being elected archbishop now, some thirty years later.

However, Bishop Macarius writes: “My conscience forces me to condemn the election of Chrysostom as archbishop as totally uncanonical because, first and foremost, it was made as a result of the uncanonical defrocking of the canonical Archbishop Auxentius, whose throne Chrysostom seized while the archbishop still alive, making him an adulterous free-rider…”

Macarius here fails to mention the rather important fact that Chrysostom took no part in the defrocking of Auxentius. That was done by Gerontius and his faction – that is, Bishop Macarius’ own faction! As for “seizing” the throne, what kind of “seizure” are we talking about when Chrysostom in no way imposed himself, but was first invited by Gerontius to join the Synod, and was then elected in a perfectly canonical election?! So if Chrysostom was an “adulterous free-rider”, the Gerontian bishops were those who prepared the bedchamber and even invited the lovers into it!

---

215 In the spring of 1985, in his monastery in Paiania, Metropolitan Acacius told the present writer that he was deeply unhappy that Metropolitan Peter gave communion to new calendarists in his Astoria diocese.
“Secondly,” continues Bishop Macarius, “during the proceedings of the election, there were present two Metropolitans of Thessalonica, Chrysostom and Euthymius, and both of them voted as such, something that is totally contrary to the Holy Canons.”

This is a more just accusation. Nevertheless, it may well be asked: whose fault was it that there were two metropolitans of Thessalonica? Chrysostom had been made metropolitan of the city much earlier than Euthymius, and the Gerontians, as Chrysostom noted, had recognised the justice of his struggle against corruption in the Church. Clearly, therefore, if one of the two metropolitans was an adulterer bishop, it was Euthymius! The issue was the more serious in that the flock in Thessalonica was divided, with one part refusing to accept Euthymius because of his reputation – throughout Greece - as a homosexual.

It was agreed that the dissident parishes in Thessalonica should be allowed to commemorate Chrysostom for one year while they got used to the idea that they were now in communion with Euthymius. However, when the year was over, they had still not got used to it, and refused to commemorate Euthymius. Clearly, the only solution to the problem was a canonical ecclesiastical trial of Euthymius.

Almost immediately the problem of the legal corporations raised its head again. 8 hierarchs – Gerontius of Piraeus, Callinicus of Phthiotis, Euthymius of Thessalonica, Stephen of Chios, Athanasius of Acharnae, Justin of Euripus, Paisius of America and Vincent of Aulona (the last two joined a little later) – belonged to the board of the corporation “General Fund of the Church of the True Orthodox Christians of Greece”. 4 hierarchs – Anthony of Megara, Callinicus of Achaia, Matthew of Oinoe and Calliopius of Pentapolis – belonged to the board of the corporation “Greek Church of the True Orthodox Christians”.

The remaining 4 hierarchs – Archbishop Chrysostom, Peter of Astoria, Maximus of Magnesia and Callinicus of the Twelve Islands – did not belong to any board. Overtures towards a union of the two corporations were made by the board of the “Greek Church of the True Orthodox Christians” to the board of the “General Fund”. But these overtures were rejected.

The outlines of the schism of 1995 can already be discerned in these figures...

* *

The most important and damaging schism among the Greek Old Calendarists in this period was that of the Cyprianites...

On January 20, 1984 an article appeared in the new calendarist newspaper *Orthodoxos Typos* criticizing Metropolitan Cyprian, the last heir of the Callistite coup, and the only one who did not repent of it, for giving the sacraments to...

---

217 Bishop Macarius, *op. cit.*
hundreds of new calendarists. In the February-March issue of his journal, Agios Kyprianos, Cyprian did not deny these charges but simply called them "purely personal attacks". In September, Cyprian was banned from serving by Metropolitan Anthony and the Synod to which he then belonged for entering into communion of prayer with Patriarch Nicholas of Alexandria the previous month. Cyprian rejected this act, and early in 1985 he formed a new “Synod of Resistors” with Metropolitan Giovanni (Bascio) of Sardinia, a former Capuchin monk who, after being in the MP and the Nestorian heresy, had been baptized and ordained by the Callistites in 1982.218

Cyprian’s position was based on a new ecclesiology that in view of its subsequent importance is worth examining in some detail. It was expounded in his book, Ecclesiological Theses. “The Orthodox Church as a whole is unerring and invincible,” he writes. “It is possible, however, for Christians and for local Churches to fall in faith; that is to say, it is possible for them to suffer spiritually and for one to see a certain ‘siege of illness within the body of the Church’, as St. John Chrysostom says. It is possible for Christians to separate and for ‘divisions’ to appear within the Church, as the Apostle Paul writes to the Corinthians. It is possible for local Churches into fall into heresy, as occurred in the ancient Orthodox Church of the West, which fell into the heresies of Papism and Protestantism and finally into the panheresy of ecumenism.

“Spiritual maladies within the Church are cured either by repentance or by judgement. Until the judgement or expulsion of a heretic, schismatic, or sinner – either by the Church or, in a more direct manner, by the Lord – the opinion of a believer cannot be a substitute for the sentence of the Church and of her Lord, Jesus Christ, even if the resolution of a situation be prolonged until the Second Coming. As is well known, in the Scriptures, the Church is likened to a field replete with ‘wheat’ and ‘tares’, in accordance with Divine and ecclesiastical economy. Sinners and those who err in correctly understanding the Faith, yet who have not been sentenced by ecclesiastical action, are simply considered ailing members of the Church. The Mysteries [sacraments] of these unsentenced members are valid as such, according to the Seventh Ecumenical Council, as, for example, the President of the Synod, St. Tarasios, remarks: ‘[their] Ordination’ ‘is from God’. By contrast, should expositors of heresy punish the Orthodox opposed to them, these punishments are ecclesiastically invalid and groundless ‘from the time their preaching began’ (i.e., from the moment they began preaching heresy), as St. Celestine of Rome wrote and as the Third Ecumenical Synod agreed.”219

218 It is sometimes asserted that the Italian parishes under Giovanni voluntarily left the Moscow Patriarchate and joined the Nestorians before returning to the Old Calendarists. In 1975 the present writer heard a different story from the Italians’ bishop when they were in the MP, Metropolitan Anthony (Bloom) of Sourozh, who said that he had been forced to expel the Italians following a phone call from Metropolitan Juvenal of Tula. Juvenal said that the MP was having negotiations with the Vatican over the uniate question in the Ukraine, and the Pope had laid it down as a condition for the success of the negotiations that there should be no MP parishes in Italy. So the Italians were in fact expelled from the MP.
219 Metropolitan Cyprian, “Ai Ekklesiologikai Theseis Mas” (Our Ecclesiological Theses), Agios
When a bishop preaches heresy “publicly” “and bareheaded in the Church”, continues the metropolitan, the Orthodox Christians should immediately separate themselves from him, in accordance with the 31st Apostolic Canon and the 15th Canon of the First-and-Second Synod of Constantinople. Such action by the Orthodox does not introduce schism, but rather serves to protect the Church from schisms and divisions. “He who preaches heresy or he who brings innovation into the Church divides her and abrogates her oneness or unity. He who opposes the preaching of heresy, or who separates himself from it, is eager to save the oneness or unity of the Church. The aim of opposition and separation is the combatting of heresy, the defense of the Orthodox Faith, and the preservation of the unity of the Orthodox Church, indeed of Orthodoxy itself.”

So far so good. However, Cyprian then makes a distinctly controversial claim: “With regard to the innovation in the festal calendar, Orthodox are divided into two parts: into those who are ailing in Faith and those who are healthy, into innovators and opposers – into followers of innovation, whether in knowledge or in ignorance, and those opposed to it, who have separated themselves from heresy, in favor of Orthodoxy. The latter are strugglers for oneness among the ‘divided’, as the Seventh Ecumenical Synod calls those who so separated for the Orthodox unity of the Church. The followers of the festal calendar innovation have not yet been specifically judged in a Pan-Orthodox fashion, as provided for by the Orthodox Church. As St. Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain writes, the violator of established precepts is considered sentenced, insofar as he is judged by ‘the second entity (which is the council or synod).’ Since 1924, the innovators have been awaiting judgement and shall be judged on the basis of the decisions of the holy Synods, both Oecumenical and local, and, to be sure, on the basis of the ecclesiastical pronouncements of the sixteenth century against what were then Papal proposals for changes in the festal calendar. In this respect, those who have walled themselves off from the innovators have actually broken communion ‘before [a] conciliar or synodal verdict,’ as is allowed in the Fifteenth Canon of the First-and-Second Synod. That is to say, the innovators are still unsentenced. Consequently, their Mysteries are valid…”

“Every innovationist member of the divided Greek Church is capable of changing over to opposition against the Ecumenist innovation. This can be accomplished through repentance... A return to Orthodoxy can also take place through a formal renunciation of heresy... Therefore, the Orthodox Tradition of the Holy Oecumenical Synods and of the Holy Fathers of the Orthodox Church prescribes that that part of the divided Greek Church that is ailing in Faith be received by one of the foregoing means of repentance and returned to the ranks of Orthodoxy. For they are not condemned schismatic or heretical Christians, but members of the Church who have not yet been brought to trial.”
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222 Barker, op. cit., pp. 61, 62.
To suppose that the innovators were “still unsentenced” was a mistake. In May, 1935, all the truly Orthodox (i.e. Old Calendar) Metropolitans of the Church of Greece came together and synodically condemned the new calendarists as schismatics without the grace of sacraments. Concerning the implications of this declaration with regard to the question of grace, the metropolitans made themselves crystal clear in an encyclical issued on June 8/21, 1935: “We recommend to all those who follow the Orthodox Calendar that they have no spiritual communion with the schismatic church of the schismatic ministers, from whom the grace of the All-Holy Spirit has fled, because they have violated the decisions of the Fathers of the Seventh Ecumenical Council and the Pan-Orthodox Councils which condemned the Gregorian calendar. That the schismatic Church does not have Grace and the Holy Spirit is affirmed by St. Basil the Great, who says the following: ‘Even if the schismatics have erred about things which are not Dogmas, since the head of the Church is Christ, according to the divine Apostle, from Whom all the members live and receive spiritual increase, they have torn themselves away from the harmony of the members of the Body and no longer are members [of that Body] or have the grace of the Holy Spirit. Therefore he who does not have it cannot transfer it to others.’”\textsuperscript{223}

Now some have argued that this conciliar decision was later rejected by the leader of the Greek Old Calendarists, Metropolitan Chrysostom of Florina, and that it therefore represents only an “extremist”, “Matthewite” position. However, the doctrine that schismatics have no grace is not a specifically “Matthewite” position, but was proclaimed as early as 1935, before the Matthewite faction was formed, and is based on many canons and patristic sayings, notably the First Canonical Epistle of St. Basil the Great. In fact, as Bishop Ephraim of Boston points out, the new calendarists and the Moscow Patriarchate have adopted a distinctly “Matthewite” position in relation to the True Orthodox, declaring that they have no grace of sacraments – while at the same time declaring that the Western heretics do have grace!\textsuperscript{224}

In any case, it is not true that Metropolitan Chrysostom renounced the Council of 1935. From 1937 to 1950 he appeared to doubt it, introducing the notion (unknown in patristic literature, as Bishop Ephraim again correctly points out), of “potential schism”. But in 1950 he repented of these doubts and openly and unambiguously returned to the confession of 1935. Some have said that in private correspondence he claimed to have been pushed into making this confession by “extremists”, that he made it for the sake of unity and that it did not represent his true thinking. It seems extremely unlikely that such a great confessor, whose relics are fragrant and who was canonized in 2016, could have dissembled in his confession of faith. But in any case, even if he had private doubts, it is his public confession that we must judge him by – and that, from 1950 to the end of his life, was thoroughly Orthodox.

\textsuperscript{223} Calliopius, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 277-278.

\textsuperscript{224} Letter of Reader Polychronios, April 29 / May 12, 1987.
Now Cyprian does not mention the Council of 1935. Nor does he mention Metropolitan Chrysostom’s encyclical of 1950, nor the Old Calendarist Council under the presidency of Archbishop Auxentius in 1974 (when Cyprian himself was under his omophorion), which explicitly declared that the new calendarist ecumenists had no grace of sacraments. Nor does he mention ROCOR’s anathema against ecumenism in the previous year (1983), which fell also on the new calendarists. The reason for these omissions cannot be that he does not know of their existence. The reason can only be – although he does not write this explicitly – that he rejects their validity, or at any rate the validity of their decisions in relation to the ecumenists.

To understand why he does this, let us now turn to his theory of the Councils and their relationship to heretics… Of central importance in Cyprian’s argument is his concept of the “Unifying Synod”, that is, a Synod that unites the heretics to Orthodoxy, such as the Seventh Ecumenical Council. By implication – although, again, he does not state this explicitly here – a Synod that simply condemns the heretics without uniting them to Orthodoxy (such as the decisions of the Greek Old Calendarist Councils of 1935 and 1974 against the new calendarists, or the 1983 anathema of the Russian Church Abroad against Ecumenism) is of less significance and is not in fact competent to expel heretics from the Church. Since Cyprian’s work appeared the year after the 1983 anathema, it is possible that the whole purpose of his ecclesiology is to refute it and denigrate its significance.

In fact, it is difficult to see, according to Cyprian’s theory, how or when any heretic has been expelled from the Church. For if, before the convening of a Unifying Synod, the heretics are not outside the Church but simply an ailing faction within the Church, and if a Unifying Synod does not expel heretics from the Church but simply unites the ailing and the healthy parts of the same Church in a closer union, there seems to be no mechanism for the expulsion of heretics from the Church altogether – in other words, there are no Separating or Expelling Synods. It would not be inconsistent with his theory to suppose that those heretics who refuse to be unified by the Unifying Synod are thereby expelled from the Church altogether; but this is not stated explicitly (at any rate, in the position paper under review), so heavy is the emphasis on the supposed fact that these Synods unified rather than expelled the heretics.

Cyprian develops his concept of a “Unifying Council” thus: “During the reign of the iconoclastic innovation, for example, it was impossible for an Orthodox Synod of the entire Church to be convened. For this reason, such a Synod was convened when the iconoclastic heresy was no longer in power, that is, in 787, as the Seventh Oecumenical Synod of union. The same Seventh Oecumenical Synod writes through its Fathers that the Synod took place ‘so that we might change the discord of controversy into concord, that the dividing wall of enmity might be removed and that the original rulings of the Catholic [Orthodox] Church might be validated.’ That is, it was convened so that the differing factions of the Church, divided up to the time of the Synod – the Iconoclasts disagreeing with the Orthodox belief and the Orthodox opposed to the iconoclastic heresy - might be united by means of an agreement within Orthodoxy.”
This is inaccurate both as regards the Ecumenical Councils in general and as regards the Seventh Council in particular. First, there were some Ecumenical Councils that took place without the participation of heretics – the Second and the Fifth. According to the reasoning of Cyprian, these must be considered not to be “Unifying” and therefore lacking in full validity! And yet there is no “more valid” Council in Orthodox history than the Seven Ecumenical Councils. Moreover, after several of the Ecumenical Councils many of the heretics were not only not “united”, but remained in bitter enmity to the Orthodox Church. Thus there were many Arians after the First Council, many Nestorians after the Third and many Monophysites after the Fourth – in fact, all three heresies are very numerous to the present day. Even the Seventh Council was only temporarily “unifying”, since the iconoclastic heresy broke out again some years later. Thus according to the reasoning of Cyprian, we must eliminate the First, Third and Fourth Ecumenical Councils from the category of “Unifying Council”.

Secondly, even those Councils which took place with the participation of heretics did not receive them until they had renounced their heresies. The heretics were outside the Church until such a renunciation. However, if, as Cyprian asserts, heretics cannot be considered to be outside the Church until they have been condemned at a “Unifying Council” in which they themselves participated, then not only were the Arians, Nestorians, Monophysites and others still “members of the Church weak in faith” until the Unifying Councils that condemned them, but, as Bishop Nectary (Yashunsky) pointed out, “we shall have to recognize the Roman Catholics and Protestants as ‘as yet uncondemned members of the Church’, because since the time of their separation there has not been (and until ‘their union in Orthodoxy’ there cannot be) a Council of the united (undivided Universal Church) in common with them!”

“As far as the Seventh Council is concerned,” continues Hieromonk Nectarius, “not only did it not consider the iconoclasts to be a part of the Church, but they themselves did not pretend to be such.” In support of this statement, Fr. Nectarius quotes from the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council. “These are the words of the uniting iconoclasts. Thus Basil, bishop of Ancyra, said: ‘As far as I was able, I investigated the question of the icons and converted to the Holy Catholic Church with complete conviction.’ Theodore, bishop of Myra, said: ‘... I beseech God and your holiness to unite me, the sinful one, to the Holy Catholic Church.’ (pp. 41, 43 in the edition of the Kazan Theological Academy).”

And here are the witnesses of the holy Fathers of the Council: “His Holiness Patriarch Tarasius said: ‘What is now to be our relationship to this heresy that has again arisen in our time?’ John, the most beloved of God, locum tenens of the apostolic throne in the east, said: ‘Heresy divides every man from the Church.’ The Holy Council said: ‘That is evident.’ The Holy Council said: ‘Let the bishops who are standing before us read their renunciations, insofar as they are now converting to the Catholic Church.’” (p. 48).

225 Yashunsky, Ekklesiologicheskie Antitezisy (Ecclesiological Antitheses) (MS).
Thirdly, the exceptional importance of Ecumenical or “Unifying” Councils should not lead us to cast doubt on local Councils’ authority to expel heretics from the Church. Many of the heretics of the early centuries were first cast out of the Church by local Councils. For example, Arius was cast out by a local Council presided over by St. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, in 321 and again in 323 (the First Ecumenical Council did not take place until 325). Again, local Councils convened at Rome condemned the Nestorians (under Pope St. Celestine), the Monothelites (under Pope St. Martin) and the Iconoclasts (under Pope Gregory III) – in each case before the convening of the Third, Sixth and Seventh Ecumenical Councils, which never disputed the validity of these local Councils, but rather confirmed their decisions.

Thus when the heretical bishop Theodosius in conversation with St. Maximus the Confessor disputed the validity of the local Council under St. Martin that condemned the Monothelites on the grounds that it was not convened by an emperor, St. Maximus replied that the validity of a Council depended on its recognising “the true and immutable dogmas”, not on who convened it or how general it was. Again, when the same saint was asked in the Emperor’s palace why he was not in communion with the Throne of Constantinople, he replied: “… They have been deposed and deprived of the priesthood at the local council which took place recently in Rome. What Mysteries, then, can they perform? Or what spirit will descend upon those who are ordained by them?”

Again, Bishop Theophan the Recluse points out that before the beginning of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, its president-to-be, St. Tarasius, bewailed the fact that “we (the iconoclastic Church of Constantinople) are being anathematised by them (the other Local Churches in Local Councils) every day”.

If local Councils did not have the authority to expel heretics from the Church, we should have to condemn many local Councils for exceeding their competency and assuming an authority that did not belong to them. These would include many of the Councils of the Early Church, which expelled such heretics as Marcion and Sabellius; the local Councils of the Great Church of Constantinople between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries that expelled the Roman Catholics; and the Councils of the Russian Church presided over by Patriarch Tikhon that anathematized the communists and their co-workers in 1918 and the renovationist heretics in 1923. However, the Church, which has the mind of Christ, has accepted all of these acts as lawful and valid. To think otherwise is to suppose that for the last several hundred years the Church has – God forbid! - lost her God-given power to bind and to loose since the convening of the last Ecumenical or Pan-Orthodox Council!

228 For the Cyprianite position, see Patrick Barker, op. cit. For criticism of the Cyprianite ecclesiology, see Holy Transfiguration Monastery, The Struggle against Ecumenism, pp. 112-120; V.
The danger to which the false Cyprianite ecclesiology exposes its followers can be seen from the behaviour of one of Cyprian’s bishops, Chrysostomos (Gonzales) of Etna, California. On July 18, 1986 he wrote an open letter to the new calendar Archbishop James (Koukouzis) in which he said that his synod had cut itself off from the rest of the Old Calendar Church because it believed that the new calendar church was the mother church. “We never denied the existence of the Grace in our Mother Church” – that is, the new calendar church. And then he went on to say: “We are not another Church over and above the Mother Church”. He congratulated James on “his many accomplishments” and hoped that there would one day figure among his “many accomplishments” “the bringing of your Orthodox brethren (Old Calendarists) together with you” (where?). And he ended his open letter by saying: “I the youngest and least among the traditionalist bishops in this country, ask your forgiveness for any involuntary offense and humbly kiss your right hand.”

Such treachery against the Old Calendarists could not go unpunished, and on November 5/18, 1986, Archbishop Chrysostom’s Synod proceeded to defrock Metropolitan Cyprian and “John of Sardinia, and those ordained by them, to wit: a) Chrysostomom Gonzales (Mexican), b) Niphon Gigoundou (Kenyan), c) Chrysostom Kouskoutsopoulos, d) Chrysostom Marlasis and three more, that is: one Swedish, one Italian and one Austrian of whom their identities are unknown to us, all of whom compose the innovative "Holy Synod of Resistance”. The Cyprianites were deposed for creating a schism, for giving communion to new calendarists (“because he without discernment gives the Holy Mysteries of our Church to modernizing, schismatic and ecumenist new calendarists”) and for preaching that the new calendarists have grace of sacraments (“because he has fallen from the Orthodox faith… and embraced ecumenist false beliefs, namely, that the schismatic new-calendarists make up the unaltered One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church., which is the treasury of saving grace”). The judgement was signed by Archbishop Chrysostomos and Metropolitan Gerontius, Callinicus (of Thaumakou), Anthony (of Attica and Megara), Maximus (of Demetrias and Magnesia), Callinicus (of Achaia), Matthew (of Oinoe), Calliopius (of Pentapolis), Callinicus (of the Dodecanese), Euthymius (of Thessalonica), Stephanos (of Chios), Athanasius (of Acharnae) and Justin (of Euboea).

The judgement points out that in September, 1984, after Cyprian had prayed with the ecumenist Patriarch Nicholas he had been summoned to give an account of himself, but had not appeared. Then, on September 19, he had been banned from serving for 40 days, but had continued to serve. Finally, on April 5, 1985 Cyprian and Giovanni of Sardinia had formed their own Synod and separated from the GOC Synod. The Cyprianites contested the decision on procedural

---

grounds, in that they had not been given notification of the trial, on factual grounds, in that they had not concelebrated with Patriarch Nicholas, and on canonical grounds, in that they could not be judged by the Chrysostomites anyway since they had never formed part of their Synod.

This latter defence was very weak. The “Florinite” bishops as a whole formed a single group, in spite of schisms. If Florinates could not judge Florinates, then who – the new calendarists?!

More serious was the criticism that if Cyprian was defrocked for giving communion to new calendarists, why not Peter of Astoria also, since he also gave communion to new calendarists, considering them to be Orthodox? In answer to that it could be pointed out that Cyprian was also defrocked for heresy (the word is mentioned several times in the judgement), the heresy of ecumenism. In fact, he had developed a whole ecclesiological theory, a subtle variant on ecumenism – a charge that could not be leveled at Bishop Petros.

Nevertheless, the problem with Bishop Petros was becoming more acute. In May, 1994, Archimandrite Paul Stratigeas, Peter’s nephew and chancellor of the diocese of Astoria, admitted in an interview to the New York National Herald: “I provide the Mysteries to the followers of the new calendar.” However, Archimandrite Paul sincerely repented, and later, as Metropolitan of Astoria in succession to Peter, decreed that new calendarists who came to church seeking communion must first have confession, and then, during confession, be instructed that they must repent of the heresies of the new calendarists and receive Chrismation.

In 1997 ROCOR Archpriest Lev Lebedev had a debate with the Cyprianites, which, he wrote, “concerned a very important matter. The Synod of the Resisters of Metropolitan Cyprian has officially declared that the ecumenist churches are also grace-filled and the sacraments there valid. I understood (in the debate) 230 Bishop Ambrose wrote: “You also mention the fact that Archbishop Chrysostomos’ Synod apparently deposed our Metropolitan in 1986. As now, almost twenty years later, no such document has ever been communicated to us, we are still in the dark. All we have seen is a text printed in their periodical, but the four then members of their Synod whom we asked (Petros of Astoria, Gerontios of Piraeus, Antonios of Attika, and Euthymios of Thessaloniki) all said that no such text had ever been shown to them, nor had they signed it; they regarded the whole affair as an invention of the personal animosity of Kalliopios.” (personal communication, August 12, 2005) 231 Bishop Ambrose of Methone wrote: “The accusation of ‘praying with the ecumenist Patriarch Nicholas’ is delightfully absurd. As I was present, I can witness what happened: One Sunday, when the Liturgy had already begun, the door of the altar opened and in tottered, totally unexpected, Patriarch Nicholas of Alexandria. He sat there until the end (he was by then almost blind) and in the sermon the Metropolitan mentioned his presence and expressed a prayer that God would enlighten him to condemn the ecumenist heresy – otherwise no-one outside would have known he was there. Afterwards he tottered off again. Should we have thrown the old man down the steps? When one reaches such a level of silliness, how can one take anything seriously? As to the 40 days’ suspension, we knew nothing of such a decision until afterwards, when I was given a copy of the document in Kenya, of all places, by a priest of Paisios, the rev. David Palchikoff, who had been given it by Bishop Vikentios during his visit to Africa a few weeks before.” (personal communication, November 10, 2005)
better and deeper what they wanted to say. And they to a large extent took in my criticism. Vladyka Cyprian referred in particular to the opinion of our Hieromartyr Cyril of Kazan, and affirmed that the sacraments are valid, but are to the condemnation of the conscious ecumenists, but are saving for the simple, ignorant people. But I said that insofar as, in this way, the grace of God works differently in the ecumenist churches from in the Orthodox who reject heresy, the Synod of Resisters must not and cannot make official declarations, neither about the presence of grace nor about the lack of grace in these churches. It is sufficient that he on principle has no Eucharistic communion with them and reproaches ecumenism as a heresy. Otherwise, the result is a great temptation for the Orthodox (especially in Russia) and a whole series of theoretical theological misunderstandings. The debate is not over. But I am prepared to ascribe the mistake of the Synod of Cyprian to the realm of ‘personal theological opinions’, which does not destroy my unity with them, since on the whole Cyprian himself and all his bishops and monks are undoubtedly people who think and live in a very Orthodox way!”

Metropolitans Cyprian and John “proceeded to consecrate new bishops for their self-styled ‘Synod of Those in Resistance’. Unfortunately, many of the newly-consecrated bishops for the Cyprianite Synod were of similar ill-repute as their consecrators. Among the first Cyprianite bishops to be consecrated were Chrysostom (Mariasis) of Christianoupolis, Ambrose (Baird) of Methone, Michael (Pirenta) of Nora, and Symeon (Minihofer) of Lampsacus. This latter bishop, among others, has a very interesting history. Born Helmut Clemens Kyrillus Symeon Minihofer-Windisch, he was ordained and consecrated by bishops of the so-called ‘American Orthodox Catholic Church’ – a Roman Catholic organization of Brazilian origin, in schism from the Vatican. In 1978, he was elected as ‘Patriarch’ Cyril of the ‘American Orthodox Catholic Church’, though he resided in Switzerland. ‘Patriarch’ Cyril resigned from his position in 1985, and was accepted into the ‘Synod of Those in Resistance’ under Bishop Cyprian, who installed him as Symeon, the titular bishop of Lampsacus.

“At some point during this time, a certain Bishop Eulogius of Milan (formerly of the ‘Lisbonite’ schism) was accepted into the ‘Synod of Those in Resistance’, in which he assisted Bishop Cyprian in performing more consecrations. Among the new bishops consecrated were Chrysostom (Gonzales) of Etna, Niphon (Kigundu) of Uganda, Auxentius (Chapman) of Photike, Photius (Siromachov) of Triaditsa, and Chrysostom (Alemangos) of Sydney. Unfortunately, all of these bishops have the same typical defects as their consecrators: they are either unacceptable on canonical grounds or confess an ecclesiology that is contrary to the teachings of the Orthodox Church.”

---
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57. ROCOR BEGINS TO CRACK

“After my death,” said St. Philaret of New York, “our beloved Church abroad will break three ways ... first the Greeks will leave us as they were never a part of us ... then those who live for this world and its glory will go to Moscow ... what will remain will be those souls faithful to Christ and His Church.”\(^\text{234}\)

Let us see how the first schism took place...

Metropolitans Acacius of Diauleia and Gabriel of the Cyclades had refrained from joining the Synod under Archbishop Chrysostom, and in a publication entitled An End to Silence (1986) they fiercely criticised their former colleague’s agreement to become archbishop.

In retrospect, and in view of the collapse of the Synod again in 1995, it must be admitted that there was some justice in their criticism. The problems in the dioceses of Thessalonica and Astoria had not been resolved, and would not be resolved in the period 1985-1995. On the other hand, it could be argued that someone had to lead the remnants of the former Auxentiite Synod, and such a leader had to come from one of Metropolitans Acacius, Gabriel and Chrysostom, who alone had not participated in the sins of that Synod.

And it was now the turn of Metropolitans Acacius and Gabriel to make a mistake, when, early in 1987, they received under their omophorion 40 mainly Greek-American parishes led by the Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Boston.

When Metropolitan Philaret died on November 21, 1985, the Boston monastery immediately expressed its support for his successor, Metropolitan Vitaly (Ustinov), Thus on February 10, Archimandrite Panteleimon wrote: "The Synodal Church is a real standard of Orthodoxy.... Therefore, discerning where the Truth is found, we remain in unity under our bishops in the midst of many trials and temptations...because grace abides in the Synod.... We uphold our Synod primarily and foremostly as a standard of Orthodoxy. All others have betrayed the Truth. This was demonstrated of late by the election of our new Metropolitan.”\(^\text{235}\)

However, the same council which elected Metropolitan Vitaly also, writes Fr. Alexey Young, “appointed a special commission of two bishops to visit the Boston monastery and begin a private investigation into charges of sexual perversion. The commission presented its report at a meeting of the Synod on May 29, 1986, receiving testimony in person from four monks who had left the Holy Transfiguration Monastery. Fr. Panteleimon was present and denied the

\(^{234}\) Fr. John Mahon, in Facebook, 8 October, 2016, on the basis of the testimony of Fr. Vladimir Shishkoff and Matushka Maria Shishkoff.

\(^{235}\) Fr. Alexey Young, The Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia, San Bernardino, CA: the Borgo Press, 1993, pp. 75-76.
charges, but asked to be relieved of his position as abbot. The bishops granted his request, placing the monastery temporarily under Archbishop Anthony (Sinkevich) of Los Angeles and Southern California. The monks at the monastery in Boston, however, ignored this and elected one of their own – another monk who had also been charged with immorality – as abbot.

“For the next several months, information and testimony continued to be gathered, with no predetermination of Panteleimon’s guilt or innocence. Looking back, the bishops may well feel that they should have hastened the investigation, for, during this period of time, an unprecedented explosion of protest erupted from the supporters of Fr. Panteleimon. The bishops were bombarded by hundreds of letters, petitions, phone calls, and personal visits – all of them protesting their ‘Elder’s’ innocence and the unfair, even ‘un-American’ way in which they believed his case was being handled.236

“Simultaneously, Fr. Panteleimon began to make public his own list of grievances, announcing that the bishops were, practically speaking, abandoning the Anathema against Ecumenism and beginning to compromise the Faith. Secret plans and negotiations, he charged, were being worked out with the Moscow Patriarchate so that the Church Abroad could unite with the Mother Church by 1988 (the millennium of the Baptism of Russia). According to Panteleimon, this meant that the hierarchs had become, or were in the process of becoming, heresiarchs, and that the faithful had better look to their souls! This was a complete reversal of his published views of only months before.

“On November 25, 1986, Metropolitan Vitaly was asked by the Synod of Bishops to suspend Fr. Panteleimon and the abbot [Isaac] who had been uncanonically elected to succeed him, pending a canonical trial.237 This was done

236 Archbishop Anthony wrote: “Fr. Panteleimon mentions the accusation that their monastery was in a demonic cult and that the investigation by the Synod was not finished. In fact, a thorough investigation was carried out by two hierarchs and both Fr. Panteleimon himself and ten witnesses were interrogated. When the former monks who had suffered were presenting their evidence, Fr. Panteleimon was completely besides himself and, losing his self-possession, shouted to the witnesses: ‘Stop, don’t speak!’ There were 35 monastics in the monastery, and its external appearance was attractive: services every night, Greek chanting, everyone in monastic clothes and everyone receiving communion every night. However, something terrible was revealed. In the whole monastery only eight were Greeks, the rest were mainly Americans, converts from Protestantism, with an unknown or dubious past; among them were young ones and ones who had absolutely no knowledge of the spiritual life, nor of the Orthodox faith. Fr. Panteleimon had seduced them, and some sincerely believed his words that the sin of homosexuality is approved in Orthodoxy. After unnatural orgies everyone received communion. Fr. Panteleimon very quickly tonsured those entering the monastery, and therefore the external appearance of the monastery was deceptive. When the investigation was undertaken, Fr. Panteleimon gave us to understand that Greek Old Calendarist hierarchs had invited him to come over to them and that for that reason we could ‘lose’ the whole monastery. In violation of the rules of the Church Abroad, Fr. Panteleimon had not registered the monastery as being in the jurisdiction of our Synod, and for that reason, understanding that our Synod would not approve of what was happening, he left the Church Abroad together with all its property.” (Letter to V.R., March 25 / April 7, 1995). (V.M.)

237 The suspensions were in accordance with rule 159 of Peter the Great’s Regulations of the Spiritual Consistories: “A clergyman who has been accused of a crime is to be suspended from
on December 3; nine days later, Vitaly received a letter announcing that the monastery in Boston had left the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia and was taking refuge under an unnamed Greek Old Calendar bishop. Synod headquarters immediately declared this action to be ‘... a flagrant violation of the holy canons of the Church and... an attempt to avoid the consequences of any final decision a spiritual court might have made concerning the accusations [of immorality]... [This is an attempt] to flee from the spiritual authority of the Church’s hierarchy...’

In their defence, the Bostonites declared that they were fleeing the ecumenism of ROCOR, its relapse into its former lax ways in relation to the “World Orthodox” only a few years after the anathema against ecumenism...

This anathema, as we have seen, was signed by all the ROCOR bishops and was entered into the Synodicon to be read on the Sunday of Orthodoxy each year. This was the achievement, within the Synod, especially of Metropolitan Philaret, the righteousness of whose stand against ecumenism and the MP was revealed on November 8/21, 1998, when his body was found to be incorrupt. However, he found very little support among his fellow-bishops, and was only rarely able to impose his will, especially on the West European diocese under Archbishop Anthony of Geneva, from which several priests and parishes fled in the 1970s. Even with the more conservative hierarchs he sometimes had problems. Thus he once ordered the sprinkling with holy water of the church in the Monastery of the Holy Trinity, Jordanville, after Archbishop Averky had permitted Copts to serve there.

After Metropolitan Philaret’s death, a certain weakening in the confession of ROCOR was discernible, even if the contrast between the period before and after the metropolitan’s death was not as sharp as the Bostonites made it out to be. Thus early in 1986 Archbishop Anthony of Geneva openly declared his recognition of World Orthodoxy and blessed the French Mission of ROCOR under Archimandrite Ambroise (Frontier) to concelebrate with the new calendarists when they were in Greece, but not with the Old Calendarists.

They considered this to be contrary to the 1983 anathema and wrote to him: “In sending your clergy to concelebrate with the ecumenists or new calendarists, you place them under this anathema, which is a grave error... When you say that your clergy who desire to concelebrate with the ecumenists or new calendarists serving... The order for this to be done is entrusted to the local Bishop, who is obligated to take care that those who are accused of grave violation of good conduct according to God’s laws not approach to serve before the Altar of the Lord.” Also, a commission was appointed to investigate the charges of immorality against Fr. Isaac, and Hieromonk Justin was appointed as temporary administrator of the monastery. Justin later left the monastery, convinced of Panteleimon’s guilt.

238 The letter was dated November 25 / December 7. (V.M.)
239 Young, op. cit., pp. 77-78.
must, beforehand, ask for your blessing, you remind (us) of a father of a family,
who would permit his children who would wish to throw themselves into the fire,
to do so.”

Again, in October, 1986, at a clergy conference of the Midwest Diocese, Bishop Alypius of Cleveland, standing next to the icon of the Mother of God of Kursk, declared that “in spite of all the difficulties occurring throughout world-wide Orthodoxy, our Synod of Bishops of the Russian Church Abroad does not judge any other jurisdiction as being without grace or in heresy.”

Still more seriously, in his Christmas Epistle of 1986/87, Archbishop Vitaly issued an Epistle declaring that the 1983 anathema was not of universal significance, but applied only to ecumenist members of ROCOR. Of course, the anathema was issued by a Local Council, not an Ecumenical one. But, as we have seen, this by no means meant that, as Vitaly and the opponents of the anathema were trying to say, the anathema in fact had no power over anyone outside ROCOR – which was equivalent, in effect, to annulling it. The Bostonites seized on this as evidence of the fall of ROCOR. But since the epistle was published only after their departure, it was not direct justification of that departure...

In the opinion of the present writer, on the one hand the Bostonites did have a prima facie case for leaving ROCOR on the grounds of betrayal of the anathema against ecumenism. Moreover, it is clear that this was the decisive issue for many of the rank-and-file clergy and laity who followed them. On the other hand, the timing of the departure, the haste with which they left, and the abundant evidence of moral transgressions, makes it likely that the issue of ecumenism was not the real reason for the leaders’ flight, but rather a fig-leaf to cover their fear of conviction at their forthcoming trial.

This is confirmed by Fr. (later Metropolitan) Anthony Gavalas: “My position when we left the Synod was that we should commemorate no-one until we saw our way clearly in the confusion. I was told that while this would be possible for the monastery, it would be destructive to the Parishes. Then, within a few hours, we were told that we must all go under Archbishop Acacius immediately so that the monastery would be covered in the face of suspensions and depositions of Frs. Panteleimon and Isaac, and I, of course, cooperated.”

Among the hierarchs, only Bishop Gregory (Grabbe) supported the Boston monks. The Synod, he believed had acted hastily in relation both to them and to his son, Archimandrite Anthony, who had been defrocked.

246 The reason, according to Bishop Gregory, was his opposition to Vitaly’s plans to sell the
Bishop Gregory was promptly sacked from his post of Secretary of the ROCOR Synod after over fifty years work at the centre of the Church administration. This was contrary to the advice of both of the deputy-presidents of the Synod, Archbishops Anthony of Geneva and Seraphim of Chicago. It led directly to the domination of the pro-Moscow party in ROCOR. Thus from 1986 there began a “purging of the cadres”, in the course of which the leading opponents of the union with Moscow were removed and replaced by pro-Moscow ecumenists. The leaders of the pro-Moscow clique were Bishops Mark, Lavr and Hilarion. There can be little doubt, then, that the accession to power of Metropolitan Vitaly did not bring about a kind of “revolution” in ROCOR. Certainly, the last remaining elders in ROCOR, Igumen Ignaty of Hebron and Archimandrite Nektary of Eleon, bewailed it.247

In May, 1994 Bishop Gregory wrote to Metropolitan Vitaly: “For a very long time now in fact, since the first days of your leadership of our Church Abroad I have with great anxiety and turmoil of heart been tracing how quickly she has begun to slide into the abyss of administrative disorder and canonical chaos… Our woes began with the first Hierarchical Council to take place after the death of Metropolitan Philaret… On the disorganization of our Chancellery I can judge from a series of signs. Thus I was sent from Russia copies of your letters to Archbishop Lazarus and Bishop Valentine. First, I very soon managed to find out that these documents were unknown to both Secretaries of the Synod, to whom I handed over these copies. Moreover, the very subject of these letters, by the delicacy of their content, demanded their presentation by you for discussion in the Hierarchical Synod. But it turned out that the letters were not only dispatched without the knowledge of the Secretaries, but also had a whole series of other defects which quite clearly demonstrated the bankruptcy of your personal Chancellery. Although Russian notepaper was available, the letters to Russia were sent on English notepaper; they not only had no numbers, but even no dates. In the letter to Archbishop Lazarus there was no indication of whom it was being sent to, while Bishop Valentine’s title was incomplete. Finally, the very text of the letters was by no means brilliant grammatically and stylistically. Moreover, it also emerged (which is especially terrible) that at the bottom of both letters was not your signature in your own hand, but a facsimile!

247 Isaac Gindis, personal communication.
Bishop Gregory concludes crushingly: “For all the years of the existence of the Church Abroad we have enjoyed respect and glory for nothing else than for our uncompromising faithfulness to the canons. They hated us, but they did not dare not to respect us. But now we have shown the whole Orthodox world that the canons are for us just an empty sound and we have become a laughing-stock in the eyes of all those who have any kind of relationship to Church questions. Look: you yourself, at the Council in Lesna, permitted yourself to say that for us, the participants in it, this was not now the time to examine canons, but we had to act quickly. You, holding the tiller of the ecclesiastical ship, triumphantly, in front of the whole Council, declared to us that now we had to hasten to sail without a rudder and without sails. At that time your words appalled me, but I, knowing of your irritation towards me because I insist that we have to live in accordance with the canons, still hoped that all was not lost and that our Bishops would somehow shake off the whole nightmare of these last years. Think, Vladyko, of the tens of thousands of Orthodox people we have deceived both abroad and in Russia. Don’t calm yourself with the thought that if there is some guilt somewhere, then it lies equally on all our hierarchs. The main guilt will lie on you, as the leader of our Council. I have had to hear from some Bishops that sometimes the Synod decrees one thing, and then you, taking no account of previous resolutions, on your own initiative either change them or simply rescind them. And look now, as has already become quite well known, after the stormy March session of the Synod, it dispersed without making a single resolution. During it the question was discussed of banning the Russian Hierarchs from serving. Nevertheless, you demanded that the Secretariat that it send off an ukaz banning bishops who were not even under investigation. Both from the point of view of the 34th Apostolic canon, and from an ecclesiastical-administrative point of view, this is unprecedented lawlessness. Remember, Vladyko, your reproachful speech against Metropolitan Philaret, when in 1985 you for ten minutes non-stop fulminated against him for transgressing the 34th Apostolic canon. The crimes of Metropolitan Philaret seem to me to be miniscule by comparison with what is happening now.”

Patrick Barrett considers that the schism between ROCOR and the “Bostonites” could have been avoided if Bishop Gregory had still been at the helm: “Both Father Panteleimon and Father Isaac were prepared to step aside. True panic only hit the monastery and the parishes allied to it when the Synod refused to allow Father Justin to be named acting abbot. That’s when people began to believe that the synod’s true purpose was to seize the monastery. Then people began to think, well, they’ve eliminated Bishop Gregory and now they’re going after Father Panteleimon, so they’re obviously trying to take out everybody who opposes union with the MP. Bishop Gregory could have handled this situation easily. In fact, many of the people who ended up leaving ROCOR in 1986 were calling Bishop Gregory hoping for help or reassurance, but who was Bishop Gregory? By then, he was nobody to the Synod. Bishop Gregory had moral authority with the

monastery and those parishes, with his help, the synod could even have removed Fathers Panteleimon and Isaac and still not lost the monastery and parishes.”

Be that as it may, the Bostonites fled to the protection of the Greek Old Calendarist Metropolitans Acacius and Gabriel. They were undoubtedly True Orthodox... However, in 1987, 39 of the 40 parishes left the two metropolitans giving no canonical reason and came under the omophorion of Auxentius.

Now it may be asked: why did the Bostonites not join Auxentius in the first place? The answer is clear: the crimes of Auxentius were known to Panteleimon, and more than one person who knew him well has testified that for several years before he joined Auxentius he considered him to be a traitor to Orthodoxy. It was because of this strongly expressed rejection of Auxentius that the Bostonites did not join him at the beginning, but instead joined the two independent metropolitans, who were not tainted with Auxentius' crimes.

So far, an argument can be adduced in defence of the Bostonites' actions. But then why, only six months later, did they leave the two metropolitans and join Auxentius? Because Metropolitan Gabriel, disturbed by the accusations against Panteleimon, had separated from Metropolitan Acacius. This meant that the Bostonites now had no possibility of achieving one of their principal aims – a bishop or bishops of their own for America. Auxentius’ Synod, on the other hand, was notoriously willing to consecrate new bishops. So it became expedient to keep silent about Auxentius’ crimes (which, according to witnesses, Fr. Panteleimon had been more than willing to condemn in previous years), and to seek refuge in this most unsafe haven.

That the Bostonites were seeking of their bishop of their own is evident from a letter of Fr. Niketas Palassis to Fr. Anthony Gavalas: “Frankly, we were stunned and sorrowed by Metropolitan Gabriel’s departure. Actually, it appeared we had been detoured and led into a dead-end street. Without a second bishop to give us support and credibility, we face the prospect of being one of the hundreds of vaganti groups which flood our nation. Without at least a second bishop we can have no hope that the clergymen who are watching us so carefully will ever join with us. Conversations with several of them have confirmed that fact. They are not attracted to us with a single bishop…”

Further proof is provided by the letter of the Bostonites’ secretary, dated July 2/15, 1987 to Metropolitan Acacius, in which he writes: “It is evident to all that without a hierarch who knows both English and Greek and who has sufficient theological training, the flock in America, which is constituted of both English and Greek-speaking faithful, cannot be properly served.” However, it was obvious that their bishop’s not knowing English was not a canonical reason for leaving him. So the Bostonites invented another reason: in the last six months, they said, they had “formed a more precise picture of ecclesiastical matters which

---

– to an especially greater extent in recent times – have become obscured under
the prism of subjective judgements, or unverified information, and this because
of the difficulties of communication between the New World and Greece. Thus,
they have arrived at the conclusion and conviction that, today, the reasons for
your position of protest and voluntary absence from the meetings of the Synod of
Archbishop Auxentios have ceased.”

These statements are extremely vague – we are given no idea of what new
facts emerged that could so radically change their opinion of Auxentius and
prove his innocence. In truth, there were no such facts. The Bostonites were
thoroughly acquainted with the Church situation in Greece; it was not new
knowledge that had changed the situation but the departure of Metropolitan
Gabriel from their Church.

Another Bostonite argument was that since Metropolitan Acacius had stated
both that “if you are able to find hierarchs who have Apostolic succession, you
should turn to them”, and that “the judgement, the choice and the formulation of
your future course depends on you”252, this meant that he had blessed them to
join Auxentius. But Metropolitan Acacius’ extremely negative attitude towards
Auxentius was well known to all. It was obvious that by a “hierarch who has
Apostolic succession” he did not mean Auxentius.

Thus on hearing that they were going to invite Auxentius to their conference
in Worcester, Massachusetts in July, 1987, he wrote: “While we were preserving
vividly and indelibly the wonderful image of all that we had seen and heard
during our recent visit to your Orthodox parishes, suddenly the information
came, like a lightning bolt out of a clear sky, that a few of your spiritual leaders
are thinking of going under the irrevocably fallen former Archbishop Auxentius.

“We hope that it is only some malicious rumour designed to defame your
Orthodox ecclesiastical communities before all Orthodox everywhere and to
render futile the struggle you have waged on behalf of the strictness of
Orthodoxy. That is what we believe, for only the utmost madness and morbid
recklessness would otherwise explain the subjugation of a Movement on behalf of
piety and the preservation of the traditional genuineness of our Holy Orthodoxy
under a leader who so tragically failed and brought the Church of the True
Orthodox in Greece into contempt and disrepute.

“A multitude of uncanonical actions and illegal ordinations done with
supreme disdain for the authority of our Holy Church, the ungodfearing
trampling down of the Sacred Canons, and the devious manner of the ‘ordination
to the episcopate’ of the piteous and miserable Dorotheus Tsakos render
Auxentius guilty before Divine and human justice, as well as before the impartial
and unbribable judgement of history itself.

252 Letter of Metropolitan Acacius to Protopresbyter Panagiotes Carras and the most venerable
“Can it be that you seek refuge in such a wreckage of a house? Shudder, O sun, and groan, O earth! If that be the case, you will with your own hands destroy your own work and raze your spiritual edifices to the ground. Moreover, you offer to your enemies unexpected arguments against yourselves. These are much more powerful than the arguments with which they presently seek to sully the reputation of the pious and virtuous clergymen who, at the present moment, stand at the head of your struggle!

“And, above all, such a thoughtless and frivolous action will sever the unity of your ecclesiastical communities because those among you whose souls have a more acute sense of smell will not be able to tolerate the stench of that devious failure Auxentius’ condemned and illegal actions.

“It is out of a pained heart that we write the above so that the beacon of Orthodoxy will not be so ignominiously extinguished, the beacon which is lit by the strictness of your Orthodoxy and your blameless ecclesiastical ethos.

“And besides, as long as you came freely and unconstrained by anyone and committed the episcopal supervision of your parishes to me, I condemn any discussions with Auxentius as divisive acts and I advise you to cut them off completely.

“Do not forget that ‘he who acts in secret from his bishops serves the devil’, according to St. Ignatius the Godbearer…”253

However, the Bostonites concealed the letter of their archpastor from his flock and, to the great distress of many clergy and laity, removed almost all their parishes from the jurisdiction of a true bishop to that of a condemned schismatic, giving no canonical justification whatsoever for their act.

In December, the former French mission of ROCOR in Paris, led by Archimandrite Ambroise Frontier, left the Chrysostomites because of dissatisfaction with a priest in the south of France and followed the Bostonites under Auxentius’ omophorion.254 Before his death in 1994, Auxentius ordained several bishops for this group, who now call themselves “The Holy Orthodox Church in North America” (HOCNA). And so Auxentius’ Church, which had almost died out in Greece, received a new lease of life.

---


254 The present writer’s parish in England was being served by the French mission at this time. When he protested to Fr. Ambroise that he felt he had no good canonical reason for following Ambroise out of the Chrysostomite Synod, Fr. Ambroise said to him: “Yes, you have no good reason; you should stay.”
Auxentius proceeded to acquit the Bostonite leaders of homosexuality.²⁵⁵ But Fr. Anthony Gavalas wrote: “Given Archbishop Auxentius’ toleration, at least, of homosexuals in his own jurisdiction, of what use will be an exoneration signed by him? Will it not allow our enemies to say that the monastery is guilty and so placed itself in a jurisdiction tolerant of such violations?”

He was not far off the mark, and in 2012 Abbot Isaac admitted publicly that the charges against Fr. Panteleimon were true... This, together with HOCNA’s embracing of the name-worshipping theory, led to most of HOCNA’s clergy and parishes leaving and joining the Florinite Old Calendarists under Archbishop Kallinikos of Athens...

In the second half of the 1980s Pope John Paul II began to raise the tempo of ecumenism still further. While remaining conservative in his moral teaching, he showed himself to be an extreme radical in his dogmatic teaching. While trashing Marxism in his native Poland, he showed himself extremely accommodating to the theist enemies of Christianity. Thus in 1985 he blessed the publication, by the Vatican’s Pontifical “Commission for Union with Non-Christians”, of a twelve-page document containing new directives “for a correct presentation of Jews and Judaism in sermons and in the catechism of the Catholic Church”. The twelfth paragraph of this document declared: “Heeding the same God, Who has spoken on the foundation of the same word (that the Jews have), we must bear witness according to the same remembrance and with a common hope in Him Who is the Lord of history. Therefore it is necessary for us to take upon ourselves the obligation to prepare the world for the coming of the Messiah, working together for social justice, for the respect of the rights of the human personality, and of the nation, and of international social reconstruction. The law of love for one’s neighbour, the common hope of the Kingdom of God, and the great heritage of the prophets motivate us, both Christians and Jews, to do this. Such a conception, taught sufficiently early through the catechism, would educate young Christians for a cooperation and collaboration with the Jews which would exceed the limits of simple dialogue.”\textsuperscript{256} It would indeed, for it would involve Catholics becoming Jews, awaiting the same “Messiah” that the Jews are waiting for – that is, the Antichrist!...

Then, in 1986 the Pope invited the leaders of all the world’s religions to pray for “peace in our time” in Assisi.

“One on the joint prayers in Assisi (Italy) we have documentary films. How useful it would be to show them to the zealots of ‘Orthodoxy Soviet-style’! Behind the tribune there followed, one after the other, Catholics, Protestants, African idolaters in war-paint, Red Indians in feathers, an invoker of snakes, the Dalai Lama, who confesses himself to be a god, Metropolitan Philaret [Denisenko] of the Moscow Patriarchate, and many, many others, raising up prayers behind the tribune – each in his own style: the Red Indian smoked the pipe of peace, the invoker of snakes brought his cobra. And over all this there ruled, as the chief pagan priest, the Pope of Rome, whom the whole of this multi-coloured crowd in feathers, tattoos, loin-cloths and metropolitan mitres came up to greet in a luxurious, colourful and unending queue – over which there hovered, unseen, the ‘positive relationship’ and blessing of Patriarch Pimen...”\textsuperscript{257}

\textsuperscript{257} Obnovlentsy i Moskovskaya Patriarkhia: preemstvo ili evoliutsia? (The Renovationists and the Moscow Patriarchate: succession or evolution?), Suzdal, 1997, p. 15. In September, 1998 the Pope said: “Through the practice of what is good in their own religious traditions, and following the dictates of their consciences, members of other religions positively respond to God’s invitation, even though they may not recognize Him as their Saviour” (Vertograd (English edition), December, 1998, p. 11)
An Italian Catholic newspaper, *Si Si No No* wrote: “Never has our Lord been so outraged, never have His holy places been so profaned, His Vicar so humiliated, His people so scandalized by His own ministers, as at Assisi. The superstitions of the several false religions practised at Assisi pale by comparison with the betrayal of our Lord by these ministers. In St. Peter’s the bonzes adored the Dalai Lama (for them, a reincarnation of Buddha). In that church a statue of the Buddha was placed atop the Tabernacle on the main altar. In St. Gregory’s the Red Indians prepared their pipe of peace on the altar; in Santa Maria Maggiore’s, Hindus, sitting around the altar, invoked the whole range of Hindu gods; in Santa Maria degli Angeli’s, John-Paul II sat in a semi-circle of wholly identical seats amidst the heads of other religions so that there should be neither first nor last.”

Even as ecumenism reached its zenith, difficulties were encountered. The Pope, in particular, in spite of his extreme ecumenism, was having difficulties in his relations with the Jews, with the Anglicans and with the Orthodox, not to mention the liberal wing of his own confession. Thus in May, 1987, during his visit to Germany, the Pope planned to canonize Edith Stein, a Jewish convert to Catholicism who became a Carmelite nun and was tortured to death by the Nazis in Auschwitz. In memory of this new saint the Polish Carmelite Order decided to construct a small monastery on the site of the former concentration camp. But this aroused great fury among the Jews, who claimed that Auschwitz was “a Jewish monument” and that the canonization of a Jewish convert to Catholicism was “not particularly tactful”, since it implied that for the Pope only those Jews who converted to Catholicism were good. Eventually, the Jews dropped their objections to the canonization; but the nine Catholic nuns were forced to leave Auschwitz and abandon their plans of building a monastery there.

Again, difficulties arose in relations with the Anglicans because of the Anglican decision, in March, 1987, to allow women to serve as priests - in spite of the fact that it had been made quite clear to the Anglicans that their ordination of women priests would endanger ecumenical relations with the Orthodox and the Catholics. It demonstrated that the real inner dynamic of ecumenism is *not* the desire for union, but the desire for the new - that is, modernism and secularism in all its forms, including feminism. Although Rome remained committed to a male celibate priesthood, it, was affected by these modernist winds, as Malachi Martin wrote: “A peculiar piece of desecration of Christ’s Church is being committed by the anti-church in its fomenting of the feminist movement among female religious. Jesus, in his sufferings, had at least the consolation of knowing that the women among his followers did not scatter like scared rabbits, nor did they betray him. They stayed with him to the bitter end of Calvary. Today, the women’s movement in the Church, certainly allowed and in some cases

---

260 “Vatikan i Evrei” (The Vatican and the Jews), *Pravoslavnaia Rus’* (Orthodox Russia), № 8 (1340), April 15/28, 1987, p. 9.
encouraged by the anti-Church, is bent on desecrating the Body of the Church in the Sacrament, in the sacred vows of religion, in the precious function of priest, pastor and teacher. All this can be traced to the Judas complex, part of the mystery of iniquity that is now operating in high gear throughout the Roman Catholic institutional organization."

A third difficulty was the increasing tension in Catholic-Orthodox relations. These relations had reached a new high in November, 1987, when Patriarch Demetrius went to Rome and concelebrated with the Pope (up to but not including communion from a common chalice).262 At this point it seemed as if nothing could prevent the full union of the Orthodox Churches with Rome. But while the Pope’s ecumenism was welcome, his anti-communism was not – at least in the eyes of the KGB agents in cassocks who constituted the leaders of East European Orthodoxy.

Thus in 1986 Patriarch Pimen publicly criticised the Pope for criticising socialism and dialectical materialism. “We speak out,” he said, “for the cooperation of Christians, Marxists and all people of good will... which only increases our perplexity at those sections of the recent Encyclical of Pope John-Paul II, Dominum et vivificantam which are devoted to materialism and Marxist doctrine.... [The encyclical] contains elements directed towards the division and opposition of Christians and Marxists... In the encyclical an attempt is made to analyse the system of materialism... as an ideology... It is quite obvious that such a combined application of materialist doctrine to life can be found first of all in the socialist states and countries, which have chosen the socialist path of development... It is precisely in these countries that the creation of a new life by the efforts of believers and unbelievers working together is being realised... This reality, as we understand it, contradicts those positions of the encyclical in which it is affirmed that materialism as a system of thought has as its culmination – death... Insofar as ‘signs of death’ are indicated in relation ‘to the dark shadow of materialist civilisation’, the impression is created, in the context of a critique of Marxist doctrine, that in all this the states and people who follow the socialist path of development are guilty... It remains to express our profound sadness at such a position.”263

Even in an age distinguished by unheard-of betrayals of Orthodoxy, this amazes one by its audacity: the leader of the Russian Orthodox Church officially defending the doctrine of materialism!!!

A critical point was reached in the millennial year of the Baptism of Rus’ in 1988. Since the Baptism of Rus’ in 988 had taken place when the Eastern and Western Churches were in full communion, this festivity might have been expected to have ecumenical potential. However, the nationalist revival had

262 “Ο ‘Πατριάρχης’ Δημητριός συμπροσεύκθει και συλλειτουργεί με τους αιρετικούς” (Patriarch Demetrios prays together and liturgises with heretics), Agios Agathangelos Esphigmenitis (St. Agathangelos of Esphigmenou), № 104, November-December, 1988, pp. 10-44.
begun in the Baltic States, and the Russian secular and ecclesiastical authorities feared that if the Pope were invited to the country, his presence might provide a focus for separatist sentiment in the Baltic and Ukraine as it had in Poland earlier in the decade. So they offered him an invitation on condition he did not visit those areas. The offer was refused...

Encouraged by the radicalism of their “elder brother”, the Pope, Orthodox leaders plunged to new depths of apostasy. Thus in 1989 Patriarch Parthenius of Alexandria declared: “The prophet Mohammed is an apostle. He is a man of God, who worked for the Kingdom of God and created Islam, a religion to which belong one billion people... Our God is the Father of all men, even of the Muslims and Buddhists. I believe that God loves the Muslims and the Buddhists... When I speak against Islam or Buddhism, then I am not found in agreement with God... My God is the God of other men also. He is not only the God of the Orthodox. This is my position.”

A Greek newspaper fittingly commented on these words: “So ‘Mohammed is an apostle’ and the new-martyrs, then, are ‘not found in agreement with God!’”264 Another newspaper said: “He denies Christ and likens himself to Mohammed!”265 Which amounted, according to the theologian A.D. Delimbasis, to “the mortal sin of denial of one’s faith. Even were Patriarch Parthenius to repent of this, he can be accepted in the Orthodox Church only as a layman. ‘Should he repent, let him be received as a layman,’ says the Canon [Apostolic Canon 62].”266

The newspapers and theologians might criticise the patriarch’s blasphemy, but not one of the Local Orthodox Churches did. On the contrary: they seemed by their actions to express their approval of the Alexandrian patriarch’s conversion to Islam, and strove to imitate it. Thus Metropolitan Pitirim of Volokolamsk, the head of the MP’s publishing department, instead of using the new-found freedom of his Church to publish desperately needed Bibles and patristic literature, blessed the publication of – the Koran!

Extreme though Catholic ecumenism might be, it did not go so far as to include communism and dialectical materialism in its embrace. In fact, as we have seen, Pope John-Paul II played a part in the downfall of communism in his native Poland, and hence in the rest of Eastern Europe. The “honour” for taking ecumenism to the extreme even of embracing materialism belongs, unfortunately, not to the Catholics, but to the pseudo-Orthodox.
The only exception to this trend of Orthodox super-ecumenism in World Orthodoxy was Patriarch Diodorus of Jerusalem, who left the ecumenical movement on May 22, 1989, declaring with his Synod: “The Orthodox Church firmly believes that She possesses the full, complete truth and that She is the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, the repository of Divine Grace and Truth. She alone is the ark of security within which the unsullied teachings and sacred Tradition of the Faith are to be found and the fullness of their salvific character and expression. Further participation by the Orthodox in the dialogues is now becoming harmful, damaging and, indeed, dangerous. The non-Orthodox are taking advantage of these theological dialogues and are using these contacts against the Orthodox Church. Here in the Holy Land especially they are now saying, ‘Together with the Orthodox we are trying to find the truth.’ Thus, day after day they are increasingly successful in their proselytising and draw Orthodox believers into their ranks. The non-Orthodox are also showing photographs and video films to our people in which our representatives appear embracing the non-Orthodox and they tell our faithful: ‘the union of the churches has come; come to our churches for joint prayers.’ To such acts must also be added their tempting offers of houses (and housing is a pressing problem for the majority of the Arab population), offers of jobs and of financial assistance if the Orthodox will only join their religion. This draining away or, rather, bleeding of our Orthodox flock, but above all our primary desire and obligation to preserve the purity of the Orthodox Faith and Tradition from the dangerous activities of non-Orthodox has compelled us to put an end to the dialogues, not only with the Anglicans who for some time now have been ordaining women, but also with the Roman Catholics, the Lutherans, as well as with those Protestant denominations with whom the Church of Jerusalem has only more recently had theological dialogues.”

Patriarch Diodorus showed that he was serious by refusing to sign the agreement of Chambésy with the Monophysites in 1990; he strongly criticized the official intercommunion between the Antiochian and Alexandrian patriarchates and the Monophysites; and in 1992, at the meeting of the heads of the Orthodox Churches in Constantinople in 1992, he argued forcefully for breaking all dialogue with the Vatican. However, these objections were exceptions to the general rule, which was: the rapid spread, even beyond the increasingly porous iron curtain, of both inter-Christian and inter-faith Ecumenism…

---

59. ROCOR AND THE CATACOMBS

The crushing of the dissident movement in the Soviet Union in the early 1980s had a temporarily sobering effect on the liberals in ROCOR, and led to a very important ecclesiastical act: the canonization of the Holy New Martyrs of Russia, headed by Tsar-Martyr Nicholas II, in New York in November, 1981. News of this event seeped into the Soviet Union, and ROCOR’s icon and service to the new martyrs became more and more widely used even among members of the MP. It was these prayers to the holy new martyrs, more than the support of the Pope for anti-communists in Poland, that was the real catalyst for glasnost’ and perestroika, and hence the fall of communism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe as a whole.

The weakening of communism raised hopes of a mass movement of believers out of the MP into the True Church. But this raised the question: which Church – the Catacomb Church inside Russia, or ROCOR? In either case, the question of the relationship between ROCOR and the Catacomb Church needed to be clarified.

For some years, the ROCOR Synod had continued to have contacts with Catacomb clergy, some of whom began to commemorate Metropolitan Philaret while others were actually received under his omophorion. Thus in 1977, after the death of their Catacomb archpastor, Archbishop Anthony (Galynsky-Mikhailovsky), fourteen of his clergy were received “at a distance” into ROCOR.268

The presence of a sizeable group of Catacomb clergy under the omophorion of ROCOR naturally led to the raising of the question of the consecration of a bishop for the Catacomb Church. Vitaly Shumilo writes: “The question of the reestablishment of the episcopate of the Catacomb Church was raised at the Hierarchical Synod of ROCOR [in 1981]. It was decided secretly to tonsure and ordain to the episcopate a clergyman of the West European diocese whose sister lived in the USSR [Hieromonk Barnabas (Prokofiev)], thanks to which he could more easily obtain a visa. The Council entrusted this secretly ordained bishop to secretly ordain Fr. Lazarus to the episcopate in order that he should lead the

---

268 Metropolitan Epiphany (Kaminsky), personal communication, May, 1995. The text of the resolution of the ROCOR Synod was as follows: “There were discussions on the question of the fourteen clerics accepted into communion of prayer from the Catacomb Church who submitted their petitions to the Hierarchical Synod through Archimandrite Misael of the monastery of St. Panteleimon on the Holy Mountain, which were received on November 26 / December 7, 1977. At that time the Hierarchical Synod of the ROCOR in its session of November 26 / December 7, 1977 accepted the following resolution:

“‘Trusting the witness of the fourteen priests that their reposed leader, Archbishop Anthony (Galynsky) was correctly ordained to the episcopate, and carried out his service secretly from the civil authorities, it has been decided to accept them into communion of prayer, having informed them that they can carry out all those sacred actions which priests can carry out according to the Church canons, and also giving the monastic clerics the right to carry out monastic tonsures. They are to be informed of this in the same way as their address was received.’”
According to Matushka Anastasia Shatilova, the daughter of Bishop Gregory Grabbe, the decision was made by Metropolitan Philaret, Archbishop Vitaly and Archbishop Anthony of Geneva, and she, as being the person who printed the documents, was the only other person who knew about it. In the next year, 1982, Archbishop Anthony and Bishop Mark of Berlin consecrated Hieromonk Barnabas as Bishop of Cannes. He then travelled secretly to Moscow and ordained Fr. Lazarus as Bishop of Tambov in his flat on May 10.

In May, 1990, when Lazarus was able to travel to New York, cheirothesia was performed on him by ROCOR bishops in order to correct his original cheirotonia at the hands of one bishop only.

Since this event aroused considerable controversy, it is necessary to delve a little more into its background...

---


270 Shatilova, as quoted by Fr. Roman Pavlov.

271 The official ROCOR account was published on August 1/14, 1990: “In 1982 his Eminence Anthony, Archbishop of Geneva and Western Europe, together with his Eminence Mark, Bishop of Berlin and Germany, on the orders of the Hierarchical Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, secretly performed an Episcopal ordination on Hieromonk Barnabas (Prokofiev), so that through the cooperation of these archpastors the Church life of the Catacomb Orthodox Church in Russia might be regulated. Since external circumstances no longer compel either his Eminence Bishop Lazarus in Russia, or his Eminence Bishop Barnabas in France to remain as secret Hierarchs of our Russian Church Abroad, the Hierarchical Synod is now officially declaring this fact.” (“Zaiavlenie Arkhierejskago Sinoda Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi Zagranitsej” (Declaration of the Hierarchical Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad), Pravoslavnaia Rus’ (Orthodox Russia), № 18 (1423), September 15/28, 1990, p. 16.

The ordination papers were signed by Metropolitan Philaret, Archbishop Vitaly, Archbishop Anthony of Geneva and Bishop Gregory Grabbe (letter to the present writer from Matushka Anastasia Shatilova, October 3, 2000).

272 "In a Gramota of the ROCOR Synod dated May 3/16, 1990 the following was said about this: ‘Archimandrite Lazarus (Zhurbenko) is elected by the Russian Orthodox Church that is in the Catacombs and is confirmed and established as bishop of the God-saved city of Tambov by the Sacred Hierarchical Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad in accordance with the rite of the Holy Apostolic Eastern Church, with the aid of the all-accomplishing and all-holy Spirit, in the year of the incarnation of God the Word 1982, on the 27th day of April, in the city of Moscow, being ordained by hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad by order of the Hierarchical Council of 1981. The ordination of his Grace Lazarus took place in the special circumstances elicited by the difficulties of the present time, which is why the ordination was carried out in secret.’

“In another Synodal document, no. II/35/R, it was confirmed: ‘Bishop Lazarus (Zhurbenko) has been ordained by order of the Hierarchical Council of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad as BISHOP for the regeneration and leadership of the Church in Russia.’ (Shumilo, op. cit.)

“Also, in the witness dated September 22 / October 5, 1989 signed by the First Deputy of the First-Hierarch of ROCOR it says: ‘His Grace Bishop Lazarus has been canonically ordained by the episcopate of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and is appointed to serve the Orthodox Christians of the Russian Church Catacombs.’
At the beginning of the 1960s, Monk Theodosius (Zhurbenko), the future Archbishop Lazarus, made contact, via Archimandrite Eugene (Zhukov) of Mount Athos, with ROCOR’s Archbishop Leontius (Filippovich) of Chile, who had been a catacomb priest in the Ukraine from 1937 before being consecrated Bishop of Zhitomir by the Ukrainian Autonomous Church in November, 1941.

“By means of coded correspondence,” writes Shumilo, “many widowed True Orthodox pastors and believers had communion through Monk Theodosius with ROCOR Archbishop Leontius (Filippovich) of Chile, through whom spiritual direction and communion of the True Orthodox Church was realized with the Russian Church Abroad.

“After establishing the correspondence, Archbishop Leontius took an active part in the life of the clergy and flock of the Catacomb Church. He secretly received under his omophorion many catacomb priests. In the widowed Catacomb Church in the Homeland the True Orthodox clergy and believers began to consider Archbishop Leontius to be their hierarch. Thus in the 1960s, thanks to the efforts of the future catacomb Archbishop Lazarus, secret spiritual communion was established between the widowed Catacomb TOC in the Homeland and ROCOR, and in the TOC – the commemoration of the first-hierarchs of ROCOR...

“Vladyka Leontius had the intention of secretly visiting the USSR to carry out ordinations also in the Catacomb Church. But these plans were not destined to be realized. Not having the opportunity to go to the USSR, he gave his written blessing to resort to such enforced practices as the reception of priesthood from hierarchs of the MP who had not soiled themselves by cooperation with the communist authorities and ecumenism. Thus Archbishop Leontius sent Monk Theodosius (Zhurbenko) under obedience to be ordained by his former cell-attendant, who had been imprisoned for twelve years in Stalin’s camps in Kolyma, the disgraced Bishop Benjamin (Novitsky) of Irkutsk. During the years of the German occupation Vladyka Leontius was in obedience to Bishop Benjamin, who had been the deputy of the Pochayev Lavra, and in 1941 he received ordination to the episcopate from his hands. Vladyka Benjamin was completely against the MP’s apostasy from the faith and so remained in disgrace.

“In 1971 the former Monk Theodosius was secretly ordained as Priest Lazarus (Zhurbenko) for the Catacomb Church.

“Hieromonk Lazarus worked tirelessly at gathering into one the catacomb communities scattered and dispersed throughout the USSR. By the middle of the

273 Thus “on the recommendation of Archbishop Leontius,” writes Shumilo (op. cit.), Theodosius “was sent by the catacomb clergy to negotiate with the disgraced MP hierarch Hermogen (Golubev), who had been ‘retired’ by order of the Moscow Patriarch to the Zhirovitsky monastery in Belorussia. However, although Archbishop Hermogen respected the Catacomb Church, he refused to join Her out of fear that because of him it would be easier for the KGB to purge and finally annihilate the TOC.” (V.M.)
1970s he had founded a series of secret catacomb monasteries in the Kuban. He tonsured into the schema with the name of Seraphim the well-known catacomb elder-confessor Fr. Vissarion (Markov) from Tambov, who in his will entrusted the care of his catacomb flock to Fr. Lazarus. Before his death Fr. Timothy (Nesgovorov), who had been ordained by Schema-Bishop Peter (Ladygin), and others entrusted their flocks to the care of Fr. Lazarus. By the end of the 1970s many widowed catacomb communities from Kazakhstan and Siberia to the Ukraine and Belorussia had come under the care of Fr. Lazarus. They all... and oriented themselves on spiritual union with ROCOR, the canonicity of whose episcopate was irreproachable.”274

However, many Catacomb Christians did not recognize Fr. Lazarus, considering his ordination in the MP to have been a betrayal and completely invalid. According to one source, he sought ordination in the MP only after being refused it by Archbishop Anthony Galynsky – which may explain his hostile attitude towards Archbishop Anthony later.275 According to another source, on returning to the Catacomb Church after four years in the MP, Fr. Lazarus was instrumental in betraying Catacomb Christians to the KGB and in sowing such distrust towards Bishop Theodosius (Bakhmetev) (+1986) that almost the whole of his flock deserted him.276

As a result, according to Shatilova, the highly experienced Josephite priest Fr. Michael Rozhestvensky became “the initiator of the complete rejection of the then priest Lazarus Zhurbenko because of the latter’s departing to the MP for his ordination. At a meeting of catacomb clergy in the city of Tambov in 1978, in the presence of the still-living Abbot P., Fr. Vissarion and others, Fr. Michael confirmed this position.”277 This fact, according to Matushka Anastasia, was completely unknown to the ROCOR Synod when they came to decide on the consecration of a bishop for the Catacomb Church. Otherwise, she says, the ROCOR bishops would hardly have chosen to consecrate Lazarus to the episcopate.

The candidacy of Fr. Lazarus was put forward by Archbishop Anthony of Geneva, who had received him into his diocese, and then, on January 11, 1981, raised him to the rank of archimandrite in absentia.278

Archbishop Anthony had been asked by Fr. Gleb Yakunin to consecrate a catacomb bishop for Russia, and Lazarus’ name had been put forward by Stefan

274 Shumilo, op. cit.
276 See Kto est’ kto v rossijskikh katakombakh, pp. 66-69, and E.A. Petrova, “Perestroika Vavilonskoj Bashni - poslednij shans vselukavogo antikhrista” (The Reconstruction of the Tower of Babel – a Last Chance for the All-Cunning Antichrist), Moscow, 1991, pp. 5-6 (MS).
278 According to Vladimir Kirillov (personal communication, May, 2006), in one letter Archbishop Anthony writes that he had been corresponding with Lazarus for 15 (!) years before his ordination.
Krasovitsky and Zoya Krakhmalnikova. But Yakunin, Krasovitsky and Krakhmalnikova were all dissident members of the MP, not members of the True Church. So ROCOR’s first bishop inside Russia, according to this version, turned out to be the candidate, not of the Catacomb Church, but of dissident circles in the MP…

Matushka Anastasia also claims that there was no other candidate than Fr. Lazarus, and that the bishops did not know of the existence of another good candidate in the person of Fr. Michael Rozhdestvensky.

However, Vladimir Kirillov disagrees: “Judging from all the evidence, Fr. Michael was the candidate of Metropolitan Philaret (well-known to him and a true catacomb pastor), while the ‘moderate’ Vladyka Lazarus was pleasing to Archbishop Anthony (in the documents of Vladyka Anthony the name of Fr. Michael does not figure once). And the blessing for the ordination was given precisely to Fr. Michael by Metropolitan Philaret. “History is silent as to whether Fr. Michael was told of the desire to make him a bishop or not. Let alone whether he agreed to it or not. It is a mysterious story. After all, all the contacts were through Fr. Lazarus, who did not begin this affair in order to put forward the candidature of another man. In any case, Bishop Barnabas [who consecrated Fr. Lazarus in 1982] was informed by Fr. Lazarus that Fr. Michael had not appeared at the meeting and that the only candidate was – he.”

Vladimir Kirillov argues that Fr. Lazarus engineered his own consecration at the expense of Fr. Michael. He put before Archbishop Anthony the idea “that chaos and savagery reigned in Russia because of the absence of a lawful bishop [Lazarus claimed that the last true bishop had died in 1957] and that for that reason many sympathizing priests sympathetic in the MP stayed there. And if only a bishop would appear, things would go well (of course, this turned out to be pure bluff). In the end the desire matured in Vladyka Anthony to help his brothers in Russia, the more so in that there was such a knowledgeable catacomb person as Fr. Lazarus (who, by the way, was not a person chosen by the catacombs and spoke exclusively in his own name).”

Kirillov even claims – on the basis of the testimony of Vladyka Lazarus himself – that there was some kind of prior agreement to ordain, not Fr. Lazarus, but Fr. Michael: “In principle, according to the agreement, [Bishop Barnabas] should have ordained Fr. Michael to the episcopate. But, as Vladyka Lazarus told the author of these lines in 1994, Fr. Michael refused and then he [Lazarus] had to ‘take his place’. According to both Shatilova and Kirillov, when Vladyka Barnabas was searching for a worthy candidate for ordination to the rank of Bishop of the Catacomb Church, Fr. Lazarus craftily suggested the widowed Fr. Michael, and himself was called to invite him to be ordained to the episcopate.

280 Shatilova, as quoted by Fr. Roman Pavlov.
On receiving the invitation with the signature of Fr. Lazarus, Fr. Michael did not go. Vladyka Barnabas was left with neither a choice nor time, and was forced to consecrate Hieromonk Lazarus to the episcopate. Fr. Michael’s position in relation to Vladyka Lazarus remained unchanging to the very end of his life [in 1988].

* 

Be all that as it may, “after Vladyka Lazarus’ secret ordination,” writes Shumilo, “many catacomb communities of the TOC in the Kuban, Ukraine, in the Central Black Earth region of Russia, the Northern Caucasus, Belorussia, Siberia, Kazakhstan, Bashkiria and other regions, united around him.

“From the moment of the reestablishment of a canonical hierarchy in the Catacomb Church in the Homeland there began its gradual regeneration and building up. The secret Bishop Lazarus in a self-sacrificing way, in spite of the great risk for his own life, tirelessly went round the catacomb communities of the TOC scattered throughout the whole boundless expanse of Holy Russia, which had been turned by the God-fighters into the atheist USSR, serving secretly at night, preaching, confessing, communing and ordaining new catacomb priests. In the period from 1982 to 1990 alone Bishop Lazarus ordained about 20 new catacomb clergy for the TOC. Many catacomb priests who accepted ordination from the uncanonical catacomb hierarchies of the ‘Sekachites’ and the ‘Alfeyevites’ were united to him through correction of their ordinations.”

---

60. GLASNOST’ AND PERESTROIKA

Jean-Francois Revel wrote in 1985: “The Soviet Union... is undoubtedly sick, very sick. It will die, that’s certain,... because it is in and of itself a society of and for death. But the prime question of our time is which of the two events will take place first: the destruction of democracy by communism or communism’s death of its own sickness? It seems to me that the second process is advancing less rapidly than the first.”

Indeed, a superficial view of the situation would have confirmed Revel’s judgement that the West would collapse before the Soviet Union. As John Darwin writes, “In the mid-1980s the scope of Soviet ambition seemed greater than ever. From a forward base at Camranh Bay in southern Vietnam, the Soviet navy could make its presence felt across the main sea lanes running through South East Asia and in the Indian Ocean, a ‘British lake’ until the 1950s. By laying down huge new aircraft carriers like the Leonid Brezhnev, Moscow now aimed to rival the Americans’ capacity to intervene around the globe. But then in less than half a decade this vast imperial structure – the ruling power across Northern Eurasia, the tenacious rival in Southern Asia, Africa and the Middle East – simply fell to pieces. By 1991 it was an empire in ruins. There was no ‘silver age’ or phase of decline: just a calamitous fall...”

However, in the same year of 1985, the Soviets propelled to power in the Kremlin a leader who was prepared to begin a partial democratisation of the country with the aim of modernizing and strengthening the Soviet State. For “the KGB, as Stone writes, unlike many of the geriatric leaders of the state, “knew how far things had gone wrong, and, with a view to shaking up the old men, saw that a degree of public criticism and respect for law would be helpful, quite apart from the good impression to be made abroad. The Party and the KGB had had a host-parasite relationship... Now the parasite was given responsibility.” And so the parasite now “came up with the last useful idiot, Mikhail Sergeyevitch Gorbachev, in himself an obviously decent man, whose task was to soft-soap the West...”

By the Providence of God, however, Gorbachev’s reforming efforts, though designed to strengthen Communism in the long term, led to its downfall and the resurgence of religion...

“In his first speech as leader,” writes Bernard Simms, “Gorbachev announced his intention to maintain ‘military-strategic parity with the aggressive NATO’. Like the tsarist modernizers of old, Gorbachev’s first concern was not economic liberalization, popular standards of living or democratization... What was innovative about his approach, however, was that it did not just conceive of

288 Stone, op. cit., pp. 541, 536.
internal change as a means to increasing external power through greater military mobilization. Instead, Gorbachev sought to expose and reform abuses in what he regarded as a basically just system. He also hoped that a more conciliatory attitude towards dissidents would reduce the terrible international battering the Soviet Union had received over human rights since the mid-1970s. Gorbachev now proclaimed a policy of reconstruction (‘Perestroika’) – a ‘revolution[ary]…acceleration of the socio-economic and cultural development of Soviet society’ – and openness (‘Glasnost’). Greater freedom of expression, Gorbachev believed, would mobilize the intelligentsia and reduce incompetence and corruption. Dissidents were released, police repression was greatly eased, civil rights groups emerged, there was a revival of the [official] Russian Orthodox Church and a vibrant public sphere moved from the underground into the open…”289

As Vladimir Bukovsky and Pavel Stroilov write: “By the beginning of the 1980s, the Soviet leadership had finally woken up to the fact that their system had entered a period of profound structural crisis. On the one hand, their economic model, unproductive and wasteful by definition, like all socialist models, had brought them to the brink of bankruptcy. On the other, their very ‘success’ in exporting that model to other countries was becoming an unbearable burden to carry on their shoulders. With their troops bogged down in Afghanistan, and with the Polish crisis looming large on their doorstep, the ‘cost of Empire’ had become virtually unsustainable. Simply put, they had suddenly realised that their economic base was too small for their global ambitions. Added to that a new round of the arms race forced on them by Ronald Reagan, falling oil prices and a growing discontent at home, and one could understand their sudden urge for reforms. A final blow came with Reagan’s obsession with the ‘Star Wars’ project. The Americans might have been bluffing, but the Soviets had to follow suit regardless, trying to compete in the very sphere where they were most behind the West – high-tech.”290

The technological gap between the superpowers was growing larger all the time. As David Reynolds writes, “Back in the 1970s the United States seemed to be floundering. Industrial growth had stagnated, inflation was out of control and the heavy industries on which the post-war boom had been based, like cars and textiles, were no longer competitive against Asian competition. Parts of urban America seemed like a rustbelt. In the 1980s, however, new service industries, spearheaded by IT and boosted by deregulation, seemed to signal a ‘post-industrial’ society. Meanwhile, however, the Soviet Union remained a ‘heavy metal’ society – locked in the smokestack industries of yesteryear. Behind the Iron Curtain deregulation and the IT revolution were inconceivable. The Soviets had found it hard enough to keep up with mainframe computers; their anaemic consumer economy offered no stimulus to PC development; and the cell-phone explosion was totally impossible in a closed society. Information is power and, under communism, both were tightly controlled.

“In computers and electronics the Soviet Union lagged behind European clients like Czechoslovakia and East Germany, yet even then their pirated products did not compare with authentic Western versions that were now flooding into eastern Europe. ‘With these computers comes not only technology but also ideology,’ lamented one Czech computer designer. ‘Children might soon begin to believe that Western technology represents the peak and our technology is obsolete and bad.’ In ten years’ time, he warned, ‘it will be too late to change our children. By then they will want to change us.’

“So the PC and information revolution posed a double challenge to the Soviet bloc – both economic and ideological. Moscow’s Five-Year-Plan of 1985 envisaged 1.3 million PCs in Soviet schoolrooms by 1995, but the Americans already had 3 million in 1985 and in any case the main Soviet PC, the Agat, was an inferior version of the crude and now antiquated Apple II.

“Gorbachev was keenly aware of these problems…

“Becoming part of the American-led information age was a major reason why Gorbachev was so anxious to forge a new relationship with the United States. Otherwise the USSR would be consigned to obsolescence. By the 1980s, in fact, the whole Soviet bloc was in ‘a race between computers and collapse’.”

At this point it should be pointed out that the worship of science in the Soviet Union almost reached the point of madness – even of satanism. Thus on May 7, 1984, the Day of the Physicist, a satanic ball was staged by nuclear physicists that was captured in a 1988 documentary film called Zvezda Polyn’ (the star of Chernobyl). The film-maker clearly saw a link between the ball and the terrible catastrophe that took place at Chernobyl only two years later…

*

Gorbachev’s attempts to introduce a limited kind of market economy (it was called a “socialist market”) were not successful. For, as Tony Judt writes, “The reforming instinct was to compromise: to experiment with the creation – from above – of a few favored enterprises freed from bureaucratic encumbrances and assured a reliable supply of raw materials and skilled labor. These, it was reasoned, would serve as successful and even profitable models for other, similar, enterprises: the goal was controlled modernization and progressive adaptation to pricing and production in response to demand. But such an approach was foredoomed by its operating premise – that the authorities could create efficient businesses by administrative fiat.
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“By pumping scarce resources into a few model farms, mills, factories or services the Party was indeed able to forge temporarily viable and even notionally profitable units – but only with heavy subsidies and by starving less-favored operations elsewhere. The result was even more distortion and frustration. Meanwhile farm managers and local directors, uncertain of the way the wind was blowing, hedged their bets against the return of planned norms and stockpiled anything they could lay their hands on lest centralized controls tighten up again.

“To Gorbachev’s conservative critics this was an old story. Every Soviet reform program since 1921 began the same way and ran out of steam for the same reasons, starting with Lenin’s New Economic Policy. Serious economic reforms implied the relaxation or abandonment of controls. Not only did this initially exacerbate the problems it was designed to solve, it meant just what it said: a loss of control. But Communism depended on control – indeed Communism was control: control of the economy, control of information, control of movement and opinion and people. Everything else was dialectics, and dialectics – as a veteran Communist explained to the young Jorge Semprún in Buchenwald – ‘is the art and technique of always landing on your feet’.

“It soon became obvious to Gorbachev that to land on his feet as he wrestled with the Soviet economy he must accept that the Soviet economic conundrum could not be addressed in isolation. It was but a symptom of a larger problem. The Soviet Union was run by men who had a vested interest in the political and institutional levers of a command economy: its endemic minor absurdities and quotidian corruption were the very source of their authority and power. In order for the Party to reform the economy it would first have to reform itself.

“This, too, was hardly a new idea – the periodic purges under Lenin and his successors had typically proclaimed similar objectives. But times had changed. The Soviet Union, however repressive and backward, was no longer a murderous totalitarian tyranny. Thanks to Khrushchev’s monumental housing projects most Soviet families now lived in their own apartments. Ugly and inefficient, these low-rent flats nonetheless afforded ordinary people a degree of privacy and security unknown to other generations: they were no longer so exposed to informers or likely to be betrayed to the authorities by their neighbors or their in-laws. The age of terror was over for most people and, for Gorbachev’s generation at least, a return to the time of mass arrests and party purges was unthinkable.

‘In order to break the stranglehold of the Party apparat and drive forward his plans for economic restructuring, then, the General Secretary resorted instead to ‘glasnost’ – ‘openness’: official encouragement for public discussion of a carefully restricted range of topics. By making people more aware of impending changes and heightening public expectation, Gorbachev would forge a lever with which he and his supporters might pry loose official opposition to his plans... But for Gorbachev the urgency of the need for official openness was brought home to him by the catastrophic events of April 26th 1986.
“On that day at 1.23 am, one of the four huge graphic reactors at the nuclear power plant at Chernobyl (Ukraine) exploded, releasing into the atmosphere 120 million curies of radioactive materiel – more than one hundred times the radiation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined. The plume of atomic fallout was carried north-west into Western Europe and Scandinavia, reaching as far as Wales and Sweden and exposing an estimated five million people to its effects. In addition to the 30 emergency workers killed on the spot, some 30,000 people have since died from complications caused by exposure to radiation from Chernobyl, including more than 2,000 cases of thyroid cancer among residents in the immediate vicinity.

“Chernobyl was not the Soviet Union’s first environmental disaster. At Cheliabinsk-40, a secret research site near Ekaterinburg in the Ural Mountains, a nuclear waste tank exploded in 1957, severely polluting an area 8 km wide and 100 km long. 76 million cubic metres of radioactive waste poured into the Urals river system, contaminating it for decades. 10,000 people were eventually evacuated and 23 villages bulldozed. The reactor at Cheliabinsk was from the first generation of Soviet atomic constructions and had been built by slave labor in 1948-51.

“Other man-made environmental calamities on a comparable scale included the pollution of Lake Baikal; the destruction of the Aral Sea; the dumping in the Arctic Ocean and the Barents Sea of hundreds of thousands of tons of defunct atomic naval vessels and their radioactive contents; and the contamination by sulphur dioxide from nickel production of an area the size of Italy around Norilsk in Siberia. These and other ecological disasters were all the direct result of indifference, bad management and the Soviet ‘slash and burn’ approach to natural resources. They were born of a culture of secrecy. The Cheliabinsk-40 explosion was not officially acknowledged for many decades, even though it occurred within a few kilometres of a large city – the same city where, in 1979, several hundred people died of anthrax leaked from a biological weapons plant in the town centre.

“The problems with the USSR’s nuclear reactors were well known to insiders: two separate KGB reports dated 1982 and 1984 warned of ‘shoddy’ equipment (supplied from Yugoslavia) and serious deficiencies in Chernobyl’s reactors 3 and 4 (it was the latter that exploded in 1986). But just as this information had been kept secret (and no action taken) so the Party leadership’s first, instinctive response to the explosion on April 26th was to keep quiet about it – there were, after all, fourteen Chernobyl-type plants in operation by then all across the country. Moscow’s first acknowledgement that anything untoward had happened came fully four days after the event, and then in a two-sentence official communiqué.293

---
293 The author was a member of a group of Surrey University students in Russia at the time. The first they heard of the disaster was not from the Soviet authorities, but from parents phoning up from England. The authorities at first denied the news. (V.M.)
“But Chernobyl could not be kept secret: international anxiety and the Soviets’ own inability to contain the damage forced Gorbachev first to make a public statement two weeks later, acknowledging some but not all of what had taken place, and then to call upon foreign aid and expertise. And just as his fellow citizens were then made publicly aware for the first time of the scale of official incompetence and indifference to life and health, so Gorbachev was forced to acknowledge the extent of his country’s problems. The bungling, the mendacity and the cynicism of the men responsible both for the disaster and the attempt to cover it up could not be dismissed as a regrettable perversion of Soviet values: they were Soviet values, as the Soviet leader began to appreciate.

“Beginning in the autumn of 1986 Gorbachev shifted gears. In December of that year Andrei Sakharov, the world’s best-known dissident, was liberated from house arrest in Gorky (Nizhnij Novgorod), a harbinger of the large-scale release of Soviet political prisoners that began in the following year. Censorship was relaxed – 1987 saw the long-delayed publication of Vassily Grossman’s Life and Fate (twenty-six years after M.S. Suslov, the Party’s ideological commissar, had predicted that it could not be released for ‘two or three centuries’). The police were instructed to cease jamming foreign radio broadcasts. And the Secretary General of the CPSU chose the occasion of his televised speech to the Party Central Committee in January 1987 to make the case for a more inclusive democracy, over the heads of the Party conservatives and directly to the nation at large.

“By 1987 more than nine out of ten Soviet households possessed a television, and Gorbachev’s tactic was initially a striking success: by creating a de facto public speech for semi-open debate about the country’s woes, and breaking the governing caste’s monopoly of information, he was forcing the Party to follow suit – and making it safe for hitherto silent reformers within the system to speak out and give him their backing. In the course of 1987-88 the General Secretary was, almost despite himself, forging a national constituency for change.

“Informal organizations sprang up: notably ‘Club Perestroika’, formed in Moscow’s Mathematical Institute in 1987, which in turn gave birth to ‘Memorial’, whose members devoted themselves to ‘keeping alive the memory of the victims’ of the Stalinist past. Initially taken aback at their own very existence – the Soviet Union, after all, was still a one-party dictatorship – they soon flourished and multiplied. By 1988 Gorbachev’s support came increasingly from outside the Party, from the country’s newly emerging public opinion.

“What had happened was that the logic of Gorbachev’s reformist goal, and his decision, in practice, to appeal to the nation against his conservative critics within the apparatus, had transformed the dynamic of perestroika. Having begun as a reformer within the ruling Party, its General Secretary was now increasingly working against it, or at least trying to circumvent the Party’s opposition to change. In October 1987 Gorbachev spoke publicly of Stalinist crimes for the first time and warned that if the Party did not champion reform it would lose its leading role in society.
“In the Party conference of June 1988 he reiterated his commitment to reform
and to the relaxation of censorship, and called for the preparation of open (i.e.
contested) elections to a Congress of People’s Deputies for the following year. In
October 1988 he demoted some of his leading opponents – notably Yegor
Ligachev, a longstanding critics – and had himself elected President of the
Supreme Soviet (i.e. head of state), displacing Andrei Gromyko, last of the
dinosaurs. Within the Party he still faced strong rearguard opposition; but in the
country at large his popularity was at its peak, which was why he was able to
press forward – and indeed had little option but to do so.

“The elections of May/June 1989 were the first more or less free vote in the
Soviet Union since 1918. They were not multi-party elections – that would not
happen until 1993, by which time the Soviet Union itself was long gone – and the
outcome was largely pre-determined by restricting many seats to Party
candidates and forbidding internal Party competition for them; but the Congress
they elected included many independent and critical voices. Its proceedings were
broadcast to an audience of some 100 million spectators, and demands by
Sakharov and others for further change – notably the dethroning of the
increasingly discredited Party from its privileged position – could not be swept
aside, even by an initially reluctant Gorbachev. The Communists’ monopoly of
power was slipping away, and with Gorbachev’s encouragement the Congress
would duly vote the following February to remove from the Soviet constitution
the key clause – Article Six – assigning the Communist Party a ‘leading role’.

“The course of Soviet domestic upheaval from 1985 to 1989 was facilitated by a
major shift in Soviet foreign policy under Gorbachev and his new Foreign
Minister Edvard Shevardnadze. From the outset Gorbachev made clear his
determination to unburden the USSR at the very least of its more onerous
military encumbrances. Within a month of coming to power he had halted Soviet
missile deployments and gone on to offer unconditional negotiations on nuclear
forces, starting with a proposal that both superpowers halve their strategic
arsenals. By May 1986, after a surprisingly successful ‘summit’ meeting with
Reagan in Geneva (the first of an unprecedented five such encounters),
Gorbachev agreed to allow US ‘forward-based systems’ to be excluded from
strategic arms talks, if that would help get these under way.

“There followed a second, Rejkjavik summit in October 1986 where Reagan
and Gorbachev, while failing to reach agreement on nuclear disarmament,
nonetheless laid the basis for future success.294 By late 1987 Shevardnadze and US

294 At Rejkjavik, writes Serhii Plokhy, “Reagan and Gorbachev all but agreed – to the horror of
their advisers – to liquidate nuclear arms entirely. What stood in the way of the deal was Reagan’s
insistence on continuing to develop his Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), a missile defense
program. Gorbachev believed that SDI, if ever implemented by the Americans, would put the
Soviets at a disadvantage. The summit ended in a deadlock, and the world seemed to be returning
to the darkest days of the Cold War. But the dialogue was eventually resumed. Andrei Sakharov,
the father of the Soviet hydrogen bomb and a prominent political dissident, helped convince
Secretary of State George Schultz had drafted an Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, signed and ratified the following year. This Treaty, by endorsing Ronald Reagan’s earlier ‘zero option’ proposal, constituted Soviet acceptance that a nuclear war in Europe was un-winnable – and served as the prologue to an even more important treaty, signed in 1990, strictly limiting the presence and operation of conventional forces on the European continent.

“Seen from Washington, Gorbachev’s concessions on arms naturally appeared as a victory for Reagan – and thus, in the zero-sum calculus of Cold War strategists, a defeat for Moscow. But for Gorbachev, whose priorities were domestic, securing a more stable international environment was a victory in itself. It bought him time and support for his reforms at home. The true significance of this sequence of meetings and accords lay in the Soviet recognition that military confrontation abroad was not only expensive but also dysfunctional: as Gorbachev expressed it in October 1986 in the course of a visit to France, ‘ideology’ was not an appropriate basis for foreign policy.

“These views reflected the advice he was beginning to get from a new generation of Soviet foreign affairs experts, notably his colleague Aleksandr Yakovlev, to whom it had become clear that the USSR could exercise more control over its foreign relations by well-calculated concessions than by fruitless confrontation. In contrast to the intractable problems he faced at home, foreign policy was an arena in which Gorbachev exercised direct control and could thus hope to effect immediate improvements. Moreover the strictly Great-Power dimension of Soviet foreign policy relations should not be exaggerated: Gorbachev placed at least as much importance on his relations with western Europe as on his dealings with the US – he made frequent visits there and established good relations with González, Kohl and Thatcher (who famously regarded him as a man with whom she ‘could do business’).

“Indeed, in important respects Gorbachev thought of himself above all as a European statesman with European priorities. His focus upon ending the arms race and the stockpiling of nuclear weapons was closely tied to a new approach to the Soviet Union’s role as a distinctively European power. ‘Armaments,’ he declared in 1987, ‘should be reduced to a level necessary for strictly defensive purposes. It is time for the two military alliances to amend their strategic concepts to gear them more to the aims of defense. Every apartment in the ‘European home’ has the right to protect itself against burglars, but it must do so without destroying its neighbors’ property.’

“In a similar spirit and for the same reasons, the Soviet leader understood from the outset the urgent need to extract the Soviet Union from Afghanistan, the ‘bleeding wound’ as he described it to a Party Congress in February 1986. Five months later he announced the withdrawal of some 6,000 Soviet troops, a redeployment completed in November of the same year. In May 1988, following Gorbachev that SDI was little more than a figment of Reagan’s imagination” (The Last Empire, London: Oneworld publications, 2015, p. 13). (V.M.)
an accord reached at Geneva with Afghanistan and Pakistan and guaranteed by both great powers, Soviet troops began to leave Afghanistan and Pakistan: the last remaining soldiers of the Red Army departed on February 15th 1989.

“Far from addressing the Soviet nationalities question, the Afghan adventure had, as was by now all too clear, exacerbated it. If the USSR faced an intractable set of national minorities, this was in part a problem of its own making: it was Lenin and his successors, after all, who had invented the various subject ‘nations’ to whom they duly assigned regions and republics. In an echo of imperial practices elsewhere, Moscow had encouraged the emergence – in places where nationality and nationhood were unheard of fifty years earlier – of institutions and intelligentsias grouped around a national urban center of ‘capital’. Communist Party First Secretaries in the Caucasus, or the central Asian republics, were typically chosen from the dominant local ethnic group. To secure their fiefdom these men were understandably drawn to identify with their ‘own’ people, particularly once fissures began to appear in the central apparatus. The Party was starting to fracture under the centrifugal pull of anxious local administrators protecting their own interests.

“Gorbachev seems not to have fully understood this process. ‘Comrades,’ he informed the Party in 1987, ‘we can truly say that for our country the nationalities issue has been resolved.’ Perhaps he did not altogether believe his own claims; but he certainly thought that some loosening of central control and addressing of long-standing grievances would suffice (in 1989 the Crimean Tatars, for example, were finally allowed to return home after many decades of Asian exile). In a continental empire of over one hundred ethnic groups from the Baltic to the Sea of Okhotsk, most of whom had long-standing grievances that glasnost now encouraged them to air, this was to prove a serious miscalculation. The idea that it was the Leninist project itself that might be at fault remained alien to the Soviet leader until very late – only in 1990 did he finally permit the domestic publication of overtly anti-Leninist writers such as Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn.

“The spirit of Gorbachev’s early goals is exemplified in the inimitable tone of the new-found toleration for pop music, as expressed by Pravda in October 1986: ‘Rock and roll has a right to exist but only if it is melodious, meaningful and well-performed,’ That is precisely what Mikhail Gorbachev wanted: a melodious, meaningful and well-performed Communism. Necessary reforms would be undertaken and appropriate freedoms granted, but there was to be no unregulated licence – as late as February 1988 the government was still clamping down fiercely on independent publishing houses and printers.

“It is one of the curiosities of Communist reformers that they always set out with the quixotic goal of reforming some aspects of their system while keeping others unaffected – introducing market-oriented incentives while maintaining central planning controls, or allowing greater freedom of expression while retaining the Party’s monopoly of truth. But partial reform or reform of one sector in isolation from others was inherently contradictory. ‘Managed pluralism’ or a ‘socialist market’ was doomed from the start. As for the idea that the ‘leading role’
of the Communist Party could be sustained while the Party itself shed merely the pathological excrescences of seven decades of absolute power, this suggests a certain political naiveté on Gorbachev’s part. In an authoritarian [despotic] system power is indivisible – relinquish it in part and you must eventually lose it all. Nearly four centuries earlier, the Stuart monarch James I understood these things much better – as he put it in a succinct rebuff to Scottish Presbyterians protesting at the power vested in his bishops: ‘No Bishop, no King’.

“The inadequacy of Gorbachev’s response to demands for autonomy at the Soviet empire’s far-flung margins should not come as a surprise. Gorbachev was from the outset, as we have seen, a ‘reform Communist’, albeit a very unusual one: sympathetic to the need for change and renewal but reluctant to assault the core tenets of the system under which he had grown up. Like many in his generation in the Soviet Union and elsewhere he genuinely believed that the only path to improvement lay through a return to Leninist ‘principles’.” 295

However, at this point we must part company with Judt and insist: there is a kind of authoritarian power that is not indivisible. This is the Orthodox Autocratic power, which is a “Symphony of Powers” in which Bishops rule the Church and the King rules the State. And this, of course, was the system that the Communists overthrew in 1917...

So the real question in 1988 was: could a “melodious” transition, or restoration, be effected from the Communist despotism to an Orthodox autocracy, or “symphony of powers”? But the answer to this question depended on a second: could the official Orthodox Church in Russia be converted from being pawn of Communist power to a fully autonomous religious institution subject only to God? And this in turn depended on a third question: could the Russian people as a whole convert from the Communist world-view to that of genuine Orthodox Christianity?

295 Judt, op. cit., pp. 596-603. In 1989 Zbigniew Brzezinski made a similar point in his book The Grand Failure – by which, of course, he meant the failure of Communism. A reviewer of the book writes: “As a practical matter, [Brzezinski] concludes, global communism has foundered, not prospered. In the USSR, the author notes, Gorbachev's renewal efforts have produced unintended consequences, including divisive debates over the Communist Party's stewardship and de facto subversion of the system's ideological foundations. Communism's ‘fatal dilemma’ in the Soviet Union, he asserts, is that ‘its economic success can only be purchased at the cost of political stability, while its political stability can only be sustained at the cost of economic failure.’ As a practical matter, he concludes, global communism has foundered, not prospered. In the USSR, the author notes, Gorbachev's renewal efforts have produced unintended consequences, including divisive debates over the Communist Party's stewardship and de facto subversion of the system's ideological foundations. Communism's ‘fatal dilemma’ in the Soviet Union, he asserts, is that ‘its economic success can only be purchased at the cost of political stability, while its political stability can only be sustained at the cost of economic failure.’” (Kirkus review, 8 March, 1989, https://www.kirkusreviews.com/book-reviews/zbigniew-brzezinski/the-grand-failure)
61. RELIGIOUS LIBERALIZATION IN THE SOVIET UNION

In his book *The Perestroika Deception*, the former KGB agent and defector to the West Anatoly Golitsyn outlined a plan that the KGB had conceived for deceiving the West about its basic intentions. Several later defectors, planted by the KGB, tried to persuade the West that this plan was fictitious. But the development of events in the perestroika years, 1985-91, showed that almost all his predictions had been accurate...

At the beginning of *perestroika* there was no sign of the religious liberalization that was to come. Thus in November, 1986, Gorbachev told party officials in Tashkent that religious faith and party membership were incompatible (this was probably aimed at Muslim communists): “There must be no let-up in the war against religion because as long as religion exists Communism cannot prevail. We must intensify the obliteration of all religions wherever they are being practised or taught.”

Again, in November, 1987 Gorbachev said to the Politburo: “*Perestroika* is no retreat from communism but rather a step toward the final realization of Marxist-Leninist utopia: a continuation of Lenin’s ideas. Those who expect us to give up communism will be disappointed. In October, 1917 we parted from the Old World, rejecting it once and for all. We are moving toward a new world, the world of communism. We shall never turn off that road. *Perestroika* is a continuation of the October revolution…

“Comrades, do not be concerned about all you hear about *glasnost’* and democracy. These are primarily for outward consumption. There will be no serious internal change in the USSR other than for cosmetic purposes. Our purpose is to disarm America and let them fall asleep. We want to accomplish three things: (1) the Americans to withdraw conventional forces from Europe, (2) the Americans to withdraw nuclear forces from Europe, and (3) the Americans to stop proceeding with SDI [the Star Wars Defence System].”

Again, in 1987 Gorbachev’s chief ideologist, Alexander Yakovlev, said concerning the millenium of the Baptism of Rus’ in 1988: “To God what is God’s, to the Church what is the Church’s, but to us, the Marxists, belongs the fullness of truth. And on the basis of these positions any attempts to represent Christianity as the ‘mother’ of Russian culture must be decisively rejected. And if the Russian Middle Ages merit the attention of historians, such cannot be said of the 1000-year date of Orthodoxy.” But 1988 did indeed prove to be a turning-point, perhaps the beginning of a return to the Russia of 988.

---

296 [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zkw8nwHG2GM](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zkw8nwHG2GM)
For it was precisely at this time that Gorbachev’s need to pass from what Sir Geoffrey Hosking called “Mark 1” to “Mark 2” perestroika, dictated a change in policy towards the Church, too. For the success of perestroika required sincere believers in the new order from members of the Church, not just party hacks.

In March, 1988 Constantine Mikhailovich Kharchev, the head of the Council for Religious Affairs, told representatives of the higher party school in Moscow: “We attained our greatest success in controlling religion and suppressing its initiative amidst the priests and bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church. At first this gave us joy, but now it threatens to bring unforeseen consequences in its train... Now a priest often has no connection with his parish, but he is born somewhere else, and is often even of a different nationality. He comes once a week to the parish in a car, serves the liturgy... and wants to know nothing more. Many even like this, after all they are not responsible for anything: neither for their flock, nor for the money, nor for the repair of the church. The official in giving him his licence warns him: take your 350 roubles, and don't poke your nose into anything...

“We, the party, have fallen into a trap of our own anti-ecclesiastical politics of bans and limitations, we have cut the pope off from the believers, but the believers have not begun as a result to trust the local organs more, while the party and the state is increasingly losing control over the believers. And in addition, as a consequence, we witness the appearance of unspiritual believers, that is, those who carry out the ritual side [of Church life] and are indifferent to everything. And the main thing – are indifferent to communism... It is easier for the party to make a sincere believer into a believer also in communism. The task before us is: the education of a new type of priest; the selection and placing of a priest is the party’s business.”

“For 70 years,” he said, “we have struggled with the Church. In particular, we have been concerned that the most amoral and corrupt people should be appointed to the most significant posts. And now, look, we want these people arrange a spiritual regeneration for us...”

The critical point came in April, 1988, when Gorbachev met church leaders and worked out a new Church-State concordat reminiscent of the Stalin-Sergius compact of 1943. This concordat, combined with the underlying growth in religious feeling that had now been going on for several years, and the recovery of courage made easier by glasnost’ and the release of most of the religious and political prisoners, made the millenial celebrations in June a truly pivotal event. Moreover, the very wide publicity given to the celebrations in the media gave a powerful further impulse to the movement of religious regeneration.

---

The fruits were soon evident for all to see. Religious and political prisoners were freed; permission was given for the reopening of hundreds of churches (1,830 in the first nine months of 1990); and religious societies and cooperatives of almost all denominations sprang up all over the country. Programmes on Orthodox art and architecture, and sermons by bearded clergy in cassocks, became commonplace on television; and commentators from right across the political spectrum began to praise the contribution of the Orthodox Church to Russian history and culture. There was openness, too, on the terrible cost to Russia of Leninism and Stalinism – one estimate, by the scientist D.I. Mendeleev, calculated that there were 125 million innocent victims of the communist yoke.301

* 

There were negative aspects to this process. The True Orthodox Church remained outlawed; resistance to the opening of churches by local officials continued in the provinces; and religious activists objected to the adulterous mixing of religion and nationalism, and religion and humanist culture.302 Moreover, the suspicion continued to exist that the party’s new-found respect for religion was simply a tactical ploy, a case of reculer pour mieux sauter.

Such scepticism had some basis in reality. After all, no leading communist had announced his conversion to Christianity. Moreover, in April, 1988, the month in which Gorbachev met the patriarch, an unsigned article in Kommunist hinted that the real aim of Gorbachev’s rapprochement with the Church was to communize the Church rather than Christianize the party. And yet, if that was the party’s aim, it backfired. For unlike the concordat of 1943, which did indeed have the effect of communising the official Church, the concordat of 1988 seems to have helped to free Orthodox Christians from bondage to Communist ideology and coercion. For if the Church hierarchs continued to pay lip-service to “Leninist norms”, this was emphatically not the case with many priests and laity, of whom Fr. Gleb Yakunin (liberated in 1987) was probably the most influential and best known.

This was most strikingly evident in March, 1990, when the elections returned 300 clerics of various faiths as deputies at various levels, including 190 Russian Orthodox, while the Communist Party candidates in the major cities were routed. In April, the Christian Democratic Movement, led by RSFSR deputies Fr. Gleb Yakunin, Fr. Vyacheslav Polosin and philosopher Victor Aksyuchits, held its founding congress. Then, on May 19, the birthday of Tsar Nicholas II, the Orthodox Monarchist Order met in Moscow, and called for the restoration of Grand-Duke Vladimir Kirillovich Romanov to the throne of all the Russias. Grand-Duke Vladimir was a member of ROCOR, so his recognition by the monarchists inside Russia would have meant an enormous increase in prestige

for ROCOR at the expense of the patriarchate. However, the Grand-Duke spared the patriarchate this embarrassment by apostasizing to it and then dying in November, 1991.303

Contrary to the hopes and expectations of many, the MP remained devoted to the Soviet ideology to the last minute. And yet even it began to show signs of change under the influence of *glasnost*. The first sign was at the church council in June, 1988, when the 1961 statute making priests subordinate to their parish councils was repealed. Then came the canonization of Patriarch Tikhon in October, 1989. And then, on April 3, 1990 the Synod issued a declaration in which it (i) declared its neutrality with regard to different political systems and ideologies, (ii) admitted the existence of persecutions and pressures on the Church in the past, and (iii) tacitly admitted the justice of some of the criticism directed against it by the dissidents.304 Finally, in May, Metropolitan Vladimir of Rostov, the head of a commission formed to gather material on priests and believers who had been persecuted, said that “up to now, the details of the repression of the Russian Orthodox Church have been ignored or falsified by official, state and even numerous Church figures in order to meet the accepted ideological stereotypes.”305

The climax to this process was reached in June, when the polls revealed that the Church had now passed the Party, the Army and the KGB in popularity.306 People wondered: could this be the beginning of the end of sergianism? Was this the moment when the MP, freed at last from the yoke of communism, and under no obligation to pursue the communist-imposed policy of ecumenism, would finally repent of its past and return to the True Church?…

---

303 Archbishop Anthony of Los Angeles, "Velikij Knyaz' Vladimir Kirillovich i ego poseschennie SSSR" (Great Prince Vladimir Kirillovich and his Visit to the USSR), Pravoslavniy Vestnik (Orthodox Herald), №№ 60-61, January-February, 1993.

There are sharp differences of opinion on whether Grand Duke Vladimir Kirillovich was the true heir to the Russian throne. For the argument in favour, see Archpriest Lev Lebedev, “Kogo i chego nam nuzhno berech’sa?” (Who and what must we care for?), Dal’nevostochnij Monarkhiceskij Vestnik (Far-Eastern Monarchist Gazette), № 18, 2006, pp. 1-3. And for the argument against, see Mikhail Nazarov, Kto Naslednik Rossijskogo Prestola? (Who is the Heir of the Russian Throne?), Moscow, 1996.

304 Moskovskij Tserkovniy Vestnik (Moscow Ecclesiastical Herald), № 9 (27), April, 1990, pp. 1, 3.

305 Oxana Antic, "The Russian Orthodox Church moves towards coming to terms with its past", Report on the USSR, March 8, 1991.

306 Moscow News, June 3-10, 10-17, 1990.
Throughout the Soviet period ROCOR had taken a public position against the MP and in support of the True Orthodox Church. In 1990, as the Union began to collapse, ROCOR decided to open parishes on Russian soil and thereby provide an alternative for believers who on the one hand did not want to join the MP, but on the other hand were not prepared for the rigours of catacomb life. As we shall see, however, this was not a real call to arms against the MP. For outside Russia, most believers were displaying signs of “war weariness”; they wanted to believe that the Soviet Union had miraculously changed into a normal State overnight, that the KGB had disappeared, that the communists had repented, that the Moscow Patriarchate had been transformed from an adulteress into a pure virgin…

The story really began at the end of 1988, when the layman Boris Kazushin (now Hieromonk Tikhon) went to New York, handed Metropolitan Vitaly a mass of documents and asked him to open parishes of ROCOR inside Russia and accept his own parish under his omophorion.\textsuperscript{307}

According to another source, however, this idea goes back to a correspondence initiated during the perestroika period between the dissident Russian layman (and later priest) Stefan Krasovitsky and Bishop Gregory (Grabbe). Wojciech Zalewski writes: “In April 1989 Krassovitsky in a letter to Grabbe indicated that Alexis Aver’ianov, Zoia Krakhmal’nikova and he himself were thinking about ‘the necessity of trying to organize a podvorie of the Church Abroad in Russia’. In September (14/27 September, 1989) he is more specific. Although he did not foresee a possibility that even a single already-established parish would come under ROCA [ROCOR], i.e., under Lazarus’ jurisdiction, he suggests forming and registering an informal society (union, that is, brotherhood) in secret unity with ROCA. Its members would not attend the MP churches. Krassovitsky even sent Grabbe a proposal for such a society. When the membership grows, he writes, then a request for a church building for our own could be submitted or even a church of our own could be built. Furthermore, it would be useful to take over from the government some schools and ‘educate in these schools a hostile attitude to society in its present moral-ideological condition’. Finally, it will be necessary to find an official name for Lazarus’s jurisdiction. At the beginning of October (30 September / 13 October, 1989) Krassovitsky writes ‘it would be good to get a church for Vladyka Lazarus’ and suggests that priests George Edel’shtein, Oleg Steniaev, Aleksei Aver’ianov and possibly Father Gleb Yakunin all could be helpful in this matter. In turn Grabbe answers by stressing a need for candidates for new bishops without whom ‘the matter could die. VI. Lazarus must have this in view’ and suggests pulling other members of the Catacomb Church into ROCA’s orbit. To that Krassovitsky replies: ‘According to VI. Lazar, the canonicity of the church-servers of these groups is very doubtful. Besides, in my experience with them they are either infected with a spirit of narrow sectarianism

\textsuperscript{307}Kazushin, Open Letter to Bishop Victor of Western Europe, November 2/15, 2009, \texttt{http://frtikhon.livejournal.com.}
bordering on unhealthy mysticism, or with heresies like sophianism’ (23 November / 6 December, 1989).”

In March, 1990 ROCOR issued the following guidelines for its Church in Russia, to be known as the “Free Russian Orthodox Church” (FROC): "I. The free Russian Orthodox parishes are neither an independent nor a new hierarchal structure; they are in eucharistic communion with and in the jurisdiction of and subject to the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, which is headed by its first hierarch, Metropolitan Vitaly, and is the preserver of unadulterated Orthodoxy and the traditions of the Russian Orthodox Church.

"II. The clergy are not to join in eucharistic communion with the Moscow Patriarchate until it renounces the declaration of Metropolitan Sergius, until it repents of the errors which followed this uncanonical declaration, and removes those ruling bishops who have compromised themselves by uncanonical and immoral acts, who have been involved in corruption and the embezzlement of church funds, who have been placed in power through the interference of the secular authorities, and who have allowed distortions in the services of the Russian Orthodox Church.

"III. The parishes may not pray for the government as long as the controlling and guiding power remains the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has a militantly atheistic and anti-Church program. In addition, prayer is allowed for apostates only during the prayer, ‘that Thou mightest appear to them who have fallen away,’ but not during the proskomedia.

"IV. The reasons for the establishment of free parishes: The free Russian Orthodox parishes have opened due to the absolutely paralyzed, unrepentant state of the hierarchy and clergy of the Moscow Patriarchate, who have fallen away from pure Orthodoxy through the acceptance of the declaration by Metropolitan Sergius (who usurped the power of the Church in Russia) in 1927 of loyalty to the militantly atheistic communist Soviet power.

"The main errors of the Moscow Patriarchate after the declaration of 1927 are as follows:

"1. The excommunication of those hierarchs, clergy, monastics and laymen who did not accept the declaration, which was followed by mass terror and murder of those who did not accept the atheistic government.

"2. The desecration of the memory of the Holy New Martyrs and Confessors.

"3. The collaboration with the atheistic government even in the business of closing churches. Devoted service to the government and public prayer to

Zalewski, “Vozvrashchenie Russkoj Zarubezhnoi Tserkvi na Rodinu. Vzgliad Episkopa Grigoria (Grabbe). Iurii Pavlovich Grabbe’s (Bishop Grigorii) Vision of the Return of the Orthodox Church to the Homeland in the Post-Soviet Era” (MS, in English mainly).
strengthen its power, which in turn fights against faith and the Church.

"4. The distortion of the sacraments, rites, sermon, and carelessness in the spreading of the Word of God. Refusal to catechize, which has led masses of laypeople into ignorance and a superficial acceptance of Christianity.

"5. The participation and membership in the World Council of Churches and the ecumenical movement, for the creation of a worldwide "church", that would unite all heresies and religions.

"6. Submission to secular, atheistic authorities and allowing them to rule the inner life of the church even to the extent of direct control, with the ultimate goal of destroying faith.

"7. The alienation of the hierarchy and clergy from the flock, and a careless, proud relationship towards the laypeople in direct violation of the apostolic injunction to clergy to be an example and not exercise power over others.

"8. The wide-spread moral depravity and mercenariness among the uncanonical clergy.

"9. Uncanonical and capricious transferring of diocesan bishops."309

This was a good manifesto. The problem was: it was not adhered to consistently. And this failure, together with personnel and administrative failures, constituted the main reason for the collapse of ROCOR’s mission in Russia. The momentous event of the return of the exiles to Russia was undertaken almost casually, without a clearly defined strategy. Hence difficult problems arose, problems that ROCOR in the end found insuperable...

The first problem was one of self-definition: how could the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad continue to call herself the Church Abroad if she now had parishes inside Russia? After all, her Founding Statute or Polozhenie stated that ROCOR was an autonomous part of the Autocephalous Russian Church, that part which existed (i) outside the bounds of Russia on the basis of Ukaz № 362 of November 7/20, 1920 of Patriarch Tikhon and the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, and (ii) temporarily until the fall of communism in Russia. With the fall of communism and the creation of ROCOR parishes inside Russia in 1990, it would seem that these limitations in space and time no longer applied, and that ROCOR had ceased to exist as a canonical organisation in accordance with her own definition of herself in the Polozhenie. The solution to this problem was obvious: change the Polozhenie! And this was in fact the solution put forward by Bishop Gregory (Grabbe), who had been Chancellor of the Synod from 1931 until his retirement by Metropolitan Vitaly in 1986.

However, the ROCOR episcopate declined his suggestion, probably because a change in the Polozhenie that removed the spatial and temporal limitations of ROCOR’s self-definition would have had the consequence of forcing the ROCOR episcopate to: (i) remove the centre of her Church administration from America to Russia, (ii) proclaim herself (alongside any Catacomb Church groups that she might recognise) as part of the Russian Orthodox Church inside Russia and distinguished from the other parts only by its possessing dioceses and parishes abroad, and (iii) enter into a life-and-death struggle with the MP for the minds and hearts of the Russian people.

However, the ROCOR bishops could not accept these consequences. After all, they were well-established abroad, increasingly dependent economically on money from foreign converts to Orthodoxy, and with few exceptions were not prepared to exchange the comforts and relative security of life in the West for the uncertainty and privations of life in Russia. Thus even after the fall of communism, ROCOR’s first-hierarch, Metropolitan Vitaly, never set foot on Russian soil, in spite of numerous invitations from believers.

Of course, the whole raison d’être of ROCOR was to return to her homeland in Russia (she was previously called the Russian Church in Exile, and exiles by definition want to return to their homeland); and it was in anticipation of such a return that she had steadfastly refused to endanger her Russian identity by merging with other Local Orthodox Churches or by forming local jurisdictions identified with specific western countries (like the formerly Russian schism from ROCOR calling itself the Orthodox Church of America). But generations had passed since the first emigration, the descendants of that first emigration had settled in western countries, learned their languages, adopted their ways, put down roots in foreign soil. The exiles were no longer exiles from, but strangers to, their native land…

A second problem concerned ROCOR’s relationship to the Catacomb Church. Since 1927, when ROCOR had broken communion with Metropolitan Sergius at the same time as the Catacomb Church, she had looked upon the Catacomb Church as the True Church inside Russia with which she remained in mystical communion, even if such communion could not be realised in face-to-face meeting and concelebration. Indeed, after the death, in 1937, of Metropolitan Peter, the last universally recognised leader of the Russian Church, ROCOR commemorated “the episcopate of the persecuted Russian Church” – that is, the episcopate of the Catacomb Church. After the war, however, a change began to creep in, at first almost imperceptibly, but then more and more noticeably. On the one hand, news of Catacomb bishops and communities became more and more scarce, and some even began to doubt that the Catacomb Church existed any longer. On the other hand, as we have seen, some Catacomb priests inside Russia, having lost contact with, and knowledge of, any canonical bishops there might still be inside Russia, began commemorating Metropolitan Anastasy, first-hierarch of ROCOR.

These tendencies gave rise to the perception that the leadership of True
Orthodoxy had now passed from inside Russia to outside Russia. Moreover, the significance of the Catacomb Church began to be lost, as the struggle was increasingly seen to be between the “red church” inside Russia (the MP) and the “white church” outside Russia (ROCOR). This position was reinforced by the negative attitude taken towards most of the Catacomb clergy still alive in 1990 by Bishop Lazarus of Tambov, the bishop secretly consecrated by ROCOR in 1982 as her representative in Russia, who declared that the last canonical Catacomb bishop, Schema-Bishop Peter (Ladygin), died as long ago as 1957, and that he and his clergy were now the only group that could rightly be called “the Catacomb Church”.

A third, critical problem concerned the status of the Moscow Patriarchate. ROCOR’s position here was tragically double-minded: the bishops proved themselves incapable of making up their minds whether the MP was their bitterest enemy or their most beloved mother, whether it was necessary to fight her or unite with her! This double-mindedness bore bitter fruit that was to lead to schism and the collapse of ROCOR’s mission inside Russia and the eventual fall of the main body of ROCOR herself.

The roots of this double-mindedness go back to the post-war period, when large numbers of Christians fleeing towards Western Europe from Soviet Russia were joined to ROCOR. In receiving these Christians, little difference was made between those who had belonged to the Catacomb Church, and those who had belonged to the MP. Some, even including bishops, turned out to be KGB agents, and either returned to the MP or remained as “moles” to undermine ROCOR. Others, while sincerely anti-Soviet, were not sufficiently “enchurched” to see the fundamental ecclesiological significance of the schism in the Russian Church.

Thus a certain “dilution” in the quality of those joining ROCOR in the second emigration by comparison with the first – and the problem was to get worse with the third and fourth emigrations of the 70s, 80s and 90s – which began to affect the confessing stance of the Church as a whole. Even members of the first emigration were proving susceptible to deception. Thus over half of the Church in America and all except one diocese in China (that of Shanghai, led by St. John Maximovich) were lured back into the arms of the Soviet “Fatherland” and its Soviet “Church”.

Another reason for this diminution in zeal was ROCOR’s continuing communion with the Local Orthodox Churches of “World Orthodoxy” even after all of these (except Jerusalem) sent representatives to the local Councils of the MP in 1945 and 1948. The reasons for this continuation of communion depended on the Church in question. Thus communion continued with the Serbian Church because of the debt of gratitude ROCOR owed to it because of the hospitality
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shown by the Serbian Church to ROCOR in the inter-war years. Communion continued with the Jerusalem Patriarchate because all churches in the Holy Land, including ROCOR monasteries, were required, under threat of closure, to commemorate the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Communion also continued, albeit intermittently, with the Greek new calendarist churches, because the Patriarchate of Constantinople was powerful in the United States, the country to which ROCOR moved its headquarters after the war.

This ambiguous relationship towards “World Orthodoxy” inevitably began to affect ROCOR’s zeal in relation to the MP in particular. For if the MP was recognised by Serbia and Jerusalem, and Serbia and Jerusalem were recognised by ROCOR, the conclusion was drawn that the MP, while bad, was still a Church. And this attitude in turn affected ROCOR’s attitude towards the Catacomb Church, which was no longer seen by many, including several of the bishops, as the only true Church in Russia, but rather as a brave, but not entirely canonical organisation or collection of groupings which needed to be “rescued” by ROCOR before it descended into a form of sectarianism similar to that of the Old Believers.

This pro-Muscovite tendency in ROCOR was led, by the powerful Archbishop Mark of Berlin, who argued that ROCOR should return into communion with the patriarchate now that communism had fallen.312

As ROCOR began to lose confidence in herself and the Catacomb Church as the only bearers of true Russian Orthodoxy, the accent began to shift towards the preservation, not of Orthodoxy as such, but of Russianness. But for a foreign Church, however Russian in spirit, to claim to be more Russian than the Russians inside Russia was bound to be perceived as arrogant and humiliating (especially in the mouth of an ethnic German such as Archbishop Mark of Berlin!). And so, after the need to display a specifically Soviet patriotism fell away in the early 90s, the MP was able to mount a successful counter-attack, claiming for itself the mantle of “Russianness” as against the “American” church of ROCOR.

As a result, at the very moment that ROCOR was called to enter into an open war with the MP for the souls of the Russian people on Russian soil, she found herself unprepared, hesitant, unsure of her ability to fight this enemy, unsure even whether this enemy was in fact an enemy and not a potential friend, sister or even “mother”.

In consequence, ROCOR found itself “moving in two directions”, as the brother-priests Dionysius and Timothy Alferov put it. “The first was that of establishing [ROCOR] parishes in Russia. The second was working to enlighten the clergy of the very MP itself, and had as its goal the passing on to the [Russian] Homeland of the riches of the [Russian] Abroad’s spiritual and ecclesio-social experience. The adherents and supporters of both these courses of action argued
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amongst themselves from the start, although it cannot be said that these two approaches would have been completely and mutually exclusive, the one of the other.”

This double-mindedness eventually led to the collapse of the mission. For “if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who will prepare for battle?” (I Corinthians 14.8). Looking more at her enemies than at the Lord, ROCOR began, like the Apostle Peter, to sink beneath the waves. And the MP which, at the beginning of the 90s had been seriously rattled, recovered her confidence. By the middle of the 90s she had recovered her position in public opinion, while ROCOR lost ground.

This doublemindedness can be seen in ROCOR Synod’s statement of May 3/16, 1990, which was written by Archbishop Anthony of Geneva. In general it was strongly anti-MP, declaring that sergianism would not come to an end “until it renounces the declaration of Metropolitan Sergius, repents of the errors that followed from it, removes from its administration the hierarchs that have compromised themselves by anticanonical and amoral acts, have been involved in corruption and theft from the state through the mediation of secular authorities, and have also permitted distortions in the Divine services of the Russian Orthodox Church.” But it contained the qualification that there might be true priests dispensing valid sacraments in the patriarchate.

The idea that there can be true priests in a heretical church is canonical nonsense (Apostolic Canon 46), and Bishop Gregory (Grabbe) immediately obtained the removal of the offending phrase. But the damage had been done; the fatal disunity we have already observed within ROCOR about the status of its main enemy, the MP, now infected and weakened her mission within Russia. In fact, the very existence and legitimacy of ROCOR’s mission within Russia was opposed by many within ROCOR...

Thus Nun Cassia (Tatiana Senina) wrote: “Already at the beginning of the 1990s far from all the clergy of ROCOR supported the creation of canonical structures of our Church in Russia. This, for example, is what Fr. Alexander Mileant (now Bishop of Buenos-Aires and South America) wrote in 1991, officially addressing the believers of the MP in the name of his parish: ‘... Many write to us from Russia about the problems in the Russian Church (Moscow Patriarchate), about the presence in it of unworthy clergy who co-operated with the God-fighting power... Their presence in the Church is one more inherited illness which we must begin to cure with the help of God. However, we are disturbed by the move of some parishes dissatisfied with the Moscow Patriarchate into the spiritual care of the Russian Church Abroad, and also by the consecration of bishops for Russia. This can lead to a splintering of the Russian Church into a multitude of jurisdictions warring with each other and to the
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strengthening of sectarianism. Apparently the most appropriate thing to do now would be to convene an All-Russian Church Council as soon as possible with the participation of the bishops of the Moscow Patriarchate, the Russian Church Abroad and if possible of other Orthodox Churches in order to discuss the problems of the Orthodox Church in Russia and for the rapprochement or even merging of the Church Abroad with the mother Russian Church. I pray God to enlighten all the archpastors to find the way to correct the problems and instill peace in the Church. On my part I wish success to his Holiness Patriarch Alexis and all the clergy of the Russian Orthodox Church in the strengthening of faith in the Russian people!”315

Nevertheless, the mission provided hungry believers in Russia with two priceless assets: a canonical hierarchy, and correct doctrine. Thanks to these, and in spite of multiple shocks, the True Church in Russia survived into the critical period of the 1990s…

Although the fall of Communism had begun in Poland in 1981, as we have seen, the process had stymied in a kind of stalemate for eight years. But then it gradually dawned on both sides in the stand-off that the process of perestroika in the USSR was irreversible, especially after Gorbachev’s speech on December 7, 1988 at the United Nations. For, as Judt writes, “after announcing unilateral cuts in Soviet conventional forces in Europe, Gorbachev went on to advise his audience that ‘Freedom of choice is a universal principle. There should be no exceptions.’ This was more than just a renunciation of the ‘Brezhnev Doctrine’, an acknowledgement that Moscow would not use force to impose its version of ‘Socialism’ upon fraternal states. What Gorbachev was conceding – and was immediately understood to have conceded – was that the citizens of the satellite states were now at liberty to go their own way, Socialist or not. Eastern Europe was about to re-enter history…”

Garry Kasparov, the former world chess champion, has speculated that in letting Eastern Europe go its own way Gorbachev was motivated by self-interest and the desire to save his own skin: “It would have been foolish for Gorbachev to take risky military action in Hungary or Czechoslovakia when he had to worry about stability in the USSR. When your own house is on fire you don’t send the firefighters to your neighbour’s house.” However, it should be pointed out that the date of his speech at the United Nations — December, 1988 — preceded the beginning of real disturbances in any part of Europe by nearly a year. The Berlin Wall did not fall for another year, and the first blood was not shed in Eastern Europe until the Romanian dictator’s fall in December, 1989. So we may concede to Gorbachev some genuine democratic idealism in this matter – although there can be no doubt that his aim was always the reform of Communism, not its final demise…

The Poles immediately seized the opportunity. At the beginning of 1989 the government accepted that Solidarity and other parties could join in the political process. Then, in April, writes Chetverikova, “Lech Walesa and the representatives of the Polish government finally signed an Agreement on political and economic reforms, and in May the Polish Catholic church received a status that has no analogy in other East European countries: they returned to it the property that had been confiscated in the 1950s and allowed it to create its own educational institutions. In June of the same year the representatives of ‘Solidarity’ were victorious at the parliamentary elections, and its candidate, Tadeusz Mazowiecki, was elected as prime minister.”

“Soon,” writes J.M. Roberts, “the new parliament denounced the German-Soviet agreement of August 1939, condemned the 1968 invasion of
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Czechoslovakia, and set up investigations into political murders committed since 1981.

“In August Walesa announced that Solidarity would support a coalition government; the communist diehards were told by Mr Gorbachev that this would be justifiable (and some Soviet military units had already left the country). In September a coalition dominated by Solidarity and led by the first non-communist Prime Minister since 1945 took office as the government of Poland. Western economic aid was soon promised. By Christmas 1989 the Polish People’s Republic had passed from history and, once again, the historic Republic of Poland had risen from its grave.”319

The Polish counter-revolution could be said to have been completed in 1990, when “Lech Walesa became president of the country, and, characteristically wishing to be delivered from all signs of the socialist system, even on the symbolic level, he received his privileges, not from the lawful president Jaruzelski, but from the president of Poland in exile, Richard Kacharowski.”320

* 

Solidarity won the Polish election on June 4, 1989. By one of those coincidences that draws the attention of all believers in Divine Providence with eyes to see, this also happened to be the date of the Tiananmen Square massacre of democracy demonstrators in Beijing. Now according to the conventional version of history, these two events were diametrically opposite in their significance: Solidarity’s victory signified the triumph of Democracy over Communism in Warsaw, while the Chinese Army’s crushing of demonstrators signified the triumph of Communism over Democracy in Beijing. However, Naomi Klein has persuasively argued that neither of these events should be seen simply as the victory of one or the other ideology, but in both the one and the other case the victor was a third party that we have already encountered – Friedman’s Chicago School of Economics and its doctrine of “shock economic therapy”.

“As Latin America had just learned,” writes Klein, “authoritarian regimes have a habit of embracing democracy at the precise moment when their economic projects are about to implode. Poland was no exception. The Communists had been mismanaging the economy for decades, making one disastrous, expensive mistake after another, and it was at the point of collapse. ‘To our misfortune, we have won!’ Walesa famously (and prophetically) declared. When Solidarity took office, debt was $40 billion, inflation was at 600 percent, there were severe food shortages and a thriving black market. Many factories were making products that, with no buyers in sight, were destined to rot in warehouses. For Poles, the situation made for a cruel entry
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into democracy. Freedom had finally come, but few had the time or the inclination to celebrate, because their paychecks were worthless. They spent their days lining up for flour and butter if there happened to be any in the stores that week.

“All summer following its triumph at the polls, the Solidarity government was paralyzed by indecision. The speed of the collapse of the old order and the sudden election sweep had been shocks in themselves: in a matter of months, Solidarity activists went from hiding from the secret police to being responsible for paying the salaries of those same agents. And now they the added shock of discovering that they barely had enough money to make the payroll. Rather than building the post-Communist economy they had dreamed of, the movement had the far more pressing task of avoiding a complete meltdown and potential mass starvation.

“Solidarity’s leaders knew they wanted to put an end to the state’s viselike grip on the economy, but they weren’t at all clear about what could replace it. For the movement’s militant rank-and-file, this was the chance to test their economic program: if the state-run factories were converted to workers’ cooperatives, there was a chance they could become economically viable again – worker-management could be more efficient, especially without the added expense of party bureaucrats. Others argued for the same gradual approach to transition that Gorbachev was advocating at the time in Moscow – slow expansion of the areas in which supply-and-demand monetary rules apply (more legal shops and markets), combined with a strong public sector modelled on Scandinavian social democracy.

“But as had been the case in Latin America, before anything else could happen, Poland needed debt relief and some aid to get out of its immediate crisis. In theory, that’s the central mandate of the IMF: providing stabilizing funds to present economic catastrophes. If any government deserved that kind of lifeline it was the one headed by Solidarity, which had just pulled off the Eastern Bloc’s first democratic ouster of a Communist regime in four decades. Surely, after all the Cold War railing against totalitarianism behind the Iron Curtain, Poland’s new rulers could have expected a little help.

“No such aid was on offer. Now in the grips of Chicago School economists, the IMF and U.S. Treasury saw Poland’s problems through the prism of the shock doctrine. An economic meltdown and a heavy debt load, compounded by the disorientation of rapid regime change, meant that Poland was in the perfect weakened position to accept a radical shock therapy program. And the financial stakes were even higher than in Latin America: Eastern Europe was untouched by Western capitalism, with no consumer market to speak of. All of its most precious assets were still owned by the state – prime candidates for privatization. The potential for rapid profits for those who got in first were tremendous.
“Confident in the knowledge that the worse things got, the more likely the new government could be to accept a total conversion to unfettered capitalism, the IMF let the country fall deeper and deeper into debt and inflation. The White House, under George H.W. Bush, congratulated Solidarity on its triumph against Communism but made it clear that the U.S. administration expected Solidarity to pay the debts accumulated by the regime that had banned and jailed its members – and it offered only $119 million in aid, a pittance in a country facing economic collapse and in need of fundamental restructuring.

“It was in this context that Jeffey Sachs, then thirty-four, started working as an adviser to Solidarity. Since his Bolivian exploits, the hype surrounding Sachs had reached feverish levels. Marveling at how he could serve as economic shock doctor to half a dozen countries and still hold down his teaching job, the Los Angeles Times pronounced Sachs – who still looked like a member of the Harvard debate team – the ‘Indiana Jones of Economics’.

“Sachs’s work in Poland had begun before Solidarity’s election victory, at the request of the Communist government. It started with a one-day trip, during which he met with the Communist government and with Solidarity. It was George Soros, the billionaire financier and currency trader, who had enlisted Sachs to play a more hands-on role. Soros and Sachs travelled to Warsaw together, and as Sachs recalls, ‘I told the Solidarity group and the Polish government that I would be willing to become more involved to help address the deepening economic crisis.’ Soros agreed to cover the costs for Sachs and his colleague David Lipton, a staunch free-market economist then working at the IMF, to set up an ongoing Poland mission. When Solidarity swept the elections, Sachs began working closely with the movement.

“Though he was a free agent, not on the payroll of either the IMF or the U.S. government, Sachs, in the eyes of many of Solidarity’s top officials, possessed almost messianic powers. With his high-level contacts in Washington and legendary reputation, he seemed to hold the key to unlocking the aid and debt relief that was the new government’s only chance. Sachs said at the time that Solidarity should simply refuse to pay the inherited debts, and he expressed confidence that he could mobilize $3 billion in support – a fortune compared with what Bush had offered. He had helped Bolivia land loans with the IMF and renegotiated its debts; there seemed no reason to doubt him.

“That help, however, came at a price: for Solidarity to get access to Sachs’s connections and powers of persuasion, the government first needed to adopt what became known in the Polish press as ‘the Sachs Plan’ or ‘shock therapy’.

“It was an even more radical course than the one imposed on Bolivia: in addition to eliminating price controls overnight and slashing subsidies, the Sachs Plan advocated selling off the state mines, shipyards and factories to the private sector. It was a direct clash with Solidarity’s economic program of
worker ownership, and though the movement’s national leaders had stopped talking about the controversial ideas in that plan, they remained articles of faith for many Solidarity members. Sachs and Lipton wrote the plan for Poland’s shock therapy transition in one night. It was fifteen pages long and, Sachs claimed, was ‘the first time, I believe, that anyone had written down a comprehensive plan for the transformation of a socialist economy to a market economy.’

After three months of debate and a lot of opposition from the Solidarity leadership (especially Walesa himself), the Sachs Plan was eventually accepted. The main argument that persuaded them appears to have been Sachs’ thesis that “Poland would cease being exceptional and become ‘normal’ – as in ‘a normal European country’.” True, Sachs then “helped Poland negotiate an agreement with the IMF and secured some debt relief and $1 billion to stabilize the currency – but all of it, particularly the IMF funds, were strictly conditional on Solidarity’s submitting to shock therapy.”

In a feverish atmosphere of “extraordinary politics”, shock therapy was imposed. “It made a mockery of the democratic process since it directly conflicted with the wishes of the overwhelming majority of voters who had cast their ballots for Solidarity. As late as 1992, 60 percent of Poles still opposed privatization for heavy industry. Defending his unpopular actions, Sachs claimed he had no choice, likening his role to that of a surgeon in an emergency room. ‘When a guy comes into the emergency room and his heart’s stopped, you just rip open the sternum ad don’t worry about the scars that you leave,’ he said. ‘The idea is to get the guy’s heart beating again. And you make a bloody mess. But you don’t have any choice.’

“But once Poles recovered from the initial surgery, they had questions about both the doctor and the treatment. Shock therapy in Poland did not cause ‘momentary dislocation’s, as Sachs had predicted. It caused a full-blown depression: a 30 percent reduction in industrial production in the two years after the first round of reforms. With government cutbacks and cheap imports flooding in, unemployment skyrocketed, and in 1993 it reached 25 percent in some areas – a wrenching change in a country that, under Communism, for all its many abuses and hardships, had no open joblessness. Even when the economy began growing again, high unemployment remained chronic. According to the World Bank’s most recent figures, Poland has an unemployment rate of 20 percent – the highest in the European Union. For those under twenty-four, the situation is far worse: 40 percent of young workers were unemployed in 2006, twice the EU average. Most dramatic are the number of people in poverty: in 1989, 15 percent of Poland’s population was living below the poverty line; in 2003, 59 percent of Poles had fallen below the line. Shock therapy, which eroded job protection and made daily
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life far more expensive, was not the route to Poland’s becoming one of Europe’s ‘normal’ countries (with their strong labor laws and generous social benefits) but to the same gaping disparities that have accompanied the counterrevolution everywhere it has triumphed, from Chile to China…”

Let us turn, then, to China, where, as Klein writes, the government, "then led by Den Xiaoping, was obsessed with avoiding a repeat of what had just happened in Poland, where workers had been allowed to form an independent movement that challenged the party’s monopoly hold on power. It was not that China’s leaders were committed to protecting the state-owned factories and farm communes that formed the foundation of the Communist state. In fact, Deng was enthusiastically committed to a corporate-based economy – so committed that, in 1980, his government invited Milton Friedman to come to China and tutor hundreds of top-level civil servants, professors and party economists in the fundamentals of free-market theory. ‘All were invited guests, who had to show a ticket of invitation to attend,’ Friedman recalled of his audiences in Beijing and Shanghai. His central message was ‘how much better ordinary people lived in capitalist than in communist countries’. The example he held up was Hong King, a zeon of pure capitalism that Friedman had long admired for its ‘dynamic, innovative character that has been produced by personal liberty, free trade, low taxes, and minimal government intervention.’ He claimed that Hong Kong, despite having no democracy, was freer than the United States, since its government participated less in the economy.

“Friedman’s definition of freedom, in which political freedoms were incidental, even unnecessary, compared with the freedom of unrestricted commerce, conformed nicely with the vision taking shape in the Chinese Politburo. The party wanted to open the economy to private ownership and consumerism while maintaining its own grip on power – a plan that ensured that once the assets of the state were auctioned off, party officials and their relatives would snap up the best deals and be first in line for the biggest profits. According to this version of ‘transition’, the same people who controlled the state under Communism would control it under capitalism, while enjoying a substantial upgrade in lifestyle. The model the Chinese government intended to emulate was not the United States but something much closer to Chile under Pinochet: free markets combined with authoritarian political control, enforced by iron-fisted repression.

“From the start Deng clearly understood that repression would be crucial. Under Mao, the Chinese state had exerted brutal control over the people, dispensing with opponents and sending dissidents for re-education. But Mao’s repression took place in the name of the workers and against the bourgeoisie; now the party was going to launch its own counterrevolution and ask workers to give up many of their benefits and security so that a minority could collect huge profits. It was not going to be an easy task. So, in 1983, as Deng opened up the country to foreign investment and reduced protections for workers, he also ordered the creation of the 400,000-strong People’s Armed Police, a new, roving riot squad charged with quashing all signs of ‘economic crimes’ (i.e., strikes and protests). According to the China historian Maurice Meisner, ‘The People’s Armed Police kept American
helicopters and electric cattle prods in its arsenal.’ And ‘several units were sent to Poland for anti-riot training’ – where they studied the tactics that had been used against Solidarity during Poland’s period of martial law.

“Many of Deng’s reforms were successful and popular – farmers had more control over their lives, and commerce returned to the cities. But in the late eighties, Deng began introducing measures that were distinctly unpopular, particularly among workers in the cities – price controls were lifted, sending prices soaring; job security was eliminated, creating waves of unemployment; and deep inequalities were opening up between the winners and losers in the new China. By 1988, the party was confronting a powerful backlash and was forced to reverse some of its price deregulation. Outrage was also mounting in the face of the party’s defiant corruption and nepotism. Many Chinese citizens wanted more freedom in the market, but ‘reform’ increasingly looked like code for party officials turning into business tycoons, as many illegally took possession of the assets they had previously managed as bureaucrats.

“With the free-market experiment in peril, Milton Friedman was once again invited to pay a visit to China – much as the Chicago Boys and the piranhas had enlisted his help in 1973, when their program had sparked an internal revolt in Chile. A high-profile visit from the world-famous guru of capitalism was just the boost China’s ‘reformers’ needed.

“When Friedman and his wife, Rose, arrived in Shanghai in September 1988, they were dazzled by how quickly mainland China was beginning to look and feel like Hong Kong. Despite the rage simmering at the grass roots, everything they saw served to confirm ‘out faith in the power of free markets’. Friedman described this moment as ‘the most hopeful period of the Chinese experiment’.

“In the presence of official state media, Friedman met for two hours with Zhao Ziyang, general secretary of the Communist Party, as well as with Jiang Zemin, then party secretary of the Shanghai Committee and the future Chinese president. Friedman’s message to Jiang echoed the advice he had given to Pinochet when the Chilean project was on the skids: don’t bow to the pressure and don’t blink. ‘I emphasized the importance of privatization and free markets, and of liberalizing at one fell stroke,’ Friedman recalled. In a memo to the general secretary of the Communist Party, Friedman stressed that more, not less, shock therapy was needed. ‘China’s initial steps of reform
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have been dramatically successful. China can make further dramatic progress by placing still further reliance on free private markets.’…

“Friedman’s trip did not have the desired results. The pictures in the official papers of the professor offering his blessing to party bureaucrats did not succeed in bringing the public onside. In subsequent months, protests grew more determined and radical. The most visible symbols of the opposition were the demonstrations by student strikers in Tiananmen Square. These historic protests were almost universally portrayed in the international media as a clash between modern, idealistic students who wanted Western-style democratic freedoms and old-guard authoritarians who wanted to protect the Communist state. Recently, another analysis of the meaning of Tiananmen has emerged, one that challenges the mainstream version while putting Friedmanism at the heart of the story. This alternative narrative is being advanced by, among others, Wang Hui, one of the organizers of the 1989 protests, and now a leading Chinese intellectual of what is known as China’s ‘New Left’. In his 2003 book, China’s New Order, Wang explains that the protesters spanned a huge range of Chinese society – not just elite university students by also factory workers, small entrepreneurs and teachers. What ignited the protests, he recalls, was popular discontent in the face of Deng’s ‘revolutionary’ economic changes which were lowering wages, raising prices and causing ‘a crisis of layoffs and unemployment’. According to Wang, ‘These changes were the catalyst for the 1989 social mobilization’.

“The demonstrations were not against economic reform per se; they were against the specific Friedmanite nature of the reforms – their speed, ruthlessness and the fact that the process was highly antidemocratic. Wang says that the protesters’ call for elections and free speech were intimately connected to this economic dissent. What drove the demand for democracy was the fact that the party was pushing through changes that were revolutionary in scope, entirely without popular consent. There was, he writes, ‘a general request for democratic means to supervise the fairness of the reform process and the reorganization of social benefits.’”326

J.M. Roberts takes up the story: “Posters and rallies began to champion calls for greater ‘democracy’. The regime’s leadership was alarmed, refusing to recognize the [newly formed and unofficial Student] Union which, it was feared, might be the harbinger of a new Red Guards movement. There were demonstrations in many cities and as the seventieth anniversary of the May 4th Movement approached the student activists invoked its memory so as to give a broad patriotic colour to their campaign. They were not able to arouse much support in the countryside, or in the southern cities, but, encouraged by the obviously sympathetic attitude of the general secretary of the CCP, Zhao Ziyang, began a mass hunger strike. It won widespread popular sympathy and support in Peking. It started only shortly before Mr. Gorbachev arrived in the capital; his state visit, instead of providing further reassuring evidence of
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China’s international standing, only served to remind people of what was going on in the USSR as a result of policies of liberalization. This cut both ways, encouraging the would-be reformers and frightening the conservatives. By this time the most senior members of the government, including Deng Xiaoping, seem to have been thoroughly alarmed. Widespread disorder might be in the offing; they believed China faced a major crisis. Some feared a new cultural revolution if things got out of control (and Deng Xiaoping’s own son, they could have remarked, was still a cripple as a result of the injuries inflicted on him by Red Guards). On 20 May martial law was declared.

“There were signs for a moment that the government might not be able to impose its will, but the army’s reliability was soon assured. The repression which followed was ruthless. The student leaders had move the focus of their efforts to an encampment in Peking in Tiananmen Square, where, thirty years before, Mao had proclaimed the foundation of the People’s Republic. From one of the gates of the old Forbidden City a huge portrait of him looked down on the symbol of the protesters: a plastic figure of a ‘Goddess of Democracy’, deliberately evocative of New York’s Statue of Liberty. On 2 June the first military units entered the suburbs of Peking on their way to the square. There was resistance with extemporized weapons and barricades. They forced their way through. On 4 June the students and a few sympathizers were overcome by rifle-fire, teargas, and a brutal crushing of the encampment under the treads of tanks which swept into the square. Killing went on for some days, mass arrests followed (perhaps as many as ten thousand in all). Much of what happened took place before the eyes of the world, thanks to the presence of film-crews in Peking which had for days familiarized television audiences with the demonstrators’ encampment. Foreign disapproval was almost universal…”

“For Deng and the rest of the Politburo, the free-market possibilities were now limitless. Just as Pinochet’s terror had cleared the streets for revolutionary change, so Tiananmen paved the way for a radical transformation free from fear of rebellion. If life grew harder for peasants and workers, they would either have to accept it quietly or face the wrath of the army and the secret police. And so, with the public in a state of raw terror, Deng rammed through his most sweeping reforms yet.

“Before Tiananmen, he had been forced to ease off some of the more painful measures: three months after the massacre, he brought them back; and he implemented several of Friedman’s other recommendations, including price deregulation. For Wang Hui, there is an obvious reason why ‘market reforms that had failed to be implemented in the late 1980s just happened to have been completed in the post-1989 environment’; the reason, he writes, ‘is that the violence of 1989 served to check the social upheaval brought about by this process, and the new pricing system finally took shape.’ The shock of the massacre, in other words, made shock therapy possible.

“In the three years immediately following the bloodbath, China was cracked open to foreign investment, with special export zones constructed throughout the country. As he announced these new initiatives, Deng reminded the country that ‘if necessary, every possible means will be adopted to eliminate any turmoil in the future as soon as it has appeared. Martial law, or even more severe methods, may be introduced.’

“It was the wave of reforms that turned China into the sweatshop of the world, the preferred location for contract factories for virtually every multinational on the planet. No country offered more lucrative conditions than China: low taxes and tariffs, corruptible officials and, most of all, a plentiful low-wage workforce that, for many years, would be unwilling to risk demanding decent salaries or the most basic workplace protections for fear of the most violent reprisals.

“For foreign investors and the party, it has been a win-win arrangement. According to a 2006 study, 80 percent of China’s billionaires (calculated in Chinese yuan) are the children of Communist Party officials. Roughly twenty-nine hundred of these party scions – known as ‘the princelings’ – control $260 billion. It is a mirror of the corporatist state first pioneered in Chile under Pinochet: a revolving door between corporate and political elites who combine their power to eliminate workers as an organised political force. Today, the collaborative arrangement can be seen in the way that foreign multinational media and technology companies help the Chinese state to spy on its citizens, and to make sure that when students do Web searches or phrases like ‘Tiananmen Square Massacre’, or even ‘democracy’, no documents turn up.328 ‘The creation of today’s market society was not the result of a sequence of spontaneous events,’ writes Wang Hui, ‘but rather of state interference and violence’.329

“Chinese society,” writes Andrew J. Nathan, “fell into a deep anomy after June 4. Numbed, people everywhere turned away from politics. The sensitive intellectual class, and especially the young students with their exuberant idealism, entered the 1990s with nothing like the admirable social engagement they had shown in the 1980s. The campuses were tranquil, and China seemed shrouded in a dour mist that harboured a spiritual emptiness. Money ruled everything, morals died, corruption burgeoned, bribes were bartered, and when all this became known on the campuses it turned students thoroughly off politics...”330

328 “Today, any discussion of the Tiananmen Square protests is still banned in China. Films, books, newspapers and even whole publishing companies have been suppressed and shut down for breaking this rule. Chinese authorities have also attempted to censor the internet when it comes to the protests, but with less success. Search terms such as ‘June 4’ are blocked, but increasingly, social media have turned to more oblique code names.” ("Tiananmen Square Massacres", All About History, No. 043, p. 77) (V.M.)
329 Klein, op. cit., pp. 189-190.
The impact abroad was even greater. As Misha Glenny writes, “The world economy has never experienced a change comparable to the release of 1.25 billion people’s energy that followed China’s renewed reforms in 1991. From accounting for less than 1 per cent of global trade in 1990, China had become the world’s third-largest trader by 2004, outstripping Japan and only lagging behind the entire European Union and the United States. Analysts at the World Trade Organization predicted that its 6.7 per cent of global trade in that year would top 10 per cent within a decade. In its 2007 Trade Policy Review of China, it also pointed out that in the course this ten-year expansion, the country would need to create yet another 100 million jobs. China’s economies of scale mean that it can already compete in any industrial sector, and before long in most service sectors, too.”331

*

The Tiananmen massacre had another importance consequence: a turn in government rhetoric towards nationalist modes of expression. Thus even before the final decision to clear the Square, Deng Xiaoping expressed a typically Communist, but at the same time characteristically Chinese nationalist approach to the situation, going back to the Opium war of 1842: “The causes of this incident have to do with the global context. The Western world, especially the United States, has thrown its entire propaganda machine into agitation work and has given a lot of encouragement and assistance to the so-called democrats or opposition in China – people who are in fact the scum of the Chinese nation. This is the root of the chaotic situation we face today... Some Western countries use things like ‘human rights’, or like saying the socialist system is irrational or illegal, to criticize us, but what they’re really after is our sovereignty. Those Western countries that play power politics have no right at all to talk about human rights!"

Deng goes on to show how much the philosophy of human rights had penetrated the Communist world, displaying a defensiveness and a China-centred vision that implicitly renounced world revolution. He also displayed an unusual – for a Communist – concern for the welfare of the Capitalist countries of Pacific Asia, with which he tied China’s own prosperity: “Look how many people around the world they’ve robbed of human rights! And look how many Chinese people they’ve hurt the human rights of since they invaded China during the Opium war!...

“Two conditions are indispensable for our developmental goals: a stable environment at home and a peaceful environment abroad. We don’t care what others say about us. The only thing we really care about is a good environment for developing ourselves. So long as history eventually proves the superiority of the Chinese socialist system, that’s enough. We can’t bother about the social systems of other countries. Imagine for a moment what could

happen if China falls into turmoil. If it happens now, it’d be far worse than the Cultural Revolution.

“Once civil war got started, blood would flow like a river, and where would human rights be then? In a civil war, each power would dominate a locality, production would fall, communications would be cut off, and refugees would flow out of China not in millions or tens of millions but in hundreds of millions.

“First hit by this flood of refugees would be Pacific Asia, which is currently the most promising region of the world. This would be disaster on a global scale. So China mustn’t make a mess of itself. And this is not just to be responsible to ourselves, but to consider the whole world and all of humanity as well…”

Then he expressed his determination, on the one hand, to continue the Friedmanite economic revolution, and on the other, to preserve the Communist Party’s monopoly of power: “No one can keep China’s reform and opening from going forward. Why is that? It’s simple. Without reform and opening our development stops and our economy slides downhill. Living standards decline if we turn back. The momentum of reform cannot be stopped. We must insist on this point at all times.

“Some people say we allow only economic reform and not political reform, but that’s not true. We do allow political reform, but on one condition: that the Four Basic Principles are upheld. [The Four Basic Principles are Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong thought, socialism, the people’s democratic dictatorship, and leadership by the Chinese Communist Party].…

“We can’t handle chaos while we’re busy with construction. If today we have a big demonstration and tomorrow a great airing of views and a bunch of wall posters, we won’t have any energy left to get anything done. That’s why we have to insist on clearing the Square.”332

“In the aftermath of the massacre,” as Maria Chang writes, “the government sought to regain control by instigating a campaign of national unity in which young people were singled out for ‘patriotic education’. Calling the democracy movement a ‘counter-revolutionary rebellion’ that had the ‘black hands’ of foreign enemies behind it, the party urged the people to unite under its leadership or China would descend into chaos. In September 1994, the Patriotic Education Campaign was expanded to include the entire populace, followed by the publication in November 1995 of Selected Words for Instruction in Patriotic Education containing the writings and speeches of Mao, Deng, and Jiang Zemin on patriotism. The official People’s Daily admitted that the book was meant ‘to fill an ideological vacuum’ in the Chinese people, who were enjoined to ‘love their country’. Spearheading the campaign was Jiang,

332 Deng, in Nathan, op. cit., pp. 32, 33.
who instructed his party to rebuild itself ‘under the new banner of nationalism’ and urged that the masses, especially the youth, be ‘deeply inculcated’ with the values of ‘patriotism’.

“Although the Tiananmen incident was the catalyst, Beijing’s turn to patriotic nationalism has deeper roots and can be better understood in the larger context of the Communist Party’s need to re legitimize its rule. Deng’s market reforms had managed to salvage his party’s tattered legitimacy from the ruination wrought by Mao and rebuild it upon a pragmatic basis of economic performance. But China’s ideocratic political system demands more than pragmatic legitimation, requiring instead doctrinal legitimation provided by some overarching ideology. Jiang Zemin admitted as much when he said in a speech in 1996 that ‘Only with resolute theory can our politics be steadfast.’ And the Communist Party seems to have found its new doctrinal legitimation in Deng’s developmental nationalism.

“Franz Schurmann once observed that the CCP divides its ideology into two parts: The first is ‘theory’ (lilun) comprised of ideas that are claimed to be universally applicable and for all time; the second is ‘thought’ (sixiang), the practical application of universal theory to concrete circumstances of a particular time and place. For much of its history, the CCP considered Marxism-Leninism to be its guiding theory, while the ideas of Mao Zedong served as its thought. In March 1999, however, the party elevated the reformist ideas of Deng to the level of theory when it incorporated ‘Deng Xiaoping theory’ into the preamble of its constitution. In so doing, the Communist Party appeared to signal its formal adoption of developmental nationalism as its ideology. As observed by The Economist, with communism discredited and democracy distrusted, China’s leaders have turned to ‘a new ideology’ of ‘visceral nationalism’ to justify their power…”

By a remarkable coincidence, only a few years later the other former Communist superpower, Russia, moved in a very similar direction: after the fall of Communism and a decade of Friedmanite economic shock therapy under Yeltsin, Putin has moved to a new ideology of “visceral nationalism”…

THE FALL OF THE BERLIN WALL

“Poland,” writes Roberts, “led eastern Europe to freedom. The importance of events there had quickly been perceived in other communist countries, whose leaders were much alarmed. In varying degrees, too, all eastern Europe was exposed to the new factor of a steadily increasing flow of information about non-communist countries, above all, through television (which was especially marked in the GDR). More freedom of movement, more access to foreign books and newspapers had imperceptibly advanced the process of criticism there as in Poland. In spite of some ludicrous attempts to go on controlling information (Romania still required that typewriters be registered with the state authorities), a change in consciousness was under way…”

Tiananmen had been a victory for the Communist Party (and Chicagoan economics); but it was to be the last before the end of the millennium. Moreover, it helped the anti-Communist revolutionaries of Central and Eastern Europe by teaching them some valuable lessons. First, it showed that Communism could not be overcome by violence alone. Hence the remarkable eschewal of violence – with the partial exception of Romania – in the East European revolutions that developed with such extraordinary speed in the later part of 1989. A second lesson learned by the East Europeans – again with the partial exception of the Romanians – was that victory was not assured until the Communist Party itself, together with its security apparatus, had been at least partially “turned”, either through the removal of the threat of external invasion from Moscow (this was a particular threat to Poland and East Germany), or through shame at earlier betrayals of the nation (Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968). A third lesson was that the enslaved peoples of Communism were more likely to rise up against their enslavers if they had a flourishing example of a non-Communist state on their doorstep, to which they could be united. For the anti-Communists of Central and Eastern Europe in 1989 that alluring neighbouring state was the European Union...

But the remarkable thing about this process was how cautiously, not to say reluctantly, the EU took part in it. The ugly truth was that the EU had become so accustomed to appeasing Communist Eastern Europe through decades of Ostpolitik and détente, and so ready to turn its eyes away from the terrible reality of Communism for the sake of its own material comfort and security, that when it came to assisting in the process of finally destroying Communism and the Iron Curtain that separated East and West, they were unprepared and unwilling. The real movers here were the captive peoples themselves, assisted by the heads of the superpowers, Gorbachev, Reagan and Bush – and Germany’s Helmut Kohl, who was determined to seize the opportunity to reunite his country.

Roberts writes that the Hungarians’ “most important contribution to the dissolution of Communist Europe came in August 1989. Germans from the GDR were then allowed to enter Hungary freely as tourists, though their purpose was known to be to present themselves to the embassy and consulates of the Federal Republic for asylum. A complete opening of Hungary’s frontiers came in September (when Czechoslovakia followed suit) and a flow became a flood. In three days 12,000 East Germans crossed from these countries to the west. The Soviet authorities remarked that this was ‘unusual’. For the GDR it was the beginning of the end. On the eve of the carefully-planned and much-vaunted celebration of forty years’ ‘success’ as a socialist country, and during a visit by Mr Gorbachev (who, to the dismay of the German communists, appeared to urge the east Germans to seize their chance), riot police had to battle with anti-government demonstrators on the streets of east Berlin. The government and party threw out their leader, but this was not enough. November opened with huge demonstrations in many cities against a regime whose corruption was becoming evident; on 9 November came the greatest symbolic act of all, the breaching of the Berlin Wall. The East German Politburo caved in and the demolition of the rest of the Wall followed.

“More than anywhere else, events in the GDR showed that even in the most advanced communist countries there had been a massive alienation of popular feeling from the regime. 1989 had brought it to a head. All over eastern Europe it was suddenly clear that communist governments had no legitimacy in the eyes of their subjects, who either rose against them or turned their backs and let them fall down. The institutional expression of this alienation was everywhere a demand for free elections, with opposition parties freely campaigning. The Poles had followed their own partially-free elections in which some seats were still reserved to supporters of the existing regime, with the preparation of a new constitution; in 1990, Lech Walesa became President. A few months earlier, Hungary had elected a parliament from which emerged a non-communist government. Soviet soldiers began to withdraw from the country. In June 1990 Czechoslovakian elections produced a free government and it was soon agreed that the country was to be evacuated of Soviet forces by May 1991. In none of these countries did the former communist politicians get more than 16 per cent of the vote. Free election in Bulgaria was less decisive: there, the contest was won by the communist party members turned reformers and calling themselves socialists.

“In two countries, events turned out differently. Romania underwent a violent revolution (ending in the killing of its former communist dictator) after a rising in December 1989 which revealed uncertainties about the way ahead and internal divisions ominously foreboding further strife. By June 1990 a government some believed still to be heavily influenced by former communists had turned on some of its former supporters, now critics, and crushed student protest with the aid of vigilante squads of miners at some cost in [1100] lives and in disapproval abroad. The GDR was the other country where events took a special turn. It was bound to be a special case,
because the question of political change was inescapably bound up with the question of German re-unification. The breaching of the Wall revealed that not only was there no political will to support communism, there was no will to support the GDR either. A general election there in March 1990 gave a majority of seats (and a 48 per cent vote) to a coalition dominated by the Christian Democrat party – the ruling part of the western German Federal Republic. Unity was no longer in doubt; only the procedure and timing remained to be settled.

“In July the two Germanies joined in a monetary, economic and social union. In October they united, the former territories of the GDR becoming provinces of the Federal Republic. The change was momentous, but no serious alarm was openly expressed, even in Moscow, and Mr. Gorbachev’s acquiescence was his second great service to the German nation. Yet alarm there must have been in the USSR. The new Germany would be the greatest European power to the west. Russian power was now in eclipse as it had not been since 1918. The reward for Mr. Gorbachev was a treaty with the new Germany promising economic help with Soviet modernization. It might also be said, by way of reassurance to those who remember 1941-45, that the new German state was not just an older Germany revived. Germany was now shorn of the old east German lands (had, indeed, formally renounced them) and was not dominated by Prussia as both Bismarck’s Reich and the Weimar republic had been. More reassuring still (and of importance to west Europeans who felt misgivings), the Federal Republic was a federal and constitutional state seemingly assured of economic success, with nearly forty years’ experience of democratic politics to build on, and embedded in the structures of the EC and NATO. She was given the benefit of the doubt by west Europeans with long memories, at least for the time being.

“At the end of 1990, the condition of what had once seemed the almost monolithic east European bloc already defied generalization or brief description. As former communist countries (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary) applied to join the EC, or got ready to do so (Bulgaria), some observers speculated about a potentially wide degree of European unity than before. More cautious judgements were made by those who noted the virulent emergence of new – or re-emergence of old – national and communicable division to plague the new East. Above all, over the whole area there gathered the storm-clouds of economic failure and the turbulence they might bring. Liberation might have come, but it had come to peoples and societies of very different levels of sophistication and development, and with very different historical origins. Prediction was clearly unwise…”335

However, one thing could be safely predicted: if Germany would be reunited, the Cold War would be over…

*  

Judt writes: “Credit for German re-unification – a unique case of fusion in a decade of fission – must go in the first place to Helmut Kohl. The West German Chancellor was initially as hesitant as everyone else – on November 28th 1989 he presented to the Bundestag a five-year program of cautious steps toward German unity. But after listening to East German crowds (and assuring himself of the support of Washington) Kohl calculated that unified Germany was now not merely possible but perhaps urgent. It was clear that the only way to staunch the flow west (2,000 people a day at one point) was to bring West Germany east. In order to keep East Germans from leaving their country, the West German leader set about abolishing it.

“As in the 19th century, German unification was in the first instance to be achieved by a currency union; but political union inevitably followed. Talk of a ‘confederation’, which the West Germans had initially encouraged and Hans Modrow’s GDR cabinet had eagerly pursued, was precipitately dropped and in the hastily called East German elections of March 1990 Christian Democrat candidates ran on a unification ticket. Their ‘Alliance for Germany’ won 48 percent of the vote: the Social Democrats, handicapped by their well-advertised ambivalence on the subject, won just 22 percent. The former Communists – now the Party of Democratic Socialism – secured a respectable 16 percent showing...

“The first act of the new majority in the GDR Volkskammer, represented by a CDU-SPD-Liberal coalition led by Lothar de Maizière, was to commit their country to German unity. On May 18th 1990 a ‘monetary, economic and social union’ was signed between the two Germanies, and on July 1st its crucial clause – the extension of the Deutschmark to East Germany – came into force. East Germans could now exchange their virtually useless East German marks – up to the equivalent of DM 40,000 – at a hugely advantageous rate of 1:1. Wages and salaries in the GDR would henceforth be paid in Deutschmarks at parity – a dramatically effective device for keeping East Germans where they were, but with grim long-term consequences for East German jobs and the West German budget.

“On August 23rd, by pre-agreement with Bonn, the Volkskammer voted to accede to the Federal Republic. A week later a Treaty of Unification was signed, by which the GDR was absorbed into the FRG – as approved by its voters in the March elections and permitted under Article 23 of the 1949 Basic Law. On October 3rd the Treaty entered into force: the GDR ‘acceded’ to the Federal Republic and ceased to exist.

“The division of Germany had been the work of the victors of World War Two and its reunification in 1990 would never have come about without their encouragement or consent. East Germany was a Soviet satellite state, with 360,000 Soviet troops still stationed there in 1989. West Germany, for all its independence, was not free to act autonomously on this matter. As for Berlin, until a final peace settlement was reached it remained a city whose fate
formally depended upon the original occupying powers – France, Britain, the US and the Soviet Union.

“Neither the British nor the French were in any particular hurry to see Germany reunited. To the extent that West Europeans even thought about a unified Germany they assumed – reasonably enough – that it would come at the end of a long process of change in Eastern Europe, not right at the outset. As Douglas Hurd (the British foreign secretary) observed in December 1989, reflecting on the imminent conclusion of the Cold War: This was ‘a system... under which we’ve lived quite happily for forty years.’

“His Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, made no secret of her fears. In her memoirs she recalls a hastily convoked meeting with French President Mitterand: ‘I produced from my handbag a map showing the various configurations of Germany in the past, which were not altogether reassuring about the future... [Mitterand] said that at moments of great danger in the past France had always established special relations with Britain and he felt such a time had come again... It seemed to me that although we had not discovered the means, at least we both had the will to check the German juggernaut. That was a start.’

“Mrs. Thatcher – and she was not alone – was also worried that German unification might destabilize Mikhail Gorbachev, possibly even leading to the fall (by analogy with Nikita Khrushchev’s disgrace following his Cuban humiliation). But the British, for all their anxieties, had nothing to offer by way of an alternative to the course of events then unfolding in Germany and they duly acquiesced. Mitterand was not so easily appeased. More than anyone else, the French were truly disturbed by the collapse of the stable and familiar arrangements in Germany and in the Communist bloc as a whole.

“The first reaction from Paris was to try and block any move to German unification – Mitterand even going so far as to visit the GDR in December 1989 in a show of support for its sovereignty. He declined Helmut Kohl’s invitation to attend a ceremony to mark the re-opening of the Brandenburg Gate, and tried to convince Soviet leaders that, as traditional allies, France and Russia had a common interest in blocking German ambitions. Indeed, the French were banking on Gorbachev to veto German unity – as Mitterand explained to his advisers on November 28th 1989, ‘I don’t want to do anything to stop it, the Soviets will do it for me. They will never allow this greater Germany opposite them.’”

The French attitude to German reunification showed very clearly how old-style nationalism and balance-of-power politics were completely out of place in this age. The chance to overthrow Communism, the most evil system in world history, had offered itself in East Germany, with vast consequences throughout Europe and the world; but the French wanted to stop it, using the

---

Soviet bear to stamp on German freedom – all for the sake of preventing their closest ally in the European Union, West Germany, from becoming stronger than they! This showed how, at root, the thinking of leaders in Communist East and Capitalist West was not that different, but was similarly short-sighted and egoistical.

And so the remark of the British diplomat Robert Cooper is just: “What came to an end in 1989 was not just the Cold War or even, in a formal sense, the Second World War” but “the political systems of three centuries: the balance of power and the imperial urge.”\(^3\) It was not that human nature or the essential patterns of politics had changed; the will to power still existed in both East and West. What had changed were the stakes, which were global, not national, which meant that it was now senseless – even from a nationalist point of view – to pursue purely national advantage in the nuclear age.

Fortunately, Gorbachev and Kohl thought more strategically than Mitterand, more in accordance with the real benefits of all their peoples, - and the opportunity was seized.\(^3\) In any case, after Kohl’s decisive victory in the East German election, “the French President adopted a different tack. The Germans could have their unity, but at a price. There must be no question of an enhanced Germany taking an independent path, much less reverting to its old middle-European priorities. Kohl must commit himself to pursuing the European project under a Franco-German condominium, and Germany was to be bound into an ‘ever-closer’ union – whose terms, notably a common European currency, would be enshrined in a new treaty (to be negotiated in the following year in Maastricht).

“The Germans,” continued Judt, “agreed readily enough to all the French conditions… Unification was well worth some appeasement of Germany’s nervous European neighbour. In any case, Kohl… was not troubled at the idea of tying Germany ever more closely in the European Union.”\(^3\)

---

\(^3\) Cooper, in Ivan Krastev and Mark Leonard, “Europe’s Shattered Dream of Order”, *Foreign Affairs*, May-June, 2015.

\(^3\) It was as the holy Hermitess Helena of Chin in the Caucasus had prophesied in 1955, saying: “The eighth leader [of the Soviet Union] is called Michael [i.e. Michael Gorbachev, the eighth Soviet leader since Lenin]. He will be young and good-looking. He will change the situation. However, then there will come great poverty…” (Antonios Markou, *I Osia Eleni tou Kavkasou* (St. Helena of the Caucasus), Koropi, Attica, 2001)

\(^3\) Judt, *op. cit.*, p. 640.
In September, 1990, inter-Christian ecumenism took a major step forward at Chambésy, Switzerland, where a Declaration was agreed between a Joint Commission of Orthodox and Monophysite (called “Oriental Orthodox” in the documents), the Orthodox and Monophysites being called two “families of churches” (a phrase unknown to Orthodox ecclesiology). Paragraph Four of the Declaration said: “The two families accept that the two natures [of Christ] with their own energies and wills are united hypostatically and naturally without confusion, without change, without division and without separation and that they are distinguished only in thought (τη θεωρια μονη).”

This was already completely unacceptable to the Orthodox, and represented a heretical, Monophysite formulation. The two natures and wills of Christ are not distinguishable “only in thought”, but also in reality. Paragraph Seven also spoke of the two natures being distinguishable “only in thought”, which implied, as Ludmilla Perepiolkina points out “an absence of this distinction in reality”.340

Paragraph Five stated: “The two families accept that the One Who wills and acts is always the single Hypostasis of the incarnate Logos”. However, as Perepiolkina again correctly points out, according to the teaching of St. Maximus the Confessor, “the concept of energy (activity) of nature is attributable only to nature as a whole, and not to the hypostasis. This teaching was affirmed at the Sixth Ecumenical Council. In the Chambésy Declaration, as it is evident from Paragraph Five, natural wills and energies in Jesus Christ are attributed to His Hypostasis. In other words, this Paragraph is a purely Monothelite formula.”341

Paragraph Eight stated: “The two families accept the first three Ecumenical Councils which form our common heritage. With regard to the four later Councils of the Orthodox Church, the Orthodox affirm that, for them, points one through seven are also the teaching of these four later Councils, whereas the oriental Orthodox consider this affirmation of the Orthodox like their own interpretation. In this sense the oriental Orthodox respond positively to this affirmation.” An unclear statement, about which one thing, however, is clear: the Monophysites did not commit themselves to accepting the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Ecumenical Councils in the way the Orthodox did, but only “positively responded to their affirmation”, which means nothing in dogmatic terms.

Paragraph Nine stated: “In the light of our joint declaration on Christology and the joint affirmations mentioned above, we now clearly realize and understand that our two families have always loyally guarded the same and authentic Christological Orthodox Faith, and have maintained uninterrupted the apostolic tradition although they may have used the Christological terms in a different manner. It is that common faith and that continual loyalty to the

340 Perepiolkina, op. cit., p. 251.
341 Perepiolkina, op. cit., p. 252.
apostolic tradition which must be the basis of our unity and communion.”

This was in flat contradiction to 1500 years of Orthodox Tradition. In this period all the Holy Fathers unambiguously affirmed that the Monophysites had not “loyally guarded the same and authentic Christological Orthodox Faith”, and were in fact heretics. But the modern ecumenists claimed that all the six hundred and thirty holy Fathers of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, as well as all the Fathers of all the succeeding Council that condemned Monophysitism, were wrong, and the whole controversy was simply based on some linguistic misunderstandings!

Paragraph Ten of the Declaration stated: “The two families accept that all the anathemas and the condemnations of the past which kept us divided must be lifted by the Churches so that the last obstacle to full unity and communion of our two families can be removed by the grace and power of God. The two families accept that the lifting of the anathemas and the condemnations will be based on the fact that the Councils and the father previously anathematised or condemned were not heretics.”

So the Seven Ecumenical Councils needed to be amended, said these “theologians”, and the anathemas against all the Monophysite councils and fathers, including the notorious heresiarchs Dioscurus, Timothy and Severus, lifted! This was a clear and explicit rejection of the Faith of the Seven Ecumenical Councils!

Of course, the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches (with the exception of Jerusalem) had already implicitly rejected the Councils and the Fathers by their communion in prayer and the sacraments with all sorts of heretics, and even pagans, of which the WCC General Assembly in Canberra in 1991 was perhaps the most extreme example. Nevertheless, it was a further and important stage to say explicitly that the Ecumenical Councils, the highest authority in Orthodoxy, had been wrong, that the Monophysites should not have been condemned, that they had been Orthodox all these centuries although the Holy Fathers and all the saints of the Orthodox Church considered them to be heretics. This was not simply a failure to come up to the standards of the Ecumenical Councils: it was a renunciation of the standards themselves.

Although the Chambesy unia was not formally ratified by the Moscow Patriarchate, this was for completely non-theological reasons,342 and the MP has continued to act as if the unia were valid and true.

It was therefore with complete justification that the Holy Synod of the Truth Orthodox Church of Greece under Archbishop Chrysostom (Kiousis) issued the following statement in July, 1991:-

“At Chambésy the Orthodox and the Monophysites agreed that ‘now they have clearly understood that both families (i.e. the Orthodox and the Monophysites) have always loyally maintained the same authentic Orthodox Christological Faith and the unbroken continuity of the Apostolic tradition…”

“… How is it possible to accept as correct that which has now been understood by twenty-one representatives of the Patriarchates and Autocephalous Churches – that is, that for fifteen hundred years the Orthodox and Monophysites had the same Christological Faith – when it is a fact that four Ecumenical Councils condemned the latter as heretical? Is it possible that the Holy Fathers who took part in them were mistaken, and were unjust towards the Monophysites? Was there not to be found even one of the 630 Fathers of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, of the 165 Fathers of the Fifth, of the 227 of the Sixth, or of the 367 of the Seventh, to understand this which the ecumenist Orthodox of Chambésy have now understood – that is, that the Monophysites are not heretics? So it is that 1,389 Holy Fathers are in error, and the twenty-one representatives of the innovative Orthodox are right? Are we to believe that the Holy Spirit did not enlighten the Holy Fathers? Are we to deny the divine inspiration of the Holy Councils? Heretical and blasphemous! Even more boldly, are we to assert that St. Euphemia, who sealed with a miracle the Definition of Faith of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, misunderstood the ‘Orthodoxy’ of the Monophysites because she did not understand the language? A fearsome thing!

“The Orthodox and the Monophysites agree that ‘both families accept the first three Ecumenical Councils…’ [But] the Orthodox Church accepts seven Ecumenical Councils. At Chambésy, at the demand of the Monophysites, the Orthodox delegates accepted the recognition of the first three; the rest are put aside and are considered a matter only for the Chalcedonian Orthodox. For the Monophysites, who are condemned as heretics and anathematised by them, it is appropriate to oppose these four other Ecumenical Councils. But is it permissible for men, however modernist they might be, who would be called Orthodox, and who declare themselves hierarchs and theologians, to limit the Ecumenical Councils to three? How do they dare? How did they sign such a grossly treasonous agreement? At least those who signed the false union of Florence-Ferrara [with Rome], when they returned to the capital and repented, declared ‘Let our hands be cut off’ and abjured the false union…

“One can only be horrified at the betrayal of those who signed the agreement at Chambésy. Those who were deposed and anathematised as heretics by four Ecumenical Councils are now recognized as ‘saints’ and ‘Fathers’ of the innovating Church… Who are they? There is Dioscorus, whom the Fourth Ecumenical Council anathematised as being of one mind with the heretic Eutyches… and the rest against whom the Orthodox Church cries out the Anathema which is read in the hearing of all on the Sunday of Orthodoxy. Now the modernist Orthodox would honor them in their churches, make icons of them and light candles to them, asking forgiveness because our Holy Fathers unjustly condemned them as heretics…
“Let all who signed the agreement at Chambésy know that they have ceased to be Orthodox, since they are communicants of the heresy of the Monophysites.

Those who signed the agreement at Chambésy did not sign as individuals. Chiefly, they signed as representatives of their Churches, and their Churches accepted the agreement at Chambésy...

Therefore we denounce this new false union which was signed at Chambésy by the representatives of the Autocephalous Churches and Patriarchates, who, after 1,500 years, have fallen into the heresy of Monophysitism... and... the New Calendarist State Church for all that has been stated, and declare it to be heretical henceforth. We call upon every faithful Orthodox person, following upon the treasonous agreement at Chambésy, to choose between Orthodoxy and Monophysitism. Whoever wants to remain Orthodox, whoever wants to remain a member of the Body of the Church of Christ, must immediately cease all relationship and communion with the heretical and monophysitizing shepherds of the Churches which signed and accepted the agreement of Chambésy.

All who remain disinterested or silent, and ally themselves with the supporters of the agreement of Chambésy, have simply embraced Monophysitism and its wrong-thinking ‘Fathers’ Dioscorus, Severus, Timothy, and the other heretics. Such people have upon their heads the anathemas of the Ecumenical Councils. They are outside the Church, outside of salvation, and their portion is with that of all the heretics.

“We have spoken. Let every... Orthodox faithful person take up his responsibilities before God and man. ‘Let us stand aright; let us stand with fear.’”

Chambésy was followed by the Seventh General Assembly of the WCC in Canberra in 1991, in which the Orthodox delegates blasphemed against the Faith still more blatantly. Thus aboriginal pagans invited the participants to pass through a “cleansing cloud of smoke” uniting Aboriginal to Christian spirituality (!). In spite of this, Metropolitan Cyril (Gundiaev), head of the Department of External Relations of the MP and the present patriarch, said that the WCC was “our common home and we want it to be the cradle of the one church”.544

Chambésy was soon producing concrete fruits. Thus on July 22, 1991, the


Synod of the Antiochian Patriarchate (which included the notoriously pro-Islamic Metropolitan George Khodre) implemented a series of measures aimed at achieving full union with the Monophysite Syriac Church. These included a prohibition on the proselytism among the Monophysites and full eucharistic communion.\(^\text{345}\) Again, on November 12, 1991 Patriarch Ignatius IV of Antioch issued an “Official Statement of the Orthodox Church of Antioch on Relations between the Eastern Orthodox and Syrian Orthodox Churches of Antioch” in which the unia between his Church and the Syrian Monophysites (called here “the Syrian Orthodox Churches”) was proclaimed as follows:

“1. We affirm the total and mutual respect of the spirituality, heritage and Holy Fathers of both Churches. The integrity of both the Byzantine and Syriac liturgies is to be preserved.

“2. The heritage of the Fathers in both Churches and their traditions as a whole should be integrated into Christian education curricula and theological studies. Exchanges of professors and students are to be enhanced.

“3. Both Churches shall refrain from accepting any faithful from one Church into the membership of the other, irrespective of all motivations or reasons.

“4. Meetings between the two Churches, at the level of their Synods, according to the will of the two Churches, will be held whenever the need arises.

“5. Every Church will remain the reference and authority for its faithful, pertaining to matters of personal status (marriage, divorce, adoption, etc.).

“6. If bishops of the two Churches participate at a holy baptism or funeral service, the one belonging to the Church of the baptized or deceased will preside. In case of a holy matrimony service, the bishop of the bridegroom's Church will preside.

“7. The above mentioned is not applicable to the concelebration in the Divine Liturgy.

“8. What applies to bishops equally applies to the priests of both Churches.

“9. In localities where there is only one priest, from either Church, he will celebrate services for the faithful of both Churches, including the Divine Liturgy, pastoral duties, and holy matrimony. He will keep an independent record for each Church and transmit that of the sister Church to its authorities.

“10. If two priests of the two Churches happen to be in a locality where there is only one Church, they take turns in making use of its facilities.

“11. If a bishop from one Church and a priest from the sister Church happen to

\(^{345}\) The Word, April, 1992.
concelebrate a service, the bishop will preside even when it is the priest's parish.

“12. Ordinations into holy orders are performed by the authorities of each Church for its own members. It would be advisable to invite the faithful of the sister Church to attend.

“13. Godfathers, godmothers (in baptism), and witnesses in holy matrimony, can be chosen from the members of the sister Church.

“14. Both Churches will exchange visits and will co-operate in the various areas of social, cultural, and educational work.

“We ask God's help to continue strengthening our relations with the sister Church, and with other Churches, so that we all become one community under one Shepherd.”

At the time of writing, the Orthodox and the Monophysites in Syria are indeed “one community” even if they do not yet have one shepherd...

* 

Union with the Monophysites at Chambésy proceeded in parallel with moves towards union with the Catholics, with the Protestants, and even with the Jews.

In March, 1992, the heads of the Local Orthodox Churches met in Constantinople and issued a communiqué that more or less renounced missionary work. After condemning the work of Catholic Uniates and Protestant fundamentalists in Orthodox countries, they went on to “remind all that every form of proselytism – to be distinguished from evangelization and mission – is absolutely condemned by the Orthodox. Proselytism, practiced in nations already Christian, and in many cases even Orthodox, sometimes through material enticement and sometimes by various forms of violence, poisons the relations among Christians and destroys the road towards their unity. Mission, by contrast, carried out in non-Christian countries and among non-Christian peoples, constitutes a sacred duty of the Church, worthy of every assistance” (point 4). Here a dishonourable deal was being proposed: if you refrain from proselytising in Orthodox countries, we will not receive converts in western countries. Of course, this renunciation of proselytism among western heretics had been implicit in the Ecumenical Patriarchate’s statements since the encyclical of 1920, and in all the Orthodox leaders’ actions in ecumenical forums since the 1960s. But it still came as a shock to see the “Orthodox Church” renouncing the hope of conversion and therefore salvation for hundreds of millions of westerners. Here the ecumenical “Orthodox” renounced the first commandment of the Lord to His Church after the Resurrection: “Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you…” (Matthew 28.19-20).


On November 13, 1991 Patriarch Alexis of Moscow addressed the Rabbis of New York as follows: “Dear brothers, shalom to you in the name of the God of love and peace!… We are all brothers, for we are all children of the Old Testament on Mount Sinai, which, as we Christians believe, was renewed by Christ… Your law is our law, your prophets are our prophets.”

This was a profound error, which was thoroughly exposed – and anathematized – by the holy Apostle Paul in his epistle to the Galatians.\footnote{And also in the holy canons: “But if any shall be found to be Judaizers, let them be anathema from Christ” (Canon XXIX, Synod of Laodicea, c. 365 A.D.).} There is a sense in which the Old Testament law and prophets were not destroyed, but fulfilled by Christ (Matthew 5.17) – that is, in the sense that He revealed their inner meaning. But “the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ” (Galatians 3.24), and having found Christ, we follow, not the law of the Old Testament, but of the New Testament.

Some parts of the old law are still obligatory for Christians – the Ten Commandments, for example. But even there adjustments need to be made: the commandment to “keep the sabbath holy”, for example, applies now to Sundays and Church feast days, not to Saturdays. And the commandments against murder and adultery are now deepened to become commandments against anger and lust. As for circumcisions and animal sacrifices and the worship in the Temple on Mount Moriah, this is now definitely excluded, being replaced by the worship and sacraments of the Church. So the Jews’ law is not our law. Nor do they stand in a relationship of equality of honour to the Christians. As for the prophets, they prophesied about Christ; and it is the Christians, not the Jews, who have understood the prophecies and paid heed to them.

The patriarch continues: “Judaism and Christianity are united by a spiritual and natural affinity and positive religious interests. We are united with the Jews without renouncing Christianity. For this is not contrary to Christianity, but in the name and for the sake of Christianity. And the Jews are united with us also in the name and for the sake of genuine Judaism.”

231
Astonishing! Then why have the main persecutors of Orthodox Christianity for the last two thousand years been the Jews? And why does the Jews’ “holy” book, the Talmud, say such terrible things about Christ, the Mother of God and Christians in general?

No: to be united with the Jews means precisely to renounce Christianity; it is to be united with Annas and Caiaphas and Judas and to be separated from Christ and the holy Apostles, Martyrs and Fathers of the Church.

“We are separated from the Jews because we are not wholly Christian, and the Jews are separated from us because they are not wholly Jewish. Because full Christianity embraces Judaism and full Judaism is Christianity.”

The patriarch speaks truly about himself when he says he is “not wholly Christian”. More precisely, he is not Christian at all. For no Christian, whether “full” or not, can possible embrace Judaism, which is the antithesis of Christianity. For the Jews reject every single article of the Nicene Creed with the possible exception of the first, about God the Father. And yet even here it cannot be said that the Jews know God the Father. For “who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, hath not the Father” (I John 2.22-23).

“The hierarchs, clergy and theologians of our Church resolutely and openly denounce all and sundry manifestations of anti-Semitism and enmity and pogroms against the Jews.”

The Orthodox Church rejects anti-Semitism, that is, a rejection of the Jews on the grounds of their race. She also rejects pogroms because pogroms are murder. But the Church is and will never cease to be anti-Judaic, because Judaism is a lie, the worst of all lies.

“During the notorious Beilis trial, Archpriest Alexander Glagolev, a professor at the Kiev Ecclesiastical Academy, and Ivan Troitsky, a professor at the St. Petersburg Ecclesiastical Academy, firmly defended Beilis and resolutely rejected the accusations of ritual killings allegedly practised by the Jews. The Metropolitan of St. Petersburg, Antony (Vadkovsky), did much to protect the Jews from the anti-Semitic attacks of the extreme right-wing radical organizations. There were also many other hierarchs and theologians of our Church who courageously defended the Jews from the enmity and slanderous accusations made by the anti-Semitic circles: Metropolitan Macarius (Bulgakov), Bishop Donatus (Babinsky) of Grodno, Bishop Vissarion (Nechaev), Archbishop Seraphim (Mescheryakov), Archbishop Macarius (Miroliubov).”

Much could be said about the Beilis trial, which was indeed “notorious” – mainly because of the extreme pressure brought to bear upon witnesses by the Jews and their supporters, and the extreme inefficiency of the police work. Beilis was indeed acquitted, but the court established that the victim, Andrew Yuschinsky, had been the victim of a ritual murder.
The patriarch also ignored the fact that the Orthodox Church has officially glorified at least one victim of Jewish ritual murder – the Child Martyr Gabriel, to whom Metropolitan Anthony Khраповицкий wrote a service.

“We should also mention that many of our theologians and outstanding religious thinker, such as Vladimir Soloviev, Nicholas Berdiaev, and Father Sergius Bulgakov, stood up for the Jews. Vladimir Soloviev regarded the defence of the Jews, from the Christian point of view, to be one of the major tasks of his life. For him the main question was not whether the Jews were good or bad, but whether we Christians were good or bad. Much had been done for establishing a Christian dialogue by our famous religious thinkers of Jewish origin, Semyon Frank and Lev Shestov.349

“In this difficult but sacred cause for all of us we hope for understanding and help from our Jewish brothers and sisters. We shall build, by our joint efforts, a new society - one that is democratic, free, open and just. It will be a society which no one will want to leave, and in which the Jews will live confidently and calmly, in an atmosphere of friendship, creative cooperation and fraternity between the children of our common God – the Father of all, the God of your and our fathers…”350

The rabbis did not forget the honour paid to them by the patriarch: during the visit of Alexis II to the U.S.A. in 1993 the chief rabbi of New York, Schneier, presented him with the prize “The Call of Conscience”. And both in 1991 and in 1993 the patriarch was a guest of a Zionist organization of the same name; he visited synagogues and met Jewish religious leaders...

In 1992, the president of the Union of Orthodox Brotherhoods, Sergius Poliakov, declared that the patriarch’s speech to the New York rabbis had been “clearly heretical”. And a representative of the Tver diocese declared that “almost 60% of the diocesan clergy” were refusing to commemorate the patriarch.351 Unfortunately, only one of those priests actually joined the True Church...352

The MP was able to face down its dissidents. In its council in December, 1994, the patriarchate's participation in the WCC was unequivocally endorsed as having been inspired “primarily by considerations of the good it would do for the

349 The first four thinkers he mentions here are all notorious heretics! (V.M.)
Church”. Then a purge of the anti-ecumenist brotherhoods began. The decision was made to permit common prayers with heretics with the blessing of the local bishop. And with the death in 1995 of the only anti-ecumenist in the hierarchy, Metropolitan John (Snychev) of St. Petersburg, the victory of the ecumenists appeared to be sealed.

353 See A. Soldatov, "Obnovlenie ili obnovlenchstvo?" (Renovation or Renovationism?), Pravoslavnaia Rus' (Orthodox Russia), № 20 (1521), October 15/28, 1994, pp. 6-9; Service Orthodoxe de Presse (Orthodox Press Service), № 194, January, 1995, pp. 7-10 (F); V.N. Osipov, "Pravoslavnoe serdtse na vetru", Pravoslavnaia Rus' (Orthodox Russia), № 2 (1527), January 15/28, 1995, pp. 14-15.

“August 1988”, writes David Reynolds, “finally saw a ceasefire in the Iran-Iraq war. The conflict that Iraq had begun in September 1980 had turned into the longest conventional war of the twentieth century. The dead and wounded exceeded 1 million; the cost ran to $1.2 billion. Although the fighting ended, no peace was agreed and, less than two years later, on 2 August 1990, Iraq invaded and occupied its neighbour to the southeast, the emirate of Kuwait.

“Faced with vast war debts and growing internal discontent, Saddam reckoned that invading Kuwait was the best way to increase his regional power, enhance his oil revenues and shore up domestic support. Personalities aside, Iraq – hacked by the British in 1921 out of the ruins of the Ottoman empire – was virtually landlocked, having only fifteen miles of coastline through which its exports (mostly oil) could flow into the Gulf. Territorial disputes with neighbouring Iran and Kuwait were features of its national history.

“So Iraqi warmaking in 1990 was the act of a fragile state as well as a megalomaniac leader, but it was only possible because the West had built up Saddam as a major power. From 1983, as the war against Iran went decisively against him, the US and Arab states, including Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, came to his aid to prevent victory for the Islamic revolutionaries in Teheran. In 1983-4 Baghdad’s trade with Washington was three times the value of its trade with Moscow, officially its main patron. Saddam was receiving top-quality US intelligence as well as credits to build an oil pipeline to Jordan. Britain and other NATO states helped further to expand Saddam’s arsenal – often using a spurious distinction between military and non-military equipment to sell machine weaponry. The lack of Western condemnation of Saddam’s brutal methods of war in Iran (including the use of chemical weapons) encouraged him to expect similar indifference when he attacked Kuwait.

“The outcry that greeted Saddam’s attack – from Bush in Washington to Hosni Mubarak in Cairo - was partly anger at having been deceived and surprised, but there was far more at stake than amour-propre. Although Kuwait was an autocratic monarchy, it was also a small country brutally overwhelmed by a big neighbour. Within hours Iraq had been unanimously condemned by the fifteen-member UN Security Council; even Marxist Cuba supported the United States…

“By effectively promising to liberate Kuwait, the president was going against the firm advice of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, Colin Powell – the first black American to hold that post. Bush had been goaded by the media but he was also expressing gut instinct, and what stuck in his gut was Hitler.
“‘Half a century ago, the world had the chance to stop a ruthless aggressor and missed it,’ he told a conference of war veterans later in August. ‘I pledge to you: We will not make that mistake again.’ As reports of Saddam’s atrocities in Kuwait kept coming in, the president’s anger mounted. ‘We’re dealing with Hitler revisited, a totalitarianism and a brutality that is naked and unprecedented in modern times. And that must not stand. We cannot talk about compromise when you have that kind of behaviour going on this very minute. Embassies being starved, people being shot, women being raped – it is brutal. And I will continue to remind the rest of the world that this must not stand.’

“By occupying Kuwait, Saddam had doubled his control over world oil reserves to 20 per cent; if he also invaded Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, then the proportion would rise to over half. It is not clear that he planned to do so but, having been wrong-footed over Kuwait, US policy makers lurched from complacency to alarm. Within days the Saudis had acceded to American pressure and asked for US troops to help defend their kingdom. So began Operation Desert Shield.

“General Powell and Secretary of State James Baker still hoped that international sanctions might be enough to persuade Saddam to pull our of Kuwait, but Bush and Brent Scowcroft, his national security adviser, were gearing up for war. On 30 October, Powell gave a White House briefing on his recent trip to the Middle East, using a series of flip-charts to illustrate US plans. He reported that the first phase of the mission was virtually accomplished. ‘We’ll soon be in a position to defend Saudi Arabia.’ Then Powell flipped on to explain how America could ‘go on the offensive to kick the Iraqis out of Kuwait’…

“The die was cast, but Bush was still careful to proceed by consent. On 29 November the US secured a resolution in the UN Security Council authorizing member states to ‘use all necessary means to uphold and implement’ previous resolutions about Kuwait and to ‘restore international peace and security in the area’ if Iraq was not out of the country by 15 January 1991. This gave Bush the legitimacy he needed for war.

“The following day the president praised what he called the ‘historic UN resolution’…

“… With the undeclared war in Vietnam in mind, Bush was at pains to obtain congressional approval, though the vote was close in the Senate. The White House offered various justification for the impending war – from stopping Hitlerite aggression to securing Western oil, from safe-guarding American jobs to denying Saddam a nuclear arsenal – but increasingly another slogan too precedence. As Bush told Americans on the day the war began in January 1991, ‘We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order – a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations. When
we are successful – and we will be – we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.N.’s founders.”\textsuperscript{355}

The UN’s founders had included the Soviet Union as well as the United States, and Bush’s success in this venture was largely owing to the fact that the Soviet Union under Gorbachev and Shevardnadze did not apply their usual veto on western-led undertakings.\textsuperscript{356} Moreover, the Americans were supported on the battlefield not only by the ever-faithful British, but also by the ever-obstructive French. And “among the Arab states, not merely Egypt and Saudi Arabia – long-standing American allies – were supportive but also inveterate foes such as Syria.

“So, when the defensive Operation Desert Shield became the offensive Desert Storm in mid-January 1991, it was a war waged by a unique international alliance. The mood in America, however, remained somber. Playing on these fears, Saddam promised ‘a second Vietnam and the mother of all battles’.

“On 17 January the coalition began intensive bombing against Iraq’s air defence and command systems, and then against similar targets in occupied Kuwait. Ground operations started five weeks later. The Allied commander, General H. Norman Schwarzkopf, controlled 540,000 US troops and 250,000 from the Allies, of whom the Saudis comprised the largest contingent. Schwarzkopf planned a classic encirclement. Feint attacks north against Kuwait City would suck in the enemy, while the bulk of the US armoured and mechanized units plus a British and a French division, would sweep hundreds of kilometres west and then east to cut off the Iraqi forces.

“Execution was almost perfect. The ground war began on 24 February and lasted only 100 hours before Bush called a halt to avoid what seemed on TV to be a massacre. Later estimates range from 35,000 to 80,000 Iraqi dead. The coalition lost 240 killed in action, of whom 148 were Americans…

“For Bush, victory vindicated his new rhetoric. ‘Until now, the world we’ve known has been a world divided – a world of barbed wire and concrete block, conflict, and cold war. Now, we can see a new world coming into view. A world in which there is the very real prospect of a new world order.’

“Diplomatically, however, the impact of the war was less definitive. Bush deliberately stopped fighting when Kuwait was liberated; he did not invade Iraq or seek to topple Saddam, though he hoped and assumed that after such a disaster there would be a coup in Iraq. In the aftermath, as Saddam

\textsuperscript{355} Reynolds, op. cit., pp. 532-533, 534, 535.

\textsuperscript{356} “The Soviet Union,” writes Kasparov, “had been Saddam’s main supporter, so the joint US-USSR statement condemning his invasion was another signal that the Cold War was fading” (op. cit., p. 33).
recovered, there was much criticism of US restraint, but Bush remained unrepentant. Defending his actions seven years later he argued that, in order to seek out and eliminate Saddam, ‘we would have been forced to occupy Baghdad and, in effect, rule Iraq. The coalition would instantly have collapsed.’ Furthermore, he went on, ‘we had been self-consciously trying to set a pattern for handling aggression in the post-Cold War world. Going in and occupying Iraq, thus unilaterally exceeding the United Nations mandate, would have destroyed the precedent of international response to aggression that we hoped to establish. Had we gone the invasion route, the United States could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land.’”

“Written in 1998, those words sound sadly prescient today…”

They were indeed, and in the contrast between the Gulf War of 1991 led by President George H.W. Bush and the second Gulf War of 2003 led by his son, President George W. Bush, we see not only the contrast between a wise father and a foolish son, but also why Bush senior’s “new world order” lasted for such a short time.

The key to the New World Order, as Bush senior saw it, was in the rule of international law administered by the United Nations in close cooperation with the United States as the world’s only surviving superpower. It was based on several presuppositions that were fulfilled, briefly, under Bush senior, but not fulfilled under his son, Bush junior. These included:

1. The willingness of the non-democratic members of the Security Council – Russia and China – to cooperate with the consensus of the other nations and not apply their vetoes. As time passed, this willingness disappeared. By 2003 even democratic members of the Council, such as France, refused to cooperate.
2. The willingness of the United States never to take the initiative in overseas military operations without the agreement of the United Nations. This disappeared under Bush junior, whose neo-con government was openly contemptuous of the United Nations.
3. The willingness of the United States to act solely in the interests of “the international community”, and of the populations of those countries subject to invasion, and not in order to promote its own interests, political, military or economic. This was not the case in 2003, when the interests of the Iraqi people as a whole were scarcely considered, while the interests of American big corporations, such as Halliburton, played a major role.

Of course, it could well be argued that the fulfillment of all these conditions was always a utopian dream. All confederations of sovereign or quasi-sovereign states are extremely difficult to hold together, as the history of the last days of the Soviet Union and of Yugoslavia – and probably, in our

357 Reynolds, op. cit., pp. 536, 537.
generation, of the European Union – clearly shows. Moreover, the freer and more democratic the members of the confederation are, the more difficult it becomes to achieve consensus, and the greater the temptation to turn these free confederations into less free, more despotic federations. In the case of “the international community”, the difficulties are multiplied many times, while the temptation to form a world government that will impose its will on all the nations of the world increases proportionately. Unless such a world government can be guaranteed to follow Christian rather than secular and atheist principles, it is likely that such it will become the most despotic state in history. Hence we can see how the victory of the most enlightened democracy can easily lead to the victory of the most evil and totalitarian despotism – the despotism of the Antichrist himself…
68. THE FALL OF YUGOSLAVIA (1): THE REVIVAL OF NATIONALISM

As the Soviet Union collapsed in the course of 1991, so, simultaneously, did Yugoslavia. But whereas the Soviet collapse took place relatively peacefully and quickly, the Yugoslav collapse was bloody and prolonged. It began in 1980, when the communist dictator Tito died. From 1980 until the end of the century, there were no good leaders in Serbia – and Tito himself, of course, was a most evil dictator who had murdered hundreds of priests and thousands of laymen, and effectively destroyed the Serbian Orthodox Church. But he guaranteed a fairly decent standard of living for those who did not oppose the regime (although some republics, like Kosovo, remained poor); and that fact, combined with the fact that the Serbs had occupied a privileged place in Communist Yugoslavia, meant that they came to love their dictator. Even today, and even in supposedly Orthodox households, nostalgia for Tito’s time and his portrait are often to be found. (This is the collective equivalent of what psychiatrists call “the Stockholm Syndrome” or “Capture-Bonding”. Another, still more acute example of the illness is to be found in contemporary Russians’ veneration for Stalin.)

Tony Judt writes: “The Yugoslavia [Tito] had reassembled in 1945 had a real existence. Its constituent republics were separate units in a federal state whose presidency comprised representatives from all six republics, as well as two autonomous regions (the Voyvodina and Kosovo) within Serbia. The different regions had very different pasts. Slovenia and Croatia in the north were primarily Catholic and had once been part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire as too, albeit for a shorter time, had Bosnia. The southern part of the country (Serbia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Bosnia) was for centuries under Ottoman Turkish rule, which accounts for the large number of Muslims in addition to the predominantly Orthodox Serbs.

“But these historical differences – though genuine enough and exacerbated by the experience of World War Two – had been attenuated in subsequent decades. Economic change brought hitherto isolated rural populations into sometimes uneasy contact in towns like Vukovar or Mostar; but the same changes also accelerated integration across old social and ethnic boundaries.

“Thus although the Communist myth of fraternal unity required turning a blind eye and a deaf ear to wartime memories and divisions – the history textbooks of Tito’s Yugoslavia were prudently unforthcoming about the bloody civil wars that had marked the country’s common past – the benefits of such official silences were real. The rising post-war generation was encouraged to think of itself as ‘Yugoslav’, rather than ‘Croat’ or ‘Macedonian’; and many – especially the young, the better educated and the burgeoning number of city-dwellers – had adopted the habit. Younger intellectuals in Ljubljana or Zagreb were no longer much interested in the heroic or troubled past of their ethnic forebears. By 1981 in cosmopolitan Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia, 20 percent of the population described themselves as ‘Yugoslav’.
“Bosnia had always been the most ethnically variegated region of Yugoslavia and was thus perhaps not typical. But the whole country was an interwoven tapestry of overlapping minorities. The 580,000 Serbs living in Croatia in 1991 were some 12 percent of the population of that republic. Bosnia in the same year was 44 percent Muslim, 31 percent Serb and 17 percent Croat. Even tiny Montenegro was a mix of Montenegrins, Serbs, Muslims, Albanians and Croats – not to speak of those who opted to describe themselves to census-takers as ‘Yugoslavs’. Residents of ethnically mixed regions often had little sense of their friends’ or neighbours’ nationality or religion. ‘Inter-marriage’ was increasingly common…”

In other words, Tito’s Yugoslavia had followed the same general pattern of evolution as the rest of Europe: peaceful integration, but on the basis of Mammon rather than God, economic self-interest rather than real spiritual unity… For, as we have seen, Orthodoxy, and religion in general, had declined sharply in the country, not so much as the result of physical persecution - from the 1960s that was no longer necessary, for the Church had been tamed by the UDB, Yugoslavia’s equivalent of the KGB - as through State-imposed atheist education and ecumenism. Thus whereas in 1931 barely 0.1% of the population of Yugoslavia declared itself to be without religious affiliation, and only about 12.5% in 1953, the figure was 31.6% in 1987. The phenomenon of religious non-affiliation was particularly striking precisely in the Serb territories. Thus 54% were non-affiliated in Montenegro, and a 1985 survey put the proportion of believers in Bosnia at 17 per cent… As the Orthodox writer Jim Forest pointed out in 1995, “Serbia is one of Europe's most secularised societies. Tito’s anti-religious policies were more effective than those of Stalin, Khruschev or Brezhnev. Few Serbs are even baptized (the usual estimate is five per cent) and far fewer are active in church life.” As for marriages, in the diocese of Rashka and Prizren, “for 50 long years almost no one was married and all those families lived in a state of adultery”, until the appointment of Bishop Artemije, when “very slowly and with difficulty, people got used to this requirement of the Church and the amount of those who marry increases with each year.”

But once Tito’s iron hand had been removed this secularist idyll was shattered by passions he had helped suppress if not extirpate. These passions were ethnic, not religious, even if the belligerents clothed their causes in religious flags and sought the aid of co-religionists in other countries. It was not for or against Orthodoxy; it was for and against the glory and territorial strength of individual Yugoslav nations – but also of politicians trying to hang on to power…

---

361 Forest, “An Orthodox Response to the War in Former Yugoslavia”, Orthodox Outlook, vol. VIII, № 6, 1995, p. 32. Baptisms in the Serbian Church are now very often only pourings, not full immersions.
362 Church News (the English translation of Tserkovnie Novosti), vol. 9, № 8 (64), August, 1997, p. 7.
It all started when it was decided to reopen the historical archives... Dejan Djokić writes: “As Yugoslavia entered the post-Tito era, there were increasing calls for the pursuit of the... ideal of finding what really happened in Yugoslavia in the Second World War. The official history [which minimized the ethnic elements and called it a ‘national liberation war and a socialist revolution’] was bound to be challenged in the more relaxed political atmosphere which eventually emerged following the death of Tito in 1980, when the so-called ‘hidden’, unofficial, accounts of the war years began to appear. During what one Serbian weekly described as ‘the burst of history’, the official interpretation of Yugoslavia’s recent past was questioned by every engaged intellectual. To many observers in the late 1980s, it must have seemed that the Second World War had broken out for the second time in Yugoslavia – verbally, for the time being...

“The most controversial and most debated issue was that of Croatian genocide against Serbs during the Second World War. Both the Ustaša-directed project to rid the Independent State of Croatia of its almost two million Serbs (and also Jews and Roma) and the nature and scope of the genocide have been the subject of scholarly works. The issue remains a bone of contention between Serbs and Croats... Moreover, some Serbs argue that anti-Serbianism has always been present among Croats and that the Ustaša genocide was merely the last phase of a long process...

“The nationalist discourse in Yugoslavia, but especially in Serbia and Croatia in the late 1980s and early 1990s, sought a reconciliation between victors and losers of the Second World War who belonged to the same nation; between Partisans and Cetniks in the case of Serbs, and Partisans and Ustašas in the case of Croats. In Yugoslavia at the time ‘reconciliation’ meant a homogenisation of the nation by reconciling ideological differences within the nation...”

Reconciliation between communists and anti-communists also took place in the ecclesiastical sphere. In 1991, communion was restored between the Serbian Patriarchate and the Free Serbs. However, to this day there are communities of Free Serbs, especially in the English-speaking countries, that have not been reconciled with the patriarchate.

Paradoxically, however, this process of “reconciliation” in the long run worked in the opposite direction. For as the differences between Communists and non-Communists became less important, with the result that the vital task of freeing the country from Communism was put aside, the ethnic quarrels dating from the Ustaša genocide became more important. Moreover, a deliberate

blurring of labels took place: “četniks”, for example, no longer denoted Orthodox monarchists as in the Second World War, but rather Serbian nationalists who as often as not supported Titoism and were neither Orthodox nor monarchist.

Another issue was the economy. “From the end of the Seventies,” writes Judt, “the Yugoslav economy began to unravel. Like other Communist states, Yugoslavia was heavily indebted to the West; but whereas the response in Warsaw or Budapest was to keep borrowing foreign cash, in Belgrade they resorted to printing more and more of their own. Through the course of the 1980s the country moved steadily into hyper-inflation. By 1989 the annual inflation rate was 1,240 percent and rising.

“The economic mistakes were being made in the capital, Belgrade, but their consequences were felt and resented above all in Zagreb and Ljubljana. Many Croats and Slovenes, Communists and non-Communists alike, believed that they would be better of making their own economic decisions free of the corruption and nepotism of the ruling circles in the Federal capital. These sentiments were exacerbated by a growing fear that a small group of apparatchiks around Slobodan Milošević, the hitherto obscure President of the League of Communists in his native Serbia, was making a bid for power in the political vacuum that followed Tito’s death – by arousing and manipulating Serb national emotions.

“Milošević’s behaviour was not inherently unusual for Communist leaders in these years. In the GDR the Communists... sought to curry favour by invoking the glories of eighteenth-century Prussia; and ‘national Communism’ had been on display for some years in neighboring Bulgaria and Romania. When Milošević ostentatiously welcomed a patriotic Memorandum from the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1986, or visited Kosovo the following year to show his sympathy for Serb complaints about Albanian ‘nationalism’, his calculations were not very different from those of other East European Communist leaders of the time. In the era of Gorbachev, with the ideological legitimacy of Communism and its ruling party waning fast, patriotism offered an alternative way of securing a hold on power.

“But whereas in the rest of eastern Europe this resort to nationalism and the attendant invocation of national memories only risked arousing anxiety among foreigners, in Yugoslavia the price would be paid at home...”365

Milošević’s strategy was essentially the same as that later adopted by Putin in Russia...366 From 1986, the writing was on the wall for the old-style communists throughout Eastern Europe. They had a choice if they wanted to stay in power: either become European-style democrats, or take the nationalist road. In practice they adopted a mixture of both courses. In Yugoslavia the nationalist path was adopted – with a superficial covering of democracy.

365 Judt, op. cit. p. 671.
At the same time, democratization stimulated nationalism. As Samuel P. Huntingdon writes, “The first fairly contested elections in almost every former Soviet and former Yugoslav republic were won by political leaders appealing to nationalist sentiments and promising vigorous action to defend their nationality against other ethnic groups. Electoral competition encourages nationalist appeals and thus promotes the intensification of fault line conflicts into fault line wars. When, in Bogdan Denitch’s phrase, ‘ethnos becomes demos,’ the initial result is polemos or war.”367

“Balkan communist regimes,” writes Bernard Simms, “co-opted nationalism as a new legitimating ideology. In Romania, Nicolae Ceaușescu sought confrontation with the substantial Hungarian minority, whose Transylvanian and Banat villages were singled out for particular attention in the campaign of rural ‘systematization’. In Bulgaria, the regime turned on the local Turkish population in late 1984 and forced them to change their names, restricted their use of the Turkish language, and closed down mosques, all in the name of stamping out an alleged ‘fifth column’ of ‘terrorists’ and ‘separatists’. In Yugoslavia, the Serb leader, Slobodan Milošević, rose to power through the articulation of a Serb nationalist agenda.”368

As Niall Ferguson writes, “it is clear that Milošević’s principal motive in playing the Serbian nationalist card was to avoid the fate of Communist leaders in other East European countries. While they had been swept away by the post-1989 wave of nationalism, Milošević was able to ride it; indeed, to whip it up. And for ten years his strategy worked…”369

“In 1988,” continues Judt, “Milošević, the better to strengthen his position within the Serbian republic, began openly encouraging nationalist meetings at which the insignia of the wartime Chetniks were on public display for the first time in four decades – a reminder of a past that Tito had suppressed and a move calculated to arouse real disquiet among Croats in particular.

“Nationalism was Milošević’s way of securing a hold over Serbia – confirmed in May 1989 with his election to the Presidency of the Serbian republic. But to preserve and strengthen Serbia’s influence over Yugoslavia as a whole he needed to transform the federal system itself. The carefully calculated balance of influence between the various constituent republics had been fostered first by Tito’s charismatic leadership and then by a revolving presidency. In March 1989 Milošević set out to topple this arrangement.

“By forcing through an amendment to Serbia’s own constitution he ‘absorbed’ the hitherto autonomous provinces of Kosovo and Vojvodina into Serbia proper – while allowing them to retain their two seats in the federal presidency.

Henceforth Serbia could count on four of the eight federal votes in any dispute (Serbia, Kosovo, Vojvodina and the compliant pro-Serbian republic of Montenegro). Since Milošević’s goal was to forge a more unitary (Serb-led) state, something that the other four republics would naturally resist, the federal system of government was effectively stalemated. From the perspective of Slovenia and Croatia especially, the course of events pointed to only one possible solution: since they could no longer expect to preserve or advance their interests through a dysfunctional federal system, their only hope was to take their distance from Belgrade, if necessary by declaring complete independence.  

The change was immediately discernible. As Garry Kasparov writes, “When Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger visited his old friend Milošević in Belgrade in February 1990, he was shocked to find there was no common ground to be found. There was so much good news coming from Europe at the time that the Balkan powder keg was pushed to the background even after Eagleburger returned from his trip warning that ‘it’s much worse than anybody thought and it’s going to be much bloodier than we thought.’…”

*  

Let us now look more closely at the main focus of Serbian nationalism - the province of Kosovo, which had been part of Serbia in the late Middle Ages, but whose majority population since the Turkish conquest was Albanian.

The aim of the nationalists was to destroy the Albanian majority, by violent expulsion (what came to be called “ethnic cleansing”) and/or slaughter. With the rise of Milošević, this aim became a practical possibility… For before Milošević, Serbian nationalism had been kept in check in Kosovo. As Misha Glenny writes, “The atmosphere in Kosovo in the early eighties was heavy with tension, secret policemen were ubiquitous. Nonetheless, the local state apparatus, including the police force, was staffed mainly by Albanians, and they had no interest in provoking the Kosovars. Life was not easy, but it was free from nationalist violence. A minority of communists in Serbia, aided at times by the Belgrade media, claimed that the Serb and Montenegrin minority in Kosovo (roughly 10 per cent of the population) were subjected to systematic terrorism at the hands of the Albanian ‘irredentists’. They based these claims on the number of Serbs moving from the province to Serbia proper. There was an indeed an exodus of Serbs in the early eighties, but they were economic migrants, not refugees. The stories of rape, murder and intimidation were without foundation.”

However, an economic crisis in the mid-1980s coincided with important political changes… In the autumn of 1985, writes Noel Malcolm, a local Kosovan activist, Kosta Bulatović, who was originally from Montenegro, organized a petition “which became known as ‘petition 2,016’, after the number of signatures
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it attracted: the text contained not only demands for protection, but also a gross historical claim about the presence of 300,000 Albanians who had crossed into Kosovo from Albania since 1941 (the implication being that they should all be sent back). In February 1986 a group of 160 Serbs and Montenegrins from Kosovo presented their complaints to the federal assembly in Belgrade...

“In April 1987 news came from Kosovo that the group of Serb and Montenegrin activists round Bulatović was intending to bring another large protest in Belgrade. They asked the Serbian Party president, Stambolić, to come and speak to them first in the town of Kosovo Polje; reluctant to enter such a hostile bear-pit (he had already made several speeches criticizing Serbian nationalism), he sent his deputy, Šlobodan Milošević, instead. As Stambolić later recalled, Milošević had never shown any interest in Kosovo, and had even said to him on one occasion: ‘Forget about the provinces, let’s get back to Yugoslavia’. But the events in Kosovo Polje on 24 April 1987 were to change all that. While Milošević listened to angry speeches by local spokesmen in the ‘House of Culture’, fighting broke out between the large crowd of Serbs outside and the police, who responded with their batons. The fighting had been carefully planned by one of the local Serb leaders, Miroslav Šolević (local, at least, in the sense that he lived there: he had moved to Kosovo from the Serbian city of Niš); as he later admitted, he had arranged for a truck full of stones to be parked outside the building, to give the Serbs a copious supply of ammunition. Milošević broke off the meeting and came out to speak to the crowd, where he uttered – luckily for him, on camera – the words on which his entire political future would be built: ‘No one should dare to beat you!’ The crowd, enraptured by these words, began chanting ‘Slobo, Slobo!’ With a skill which he had never displayed before, Milošević made an eloquent speech in defence of the sacred rights of the Serbs. From that day, his nature as a politician changed; it was as if a powerful new drug had entered his veins.

“By exploiting the issue of Kosovo Milošević quickly turned himself into a ‘national’ leader, a role which enabled him to quell all opposition to his takeover of the Communist Party machine…”373

“The situation in Kosovo became the main focus for the revival of Serbian nationalism. As early as 1968, Serbian nationalist Communists such as Dobrica Ćosić were complaining about the reversal of policy in Kosovo after Ranković’s fall. ‘One could witness even among the Serbian people a re-ignition of the old historical goal and national idea – the unification of the Serbian people into a single state,’ he said. This statement, phrased as a warning but issued in the spirit of a threat, caused Ćosić to be expelled from the Central Committee… The Serbian Orthodox Church also saw its opportunity to revive the sense of religious identity in the literary and political culture of the country; and the Serbs’ obsessively possessive claims about Kosovo were indeed partly based on the fact that some of the Serbian Orthodox Church’s oldest monasteries and church buildings, including the patriarchate itself [at Peć], were located in the province.

“Together with a revival of [ecumenist] Orthodoxy, there was also a revival of interest in the forbidden topic of the Četniks during the second world war. And just as – indeed, because – the Communist policy had been to damn all the Četniks uncritically as fascist collaborators, so now the reaction of Serb nationalists was to praise them almost equally uncritically. The regime would have reason to regret its long-lasting suppression of objective historical studies of the war. Dobrica Ćosić published a novel in 1985 which featured a sympathetic portrait of the Četnik ideologist, Dragiša Vasić; and in the same year a book about the Četniks by the historian Veselin Djuretić was launched at a party hosted by the Serbian Academy of Sciences. This event was an important turning-point, a signal that Serbian nationalism could now be openly embraced by the intellectual establishment in Belgrade. In January of the following year two hundred prominent Belgrade academics and writers signed a petition which referred in hysterical terms to the ‘Albanian aggression’ and ‘genocide’ in Kosovo. All the old Serbian resentments now came to the surface: ‘a rigged political trial of the Serbian nation and its history has been going on for decades’, it complained.

“Later in 1986 a ‘Memorandum’ was drawn up by the Serbian Academy of Sciences (or at least, by a committee of it, whose membership is known to have included Ćosić), in which grievances about Kosovo were combined with the open accusation that Tito’s policies had aimed at the weakening of Serbia. ‘Nationalism’, it complained, had been ‘created from above’. This was a reference not to Serbian nationalism, of course, which these writers were busily helping to create from their own vantage-point, but to the national identities of Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins and Bosnian Muslims. The Memorandum claimed that a sinister programme of assimilation was under way in Croatia, designed to turn the Serbs there into Croats, and it also complained that ethnic Serb writers in places such as Montenegro and Bosnia were being described as writing not Serbian literature but ‘Montenegrin’ or ‘Bosnian’ literature instead. The fundamental argument of the Memorandum was that the ‘Serb people’ throughout Yugoslavia was a kind of primary entity, possessing a unitary set of rights and claims which transcended any mere political or geographical divisions: ‘The question of the integrity of the Serb people and its culture in the whole of Yugoslavia poses itself as a crucial question for that people’s survival and development.’ It was the pursuit of that ‘integrity’ which would eventually destroy Yugoslavia…”

Vasa Ćubrilović, a member of the Academy, had been acting and speaking in the cause of Serbian revolutionary nationalism since 1914. As Mark Almond writes, he “complained that the Serb authorities had been too weak and ‘Western’. Serbia ought to learn from her old enemy: ‘Turkey brought to the Balkans the customs of the Sheriat… Even the Balkan Christians learned from the Turks that not only state power and dominion, but also home and property are won and lost by the sword.’ He argued that since the Albanians still outbred the effects of Serbian recolonisation, ‘the only way and the only means to cope with them is the

---

brute force of an organized state, in which we [Serbs] have always been superior to them.’ The necessary precondition for a mass expulsion of Albanians from their ancestral homes was ‘the creation of a suitable psychosis’.

“In order to create an atmosphere of fear and a willingness to leave, the Serbian state ought to use very un-Balkan tactics: ‘The law must be enforced to the letter… fines and imprisonments, the ruthless application of all police dispositions, such as the prohibition of smuggling, cutting forests, damaging farmland, leaving dogs unchained, compulsory labour and any other measures that an experienced police force can contrive.’ In addition, property titles should be questioned and business permits withdrawn. Islam should be harassed and the daughters of Muslims forced into school with boys. But all of these measures were only the background to state-sponsored terror: ‘We should distribute weapons to our colonists. The old forms of Chetnik action should be organized and secretly assisted.’ The Montenegrins should be unleashed on the Albanians – ‘This conflict should be prepared by… our trusted people’ – and then once the Albanians replied to force with force, ‘the whole affair should be presented as a conflict between clans.’ Ćubrilović recognized the need to pacify Western opinion with the argument that any violence was just an old-fashioned tribal war. He therefore preferred to keep the Serbian Army out of action except when it was ‘secretly burning down Albanian villages and city quarters’. Chetniks should be used to suppress the Albanians whenever the action was under scrutiny so that the tribal nature could be emphasized.”

Ćubrilović’s remarks about the need to copy the Turks were both cynical and insightful. As Almond comments, “in order to rid oneself of the domination and even the legacy of the hated ‘Turk’, his worst features must be assimilated into the Serbian character. Ottoman brutality had to be matched or even surpassed in order to save Serbdom from the Turkish legacy of an Albanianised Kosovo.” Moreover, Ćubrilović was prescient in seeing how useful the argument that “any violence was just an old-fashioned tribal war” would be to Serbian politicians. It was used for years by western diplomats as an excuse for their inactivity in relation to the Šerbs’ implementation of the ideology of Greater Serbia.

The Serbian nationalists gave wildly exaggerated figures for the supposed emigration or expulsion of Serbs from Kosovo. In this they were supported by the Serbian Church, notably the leading archimandrite (now metropolitan), Atanasije Jevtić. The nationalists claimed that the main reason for Serbian emigration from Kosovo had been Albanian atrocities, particularly, according to Atanasije Jevtić, the rape of girls and old women in villages and convents… “As one Albanian writer later noted, the impression given by many Serbian publications was ‘that Albanians rape anyone they can get hold of, old women, children, married women, teenagers, and that they rape them in houses, in public places, in the street…’ The only serious study of this issue was carried out by an independent committee of Serbian lawyers and human rights experts in 1990. Analysing all the
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statistics on rape and attempted rape for the 1980s, they found first of all that the frequency of this crime was significantly lower in Kosovo than in other parts of Yugoslavia: while inner Serbia, on average, had 2.43 cases per year for every 10,000 men in the population, the figure in Kosovo was 0.96. They also found that in the great majority of cases in Kosovo (71 per cent) the assailant and the victim were of the same nationality. Altogether the number of cases where an Albanian committed or attempted the rape of a Serbian woman was just thirty-one in the whole period from 1982 to 1989; an average of fewer than five per year...

In fact, the main cause of Serbian emigration was economic. “Official reports on the reasons given for emigration from Kosovo by the 14,921 Serbs who left in the period 1983-7 present a very different picture. In 95 per cent of all cases the emigrants cited either economic or family reasons; in only eleven individual cases (less than 0.1 per cent) were pressures from Albanians given as the main cause of emigration.”

By 1991 the Serb-Montenegrin element in the Kosovan population had dwindled to 11 per cent, while the Albanian proportion had risen to 82 per cent. But the main reason for this was neither Serbian emigration nor Albanian immigration, but “the very high rate of abortion among the Serbs. By 1994 it was reported that Serbia had the highest abortion rate in the whole of Europe. For every 100 live births in inner Serbia there were 214 abortions; the equivalent figure for the whole population of Kosovo... was just twenty. While Albanian women were hostile on religious and cultural grounds to abortion, it had become an accepted part of cultural normality among the Serbs. On this point, at least, it could be said that they had only themselves to blame...”

On June 28, 1989, on the 600th anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo, Milošević organized a jamboree at the Gazimestan shrine near Pristina, noting that “the current anniversary was being held at a time when Serbia had finally regained its ‘state, national, and spiritual integrity’, and that the Serbian defeat of the fourteenth century, as well as later Serbian failures including those during the Tito period, had occurred owing to discord within the ranks of the Serb elite and political compromises by Serbia’s leaders. ‘Six centuries ago,’ Milošević pointed out, Serbia had fought the Turks and served as a ‘bulwark defending European culture, civilization and religion.’ Alluding to a perennial theme of Serbian culture, Milošević observed that although some might claim the Serbian nation had been defeated at the Battle of Kosovo, the episode could also be regarded as ‘heroic’ because of the Serbs’ valiant performance, and the fact that the victorious Turkish Sultan had been stabbed to death – the first Ottoman ruler to be killed in war – by a Serbian commander. Milošević was well aware that, although the 1389 battle had been technically a military defeat, most Serbs regarded the event and its aftermath as emblematic of how such a defeat can engender a stubbornness and fortitude to struggle against non-Serb control. He left it to his audience to
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ponder over the clear implication that perhaps the very traits that had allowed Serbs to overcome the tribulations of Ottoman rule might also assist them in dealing with their current concerns regarding Kosovo. Tactfully in view of his position as a high official in a multinational federation, Milošević urged toleration among the various nations and nationalities of socialist Yugoslavia, and also carefully avoided referring by name to the Albanians of Kosovo (who had boycotted the ceremony) or any other specific ethnic group. But near the end of his speech he reminded the gathering that six centuries after the Battle of Kosovo Serbs were ‘again today engaged in battles and facing battles’. Indeed he observed ominously that although the struggles presently involving the Serbs were ‘not armed battles… such things cannot be excluded. But no matter what their character, battles can’t be won without decisiveness, bravery and a readiness to sacrifice.’ Milošević had put his fellow Serbs on notice regarding what measures he might take, and what might be expected of them. In the excitement of the historical celebration, his audience appeared wildly eager to follow their determined new leader.

*A few months later,* continues Judt, “following bloody clashes between police and demonstrators with many dead and injured, Belgrade shut down the provincial Kosovo Assembly, placing the region under direct rule from Belgrade.

“The course of events in the far south of the country directly affected decisions made in the northern republics. At best mildly sympathetic to the Albanians’ plight, Ljubljana and Zagreb were far more directly concerned at the rise of Serbian authoritarianism. At the Slovene elections of April 1990, although a majority of the voters still favoured remaining in Yugoslavia they gave their backing to non-Communist opposition candidates openly critical of existing federal arrangements. The following month, in neighboring Croatia, a new nationalist party won an overwhelming majority and its leader, Franjo Tudjman, took over as President of the republic.

“The last straw, revealingly, came in December 1990 when – under Milošević’s direction – the Serbian leadership in Belgrade seized without authorization 50 percent of the entire drawing rights of the Yugoslav federation to cover back pay and bonuses for federal employees and state enterprise workers. The Slovenes – whose 8 percent of the population contributed one-quarter of the federal budget – were especially incensed. The following month the Slovene Parliament announced that it was withdrawing from the federal fiscal system and proclaimed the republic’s independence, though without initiating any moves to secede. Within a month, the Croat Parliament had done likewise (the Macedonian Parliament in Skopje duly followed suit).

“The consequences of these developments were initially unclear. The
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substantial Serb minority in south-eastern Croatia – notably in a long-established frontier region of Serb settlement, the Krajina – was already clashing with Croat police and calling upon Belgrade for help against its ‘Ustashe’ repressors. But Slovenia’s distance from Belgrade, and the presence of less than 50,000 Serbs in the republic, gave grounds for hope that peaceful coexistence might be engineered. Foreign opinion was divided: Washington, which had suspended all economic aid to Yugoslavia because of the Serbian measures in Kosovo, nevertheless publicly opposed any moves to secede.

“Anticipating President Bush in Kiev a few weeks later, Secretary of State James Baker visited Belgrade in June 1991 and assured its rulers that the US supported ‘a democratic and unified Yugoslavia’. But by then a ‘democratic and unified’ Yugoslavia was an oxymoron. Five days after Baker spoke both Slovenia and Croatia took control over their frontiers and initiated unilateral secession from the federation, with the overwhelming support of their citizens and the tacit backing of a number of European statesmen. In response the federal army moved up to the new Slovene border. The Yugoslav war was about to begin…”

We have seen that Milošević, Ćubrilović and the Serbian Academy of Sciences had stirred up nationalist feeling in the 1980s, so it could be said that the Serbs had started the violence. However, this violence was then fully reciprocated, with no less hatred, by other nations, especially the Croats. Indeed, the Serb and Croat nationalisms were, from a psychological point of view, mirror-images of each other, pointing to a common origin in the pathology of nineteenth-century Balkan nationalism that we have already described in earlier volumes.

As Misha Glenny writes, “the most striking manifestation” of “the complete collapse of rational politics in Yugoslavia and its constituent republics” “was the homogenization of [nationalist] consciousness among Croats and later among Serbs (although in Serbia the process was never as complete as it was in Croatia). This was fascinating to observe, if ultimately incomprehensible and distressing. Croats and Serbs argued endlessly with me as to why Serbs and Croats, respectively, were congenital monsters. They would cite history, religion, education and biology as reasons, but nobody could ever convince me why a Serb or Croat was per se good or per se bad. Throughout the campaign, nobody was able to convince me either that Serbian aggression against Croatia was justified or that the Croatian leadership had acted properly in deciding to leave Yugoslavia without taking into account the needs and fears of its Serb minority. Because of my belief that both Milošević and Tuđman were responsible for the war, I was accursed in both republics. In Serbia, unknown people telephoned me at my hotel at three in the morning and screamed at me for ‘supporting the irredentists and the Ustashas’. They have also never forgiven me for what I have written about Kosovo in the past. In Croatia I was denounced as a ‘Chetnik-lover upon whom revenge would be wrought’. On the whole, Croatia’s case was presented with considerable sympathy in the West European media. Those of us who were not uncritical of Tuđman’s programme were subject to ever more
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poisonous attacks as the war spread. Most shocking of all were the people I had known for many years from left and liberal circles in the United Kingdom who had fallen under the spell of Croatian nationalism. These people demonstrated their consistent solidarity with a small-minded, right-wing autocrat as a consequence of losing the ability to argue rationally. In extreme situations, nationalism appears to neutralize that part of the mind which is able to fathom complex equations. Indeed, action is motivated by a single Leninist principle: ‘Those who are not for us, are against us.’ Or as George Orwell paraphrased it in Animal Farm – ‘Four legs good. Two legs bad.’

Nevertheless, in large parts of the country there was still friendship between different nations, which continued right up to the beginning of actual war; the very recent feeling of being all Yugoslavs together remained strong. For example, the great majority of those Serbs who lived in Croatia – mainly city-dwellers – had no problems there until ambitious former Communist politicians on both sides – Milošević and Babić on the Serb side, Tuđman on the Croat side – began exploiting grievances and accentuating national differences for their own personal political gain.

It was in 1990 that these Communists suddenly became democrats, winning real elections. In May, 1990 Tuđman won Croatia’s first democratic election as head of the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ); and in December Milošević won Serbia’s first democratic election as head of the Serbian Socialist Party (SPS). But neither “democrat”, nor “communist” nor “socialist”, nor even “nationalist” adequately described Milošević. For he loved power (and perhaps his wife) more than his country (whether Yugoslavia or Serbia)… In March, 1991, after surviving a series of massive demonstrations in Belgrade, and dispersing the dissidents by force, he began seriously to put his nationalist agenda into practice. Thus in August the Serbs made overtures to the Soviet Defence Minister Dmitri Yazov, attempting to buy weapons, only two days before Yazov took part in the failed Moscow coup. This showed the close psychological links between Milošević’s Serbian Socialists and the Russian Communist putschists…

The Yugoslav wars began in the summer of 1991, and ended, after a brief break in 1995-1998, in the summer of 1999. The result was hundreds of thousands of deaths, terrible atrocities on all sides (most notoriously, by the Serbs at Srebrenica), ending in defeat for the Serbs and the crushing of their dreams for a Greater Serbia (for that, in spite of all their denials, is what they wanted). As Judt writes, “The Yugoslav attack on Slovenia in 1991 lasted just a few weeks, after which the army withdrew and allowed the secessionist state to depart in peace. There then followed a far bloodier war between Croatia and its rebellious Serb minority (backed by the army of ‘Yugoslavia’ – in practice Serbia and Montenegro) that lasted until an unsteady cease-fire brokered by the UN early the following year. After the Croats and Muslims of Bosnia voted for independence in March 1992, the Serbs of Bosnia declared war on the new state
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and set about carving out a ‘Republika Srpska’, again with the backing of the Yugoslav army, laying siege to a number of Bosnian towns – notably the capital, Sarajevo.” That was ended by the intervention of NATO and the Dayton Accords in Ohio in 1995. Finally there was a war in Kosovo in 1999, which was again ended by NATO’s intervention...

The problem for the republics who (quite understandably) wanted to leave Communist Yugoslavia was how to do so without bloodshed, or at any rate, seeing that the Yugoslav army (the JNA), though officially neutral, always acted in Serbia’s interests, in such a way that the army would not enter the conflict. If they had acted in concert, they might have achieved that. But the decision of Croatia and Slovenia to act separately in the first phase of the conflict torpedoed that possibility. The European Commission brokered a deal at Brioni that ended the war between Slovenia and the Serbs, allowing the Serbs to concentrate on the unprepared Croats. The war in Slovenia was short because Milošević was really interested neither in Slovenia nor in the unity of the whole of the former Yugoslavia: he was much more interested in the fertile lands of Eastern Slavonia. The war in Croatia, by contrast, was bloody and brutal. It extended all around the strange arc that formed Croatia’s border from Osijek and Vukovar in Eastern Slavonia to Glina and Karlovac in the centre to Split and Dubrovnik on the Adriatic seaboard. The fighting was almost entirely in the small towns and villages, where the most extreme nationalists on both sides were concentrated.

By the end of 1991 the Serb-Croat war was virtually over, after tens of thousands of deaths. The Serbs were able to hold on to their (relatively small) territorial gains; but television pictures of the fall of Vukovar, for example, showed that it was not only territory that the Serbs were interested in, for it was not only soldiers, but also civilians, mainly old men and women, who were led off to concentration camps. What the Serbs were trying to achieve was something that had been common in earlier Balkan history (for example, in the Balkan Wars), but which was new in contemporary Europe and would become sickeningly familiar in the years ahead and would forever be associated with the Yugoslav wars of the 1990s: ethnic cleansing.
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The last domino to fall in the anti-communist revolutions of 1989-91 was the most important one, the Soviet Union. However, unlike the East European States, the USSR did not consist mainly of a single ethnic group, but was a true multinational empire. So its transition from a single communist state to a multitude or independent states was bound to be exceptionally complex and problematic... From 1988 the Soviet republics began to declare their independence from the centre, beginning with the Transcaucasian and Baltic republics. Gorbachev was willing to give them a lot, - their own parliaments, their own communist parties, etc. - but not complete independence, which would enable local legislation to override Soviet legislation. When it became clear that no satisfactory compromise between the centre and the republics could be attained, and that Gorbachev, unlike Milošević, was not prepared to use force to preserve the old Union, it peacefully died, going out, not with a bang, but with a whimper.

The leading catalyst of the Union’s dissolution was Boris Yeltsin, a party apparatchik from Sverdlovsk who fell out with Gorbachev, and then took advantage of the possibility of political life outside the Party provided by Gorbachev himself to carve out a place for himself as the leader of the liberal opposition to him. In March, 1989 Moscovites elected him as their deputy in the Congress of People’s Deputies, and a year later Sverdlovsk sent him to the parliament of the Russian Federation, where he became speaker. In July, 1990 in a public speech before the Russian parliament Yeltsin resigned from the Communist Party and called for a full multi-party democracy. Russia’s laws were now declared by the parliament to take precedence over the Union’s. And in the autumn the Soviet Prime Minister Nikolai Ryzhkov told the Politburo that his orders were not being followed.

Gorbachev now found himself having to manoeuvre between the hard-line communists, on the one hand, who wanted to preserve the Soviet order, and Yeltsin, who wanted to destroy it and championed independence for the republics, on the other. Thus when Lithuania became the first of the republics to declare its independence in March, 1990, and hundreds were killed or injured when Soviet troops were sent into the republic in January, 1991, it was Yeltsin who supported the “rebels”. By the middle of 1991 he was President of Russia, as opposed to the Soviet Union, and as his power and popularity increased by virtue of his pro-Russian and anti-Soviet stance, so did Gorbachev’s decline.

Paradoxically, the American President George Bush, who arrived in Moscow at the end of July, 1991, favoured Gorbachev the communist over Yeltsin the anti-communist: first, because he had just signed the START treaty.

---

with the Soviets, and feared that a breakup of the Union could destroy the gains of that treaty and lead to nuclear proliferation; and secondly, because the break-up of the Union could lead to bloody civil war... Garry Kasparov records meeting several American foreign policy experts in this period. Even at this late stage, they believed in the stability of Gorbachev’s regime, and laughed at Kasparov’s prediction that it would fall in 1991.  

On August 19, the day before a treaty determining the new relationship between the centre and the republics was due to be signed, a KGB-led plot tried to oust Gorbachev while he was on holiday in the Crimea. The coup failed after only seventy-two hours, but the main beneficiary of the coup’s failure was not Gorbachev, but Yeltsin, who with thousands of Muscovites courageously held out in the Russian parliament building (the “White House”) until the nerve of the plotters cracked. Gorbachev returned to Moscow, but Yeltsin publicly (on State television) and humiliatingly showed that he was now the boss by forcing him to sign a series of decrees that effectively destroyed the power of the Soviet Union.

“Formally speaking,” writes Judt, “Gorbachev resumed his power; but in reality everything had changed for ever. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) was terminally discredited – it was not until August 21st that Party spokesmen publicly condemned their colleagues’ coup, by which time the plotters were already in prison and Yeltsin had taken advantage of the Party’s fatal hesitations to ban it from operating within the Russian federation. Gorbachev, who seemed dazed and uncertain when seen in public, was understandably slow to grasp the import of these developments. Rather than praise Yeltsin, the Russian parliament or the Russian people for their success, he spoke to the cameras about perestroika and the indispensable role the Party would continue to have in renewing itself, promoting reforms, etc.

“This approach still played well in the West, where it was widely assumed (and hoped) that after the abortive coup things would carry on much as before. But in the Soviet Union itself Gorbachev’s anachronistic reiterations of failed goals, and his apparent ingratitude to his rescuers, were a revelation. Here was a man who had been overtaken by History and didn’t know it. For many Russians the events of August had been a true revolution, a genuinely popular uprising not for the reformers and their Party but against them: the CPSU, as the demonstrators shouted at Gorbachev on his belated arrival at the Russian Parliament, was ‘a criminal enterprise’ whose own government ministers had tried to overthrow the constitution. By the time a chastened Gorbachev had got the point, suspended the CPSU and (on August 24th) resigned as its General Secretary, it was too later. Communism was now irrelevant, and so too was Mikhail Gorbachev.

“Of course, the former General Secretary was still President of the Soviet Union. But the relevance of the Union itself was now in question. The failed

387 Kasparov, op. cit., chapter 1.
putsch had been the last and greatest impulse to secession. Between August 24th and September 21st Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Georgia, Tajikistan and Armenia followed the Baltic republics and declared themselves independent of the Soviet Union—most of them making the announcement in the confused and uncertain days that followed Gorbachev’s return. Following Kravchuk’s lead in Ukraine, regional First Secretaries like Nursultan Nazarbaev of Kazakhstan, Askar Akaev in Kyrgyzstan, Gaidar Aliev in Azerbaijan, Stanislav Shushkevich in Belarus and others cannily distanced themselves from their long-standing Party affiliation and re-situated themselves at the head of their new states, taking care to nationalize as quickly as possible all the local Party’s assets.

“Gorbachev and the Supreme Soviet in Moscow could do little more than acknowledge reality, recognize the new states and lamely proposed yet another ‘new’ constitution that would embrace the independent republics in some sort of confederal arrangement. Meanwhile, a few hundred yards away, Boris Yeltsin and the Russian parliament were establishing an independent Russia. By November Yeltsin had taken under Russian control virtually all financial and economic activity on Russian territory. The Soviet Union was now a shell state, emptied of power and resources.”

Let us look more closely at that fateful day, August 22nd, when Gorbachev confronted the Russian Duma. First, he was forced to confirm Yeltsin’s decree on Russian economic sovereignty, whereby, writes Plokhy, “as of January 1, 1992, all enterprises on Russian territory would be transferred to the jurisdiction and operational control of the Russian Federation. The Russian president also decreed measures to created a Russian customs service, form Russian gold reserves, and subject the exploitation of natural resources to licensing and taxation by Russian authorities. It was a ploy designed to make Gorbachev approve a decree that he would not otherwise have countenanced, as it undermined the economic foundations of the Union…

“That was not all. A separate decree signed by Yeltsin on August 22, the day on which Gorbachev resumed his functions as president of the USSR, banned the publication of Pravda and other newspapers that had supported the coup. Yeltsin clearly overstepped his jurisdiction by firing the general director of the all-Union information agency TASS and establishing Russian government control over Communist Party media outlets on Russian territory. These measures went far beyond the rights ascribed to the Russian Federation by the draft union treaty [agreed between Gorbachev and Yeltsin earlier that month] that had been derailed by the coup. They left no doubt that as far as Russia was concerned, the treaty was dead. But Yeltsin was not content with taking more sovereign rights for Russia. Having saved Gorbachev from the plotters, he was subjecting the Soviet president to a new captivity.

Gorbachev’s aide Vadim Medvedev referred to Yeltsin’s actions in the first
days after the coup as a countercoup...”

That is true; and it makes us wonder whether this coup de grâce was not in
fact a contre-coup du diable. But if this was a diabolic counter-coup, there is no
question that the coup it overthrew was even more diabolic, nor that
Gorbachev, while formally the victim of the coup, had made it possible
insofar as the leading plotters were all his men, his appointees.

But the coup de grâce was still to come. On August 22, as crowds tore down
the statue of Felix Dzerzhinsky outside the KGB’s headquarters, and milled
round the headquarters of the Communist Party headquarters, while
desperate communist officials tried to shred compromising papers (the
machine was jammed by a hairpin!), in the Russian parliament deputies were
bombarding Gorbachev “with questions about his own complicity in the coup
and demanded that the Communist Party, his real power base, be declared a
criminal organization. Gorbachev went on the defensive. ‘This is just another
way of carrying on a crusade or religious war at the present time,’ he told the
depuities. ‘Socialism, as I understand it, is a type of conviction which people
have and we are not the only ones who have it but it exists in other countries,
not only today but at other times.’

“Then came a question about the ownership of all-Union property on the
territory of the Russian Federation and the decree on Russia’s economic
sovereignty signed by Yeltsin. ‘You today said that you would sign a decree
confirming all my decrees signed during that period,’ said Yeltsin, referring to
the measures he had signed during the coup.

“Gorbachev knew he was in trouble. ‘I do not think you have tried to put
me in a trap by bringing me here,’ he responded. Gorbachev went on to say
that he would sign a decree confirming all Yeltsin’s decrees of the coup
period except the one dealing with all-Union property. ‘I will issue such a
decree after signing the [union] treaty,’ he said to Yeltsin. This was not merely
a delaying tactic. Gorbachev was trying to keep Yeltsin on the hook: signature
on the union treaty first, property second.

“The Russian president did not like what he heard. His ruse of backdating
the decree had failed, but he had a trump card in hand and knew how to use
it against Gorbachev. ‘And now, on a lighter note,’ declared Yeltsin in front of
the cameras, ‘shall we now sign a decree suspending the activities of the
Russian Communist Party?’ Yeltsin used the pronoun ‘we’ to refer to himself.
Gorbachev was stunned. All party organizations in Russia were suddenly
on the chopping block. Without them, his already dwindling powers would be
reduced to almost nothing. After realizing what was going on, he asked his
‘ally’, ‘What are you doing?... I... haven’t we... I haven’t read this.’
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“The Russian president took his time signing the decree temporarily banning Communist Party activity on Russian territory. When Gorbachev told him he could not ban the party, Yeltsin responded that he was only suspending its activities. Welcoming the decree with applause and chants of approval, the Russian deputies went on with their interrogation of the trapped Soviet president. Gorbachev found it hard to recover from Yeltsin’s blow. ‘At that encounter,’ he remembered later, ‘Yeltsin was gloating with sadistic pleasure.’”\(^{390}\)

*  

The August coup and counter-coup took place on the Orthodox Feast of the Transfiguration, when Christ demonstrated the power of His Divinity before his three chosen disciples, Moses and Elijah. This was to remind all those with eyes to see that the fall of the Soviet Union - so unexpected by all except a very few, who included none of the leading politicians - was the work of God, not man. “Not by horses and chariots”, still less by tanks or nuclear weapons, was the Cold War brought to an end and the Soviet bloc liberated, but by the right Hand of the Most High...

However, while the Soviet Union and the Communist Party appeared to have been destroyed, there was one part of the Communist apparatus that survived the coup and even extended its influence – the Sovietized Moscow Patriarchate. The survival of this “second administration” of the Red Beast boded ill for the future. It reminds us that while the fall of the Soviet Union was an all-important political event, it was not a religious event; and that without true faith and repentance for the sins of the Soviet past even the most outwardly successful counter-revolution remained a house built on sand.

This is clearly seen in the actions of the leader of the MP at that time, Patriarch Alexis (Ridiger) – Agent “Drozdov”, as he was known in the KGB...

In June, 1990, the Hierarchical Council of the MP elected Metropolitan Alexis as the new patriarch. This was the man whom the Furov report of 1970 had called the most pro-Soviet of all the bishops, a KGB agent since 1958 who had been prepared to spy to the KGB even on his own patriarch, and who, when he was Metropolitan of Tallinn, said: “In the Soviet Union, citizens are never arrested for their religious or ideological convictions”.\(^{391}\) On being elected, he immediately, on July 4/17, 1990, the day of the martyrdom of Tsar Nicholas II, announced that he was praying for the preservation of the communist party!

Of course, after that gaffe, being a clever man, “Patriarch” Alexis quickly recovered his balance, his sense of which way the wind was blowing; and there was no further overt support of the communists. True, he did attach his

\(^{390}\) Plokhy, op. cit., pp. 143-44.  
signature, in December, 1990, to a letter by 53 well-known political, academic and literary figures who urged Gorbachev to take urgent measures to deal with the state of crisis in the country, speaking of “… the destructive dictatorship of people who are shameless in their striving to take ownership of territory, resources, the intellectual wealth and labour forces of the country whose name is the USSR”. But the patriarch quickly disavowed his signature; and a few weeks later, after the deaths in Vilnius by Soviet troops, he declared that the killings were “a great political mistake – in church language a sin”. Then, in May, he publicly disagreed with a prominent member of the hardline Soiuz bloc, who had said that the resources of the army and the clergy should be drawn on extensively to save the people and the homeland. In Alexis’ view, these words could be perceived as a statement of preparedness to use the Church for political purposes. The patriarch recalled his words of the previous autumn: the Church and the Faith should not be used as a truncheon. By June, the patriarch had completed his remarkable transformation from dyed-in-the-wool communist to enthusiastic democrat, saying to Yeltsin: “May God help you win the election”.

Still more striking was his apparent rejection of Sergianism, the doctrine justifying the submission of the Church to militant atheism preached by the first Soviet patriarch, Sergius Stragorodsky. Thus in an interview granted to Izvestia on June 6 he said: “This year has freed us from the state’s supervision. Now we have the moral right to say that the Declaration of Metropolitan Sergius has disappeared into the past and no longer guides us... The metropolitan cooperated with criminal usurpers. This was his tragedy.... Today we can say that falsehood is interspersed in his Declaration, which stated as its goal 'placing the Church in a proper relationship with the Soviet government'. But this relationship – and in the Declaration it is clearly defined as being the submission of the Church to the interests of governmental politics – is exactly that which is incorrect from the point of view of the Church... Of the people, then, to whom these compromises, silence, forced passivity or expressions of loyalty that were permitted by the Church leadership in those days, have caused pain – of these people, not only before God, but also before them, I ask forgiveness, understanding and prayers.”

And yet, in an interview given to Komsomolskaia Pravda only two months earlier, he had said: “The most important thing for the Church is to preserve itself for the people, so that they should be able to have access to the Chalice of Christ, to the Chalice of Communion... There is a rule when a Christian has to take on himself a sin in order to avoid a greater sin... There are situations in which a person, a Christian must sacrifice his personal purity,

394 “Patriarch Alexis II: I take on myself responsibility for all that happened”, Izvestia, № 137, June 10, 1991; Bishop Gregory Grabbe, “Dogmatizatsia Sergianstva” (The Dogmatization of Sergianism), Pravoslavnaja Rus’ (Orthodox Russia), № 17 (1446), September 1/14, 1991, p. 5.
his personal perfection, so as to defend something greater... Thus in relation to Metropolitan Sergius and his successors in the leadership of the Church under Soviet power, they had to tell lies, they had to say that everything was normal with us. And yet the Church was being persecuted. Declarations of political loyalty were being made. The fullness of Christian life, charity, almsgiving, the Reigning icon of the Mother of God were also renounced. Compromises were made.” In other words, Sergianism, though sinful, was justified. It may have “disappeared into the past”, but if similar circumstances arise again, the “sacrifice” of personal purity can and should be made again!...395

The patriarch showed that the poison of Sergianism was in him still during the attempted coup of August, 1991. When the Russian vice-president, Alexander Rutskoy, approached him on the morning of the 19th, the patriarch pleaded “illness” and refused to see him. When he eventually did issue a declaration – on the evening of the 20th, and again in the early hours of the 21st – the impression made was, in Fr. Gleb Yakunin’s words, “rather weak”. 396 He called on all sides to avoid bloodshed, but did not specifically condemn the plotters. As Jane Ellis comments: “Though Patriarch Alexis II issued statements during the coup, they were bland and unspecific, and he was widely thought to have waited to see which way the wind was blowing before committing himself to issuing them. It was rather the priests in the White House – the Russian Parliament building – itself, such as the veteran campaigner for religious freedom, Fr. Gleb Yakunin, as well as the Christians among those manning the barricades outside, who helped to overthrow the Communist Party, the KGB and the Soviet system.”397

It was not until Wednesday morning that the patriarch sent his representative, Deacon Andrew Kurayev, to the Russian parliament building, by which time several dissident priests were already established there. And it was two priests of the anti-sergianist Russian Church Abroad who celebrated the first supplicatory service to the New Martyrs of Russia on the balcony of the White House. Not to be outdone, the patriarchate immediately responded with its own prayer service, and at some time during the same day the patriarch anathematized all those who had taken part in organizing the coup. By these actions the patriarch appeared to have secured his position vis-à-vis Yeltsin’s government, and on August 27, Yeltsin attended a memorial service in the Dormition cathedral of the Kremlin, at which the patriarch hailed the
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396 Hieromonk Tikhon (Kozushin), personal communication; Natalia Babisyan, "Sviashchenniki na barrikadakh" (Priests on the Barricades), Khristianskie Novosti (Christian News), № 38, August 22, 1991, p. 21.
397 Ellis, "The Russian Church: hopes and fears", Church Times, September 13, 1991. During the 1993 attack on parliament he showed a similar indecisiveness. “He promised to excommunicate the first person to fire a shot, but when shooting... thundered around the ‘White House’, he forgot about his promise.” (Eugene Sokolov, “Tovarisch Drozdov – Vor Hevronskij” (Comrade Drozdov – the Thief of Hebron), Russkoe Novoe Slovo (New Russian Word), 18 July, 1997)
failure of the coup, saying that “the wrath of God falls upon the children of disobedience”. 398

So in the space of thirteen months, the patriarch had passed from a pro-communist, anti-democratic stance to an anti-communist, pro-democratic stance. This “flexibility” should have surprised nobody; for the essence of sergianism, the root heresy of the Moscow Patriarchate, is adaptation to the world, and to whatever the world believes and praises. In view of this, it is not surprising that the successful counter-revolution against Communism that took place under Yeltsin in 1991 quickly ran into severe difficulties in the later 1990s. Not being nourished and supported by true religious feeling, it withered and died in the midst of rampant corruption, bloodshed and the disillusion of the people. And so on New Year’s Day, 2000 the “empire of evil” staged a triumphant comeback in the person of KGB Lieutenant-Colonel Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin…

398 He said that the Church had not supported the coup (although there is clear evidence that Metropolitans Philaret of Kiev and Pitirim of Volokolamsk supported it), but had “taken the side of law and liberty” (Report on the USSR, vol. 3, № 36, September 6, 1991, p. 82).
The Union could probably have survived the breakaway of, for example, the Baltic republics or Georgia. The real problem was Ukraine, the second-largest republic which, writes Judt, “had a history of independence (albeit chequered), last asserted and promptly lost in the aftermath of World War One. It was also intimately associated with Russia’s own history in the eyes of many Russian nationalists. Kievan ‘Rus’ – the thirteenth-century kingdom based on the Ukrainian capital and reaching from the Carpathians to the Volga – was as integral to the core identity of the empire as Russia itself. But of more immediate and practical consideration were the material resources of the region.

“Sitting squarely athwart Russia’s access to the Black Sea (and the Mediterranean) as well as to central Europe, Ukraine was a mainstay of the Soviet economy. With just 2.7 percent of the land area of the USSR it was home to 18 percent of its population and generated nearly 17 percent of the country’s Gross National Product, second only to Russia itself. In the last years of the Soviet Union Ukraine contained 60 percent of the country’s coal reserves and a majority share of the country’s titanium (vital for modern steel production); its unusually rich soil was responsible for over 40 percent of Soviet agricultural output by value.

“The disproportionate importance of Ukraine in Russian and Soviet history was reflected in the Soviet leadership itself. Nikita Khrushchev and Leonid Brezhnev were Russians who hailed from eastern Ukraine – Khrushchev returning there in the 1930s as First Secretary of the Ukrainian Party; Konstantin Chernenko was the son of Ukrainian ‘kulaks’ deported to Siberia, while Yuri Andropov had risen to the top as a consequence of occupying the strategically central post of KGB head in Ukraine. But this close association between the Ukrainian republic and the Soviet leadership did not imply any special regard for its inhabitants.

“Quite the contrary. For much of its history as a Soviet republic, Ukraine was treated as an internal colony: its natural resources exploited, its people kept under close surveillance (and, in the 1930s, exposed to a program of punitive repression that amounted to near-genocide). Ukrainian products – notably food and ferrous metals – were shipped to the rest of the Union at heavily subsidized prices, a practice that continued almost to the end. Following World War Two, the Ukrainian Socialist Republic was considerably enlarged by the annexation from Poland of eastern Galicia and western Volhynia: the local Polish population, as we have seen, was expelled westward in exchange for ethnic Ukrainians forced out of Poland itself.

“These population exchanges – and the wartime extermination of much of the local Jewish community – resulted in a region that was by Soviet standards quite homogeneous: thus whereas the Russian republic in 1990 contained over one hundred minorities, thirty-one of them living in
autonomous regions, Ukraine was 84 percent Ukrainian. Most of the rest of 
the population were Russians (11 percent), with the remainder comprising 
small numbers of Moldovans, Poles, Magyars, Bulgarians and the country’s 
surviving Jews. Perhaps more to the point the only significant minority – the 
Russians – was concentrated in the industrial east of the country and in the 
capital Kiev.

“Central and Western Ukraine, notably around Lviv, the second city, was 
predominantly Ukrainian in language and Eastern Orthodox (Greek-Catholic) 
in religion. 399 Thanks to the relative tolerance of the Habsburgs, Ukrainians in 
Galicia had been allowed to preserve their native tongue. Depending upon 
district, anything from 78 percent to 91 percent of the local inhabitants used it 
as their first language in 1994, whereas in the territories once ruled by the 
Czar even those who identified themselves as Ukrainians often spoke Russian 
more readily.

“The Soviet constitution…. ascribed national identities to the residents of 
its separate republics and indeed defined all its citizens by ethnic-national 
categories. As elsewhere, so in Ukraine – particularly the recently-annexed 
Western Ukraine – this had self-fulfilling consequences. In earlier times, when 
the local language was mostly confined to the remote countryside, and the 
cities were Russian-speaking and Soviet-dominated, the theoretically 
decentralized and federal character of this union of national republics was of 
interest only to scholars and Soviet apologists. But with the growing number 
of urban-dwelling Ukrainian-speakers, Ukrainian-language media, and a 
political elite now identifying itself with self-consciously ‘Ukrainian’ interests, 
Ukrainian nationalism was the predictable accompaniment to Soviet 
fragmentation.

“A non-Party movement – RUKH (the ‘People’s Movement for Perestroika’) 
– was founded in Kiev in November 1988, the first autonomous Ukrainian 
political organization for many decades. It gathered considerable support, 
notably in the major cities and from ‘60s-era reform Communists; but in 
marked contrast to independence movements in the Baltic it could not 
atomatically count on mass backing and did not reflect any groundswell of 
national sentiment. In elections to the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet in March 
1990 the Communists secured a clear majority, RUKH won less than a quarter 
of the seats.

“Thus it was not Ukrainian nationalists who were to seize the initiative but 
rather the Communists themselves. The Communists in the Ukrainian Soviet 
voted, on July 16th 1990, to declare Ukrainian ‘sovereignty’ and asserted the 
republic’s right to possess its own military and the promise of its own 
laws.” 400

399 This is a mistake. The Greek-Catholics commemorate the Pope, so they are Catholic, not 
Orthodox. (V.M.)
However, writes Serhii Plokhy, “Boris Yeltsin shared Gorbachev’s stand on Ukraine. Both believed that the second-largest Soviet republic could not be allowed to go its own way. If Gorbachev, in his conversations with Bush, raised the possibility of civil strife and even war involving Ukraine and other Soviet republics, Yeltsin was calmer but no less determined. ‘Ukraine must not leave the Soviet Union,’ he told the American president during their meeting in Yeltsin’s Kremlin office. Without Ukraine, Yeltsin argued, the Soviet Union would be dominated by the non-Slavic republics. His ‘attachment’ to Ukraine reflected the attitude of the Russian population in general. According to a poll sponsored by the United States Information Agency in February and March 1991, only 22 percent were opposed.”

Now Gorbachev was determined to preserve the Soviet Union with Ukraine inside it not only because he was a Communist and the Union was his spiritual homeland, but also because he was half Ukrainian. Yeltsin was, of course, far less Unionist; but like most Russians he, too, could not conceive of Russia without Ukraine; and some of his advisors believed that Russia should now take the place of the Soviet Union as the new imperial masters — an idea that was anathema to the Ukrainians. As if responding to this thought, on August 24 the Ukrainian parliament voted for independence; the decision would be submitted to a referendum to be held on December 1. A little later the Ukrainian communist party was outlawed.

Serhii Plokhy writes: “August 24 marked a turning point, not only because of the declaration of Ukrainian independence but also because, on the same day, the three Baltic republics, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, received recognition of their independence from Yeltsin himself. The Russian president signed three letters that same day recognizing the independence of Russia’s western neighbors without attaching any conditions or questioning the newly independent states’ Soviet-era borders. His action left hundreds of thousands of ethnic Russians, most of whom had moved to the region after World War II, beyond the borders of Russia and the Union. Their concerns did not seem to be those of Yeltsin’s government.

“The new, democratic Russia refused to use force, economic pressure, or legal and diplomatic tricks to keep the Baltics republics in the Soviet Union. Territorial issues and minority rights did not seem to be significant issues at the time. In previous years, many members of Russian communities had opposed independence for the republics they called home. They joined the Moscow-sponsored and communist-run Interfronts, which welcomed Moscow’s crackdown on Baltic independence in early 1991. Their leaders, who had openly supported the coup in Moscow, now feared revenge on the part of local majorities. Yeltsin’s Russian government largely ignored their worries. Its allies were national democrats in Tallinn, Riga, and Vilnius, not Russian minorities who had sided with the Kremlin conservatives.
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“Many in the non-Russian republics of the Union wondered whether the Baltic example set a precedent for Russia’s dealings with other republics. It soon became apparent that it did not. The Baltics held a special place in the hearts and minds of Yeltsin’s democrats, and Russian diplomatic recognition did not extend to all the Soviet republics that had declared their independence before or during the coup. Georgia, which had declared independence on April 9, 1991, much earlier than Estonia or Latvia, was not granted recognition. It was not clear whether Ukraine’s declaration of independence would place it in the same camp as the Baltics or Georgia. Given that Yeltsin’s reaction to Kravchuk’s phone call on the eve of the independence vote in parliament was much calmer than Gorbachev’s, there was some hope that Ukraine’s position would be treated with respect and understanding in Russia. As it turned out, there was only a weekend pause. Kravchuk called Yeltsin with the news on Saturday, which meant that Russian reaction would not come until Monday, August 26, when the session of the Soviet parliament promised by the plotters on the first day of the coup finally convened in Moscow.”  

Yeltsin sent Rutskoy to Kiev to reason with the deputies; but he failed. And soon Kazakhstan, too, voted for independence. Yeltsin quickly understood which way the wind was blowing, and withdrew his objections to independence, as also his threat to redraw the boundaries between the two republics so as to include the Crimea and Donbass, with their large Russian populations, within Russia.

As summer passed into autumn, and it became clear that the Ukrainians were going to vote for independence in the referendum, only Gorbachev among the major players stood out against independence. For a time he was supported by his friend and admirer President Bush, still worried about nuclear proliferation if the Union should go under, as also by the prospect of civil war between the republics on the model of what was happening in Yugoslavia. However, by the end of November, under pressure from the Ukrainian lobby and the Defence department under Dick Cheney, he, too, had given in – to Gorbachev’s great mortification. Gorbachev was still in control of the Soviet army and the Union ministries. But by a decree of November 30, Yeltsin withdrew funding for them. Without money, the Union was now all but dead.

*  

As the power of the Soviet Union collapsed in Ukraine, so did that of the “Soviet Church” of the Moscow Patriarchate in the republic. The collapse was most significant and important in Western Ukraine, the most nationalist region, where the MP had recruited many of its clergy since the region’s conquest by Stalin at the end of World War Two.

402 Plokhy, op. cit., pp. 174-175.
The MP’s spiritual impotence was illustrated by its surrender of its western borderlands to the resurgent Uniates. As we have seen, at the council of Lvov in 1946 Stalin integrated the Uniates or Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC), who were Catholic by faith, but Orthodox in ritual, into the MP, and forced those Uniates who did not want to become Orthodox to go underground. When Gorbachev came to power, the Uniates began agitating for a restoration of their independence and the legalization of their Church. They were supported, surprisingly, by the chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs, Konstantin Kharchev, who insisted that local authorities keep the law in their dealings with believers and suggested the legalization of the Uniates and the free election of bishops. This roused the MP and others to complain about Kharchev to the Supreme Soviet. Kharchev was removed in June, 1989. But he made a telling comment about those who had removed him: “I suspect that some members of the Synod, from force of habit, have counted more on the support of the authorities than on their own authority in the Church.”

The UGCC finally achieved legalization in January, 1990, just after Gorbachev met the Pope in Rome. This represented the second major diplomatic triumph of the Vatican in the communist bloc (after the legalization of Solidarity in Poland) and the beginning of the re-establishment of Catholic power in Russia. However, even before they had recovered their freedom in law, the Uniates started taking over churches in Western Ukraine which they considered to be theirs by right. By December, 1991, 2167 nominally Orthodox parishes had joined the Uniates. Deprived of the help of the local authorities, who showed every sign of being on the side of the uniates, and discredited by its associations with communism, the MP seemed helpless to stop the rot.

They were also helpless to stop the revival of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church… In October, 1989, a retired patriarchal bishop, Ioann Bondarchuk, announced the creation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC). He was immediately placed under ban by the patriarchate. However, the patriarchate decided to make some concessions to Ukrainian nationalist feeling by creating, in January, 1990, a supposedly autonomous but pro-Moscow Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC-MP), led by Metropolitan Philaret (Denisenko) of Kiev. Later, Philaret was defrocked and anathematised by the MP, so he formed a third independent Orthodox Church in the Ukraine – the so-called “Kievan Patriarchate” (UOAC-KP).

Meanwhile, relations between the Orthodox and Catholics continued to deteriorate; and in March the Uniates withdrew from quadripartite discussions between Roman Catholics, Uniates, Russian Orthodox and the

---

404 One reason was that for years the MP had been teaching its seminarians, many of whom came from the Western Ukraine, that the Orthodox and the Catholics were “sister churches”. 60% of those who joined the uniates graduated from Leningrad theological schools.
UOC-MP. Then, in June, the UAOC convened its first All-Ukrainian Council in Kiev, at which Mstyslav (Skrypnyk), who had been the leader of the Ukrainian autocephalists in the USA, was enthroned as the first patriarch in Ukrainian history. The UAOC received a further significant boost after the Ukraine achieved independence at the end of 1991.

In spite of tensions between the Orthodox and the Catholics, and between different Orthodox churches, the process of religious liberalization that was well under way throughout the Soviet Union continued also in Ukraine as the referendum on independence drew nearer. Thus on November 20, 1991, the presidential candidate Leonid Kravchuk “addressed the first all-Ukrainian religious forum. The former self-described chief atheist of Ukraine (under his supervision, the ideology department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine oversaw the country’s religious organizations) asked forgiveness of religious leaders, not on behalf of the defunct party but on that of the state he now represented. As communism and atheism lost their ideological appeal and religion returned to the religious sphere, religious denominations began to play an ever more important role in society. Ukraine, which accounted for two-thirds of all Orthodox Christian parishes in the USSR and was home to most Soviet Protestants, was considered the Bible Belt of the Soviet Union. It had become a religious battleground with the arrival of perestroika and glasnost’. Kravchuk called for interreligious toleration and support for independence. He wanted religious leaders to work towards the independence of their religious institutions but to avoid strife in doing so. On November 20, leaders of sixteen religious organizations in Ukraine pledged their support for government policy on religion. It was, in effect, a gesture of support for independence.”405

On December 1, 1991 a referendum on the Ukrainian parliament’s declaration of independence in August was held. Voters were asked "Do you support the Act of Declaration of Independence of Ukraine?" The text of the Declaration was included as a preamble to the question. The referendum was called by the Parliament of Ukraine to confirm the Act of Independence, which was adopted by the Parliament on 24 August 1991. Citizens of Ukraine expressed overwhelming support for independence. In the referendum, 31,891,742 registered voters (or 84.18% of the electorate) took part, and among them 28,804,071 (or 92.3%) voted "Yes".406 The results of the referendum astounded everyone: over 90% of the electorate in a very high turn-out voted for independence. In the Russian-language provinces of Lugansk and Donetsk (the same provinces that in 2014 proclaimed that they were independent republics) the majorities were 83% and 77% respectively. Even in Crimea the majority was 54%. Every single province of Ukraine, and all its nationalities, had voted for independence. This result spelled the end of the Soviet Union...

405 Plokhy, op. cit., p. 286.
In general, as we have seen, almost all Russians were strongly opposed to the separation of Russia from Ukraine, regarding the Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians as essentially three parts of one Slavic race who should keep together on the basis of their closely related religion, culture and history. However, this was decidedly not the view of most Ukrainians. Orthodox believers felt especially strongly about this. Thus “the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church,” said Anatolius Krasikov, “is the expression of the resolute will of the Ukrainian people to finally liberate itself from the imperial [Russian] Orthodox Church which is an instrument of spiritual oppression against the Ukrainian people, aiming at its complete russification and enslavement…”

Fired by similar sentiments in spite of his atheism, and armed with the results of the referendum, the newly elected President Kravchuk of Ukraine travelled to the Belavezha hunting lodge in Belarus to meet with his counterparts from Russia and Belarus. The avowed purpose was to sign a new Union treaty proposed by Gorbachev. But Kravchuk rejected that on the first day; in general, he would allow no treaty or agreement that included the word “Union”.

On the second day, December 8, “the Slavic Trinity” of nations signed an “Agreement on the Establishment of a Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS]”. This contained fourteen articles. “The three leaders agreed to create the Commonwealth and recognize the territorial integrity and existing borders of each now independent republic. They declared their desire to establish joint control over their nuclear arsenals. They also declared their willingness to reduce their armed forces and strive for complete nuclear disarmament. The prospective members of the Commonwealth were given the right to declare neutrality and nuclear-free status. Membership of the Commonwealth was open to all Soviet republics and other countries that shared the goals and principles declared in the agreement. The coordinating bodies of the Commonwealth were to be located not in Moscow – the capital of Russia, the old tsarist empire, and the vanishing USSR - but in Minsk, the capital of Belarus.

“The three leaders guaranteed the fulfillment of the agreements and obligations of the Soviet Union, while declaring Soviet laws null and void on the territory of their states from the moment the agreement was signed. ‘The operation of agencies of the former USSR on the territory of members states of the Commonwealth is terminated,’ read the final paragraph of the agreement. It was a natural concluding statement for a document that began with the following declaration: ‘We, the Republic of Belarus, the Russian Federation (RSFSR), and Ukraine, as founding states of the USSR that signed the union treaty of 1922… hereby establish that the USSR as a subject of international law and a geopolitical reality ceases its existence.’”

---
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The three leaders returned to their respective republics fearful for their own safety. They had reason: Gorbachev was still in charge of the army and the KGB, and could have imprisoned them for treason. However, Gorbachev, though very angry and refusing to recognize the legitimacy of the Belavezha Agreement, did nothing. Most importantly, Shaposhnikov, the Soviet Minister of Defence and de facto ruler of the army, decided to support Yeltsin, and soon became Russian Minister of Defence. Then, in the middle of December the American Secretary of State James Baker visited Moscow, received the assurance he needed about nuclear arms, and became convinced that the USSR was no more...

But one major problem remained: the attitude of the non-Slav and non-Baltic republics to the CIS. For various complicated reasons, they all agreed to join this necessary, albeit necessarily weak new centre. These reasons included the need to preserve economic ties between the republics, the need for some protection against Islamic fundamentalism in the non-Slavic republics (and even also in Russia, where trouble was brewing in Chechnya), and the potential for ethnic conflicts in the individual republics on the model of the conflicts that had broken out in Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh, or of Moldova in Transnistria. On December 21 the Presidents of eleven States, but excluding Gorbachev, met in Almaty. They “focused on two big subjects: the dissolution of the USSR and the creation of a new Commonwealth that would now include not three but eleven republics. It took the heads of the post-Soviet states only three and a half hours to agree on the principles of the new international structure, which would include most of what remained of the Soviet Union after the departure of the Balts. By 3:00 p.m. the final drafts of the agreements had been sent to the typists, and two hours later they were signed at an official ceremony. At the insistence of the Central Asian republics, the leaders of the post-Soviet states, including Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus, signed the declaration on the formation of the Commonwealth anew. Now all present in Almaty were founding members of the Commonwealth.

“Most of the decisions were adopted on the initiative of the Russian delegation. First, the presidents agreed to form two coordinating institutions, the Council of Presidents and the Council of Prime Ministers. They also agreed to abolish all remaining Soviet ministries and institutions – an issue of paramount importance to Yeltsin in his ongoing struggle with Gorbachev. Russia also received the participants’ approval to declare itself the successor to the USSR, which meant, among other things, permanent membership in the Security Council of the United Nations. The agreement on joint control of nuclear arsenals was in full accord with the schem that Yeltsin had described to Baker a few days earlier in Moscow: only the president of Russia could authorize a launch of nuclear weapons, while the other presidents with a nuclear arsenal would be consulted but would have no technical ability to order a launch. By July, 1992, strategic and tactical nuclear weapons would be moved from Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan to Russia for disassembly. The leaders of the four nuclear republics, including Kravchuk, Nazarbayev, and Shushkevich, endorsed that solution…”

On December 25, 1991, while the Americans were celebrating Western Christmas, the communist red flag came down for the last time over the Kremlin and the red, white and blue of Russia, which had also been Russia’s pre-revolutionary flag, was raised in its stead. A few days later, the American President Bush, in his State of the Union address, “referred to the implosion of the Soviet Union in a year that had seen ‘changes of almost biblical proportions,’ declared that ‘by the grace of God, America won the Cold War,’ and announced the dawning of a new world order. ‘A world once divided into two armed camps,’ Bush told the joint session of the US Senate and House of Representatives, ‘now recognizes one sole and preeminent power, the United States of America.’ The audience exploded in applause…”

For the third time in seventy years the United States bestrode the globe like a colossus. All three victories – those of 1918, 1945 and 1991 - can plausibly be claimed to have been victories of American democracy over one or another species of totalitarianism. But the differences between them were important. In 1918 the proto-totalitarian state of Germany had been defeated, but it had been the Europeans who bore the main brunt of the cost, while Germany herself had been neither occupied, nor purged of her totalitarian spirit, which went on to grow in fierceness under Hitler, necessitating a second world war. Moreover, in the background then a new totalitarian empire, that of Soviet Russia, had been growing with equal speed and ferocity. In 1945 America’s share in the final victory was much larger, and the demons of Nazi Germany and Japan were finally exorcised. But Germany’s loss had been the Soviet Union’s gain; and that empire was now at the height of its powers and more than ever dangerous, making the Cold War inevitable. In that war, America’s share in the victory was larger still: the other western powers had contributed a little, but not much by comparison. Moreover, by 1991 none of the old totalitarian powers was left standing and only China, which had nipped the democratic virus in the bud on Tiananmen Square, appeared as a possible rival of the all-conquering Western democracies.

But there were disturbing resemblances between 1918 and 1991. Once again, the defeated power had not been occupied, nor its totalitarian spirit exorcised. As in 1918, so in 1991, the defeated power felt that it had been “stabbed in the back”, betrayed by foreign and domestic enemies. To make things worse, it was still a nuclear power. In December, 1994 Russia, Ukraine, the United States and the United Kingdom signed “the Budapest Memorandum”, thereby guaranteeing the territorial integrity of Ukraine, Belarus’ and Kazakhstan in exchange for giving their nuclear weapons to Russia. This solved the problem of nuclear proliferation that had so worried the Americans. But it gave Russia still more power to blackmail its neighbours. And, as events in 2014 were to prove, Ukraine’s territorial guarantees (like Czechoslovakia’s in 1938) were not worth the paper they were written on…

The Soviet Union appeared to be dead… But could “the Long War”, in Philip Bobbitt’s phrase, between democracy and totalitarianism, lasting from 1914 to 1991, really be over? Was there not a final battle still to be fought, whose consequences this time would surely be a nuclear holocaust wiping out most of humanity? As President Bush soberly noted, the prospects for such a war had dramatically receded, but they had not gone away completely… They had not gone away, fundamentally, because, on the one hand, of the wrath of man - the spirit of Soviet Russia was still alive and burning to avenge its defeat in the Cold War. And on the other hand because of the wrath of God - repentance for the terrible, unprecedented sins of the Soviet period had not been offered…

In the euphoria of this great, but incomplete and inevitably temporary triumph over evil, it was necessary to recall the words of the Apocalypse concerning the red beast: “And I saw one of his heads as if it had been mortally wounded, and his deadly wounded was healed. And all the earth marveled and followed the beast” (Revelation 13.3).

The beast was wounded, but it was not yet dead…
71. THE END OF HISTORY?

By the beginning of the 1990s, the doctrine of liberal democracy appeared to have triumphed over all other systems. It had survived the socialist and fascist revolutions, had won the Cold War with the Soviets, and appeared on the point of “turning” the last, most powerful adherent of the revolutionary ethos, Communist China. Even more successful, it seemed, was the related doctrine of free trade. As the Financial Times put it: “Never in 2,000 years has the doctrine of the free market spread so widely across the globe. Communism had been buried, socialism is in deep retreat, and even the hardiest proponents of social democracy are beset by doubt. Adam Smith has vanquished Marx, immobilized Keynes, and turned many thoughts away from Jesus… Just as religion is on the defensive, two important doctrines associated with capitalism are being taken up with less enthusiasm, and in fewer countries, than the system of wealth creation that is now everywhere regarded as the most effective that humanity has yet devised.”411

Probably the best-known defence of Liberal Democracy in the last twenty-five years is The End of History and the Last Man by the Harvard-trained political scientist Francis Fukuyama. In view of the fame of this thesis, any anti-modernist world-view, and in particular any truly coherent defence of Orthodox political theology, must take into account what Fukuyama says and refute it, or, at any rate, show that those of his analyses that are correct must lead to different conclusions from the ones he draws. What makes Fukuyama's thesis particularly interesting to Orthodox Christians is that it is possible for us to agree with 99% of his detailed argumentation while differing fundamentally from him in our final conclusions.

Fukuyama's original article entitled "The End of History?" (1992) argued that "liberal democracy represented 'the end point of mankind's ideological evolution' and 'the final form of human government,' and as such constituted 'the end of history'. That is, while earlier forms of government were characterized by grave defects and irrationalities that led to their eventual collapse, liberal democracy was arguably free from such fundamental internal contradictions. This was not to say that today's stable democracies, like the United States, France, or Switzerland, were not without injustice or serious social problems. But these problems were ones of incomplete implementation of the twin principles of liberty and equality on which modern democracy is founded, rather than flaws in the principles themselves. While some present-day countries might fail to achieve stable liberal democracy, and others might lapse back into other, more primitive forms of rule like theocracy or military dictatorship, the ideal of liberal democracy could not be improved on.”412

Fukuyama's article appeared in the summer of 1989 and received rapid and dramatic support from the collapse of communism (together with Saddam Hussein's quasi-communistic Baathism) almost immediately after. Thus by 2000 the only major country outside the Islamic Middle East and Africa not to submit its power to the ballot box was Communist China - and the Tiananmen massacre shows that democracy had sown seeds there as well. Not that Fukuyama predicted this outcome: as he honestly admitted, only a few years before neither he nor the great majority of western political scientists had anticipated the fall of communism any time soon. This fact alone should make us pause before trusting too much in Fukuyama's judgements about the future of the world and the end of history...

1. Reason, Desire and Thymos

Why, according to Fukuyama, is History moving towards world-wide democracy? At the risk of over-simplifying what is a lengthy and sophisticated argument, we may summarize his answer under two headings: the logic of scientific advance, and the logic of human need, in particular the need for recognition. Let us look briefly at each of these.

First, the survival of any modern State militarily and economically requires that science and technology be given free rein, which in turn requires the free dissemination of ideas and products both within and between States that only political and economic liberalism guarantees. "The scientific-technical elite required to run modern industrial economies would eventually demand greater political liberalization, because scientific inquiry can only proceed in an atmosphere of freedom and the open exchange of ideas. We saw earlier how the emergence of a large technocratic elite in the USSR and China created a certain bias in favor of markets and economic liberalization, since these were more in accord with the criteria of economic rationality. Here the argument is extended into the political realm: that scientific advance depends not only on freedom for scientific inquiry, but on a society and political system that are as a whole open to free debate and participation."413

Moreover, it is not reasonable to expect that the advance of science can be halted or reversed for an indefinite period. Even the destruction of civilization through a nuclear or ecological catastrophe, and the demand for a far more careful evaluation of the effects of science and technology that such a catastrophe would elicit, would not alter this. For it is inconceivable that the principles of scientific method should be forgotten as long as humanity survives on the planet; and any State that eschewed the application of that method would be at an enormous disadvantage in the struggle for survival.

Fukuyama admits that the logic of scientific advance does not by itself explain why most people in advanced, industrialized countries prefer democracy. "For if a country's goal is economic growth above all other
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considerations, the truly winning combination would appear to be neither liberal democracy nor socialism of either a Leninist or democratic variety, but the combination of liberal economics and authoritarian politics that some observers have labelled the 'bureaucratic authoritarian state,' or what we might term a 'market-oriented authoritarianism.'\textsuperscript{414}

Interestingly, as an example of such a "winning combination" of liberal economics and authoritarian politics, Fukuyama mentions "the Russia of Witte and Stolypin" - in other words, of Tsar Nicholas II... And in our own time the premier example is China...

Since the logic of scientific advance is not sufficient in itself to explain why most people and States choose democracy, Fukuyama has resort to a second, more powerful argument based on a Platonic model of human nature. According to this model, there are three basic components of human nature: reason, desire and the force denoted by the almost untranslatable Greek word thymos. Reason is the handmaid of desire and thymos; it is that element which distinguishes us from the animals and enables the irrational forces of desire and thymos to be satisfied in the real world. Desire includes the basic needs for food, sleep, shelter and sex. Thymos is usually translated as "anger" or "courage"; but Fukuyama defines it as that desire which "desires the desire of other men, that is, to be wanted by others or to be recognized".\textsuperscript{415} We might call it pride or vainglory.

Now most liberal theorists in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, such as Hobbes, Locke and the founders of the American Constitution, have focused on desire as the fundamental force in human nature because on its satisfaction depends the survival of the human race itself. They have seen thymos, or the need for recognition, i.e. ambition, as an ambiguous force which should rather be suppressed than expressed; for it is ambition that leads to tyrannies, wars and all those conflicts which endanger "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". The American Constitution with its system of checks and balances was designed above all to prevent the emergence of tyranny, which is the clearest expression of what we may call megalothymia. Indeed, for many the prime merit of democracy consists in its prevention of tyranny.

A similar point of view was expressed by the Anglican writer, C.S. Lewis: "I am a democrat because I believe in the Fall of Man. I think most people are democrats for the opposite reason. A great deal of democratic enthusiasm descends from the ideas of people like Rousseau, who believed in democracy because they thought mankind so wise and good that everyone deserved a share in government. The danger of defending democracy on those grounds is that they are not true. And whenever their weakness is exposed, the people who prefer tyranny make capital out of the exposure. I find that they're not true without looking further than myself. I don't deserve a share in governing
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a henroost, much less a nation. Nor do most people - all the people who believe in advertisements, and think in catchwords and spread rumours. The real reason for democracy is just the reverse. Mankind is so fallen that no man can be trusted with unchecked power over his fellows..."\(^{416}\)

But this argument is deficient on both logical and historical grounds. Let us agree that Man is fallen. Why should giving very many fallen men a share in government reverse that fall, making it virtuous? In moral and social life, two minuses do not make a plus. Democratic institutions may inhibit the rise of tyranny in the short term; but they also make it almost certain that democratic leaders will be accomplished demagogues prepared to do almost anything to please the electorate. One man's ambition may check the full expression of another's; but the combination of many contradictory wills can only lead to an unsatisfactory compromise.

In fact, if wisdom in politics, as in all else, comes from God, "it is much more natural to suppose," as Vladimir Trostnikov says, "that divine enlightenment will descend upon the chosen soul of an Anointed One of God, as opposed to a million souls at once".\(^{417}\) The Scripture does not say vox populi - vox Dei, but: "The heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord; He turns it wherever He will" (Proverbs 21.1). Such an Anointed Autocrat, whose functions and rights have been such a central part of this history - would have theoretically unchecked power in the secular realm, but would in practice be checked by the institution that anointed him, the Orthodox Church, and the dogmas and traditions of the Orthodox Faith.

In spite of his being a democrat, Lewis was very perceptive about the evil uses to which the word "democracy" could be put. Thus his Screwtape (an imaginative incarnation of the devil) writes: "Democracy is the word with which you must lead them by the nose. The good work which our philological experts have already done in the corruption of human language makes it unnecessary to warn you that they should never be allowed to give this word a clear and definable meaning. They won't. It will never occur to them that democracy is properly the name of a political system, even a system of voting, and that this has the most remote and tenuous connection with what you are trying to sell them. Nor of course must they ever be allowed to raise Aristotle's question: whether 'democratic behaviour' means the behaviour that democracies like or the behaviour that will preserve a democracy. For if they did, it could hardly fail to occur to them that these need not be the same.

"You are to use the word purely as an incantation; if you like, purely for its selling power. It is a name they venerate. And of course it is connected with


the political idea that men should be equally treated. You then make a stealthy transition in their minds from this political ideal to a factual belief that all men are equal. Especially the man you are working on. As a result you can use the word democracy to sanction in his thought the most degrading (and also the most enjoyable) of all human feelings... The feeling I mean is of course that which prompts a man to say I'm as good as you. The first and most obvious advantage is that you thus induce him to enthrone at the centre of his life a good, solid, resounding lie.

"Now, this useful phenomenon is in itself by no means new. Under the name of Envy it has been known to the humans for thousands of years. But hitherto they always regarded it as the most odious, and also the most comical, of vices. Those who were aware of feeling it felt it with shame; those who were not gave it no quarter in others. The delightful novelty of the present situation is that you can sanction it - make it respectable and even laudable - by the incantatory use of the word democracy."

In another place Lewis admits that not democracy, but monarchy "is the channel through which all the vital elements of citizenship - loyalty, the consecration of secular life, the hierarchical principle, splendour, ceremony, continuity - still trickle down to irrigate the dustbowl of modern economic Statecraft".

In any case, has democracy really been such a defence against tyranny? Let us take the example of the first and most famous democracy, Athens... In the sixth century BC, Athens had been ruled by Solon, one of the wisest and most benevolent of autocrats, who showed his superiority to personal ambition by retiring into voluntary exile at the height of his fame. Later, in the fifth century, Athenian democracy was led by a good leader, Pericles. But by the end of the century Socrates, the state's most distinguished citizen, had been executed; Melos had been reduced and its population cruelly butchered; and a futile and morale-sapping war against Sparta had been lost.

The lessons were not lost on the philosophers of the next century: Plato turned from democracy to the ideal of the philosopher-king; while Aristotle distinguished between "democratic behaviour" meaning "the behaviour that democracies like" and "democratic behaviour" meaning "the behaviour that will preserve a democracy" - the two do not coincide.

The behaviour that democracies like is peaceful money-making and pleasure-seeking. There is no doubt that that aim has been achieved in our democratic age. Thus Marian Topy writes: “According to the World Bank, for the first time in human history, ‘less than 10 percent of the world’s population will be living in extreme poverty by the end of 2015.’

---
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“The bank has ‘used a new income figure of $1.90 per day to define extreme poverty, up from $1.25. It forecasts that the proportion of the world’s population in this category will fall from 12.8 percent in 2012 to 9.6 percent.’

“As scholars have noted, historically speaking, grinding poverty was the norm for most ordinary people. Even in the most economically advanced parts of the world, life used to be miserable.

“To give one example, at the end of the 18th century, ten million of France’s twenty-three million people relied on some sort of public or private charity to survive and three million were full-time beggars.

“Thanks to industrial revolution and trade, economic growth in the West accelerated to historically unprecedented levels. Over the course of the 19th and 20th centuries, real incomes in the West increased fifteen-fold. But the chasm that opened up as a result of the Western take-off is now closing.

“The rise of the non-Western world is, unambiguously, a result of economic growth spurred by the abandonment of central-planning and integration of many non-Western countries into the global economy. After economic liberalization in China in 1978, to give one example, real incomes rose thirteen-fold.

“As Princeton University Professor Angus Deaton notes in his book The Great Escape, ‘The rapid growth of average incomes, particularly in China and India, and particularly after 1975, did much to reduce extreme poverty in the world. In China most of all, but also in India, the escape of hundreds of millions from traditional and long established poverty qualifies as the greatest escape of all.’”

However the behaviour that will preserve a democracy is not peaceful money-making, but war and strict discipline, in which the rights of the pleasure-seeking individual must be subordinated to the will of the state. Moreover, in order to attain democracy, the rights of individuals must be not only subordinated, but destroyed, sometimes on a massive scale. As Shakespeare put it in Julius Caesar (II, 1):

Ligarius. What’s to do?
Brutus. A piece of work that will make sick men whole.
Ligarius. But are not some whole that we must make sick?

Thus it is a striking fact that all the greatest tyrants of modern times have emerged on the back of violent democratic revolutions: Cromwell - of the English revolution; Napoleon - of the French revolution; Lenin - of the

---

Russian revolution. And was not Hitler elected by the German democracy with more than a hint of threatened violence? Again, democracies have been quite prepared to throw whole peoples to the lions of tyranny for ephemeral gains. We think of the Helsinki Accords of 1975, by which the West legitimized the Soviet conquest of Eastern Europe; or Taiwan's expulsion from the United Nations at the insistence of Red China and with the complaisance of the world's premier democracy, the United States.\textsuperscript{421}

So thymos, or ambition, is an aspect of human nature that the Anglo-Saxon liberal tradition has difficulty in accommodating. Liberals approve of the use of thymos in overthrowing tyrannies, but are short of ideas on how to tame it within an existing democracy.

Recognizing this weakness in the Anglo-Saxon model, Fukuyama turns to the German idealist tradition, as represented by the philosopher Friedrich Hegel, who attributed a much more positive value to thymos. Hegel agreed with the Anglo-Saxons that democracy was the highest form of government, and therefore that the triumph of democracy - which for some mysterious reason he considered to have been attained by the tyrant Napoleon's victory at Jena in 1806 - was "the End of History". But democracy was the best, in Hegel's view, not simply because it attained the aim of self-preservation better than any other system, but also, \textit{and primarily}, because it gave expression to thymos in the form of isothymia - that is, it allowed each citizen to express his thymos to an equal degree. For whereas in pre-democratic societies the satisfaction of thymos in one person led to the frustration of thymos for many more, thereby dividing the whole of society into one or a few masters and a great many slaves, as a result of the democratic revolutions of the eighteenth century the slaves overthrew their masters and achieved equal recognition in each other's eyes. Thus through the winning of universal human rights everyone, in effect, became a master and was able to satisfy his thymos.

Hegel's philosophy was an explicit challenge to the Christian view of political freedom and slavery. Christians regard slavery as an evil in itself but one that can be exploited by Christian slaves for their good, for the salvation of their souls. "For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant" (\textit{I Corinthians} 7.22; \\textit{Onesimus}). So "live as free men, yet without using your freedom as a pretext for evil; but live as servants of God" (\textit{I Peter} 2.16).

St. Augustine asserted that if slaves "cannot get freedom from their masters, they can make their slavery into a kind of freedom, by performing this service not in deceitfulness and fear but in faithfulness and love, until injustice passes away and all dominion and human power are brought to nothing and God is all in all..."\textsuperscript{422}
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\textsuperscript{421} President Carter accepted the idea that there is only one China – Red China – in 1979.

But this doctrine offended Hegel's pride, his thymos. So without arguing in
detail against it, he rejected it as unworthy of the dignity of man. And he
rejected Anglo-Saxon liberalism for similar reasons, insofar as he saw placing
self-preservation as the main aim of life and society as effete and degrading.

Thus Hegel would have agreed with Shakespeare's words in *Hamlet*, IV, 4:

*What is a man,*

*If his chief good and market of his time*

*Be but to sleep and feed? A beast, no more.*

The essence and glory of man consists in his love of glory and honour:

*Rightly to be great*

*Is not to stir without great argument,*

*But greatly to find quarrel in a straw*

*When honour's at the stake.*

For the greatness of man lies in his *transcendence* of self-preservation, in his
capacity for self-sacrifice. And this is a manifestation of thymos.

Fukuyama develops this critique: "It is precisely the moral primacy
accorded to self-preservation or comfortable self-preservation in the thought
of Hobbes and Locke that leaves us unsatisfied. Beyond establishing rules for
mutual self-preservation, liberal societies do not attempt to define any
positive goals for their citizens or promote a particular way of life as superior
or desirable to another. Whatever positive life may have has to be filled by the
individual himself. That positive content can be a high one of public service
and private generosity, or it can be a low one of selfish pleasure and personal
meanness. The state as such is indifferent. Indeed, government is committed
to the tolerance of different 'lifestyles', except when the exercise of one right
impinges on another. In the absence of positive, 'higher' goals, what usually
fills the vacuum at the heart of Lockean liberalism is the open-ended pursuit
of wealth, now liberated from the traditional constraints of need and scarcity.

"The limitations of the liberal view of man become more obvious if we
consider liberal society's most typical product, a new type of individual who
has subsequently come to be termed pejoratively as the *bourgeois*: the human
being narrowly consumed with his own immediate self-preservation and
material well-being, interested in the community around him only to the
extent that it fosters or is a means of achieving his private good. Lockean man
did not need to be public-spirited, patriotic or concerned for
the welfare of those around him; rather, as Kant suggested, a liberal society could be made up of

---

423 Shakespeare was the favourite author of the German idealists. But a careful reading of his
plays demonstrates that he was no democrat, but rather a convinced defender of the
hierarchical order in society. See *Richard II* and *Henry V*. 
devils, provided they were rational [italics added]. It was not clear why the citizen of a liberal state, particularly in its Hobbesian variant, would ever serve in the army and risk his life for his country in war. For if the fundamental natural right was self-preservation of the individual, on what grounds could it ever be rational for an individual to die for his country rather than trying to run away with his money and family? Even in times of peace, Hobbesian or Lockean liberalism provided no reason why society's best men should choose public service and statesmanship over a private life of money-making. Indeed, it was not clear why Lockean man should become active in the life of his community, be privately generous to the poor, or even make the sacrifices necessary to raise a family.

"Beyond the practical question of whether one can create a viable society in which all public-spiritedness is missing, there is an even more important issue as to whether there was not something deeply contemptible about a man who cannot raise his sights higher than his own narrow self-interests and physical needs. Hegel's aristocratic master risking his life in a prestige battle is only the most extreme example of the human impulse to transcend merely natural or physical need. Is it not possible that the struggle for recognition reflects a longing for self-transcendence that lies at the root not only of the violence of the state of nature and of slavery, but also of the noble passions of patriotism, courage, generosity, and public spiritedness? Is recognition not somehow related to the entire moral side of man's nature, the part of man that finds satisfaction in the sacrifice of the narrow concerns of the body for an objective principle that lies beyond the body? By not rejecting the perspective of the master in favor of that of the slave, by identifying the master's struggle for recognition as somehow at the core of what is human, Hegel seeks to honor and preserve a certain moral dimension to human life that is entirely missing in the society conceived of by Hobbes and Locke. Hegel, in other words, understands man as a moral agent whose specific dignity is related to his inner freedom from physical or natural determination. It is this moral dimension, and the struggle to have it recognized, that is the motor driving the dialectical process of history."424

Now to the Christian ear there is an inner contradiction in this critique. While agreeing that there is something profoundly repellent in the bourgeois liberal's selfish pursuit of comfortable self-preservation, we cannot agree that the struggle for recognition is anything other than a different, and still more dangerous, form of egoism. For what is self-transcending in the pure affirmation of self? Patriotism, courage and generosity are indeed noble passions, but if we attribute them to the simple need for recognition, are we not reducing acts of selflessness to disguised forms of selfishness? And so if Anglo-Saxon liberalism panders to the ignoble passion of lust, does not Hegelian liberalism pander to the satanic passion of pride?

It follows from Fukuyama's analysis that the essential condition for the creation of a perfect or near-perfect society is the rational satisfaction both of desire and of thymos. But the satisfaction of thymos is the more problematic of the two requirements. For while the advance of science and open markets can be trusted to deliver the goods that desire requires in sufficient quantities for all, it is a very tricky problem to satisfy everyone's thymos without letting any individual or group give expression to megalothymia.

However, democracy has succeeded by replacing megalothymia by two things. "The first is a blossoming of the desiring part of the soul, which manifests itself as a thorough-going economization of life. This economization extends from the highest things to the lowest, from the states of Europe who seek not greatness and empire, but a more integrated European Community in 1992, to the college graduate who performs an internal cost-benefit analysis of the career options open to him or her. The second thing that remains in place of megalothymia is an all pervasive isothyrmia, that is, the desire to be recognized as the equal of other people." In other words, democracy rests on the twin pillars of greed and pride: the rational (i.e. scientific) manipulation of greed developed without limit (for the richer the rich, the less poor, eventually, will be the poor, the so-called "trickle down" effect), and pride developed within a certain limit (the limit, that is, set by other people's pride).

There are now no checks on fallen human nature except laws – the laws passed by fallen human beings - and the state's apparatus of law-keeping. That may be preferable to lawlessness, as Solzhenitsyn pointed out in the 1970s, comparing the West with the Soviet Union; but it means that within the limits of the laws the grossest immorality is permitted. Truly a house built on sand!

2. Democracy and Nationalism

Now there are two "thymotic" phenomena that have to be controlled if the democrat's ideal of a satisfied, isothymic citizenry is to be achieved: religion and nationalism. Nationalism is a threat because it implies that all men are not equal, which in turn implies that it is right and just for one group of men to dominate another. As Fukuyama admits, "Democracy is not particularly good at resolving disputes between different ethnic or national groups. The question of national sovereignty is inherently uncompromisable: it either belongs to one people or another - Armenians or Azerbaijanis, Lithuanians or Russians - and when different groups come into conflict there is seldom a way of splitting the difference through peaceful democratic compromise, as there is in the case of economic disputes. The Soviet Union could not become democratic and at the same time unitary, for there was no consensus among the Soviet Union's nationalities that they shared a common citizenship and identity. Democracy would only emerge on the basis of the country's breakup into smaller national entities. American democracy has done surprisingly well

425 Fukuyama, op. cit., p. 190.
dealing with ethnic diversity, but that diversity has been contained within certain bounds: none of America's ethnic groups constitutes historical communities living on their traditional lands and speaking their own language, with a memory of past nationhood and sovereignty.\footnote{Fukuyama, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 119.}

Since democracy cannot contain give expression to nationalism without contradicting its own egalitarian principles, it has to undermine it - not by force, of course, but in the democratic way, that is, by sweet reason and material inducements. However, sweet reason rarely works when passions run high and deep, so in the end the warring nations have to be bribed to keep the peace. This works up to a point, but experience shows that even economically advanced countries whose desire is near to being satisfied cannot control the eruption of thymotic nationalist passions.

Thus "economic development has not weakened the sense of national identity among French Canadians in Quebec; indeed, their fear of homogenization into the dominant Anglophone culture has sharpened their desire to preserve their distinctness. To say that democracy is more functional in societies 'born equal' like the United States begs the question of how a nation gets there in the first place. Democracy, then, does not necessarily become more functional as societies become more complex and diverse. In fact, it fails precisely when the diversity of a society passes a certain limit."\footnote{Fukuyama, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 121.}

In spite of this, the ideologues of democracy continue to believe that nationalism is a threat that can only be contained by building ever-larger supra-national states. Thus the European Union was founded in 1957 on the premise that, besides the economic rewards to be reaped from the Union, it would prevent the recurrence of war between the European states in general and France and Germany in particular. Of course, the bloody breakdown of supra-national states such as the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia does not speak in support of this argument. But the democrats riposte by declaring that it is not supranationalism as such that was to blame for these breakdowns, but rather the communist system, which suppressed the thymotic aspirations of its citizens and so fuelled nationalism instead of sublimating it.

So is the democratic model of supranationalism represented by the European Union solving the problem of nationalism? The evidence seems to point in the opposite direction. Thus as the moment of the irreversible surrender of national sovereignties, i.e. monetary union, drew nearer, resistance stiffened in several countries, as witnessed by the majorities against it in many national polls. And as this resistance became stronger, so the sweet reason of the Eurocrats turned into the harsh language of threatened coercion. Thus the French Prime Minister proposed that those countries who decided not to join the monetary union (he had in mind especially Great Britain, the most sceptical of the Union's nation states) should be subject to economic
penalties. And the German Chancellor said (again, his remarks were aimed particularly at Britain) that the result of a failure to unite in Europe would mean war. This is in spite of the fact that there had been no war or even threat of war in Western Europe for the past fifty years! When the UK finally voted unambiguously to leave the EU in 2016, the head of the EU Commission denounced this act as “nationalism” and unambiguously evil.

So much for the "voluntary" union of states in the spirit of democracy and brotherhood! If you don't surrender your sovereignty, we will crush you! This is the language of nationalist hatred in supra-national guise, and it points to a central paradox or internal contradiction in democracy.

The contradiction consists in the fact that while democracy prides itself on its spirit of peace and brotherhood between individuals and nations, the path to democracy, both within and between nations, actually involves an unparalleled destruction of personal and national life. For much has been said, and truly said, about the destructive power of nationalism; but much less about how it protects nations and cultures and people from destruction (as, for example, it protected the Orthodox nations of Eastern Europe from destruction under the Turkish yoke). Again, much has been said, and truly said, about how democracy creates a culture of peace which has prevented the occurrence of major wars between democratic states; but much less about how democracy has drastically weakened the bonds created by societies other than the state, from the ethnic group and the church to the working men's club and the mother's union, with the result that, deprived of community identities, atomized, democratic man has found himself in a state of undeclared war against, or at any rate alienation from, his neighbour.

This may explain why, at just the moment when democracies seem to have matured and solved all major internal contradictions and inequalities, new nationalisms are appearing - the Basque, Scottish and North Italian nationalisms, for example, in the modern European Union.428 For men must

428 Of these, however, only Scottish nationalism appears close to achieving its goal in 2016. Scotland had been solidly conservative (with a small "c") and unionist until the early 1960s; the Scottish Nationalist Party, founded only in 1934, was seen as a curiosity rather than a serious contender for power. But the decision by the US and UK governments to locate a nuclear submarine base on the Clyde without consulting the Scottish people probably contributed to the election of Winnie Ewing as the first Scottish Nationalist MP (for Hamilton) in 1967. The deindustrialization, increasing unemployment and strike culture of the 1970s helped to bring the Labour Party to dominance in Scotland; but in the longer term these factors benefited the Scottish Nationalists even more, as the myth was spread (not least by Scottish Labour politicians) that the UK Westminster government did not represent Scots, that it “did not have a mandate” to introduce its policies north of the border. Another important factor favouring the Nationalists was the discovery of oil in large quantities under the North Sea. Now for the first time the economic argument that Scotland was too poor to live as an independent country began to lose its edge...

The New Labour government of Tony Blair gave Scotland their own parliament and a substantial devolution of powers in 1999, which, contrary to the government's expectations, led to a collapse of the Labour Unionist vote in Scotland. And so in 2007 the SNP formed a minority government, and in 2011 – a majority one. In 2014 the Nationalists lost a
feel that they belong to a community, and not just to such an amorphous community as "the European Union", still less "the International Community". But to create a community means to create partitions - not hostile partitions, not impermeable partitions, but partitions nevertheless, partitions that show who is inside and who is outside the community, criteria of membership which not everyone will be able to meet. The resilience of nationalism in both its positive and negative modes is a sign of the perennial need for community, a need which democracy has abysmally failed to satisfy.

However, while Fukuyama fully accepts the existence and seriousness of this lack in democratic society, he still seems to think that the most important and powerful sources of community life, religion and nationalism, are either already out or on the way out.

Thus in an uncharacteristically bold and unqualified statement he declares that "contrary to those who at the time believed that religion was a necessary and permanent feature of the political landscape, liberalism vanquished religion in Europe [his italics]." In 2016, when Islam looks set to dominate Europe within a generation, this remark looks simply stupid...

Fukuyama admits that nationalism is unlikely to disappear any time soon. But in the end it, too, is destined to "wither away". Thus he considers the rise of nationalism in the highly cultured, democratic and economically advanced Germany of the 1920s and 30s to have been "the product of historically unique circumstances".

"These conditions are not only not latent in most developed societies, but would be very hard (though not impossible) to duplicate in other societies in the future. Many of these circumstances, such as defeat in a long and brutal war and economic depression, are well known and potentially replicable in other countries. But others have to do with the special intellectual and cultural traditions of Germany at the time, its anti-materialism and emphasis on struggle and sacrifice, that made it very distinct from liberal France and England. These traditions, which were in no way 'modern', were tested by the wrenching social disruptions caused by Imperial Germany's hothouse industrialization before and after the Franco-Prussian War. It is possible to understand Nazism as another, albeit extreme, variant of the 'disease of the transition', a byproduct of the modernization process that was by no means a necessary component of modernity itself. None of this implies that a phenomenon like Nazism is now impossible because we have advanced socially beyond such a stage. It does suggest, however, that fascism is a

---

referendum vote to take Scotland out of the United Kingdom altogether. But in 2016, in the "Brexit" vote on taking the United Kingdom out of the European Union, a sharp difference between England and Scotland emerged: while England voted to leave the EU, the Scots voted to remain. This raises the real possibility that there will be a second referendum on Scotland’s leaving or remaining within the United Kingdom in the near future...
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pathological and extreme condition, by which one cannot judge modernity as a whole.430

Pathological and extreme Nazism may be, but it cannot be dismissed as simply an ugly but easily excised wart on the superbly toned body of Modernity. Hitler was democratically elected, and Nazism was the product of a fundamental contradiction inherent to democracy, the fact that while promising fraternity, it nevertheless destroys brotherhood, making us feel that life is a jungle in which every man is essentially alone. Sovietism was also a product of democracy, and an exposure of another of its internal contradictions - that between freedom and equality. These "deviations" to the right and left do not point to the righteousness of a supposed "royal way" in between. Rather, they are symptoms, warning signs pointing to the inner pathological nature of the ideal they both professed and to which they both owed their existence – democracy, the rule of the people.

The European Union gives as its main justification the avoidance of those nationalistic wars, especially between France and Germany, whose rivalry so disfigured the region's history. But even if France and Germany are friends now, most of the old nationalisms show no sign of dying. Moreover, the crisis in the Eurozone has reanimated traditional antipathy towards the most powerful state in it, Germany.

For pious exhortations are as useless in the face of nationalist fervour as exhortations to chastity in the face of aroused lust; in both cases grace is required to give power to the word. The problem is that when the grace that holds apparent opposites in balance is absent, it is very easy for a nation, as for an individual person, to swing from one extreme to the other, as the history of the twentieth century, characterised by lurches from nationalist Fascism to internationalist Communism shows.

Constantine Leontiev saw that the nationalism of the states of Europe could lead to a no less dangerous internationalist abolition of states “... A state grouping according to tribes and nations is... nothing other than the preparation - striking in its force and vividness - for the transition to a cosmopolitan state, first a pan-European one, and then, perhaps, a global one, too! This is terrible! But still more terrible, in my opinion, is that fact that so far in Russia nobody has seen this or wants to understand it...”431 “A grouping of states,” he said, “according to pure nationalities will lead European man very quickly to the dominion of internationalism.”432

More recently, Gabriel Robin has written: “The two ideologies, of Communism and of Europe, have much more in common that they [the
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Euroenthusiasts] like to admit... One had its apparatchiks, the other its Eurocrats... Their respective credos come together [in many respects including] the inevitable withering away of the nation-state...”

3. Democracy and Religion

The second threat to democracy, according to Fukuyama, is religion. Religion is a threat because it postulates the existence of absolute truths and values that conflict with the democratic-ecumenist idea that it doesn't matter what you believe. That is why, as the Russian Slavophile Alexei Khomyakov pointed out, religion always declines under democracies.

Fukuyama writes: “Like nationalism, there is no inherent conflict between religion and liberal democracy, except at the point where religion ceases to be tolerant or egalitarian.”

It is not surprising, therefore, that the flowering of liberal democracy should have coincided with the flowering of the ecumenical movement in religion, and at approximately the same time; and that England, the birthplace of liberal democracy, should also have supplied, in the form of the Anglican Church, the model and motor for the creation of the World Council of Churches. For ecumenism is, in essence, the application of the egalitarian principles of liberal democracy to religious belief, making relations between religious faiths an essentially political matter.

Paradoxically, Fukuyama, following Hegel, recognizes that the idea of the unique moral worth of every human being, which is at the root of the idea of human rights, is Christian in origin. For, according to the Christian view, “people who are manifestly unequal in terms of beauty, talent, intelligence, or skill, are nonetheless equal insofar as they are moral agents. The homeliest and most awkward orphan can have a more beautiful soul in the eyes of God than the most talented pianist or the most brilliant physicist. Christianity’s contribution, then, to the historical process was to make clear to the slave this vision of human freedom, and to define for him in what sense all men could be understood to have dignity. The Christian God recognizes all human beings universally, recognizes their individual human worth and dignity. The Kingdom of Heaven, in other words, presents the prospect of a world in which the isothymia of every man - though not the megalothymia of the vainglorious - will be satisfied.”

---

434 However, there are marked differences in the degree of decline. Thus Americans are much more religious in general than Europeans. In the U.S., 22 percent of people go to church on Sundays. In France it’s 15 percent, in Britain it’s around 10 percent and in the Netherlands it’s less than 6 percent. More than half of all Americans think that to be moral, you need to believe in God. But only 20 percent of people in France, Britain and Spain agree with this idea.
435 Fukuyama, op. cit., p. 216. Italics added.
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Leaving aside for the moment the question whether this is an accurate representation of the Christian understanding of freedom and equality, we may note that, however useful this idea has been in bringing the slave to a sense of his own dignity, it has to be rejected by the democrat because it actually reconciles him with his chains rather than spurring him to throw them off. For Christianity, as Hegel - and, it would seem, Fukuyama, too - believes, is ultimately an ideology of slaves, whatever its usefulness as a stepping stone to the last ideology, the ideology of truly free men, Democracy. If the slaves are actually to become free, they must not be inhibited by the ideas of the will of God (which, by definition, is of greater authority than "the will of the people") and of the Kingdom of Heaven (which, by definition, cannot be the kingdom of this world). The Christian virtues of patience and humility must also go, and for very much the same reason. For the revolution needs proud men, greedy men, impatient men, not ascetic hermits - even if, after the revolution, they have to limit their pride and impatience (if not their greed) for the sake of the stability of democracy.

But this last point leads Fukuyama to a still more important admission: that religion is useful, perhaps even necessary, to democratic society even after the revolution. For "the emergence and durability of a society embodying rational recognition appears to require the survival of certain forms of irrational recognition."437 One example of such a survival is the "Protestant work-ethic", which is the recognition that work has a value in and of itself, regardless of its material rewards.

The problem for the democrats is that while the thymotic passions necessary to overthrow the aristocratic masters and create democratic society tend to fade away when the victory has been won, the fruits of the victory still have to be consolidated and defended. It is a profound and important paradox that men are much more likely to give their lives for unelected hereditary monarchs than for elected presidents or prime ministers, even though they consider the latter more "legitimate" than the former. The reason for this is that very powerful religious and patriotic emotions attach to hereditary monarchs that do not attach to democratic leaders precisely because, whether consciously or unconsciously, they are perceived to be kings not by the will of the people, but by the will of God, Whose will the people recognizes to be more sacred than its own will.

Fukuyama struggles bravely with this ultimately intractable problem: "The liberal state growing out of the tradition of Hobbes and Locke engages in a protracted struggle with its own people. It seeks to homogenize their variegated traditional cultures and to teach them to calculate instead their own long-term self-interest. In place of an organic moral community with its own language of 'good and evil', one had to learn a new set of democratic values: to be 'participant', 'rational', 'secular', 'mobile', 'empathetic', and 'tolerant'. These new democratic values were initially not values at all in the
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sense of defining the final human virtue or good. They were conceived as having a purely instrumental function, habits that one had to acquire if one was to live successfully in a peaceful and prosperous liberal society. It was for this reason that Nietzsche called the state the 'coldest of all cold monsters' that destroyed peoples and their cultures by hanging 'a thousand appetites' in front of them.

"For democracy to work, however, citizens of democratic states must forget the instrumental roots of their values, and develop a certain irrational thymotic pride in their political system and way of life. That is, they must come to love democracy not because it is necessarily better than the alternatives, but because it is theirs. Moreover, they must cease to see values like 'tolerance' as merely a means to an end; tolerance in democratic societies becomes the defining virtue. Development of this kind of pride in democracy, or the assimilation of democratic values into the citizen's sense of his own self, is what is meant by the creation of a 'democratic' or 'civic culture'. Such a culture is critical to the long-term health and stability of democracies, since no real-world society can long survive based on rational calculation and desire alone."438

Quite so; but is it rational to believe that telling the people that "they must come to love democracy not because it is necessarily better than the alternatives, but because it is theirs" is going to fire them more than the ideas of Islamic Jihad or "The Mystic Union of the Aryan race"? The widespread disillusion with democracy that we are witnessing today, in 2016, suggest otherwise. In any case, is not loving an ideology just because it is my ideology the ultimate irrationality?

The fact is that an ideology - any ideology - that appeals to a Being greater than itself is going to have greater emotional appeal than such infantile narcissism. Moreover, the "purer" a democracy, the more serious the problem of injecting warmth into "the coldest of all cold monsters", as Nietzsche called it, becomes. For what "democratic" or "civic culture" can replace, from a psychological point of view, full-blooded religion - believing in absolute truths and values that are not just projections of our desires?

Fukuyama discusses at some length how democratic society allows its megalothymic citizens to harmlessly "let off steam" - that is, excess thymos - through such activities as entrepreneurialism, competitive sport, intellectual and artistic achievement, ecological crusading and voluntary service in non-democratic societies. He has much less to say about how thymos is to be generated in relation to the central values and symbols of democratic society when that society is becoming - in this respect, at any rate - distinctly anaemic and "microthymic". Why, for example, should I go to war to make the world safe for democracy? To defend the good of "tolerance" against the evil of "intolerance"? But why shouldn't my "enemy" be intolerant if he wants to?

Doesn’t tolerance itself declare that one man’s values are just as good as any other’s? Why should I kill him just because, by an accident of birth, he hasn’t reached my level of ecumenical consciousness and remains mired in the fanaticism of the pre-millenial, non-democratic age? The fact is that whereas democracy wages war on "bigoted", "intolerant", "inegalitarian" religion, it desperately needs some such religion itself…

4. The Dialectics of Democracy

In the last section of his book, entitled "The Last Man", Fukuyama examines two threats to the survival of democracy, one from the left of the political spectrum and the other from the right. From the left comes the challenge constituted by the never-ending demand for equality based on an ever-increasing list of supposed inequalities. "Already, forms of inequality such as racism, sexism, and homophobia have displaced the traditional class issue for the Left on contemporary college campuses. Once the principle of equal recognition of each person’s human dignity - the satisfaction of their isothymia - is established, there is no guarantee that people will continue to accept the existence of natural or necessary residual forms of inequality. The fact that nature distributes capabilities unequally is not particularly just. Just because the present generation accepts this kind of inequality as either natural or necessary does not mean that it will be accepted as such in the future...

"The passion for equal recognition - isothymia - does not necessarily diminish with the achievement of greater de facto equality and material abundance, but may actually be stimulated by it...

"Today in democratic America there is a host of people who devote their lives to the total and complete elimination of any vestiges of inequality, making sure that no little girl should have to pay more to have her locks cut than a little boy, that no Boy Scout troop be closed to homosexual scoutmasters, that no building be built without a concrete wheelchair going up to the front door. These passions exist in American society because of, and not despite, the smallness of its actual remaining inequalities..." 439

The proliferation of new "rights", many of them "ambiguous in their social content and mutually contradictory", threatens to dissolve the whole of society in a boiling sea of resentment. Hierarchy has all but disappeared. Anyone can now refuse obedience to, or take to court, anyone else - even children their parents. Bitter nationalisms re-emerge even in "the melting pot of the nations" as Afro-Americans go back to their roots in order to assert their difference from the dominant race. The very concept of degrees of excellence as something quite independent of race or sex is swept aside as all children are deemed to be equally intelligent, while Shakespeare’s claim to pre-eminence in literature is rejected because he is he had the unfair advantage of being "white, male and Anglo-Saxon".

Fukuyama points out that the doctrine of rights springs directly from an understanding of what man is. But the egalitarian and scientific revolutions undermine the Christian concept of man which the founders of liberalism, both Anglo-Saxon and German, took for granted, denying that there is any essential difference between man and nature because "man is simply a more organized and rational form of slime". It follows that essential human rights should be accorded also to the higher animals, like monkeys and dolphins, who can suffer pain as we do and are supposedly no less intelligent.\textsuperscript{440}

"But the argument," writes Fukuyama, "will not stop there. For how does one distinguish between higher and lower animals? Who can determine what in nature suffers, and to what degree? Indeed, why should the ability to experience pain, or the possession of higher intelligence, become a title to superior worth?\textsuperscript{441} In the end, why does man have more dignity than any part of the natural world, from the most humble rock to the most distant star? Why should insects, bacteria, intestinal parasites, and HIV viruses not have rights equal to those of human beings?"\textsuperscript{442} The paradox is that this new understanding of life is in fact very similar to that of Hinduism, which has evolved, in the form of the Indian caste system, probably the most stubbornly unequal society in history!

Fukuyama concludes his examination of the challenge from the Left: "The extension of the principle of equality to apply not just to human beings but to non-human creation as well may today sound bizarre, but it is implied in our current impasse in thinking through the question: What is man? If we truly believe that he is not capable of moral choice or the autonomous use of reason, if he can be understood entirely in terms of the sub-human, then it is not only possible but inevitable that rights will gradually be extended to animals and other natural beings as well as men. The liberal concept of an equal and universal humanity with a specifically human dignity will be attacked both from above and below: by those who asset that certain group identities are more important than the quality of being human, and by those who believe that being human constitutes nothing distinctive against the non-human. The intellectual impasse in which modern relativism has left us does not permit us to answer either of these attacks definitively, and therefore does not permit defense of liberal rights traditionally understood..."\textsuperscript{443}

\textsuperscript{440} On December 27, 1995, British Television (Channel 4) screened "The Great Ape Trial", a quasi-legal debate on the question whether apes should have human rights - that is, the rights to life, liberty and freedom from torture. Evidence was heard from a variety of academic "experts" from around the world who spoke about the apes' similarity or otherwise to human beings in tool-using and making, language, social relations, emotionality, and genetic makeup. The conclusion reached by the "jury" (with the exception of a journalist from \textit{The Catholic Herald}) was that apes should indeed have human rights since they belong to "a community of equals" with us.

\textsuperscript{441} This point has been developed by Joanna Bourke, Professor of History at London University, in \textit{What It Means to be Human}, London: Virago, 2011.

\textsuperscript{442} Fukuyama, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 297-298.

\textsuperscript{443} Fukuyama, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 298.
Fukuyama goes on to examine "a still greater and ultimately more serious threat" coming from the Right. This amounts to the accusation that when democratic man has won all his universal human rights, and become totally free and equal, he will be, to put it crudely, a worthless nonentity.

For individuals striving for something that is purer and higher are more likely to arise "in societies dedicated to the proposition that all men are not created equal. Democratic societies, dedicated to the opposite proposition, tend to promote a belief in the equality of all lifestyles and values. They do not tell their citizens how they should live, or what will make them happy, virtuous, or great. Instead, they cultivate the virtue of toleration, which becomes the chief virtue in democratic societies. And if men are unable to affirm that any particular way of life is superior to another, then they will fall back on the affirmation of life itself, that is, the body, its needs, and fears. While not all souls may be equally virtuous or talented, all bodies can suffer; hence democratic societies will tend to be compassionate and raise to the first order of concern the question of preventing the body from suffering. It is not an accident that people in democratic societies are preoccupied with material gain and live in an economic world devoted to the satisfaction of the myriad small needs of the body. According to Nietzsche, the last man has 'left the regions where it was hard to live, for one needs warmth.'

"One still works, for work is a form of entertainment. But one is careful lest the entertainment be too harrowing. One no longer becomes poor or rich: both require too much exertion. Who still wants to rule? Who obey? Both require too much exertion.

"No shepherd and one herd! Everybody wants the same, everybody is the same: whoever feels different goes voluntarily into a madhouse.'

"It becomes particularly difficult for people in democratic societies to take questions with real moral content seriously in public life. Morality involves a distinction between better and worse, good and bad, which seems to violate the democratic principle of tolerance. It is for this reason that the last man becomes concerned above all for his own personal health and safety, because it is uncontroversial. In America today, we feel entitled to criticize another person's smoking habits, but not his or her religious beliefs or moral behavior. For Americans, the health of their bodies - what they eat and drink, the exercise they get, the shape they are in - has become a far greater obsession than the moral questions that tormented their forbears."444

"Modern education... stimulates a certain tendency towards relativism, that is, the doctrine that all horizons and value systems are relative to their time and place, and that none are true but reflect the prejudices or interests of those who advance them. The doctrine that says that there is no privileged

perspective dovetails very nicely with democratic man's desire to believe that his way of life is just as good as any other. Relativism in this context does not lead to the liberation of the great or strong, but of the mediocre, who were now told that they had nothing of which to be ashamed. The slave at the beginning of history declined to risk his life in the bloody battle because he was instinctively fearful. The last man at the end of history knows better than to risk his life for a cause, because he recognizes that history was full of pointless battles in which men fought over whether they should be Christian or Muslim, Protestant or Catholic, German or French. The loyalties that drove men to desperate acts of courage and sacrifice were proven by subsequent history to be silly prejudices. Men with modern educations are content to sit at home, congratulating themselves on their broadmindedness and lack of fanaticism. As Nietzsche's Zarathustra says of them, 'For thus you speak: "Real are we entirely, and without belief or superstition.' Thus you stick out your chests - but alas, they are hollow!"  

"A dog is content to sleep in the sun all day provided he is fed, because he is not dissatisfied with what he is. He does not worry that other dogs are doing better than him, or that his career as a dog has stagnated, or that dogs are being oppressed in a distant part of the world. If man reaches a society in which he has succeeded in abolishing injustice, his life will come to resemble that of the dog. Human life, then, involves a curious paradox: it seems to require injustice, for the struggle against injustice is what calls forth what is highest in man."

For a man is more than a dog or a log. Even when all his desires have been satisfied, and even when all injustice has been eradicated, he wants, not to sleep, but to act. For he has a free will that depends on nothing outside itself, as described by Dostoyevsky's underground man: "one's own free, unrestrained choice, one's own whim, be it the wildest, one's own fancy, sometimes worked up to a frenzy... And where did these sages pick up the idea that man must have something which they feel is a normal and virtuous set of wishes? What makes them think that man's will must be reasonable and in accordance with his own interests? All man actually needs is independent will, at all costs and whatever the consequences..."

Here we come to the root of the problem. Democracy's raison d'être is the liberation of the human will through the satisfaction of his most basic desires. But the problem is that the will, thus satisfied, has only just begun to manifest itself. For the will is not essentially a will to anything - not a will not to eat, not a will to power; it is simply will tout court. "I will, therefore I am. And if anyone else wills otherwise, to hell with him! And if I myself will otherwise, to hell with me!"

---

446 Fukuyama, op. cit., p. 311.
447 Dostoyevsky, Notes from Underground, New York: Signet Classics.
So perhaps war (and suicide) must be permitted in the society whose purpose is "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"? Of course, this was not the Founding Fathers' intention. They were reasonable men. But perhaps they did not pursue their reasoning through to its logical conclusion. Perhaps they did not understand that those bloody Roman dictators were not stupid when they defined the desires of the mob as bread and circuses, in which "circuses" had to include gladiatorial murder.

In this connection, George Orwell – who was, of course, a leftist writer – writes some wise things on the roots of Hitler's appeal: "Certainly all progressive' thought, has assumed tacitly that human beings desire nothing beyond ease, security and avoidance of pain. In such a view of life there is no room, for instance, for patriotism and military virtues. The Socialist who finds his children playing with soldiers is usually upset, but he is never able to think of a substitute for the soldiers; tin pacifists somehow won't do. Hitler, because in his own joyless mind he feels it with exceptional strength, knows that human beings don't only want comfort, safety, short working-hours, hygiene, birth-control and, in general, common sense; they also, at least intermittently, want struggle and self-sacrifice, not to mention drums, flags and loyalty-parades."448

Hegel, unlike the Anglo-Saxons, did have a place for violence and war in his system - not war for war's sake, but war for democracy's sake. "A liberal democracy that could fight a short and decisive war every generation or so to defend its own liberty and independence would be far healthier and more satisfied than one that experienced nothing but continuous peace. Hegel's view of war reflects a common experience of combat: for while men suffer horribly and are seldom as frightened and miserable, their experience if they survive has the tendency of putting all things in a certain perspective."449

But for men who believe in nothing beyond themselves, there is nothing ennobling or purifying about war. It simply debases them still further. That has been the fate of those Russian soldiers, who, on returning from the war in Chechnya, continue the war in mindless murders of their own people. For such men, war has become an end in itself. In a world in which all objective values have been radically undermined, killing is the only way they have to prove to themselves that they exist, that they can make a difference to their surroundings.

For "supposing", continues Fukuyama, "that the world has become 'filled up', so to speak, with liberal democracies, such that there exist no tyranny and oppression worthy of the name against which to struggle? Experience suggests that if men cannot struggle on behalf of a just cause because that just

cause was victorious in an earlier generation, then they will struggle against the just cause. They will struggle for the sake of struggle. They will struggle, in other words, out of a certain boredom: for they cannot imagine living in a world without struggle. And if the greater part of the world in which they live is characterized by peaceful and prosperous liberal democracy, then they will struggle against that peace and prosperity, and against that democracy.\textsuperscript{450}

As examples of this phenomenon, Fukuyama cites the évènements in France in 1968, and the scenes of patriotic pro-war enthusiasm repeated in Paris, Petrograd, London, and Vienna in August, 1914. And yet there is a much better example much closer to home - the crime that has become such a universal phenomenon in modern democracies from London to Johannesburg, from Bangkok to Sao Paolo, from Washington to Moscow. It is as if Dostoyevsky's underground man has now become a whole class - the underclass of the metropolitan octopuses, whose tentacles extend ever wider and deeper into the major institutions and governments of the world.

And so, towards the end of the second millennium, we have come to the period before the coming of the Antichrist as described by St. Paul. For “know this,” he said, “that in the last times perilous times will come: for men will be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, boasters, proud, blasphemous, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, unloving, unforgiving, slanderers, without self-control, brutal despisers of good, traitors, headstrong, haughty, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, having a form of godliness but denying its power... For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but according to their own desires, because they have itching ears, will heap up for themselves teachers, and they will turn their ears away from the truth, and be turned aside to fables” (II Timothy 3.1-5, 4.3-4).

Democrats ascribe the causes of sin and crime to poverty or unemployment, to a lack of education or a lack of rights. But most modern criminals are not hungry, nor are they struggling for rights; there is no need as such in most modern crime, no idealism, however misguided. Their motive may sometimes be revenge, or sex, or money; but in general their deeds are not “crimes of passion” in the conventional sense. Rather, their motive, as often as not, is that of Dostoyevsky's Underground Man, the desire to express their own, "independent will, at all costs and whatever the consequences”. Thus the logical consequence of the attainment of full democracy is nihilism, the universal war of every man against every man, for the sake of no man and no thing. For "modern thought raises no barriers to a future nihilistic war against liberal democracy on the part of those brought up in its bosom. Relativism - the doctrine that maintains that all values are merely relative and which attacks all 'privileged perspectives' - must ultimately end up undermining democratic and tolerant values as well."\textsuperscript{451}
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5. Democracy’s Inevitable Demise

As the world turned from the second into the third millennium since Christ, it was clear that “the End of History” in the shape of the complete, global triumph of democracy and free trade was not yet, and that opposite tendencies were developing. True, there were more nominally democratic countries than ever before, - “by 2000, 60 per cent of the world’s population lived in democracies, a far higher share than in 1974,”452 - and the Chicago-style liberalization of the financial and commodity markets had proceeded apace. But on the horizon, like clouds that gradually draw nearer, becoming larger and darker all the time, several distinct threats to the New World Order, some old and some relatively new, were emerging. America’s pyrrhic and costly victory over Saddam Hussein’s Iraq in 2003 was a turning point; thereafter, her prestige has plummeted.

Fukuyama’s argument could and should have concluded: "Democracy is doomed; we must find some other truths and values - absolute truths and values, or we shall all perish in a morass of relativism and nihilism."

But at this point the limitations of his democratic education lead him to make his only act of mauvaise foi. For in spite of the defects in the system that Fukuyama has himself exposed, he still declares his faith that democracy will win out in the end, if only because all other systems are dead or in the process of dying. And in an aptly American metaphor he compares the progress of democracy to a wagon train that, having crossed the Rockies in a raging blizzard and having withstood all the assaults of wild Indians and howling coyotes, comes to rest in - smog-filled, drug-addicted, crime-infested Los Angeles… Only in the very last sentence does he - very tentatively - recover somewhat and look over the parapet of democracy’s last stand: "Nor can we in the final analysis know, provided a majority of the wagons eventually reach the same town, whether their occupants, having looked around a bit at their new surroundings, will not find them inadequate and set their eyes on a new and more distant journey..."453

Fukuyama may have his doubts - but these are overridden by his conviction that democracy represents “the end of history”, the final, and best, politico-economic system. The well-founded doubts about the ultimate viability of democracy could be expressed as follows: can a system built, not on absolute truth, but on the relativisation of all opinions through the ballot box, nor on the eradication, or even the restraint of man’s fallen passions, but on their management and manipulation, bring lasting peace and prosperity? In a sense there is no competition; for the only system that is radically different from liberal democracy, Autocracy, sets itself a quite different goal: not peace and prosperity in this life, but salvation in the next. So even if it could be

proved that liberal democracy satisfied the earthly needs of men better, this is no way invalidates Autocracy, insofar as the true subjects of Autocracy would gladly exchange happiness and prosperity in this life for salvation in the next. For while the purpose of democracy is the fullest satisfaction of man’s fallen nature, the purpose of Autocracy is the recreation of man’s original, unfallen nature in Christ; democracy seeks satisfaction: Autocracy – deification.

But it may be doubted that liberal democracy will achieve even its own base ends. For the cult of reason and liberalism, as L.A. Tikhomirov writes, “very much wants to establish worldly prosperity, it very much wants to make people happy, but it will achieve nothing, because it approaches the problem from the wrong end. It may appear strange that people who think only of earthly prosperity, and who put their whole soul into realising it, attain only disillusionment and exhaustion. People who, on the contrary, are immersed in cares about the invisible life beyond the grave, attain here, on earth, results constituting the highest examples yet known on earth of personal and social development! However, this strangeness is self-explanatory. The point is that man is by his nature precisely the kind of being that Christianity understands him to be by faith; the aims of life that are indicated to him by faith are precisely the kind of aims that he has in reality, and not the kind that reason divorced from faith delineates. Therefore in educating a man in accordance with the Orthodox world-view, we conduct his education correctly, and thence we get results that are good not only in that which is most important [salvation] (which unbelievers do not worry about), but also in that which is secondary (which is the only thing they set their heart on). In losing faith, and therefore ceasing to worry about the most important thing, people lost the possibility of developing man in accordance with his true nature, and so they get distorted results in earthly life, too.”

Thus even the most perfectly functioning democracy will ultimately fail in its purpose, for the simple reason that while man is fallen, he is not completely fallen. He is still made in the image of God, so that even when all his fallen desires have been satisfied there will still be an unsatisfied longing for something higher, something to fill the God-shaped hole at the centre of his being (St. Augustine). “Happiness” (Mammon) – the supreme “right” of man, according to the American Constitution – is unattainable as long as only our own, and not other people’s happiness, our own glory, and not God’s glory, is the goal; and even if it is attained on earth, it will only be brief and entail inevitable ennui; for it will bring the frustration of the desire for the infinitely greater happiness of heaven, eternal joy in God. The revolutionary age that followed the age of reason highlighted this truth, albeit in a perverted, demonic way; for it showed that there is more in heaven and earth and in the soul of man – far greater heights, but also far more abysmal depths - than were ever dreamed of in the complacent psychology of the liberal

philosophers. It is time – high time - to return to the Age of Faith – if not materially and technologically, at any rate morally and philosophically – when right-believing kings and bishops, governed by “the faith once delivered to the saints” (Jude 3), laboured in harmony to bring the bodies and souls of men to the City whose founder and builder is God. “For here we have no continuing city, but we seek the one to come” (Hebrews 13.14)…