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No one can serve two masters, for either he will hate the tone and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and Mammon.


Now I am become Death, the destroyer of worlds.
J. Robert Oppenheimer (1945), quoting the Bhagavad Gita.

As soon as men decide that all means are permitted to fight an evil, then their good becomes indistinguishable from the evil that they set out to destroy.
C. H. Dawson.

The only way to convince oneself and the rest of humanity that the socialist system is best is to see to it that there are no other systems.
Jean-Francois Revel (1985).

We may be heading not for general breakdown but for an epoch as horribly stable as the slave empires of antiquity. The Soviet Union is a state at once unconquerable and in a permanent state of Cold War with its neighbours.
George Orwell.

Totalitarianism probably demands a disbelief in the very existence of objective truth.
George Orwell.

“Comrade, your statement is factually incorrect.”
“Yes, it is. But it is politically correct.”
Soviet anecdote.

‘The nations of Europe must be guided towards a Superstate without their peoples understanding what is happening. This can be carried out in successive stages, each camouflaged as having an economic goal, but which will end up by leading them irreversibly into a federation’.
Jean Monnet (1952).

Au dessus (de cette foule innombrable) s’élève un pouvoir immense et tutélaire, qui se charge lui seul d’assurer leur jouissance et de veille sur leur sort. Il est absolu, détaillé, régulier, prévoyant et doux. Il ressemblerait à la puissance paternelle, si, comme elle, il avait pour object de préparer les hommes à l’âge viril; mais il ne cherche au contraire qu’à les fixer irrévocablement dans l’enfance.
Alexis De Tocqueville.

Of the three forms of state power: monarchy, democracy and despotism, strictly speaking, only the first, monarchy, is based on a religious-ethical principle, the second, democracy, is based on an a-religious ethical principle, and the third, despotism, is based on an anti-religious, satanic principle!

Professor-Confessor I.M. Andreyev (+1976)
INTRODUCTION

I. THE DANGEROUS YEARS (1945-1953)  
1. THE AMERICAN JANUS  
2. ANARCHY IN EUROPE  
3. THE SOVIET OLD ORDER  
4. THE SORROWS OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH  
5. THE CHURCH IN EASTERN EUROPE  
6. THE YUGOSLAV WAY  
7. AMERICA, JAPAN AND CHINA  
8. MAOIST COMMUNISM  
9. WESTERN DECOLONIZATION AND SOVIET IMPERIALISM  
10. THE UNITED NATIONS  
11. THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES  
12. THE STATE OF ISRAEL  
13. THE KOREAN WAR  
14. DIVISIONS IN THE GREEK CHURCH  
15. THE CULT OF STALIN  
16. DNA, DARWINISM AND THE NEW AGE

II. THE AFFLUENT YEARS (1953-1973)  
17. THE DECLINE OF ENGLAND  
18. THE SEXUAL AND THERAPEUTIC REVOLUTIONS  
19. THE EUROPEAN UNION  
20. FROM MARXISM-LENINISM TO CULTURAL MARXISM  
21. THE SUCCESSORS OF STALIN  
22. ROCOR AT THE CROSSROADS  
23. PAN-ARAB NATIONALISM AND THE SUEZ CRISIS  
24. THE COMMUNISTS BECOME ECUMENISTS  
25. THE "THEOLOGY OF PEACE"  
26. NUCLEAR WAR AND THE CUBAN CRISIS
27. THE KHRUSHCHEV PERSECUTION 223
28. THE PASSPORTLESS MOVEMENT 228
29. THE OLD CALENDARISTS RESTORE THEIR HIERARCHIES 233
30. MAO'S WAR ON CHINA 242
31. FROM PARIS TO PRAGUE 250
32. THE LIFTING OF THE ANATHEMAS 259
33. THE FALL OF THE SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN CHURCHES 270
34. "THE HERESY OF HERESIES" 288
35. MOSCOW AND THE METROPOLIA 294
36. RUSSIAN AND GREEK COUNCILS 297
37. THE VOICE OF MOUNT ATHOS 306
38. ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN DISSIDENCE 308
39. THE VIETNAM WAR AND THE SIXTIES GENERATION 311
40. NIXON IN CHINA 318
INTRODUCTION

This book is the sixth volume in my series entitled *An Essay in Universal History*. The earlier volumes were: Part 1: The Age of Faith (to 1453), Part 2: The Age of Reason (1453 to 1789), Part 3: The Age of Revolution (1789 to 1861), Part 4: The Age of Empire (1861 to 1914) and Part 5: The Age of Catastrophe (1914 to 1945). In the five earlier volumes of this series, I surveyed the history of the world from the beginning to 1945 from the point of view of Orthodox Christianity. In this work I am essentially doing the same thing for the period 1945-1991, from the end of the Second World War in 1945 to the end of the Cold War and the Fall of the Soviet Union in 1991.

This sixth volume is subtitled “The Age of Mammon” because while Mammon, the power of money, has always been important in world history - it is, after all, “the root of all kinds of evil”, as St. Paul says - it was only in the period covered by this book that we may be so bold as to affirm that it became the decisive factor in life outside the True Church of Christ.

It did so in several ways. First, the outcome of the Cold War – the great event that dominates this period - came to be determined, under God, not so much by the relative numbers of soldiers on the two sides, nor by the relative strength of the will to win on the one side by comparison with the other, nor even by the superior attractiveness of Capitalism as an ideology, but by technology – and it was their backwardness in technology compared to the West that finally compelled the Soviet leaders to throw in the towel. In other words, the Capitalists defeated the Communists (at least temporarily) because of their greater financial resources and economic productiveness. Secondly, political ideologies came more and more to be dominated by the theme of the redistribution of money from the rich to the poor: one of the main factors distinguishing Communism from Socialism and the western-style welfare state was their attitude to how, and how radically, money should be redistributed. And thirdly, the vast increase in general prosperity in this period – beginning in the West and spreading outwards - decisively influenced in a negative way men’s attitudes to the world around them and God above them...

In *Das Kapital* (1867), Karl Marx explained how communism would come about in terms that sound eerily prophetic today: "Owners of capital will stimulate the working class to buy more and more expensive goods, houses and technology, pushing them to take more and more expensive credits, until

---

1 With greater financial resources enabling them to exploit nuclear technology, the Nazis may well have won World War II. Thus Eric Hobsbawm writes: “Essentially it is now clear that Nazi Germany failed to make a nuclear bomb not because German scientists did not know how it could be made, or try to make it, with different degrees of reluctance, but because the German war-machine was unwilling or unable to devote the necessary resources to it. They abandoned the effort and switched to what seemed the more cost-effective concentration on rocketry, which promised quicker returns” (*Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century* (1914-1991), London: Abacus, 1994, p. 527, note).
their debt becomes unbearable. The unpaid debt will lead to bankruptcy of banks, which will have to be nationalized, and the State will have to take the road which will eventually lead to communism."

Capital and capitalism is therefore the real master of the world that worships Mammon. As Yanis Varoufakis writes: “The German philosopher Schopenhauer castigated us modern humans for deceiving ourselves that our beliefs and actions are subject to our consciousness. Nietzsche concurred, suggesting that all the things we believe in, at any given time, reflect not truth but someone else’s power over us. Marx dragged economics into this picture, reprimanding us all for ignoring the reality that our thoughts have become hijacked by capital its drive to accumulate. Naturally, although it follows its own steely logic, capital evolves mindless. No one designed capitalism and no cancivilize it now that is going at full tilt.

“Having simply evolved, without anyone’s consent, it quickly liberated us from more primitive forms of social and economic organization. It bred machines and instruments (material and financial) that allowed us to take over the planet. It empowered us to imagine a future without poverty, where our lives are no longer at the mercy of a hostile nature. Yet, at the same time, just as nature spawned Mozart and HIV using the same indiscriminate mechanism, so too did capital produce catastrophic forces with a tendency to bring about discord, inequality, industrial-scale warfare, environmental degradation and, of course, financial freefalls. In one fell swoop, it generated – with neither rhyme nor reason – wealth and crises, development and deprivation, progress and backwardness…”

But we don't have to be Marxists – or accept Varoufakis’ deterministic and Darwinist premises - in order to reach this truth. Christ said that we can choose to be ruled either by God or by Mammon (in its modern form, Capitalism); we cannot serve both. So a civilization that places free markets and economic growth at the head of the corner is not Christian, and will inevitably degenerate into anti-Christianity. Similarly, the moderate form of socialism called welfarism is no substitute for truly Christian faith and values. It merely tries to ensure (unsuccessfully in the long run) that the capitalist cake is shared out with a minimum of equity and without the fear of war or revolution.

And of course Communism is no solution. It simply exchanges the slavery of Capital for the still more terrible slavery of the atheist totalitarian state, which worships matter in the form of dialectical materialism. Moreover, in its most recent incarnation, under Putin, it appears to be returning to its bank-robber origins, and the first and most primitive form of Mammon-worship – grand larceny…

---

However, the Cold War was not an exclusively political, military and economic struggle between Capitalism and Communism. It was also a religious struggle between the Russian revolution in its post-war forms and the Orthodox Church. Insofar as Orthodoxy found itself opposed not only to Soviet Communism, but also to Western Capitalism – not only to the beast of the Apocalypse, but also to the Babylonian whore! – we can say that this was not a two-way, but a three-way contest, involving the true faith in opposition to two godless secular ideologies, Liberal Capitalism and Antitheist Communism. But Orthodoxy, although an essential part of the history of this period, especially in Eastern Europe, had very little impact on political or cultural history. This was because, first, the most significant fact of this period is the collapse, in all except a few regions of the world, of the influence of religion. And secondly, because genuine Orthodoxy was persecuted, and had to operate, for the most part, underground.

We must make an immediate qualification here. By “the influence of religion” we do not mean numbers of believers in the organized religions such as Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism. Even if reliable statistics were to demonstrate that the absolute or relative numbers of believers in these religions had declined, this would only be confirming a trend that had been evident for centuries, especially in the developed world. The more significant fact was that most men now, even if professing to belong to one of the organized religions, in fact believed at the same time and primarily in a very specific form of materialist anti-religion that has been called scientism.³

Scientism is, in the first place, the belief that empirical science is the only reliable path to truth, superseding and in effect rejecting all religious revelation, and secondly, the belief that the model of the universe and man’s place in it that most scientists adhere to is unquestionably true – the idea, namely, that the world and everything in it has evolved by chance from a tiny mass of superheated dust to produce all the beings, animal, vegetable and mineral, that we see around us without the addition or intervention of any purely spiritual, immaterial power.

The only conventional religion to make a significant impact on world politics while rejecting scientism has been Islam. However, Islamic fundamentalism became important only in the later part of our period. Before that, we see the combined assault on traditional religion provided by the militant atheism of the Soviet Union and other communist countries, on the one hand, and the more subtle assault provided by the human rights philosophy of the western countries and the ecumenical movement, on the other. Of course, the Capitalist West is usually portrayed as having been protective of religion whereas the Communist East persecuted it. And this was true to a degree, as was witnessed by the flood of Christian, and later Jewish refugees, from East to West. Nevertheless, as we shall see, in its

³ The word was coined in France in 1936 (Hobsbawm, op. cit., p. 545, note).
persistent and subtle undermining of the foundations of religious belief, the West turned out to be no less revolutionary in relation to religion than the East, especially as persecution slackened in the East and the sexual and LGBT revolutions kicked in in the West.

*

In view of this greatly increased secularization and economization of life in the second half of the twentieth century, it may seem paradoxical that I continue to devote as much space as in earlier volumes to religion in general and to what I consider to be the true religion, Orthodox Christianity, in particular. After all, it may be objected, the situation has changed radically since the Age of Faith (volume 1), when men were religious and religious questions and disputes were at the centre of life. In the Age of Reason (volume 2), this was still the case, even if secularist tendencies were gaining in strength. But by the Ages of Revolution and Empire (volumes 3 and 4) secular religions such as nationalism, socialism and romanticism were already more important to most men than any of the traditional religions, at any rate in the West. However, by the Ages of Catastrophe and Mammon (volumes 5 and 6), we have entered what has been called, not inappropriately, a “post-Christian” age, when most people have not even heard of, let alone taken any interest in, the religious issues discussed in this book.

However, a universal history from an Orthodox Christian point of view must concentrate its attention first and foremost on the workings of Divine Providence as the key to the understanding of history. After all, God does not cease to work in and through history just because most people do not believe in Him: on the contrary, it is precisely because so many do not believe that He intervenes so often to chastise and warn unbelieving mankind, trying to draw them back to the right path. Such a vision entails both trying to discern how His justice and mercy are working in the great revolutions and wars that affect the lives of hundreds of millions of people, and examining the upheavals in that far smaller segment of mankind that constitutes God’s instrument of salvation on earth, the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

Even if the True Church contracts to a tiny dot, as it did in the twentieth century, and appears to earthly reasoning to be on the edge of extinction now, it still remains the only engine of true renewal available for all the tribes of men. Moreover, tiny and apparently insignificant though it may be, it is the key to the understanding of the vast events taking place from the beginning to the end of the whole historical process. For everything is for the sake of the Church and for the salvation of men through the Church. That is why an accurate description of what happens in the Church is not just important, but the most important task of an Orthodox Christian history of the world. Indeed, so transcendentally important is it that, according to the Holy Fathers, God will bring the world to an end when there is no longer anybody left who is worthy to enter His Church.
The approach of this work is therefore unashamedly eschatological… There are many material signs that the world is approaching its end: the demographic explosion, the development of ever-more dangerous means of mass destruction, the possibility envisaged by some futurologists that man himself is changing himself from Homo Sapiens into another species, Homo Deus. But the surest sign remains the spiritual one: that man is losing faith in the One True God; for, as Christ said: “When the Son of Man comes [again], will He really find faith on the earth?” (Luke 18.8).

This book is written in the conviction that we are nearing the end of history, but that we can still prolong it for ourselves and our descendants by endeavouring to learn its lessons. Of these, the most important is that history has a Lord and God, without Whose will, as the Russian proverb goes, a man cannot even cross a field… It follows that for my outlook on history I am indebted first of all to the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Fathers of the Church, who taught me, in the words of St. Athanasius the Great, that in the writing of history, as in every other endeavor, “we should serve, not the times, but God”.


100th Anniversary of the Abdication of Tsar-Martyr Nicholas II.

---

I. THE DANGEROUS YEARS (1945-1953)
1. THE AMERICAN JANUS

The new American President in 1945, Harry S. Truman, represented both the strengths and the weaknesses of the American state and people. After a hesitant start at Potsdam at which he displayed his predecessor’s underestimation of Stalin, and an unnecessarily passive acceptance of the decision to drop the atom bomb on the Japanese, he acted decisively to stop Soviet expansion in Western Europe, Iran, Turkey and Greece, where he took the place of the exhausted and bankrupt British, thereby winning “the war of the British succession”. Displaying imagination and generosity, he approved the Marshall Plan for Europe, which was almost as important as American troops in saving the West from Soviet tyranny. Again, he displayed firmness and courage in defending South Korea from invasion from the North. By the Providence of God, he played the decisive role in shoring up the Western world against Stalin, the most evil and powerful dictator in history, fulfilling the vital function, if not of “him who restrains” the coming of the Antichrist (for such a role could be played only by an Orthodox Autocrat), at any rate of “world policeman”. For that, the whole world should be grateful to him and to the American people. Indeed, there can be no doubt that in a secular sense America saved humanity in the immediate post-war era. It is sufficient to imagine what the world would have been like if Stalin had not had had in the Americans a powerful and determined opponent, or how many millions would have starved to death if America had not “fed the world” in accordance with the 1911 prophecy of St. Aristocles of Moscow.

Also vital was America’s contribution to the post-war economic order. According to Yanis Varoufakis, America “came out of the Second World War as the major (indeed, if one excludes Switzerland, the only) creditor nation. For the first time since the rise of capitalism, all of the world’s trade relied on a single currency (the dollar) and was financed from a single epicenter (Wall Street). While half of Europe was under the control of the Red Army and Europeans generally were openly questioning the merits of the capitalist system, the New Dealers who had been running Washington since 1932 realized that history had presented them with a remarkable opportunity: to erect a post-war global order that would cast American hegemony in stainless steel. It was an opportunity that they seized upon with glee.

“Their audacious scheme sprang from the two sources that lie behind every great [secular] achievement – fear and power. The war endowed the United States with unprecedented military and economic might. But, at the same time, it acted as a constant reminder of America’s failure properly to come to terms with the legacy of 1929 before the Japanese navy unleashed its

---

5 “In 1948, talking about the Potsdam conference, he told a reporter that he knew Stalin well and that ‘I like old Joe’; the dictator, he maintained, was a decent sort who could not do as he wished because he was the Politburo’s prisoner. Here we are, back to the hawks and doves, a notion that the Soviets would always know how to play on to extort one-way concessions” (Jean-François Revel, How Democracies Perish, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1985, p. 220).

bombs and torpedoes on Pearl Harbor. The New Dealers never forgot the unexpectedness of the Great Depression and its resistance to ‘treatment’. The more power they felt they had in their hands, the greater was their fear that a new 1929 could turn it into ash that trickled through their fingers.

“Even before the guns had fallen silent in Europe, and even before the Soviet Union emerged as a dragon to be slain, the United States understood that it had inherited the historic role of reconstructing, in its own image, the world of global capitalism. For if 1929 nearly ended the dominion of capital at a time of multiple capitalist centres, what would a new 1929 do when the larger game, global capitalism, revolved around a single axis, the dollar?

“In 1944, the New Dealers’ anxieties led to the famous Bretton Woods conference. The idea of designing a new global order was not so much grandiose as essential. At Bretton Woods a new monetary framework was designed, acknowledging the dollar’s centrality but also taking steps to create international shock absorbers in case the US economy wavered. It took fifteen years before the agreement could be fully implemented. During the preparatory phase, the United States had to put together the essential pieces of the jigsaw puzzle of the Global Plan, of which Bretton Woods was an important piece.

“While the war was still raging in Europe and the Pacific, in July 1944, 730 delegates converged on the plush Mount Washington Hotel located in the New Hampshire town of Bretton Woods. Over three weeks of intensive negotiations, they hammered out the nature and institutions of the post-war global monetary order.

“They did not come to Bretton Woods spontaneously, but at the behest of President Roosevelt, whose New Deal administration was determined to win the peace, after having almost lost the war against the Great Depression. The one lesson the New Dealers had learned was that capitalism cannot be managed effectively at the national level. In his opening speech, Roosevelt made that point with commendable clarity: ‘The economic health of every country is a proper matter of concern to all its neighbours, near and far.’

“The two issues that were ostensibly central to the conference were the design of the post-war monetary system and the reconstruction of the war-torn economies of Europe and Japan. However, under the surface, the real questions concerned (a) the institutional framework that would keep a new Great Depression at bay, and (b) who would be in control of that framework. Both questions created specific tensions, especially between the two great allies represented, in the US corner, by Harry Dexter White and, in the British corner, by none other than John Maynard Keynes. In the aftermath of the conference, Keynes remarked: ‘We have had to perform at one and the same time the tasks appropriate to the economist, to the financier, to the politician, to the journalist, to the propagandist, to the lawyer, to the statesman – even, I think, to the prophet and to the soothsayer.’
“Two of the institutions that were designed at Bretton Woods are still with us and still in the news. One is the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the other the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), today known simply as the World Bank. The IMF was to be global capitalist system’s ‘fire brigade’ – an institution that would rush to the assistance of any country whose house caught (fiscal) fire, handing out loans on strict conditions that would ensure that any balance of payments deficit would be fixed and the loans repaid. As for the World Bank, its role would be that of an international investment bank, with a remit to channel productive investments to regions of the world devastated by the war.”

Most important was the creation of the “Bretton Woods system”, which, according to Liam Halligan, has meant that the world since then “has traded relatively freely, with the short-term protectionist instincts of politicians being kept in check by WTO [World Trade Organisation] rules”, with the result that there was “a 12-fold expansion in global trade between 1950 and 2010 – and a huge increase in global prosperity”.

The Bretton Woods system is “a system of fixed exchange rates, with the dollar at its heart. The main idea was that each currency would be locked to the dollar at a given exchange rate. Fluctuations would be allowed only within a narrow band of plus or minus 1 per cent, and governments would strive to stay within this band by buying or selling their own dollar reserves. A renegotiation of the exchange rate of a particular country was only allowed if it could be demonstrated that its balance of trade and its balance of capital flows could not be maintained, given its dollar reserves. As for the United States, to create the requisite confidence in the international system, it committed itself to pegging the dollar to gold at the fixed exchange rate of $35 per ounce of gold and to guarantee full gold convertibility for anyone, American or non-American, who wanted to swap their dollars for gold.”

There was a lot of talk about the creation of a new global currency. But this was never on the cards in view of the dominance of the US dollar. However, writes Richard Horowitz, “the US assumed that a formal identification of their own currency as the official world reserve would be too aggressive a position diplomatically... The US proposed instead a vague euphemism: ‘gold-convertible currency’. It fooled no sophisticated observer and Keynes called it ‘idiocy’. Given its uniquely vast gold holdings, the US had the only currency realistically convertible into bullion. But the US delegation feared diplomatic disaster by trying to codify this fact.

---

8 Halligan, “We should be tearing down barriers, not putting them up”, The Sunday Telegraph, Business section, September 4, 2016, p. 4. As we shall see, there was an important change in the Bretton Woods system in 1973. Nevertheless, the “spirit of Bretton Woods” survived.
9 Varoufakis, op. cit., p. 60.
“Handling the issue at the conference for Britain would be Dennis Robertson, the Cambridge economist to whom Keynes delegated many key negotiations, admiring his intellectual subtlety and patience of mind and tenacity of character to grasp and hold on to all details and fight them through. Robertson was present during the final discussion of the IMF’s charter when the delegation representing British India demanded that the US define exactly what ‘gold-convertible currency’ meant. To the amazement and delight of the Americans, Robertson rose to propose its replacement with ‘gold and United States dollars’, effectively crowning the dollar supreme. A giddy White stayed up until three o’clock in the morning incorporating Robertson’s proposal into the draft articles. The rest is monetary history…”10

The Bretton Woods system, together with the Marshall Plan and other American-sponsored initiatives, formed the basis for the greatest rise in prosperity in the whole of world history. However, two flaws were to become increasingly evident in America’s behaviour in the following decades. The first was her Rousseauist tendency to force people to be free by means that betrayed her own liberal ideals. And the second was the tendency to choose corrupt allies – Masonic businessmen, oil-rich kings, the kingdom of Mammon in general – to help her attain her generally well-intentioned ends.

* 

After a short period in which the Americans followed Roosevelt’s policy of showing “respect” and some indulgence towards their Soviet wartime allies, an important change of policy took place. In June, 1946 President Truman declared his determination not to “baby” the Soviets, as he put it, and to prevent their expansion into Western Europe. A plan was drawn up to drop nuclear bombs, in the event of war, on a series of Soviet cities, and in September his Secretary of State Byrnes declared in Germany that American troops would stay there as long as they were needed – an implicit reversal of Roosevelt’s promise that they would be recalled home within two years.

At first Truman had not understood the truly desperate plight of the Europeans. Lend-lease was halted after VE Day, and even the Americans’ closest allies, the British, were almost denied a desperately needed loan. Loans were provided to some nations – but only as stop-gaps to save the starving, not as the basis for a real revival of the European economy. The Bretton Woods agreement in 1944 had envisaged such a revival of the European economies as part of a new system of convertible currencies and international free trade. But in the beginning America, the world’s only economic super-power, which “by the spring of 1945 accounted for half the world’s manufacturing capacity, most of its food surpluses and virtually all international financial reserves”11, was not willing to provide the cash that alone could kick-start such a revival.

However, the president was persuaded to change course by a variety of factors: the withdrawal of the British from Greece for mainly financial reasons, the terrible winter of 1946-47 and the real threat of starvation and anarchy hanging over large areas of Western Europe – which in turn threatened the coming to power of communist regimes in France and Italy. In March, 1947, in a speech that came to be called “the Truman doctrine”, he put the case for helping Greece and Turkey: “Totalitarian regimes imposed upon free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States... At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one. One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression. The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedom. I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.”

In June, Secretary of State Marshall put forward a European Recovery Program. “It would take Truman months to get what became known as the Marshall Plan through Congress, but in four years from 1948 the United States provided $13 billion [$210 billion in early twenty-first-century prices] of aid to western Europe. During that same period the Soviet Union took out roughly the same amount from eastern Europe.” Marshall Aid was also offered to Eastern Europe – all the European countries, in fact, except Franco’s Spain. This unprecedented act of enlightened self-interest did the trick; the Western European economy spluttered into life.

“At first,” writes Jean-François Revel, “instead of lambasting American generosity, as it later did, pretending to see the plan as a satanic maneuver by Western imperialism and its ‘trusts’, the USSR showed great interest in the offer. Stalin even sent Vyacheslav M. Molotov to Paris to discuss it with the British and French Foreign Ministers. But he quickly realized that acceptance of Marshall Plan aid would hamper the process of absorption and consolidation then nearing fulfillment in satellite Europe and might even shake the totalitarian Soviet system. For an American condition to granting credits was that the beneficiary countries coordinate their reconstruction and harmonize their economies. This was the embryo of the future Common Market. To the Communist leadership. This meant creation of a pan-European network of consultation and exchanges, an imbrication of economies and interpenetration of societies that would in any case have

---

shattered totalitarian power in the satellites and put even Moscow’s on shaky ground. How could Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, East Germany have resisted the attraction of a Western Europe that, in 1950, was about to embark on the most vigorous economic expansion in its history? To force them to remain in the Soviet orbit, to put up with the pervasive beggary of daily life that marks socialist economies, Moscow had to separate them forcibly and totally from the West. So the Soviet Union refused Marshall Plan aid for itself and obliged its satellites to do the same. An ultimatum from Stalin barred Czechoslovakia, which maintained its hopes until the last minute, from accepting American assistance.”  

Nevertheless, and in spite of this rebuff, the Americans succeeded in keeping Western Europe in their sphere when the Communists came critically close to victory there. “Truman showed great dexterity in determining which of the Western European leftist parties could become U.S. allies. He correctly concluded that Italy’s Communists and Socialists were monolithic: they were united in supporting the Soviet Union and opposing the U.S.-sponsored Marshall Plan. Truman instead cultivated the Christian Democrats, helping them win a crucial election in 1948. In France, however, Truman recognized that the Socialists opposed communism and struck a deal with them, allowing France to become an ornery but genuine U.S. partner.”  

And so the West was saved; for the time being the threat of Communism receded…

The main problem for those trying to kick-start the European economy was Germany, which as the industrial power-house of Europe held the key to her economic recovery, but which was still ruled by the armies of the four Great Powers and which therefore could not be treated like any other European country. Both France and the Soviet Union feared German revanchism, which is why France, on the one hand, wanted reparations and control of the coal-producing regions of the Ruhr and the Rhineland, while the Soviets, on the other, wanted a restoration of reparations from the Western zone (they had already grabbed what they wanted from the East) and the single administrative system and economy over the whole of Germany which would enable them to obtain that. However, the Anglo-Americans (who had merged their two military districts into a “Bizone”) no longer feared German revanchism, and in general wanted, instead of reparations, a swift recovery of the German economy that would benefit all. And so in August, 1947 “they unilaterally increased output in the Bizone (to a chorus of Soviet and French criticism). The Joint Chiefs of Staff directive ICS 1067 (the ‘Morgenthau plan’) was replaced by JCS 1779 which formally acknowledged the new American goals: economic unification of the western zone of Germany and the encouragement of German self-government. For the Americans especially, Germans were rapidly ceasing to be the enemy…”

---

14 Revel, op. cit., p. 102.
16 Judt, op. cit., p. 125.
Although the French disapproved, they finally came round to the idea provided Germany could be “hooked” up into a European framework that would neutralize her militarily.

By March, 1948 the joint Allied occupation of Germany had collapsed, being superseded by a two-state solution: a Communist East Germany and a Capitalist West Germany. On April 1, the Soviets cut off all transport links from the West to West Berlin, offering to lift the ban if the West withdrew their newly-introduced Deutschmark from West Berlin. The West refused – “we stay in Berlin,” as Truman put it in a telegram to London. “We will supply the city by air as a beleaguered garrison…”

However, as David Reynolds writes, “this seemed a very tall order. Many pundits believed it impossible to keep 2 million people supplied by air but the Americans and British mounted ‘Operation Vittles’, as the Americans called it (the RAF code-name was ‘Operation Plain Fare’). Against all the odds the airlift continued all through the winter; at its height a plane landed every thirty seconds, carrying essentials such as food, coal and clothing.”17 Over 200,000 flights in one year led to a Soviet climb-down on May 12, 1949.

Forty years later, Henry Kissinger asked the Soviet Foreign Minister at the time, Andrei Gromyko, “how, in light of the vast casualties and devastation it had suffered in the war, the Soviet Union could have dealt with an American military response to the Berlin blockade. Gromyko replied that Stalin had answered similar questions from subordinates to this effect: he doubted the United States would use nuclear weapons on so local an issue. If the Western allies undertook a conventional ground force probe along the access routes to Berlin, Soviet forces were ordered to resist without referring the decision to Stalin. If America were mobilizing along the entire front, Stalin said, ‘Come to me’. In other words, Stalin felt strong enough for a local war but would not risk general war with the United States…”18

We may wonder whether the Soviets would have dared any kind of war at that point. Revel argues that if the Americans had made a determined effort to enforce their agreements with the Soviets over Berlin, it is possible that they could have achieved, not just the relief of West Berlin, but the reunification of Germany: “It was not only in 1952 [when Stalin dangled the prospect of the reunification of Germany before the West] that the West let a chance go by to negotiate a German reunification treaty, which would have eliminated one of the most glaring weaknesses in the democratic camp and one of Moscow’s most effective means of blackmail. Truman fumbled a first opportunity during the 1948 Berlin blockade when he refused to send an armored train from West Germany to Berlin to see if the Soviets would dare to attack it. Whether they did or not, they were beaten and the United States

---

17 Reynolds, op. cit., p. 383.
could have capitalized on their blunder to demand clarification of the German situation. Instead, the American airlift eluded the blockade, in a sense, without really breaking it. Washington was unable to follow up its prestige victory with a diplomatic victory. When the blockade was lifted in 1949, the Allies, as usual, returned to their old stances, as shaky militarily as they were confused juridically. Under the elementary rules of diplomacy, the Allies should have demanded that, in reparation for the Soviet treaty violation, Moscow negotiate an immediate German peace treaty. Their failure to do so is proof of their diplomatic incompetence. That the Allies failed to press the advantage granted them by the Soviet setback during that brief period when the United States had a monopoly on the atomic bomb, which gave it an absolute superiority unprecedented in history, has no rational explanation, however blind we may think Western leaders were at the time – an estimate we need not be tender about. There certainly would have been nothing immoral about using our atomic monopoly to force Stalin to agree to a German peace treaty, since we would have been using our military superiority not to make war but to eliminate a cause of future war or, at least, of permanent friction and of fundamental Western weakness."

However, the Berlin blockade did spur the West into creating the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Its aim was to defend its members – Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxemburg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the United States – against Soviet aggression. The critical Article 5 began with the words: “The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.”

“NATO,” writes Kissinger, “was a new departure in the establishment of European security. The international order no longer was characterized by the traditional European balance of power distilled from shifting coalitions of multiple states. Rather, whatever equilibrium prevailed had been reduced to that existing between the two nuclear superpowers. If either disappeared or failed to engage, the equilibrium would be lost, and its opponent would become dominant. The first was what happened in 1990 with the collapse of the Soviet Union; the second was the perennial fear of America’s allies during the Cold War that America might lose interest in the defence of Europe. The nations joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization provided some military forces but more in the nature of an admission ticket for a shelter under America’s nuclear umbrella than as an instrument of local defense. What America was constructing in the Truman era was a unilateral guarantee in the form of a traditional alliance...”

And so the Cold War had begun...

---

19 Revel, op. cit., pp. 251-252.
In retrospect, we can see that the two decisive events that elicited this war were Stalin’s rejection of Marshall Aid for Eastern Europe and the communist coup in Czechoslovakia in February, 1948, which put paid to the last hopes of a peaceful evolution to a non-communist system in the East. In reality, however, a cold war had existed between the Communist East and the Capitalist West since the early 1920s, interrupted only briefly during the war years 1941-45. Such a war had been declared on all “normal” governments by Lenin, and Stalin had faithfully followed the Leninist line except for the short period of the Popular Fronts in the late 1930s and the wartime alliance of 1941-45. So 1948-49 simply marked a return to the norm with regard to the relationship of normal governments to the profoundly abnormal anti-state of the Soviet Union. Only now, thanks to the firmness and imagination of the American leaders, Western Europe was on the road to economic recovery without the temptations of communism and fascism that had so weakened it in the 1930s, while Eastern Europe, more firmly enslaved than ever, was falling further and further behind economically. Thus the advantage gained by Stalin after his victory in the war was being whittled away.

However, at this peak of the United States’ power and glory, another American weakness began to appear – and was again reflected in the life of her chief executive... Truman owed his rise in politics before the war to “Boss” Tom Pendergast, who, as Victor Sebestyen writes, “controlled Kansas City business and the State of Missouri’s elected offices. The Pendergast ‘machine’ was sophisticated. It went beyond stuffing ballot boxes and other vote-rigging tactics. It turned politics, prohibition, prostitution and gambling into thriving enterprises, the profits of which could be invested into more legitimate areas. Truman never took cash for favours, thus squaring his conscience, but he depended on the Pendergast machine to deliver, by hook or by crook, large lopsided majorities for ‘his’ candidates. Typically, Truman stayed loyal to Pendergast well after it was politically expedient to do so, and even after Pendergast was convicted of tax evasion and sent to Leavensworth jail Truman defended him. ‘He has been a friend to me when I needed it,’ he said. ‘I am not one to desert a ship when it is about to go down, Besides, Truman admired Pendergast, ‘... even if he did own a bawdy house, a saloon and a gambling establishment, because he was a man of his word.’...”21 We see here the besetting sin of American politics and politicians, which got worse over time: a tendency to justify evil means by good ends, to choose sleazy and corrupt friends and allies to carry out well-intentioned goals. “The path to hell is paved with good intentions”, and this could be said particularly of American politics in the post-war era. So often good intentions such as freedom from oppression and prosperity for all were undermined by ill-chosen methods and allies, leading inevitably to charges of inconsistency and hypocrisy. Perhaps this is an inevitably feature of realpolitik in most historical eras. Certainly it appears to be inevitable in modern democracies, where unsavoury deals with unsavoury characters have to be struck for a politician to make any impact on domestic or international politics.

Truman is not singled out here because he was any worse than very many before and after him. On the contrary, he was one of the best of American presidents, who, as we have seen, did much to save western civilization at a particularly critical time of anarchy and chaos. But the deal he struck, and stuck to, with the unsavoury Pendergast is symbolic...

The struggle against communism was (and is) a sacred and utterly necessary struggle. And after the war it seemed to be a struggle of good against evil as Christian democrats in America and Europe struggled – successfully, in this period – to save their societies from a truly mortal threat. But the trouble with “Christian democracy”, as more and more people came to see as the century wore on, was that it was not really Christian at all...

Truman is again a good example. He was a regular church-goer. But at the same time he was a Freemason – and not just a low-level, relatively inactive Mason (like Churchill), but a very high ranking one. Thus “In 1959, he was given a 50-year award by the Masons, recognizing his longstanding involvement: he was initiated on February 9, 1909 into the Belton Freemasonry Lodge in Missouri. In 1911, he helped establish the Grandview Lodge, and he served as its first Worshipful Master. In September 1940, during his Senate re-election campaign, Truman was elected Grand Master of the Missouri Grand Lodge of Freemasonry; Truman said later that the Masonic election assured his victory in the general election. In 1945, he was made a 33° Sovereign Grand Inspector General and an Honorary Member of the supreme council at the Supreme Council A.A.S.R. Southern Jurisdiction Headquarters in Washington D.C.”

Truman’s Masonry not only assured his victory in the election: it was also probably decisive in motivating his support for the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. Roosevelt had abandoned his Zionism towards the end of his life, and both the American State Department and Defense Department, as well as the oil companies, were strongly against it. But the central myth of Masonry is the rebuilding of the Temple at Zion, so how could Truman have resisted that call?

It is this combination of (heretical) Christianity with anti-Christian Masonry, the controllers of most of the world’s wealth, which would be the Achilles heel of post-war “Christian democracy” not only in America, but throughout the West, ensuring that the victory over Communism attained in 1989-91 as the Iron Curtain fell would be incomplete and illusory... The American empire – for that’s what it was, albeit an unusually benign one - probably reached its peak in 1945 and the immediate post-war years. There then began a slow but steady decline in relative power and influence that has continued to the present day.

---

2. ANARCHY IN EUROPE

"With the exception of Germany," writes Tony Judt, "and the heartland of the Soviet Union, every continental European state involved in World War Two was occupied at least twice: first by its enemies, then by the armies of liberation. Some countries – Poland, the Baltic states, Greece, Yugoslavia – were occupied three times in five years. With each succeeding invasion the previous regime was destroyed, its authority dismantled, its elites reduced. The result in some places was a clean slate, with all the old hierarchies discredited and their representatives compromised. In Greece, for example, the pre-war dictator Metaxakas had swept aside the old parliamentary class. The Germans removed Metaxakas. Then the Germans too were pushed out in their turn, and those who had collaborated with them stood vulnerable and disgraced.

"The liquidation of old social and economic elites was perhaps the most dramatic change. The Nazis’ extermination of Europe’s Jews was not only devastating in its own right. It had significant social consequences for those many towns and cities of central Europe where Jews had constituted the local professional class: doctors, lawyers, businessmen, professors. Later, often in the very same towns, another important part of the bourgeoisie – the Germans – was also removed, as we have seen. The outcome was a radical transformation of the social landscape – and an opportunity for Poles, Ukrainians, Slovaks, Hungarians and others to move up into the jobs (and homes) of the departed.

"This leveling process, whereby the native populations of central and eastern Europe took the place of the banished minorities, was Hitler’s most enduring contribution to European social history. The German plan had been to destroy the Jews and the educated local intelligentsia in Poland and the western Soviet Union, reduce the rest of the Slav peoples to neo-serfdom and place the land and the government in the hands of resettled Germans. But with the arrival of the Red Army and the expulsion of the Germans the new situation proved uniquely well adapted to the more truly radicalizing projects of the Soviets.

"One reason for this was that the occupation years had seen not just rapid and bloodily enforced upward social mobility but also the utter collapse of law and the habits of life in a legal state. It is misleading to think of the German occupation of continental Europe as a time of pacification and order under the eye of an omniscient and ubiquitous power. Even in Poland, the most comprehensively policed and repressed of all the occupied territories, society continued to function in defiance of the new rulers: the Poles constituted for themselves a parallel underground world of newspapers, schools, cultural activities, welfare services, economic change and even an army – all of them forbidden by the Germans and carried on outside the law and at great personal risk.
“But that was precisely the point. To live normally in occupied Europe meant breaking the law: in the first place the laws of the occupiers (curfews, travel regulations, race laws, etc.) but also conventional laws and norms as well. Most common people who did not have access to farm produce were obliged, for example, to resort to the black market or illegal barter just to feed their families. Theft – whether from the state, from a fellow citizen or from a looted Jewish store – was so widespread that in the eyes of many people it ceased to be a crime. Indeed, with gendarmes, policemen and local mayors representing and serving the occupier, and with the occupying forces themselves practicing organized criminality at the expense of selected civilian populations, common felonies were transmuted into acts of resistance (albeit often in post-liberation retrospect).

“Above all, violence became part of daily life. The ultimate authority of the modern state has always rested in extremis on its monopoly of violence and its willingness to deploy force if necessary. But in occupied Europe authority was a function of force alone, deployed without inhibition. Curiously enough, it was precisely in these circumstances that the state lost its monopoly of violence. Partisan groups and armies competed for a legitimacy determined by their capacity to enforce their will in a given territory. This was obviously true in the most remote regions of Greece, Montenegro and the eastern marches of Poland where the authority of modern states had never been very firm. But by the end of World War Two it also applied in parts of France and Italy.

“Violence bred cynicism. As occupying forces, both Nazis and Soviets precipitated a war of all against all. They discouraged not just allegiance to the defunct authority of the previous regime or state, but any sense of civility or bond between individuals, and on the whole they were successful. If the ruling power behaved brutally and lawlessly to your neighbour – because he was a Jew, or a member of an educated elite or ethnic minority – then why should you show any more respect for him yourself? Indeed, it was often prudent to go further and curry pre-emptive favour with the authorities by getting your neighbour in trouble.”

“At the conclusion of the First World War, it was borders that were invented and adjusted, while people were on the whole left in peace. After 1945 what happened was rather the opposite: with one major exception [Poland] boundaries stayed broadly intact and people were moved instead. There was a feeling among Western policymakers that the League of Nations, and the minority clauses in the Versailles Treaties, had failed and that it would be a mistake even to try and resurrect them. For this reason they acquiesced readily enough in the population transfers.”

---

25 Judt, op. cit., p. 27.
Thus in its Article XIII the Potsdam Conference authorized the transfer of vast numbers of Germans from Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland (which, while losing its eastern provinces to the Soviets, took over the former German provinces of Pomerania, Silesia and East Prussia). This “ethnic cleansing” extended even further east – 700,000 Germans, for example, were expelled from Romania. It was accompanied by mass murder, torture and rape. As Victor Sebestyen writes: “The Germans were not wanted anywhere outside Germany. Vast populations had been forced to uproot in the biggest refugee crisis the world had ever seen. Hitler had dreamed of an ethnically pure Europe. Paradoxically, Germany’s defeat ensured that by the end of 1946 his dream was, to a great extent, a reality…”

In all, some 12 million ethnic Germans were expelled and forced to travel back to their homeland, suffering half a million lost lives as starvation, disease and revenge attacks took their toll. Again, between 6 and 8 million former prisoners of war and slave labourers were released to roam the German countryside, looting and taking revenge on civilians. At the same time in the East, hundreds of thousands took to the forests in the Baltic States to resist their “liberation” by the Red Army; tens of thousands died. Losses were still greater further south, as Ukrainian “Banderites” fought the Soviets and Poles fought Ukrainians; there were large transfers of population in both directions across the Polish-Ukrainian border. In Belorussia an anti-soviet resistance movement lasted from 1944 to 1956. In Yugoslavia Serbs massacred Croats in retaliation for the hundreds of thousands they had lost at the hands of the Ustashi in the war. In Greece, British and monarchists killed communists and vice-versa. In many countries of Western Europe, especially Italy and France, collaborators were murdered, imprisoned or simply humiliated.

---

27 In view of the massive propaganda directed by the modern Russian media against the “Banderites”, it is worth heeding the words of Professor Andrei Zubov: “This was a national liberation movement, an anti-communist one.

“Stepan Andreyevich Bandera was born and lived in that part of the Ukraine which was part of Poland before 1939. And he saw all the Soviet horrors from peaceful and wealthy (by comparison with Soviet Ukraine) Galicia. He saw how, during the Great Ukrainian Famine [golodomor], people who were dying from hunger hurled themselves across the frontier onto Polish territory, how they were shot by Soviet border-guards. And for that he hated Soviet power.

“Any nationalism is a terrible thing, especially with weapons in its hands. But Bandera was a hundred times less cruel than the NKVD of Beria and Abakumov when they fought against the Banderites.

“Therefore any attempt to liberate them from this state was already an element of justice. And in this sense the Banderite movement was more justified from the point of view of morality than the Stalinist Soviet state.” ("Banderovtsy - eto primer bol'shoj ljzhi sovetskoj sistemy" (The Banderites are an example of the big lie of the Soviet system), Nash Dom, January 8, 2016, http://www.nashdom.us/home/public/publikatsii/banderovtsy---eto-primer-bolshoj-ljzhi-sovetskoj sistemy)

Nor did survivors of the Holocaust, in spite of their terrible experiences during the war, feel much safer at the end of it. Much of Eastern Europe had been virulently anti-semitic in the 1930s, and the same disease broke out now in pogroms such as that in Kielce in Poland in July, 1946. There was a particular new motive for this fresh outburst: the property of the Jews had been appropriated by new Gentile owners, who did not want to give it up. So Jews had to flee again. Ironically, many of them fled to the land of their former persecutors, Germany (63,387 between July and September, 1946\(^30\)); others – to Palestine...

As Sebestyen writes, “Millions of Hungarians, Poles and Romanians had benefited from the Holocaust – an entirely new middle class had been created in just a few years. State direction of the economy in Eastern Europe did not begin with Soviet-style post-war communism; it had happened under the authoritarian regimes in the 1930s, and was given a boost by the Nazis. The popular Polish magazine *Odrozdzenie* noticed ‘an entire social stratum – the new-born Polish bourgeoisie – which took the place of murdered Jews, often literally, and because it smelled blood on its hands, it hated Jews more strongly than ever.’ The returning Jews were resented by the majority. People cursed their luck that of all the Jews who had ‘disappeared’ during the war, their Jews had to be the ones who came back…”\(^31\)

Some of the continuing conflicts in post-war Europe had an ideological character, such as the Greek civil war between the monarchists and the communists. Others were “wars of liberation” from the new totalitarian conquerors, the Red Army, mixed with nationalist motives, as in the Baltic states and Ukraine. But most of them were simply wars of vengeance against those who had collaborated, or the continuation of pre-war racial tensions.

Thus Sebestyen describes the Czech vengeance on the Germans, supervised by their impeccably democratic and civilized President Edvard Beneš: “In the two years after the war Beneš expelled more than two and a half million Germans from Czechoslovakia, often with no notice of any kind. Nor did he seem to care how many died in the process. He expropriated the property of the ethnic ‘Sudeten’ Germans, the majority of whom were from families who had lived in Czechoslovakia for generations. It was payback – not only for the barbaric Nazi years, but also because they had been of the ruling caste before independence in 1918. In 1943, while still in exile, Beneš had issued a chilling decree: ‘We have decided to eliminate the German problem in our republic once and for all. The entire German nation deserves the limitless contempt of all mankind. Woe, woe, thrice woe to the Germans. We will liquidate you.’

\(^31\) Sebastyen, *op. cit.*, p. 287.
“Later, back home in Prague, he called not only for a ‘definitive clearance of the Germans from our country, but also a clearance of German influence.’ At no point did the Allied powers express any disapproval. Churchill’s Cabinet accepted the expulsions as ‘inevitable... even desirable’, and in December, 1944 the Prime Minister told the House of Commons, ‘Expulsion is the method which as far as we have been able to tell will be the most satisfactory and lasting. A clean sweep will be made. I am not alarmed at the prospect of the disentanglement of the people, nor am I alarmed by these large transfers.’ Stalin encouraged Beneš, telling him, ‘This time the Germans will be destroyed so that they can never again attack the Slavs.’”

The Western Allies did little to extinguish this flame of war that erupted over much of Western and Central Europe. They had too little sympathy for the mainly German victims, and were too occupied in providing minimal living conditions for those living in their zones of occupation and “denazifying” them. For food was scarce, especially in the British zone of occupation; rations in Britain had to be reduced in order to keep the Germans from starving.

In the Soviet zone of occupation the East Germans had more food. But that was their only advantage. In Eastern Prussia, Pomerania and Silesia, 1.4 million German women were raped, most of them several times, and most industrial plant was transported eastwards by the Red Army, together with luxury goods destined for the Soviet generals and millions of soldiers and former prisoners of war destined for the Gulag. American diplomat George Kennan wrote that “the disaster which befell this area with the entry of the Soviet forces has no parallel in modern European experience. There were considerable sections of it where, to judge by all existing evidence, scarcely a man, woman or child of the indigenous population was left alive after the initial passage of Soviet forces... The Russians... swept the native population clean in a manner that had no parallel since the days of the Asiatic hordes.”

Judt continues: “The situation in the newly liberated states of western Europe, then, was bad enough. But in central Europe, in the words of John McCloy of the US Control Commission in Germany, there was ‘complete economic, social and political collapse... the extent of which is unparalleled in history, unless one goes back to the collapse of the Roman Empire.’ McCloy was speaking especially of Germany, where the Allied Military Commission

32 Sebestyen, op. cit., pp. 129-130.
33 Judt writes: “The British were extracting at most $29 million in reparations from Germany; but the occupation was costing London $80 million a year, leaving the British taxpayer to foot the bill for the difference even as the British government was forced to impose bread rationing at home (an expedient that had been avoided throughout the war). In the opinion of the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, Hugh Dalton, the British were ‘paying reparations to the Germans’” (op. cit., p. 123).
35 Kennan, in Judt, op. cit., p. 19.
36 In reality, it was probably much worse than in antiquity.
had to build everything from scratch: laws, order, services, communications, administration. But at least they had the resources to do it. Further east, matters were worse still.

“Thus it was Hitler, at least as much as Stalin, who drove a wedge into the continent and divided it. The history of central Europe – of the lands of the German and Habsburg Empires, the northern parts of the old Ottoman Empire and even the westernmost territories of the Russian Czars – had always been different in degree from that of the nation states of the West. But it had not necessarily differed in kind. Before 1939 Hungarians, Romanians, Czechs, Poles, Croats and Balts might look enviously upon the more fortunate inhabitants of France or the Low Countries. But they saw no reason not to aspire to similar prosperity and stability in their own right. Romanians dreamed of Paris. The Czech economy in 1937 outperformed its Austrian neighbour and was competitive with Belgium.

“The war changed everything. East of the Elbe, the Soviets and their local representatives inherited a sub-continent where a radical break with the past had already taken place. What was not utterly discredited was irretrievably damaged. Exiled governments from Oslo, Brussels or The Hague could return from London and hope to take up the legitimate authority they had been forced to relinquish in 1940.37 But the old rulers of Bucharest and Sofia, Warsaw, Budapest and even Prague had no future: their world had been swept aside by the Nazis’ transformative violence. It remained only to decide the political shape of the new order that must now replace the unrecoverable past…”38

In his book Black Earth: The Holocaust as History and Warning, Timothy Snyder argues that the Holocaust took place, not so much because an evil state organized it, but because very many of the Jews who were killed were in effect stateless, and “one could do what one wanted with stateless people”. So the real destroyer was not states but the absence of statehood, anarchy. Whatever the merits of this thesis with regard to the Holocaust – and scholarly opinions differ sharply on that39 - it certainly has merit in relation to the immediate post-war years in Europe, when the main fact for very many was simply anarchy, the destruction of all signposts from the past, all institutions, ideals and morality. Moreover, it is equally applicable to the whole catastrophic period from the First World War to the death of Stalin (1914-53), with its vast Jewish and Gentile (especially Orthodox Christian) Holocausts covering most of Central and Eastern Europe. These were the

37 However, the Prime Minister of Norway from 1945-49 and 1955-65, Einar Gerhardson, was a KGB agent. He was the first western leader to visit the Soviet Union after the war. “Norvegovshoke:’otets natsii’, 15 let vozglavlaluischij kabinet, byl agentom KGB”, December 25, 2015, 9, http://9tv.co.il/news/2015/12/25/219244.html.
results of the fall of the last multi-national empires of the Habsburgs and the Romanovs, which held back the tide of anarchy, but were then swept away by the anti-states of Hitler and Stalin, together with many millions of their former subjects...
3. THE SOVIET OLD ORDER

As the Cold War began, it became necessary for the West to define its former ally and new enemy in the East. The term they came up with was the same that Mussolini had applied to his own regime in the 1920s – “totalitarian”. Of course, the use of this term pointed – correctly – to the close kinship between Communism and Fascism. As Anne Applebaum writes, it was “Hannah Arendt, who defined totalitarianism in her 1949 book, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, as a ‘novel form of government’ made possible by the onset of modernity. The destruction of traditional societies and ways of life had, she argued, created the conditions for the evolution of the ‘totalitarian personality’, men and women whose identities were entirely dependent on the state. Famously, Arendt argued that Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union were both totalitarian regimes, and as such were more similar than different. Carl J. Friedrich and Zbigniew Brzezinski pushed that argument further in *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*, published in 1946, and also sought a more operational definition. Totalitarian regimes, they declared, all had at least five things in common: a dominant ideology, a single ruling party, a secret police force prepared to use terror, a monopoly on information and a planned economy. By those criteria, the Soviet and Nazi regimes were not the only totalitarian states. Others – Mao’s China, for example – qualified too.”

However, the definitions of anti-communist intellectuals like Arendt or Brzezinski or Koestler made little impact on the prevailing tendency in Western European intellectual life, which was pro-Communist – or at any rate, anti-fascist and therefore, in the twisted logic of the time, necessarily anti-anti-communist. This was especially the case in France, whose communist party was second in size only to Italy’s, and where the beginning of the shameful Stalinist show-trials elicited only the denial of obvious facts and frantic defence of the totalitarian dictator. This pro-Communism went with a despising of all things American, in spite of the fact that the Americans had liberated France and her survival as an independent country depended entirely on them.

As Judt writes, “Communism excited intellectuals in a way that neither Hitler nor (especially) liberal democracy could hope to match. Communism was exotic in locale and heroic in scale. Raymond Aron in 1950 remarked upon ‘the ludicrous surprise – that the European Left has taken a pyramid-builder for its God.’ But was it really so surprising? Jean-Paul Sartre, for one, was most attracted to the Communists at precisely the moment when the ‘pyramid-builder’ was embarking upon his final, crazed projects. The idea that the Soviet was engaged upon a momentous quest whose very ambition justified and excused its shortcomings was uniquely attractive to rationalist intellectuals. The besetting sin of Fascism had been its parochial objectives. But Communism was directed towards impeccably universal and

---

transcendent goals. Its crimes were excused by many non-Communist observers as the cost, so to speak, of doing business with History.

“But even so, in the early years of the Cold War there were many in Western Europe who might have been more openly critical of Stalin, of the Soviet Union and of their local Communists had they not been inhibited by the fear of giving aid and comfort to their political opponents. This, too, was a legacy of ‘anti-Fascism’, the insistence that there were ‘no enemies on the Left’ (a rule to which Stalin himself, it must be said, paid little attention). As the progressive Abbé Boulier explained to François Fejto, when trying to prevent him from writing about the Rajk trial: drawing attention to Communist sins is ‘to play the imperialists’ game’.

“This fear of serving anti-Soviet interests was not new. But by the early fifties it was a major calculation in European intellectual debates, above all in France. Even after the East European show trials finally led Emmanuel Mounier and many in his *Esprit* group to distance themselves from the French Communist Party, they took special care to deny any suggestion that they had become ‘anti-Communist’ – or worse, that they had ceased to be ‘anti-American’. Anti-anti-Communism was becoming a political and cultural end in itself…”

*41*

There is little evidence that Stalin was planning to extend his conquests westwards in 1945; he was not ready for world war, especially while he did not have his own atomic bomb, and needed time to digest his newly-acquired empire in Central and Eastern Europe. His only sign of renewed aggression outside the Far East was in creating an Azerbaijani puppet state in Iran, which the West vigorously – and successfully - resisted. Stalin even hesitated to impose communism fully and immediately on his European conquests – although it was already clear that he had no intention of fulfilling the promises he had made at Yalta to introduce democracy there.

However, this was only a transitional phase; Stalin’s ultimate aim of destroying the West remained unchanged, as was made clear in a speech by Beria’s deputy, Minister of State Security Victor Abakumov, to an audience of SMERSH officers at NKVD Headquarters in occupied Europe near Vienna in the summer of 1945: “Comrade Stalin once said that if we don’t manage to do all these things very quickly the British and Americans will crush us. After all they have the atom bomb, and an enormous technical and industrial advantage over us. They are rich countries, which not been destroyed by the war. But we will rebuild everything, with our army and our industry, regardless of the cost. We Chekists are not to be frightened by problems and sacrifices. It is our good fortune… that the British and Americans in their attitudes towards us, have still not emerged from the post-war state of calf-

love. They dream of lasting peace and building a democratic world for all men. They don’t seem to realize that we are the ones who are going to build a new world, and that we shall do it without their liberal-democratic recipes. All their slobber plays right into our hands, and we shall thank them for this, in the next world, with coals of fire. We shall drive them into such dead ends as they’ve never dreamed of. We shall disrupt them and corrupt them from within. We shall lull them to sleep, sap their will to fight. The whole ‘free western’ world will burst apart like a fat squashed toad. This won’t happen tomorrow. To achieve it will require great efforts on our part, great sacrifices, and total renunciation of all that is trivial and personal. Our aim justifies all this. Our aim is a grand one, the destruction of the old, vile world.”

This speech demonstrates two things. On the one hand, the old satanic hatred of the Leninist-Bakuninite revolution for the whole of “the old, vile world” continued unabated. That meant that no “normal” relations would be possible with the Soviet Union; for it was in fact an anti-state determined to destroy all normal statehood throughout the world. Two possibilities were therefore open to the West: war, or “containment”, to use the phrase of the venerable American diplomat John Kennan in his famous “Long Telegram” of February 22, 1946. The West contemplated war, but in the end chose containment; that is, the Soviets were to be contained within the boundaries of their WWII conquests, as sanctioned at Yalta and Potsdam.

On the other hand, Stalin was not yet ready for further military expansion. Denis Healy asserted that “all that the Red Army needed in order to reach the North Sea was boots.” But it was not quite as simple as that. As the Marxist historian Eric Hobsbawm writes, “Except in the Balkan guerilla strongholds, the communists made no attempt to establish revolutionary regimes. It is true that they were in no position to do so anywhere west of Trieste even had they wanted to make a bid for power, but also that the USSR, to which their parties were utterly loyal, strongly discouraged such unilateral bids for power. The communist revolutions actually made (Yugoslavia, Albania, later China) were made against Stalin’s advice. The Soviet view was that, both internationally and within each country, post-war politics should continue within the framework of the all-embracing anti-fascist alliance, i.e. it looked forward to a long-term coexistence, or rather symbiosis, of capitalist and communist systems, and further social and political change, presumably occurring by shifts within the ‘democracies of a new type’ which would emerge out of the wartime coalitions. This optimistic scenario soon disappeared into the night of the Cold War, so completely that few remember that Stalin urged the Yugoslav communists to keep the monarchy or that in 1945 British communists were opposed to the break-up of the Churchill wartime coalition, i.e. to the electoral campaign which was to bring the Labour government in power. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that Stalin meant all this seriously, and tried to prove it by dissolving the Comintern in 1943, and the Communist Party of the USA in 1944.

“Stalin’s decision, expressed in the words of an American communist leader ‘that we will not raise the issue of socialism in such a form and manner as to endanger or weaken... unity’ made his intentions clear. For practical purposes, as dissident revolutionaries recognized, it was a permanent goodbye to world revolution. Socialism would be confined to the USSR and the area assigned by diplomatic negotiation as its zone of influence, i.e. basically that occupied by the Red Army at the end of the war...”

Why this (temporary) abdication from Lenin’s dream? Because, for all its massive power, the Soviet Union was vulnerable in many ways...

“In the West,” as Nikolai Tolstoy writes, “Russian heroism and wartime propaganda had combined to exaggerate the formidable strength of the Red Army. A prescient few already saw it as a potent threat to Western Europe. To Stalin matters appeared in a rather different light. True, his armies had, with unheard-of gallantry and sacrifices, hunted down ‘the Nazi beast in his lair’. But he also knew better than most how very near at times they had been to defeat, and also how much his conquests had owed to lend-lease supplies and American and British strategic bombing. Now the United States, with an industrial capacity and military resources dwarfing those of Germany at the height of her power, faced him in the heart of Europe....

“In 1945 the USSR still possessed no strategic air force, and there can be no doubt that Stalin regarded the awesome striking power under Eisenhower’s command with apprehension. In April 1944 he had warned his Chiefs of Staff against any idea that the defeat of Germany would be the end of their problems. There would be other dangers, equally great; notably the exposure of the Red Army to populations hostile to Communism, and stiffening relations with the Allies in the West. Meanwhile, in the Ukraine, Byelorussia and the Baltic States, nationalist partisans were fighting the Red Army and NKVD units on a scale recalling the bitterest days of the Civil War. Stalin was clearly fearful that the Western Allies would have the wit to play that card the purblind Germans had thrown away: the opposition of the Russian people to the regime. The extent of his fear may be gauged by his absolute refusal to consent to British arming of Russian sentries in prisoner-of-war camps or even enrolling them in a purely nominal ‘armed Allied unit’. He feared this might provide cover for the levying of a new ‘Vlasov’ army.

“Fear of military confrontation with the Anglo-Americans, revolt inside the Soviet Union, or contamination of the Red Army in occupied Europe effectively inhibited Stalin from any rash ventures in 1945. There were points on which he would not give way, but they were points on which the Anglo-Americans had no effective means of bringing pressure to bear. The new Soviet-Polish frontier, the annexation of the Baltic States, the refusal to
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implement Churchill’s illusory ‘percentages’ agreement: all these moves took place safely behind Red Army lines, and the worst the democracies could do was affect not to recognize their legitimacy.

“Caution was everything. It was still hard to believe that the West was sincere in its belief in the possibility of genuine post-war cooperation between the two irreconcilable systems. The results of the Teheran Conference had seemed almost too good to be true (Stalin returned to the Kremlin ‘in a particularly good frame of mind’) and after Potsdam a Soviet official noted that ‘the Soviet diplomats won concessions from the Western Allies to an extent that even the diplomats themselves had not expected’. After the defeat of Germany Stalin had been fearful that the Americans might not pull back to the demarcation line, and remained convinced that Eisenhower could, had he chosen, have taken Berlin. Still, the Allies were co-operating, for whatever reason, and as Roosevelt had irresponsibly announced at Yalta that the United States forces would withdraw from Europe within two years of victory, there was every incentive for a policy of ‘softly, softly, catchee monkey’.

“Despite the overwhelming Soviet military presence in Eastern Europe, Stalin was careful for some time to maintain the pretence and even, to a limited, fast diminishing extent, the reality of tolerating non-Communist institutions and political parties. In Romania it was announced that there was no intention of altering the country’s frontiers or social system. It was more than two years before King Michael was obliged to leave the country. Similarly, in Poland, Bulgaria and Hungary the shades of independent institutions were permitted to linger on until election results proved that the most extreme efforts of intimidation and propaganda could not induce populations voluntarily to accept Communist domination. Czechoslovak ‘independence’ survived a little longer, as a result of Stalin’s confidence in the pliability of Dr. Beneš and his colleagues.

“Postponement of the full establishment of the Soviet ‘New Order’ in Eastern Europe was clearly due to several factors. If the new regimes could gain power by constitutional and legal means, this would facilitate the task of Communist Parties in Western Europe, and it was essential, too, not to jettison chances of securing a settlement in Germany favourable to Soviet expansion.

“In any case, Stalin was by no means so confident as hindsight would suggest. In Poland the carefully-planned abduction and trial of sixteen leaders of the Home Army resistance movement in March 1945 suggest that in his view effective Polish armed resistance to the imposition of Soviet rule posed
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44 As Boris Souvarin put it in a 1948 article: “Stalin’s policy is made up of caution, patience, intrigue, infiltration, corruption, terrorism, exploitation of human weaknesses. It only moves to frontal attack when it cannot lose, against an adversary of its choice who is defeated in advance” (in Revel, op. cit., p. 97). (V.M.)
sufficient threat to make it worth risking the inevitable outcry that would arise in the West.

“All over Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, the NKVD and SMERSH stretched their enormous resources to cauterize resistance. Soviet propaganda had tended for ideological reasons to exaggerate the role played by partisan and ‘people’s’ armies in defeating Nazism, and they clearly were now taking no chances. Suspect elements of occupied countries were dispatched in an unceasing shuttle of trainloads to the GULAG camps, which continued to underpin Soviet economic production until after Stalin’s death.

“About five and a quarter million Soviet citizens were recovered from Western and Central Europe. All had to be elaborately screened, after which the majority were assigned to forced labour in GULAG camps and elsewhere. At the same time deportations from the Caucasus, the Crimea, the Ukraine, the Baltic States and other regions of the USSR continued unabated. As if this were not enough, the hard-pressed NKVD apparatus had to absorb millions of Germans, Japanese, Romanian and Hungarian prisoners-of-war.

“The eight years between VE Day and Stalin’s death saw the dictator become increasingly jealous, vengeful and vindictive. Fear of the Soviet and Soviet-dominated people, mistrust of the power of the United States, apprehension at the onset of old age with all its dangerous frailties, and recurring bouts of paranoid suspicion concurred to cause him to double and redouble precautions deemed necessary for his survival and that of the regime.

“Danger loomed everywhere. The USSR was sealed in a quarantine more hermetic even than before the war. The tentacles of the NKVD uncoiled to crush incipient dissent even before its practitioners were aware of their own intentions. Jews, heretical biologists, bourgeois composers, critics of Lysenko’s eccentric genetic theories, supporters of Marr’s still odder philological speculations… all, all were engaged in conspiracies so dark that only the Leader could penetrate the Arcanum… But Stalin was not mad, not even at the end when death interrupted the unfolding of the notorious ‘doctors’ plot’. As Adam Ulam writes, ‘the madness lay in the system that gave absolute power to one man and allowed him to appease every suspicion and whim with blood.’ His formative years had been spent in an entirely conspiratorial atmosphere. Roman Malinovsky, one of Lenin’s ablest colleagues, had proved to be a Tsarist spy. And now NKVD records contained the names of innumerable highly-placed men and women in capitalist countries who had outwitted the formidable British and American security services in order to betray their class and country. As Stalin chuckled at the blindness of his enemies, the uncomfortable corollary must have recurred as frequently: how many of his people were secreted leagued with ‘the gentlemen from the Thames’? What if one of his closest cronies – Molotov, Mikoyan or Voroshilov – for example – were an English spy of assassin?
“It is clear that the Soviet Union for internal reasons sought to put a distance between itself and the West. The absurd and cruel policy of refusing to allow Soviet war brides of US and British servicemen to leave the country betrayed the extent of Stalin’s fears. War had stretched the resources of the police-state to their limits – limits now being tested further by the herculean task of reimposing totalitarian controls within the USSR, and extending them to the conquered territories beyond. The military power of the Western Allies was daunting enough, but the danger to Soviet morale seemed still greater.”

Even without the western threat (although in truth, the West’s stance was defensive), Soviet morale was low enough. In spite of stripping Eastern and Central Europe of vast resources – reparations far greater than had been agreed at Yalta – the country was still desperately poor. As John Darwin writes, “Harvest failure in 1946 brought large-scale famine. Economic recovery was the final achievement of Stalin’s industrial order. Ferocious work discipline, conscripted labour, and the heavy reliance on slave or semi-slave labour were used even more widely than before the war against a cowed, ill-fed and exhausted population. Perhaps 10 per cent of industrial output came from the GULag…” Kirill Alexandrov writes: “The famine of 1947 and the armed struggle with the rebels in the western provinces of the USSR took away no less than one million lives.”

What resources there were were spent on the army, the secret services and building the atom bomb, while millions starved – quietly and without protest. Only in the concentration camps was there a measure of protest! There Christians of many kinds together with writers like Solzhenitsyn (who was imprisoned for criticizing Stalin in 1945) nurtured their internal freedom in conditions of total slavery, where they had nothing but their chains to lose.

And yet, as Martin Gilbert writes, “an element of lawlessness also perturbed the apparently settled routine of Soviet life. In 1946 Stalin was told that the security police had arrested 10,563 pupils who had run away form Factory Training Schools, as well as from trade and railway schools. According to a report from the Minister of the Interior, S.N. Kruglov, ‘Many crimes had been committed, including robbery and gangsterism’, by students from the schools. Kruglov also gave Stalin the reason. ‘The living conditions in the schools are unsatisfactory,’ he explained. ‘They are unsanitary and cold, and often without electric light.’

45 Tolstoy, op. cit, pp. 351, 352-355.
“It was not only the discipline of trainees that Stalin sought to tighten. Disciplining the intelligentsia was another task that he set himself. The instrument of his will was A.A. Zhdanov, his lieutenant on the ideological front, who called a special conference of writers, artists and composers – including Shostakovich, Prokofiev, and Khachaturian – to warn them of the folly of independent thought, in music as much as in writing and art. The Soviet Writers’ Union met with Stalin’s particular anger for what he saw as repeated attempts at independent expression of opinion. The poet Anna Akhmatova was among those expelled from the Union in 1946. Such expulsion meant an end to the right to publish – a writer’s means of livelihood.”

He also began to tighten his grip on the Jews. In January, 1948 he ordered the murder in a staged car accident of Solomon Mikhoels, the famous Jewish actor. Then came the famous “Doctor’s Plot”, which was still obsessing Staling at the time of his death.

In February, 1948, “the Central Committee of the Communist Party issued a decree on music, accusing Shostakovich, Prokofiev and Khachaturian of ‘losing touch with the masses’ and of falling victims to ‘decadent bourgeois influences’. The three made an immediate confession of their ‘errors’ and promised to mend their ways – and amend their music – in future. Newspapers also fell under the displeasure of the most rigorous ideological scrutiny. The satirical magazine Krokodil was censured by the Central Committee for its ‘lack of militancy’ in portraying the evil ways of capitalism. The Academy of Social Sciences, which had been established after the war, was reorganized to provide a more rigorous ideological training for Party and State officials.

“With Stalin’s personal sanction, a ferocious newspaper campaign was launched against two declared enemies of Soviet Communism, ‘bourgeois nationalism’ and the ‘survival of religious prejudice’. Some indication of how deeply religious feeling must have survived after thirty-one years of Communist rule was seen in the calls in Pravda for a more vigorous anti-religious propaganda…”

In Eastern Europe Stalin controlled everything through the KGB. Christopher Andrew and Vasily Mitrokhin write: “Communist-controlled security services, set up in the image of the KGB and overseen – except in Yugoslavia and Albania – by Soviet ‘advisers’, supervised the transition to so-called ‘people’s democracies’. Political development in most east European

states followed the same basic pattern. Coalition governments with significant numbers of non-Communist ministers, but with the newly founded security services and the other main levers of power in Communist hands, were established immediately after German forces had been driven out. Following intervals ranging from a few months to three years, these governments were replaced by bogus, Communist-run coalitions which paved the way for Stalinist one-party states taking their lead from Moscow.

“The German Communist leader Walter Ulbricht announced to his inner circle on his return to Berlin from exile in Moscow on 30 April 1945: ‘It’s got to look democratic, but we must have everything under our control.’ Because a democratic façade had to be preserved throughout Eastern Europe, the open use of force to exclude non-Communist Parties from power had, as far as possible, to be avoided. Instead, the new security services took the lead in intimidation behind the scenes, using what became known in Hungary as ‘salami tactics’ – slicing off one layer of opposition after another. Finally, the one-party people’s democracies, purged of all visible dissent, were legitimized by huge and fraudulent Communist majorities in elections rigged by the security services.

“During the early years of the Soviet Bloc, Soviet advisers kept the new security services on a tight rein. The witch-hunts and show trials designed to eliminate mostly imaginary supporters of Tito and Zionism from the leadership of the ruling Communist Parties of eastern Europe were orchestrated from Moscow. One of the alleged accomplices of the Hungarian Minister of the Interior, László Rajk, in the non-existent Titoist plot for which Rajk was executed in 1949, noted how, during his interrogation, officers of the Hungarian security service ‘smiled a flattering, servile smile when the Russians spoke to them’ and ‘reacted to the most witless jokes of the [MGB] officers with obsequious trumpetings of immoderate laughter’.”

4. THE SORROWS OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH

The only real resistance to Stalin’s rule in the 20s and 30s had been the Russian Orthodox Church. From 1927 his task in destroying and/or subduing the Church had been made much easier when the senior hierarch, Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky) of Nizhni-Novgorod, who later became Patriarch of Moscow in 1943, more or less surrendered the freedom of the Church into the hands of the Bolsheviks in his notoriously pro-Soviet “Declaration”. However, the battle was not over; for many hierarchs and priests, and several hundreds of thousands of believers fled into the catacombs to form the so-called Catacomb or True Orthodox Church. After very severe persecutions their numbers had been decimated; but in 1945 the Church still survived, living in the conditions of the greatest secrecy. Moreover, they were supported by the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia (ROCOR), with its headquarters in Munich and then New York, which became a beacon of anti-communist resistance for Orthodox Christians in the free world and a lodestone of hope for all true believers inside the Union.

The lot of the True Russian Church inside Russia was, if possible, even more difficult in the post-war years than before the war. Pastors were now even rarer, and they had to hide even deeper in the underground. As Archbishop Lazarus (Zhurbenko) said: “The catacomb believers feared the Moscow Patriarchate priests even more than the police. Whenever a priest came for some reason or other, he was met by a feeling of dread. The catacomb people would say, ‘A red detective has come.’ He was sent deliberately, and he was obliged to report everything to the authorities. Not infrequently, hierarchs and priests told the people outright, directly from the ambon, ‘Look around, Orthodox people. There are those who do not come to church. Find out who they are and report to us; these are enemies of the Soviet regime who stand in the way of the building of Socialism.’ We were very much afraid of these sergianist-oriented priests.”

Only in the central regions of Tambov, Lipetsk, Tula, Ryazan and Voronezh was there a certain increase in catacomb activity; many young people took leading positions in the movement. And in the 1950s there were still quite a few wandering catacomb priests and a few holy bishops, such as Anthony (Galynsky), Peter (Ladygin) and Barnabas (Belyaev). Many more were released by Khruschev’s 1956 amnesty.

But if there were few priests, there were many confessors. For example, in November, 1950, three nuns arrived at the dreaded Arctic camp of Vorkuta. They were assigned to a plant which bricks for construction work throughout the Russian Arctic. Some have said that these nuns came from Shamordino, since it is known that in the 1930s some Shamordino nuns adopted a similarly uncompromising attitude towards Soviet power. However, the author of the
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following account, the American John Noble, indicates that he does not know
where they came from. He simply says: "At Vorkuta these women were
referred to as veruiushchie or believers, the term applied to the Christians in
Russia who still carry on personal devotions in secret, not unlike the
Christians who met underground in the catacombs and defied the
persecutions of Nero."

Noble continues: "When the nuns were first taken to the brick factory, they
told the foreman that they regarded doing any work for the communist
regime as working for the devil, and, since they were the servants of God and
not of Satan, they did not propose to bow to the orders of their foreman
despite any threats he might make.

"Stripped of their religious garb, the nuns' faith was their armour. They
were ready to face anything and everything to keep their vow and they did
face their punishment, a living testimony of great courage. They were put on
punishment rations, consisting of black bread and rancid soup, day after day.
But each morning when they were ordered to go out to the brick factory, into
the clay pits, or to any other back-breaking assignment, they refused. This
refusal meant, of course, that they were destined to go through worse ordeals.
Angered by their obstinacy and fearing the effect upon the other slave
labourers, the commandant ordered that they be placed in strait jackets. Their
hands were tied in back of them and then the rope with which their wrists
were bound was passed down around their ankles and drawn up tight. In this
manner, their feet were pulled up behind them and their shoulders wrenched
backward and downward into a position of excruciating pain.

"The nuns writhed in agony but not a sound of protest escaped them. And
when the commandant ordered water poured over them so that the cotton
material in the strait jackets would shrink, he expected them to scream from
the pressure on their tortured bodies but all that happened was that they
moaned softly and lapsed into unconsciousness. Their bonds were then
loosed and they were revived; in due course, they were trussed up again, and
once more the blessed relief of unconsciousness swept over. They were kept
in this state for more than two hours, but the guards did not dare let the
torture go on any longer, for their circulation was being cut off and the
women were near death. The communist regime wanted slaves, not skeletons.
They did not transport people all the way to Vorkuta in order to kill them.
The Soviet government wanted coal mined. Slave labourers were expendable,
of course, but only after years of labour had been dragged out of them. Thus
the commandant's aim was to torture these nuns until they would agree to
work.

"Finally, however, the commandant decided that he was through trying.
The nuns were either going to work or he was going to have to kill them in
the attempt. He directed that they again be assigned to the outdoor work
detail and, if they still refused, that they be taken to a hummock in the bitter
wind of the early Arctic winter, and left to stand there immobile all day long.
to watch the other women work. They were treated to this torture, too. When the pale light of the short Arctic day at last dawned, they were seen kneeling there and the guards went over expecting to find them freezing, but they seemed relaxed and warm.

"At this, the commandant ordered that their gloves and caps be removed so that they would be exposed to the full fury of the wind. All through the eight-hour working day they knelt on that windy hilltop in prayer. Below them, the women who were chipping mud for the brick ovens were suffering intensely from the cold. Many complained that their feet were freezing despite the supposedly warm boots they wore. When in the evening other guards went to the hill to get the nuns and take them back to the barracks, they expected to find them with frostbitten ears, hands and limbs. But they did not appear to have suffered any injury at all. Again the next day they knelt for eight hours in the wind, wearing neither hats nor gloves in temperatures far below zero. That night they still had not suffered any serious frostbite and were still resolute in their refusal to work. Yet a third day they were taken out and this time their scarves too were taken away from them.

"By this time, news of what was happening had spread throughout all the camps in the Vorkuta region. When at the end of the third day, a day far colder than any we had yet experienced that winter season, the bareheaded nuns were brought in still without the slightest trace of frostbite, everyone murmured that indeed God had brought a miracle to pass. There was no other topic of conversation in the whole of Vorkuta. Even hardened MVD men from other compounds found excuses to come by the brick factory and take a furtive look at three figures on the hill. The women working in the pits down below crossed themselves and nervously mumbled prayers. Even the commandant was sorely disturbed. If not a religious man, he was at the least a somewhat superstitious one and he knew well enough when he was witnessing the hand of a Power that was not of this earth!

"By the fourth day, the guards themselves were afraid of the unearthly power which these women seemed to possess, and they flatly refused to touch them or have anything more to do with them. The commandant himself was afraid to go and order them out onto the hill. And so they were not disturbed in their prayers, and were taken off punishment rations. When I left Vorkuta four years later, those nuns were still at the brick factory compound and none of them had done a day’s work productive for the communist regime. They were regarded with awe and respect. The guards were under instructions not to touch them or disturb them. They were preparing their own food and even making their own clothes. Their devotions were carried on in their own way and they seemed at peace and contented. Though prisoners, they were spiritually free. No one in the Soviet Union had such freedom of worship as they.

"What their example did to instil religious faith in thousands of prisoners and guards there at Vorkuta, I cannot begin to describe. Later on, when I had
the opportunity as a locker-room attendant for the MVD men to talk with some of the more hardened Russian communists about religion, not one of them failed to mention the Miracle of the Nuns. With a puzzled expression, each would ask my opinion of it. How could such a thing happen, they would say. How could God have saved these women from freezing on that hill!

"I could not answer, except in terms of my own experience with prayer and with faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. I told them how I was saved from starvation and said that evidently the nuns had found the same strength through prayer. They were visibly moved by this additional demonstration of the fact that God's power exists.

"The rationalist looks in vain for an explanation of such an event. God showed His hand in a miracle on that hill in the Arctic wastes of Russia and by that miracle brought faith to Vorkuta. Thousands of prisoners were buoyed up in their resistance to Communism. Many communists themselves were touched and an unadmitted hunger in their hearts for religious faith was thereby brought to light..."\textsuperscript{54}
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ROCOR now entered a very difficult period of her existence as bishops and communities joined Moscow in the throes of a pseudo-patriotic passion. One of those who resisted this temptation was Bishop John of Shanghai, the famous wonderworker, who led his Russian émigré flock to safety out of Mao's China. Ajay Kamalakara writes: “As the winds of change blew across civil war-ridden China in 1948, the community of ‘White Russians,’ emigrants who fled Russia in the wake of the Bolshevik Revolution, grew increasingly uneasy over the political developments in their adopted country. Forces loyal to the Communist Party of China were winning the civil war against Kuomintang-led government.

“The Russian community, comprising mainly of the members of the intelligentsia, thrived for more than 25 years in cities such as Harbin Beijing and Shanghai. As the Chinese communists, backed by the Soviet Union, started defeating the government forces, they began to forcibly repatriate Russians to the USSR. 40,000 Cossacks were sent back to the Soviet Union, only to be marched off to labor camps in the Russian Far East. The community of 6,000 ‘White Russians’ in China appealed to several countries for help through the International Refugee Organization (IRO), which later became the United National High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

“Many countries, including the U.S., responded sympathetically, but only one gave the reply they desperately needed—the then very new Republic of

the Philippines, led by President Elpidio Quirino,” says Kinna Kwan, Senior Researcher at the President Elpido Quirino Foundation. Close to 6,000 anti-Communist refugees left China on rusty ships to land in the small Philippine island of Tubabao (a four-hour boat ride away from the city of Guiuan). They were evacuated with the help of the IRO, according to Kwan. For the next four years, the community lived on the Philippine island.

“For the locals on the island, ‘these four years comprise a very interesting period they fondly refer to as the Tiempo Ruso, or the Time of the Russians,’ Kwan wrote in an article titled ‘The Philippines and Asylum: A Historical Perspective lecture by UNHCR Representative to the Philippines entitled Tiempo Ruso.’

“The typhoon-ravaged island, which was a receiving station for personnel working for a U.S. Naval base during the Second World War, had a small population of fishing families and a handful of concrete structures.

“The ‘White Russian’ community had an active social life. According to Kwan, the resourceful refugees comprising of teachers, doctors, engineers, architects, ex-military officers, lawyers, artists, performers, and priests, used their professional skills and knowhow to improve living conditions and even achieve a sense of normalcy on the island.

“The camp eventually grew to be a thriving “little Russian city,” divided into 14 main districts with democratically-elected leaders, and with organized communal kitchens, power stations, Russian schools, a hospital and a dental clinic, an arbitration court, a police force and a little jail, and several churches for different faiths—including a wooden Russian Orthodox church built from an abandoned church left by the Americans,’ Kwan wrote in the article for the UNHCR.

“‘Through sheer hard work, they converted the settlement into a very livable town,’ says Larissa Goncharova, a historian who is writing a book on ‘White Russians.’ The refugees even set up an open-air cinema, a theater company and conducted piano and dance lessons, Goncharova adds. ‘These people were among the first to spread Russian culture in the Philippines.’

“The locals on the island hold Russian Orthodox Bishop John Maximovitch in high reverence. ‘He is remembered to this day not only by former Tubabao refugees but also by the Tubabao natives as the holy man who blessed the camp from four directions every night to ward off typhoons and other potential dangers,’ Kwan wrote in the UNHCR article.
“In October 1949, Philippine President Quirino visited the camp and ordered that the barbed wire around the camp be taken down.

“Over the next three years, the refugees were eventually resettled in different countries. Around half the population went to the United States, and large numbers moved to Australia and South America. There are still around 40 families living in and around Manila, says Goncharova. ‘The camp was closed in 1953.’”

It was not only St. John’s Chinese flock that fled to the United States. In 1948, as Archbishop Averky (Taushev) writes, “a vigorous migration of Russians to the United States of North America began, and many began to ask [ROCOR’s] Vladyka Metropolitan [Anastasy] to move there also together with the Hierarchical Synod. People in America also asked him to come; there a sad schism had just taken place (in 1946) after the so-called ‘Cleveland council’, at which it was decided [by four out of eight bishops] to move to the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarch Alexis. At the beginning Vladyka Metropolitan wavered, but Munich was becoming more and more empty, and the refugee camps and the parishes in them were gradually closing down. And finally Vladyka President decided to move to where most of his flock had moved and where they were urgently inviting him to come.

“Vladyka Metropolitan Anastasy’s departure for America took place on November 10/23, 1950. The next day he arrived at the airport in New York and was triumphantly received in the Ascension cathedral.

“The next day after his arrival, on November 12/25, Vladyka Metropolitan went to the Holy Trinity monastery in Jordanville, where he carried out a triumphant consecration of the just completed stone monastery church in honour of the Holy Trinity, after which a Hierarchical Council took place in which 11 hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad took part.”

At this Council holy myrrh was sanctified for the first time in ROCOR’s history. Previously, myrrh had been received from the Serbian Church. This act had an important symbolical significance as being normally the act of an autocephalous Church. The Bishops also “adopted a resolution on the issue of the ecumenical movement. It was composed by Archbishop John of Western Europe and Bishops Nathanael of Brussels and Nicon of Florida. This

document forbade members of ROCOR any form of participation in the ecumenical movement, and relegated all contacts with non-Orthodox Christians to the sphere of cooperative social activities.”

The ROCOR Synod’s move to America was timely, because, as indicated by Archbishop Averyk, her position in that vital country had been shaken in recent years. “On October 26-27 [1944] the hierarchs of the Church Abroad in North America Archbishop Vitaly, Bishop Jerome and Bishop Joasaph took part in the Hierarchical Council of North America, in which the election of Metropolitan Sergius to the Russian patriarchal throne was discussed. A resolution was passed recognizing the election and indicating that the Patriarch Sergius of Moscow should be commemorated at Divine services – without, however, removing the commemoration of Metropolitans Anastasy and Metropolitan Theophilus of North America. Following this conciliar decision, Metropolitan Theophilus issued an ukaz on the commemoration of all three hierarchs in all the parishes of North America. This resolution was signed also by the ROCOR hierarchs Vitaly (Maximenko), Tikhon (Troitsky), Joasaph and Jerome.”

On May 31, after the death of Patriarch Sergius, a Council of the North American Bishops under Metropolitan Theophilus and with Archbishop Vitaly’s participation issued an ukaz on the commemoration of the patriarchal locum tenens, Metropolitan Alexis, in all the churches. Meanwhile, Bishops, Alexis of Alaska and Macarius of Boston, joined Moscow, as did Bishop Nicholas (Ono) of Tokyo in November, 1946. In the same month, at a clergy-lay council in Cleveland, with the agreement of Metropolitan Theophilus but without the agreement of the other bishops, the council was recognized as the supreme legislative and administrative organ of the American metropolia – an act that reduced the power of the bishops to almost nothing. Four out of the nine bishops voted to return to the MP. Metropolitan Theophilus then wrote to the five dissenting bishops that they were excluded from his metropolia. The five dissenters returned into submission to ROCOR.

“In preparation for the council,” writes Ivan Andreyev, “it was very interesting and characteristic that the same persons who fought for the Moscow jurisdiction and the split from the [ROCOR] Synod and ‘helped’ Metropolitan Eulogius in Europe, moved from Paris to America and began to ‘help’ Metropolitan Theophilus [the leader of the American Metropolia]. With unusual knowledge of church matters, these professors of engineering and

---
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other fine arts began to state authoritatively that ‘the Moscow Patriarchate has not deviated from the dogmas, canons and rites of Orthodoxy in any way, and the politics conducted by its head, even though it is condemned today by many, cannot have a decisive influence on its canonical position.’ In this way the Cleveland council prepared itself by only a formal cooperation with the Synod Abroad, and then, completely backing down from its position, pronounced this resolution: ‘We are passing the resolution to request His Holiness, the Patriarch of Moscow, to reunite us to his bosom and be our spiritual father, under the stipulation that we preserve our full autonomy, which exists at the present time. Since the hierarchical authority of the patriarchate is incompatible with the hierarchical authority of the Synod Abroad of the Russian Orthodox Church, the American Church is discontinuing any administrative subordination to the Synod Abroad.”

In 1947 Metropolitan Gregory, Patriarch Alexis’ ambassador, brought a draft Statute of “the autonomous administration” of the Russian Orthodox Church in North American and Canada. In it, as Alexander Bogolepov writes, “the Moscow Patriarch attempted to make subject to his own confirmation the election of any American Metropolitan, as well as the elections of the diocesan bishops. Patriarch Alexis, in his Ukase of February 16, 1945, recommended two candidates of his own (Metropolitan Benjamin and Archbishop Alexis) to the All-American Sobor for election as Metropolitan. The Patriarch’s Ukase went on to say that this imposed no limitation on the right of the All-American Sobor to nominate and elect its own candidate, but at the same time it was pointed out that the Moscow Patriarchate had the canonical right to refuse to confirm the candidate so elected for any reason whatsoever. According to Metropolitan Gregory’s Draft Statute, the Metropolitan and the Bishops of the American Church were subject to approval by the Moscow Patriarch and could be deposed by him. This would make possible the gradual replacement of the entire episcopate; diocesan bishops would all be replaced by bishops agreeable to Moscow. According to the same draft, the decrees of the All-American Sobor would be subject to confirmation by the Bishops’ Sobor, and, by the same token, its entire activity would be subordinated to an episcopate faithful to Moscow.”

Such a degree of subordination to Moscow proved unacceptable to the American Metropolia, and the union did not take place for the time being. However, neither did the Metropolia return to ROCOR... In spite of the defection of the American Metropolia, ROCOR in America continued to grow. Moreover, as Archbishop Vitaly (Maximenko) of Jordanville pointed out, “a normal relationship to the question of Americanisation has been found. Instead of completely renouncing the Russian Church style of life and complete Americanisation, even in the ecclesiastical and Divine services

---

sphere, an American Orthodox Mission attached to the Synod has been organised, headed by an American Archbishop, James (Iakov). He has American clergy, and does missionary work among Americans, organising American parishes out of them.”

This missionary aspect of ROCOR’s activities became particularly important in the post-war period as most of “World Orthodoxy” fell into the heresy of ecumenism and into communion with the Sovietized Moscow Patriarchate. ROCOR with its scattering of parishes around the world became a light for the world, almost the last true witness to God’s truth in an age of increasing secularization and atheism.

In 1948 the MP celebrated the 450th anniversary of its foundation. The celebrations were attended by representatives of the Ecumenical, Antiochian, Alexandrian, Greek, Serbian, Romanian, Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Polish and Georgian Churches. Only Jerusalem and Cyprus, among the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches, were not represented. Immediately after the celebrations, a Church Council took place. Only the East European Churches within Moscow’s orbit and Antioch attended. The Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria and Greece boycotted it, ostensibly on the grounds that only Constantinople had the right to call such a conference, but more probably because they did not wish to involve themselves in the inevitable adulations of Stalin.

When KGB Colonel G. Karpov, head of the Department for the Affairs of the Russian Church and her real master, learned that Metropolitan Germanus of Thyateira and Great Britain, the representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch Maximus, was not arriving in Moscow until after the working days of the Council, he said: “He is well-known to be an English spy”. And about Patriarch Maximus, who had given Metropolitan Germanus this order, he said: “he has long been ill with schizophrenia and must in the near future go into retirement”. This was no idle threat: the next year Patriarch Maximus was forced into retirement by his Synod on grounds of mental illness, although he was completely sane. However, this was a mistake of the Kremlin politicians; for Maximus’ place on the ecumenical throne was taken
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by the 33\textsuperscript{rd} degree Mason Athenagoras, who arrived in Constantinople from America on the private plane of the American President Truman...

It is now known that all the decisions of the Moscow council of 1948 were planned a year and a half before by the Central Committee of the Communist Party.\footnote{Documents in M. Shkarovskij, \textit{Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' i Sovietskoe Gosudarstvo s 1943 po 1964 gg.} (The Russian Orthodox Church and the Soviet State from 1943 to 1964).} Consequently it is not surprising to see from the hierarchs’ special epistle that their motives were purely political: “The world is going through a stormy time in which the irreconcilable differences between the Catholic and rationalist-Protestant West, on the one hand, and the Orthodox East, on the other, are clearly manifest... We servants of the Orthodox Church have been painfully impressed by the fact that those who are stirring up a new war are children of the Christian Catholic and Protestant world. We are deeply grieved that from the stronghold of Catholicism, the Vatican, and the nest of Protestantism, America, instead of the voice of peace and Christian love we hear blessing of a new war and hymns in praise of atomic bombs and such-like inventions, which are designed for the destruction of human life. All Christians, regardless of nation and creed, cannot help blaming the Vatican for this policy. We fervently beseech the Chief Pastor, our Lord Jesus Christ, that He enlighten the Catholic hierarchy with the light of His Divine teaching and help it to realize the abyss of its sinful fall.”\footnote{Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii (The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate), 1948, N 12, p. 6; cited in Yakunin, “V sluzhenii k kul’tu (Moskovskaa Patriarkhia i kul’t lichnosti Stalina)” (In the Service of the Cult (the Moscow Patriarchate and Stalin’s Cult of Personality), in Furman, D.E., Fr. Mark Smirnov (eds.), \textit{Na puti k svobode sovesti} (On the Path to Freedom of Conscience), Moscow: Progress, 1989, p. 197.}

The most theological contribution to this council came from Archbishop Seraphim (Sobolev), formerly of ROCOR. He prepared three reports: against the ecumenical movement, on the old and new calendars, and on the Anglican hierarchy. Seraphim expressed a "particular opinion" on the calendar question, considering the council's resolution on this question to have been inadequate. In his report against Ecumenism he stressed that the presence of Orthodox representatives at ecumenical conferences, even as observers, constituted apostasy from Holy Orthodoxy.

Protopriest G. Razumovsky also spoke well: "The Russian Orthodox Church," he said, "had always taught and still teaches that Pentecost, or the descent of the Holy Spirit, has already taken place and that the Christians do not have to wait for a new appearance of the Holy Spirit, but the glorious Second Coming of Jesus Christ. The diminution of the significance of the single sacrifice of Jesus Christ and the prophecy of a future 'third hour', in which the expected Kingdom of the Holy Spirit will be revealed is characteristic of the teaching of the Masons and the heretics; while the newly
revealed prophecy of the expected Ecumenical Pentecost can be nothing other than an old echo of the false teaching of these deceived heretics.”\footnote{Archimandrite Charalampos Vasilopoulos, \textit{Oikoumenismos khoris maska} (Ecumenism Unmasked), Athens: Orthodoxos Typos, 1988, p. 122.}

On July 15, 1948 a feast in honour of the participants in the Council was laid on by the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church. About 200 people were present. The representative of the Bulgarian Church proposed a toast to Stalin for the communist Prime Minister of Bulgaria. Karpov declared that the guests had become personally convinced in Moscow that the Russian Orthodox Church was completely free and independent of the State. Metropolitan Germanos of Thyateira praised Stalin and called Karpov a minister who “aids the strengthening and flourishing of Orthodoxy in the Soviet Union”. Metropolitan Elias of the Lebanon said that it was only thanks to Stalin that the flourishing of the Russian Orthodox Church had been guaranteed throughout the world.\footnote{Monk Benjamin, \textit{op. cit.}, part 3, p. 133.}

In July, 1951 the heads of the Churches of Antioch, Russia, Georgia, Romania and Bulgaria gathered in Zagorsk and issued a purely political statement in favour of “peace” and against the USA.\footnote{\textit{Zhurnal Moskovskoj Patriarkhii} (Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate), N 8, 1951; Monk Benjamin, \textit{op. cit.}, part 4, pp. 12-13.} The “theology of peace” – that is, the removal of all obstacles to the communist domination of the world – was becoming the major content of top-level ecclesiastical meetings in the eastern bloc.

For the moment pro-communism was combined with anti-ecumenism (for purely political reasons); but the time would shortly come when the communist masters of the East European Churches would compel the patriarchs to change course and embrace ecumenism – for the sake of giving their pro-communist message a wider audience and deeper penetration...

\section*{5. THE CHURCH IN EASTERN EUROPE}

Similar tactics to the KGB’s repression of the Russian Orthodox Church were used in other East European countries... In Romania the communists took over in 1944, but there was strong opposition to them, and it was only after King Michael was forced to emigrate in 1947 that the persecution began in earnest. As Fr. George Calciu writes, “they began to create the same situation that was in Russia. The majority of the political counsellors and Securitate were Russian. They had come from Russia to transmit their experience to the young Romanian communists.”\footnote{Calciu, \textit{Christ is Calling You!}, Forestville, Ca.: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1997, pp. 95-96.}

Fr. George himself passed through the hell of the prison of Pitești, which experience “altered our souls and hearts, and little by little, one by one, we
fell. Namely, we came to deny God and to sever ourselves from our families. We came to forget all that was good in our hearts. Fortunately, this experiment lasted only about three years...”

In his biography of Valeriu Gafencu (+1952), Monk Moise writes: “Among the many prisons of Communist Romania, Pitești is a particular one. It became famous for the horrible atrocities that happened there as a result of the implementation of that satanic experiment known as re-education...

“In the first part of the year 1948, following an order from Bucharest, the prisoners were grouped according to their age at the time of arrest. All university students were sent to Pitești. In the first phase, the prisoners, most of them Legionnaires, lived under a rather lax regime. In short time, however, things changed and [what can be identified as] a program of extermination was initiated. The guards became very strict, doling out harsh punishments to the prisoners for perceived offenses. The quality of food deteriorated and they were given just enough food to keep them alive. Beatings, cold and hunger lowered their physical and moral resistance. All of these measures represented only the preparatory phase, so that when re-education was later unleashed, exhausted prisoners would be that much easier to subdue.

“A group of prisoners was brought to Pitești from Suceava, led by Eugen Țurcanu. Țurcanu was to become famous for crimes and tortures committed at Pitești and later at Gherla. Eugen Țurcanu and the other Suceava prisoners had gone over to the Communist side and they were identified by prison administration as the tool by which re-education would be implemented. It must be stated from the beginning that re-education was conceptualized at a high level, by leadership in the Ministry of the Interior, Țurcanu and his group being their instruments, essentially. When the experiment was called off, they were executed by the very Communist government they had served, while those who were truly guilty, those in the shadows, went unpunished.

“At first, the Suceava prisoners were scattered throughout the cells, mixed in with the others. They succeeded in gaining the others’ trust with their well-meaning attitude. After some time, at the beginning of December, 1949, the Suceava prisoners, together with other prisoners who were purposefully selected, were brought back together, to inhabit the same cell. One day, Țurcanu and his group announced to the others that they had changed their ideas, that they had given up Legionnairism and had been re-educated, adopting communist ideology. When they recommended to the others that they do the same, there was objection and laughter. Țurcanu and his followers attacked. They began beating the others, armed with broomsticks and wooden clubs hidden ahead of time under mattresses. Soon thereafter, the prison leadership – director, officers, guards – joined Țurcanu, severely beating the others [who wouldn’t renounce Legionnairism]. This moment marked the beginning of the re-education program, which meant continuous
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beatings and torture. The prisoners, closely supervised by Țurcanu’s group, were subjected to a regime of constant terror without the possibility of escaping or committing suicide.

“The torture was well-planned; it stopped only when the prisoner was about to die. There were various kinds of torture: beatings, hunger, being forced to maintain the same position 17 hours a day – legs extended horizontally, hands on knees, chest at 90 degrees – and at the slightest wavering, the supervisor would respond with a club. The prisoners were forced to drink urine and to eat excrement from buckets that served as toilets in the cells. They were forced to drink highly-salted water and then left to dry out from thirst; these were some of the may other tortures devised by the sick minds of the torturers. Those who caved [in] were required to ‘unmask’, i.e., to reveal everything they had not confessed at their interrogation, to betray those prisoners who had helped them in prison or those guards who had treated them humanely. Likewise, in order for the destruction to be complete, each one of them was required to profane the memory of whatever had been most important to him in front of everyone in his cell. For example, perhaps someone loved his mother or wife very much. In front of everyone, he was required to denounce them, to make the most obscene and absurd statements about them. Whatever was bright and good in the mind of the one being tortured had to be slandered and dirtied.

“Theological students and those who were devout – ‘mystical bandits’, as they were called – were forced to apostasize, to deny God, to curse everything that had to do with the Christian faith. At Christmas and Pascha, they were forced to sing carols or well-known religious hymns with altered words which profaned Christ and the Virgin Mary. They were forced to participate in blasphemous processions and to celebrated ‘liturgies’ using human waste from buckets in the prison cells, and were then forced to swallow it as ‘Communion’. Some of them were ‘baptized’ in tubs full of excrement. I believe that these things provide sufficient proof of the satanic nature of re-education.

“After the prisoner ‘unmasked’ himself, in order to prove that he had been re-educated, he was required to become a torturer himself and to convince others to give up ‘all bourgeois rottenness’ and to accept communist ideology. Through the use of terror, the prisoners were truly brainwashed. The tortured, no longer able to endure the incessant torment, unable to commit suicide, always closely supervised, finally gave in and were transformed into robots, their hearts turned to stone and, from being victims, they became executioners. Not even after being re-educated did they escape the terror for, at the slightest sign of solidarity with their victims, they were subjected to torture themselves. And thus, living in a state of constant terror, always suspicious of one another, they broke down completely, foregoing the possibility of returning to a normal state. Dumitru Bordeianu, who experienced this experiment, described the experience in his book Mărturisiri din Mlaștina Disperării (Confessions from the Mire of Despair). He says that at
a given moment a demonic ‘communion’ was created between the torturer and the one tortured. For example, if Țurcanu asked him what he was thinking, he was unable to lie because Țurcanu would have sensed it immediately. From this came the fear of even thinking something which could be considered bad by Țurcanu: You couldn’t hide anything if you were questioned, while telling the truth was punished.

“Another Satanic aspect of re-education was that everything that one had hidden at the interrogation and that represented a point of support on the path of internal collapse began to torment him so much that he himself requested to ‘unmask’, feeling afterwards a sense of relief like that after sacramental confession, even though the things he confessed were held against him. A strange process occurred, resulting in mutations to the personality of the one tortured, who came to disavow his former beliefs and to accept whatever Țurcanu imposed upon him with the conviction that he was doing good. In the process of brainwashing, ‘his mind was enlightened’, he experienced a sense of relief, he ‘understood’ everything that he had previously rejected and he set out, in full confidence, to bring others into the same state of ‘enlightenment’. For those of us who have not passed through similar demonic states, these things are incomprehensible.

“Most of those who tortured others did so under the dominion of terror, without experiencing the mutations I referred to above. The system was planned in such a way that, as a result of the continual torture, very few were able to hold out to the end. In general, most of them compromised, some of them more, some less, according to the structure and stamina of each.

“From Pitești, the system was extended to Gherla and the Canal, but due to the fact that word leaked out and there were international protests, the re-education experiment was stopped. If the secrecy had been maintained, re-education would have been applied to every prison in the country.

“Looking at re-education from a spiritual perspective, both those who directed this experiment from the shadows and those who applied it were nothing but instruments of the devil in the destruction of souls. Father Gheorghe Calciu, who went through Pitești, said, ‘In order to understand what Pitești was, we must remain above the facts and get at the roots of this evil, try to see the internal mechanisms of perversion and its metaphysical dimension. I believe that Pitești was a diabolical experiment. What occurred there was a struggle between good and evil, in which the executioners and the victims were simply instruments. It was a diabolical experiment that took place in our country more than in any other place in the world.’

“The satanic character of re-education was clearly seen in the words of Țurcanu, preserved in the memory of one political prisoner: ‘If Christ had passed through my hands, He never would have made it to the cross. He would not have been resurrected. Christianity, that great lie, would never have existed, and the world would have lived peacefully! I am Țurcanu! The
first and the last! No one has ever been born who could replace me. No one can lie to me the way that I lie to you fools. I am the true Gospel! I am writing it now. I have something to write on – your carcasses. What I write is true, it’s not a bedtime story for children.’

“Although the devil may have imagined that he won the battle through terror, he had few decisive victories among those who compromised, some more, some less. After the torture stopped, most of those who acquiesced gradually returned to God. Considering the subsequent evolution of the re-educated, the devil won a battle at Pitești, but not the war. According to Father Calciu, most of them returned to Christ more vehemently than before their trial by fire…”

* 

During the war, King Boris III of Bulgaria had tried to preserve his country’s neutrality between Hitler and Stalin, and, persuaded by Metropolitan Stefan of Sophia, had refused to allow the Bulgarian Jews to be taken to Hitler’s death-camps. For this he was killed in 1943. Professor Ya.Ya. Etinger writes: ‘Hitler demanded from his ally Bulgaria the dispatch of all the Jews of Bulgaria, Macedonia and Thrace to Auschwitz – about 48,000 people were subject to deportation. The head of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, Metropolitan Stefan of Sophia, on learning from the chief rabbi Asher Khamanel, the president of the capital’s Jewish community, that ‘the Commissariat for Jewish questions’ had already prepared the first lists of eminent Jews subject to deportation to Hitler’s death camps, openly declared: ‘I will conceal all the Jews in the churches and monasteries, but I will not hand them over for reprisals.’ He personally demanded that Prime-Minister Filov revoke the arrests of Jews in a series of cities in the country. The metropolitan also sent a letter to Tsar Boris, in which he wrote: ‘Let us not commit abominations, for which our good-hearted people will sometime have to feel shame, and perhaps other misfortunes.’ The metropolitan promised that he himself would remain under house arrest until the arrested Jews were released. For this he was accused by the local fascist organizations of ‘betrayal of the race and treachery’. Rabbi Khamanel, whom the police were hunting, was hidden by the metropolitan in his own podvorie. On May 24, the day of the national feast of SS. Cyril and Methodius, thousands of people came out onto the streets of the capital declaring that they would not tolerate the murder of their fellow citizens. Another highly placed clergyman, Metropolitan Cyril of Plovdiv, later patriarch of Bulgaria, also sent an epistle to the tsar. In his letter he demanded that the tsar immediately revoke the barbaric order. Otherwise, declared the metropolitan, he would not answer for the actions of the people and clergy. According to the reminiscences of eye-witnesses, he warned the local police authorities that he had said to the Jews of one of the poorest quarters of the city: ‘I present you my house. Let us see whether they will be able to get you out of there.’ And in a letter to Filov

he said that he would go with a cross in his hands to the death camp in Poland ahead of the convoys with the Jews. These many protest actions attained their goal and the deportation was stopped. Tsar Boris III invited the German consul, A. Bickerle, and categorically declared: ‘The Jews of my country are its subjects and every encroachment on their freedom will be perceived by us as an insult to the Bulgarians.’ Prime Minister B. Filov wrote in his diary: ‘His Majesty completely revoked the measures taken against the Jews.’ On returning from Hitler’s head-quarters on August 28, 1943, Tsar Boris very soon died. There are grounds for supposing that he was killed by the Hitlerites for refusing to carry out the will of the Fuhrer.”

After the death of Tsar Boris, his brother, Prince Cyril, became regent and continued the same policy. But after the Soviet troops entered Bulgaria he was arrested and shot on “Bloody Thursday”, February 3, 1945. Then so-called associations of priests controlled by the communists were infiltrated into the Church of Bulgaria, as into neighbouring Serbia. “After assuming power,” writes Ivan Marchevsky, “the communists began to destroy the clergy: a third of the 2000 members of the clergy was killed. Then they began to act in a different way: Vladykas appointed ‘from above’ ordained obedient priests.”

Archbishop Seraphim (Sobolev) of Boguchar, who was in charge of ROCOR’s flock in Bulgaria, also joined the MP – although, according to his spiritual daughter, Abbess Seraphima (Lieven), he continued to call the Soviet power “satanic” and to oppose the infiltration of communist influence into the Bulgarian Church. In 2016 he was canonized by the MP.

* 

The timing of the Council of Moscow in 1948 was clearly aimed at upstaging the First General Assembly of the World Council of Churches which was also taking place in that month. In line with Stalin’s foreign policy, the delegates denounced the West and the Vatican and condemned the ecumenical movement. Moscow’s hostility to the Vatican was determined especially by its desire to eliminate uniatism in Eastern Europe – that is, churches serving according to the Eastern Orthodox rite but commemorating the Pope.

A start had been made already towards the end of the war, when it was suggested to the unite episcopate in Western Ukraine that it simply “liquidate itself”. When all five unite bishops refused, in April, 1945, they were arrested. Within a month a clearly Soviet-inspired “initiative
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movement” for unification with the MP headed by Protopresbyter G. Kostelnikov appeared. By the spring of 1946 997 out of 1270 uniate priests in Western Ukraine had joined this movement, and on March 8-10 a uniate council of clergy and laity voted to join the Orthodox church and annul the Brest unia with the Roman Catholic Church of 1596. Central Committee documents show that the whole procedure was controlled by the first secretary of the Ukrainian party, Nikita Khruschev, who in all significant details sought the sanction of Stalin.

In October, 1948 the 1,250,000 uniates of Romania (the Romanian unia had taken place at Blaj in Transylvania in 1697) were united with the Romanian Patriarchate. Then, in April, 1950, a council took place at Prešov in Slovakia attended by 820 delegates, at which it was agreed to revoke the Uzhhorod unia of 1649 and return to Orthodoxy. The “converted” uniates formed a new, East Slovakian diocese of the Czech Orthodox Church.

However, as Archbishop Tikhon of Omsk writes, the merger of the uniates into the MP harmed both the uniates and the MP. It infected the MP, which drew a large proportion of its clergy from the Western Ukraine, with the false asceticism and mysticism of the Catholics. And the uniates, “on being merged into the unorthodox patriarchate, did not come to know the grace-filled ‘taste of True Orthodoxy’. The fruits of this ‘union’ are well known to all today.”

In August, 1948, Metropolitan Dionysius, head of the Polish Church, petitioned the MP to be received into communion, repenting of his “unlawful autocephaly”. In November, the MP granted his request, and granted the Polish Church autocephaly – again. However, because of his “sin of autocephaly”, and because he had accepted the title of “His Beatitude”, Dionysius was not allowed to remain head of the Church. Another reason may have been his participation in the creation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church during the war. This decision remained in force despite a plea on Dionysius’ behalf by Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople in February, 1950. In 1951, at the Poles’ request, the MP appointed a new metropolitan for the Polish Church. From now on the Polish Church, though with the new calendar, returned to Moscow’s orbit.

---
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In 1948 the head of the Albanian Orthodox Church, Archbishop Christopher of Tirana, was deposed and imprisoned by the communist government for “hostile activity in relation to the Albanian people”. Then, from February 5 to 10, 1950, a Local Council of the Albanian Church took place in Tirana. A new constitution was worked out in which it was declared that the elections of the clergy should take place with the participation of the laity.

A pseudo-patriotic note was sounded in article 4: “Parallel with the development of religious feeling, the Orthodox Autocephalous Albanian Church must instil into believers feelings of devotion to the authorities of the people of the People’s Republic of Albania, and also feelings of patriotism and of striving for the strengthening of national unity. Therefore all the priests and co-workers of the Church must be Albanian citizens, honourable, devoted to the people and the Homeland, enjoying all civil rights.” The episcopate had to pronounce the following oath: “I swear by my conscience before God that I will preserve the faith and dogmas, canons and Tradition of the Orthodox Church, and faithfulness to the people of the Albanian People’s Republic and its democratic principles, as prescribed by the Constitution.”

On March 5 the new head of the Albanian Church, Archbishop Paisius, gave a speech in front of the All-Albanian conference in defence of peace in which he said: “In agreement with the great ideals of love, brotherhood and peace throughout the world on which the Church is based, we will struggle for the holy affair of the liberation of the whole of mankind from hostile encroachments on its peaceful life. This task must be unanimously accomplished by all our clergy, as preachers of peace who are bound to direct the will of the flock to the struggle for peace... We preach peace, but we know that peace is not given gratis, therefore we bless the struggle for the final victory over those who are stirring up war...”

6. THE YUGOSLAV WAY

By the end of the 1940s all the states of Eastern Europe – including East Germany but excluding Greece – had been transformed into totalitarian states on the Soviet model. All, together with their official Orthodox churches, became slaves of the Georgian dictator with the exception of Tito’s Yugoslavia and the Serbian Orthodox Church.

---
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“Soviet links with the new Communist States,” writes Martin Gilbert, “were maintained by the presence of large numbers of Soviet troops, and were strengthened by formal agreements. On February 4 [1948], during the signature of a Soviet-Roumanian Treaty, Molotov – who had concluded his semi-eponymous treaty with Ribbentrop nine years earlier – spoke of how important the new treaty was ‘at a time when the new war-mongers in the imperialist camp are patching together military-political blocs directed against the Soviet Union’. Considerable stress was laid on the threat to the Soviet Union of American military might, assisted by various ‘lackeys of imperialism’, of whom Britain was usually portrayed as the second – and sometimes even as the principal – villain.

“The Soviet treaties with her neighbours were quickly extended – Hungary signed on February 18 and Bulgaria on March 18. Poland was already signed up. On April 6 non-Communist Finland signed a treaty with the Soviet Union promising to repel any direct aggression on Finland by Germany or any State allied to Germany. One wartime ally and associate of the Soviet Union had begun, however, to resist the pressures from Moscow: President Tito of Yugoslavia. His partisan forces had been as instrumental as the Soviet Army – if not more so – in driving the Germans from his country. Tito courageously broke with Stalin and sought to maintain his own form of Communism.”

Tito had been a nagging problem for Stalin since 1945. Judt explains: “The Yugoslav efforts to acquire parts of Austrian Carinthia and the Istrian city of Trieste were an embarrassment to Stalin in his dealings with the Western allies, and an impediment to the domestic progress of the Italian Communists especially. Tito’s initial support for the Greek Communists was similarly embarrassing, since Greece fell unambiguously into the Western ‘sphere’. Yugoslav ambitions to created and lead a Balkan Federation incorporating Albania and Bulgaria ran afoul of Stalin’s preference for maintaining his own direct control over each country in his sphere of influence. And the unabashedly revolutionary domestic politics of the Yugoslav Party – which held power without the constraint of alliances with ‘friendly’ parties and was thus far more radical and ruthless than other East European Communists – risked putting in the shade the Soviet model. In matters of revolution, Tito was becoming more Catholic than the Soviet pope.”

Gilbert continues: “On March 27 Stalin sent Tito a letter, signed by himself and Molotov, warning of the dangers of the breach. At the heart of it was the sentence: ‘We think Trotsky’s political career is sufficiently instructive.’ But Tito would not allow himself or his country to be browbeaten. At a meeting of the Cominform in Budapest in June, which Yugoslavia declined to attend, the senior Soviet representative told the other Eastern European and Western
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Communist delegates: ‘We possess information that Tito is an imperialist spy.’

“On June 28, reflecting the exchange of letters between Tito and Stalin, the Cominform published a resolution calling on the people of Yugoslavia either to force their government to support the Soviet Union, or to form a new government that would do so. Vladimir Dedjer, who had fought at Tito’s side throughout the war, and whose wife Olga, herself a partisan, had been killed in action against the Germans, later recalled how the Cominform resolution was received in Belgrade:

“The great majority, which had not been conversant with the letters, simply could not believe their eyes. There were people who cried from despair in the streets that morning. But was the first reaction. After the first pain came a wave of indignation, and pride. The whole country united as one man. Feelings rose high. Men in the street were proud of their country. The air was charged with feeling as before, during the greatest events in the modern history of Yugoslavia.

“From many parts of Yugoslavia cables reported: “People feel as they did on March 27, when Yugoslavia broke the Axis yoke and challenged Hitler.””

Yugoslavia’s leaving the Stalinist bloc, and her supposed adoption of a “third way” between East and West, Communism and Capitalism, was important as demonstrating that Stalin was not all-powerful, even in Eastern Europe. However, it must not be thought that Yugoslav Communism was essentially different from the Stalinist variety – Tito was not about to betray his long-held convictions and Muscovite training. And we see this especially in relation to the Serbian Orthodox Church...

*

The Serbian King Peter remained in exile in England after the war, trying to help the resistance to Communism in his homeland from outside. For some years this struggle was led from within the country by the leading Church hierarchs.

As Bishop Akakije (Stankević) of Uteshiteljevo writes: “During the Second World War and until 1946, since the German Nazis had imprisoned the Serbian Patriarch Gabriel (Dočić) and later put him into the Dachau concentration camp because of his anti-Nazi statements, the administration of the Serbian Church was taken over by Metropolitan Joseph (Tsvijić) of Skopje, who was parted from his diocese after the Bulgarian occupation of Macedonia. Together with the Patriarch they imprisoned Bishop Nikolai of Žiča, who was the most respected and best loved Serbian bishop among the

95 Gilbert, op. cit., pp. 823-824.
people, and whose opinion was considered important among the bishops, priests, monks and people. In that period, a number of Serbian hierarchs did not understand the real meaning of the evil of communism that was spreading fast throughout Serbia. Such a soft and inadequate attitude on the part of the Serbian Church towards communism is astonishing when we know that the Synod of the Russian Church Abroad had been in Sremski Karlovtsy even before the beginning of the war, for more than twenty years, and throughout that period it had been warning everyone, explaining the diabolical nature of the communist and sergianist hell... through which their country, Russia, had passed and from which they had been forced to flee for that reason. Also, those frightening warnings began to come true at the very beginning and during the war through all those monstrous evil deeds against the Serbian people, kingdom and Church that were committed by the communist bands in Serbia.

“At that time, the justified position existed that it was not necessary to waste strength and men by confronting the large power of Nazi Germany and her allies (let us remember that at that time there was an order that for every German soldier killed 100 Serbs be killed)..., but that we should turn ourselves exclusively to the internal problem of communism, which was coming over Serbia like a dark shadow. Inspired by this idea, at the beginning of the war, the prime minister of the Serbian government in occupied Serbia, General Milan Nedić, requested from the Synod of the Serbian Church to condemn in the name of the Church the communists and the leader of the liberation movement, the so-called Chetniks, Colonel Dragoliub Mikhailović, who together with the communists started the guerilla struggle against the German occupation army. The Synod replied to this appeal of General Nedić: ‘The Church is above parties, Dragoliub Mikhailović, Ljotić and the communists.’ By the way, the unnatural companionship mentioned above was broken very soon because Mikhailović’s national forces soon became completely at odds with the army organized by the communist party of Yugoslavia led by Joseph Broz Tito. Colonel, later General Mikhailović continued to fight the Germans, but on a much smaller scale, and he forced the communists to leave the territory of Bosnia, and because of that General Nedić was unofficially helping him.⁹⁶

“Such a soft position was not only a result of a misunderstanding of the evil, God-fighting nature of communism, but in some places it was open sympathy with those forces, even communist bands, who were fighting

⁹⁶ Draza Mikhailović was executed by the communists on July 4/17, 1946. Some doubt whether Mikhailović was a true martyr, accusing him of practising "ethnic cleansing" against Muslims during World War II (Norman Cigar, Genocide in Bosnia, Texas A&M University Press, 1995, pp. 18-19). However, Norman Malcolm argues (op. cit., p. 179) that there is no definite evidence for this. Tim Judah agrees (The Serbs, London: Yale University Press, 1997, pp. 120-121). See also K. Glazkov, "K 50-leitu raspravy nad Dragoliubom-Drazhej Mikhailovichem" (To the 50th Anniversary of the Execution of Draza-Dragoliuboj Mikhailovich), Pravoslavnaia Rus' (Orthodox Russia), N 17 (1566), 1/14 September, 1996, p. 5. (V.M.)
against the Germans. The result of those positions was a very strong anti-
German feeling, and contrary to that, great sympathy for the English side
among many of the Serb hierarchs. How different was the position of the
Russian Patriarch Tikhon towards the communists from the flexible position
of the Serbian hierarchs. He was completely trapped by the Bolshevik
revolution in 1918, but anathematized the communists and all those who
cooperate with them.

“Most of the official church statements during the war were vague. For
that reason in 1942 the Serbian patriot and politician Dmitrij Ljotić wrote in
his article ‘Neither Hot nor Cold’: “We heard the message of our paternal
hierarchs gathered in the Synod and around it. They call on the people to
have peace, love and unanimity... They simply called the citizens to peace
and unity and love, taking good care how to gain peace, unanimity and love.
And to make that position even more visible, they cared very much not to use
a single word to explain who are those people in our country who disturb
peace, unanimity and love, who kill the priests and other peaceful citizens
and insult the Church....

“... The communists, on account of Red Moscow, want sabotage, disorder,
rebellion, which leads to national destruction. General Nedić doesn’t want
any of these three because if we avoid them then the Serbian people will live.
Even those who were lucky enough to run away to London send us messages
to preserve peace, and that people should keep away from sabotage and
rebellion.

“Church representatives pass over all this and speak about peace, love
and unanimity, not saying a single word about which course is better: that of
General Nedić, or that of the communists. If the message were necessary, it
would have been necessary to tell that, too, to the people. If they didn’t want
to say that, it would have been more glorious and wiser to keep silent.

“If our hierarchs could not choose which of these two courses is better,
how could they find a way to move themselves from their God-saving
dioceses and hide here in Belgrade? Why didn’t they wait for the communists
there?’

“By the end of 1944 Soviet troops started to come into Serbia, and in
October, 1944 they entered Belgrade together with the Yugoslav communist
army. Many of the national forces and the clergy who were aware of the hell
awaiting them in Serbia under these rulers, left Serbia together with the
defeated Germans, and retreated towards Slovenia. Bishop Nikolai
Velimirović was the only one to understand how tragic the situation was, so
in Slovenia he gave his blessing to the gathering of all the national anti-
communist forces who were grouped there and were retreating before Tito’s
troops and the Red Army. Several hundred thousand Serb četniks, the Ljotić
volunteers, the Nedić national guard, Slovenian nationalists loyal to the
kingdom of Yugoslavia and some Russian White Guards were ready to stand
together against oncoming communism. Even General Vlasov with his 400,000 soldiers headed towards Slovenia, as the only ray of hope, the last chance for the communists to be driven away from the borders of Yugoslavia, as they had been in neighbouring Greece. Unfortunately, the allies had the most important role. General Vlasov was stopped by the ‘Allies’ and handed over together with his army to be killed by the Soviets, while the national forces in Slovenia were cheated by the Americans and English, deprived of their arms, and handed over to Tito’s partisans, who in a short period of time and in the most monstrous ways tortured, killed and burned bodies and put into mass graves several hundred thousand men. Just in one day, the partisans killed 62 Serbian priests from Montenegro, who found themselves in Slovenia with the leftovers of Djurishić’s Montenegrin national forces, which had already been reduced to one tenth of their former number by the partisans and Croatian Ustaše while they were passing through Bosnia. A small number of nationalists succeeded in fleeing through Italy and so the killing by the communists did not affect them. In this way, again with the help of the ‘Allies’, Tito’s assumption of power was guaranteed. Bishop Nikolai stayed firm in the United States, where he continued his fight for the liberation of the Serbian Church and State from the communists.97

“Some sources report that Metropolitan Joseph [Tsvijović] and the bishops who stayed in the country (Nectarije Krul, Jovan Ilić, Arsenije Bradvarević, Emilian Piperković) openheartedly greeted the Soviet troops and Yugoslav partisan troops. In October, 1944 Metropolitan Joseph delivered a message to the people in which he called the liberation of Belgrade and Serbia the ‘dawning’. On November 12, 1944 in the Saborna church in Belgrade a pannikhida was held for all those killed in the struggle for the liberation of Belgrade. The service was celebrated by Metropolitan Joseph... The priesthood of Belgrade was collecting donations for wounded Soviets and partisans. In the Nativity Epistle of the Holy Synod, they spoke with delight about the new situation arising from the expulsion of the enemies from the country (the occupiers and the liberation of the country)...

“The next big deviation from the pre-war position was the relationship of the Serbian Orthodox Church towards the Soviet Moscow Patriarchate, with which the Serbian Church got in touch immediately after Soviet troops entered Serbia. A delegation from the Moscow Patriarchate headed by Bishop Sergius of Kirovgrad came to Belgrade in 1944.

“In March 1945 Metropolitan Joseph accompanied by Bishop Jovan of Niš and Bishop Emilian of Timočki travelled, at the request of the authorities, to Moscow, where they attended the false Council and the Soviet theatrical enthronement of the new patriarch, Alexis I.

97 After being released from Dachau, Bishop Nikolai chose not to return to communist Yugoslavia, but emigrated to the United States. In 1951 he settled in the American Metropolia’s St. Tikhon monastery, eventually becoming rector. He reposed in 1956 in very suspicious circumstances. (V.M.)
“Tito’s communists, taking over power with the help of America, England and the Soviet Union, at the very beginning showed their openly anti-Christian character. Very fierce anti-Church laws were enforced, and an agrarian reform was made whereby the Church was deprived, right from the beginning, of 70,000 hectares of land, 1,180 church buildings, a printing plant and a pension fund for the clergy. State donations to the Church were stopped, the catechism was thrown out of the schools, the authorities created big problems for the theological schools, the Church had to deliver all the registration books to the State registration offices, etc., etc.

“Right from the beginning, persecutions and killings of clergy began. The first martyr was Metropolitan Joanikije [Lipovac] of Montenegro, who was tortured by Tito’s communists for several months in prison. Partisan Major Kovačević brought him a chalice filled with the fresh blood of murdered Chetniks (that’s how he explained it), and he made the metropolitan commune in that blood. The metropolitan stayed firm, and was killed and burned in Arandzelovats during the night between the 8th and 9th of September, 1945. In this period of the consolidation of their revolutionary authority, the communists were helped by the ‘Allies’, English and Soviet. In 1944 and 1945 there were shootings without trial of all those priests who, as they believed, were unable to adapt to collaboration with the communists. According to incomplete information, the communists in those years killed 98 Serbian priests.

“After all these events, and finally losing trust in the Allies, who at the end, on the orders of Tito, even bombed a lot of Serbian cities and turned them into ruins, Metropolitan Joseph finally took an openly anti-communist position. He started to criticise the actions of the communist authorities in public, but his acts did not influence other bishops to take the same position towards the new godless authorities.

“Since he took such a fearless position towards the communists, Metropolitan Joseph found himself in a very difficult position and he was under a number of pressures. Several times the new authorities organized ‘spontaneous demonstrations’ with red flags, banners and shouts of ‘Down with Joseph!’ During one such anti-religious event, when a large number of demonstrators stopped in front of the patriarchal building, and started to shout the well-known words, ‘Down with Joseph! Down with Joseph!’ the metropolitan came out onto the balcony and in the strong voice with which

98 Things got worse in 1947 when Tito placed a Catholic at the head of the Commission for Religious Confessions (Monk Benjamin, op. cit., part 3, pp. 122-123), (V.M.)
99 70 of his priests died with Metropolitan Joanikije (The Diocesan Council of the Free Serbian Orthodox Diocese of the U.S.A. and Canada, A Time to Choose, Third Lake, Ill.: Monastery of the Most Holy Mother of God, 1981, p. 10). According to Norman Malcolm (Bosnia. A Short History, London: Papermac, 1996, p.193), up to 250,000 people [of all the nations of Yugoslavia] were killed by Tito’s mass shootings, forced death marches and concentration camps in the period 1945-6. (V.M.)
he usually spoke to thousands of the faithful, shouted as if he did not understand: ‘Down with Joseph? Which Joseph? Broz or Stalin?’

‘Just after the end of the war, he rejected the request of the federal minister of internal affairs, Vlade Zečović, to send a message to the clergy that they should not commemorate the king’s name in the Divine services. In rejecting this, he said: ‘The king’s name will be commemorated until the state organization is decided.’ Having seen the firm position of Metropolitan Joseph, the communists changed their threats and tactics. In 1946 he began to receive official delegations from the authorities, bringing him messages that ‘Tito is regretting that he didn’t have the honour of meeting the representative of the Serbian Church, and he is expressing his sincere wish to do this as soon as possible’. The same year Metropolitan Joseph delivered a speech in the patriarchal chapel in which he said: ‘Such a shame and disaster the Serbian people have not undergone since the Turks. Let everyone know that many have broken their teeth attacking the Church. So will the communist beast. Endure, Serb, and don’t be afraid.’ The Soviet Patriarch Alexis I, during his visit to Bulgaria (in June, 1946) expressed the wish to visit the Serbian Church. That message he sent through Bishop Irinaeus Ćilić who was in Bulgaria attending the celebration of the 1000-year anniversary of the repose of St. John of Rila the Wonderworker. Metropolitan Joseph did not reply to Patriarch Alexis. After the war, while sending one of his priests to a parish in a village, he gave him a cross and asked him: ‘Do you remember how the Spartan mother saw off her son to the battle, giving him the spear? I give you the cross of Christ, and am sending you to the terrible war with the godless. Here, my son, is the cross and the vow with it or on it.’

‘Metropolitan Joseph began to criticise the MP’s subordination to the communists. For example, in a conversation with the American ambassador Harold Schantz he declared that the MP was an extended arm of the Kremlin, which was trying to Bolshevize the Serbian Orthodox Church. {However,} he still did not completely understand the deep meaning of handing over the freedom of the Church to the militant godfighters, which is sergianism; he didn’t in the name of the Serbian Church stop giving the Soviet church communion in prayer and sacraments as well as other support for it.

“The political orientation of the Serbian bishops at that time, from a strictly Orthodox point of view, was not equal to the seriousness of the historical situation in which Serbia and the Serbian Church found themselves. They didn’t attach enough importance to the political system in Serbia, such as the Orthodox autocracy-monarchy, but the tendency was towards modern political options, to the democratic organization of the State, which, as is well-

---


101 Moreover, on May 19-20, 1946 a Hierarchical Council of the Serbian Orthodox Church allowed the Church in Czechoslovakia to enter the MP. This decision was confirmed on May 15, 1948 (Monk Benjamin, op. cit., part 3, p. 110). (V.M.)
known, is, together with communism, just one of the sides of the Judaeo-Masonic coin... In the early-mentioned discussion of Metropolitan Joseph with the American ambassador he made the contradictory declaration that Stalin had taken over the position of Tsar Nicholas II. According to him, it [communism] was the same type of rule – authoritarian and undemocratic - as tsarism was. He claimed that he was against every type of totalitarian regime, both right and left. Metropolitan Joseph, like all other Serbian bishops, was actually in favour of the system of the liberal democratic kingdom that was enforced in the kingdom of Yugoslavia before the war.

“In the Church and among the people everybody wanted Patriarch Gabriel to return to Yugoslavia, who had been released from German imprisonment [in Dachau] at the end of the war, and still did not come back. Since Metropolitan Joseph rejected many of their requests, the communists had the idea of inviting Patriarch Gabriel, who was temporarily in Italy, to come back to the country, to which, after a time, he agreed. He adopted a more modest position than Joseph. He considered that, with the help of ‘diplomacy’, more coordination with the authorities and keeping away from conflicts, he would save the Serbian Church from total disaster, so he started to declare loyalty to the authorities, although he often criticised their representatives, even Tito himself, concerning their actions against the Church, always declaring he was against the actions, but not the authorities themselves. He managed to avoid enforcing many requests of the communists, likewise the recognition of the communist clergy association, the foundation of the so-called Macedonian Church, as well as the condemnation and defrocking of the hierarchs abroad whose removal was requested by the authorities.

“But he did take part in the Pan-Slavic Congress in Belgrade in 1946 in which he declared gratitude to ‘Mother Russia’ for preserving the unity of the Slavs, repeating the words that Metropolitan Joseph had said at the liberation

102 He had been waiting for the return to the country of King Peter. However, in the autumn of 1946 Archbishop Eleutherius (Vorontsov) of the MP persuaded Patriarch Gabriel to change his mind. In a report to the Central Committee on February 14, 1947, G. Karpov remarked that Archbishop Eleutherius ‘at the command of Patriarch Alexis has conducted a series of conversations with Gabriel and persuaded him of the necessity of returning to Yugoslavia and working with the democratic government of Tito, abandoning hopes of the restoration of the monarchy. In December, 1946 the Serbian patriarch declared that he remains faithful to the traditional friendship with Russia and categorically rejects an orientation towards the West. Patriarch Gabriel also expressed the thought of the necessity of the gathering in Moscow of representatives of all the Orthodox Churches. At the Pan-Slavic Congress in Belgrade in December, 1946, Patriarch Gabriel expressed that which we in Moscow have been impatiently waiting for him to say: ‘... he considers that the seniority in the Orthodox world should belong to the Moscow Patriarchate, and the Russian Church should become the Mother for the Slavic churches.’ Developing this thought and noting the anti-Slavic and anti-Soviet ‘undermining’ work of the Vatican, Patriarch Gabriel said: ‘That is why we need to be together with the Russian people and the Russian Church, in order to oppose all the snares and enemy intrigues of the whole of the West headed by the Pope of Rome and his supporters.” (RTsKhIDNI, f. 17, op. 125, d. 407, l. 27; Monk Benjamin, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 114). (V.M.)
of Belgrade. On the same occasion he welcomed Tito and Stalin, whom he named ‘the Great’.

“In the year 1948, at the request of the authorities, he attended, in the name of the Serbian Orthodox Church, the false council hosted by the MP in Moscow, even though before that he had for a long time tried not to do so. Still, he did not fulfil many requests of the MP and the communists by which they tried to subordinate the Serbian Church to the MP.

“When Patriarch Gabriel came back to Serbia in 1946, Metropolitan Joseph naturally became his closest associate in ruling the Serbian Orthodox Church. Regardless of the fact that he still openly criticised the communist authorities, he participated, together with Patriarch Gabriel, in all public events and in the MP council of 1948.

“After the repose of Patriarch Gabriel [in 1950], it was clear to all the faithful that the only natural heir should be Metropolitan Joseph. But of course, the godless authorities who were fighting with the Church all the time would not allow Metropolitan Joseph to be elected as Serbian patriarch. Before the election of the patriarch... the UDBA [Yugoslav secret police] arrested Metropolitan Joseph in Belgrade, beat him up, and forced him into a monastery in Bosnia, where they imprisoned him in order to stop his influence on the hierarchs. He was arrested several times, and was banned from living in Belgrade, so he found shelter sometimes in the monastery of Žiča, and sometimes in Ljubostinja. Each time he was arrested and banned from Belgrade, he was heavily beaten. In 1953 he was already very ill, so he was allowed to go back to Belgrade, to the monastery of the Entrance of the Mother of God into the Temple, but without the freedom to go anywhere else. As a political prisoner, abandoned by his brother hierarchs, he reposed there on July 3, 1957.”¹⁰³

7. AMERICA, JAPAN AND CHINA

Perhaps Truman’s greatest achievement in his overall strategy of “saving the world for democracy” was democratizing Japan – even if he despised the Allied occupying forces’ Supreme Commander (or “Supreme Being”, as the Japanese jokingly called him\textsuperscript{104}), the vain and authoritarian General MacArthur. The manner in which he did it, however, was a portent of problems to come.

“For more than six years”, as John Darwin writes, “his approval was needed for any major decision. Japan’s sovereignty was suspended; Japanese were forbidden to travel abroad; no criticism was allowed of the occupation regime. A raft of reforms was designed to root out what were seen as the sources of Japan’s militaristic imperialism. Women were enfranchised and the voting age was lowered, more than doubling the electorate. A new constitution prescribed by the occupiers barred the armed forces from a seat in the government and renounced war as an instrument of national policy. The great family-rulled business combines or zaibatsu were broken up. Land reform reduced the power of the landlords and doubled the proportion of those who farmed their own land to some 60 per cent. Trade unions were encouraged. New textbooks were written, and the educational syllabus was democratized. So fierce an assault upon the pre-war order might have provoked a hostile reaction, since the civilian elite with whom the Americans dealt remained deeply conservative. In fact it formed part of a remarkable bargain. When their fears about China led them to ‘reverse course’, the Americans accepted the need for a strong Japanese state with an industrial economy. They made their peace with the powerful bureaucracy. They had the tacit support of the Japanese emperor, whose role as a figurehead had been carefully preserved.”\textsuperscript{105}

In fact, the Emperor Hirohito, still the nominal leader of the defeated Japanese, was granted immunity from having to stand trial for war crimes (of which he was undoubtedly guilty) in exchange for declaring that he was not a god, but human after all.\textsuperscript{106} His support was important in the eventual acceptance of the constitution – one composed not by any Japanese or group of Japanese, but exclusively by MacArthur’s men. As Sebestyen writes, “MacArthur had ordered the Japanese to come up with a new ‘modern, democratic framework guaranteeing freedom for all’. As the US Constitution was so central to the American way of life, he told the Japanese to prepare a comparable document. Many weeks later, the deeply conservative ministers and courtiers of the Royal Household produced a draft in which the Emperor

\textsuperscript{104} Truman later fired him for disrespect, calling him “a dumb son of a bitch”.


\textsuperscript{106} “The Japanese archives show that Emperor Hirohito was not the pawn of the militarists but enthusiastically supported and directed them. Hirohito must share some of the responsibility shouldered by [Prime Minister] Tojo for Japan’s war crimes.” (Simon Sebag Montefiore, Titans of History, London: Quercus, 2012, p. 493).
was ‘supreme’ and sovereign, offered no votes for women and no universal suffrage, and kept power in the hands of the nobility. MacArthur rejected it, along with a not-so-veiled threat in saying that there were Allied nations, and many people in Washington, who wanted to remove the Emperor and put him on trial. He himself, he said, ‘was not omnipotent’ – a rare admission for MacArthur – and if the Japanese politicians were not ‘more cooperative’, the other Allies might get their way, even against SCAP [Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers]’s wishes. They had ten days to make up their minds or he would produce a ‘radical’ new constitution. At the same time he ordered his second-in-command, General Courtney Whitney, to prepare a team of Americans to write a new document under which the Emperor would become a constitutional monarch, and American-style individual freedoms would be enshrined in law.

“The Japanese Government thought MacArthur was bluffing. At 10 a.m. on the day of the deadline, 13 February, accompanied by his senior officers, General Whitney went to the home of the Foreign Minister, Shigeru Yoshida, who was waiting with his own aides and the man who had written the preferred Japanese version of the constitution, the Professor of Jurisprudence, Juji Matsumoto. According to Whitney’s own vivid account, the Japanese delegation began to explain why they wouldn’t change their draft. Whitney interrupted, pushed aside the Matsumoto document, and said: ‘The draft… you submitted to us the other day is wholly unacceptable to the Supreme Commander as a document of freedom and democracy.’ He drew out fifteen copies of the American draft and left them on the table. Then at ten past ten he left the room and walked ‘into the sunshine of the garden… fortuitously, just at that moment an American plane passed overhead.’ Fifteen minutes later, Jiro Shirasu, one of the Professor’s aides, went outside to ask Whitney a question. The Colonel [sic] observed that ‘we are here enjoying the warmth of atomic energy’. It was a deliberately unsubtle comment and resulted in ‘an important psychological shift’.

“At 11 a.m. Whitney went back inside the house and told the Japanese clearly what would happen next if they did not immediately accept SCAP’s terms. The position of the Emperor ‘would be reviewed’ and the Americans would put their draft constitution to a referendum. As MacArthur was at that time far more popular in Japan than the governing class that had taken the people into a disastrous war – the very people in the room – the people were bound to vote yes. It was a brutal tactic but it worked. The Japanese delegation accepted, but not before asking ‘if they were about to be taken outside and shot’…”

Norman Stone writes: “Initially American policy in Japan was muddled and naively punitive. Japan sank into a morass of epidemic, starvation, black marketeering and crime that was worse than Germany’s: inflation reached 700 per cent in so far as there were goods with prices to be inflated. Then, in

\[107\] Sebestyen, op. cit., pp. 355-356.
1948, the American learning curve made its usual advance: Japan would have to be run not according to American New Deal principles, but according to her own patterns. Besides, there was a serious enough Communist presence in Japan, and by 1948 there was an even more serious Communist presence just over the water, in China. An equivalent of Konrad Adenauer, Yoshida Shiegeru, emerged in politics, with a clean record, and the Americans cooperated. In December 1948 Dean Acheson, Marshall’s successor, saw that Japan would have to be the American industrial ‘powerhouse’, now that China was falling to the Communists, and he sent a banker, Joseph Dodge, to produce a (rough) equivalent of Ludwig Erhard’s plans for West Germany: currency stabilization, resistance to union wage demands, trade credits and a very low exchange rate for the yen against the dollar. The Korean War, breaking out a few months later, created a demand for Japanese goods and services, and injected $5,500 million into the economy. As with Germany, the new programme went together with relaxation of war criminals’ imprisonment; some were quietly rehabilitated and restored to the bureaucracy, and one (Shegemi-tsu Mamoru) even became foreign minister. All of this needed a regularization of Japan’s international position, i.e. a peace treaty, and discussion of this was in the air in 1950 (although formal negotiation only started in 1951, ending that same year with a San Francisco Treaty that not only gave the Americans several bases, but also foreshadowed Japanese rearmament).”\(^{108}\)

And so, after six-and-a-half years the American occupying forces left Japan, leaving it as a stable and prosperous democracy, apparently cured of its fascist-totalitarian tendencies. This was undoubtedly the greatest achievement of the Pax Americana. At the same time, the Japanese had undoubtedly been “forced to be free”, to use Rousseau’s phrase, which was contrary to the principle of the Atlantic Charter agreed by Roosevelt and Churchill that all the peoples of the world should be free to choose their form of government. It would not be the first time that American power would enforce freedom on largely unwilling peoples around the globe...

Clearly, if the choice was between being forced to be free by the Americans and being forced to be slaves by the Soviets, then the Japanese made the right choice in deciding to surrender to the American Navy rather than to the Red Army... But the contradiction with liberal theory was evident. And this contradiction between ends and means, liberal theory and liberal practice has continued to haunt the West to the present day.

*

And yet, on the other side of the Sea of Japan, in China, there took place arguably its greatest failure. “On the day after Japan’s surrender,” writes Martin Gilbert, “from his base in Yenan, Mao Tse-tung had ordered his troops to advance ‘on all fronts’ and to disarm all Japanese troops they encountered.

---

He was determined not only to establish a Chinese Communist presence in Manchuria, but to extend Communist authority as widely as possible beyond the areas of China already under Communist control. So successful was he in overrunning large areas of northern China that the Nationalist troops [of Chiang Kai-Shek] could only be moved by air between the cities they controlled. At the end of August, Mao Tse-tung went to Chungking to negotiate with the Nationalists. But although some form of negotiations continued for a year and a half, it soon became clear that there would no outcome, no solution, and no prospect but that of civil war…”

Norman Stone writes: “As soon as Mao was back in Yenan in October 1945 he started operations in Manchuria. At the turn of 1945-6 matters did not go well for the Communists – Chiang Kai-Shek’s troops had had experience of fighting the Japanese and once they came north gave a good account of themselves, thousands of Communist troops deserting. The Soviets left Manchuria in early May 1946, and Mao made an initial error of trying to hold the cities, whereas his real strength lay with the peasants. The Nationalists did well, chasing the Communists to the north; at one stage Mao even planned to give up Harbin and retreat into Siberia. But in Jonathan Spence’s account the rush into Manchuria was a mistake; Chiang should have concentrated on building up China south of the Great Wall, not on a complicated adventure into territory where the Communists had ready Soviet support. However, Chiang was desperately anxious for victory, and at the same time unwilling to use his tanks and heavy weaponry; he neglected the countryside and mismanaged Manchuria when he ran it in 1946-7. Kuomintang finances went into an inflationary spiral, and even the Shanghai business people were alienated, while troops deserted for want of proper pay.

“The Communists were in effect also saved by the Americans. President Truman did not want a fight over China, would grant dollars, would help with shipping, but believed he could insist on the Chinese co-operating. He sent George C. Marshall in December 1945 – a hugely respected man, who had some knowledge of the country from service there in the twenties. He took against Chiang Kai-shek because of his relatives’ corruption and his own dissolute doings (although Chiang had become a Methodist and a reformed character), and a subsequent American envoy, though more sympathetic, was a buffoon. To the American professionals, Mao and Chou had little difficulty in portraying themselves as efficient popular-front democrats, and Marshall himself was impressed when he saw them at work in Yenan, in March 1946. In any case, at this moment the Americans had enough on their plate. Europe was by far the largest problem, but in Asia they faced one conundrum after another: what were they to do with Japan; the Philippines had to be sorted out; Korea was a muddle; the British, still influential, feared what a Nationalist government might do in Hong Kong. The last thing the Americans wanted to see was a Chinese civil war, and for a time Marshall accepted what Mao told him. He stopped the Nationalists at a decisive
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moment. Chiang might have destroyed the Communists in Manchuria but on 31 May Marshall told him not to go on: Chiang Kai-shek was getting American aid - $3bn in all - and he was in no position to defy Marshall. Truman wrote to Chiang, admonishingly, and under American pressure the Nationalists set up an assembly that wasted time and attracted endless criticism for sharp practice: the Americans making exactly the same mistake as they were to make in Vietnam twenty years later, of assuming that democracy Western-style needed to be introduced at once. A truce was proclaimed, just as Mao prepared to abandon Harbin and the railway link to Siberia.

“The upshot was that the Communists were left in control of Manchuria, an area twice the size of Germany, and they used these four months to consolidate their hold over it, using Japanese weaponry supplied by the Russians (as well as Japanese prisoners of war who even served as flight instructors). They took over 900 aircraft, 700 tanks, 1,700 guns and much else, together with 200,000 regular soldiers, and North Korea, which the Russians had occupied, was also a useful asset for Mao. In June 1946, when matters were going badly, he was able to send his wounded and his reserve materiel there, and when the Nationalists split Manchuria in two, North Korea was the link between the Communists in the north and the south, who would otherwise have been divided. The other decisive Soviet contribution was the remaking of the railway, which was linked up with Russia again in spring 1947…. Soviet help was decisive, though it came at a grotesque price: the export of food from a starving country.

“When Marshall imposed his ceasefire in June 1946 the Nationalists were greatly superior, with over 4 million troops to Mao’s 1.25 million; and they expelled the Communists from most of their strongholds in China proper, with Nanking again the capital. In October 1946 Chiang Kai-shek did attack Manchuria but by then the Red bases had become too strong and Mao’s chief general, Lin Biao, proved to have much military talent (it was the harshest winter in living memory, and his troops were made to carry out ambushes in fearful cold, at -40 degrees: they lost 100,000 men from frostbite). In January 1947 Marshall left China and it was the end of American efforts at mediation.”

It was also the end of Chiang’s push for victory; after this, his troops collapsed remarkably quickly, and in October, 1949 the whole of China except Taiwan came under the rule of Mao’s Communists.

On January 7, 1947, General Marshall’s report on his year-long mission to China was published. He had tried, but failed, to force the Communists under Mao into coalition with the Nationalists under Chiang. The reason, he said, was the distrust between the two sides, and in particular the Nationalists’ belief that “co-operation by the Communist Party in the Government was

---
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inconceivable, and that only a policy of force could definitely settle the issue”. 111 Of course, Communist propaganda also played its part in the Americans’ decision to stop aid to Chiang. Mao successfully deceived the American public through gullible and deceitful journalists that he was more a social-democrat or Robin Hood character than a real Communist. Another important factor was the corruption of the Nationalist government…

These considerations help us to understand the Americans’ decision. Nevertheless, in view of what happened only a few years later – the Communist conquest of the whole of China – it must be considered a tragic mistake. A decisive intervention with “boots on the ground” on the Nationalists’ side in 1946 might well have destroyed Mao’s Communists once and for all.

And how much blood and suffering that would have prevented! Already in the first two years of Communist rule, according to Kenneth Scott Latourette, between 3 and 5 million people were executed. “Most of this was by shootings in large groups which the public were encouraged or required to attend. In despair untold thousands had committed suicide. Many suffered from mental breakdown. Class consciousness was created and nurtured and with it class hatred. Mass hysteria was fomented. A strict censorship of the printed page and the radio was enforced.” 112

However, intervention would have been very difficult. The Americans were already overstretched in Asia, and still had many divisions tied down in Europe. Moreover, the Soviets supported Mao, and were supplying him with weapons captured from the Japanese in Manchuria. True, Stalin still officially recognized Chiang - the Soviet ambassador was the only representative of the major powers to see him off from Canton into exile in Taiwan. But it is unlikely that Stalin would have allowed Mao to be defeated completely: his strategy was to keep the Chinese communists dependent on him for their survival, while weakening the Americans in a long and fruitless war in China similar to what they were later mired in Vietnam.

The mention of Vietnam, where a nationalist form of communism eventually triumphed over capitalism, leads us to perhaps the most important reason why China eventually fell to the communists. Already before the end of the Second World War, it was becoming clear that a powerful reaction against the old colonial powers – Britain, France and Holland – was setting in. Their victory in 1945 temporarily stabilized their power, but not for long. India was liberated from the British in 1947, and Indochina and Indonesia from the French and Dutch respectively – but not before bitter nationalist wars. This nationalist wave was no less powerful in China, which had been humiliating and exploited by the western colonial powers since the early nineteenth century, leading to the fall of the Chinese Empire in 1911. But the
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Kuomintang regime of the inter-war years, though officially “nationalist”, was still closely linked with the West and infected with the western diseases. For those Chinese who sought a real purging of western influence and interference, Communism was a more attractive alternative. The irony is, of course, that Communism was a western doctrine whose champions, the Russians, had been one of China’s colonial predators in Tsarist times. Nevertheless, Chinese anti-colonialism was more sincere than that of the Americans, who tried to push the British and the French to give up their colonies but whose ideological and cultural kinship with them was obvious.
8. MAOIST COMMUNISM

Mao cunningly managed to combine loyalty to communist ideology with a nationalist emphasis on the superiority of the Middle Kingdom and a firm rejection of all Western concepts of international order. Thus when establishing the People’s Republic of China on October 1, 1949, he declared: “The Chinese people have stood up”... As Kissinger writes, “Mao elaborated this slogan as a China purifying and strengthening itself through a doctrine of ‘continuous revolution’ and proceeded to dismantle established concepts of domestic and international order. The entire institutional spectrum came under attack: Western democracy, Soviet leadership of the Communist world, and the legacy of the Chinese past. Art and monuments, holidays and traditions, vocabulary and dress, fell under various forms of interdict – blamed for bringing about the passivity that had rendered China unprepared in the face of foreign intrusions. In Mao’s concept of order – which he called the ‘great harmony’, echoing classical Chinese philosophy – a new China would emerge out of the destruction of traditional Confucian culture emphasizing harmony. Each wave of revolutionary exertion, he proclaimed, would serve as a precursor of the next. The process of revolution must be ever accelerated, Mao held, lest the revolutionaries become complacent and indolent. ‘Disequilibrium is a general, objective rule,’ wrote Mao: ‘The cycle, which is endless, evolves from disequilibrium to equilibrium and then to disequilibrium again. Each cycle, however, brings us to a higher level of development. Disequilibrium is normal and absolute whereas equilibrium is temporary and relative. In the end, this upheaval was designed to produce a kind of traditional Chinese outcome: a form of Communism intrinsic to China, setting itself apart by a distinctive form of conduct that swayed by its achievements, with China’s unique and now revolutionary moral authority again swaying ‘All Under Heaven’.

“Mao conducted international affairs by the same reliance on the unique nature of China. Though China was objectively weak by the way the rest of the world measured strength, Mao insisted on its central role via psychological and ideological superiority, to be demonstrated by defying rather than conciliating a world emphasizing superior physical power. When speaking in Moscow to an international conference of Communist Party leaders in 1957, Mao shocked fellow delegates by predicting that in the event of nuclear war China’s more numerous population and hardier culture would be the ultimate victor, and that even casualties of hundreds of millions would not deflect China from its revolutionary course. While this might have been partly bluff to discourage countries with vastly superior nuclear arsenals, Mao wanted the world to believe that he contemplated nuclear war with equanimity…”113

Since Mao, writes Maria Hsia Chang, “was essentially ignorant of the doctrines of Marx and Engels, whatever knowledge of Marxism he had was
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that given currency by Lenin and Stalin. From Lenin he inherited a perspective of Marxist class struggle generalized to include entire countries. The world was divided into two adversarial camps: On one side were the ‘progressive’ socialist states led by the Soviet Union; on the other were the ‘decadent’ capitalist-imperialist countries with the United States at the fore. In the global struggle that was to culminate in the inevitable collapse of capitalism, China must ‘lean to one side’ by joining the socialist camp with the Soviet Union as its mentor. From Stalin, Mao adopted the model of the command economy. The state would determine production, control costs, fix wages, and set prices; capital assets would be autarkically generated through forced savings by the Chinese people. The preponderance of those assets would be funneled into heavy industrial development rather than agriculture or consumer industries.

“To these ideas of Lenin and Stalin Mao appended his own notions concerning the persistence of the class struggle and the imperative for a ‘continuous revolution’ in which all must participate. Both turned on his inversion of Marx’s conceptualization of the relationship between the base and the superstructure.

“Instead of the classic Marxist dictum that the economic base determines the superstructure, Mao was convinced that superstructural elements of willpower and mass enthusiasm would transform the Chinese economy. Detached from the base, the elements of the superstructure became infinitely malleable, so that ‘class’ became redefined by Mao as a state of mind – a decided departure from its original Marxian meaning. An individual could become a ‘capitalist’ simply because s/he entertained ‘capitalist’ thoughts (whatever that meant), despite neither owning the means of production nor exploiting the labor of others. Given his new definition of class and class membership, Mao could argue that the installation of a socialist state in China with the attendant abolition of private property had failed to eliminate all noxious class elements. On the contrary, so long as capitalism remained in the world, its pernicious influence could seep into socialist China to contaminate the masses, resulting in ‘antagonistic contradictions’ between the unpolluted ‘people’ and the infected ‘enemies of the people’. Toward those enemies, the ranks of whom could include even leading members of the vanguard Communist Party, the state could employ ‘dictatorial’ means for their eradication. Society and the state therefore must be constantly vigilant since corruption of the self and of others was a perpetual possibility. There would have to be regular and periodic campaigns to purify and instruct the masses. All of which meant that the revolution brought the CCP to power in 1949 would have to be continuous and unceasing.

“Indeed, for as long as Mao was in power, China would lurch from one political campaign to another., In the 1950s there were the Land Reform, Three- and Five-Anti, Hundred Flowers, Anti-Rightist, and the Great Leap Forward campaigns. The 1960s were caught in the convulsion of the Cultural Revolution, followed in the 1970s by a bewildering succession of
campaigns that included the Anti-Confucian and Water Margin campaigns. Punctuating all these were the periodic ‘rectification’ (zhengfeng) campaigns within the Communist Party to purge itself of impure elements.

“The first years of the People’s Republic began with the ‘socialist transformation’ of the Chinese economy, in which feudal remnants and rudimentary capitalism were eradicated to make way for socialism. In 1950-52, land was confiscated from its owners and distributed to the heretofore landless peasants, in the course of which 1 to 15 million landlords were executed. In the cities, a process of deprivatization and demarketization began, aided by Soviet technicians and planners. Around a core of 130 industrial plants supplied by the Soviet Union, a Stalinist economy was constructed. The state rationed raw materials, maintained a monopoly of traded items, supplied producer goods, and established output quotas. By 1956, all of China’s industries had come under state control, accounting for 93 percent of total national output and 97 of all retail sales.

“The early years of socialist transformation coincided with China’s involvement in the Korean War. Convinced that their national sovereignty and security were imperiled by the activities of the United Nations forces in the Korean peninsula, millions of Chinese ‘volunteers’ went into battle to aid the North Koreans. The ill-equipped Chinese divisions were thrown into a mismatched conflict that exacted a devastating toll. By the time the war ended with an armistice in 1953, China had sustained about a million battlefield casualties.”

---

World War Two did not end on VE day, nor even on VJ day. Violence continued in a different form - but with undiminished intensity - for years. The roots of the violence lay in the fact that there was not, and could not be, any return to the status quo ante the war, especially for the colonial powers: the nationalist forces determined to throw them out were simply too strong.

“In south-east Asia and Indonesia,” writes J.M. Roberts, “the Second World War was decisive as elsewhere in ending colonial rule, though the pace was faster in Dutch and French colonies than British. The grant of representative institutions by the Dutch in Indonesia before 1939 had not checked the growth of a nationalist party, and a flourishing communist movement had appeared by then, too. Some nationalist leaders, among them one Achmed Sukarno, collaborated with the Japanese when they occupied the islands in 1942. They were in a favourable position to seize power when the Japanese surrendered, and did so by proclaiming an independent Indonesian republic before the Dutch could return. Fighting and negotiation followed for nearly two years until agreement was reached for an Indonesian republic still under the Dutch Crown; this did not work. Fighting went on again, the Dutch pressing forward vainly with their ‘police operations’ in one of the first campaigns by a former colonial power to attract the full blast of communist and anti-colonial stricture at the United Nations. Both India and Australia (which had concluded that she would be wise to conciliate the independent Indonesia which must eventually emerge) took the matter to the Security Council. Finally the Dutch gave in. The story begun by the East India Company of Amsterdam three and a half centuries before thus came to an end in 1949 with the creation of the United States of Indonesia, a mixture of more than a hundred million people scattered over hundreds of islands, of scores of races and religions. A vague union with the Netherlands under the Dutch Crown survived, but was dissolved five years later.

“For a time the French in Indo-China seemed to be holding on better than the Dutch. That area’s wartime history had been somewhat different from that of Malaysia or Indonesia because although the Japanese had exercised complete military control there since 1941 French sovereignty was not formally displaced until early 1945. The Japanese had amalgamated Annam, Cochin-China and Tongking to form a new state of Vietnam under the Emperor of Annam and as soon as the Japanese surrendered, the chief of the local communist party, the Viet Minh, installed himself in the government place at Hanoi and proclaimed the Vietnam republic. This was Ho Chi Minh, a man with long experience in the communist party and also in Europe [he was one of the founders of the French Communist Party]. The revolutionary movement quickly spread. It was soon evident that if the French wished to re-establish themselves it would not be easy. A large expeditionary force was sent to Indo-China and a concession was made in that the French recognized the republic of Vietnam as an autonomous state within the French Union. But
now there arose the question of giving Cochin-China separate status and on this all attempts to agree broke down. Meanwhile, French soldiers were sniped at and their envoys were attacked. At the end of 1946 there was an attack on residents in Hanoi and many deaths. Hanoi was relieved by French troops and Ho Chi Minh fled.

“Thus began a war in which the communists were to struggle essentially for the nationalist aim of a united country, while the French tried to retain a diminished Vietnam which, with the other Indo-Chinese states, would remain under the French Union. By 1949 they had come round to including Cochin-China in Vietnam and recognizing Cambodia and Laos as ‘associate states’. But new outsiders were now becoming interested. The government of Ho Chi Minh was recognized in Moscow and Peking…”

The process of decolonization, which began with India and Burma in 1947-48, would radically transform what came to be known as the “Third World” – that is, the whole world outside the American-European-Japanese (First World) and Soviet-Chinese (Second World) blocs. If the nineteenth century had seen the conquest of most of the undeveloped world by the European empires, the mid- and late-twentieth century saw it regain its independence – although its internal state boundaries remained largely those drawn for them by the European powers, and the influence of European culture and European economic domination became more, rather than less pervasive. This decolonization process must be seen as in the main a major moral good insofar as the colonies were in effect stolen land now being restored to their rightful native owners. And however painful it was for the former colonial masters, it was good for them too, both economically, in that, having been freed from the “white man’s burden”, they were, paradoxically, able to develop economically at a greatly quickened pace, and also culturally and spiritually, in that the arrogant racist and exploitative attitudes of the past were now recognized for what they were and, however partially and imperfectly, repented of.

However, there was also a very important negative consequence that is less often remarked upon: the missionary aims of the colonialists, which had been prominently touted as a justification of imperialism from the conquest of the Americas by the Spanish conquistadors until at least the Indian Mutiny of 1857, were now dropped. This is not to say that Christian mission ceased altogether. But it was not actively supported either by national governments or by international organizations such as Unesco, which, far from believing that the gods of the heathen were demons, were more inclined to protect their worship as a precious part of the cultural inheritance of the nations, whose enlightenment was now seen as coming through the provision of democracy and free trade, clean water, vaccines and contraceptives, rather than the Gospel of Jesus Christ…

---

As John Darwin writes, “the end of British rule in India in 1947 and the withdrawal two years later of Europe’s navies from China marked the end of the ‘Vasco da Gama’ epoch in Asian history. The age of European dominance was over. This was the verdict of an Indian historian a few years later…”

Although the prestige of the British Empire had been severely damaged by the surrender of Singapore to the Japanese in 1942, the British probably managed the process of decolonization better than anyone else. There were fewer wars than might have been expected – the main exceptions were those against Communist insurgents in Malaysia, and against the Mau-Mau in Kenya. In India, as in China, Indo-China and Indonesia, anti-colonialism and nationalism were powerful motives. During the war Indian troops had fought well – and in considerable numbers - under their British colonial masters. But there had also been serious rebellions in India in favour of the Japanese in the hope that they would drive out the British. This fact, combined with financial and military considerations, convinced the British that it was time to leave – and quickly. And so on August 15, 1947 the largest democracy in history came into being, while two large Muslim chunks of the British dominion became another new independent state - Pakistan. But in spite of partition there was bloodshed between Hindus and Muslims on a large scale.

“Churchill had warned of this in the 1930s and wanted Britain to retain sufficient powers to be able to influence moderation, and protect those who were the victims of the conflict. The Partition Council had worked to devise a geographic line that could be accepted by both Hindus and Muslims. In the weeks before independence, as it became clear that the Sikhs of Amritsar – their Holy City – would be coming under either Hindu or Muslim rule, there were violent clashes…

“The award of the Partition Council was announced two days after independence. With regard to the disputed cities on the margin of the Hindu-Muslim partition lines, India would receive Calcutta and Amritsar, and Pakistan would receive Lahore, as well as most of the area between the River Sutlej and the River Chenab. The two-day-old Government of Pakistan at once protested at what it claimed was the ‘injustice’ of the awards, under which, from the perspective of Pakistan, too large an area of the Punjab had been handed to India. The Sikhs, who remembered that they had been the rulers of the Punjab when the British took over, felt cheated of their own religious and national control.
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117 On September 1, 1945, Prime Minister Clement Attlee said: “Quite apart from the advent of the atomic bomb… the British Commonwealth and Empire is not a unit that can be defended by itself. It was the creation of sea power. With the advent of air warfare the conditions which made it possible to defend a string of possessions scattered over five continents by means of a Fleet based on island fortresses have gone” (in M.J. Cohen and John Major, History in Quotations, London: Cassell, 2004, p. 861).
“The communal violence which had begun in the weeks before independence, escalated. When Calcutta descended into bloodshed, Gandhi – who held no official position in the new Government of India – announced that he would fast ‘to the death’ unless the killings ceased. After three days the violence subsided. But in the Punjab it not only spread, but created a massive exodus of Hindus and Muslims moving in opposite directions, driven by fear. More than seven million people were on the move. Repeated butchery took place as they fled. At least a quarter of a million people were killed…”

Nor was this the end of sectarian violence. In 1971, Pakistan’s military government under General Agha Muhammad Yahya Khan banned the Awami League, a Bengali Hindu nationalist party and oversaw a military crackdown, as Harold H. Saunders writes, “that involved the systematic massacre of some 200,000 defenseless citizens and sent more than six million Bengalis fleeing across the Indian border. Later in the year, India reacted by invading East Pakistan, winning a 13-day war that made East Pakistan’s earlier declaration of independence as Bangladesh a reality.”

The three main political leaders in the Partition drama – the secular Nehru, the Muslim Jinnah and the Hindu apostle of non-violence Gandhi – had all, as Kissinger points out, “studied in British schools (including at the London School of Economics, where India’s future leaders absorbed many of their quasi-socialist ideas)”, and knew well the liberal values of the Empire they jointly overthrew. But their joint failure to obtain a peaceful transfer of power, or to preserve British India as a single state, demonstrated the limitations of those liberal values when religious faith or national sovereignty are felt to be at stake. Hence the determination of the rulers of the age in both East and West to wipe out both religious faith and national sovereignty…

Nevertheless, after Partition India emerged as a predominantly Hindu state with a stable democratic constitution. According to Kissinger, Nehru’s policy of nonalignment as between the Capitalist and Communist blocs “was different from the policy undertaken by a ‘balancer’ in a balance-of-power system. India was not prepared to move toward the weaker side – as a balancer would. It was not interested in operating an international system. Its overriding impulse was not to be found formally in either camp, and it measured its success by not being drawn into conflicts that did not affect its national interests.

---
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“Emerging into a world of established powers and the Cold War, independent India subtly elevated freedom of maneuver from a bargaining tactic into an ethical principle. Blending righteous moralism with a shrewd assessment of the balance of forces and the major powers’ psychologies, Nehru announced India to be a global power that would chart a course maneuvering between the major blocs. In 1947, he stated in a message to the New Republic, ‘We propose to avoid entanglement in any blocs or groups of Powers realizing that only thus can we serve not only [the] cause of India but of world peace. This policy sometimes leads partisans of one group to imagine that we are supporting the other group. Every nation places its own interests first in developing foreign policy. Fortunately, India’s interests coincide with peaceful foreign policy and co-operation with all progressive nations. Inevitably India will be drawn closer to those countries which are friendly and cooperative to her.

“In other words, India was neutral and above power politics, partly as a matter of principle in the interest of world peace, but equally on the grounds of national interest…””\(^{121}\)

In time, however, India’s neutrality became less neutral. This was already evident in the “Asian-African” conference held at Bandung in Indonesia in May 1955. As Darwin writes, “The host was Sukarno, the Indonesian president and hero of the anti-colonial revolution. Delegates came from more than twenty-five countries, including the Gold Coast and Cyprus, then both still colonies. Egypt was represented by Gamal Abdel Nasser. The presence of Nehru and of Chou En-lai, the prime ministers of India and China, lent an added authority to the conference proceedings. The meeting had no formal agenda, but its implicit purpose was to assert the claims of the non-Western world in international politics. Conference resolutions called for more Afro-Asian members in the United National Security Council, denounced all forms of race discrimination, and declared colonialism an evil ‘which should speedily be brought to an end’. In a notably conciliatory speech, Chou En-lai insisted that China had no expansionist aims [which was soon shown to be mendacious by China’s invasion of Tibet] and was ready to negotiate with the United States. Nehru denounced entry into an alliance with the West as ‘an intolerable humiliation for an Afro-Asian country’, and NATO as ‘one of the most powerful protectors of colonialism’. Africa and Asia should remain neutral in the conflict of East and West: ‘why should we dragged into their quarrels and wars?’

“Behind the speeches of Nehru and Chou En-lai was a vision of an Asia and Africa in which outside influence would exist only on sufferance. It was a heroic conception of decolonialization that rejected any vestige of post-imperial attachment. The Asian states would take up the struggle to free the remaining colonized peoples…”\(^{122}\)
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Revel somewhat implausibly dates India’s transition from nonaligned to later: “Between the first conference of nonaligneds in Belgrade in 1961, when the genuinely nonaligned position of Nehru prevailed, and their sixth conference in Havana in 1979, the adjective ‘nonaligned’ had plenty of time to degenerate into a lie. Just as the choice of Havana as the 1979 conference site and the election of Fidel Castro, Moscow’s number-one field executive, as the movement’s chairman showed how distorted the ideal of nonalignment had become. At that sixth conference, Marshal Tito, a few months before his death, fought his last battle to block the Sovietization of the movement of which he and Nehru had been the founding fathers. It was a lost fight; with the collapse of the last independent hold-outs, the nonaligned lined up behind the Soviet Union…”

* 

This brings us to the important point that at this time there were two quite distinct kinds of imperialism or colonialism – Western and Soviet. As Revel wrote in 1983, “Since 1945 the two imperialisms have moved in exactly the opposite directions. Since the Second World War, the major ex-colonial powers that make up today’s capitalist world have abandoned, willingly or not, the territory they had annexed over the centuries. Spain long ago lost its vast American possessions. Since then, the former overseas holdings of Britain, Holland, France, Belgium and Portugal have become a crowd of independent nations. In some cases, decolonization went ahead with speed and intelligence, in others slowly and stupidly, with terrible carnage, but in the end it was done everywhere. It is interesting to note that the colonial powers that tried to resist the trend were disapproved of by the other capitalist countries; they were isolated even among their allies and forced to give in. Just how much real independence many of these new Third World states have is a matter of considerable debate. The fact remains, however, that aspiration and accession to independence on the part of any group with even the slightest claim to statehood is one of the great postwar historical phenomena.

“At a time, then, when territorial annexation, once considered a legitimate reward for military superiority, has given way to peoples’ right to self-determination and national status, only the Soviet Union continues to grow by means of armed conquest. In the 1940-80 period of decolonization, when the old empires were restoring independence to or conferring it on the territories they had subjugated over the centuries, the Soviet Union was moving the other way, appropriating a number of foreign countries by trick or by force.

“I would hesitate to weary the reader with a list he should be able to find in the encyclopedias and history books if it were not that most of these

---
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reference books, reflecting Europe’s cultural Finlandization, shamelessly gloss over the brilliant achievements of Soviet expansionism.

“By what right, for example, did the USSR cling after the war to the countries Germany ceded to it as payment for its neutrality under the Hitler-Stalin treaty sharing out a dismembered Europe? This is how the Soviets acquired the Baltic states, eastern Poland, southern Finland and part of Romania (Bessarabia and southern Bukovina). I grant that it was Germany that later broke the treaty and invaded the Soviet Union, which, it is worth recalling, would have liked nothing better than to go on enjoying its fruitful cooperation with the Nazis. Involuntarily and oh how regrettably, Moscow had no choice but to switch camps. Indeed, it was switched by Hitler.

“Was this any reason for the democracies not to reconsider what Hitler had bestowed on Stalin? Fighting alongside the Allies in the second phase of the war of course gave USSR the right, as it did to all the victors, to recover its own territory intact. But this did not authorize it to expand, as it alone did, at the expense of other martyred countries and certainly not to keep the proceeds of its collusion with the Nazis. Yet not only did the Allies fail to challenge these ill-gotten acquisitions, but they even threw in a few gifts, such as East Prussia, Ruthenia (a part of Czechoslovakia), the Kurile Islands, and the southern part of Sakhalin Island (in the Sea of Okhotsk, north of Japan). No popular vote, no referendum or plebiscite was organized or even contemplated through which to ask all these Poles, Lithuanians, Estonians, Letts, Romanians, Slovaks, Germans and others if they wanted to become Soviet subjects. The Allies shut their eyes firmly to these annexations, a disconcerting application of the principles guiding their destruction of naziism. Absorption of these countries into Soviet territory, so prodigiously contrary to the principles of that period of decolonization, revived the practices of a monarchist Europe that died two centuries ago. It constituted what may be called the first wave of imperialism and the first zone of national annexation.

“The second wave led to the creation of a second imperial zone, that of the satellite countries.

“Just how Eastern and Central Europe were subjugated is too well known to need repeating here. The technique used in this form of colonialism is to set up the façade of an ostensibly independent state. Administration of this state is entrusted to loyal nationals who function as provincial governors and who are allowed only a few minor departures from the Soviet system, as long as they don’t tamper with its essentials. In practice, the democracies very quickly recognized the Soviet Union’s right to quell by force any disturbances arising out of demands for genuine independence in the European satellites. In other words, they soon agreed to view the European satellites as appendices to Soviet territory, a de facto situation that the Helsinki pact would legitimize in 1975.
“The third wave and third zone of Soviet territorial conquest covered more distant countries that have been annexed or subjected to Soviet control since 1960. Some of these countries, including Cuba and Vietnam, are satellites in the strict sense; another, South Yemen, has been working since 1982 to destabilize the neighboring state of North Yemen. For, driving by unflagging effort, the Soviet advance never stops.

“Then came the African satellites: Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Benin, Guinea, and other, lesser prey, often colonized by mercenaries from other satellites – Cubans or East Germans. These are more fragile protectorates, subject to the sort of accidents that caused the fall in Equatorial Guinea (the former Spanish Guinea) of dictator Francisco Macias Nguema, who, with the help of Soviet advisers, had exterminated or exiled a good third of his country’s population in only a few years.

“Fragile though they are, these distant protectorates must nevertheless be considered satellites insofar as their policies, armies, police, transport, and diplomacy are in the hands of Soviets or Soviet agents…”

* *

What was America’s attitude to colonialism? Undoubtedly sharply negative at first, as Churchill experienced to his chagrin in his conversations with Roosevelt. This was most clearly seen in Indonesia, where the Dutch colonialists “hoped to exploit the fact that nationalism enjoyed only limited backing across much of the archipelago, where fear of Japanese domination and (in some cases) anti-Islamic feeling made Dutch colonial rule the lesser of two evils. But the reality was that overall Dutch control, even under a Netherlands-Indonesia ‘commonwealth’, could not be maintained without the backing of Java, the most developed part of the island complex, with five-eighths of the population. It was Dutch failure to achieve this, and the American refusal to back a prolonged guerrilla war in Sumatra and Java (which might have wrecked the Indonesian economy and widened support for Communism), that forced the Dutch out in 1949-50.”

However, as the Cold War developed and the new colonial powers of the Soviet Union and China threatened in Europe and Asia respectively, the Americans came to see the need to keep the British and French in particular on side. So they softened their anti-colonial zeal and decided to help them in some regions – most fatefuly, the French in Vietnam. But as the anti-colonialist tide grew stronger, their irritation (to put it no more strongly) with the British and French returned. As we shall see, this was particularly important in the Suez Crisis in 1956, where the American refusal to help them led to the destruction of British influence in the Middle East and increased difficulties for the French in Algeria.

124 Revel, op. cit, pp. 56-58.  
10. THE UNITED NATIONS

World War Two destroyed more lives and property than any conflict in history. This fact convinced many that the only way to have peace on earth was to create a supra-national government that would restrain national rivalries and impose its will on aggressive states. Such an ideal goes back at least to Dante’s *De Monarchia* in the early fourteenth century. However, the origin of its modern, secular expression must be sought in the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, and Immanuel Kant’s *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* (1795), which contained the following axiom: "The law of nations shall be founded on a federation of free states".126

The first attempt at incarnating such a federation was the Congress System erected by Tsar Alexander I and the monarchs of Prussia and Austria after the defeat of Napoleon in 1815. This came to a bloody end during the Crimean War of 1854-56. The idea was revived in a limited form by Tsar Nicholas II when he founded the International Court of Arbitration at The Hague in 1899. This Court had very little practical impact and did not prevent the outbreak of World War One in 1914. However, the unparalleled destruction wrought by the war that was supposed to end all wars forced the politicians to think again…

“The first outline of the United Nations,” writes S.M. Plokhy, “was drafted by Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles on the basis of the covenant of the League of Nations. A creation of the Paris Peace Conference [of 1919], the League convened its first general assembly in Geneva in November 1920 and its last in April 1946, when representatives of its member nations voted to dissolve it. The League’s activities had in fact come to a virtual halt in 1939, the first year of the war that it had failed to prevent and for whose outbreak it was universally blamed. The problem was that the League could neither adopt nor enforce its decisions: all resolutions had to be passed with the unanimous approval of its council, an executive body that included great powers as permanent members and smaller powers as temporary ones, as well as its assembly. The principle of unanimity was enshrined in the League’s covenant, whose fifth chapter stated that ‘decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the Members of the League represented at the meeting.’ This was virtually impossible to achieve, especially when matters under discussion involved the great powers.

“The United States did not join the League. Woodrow Wilson received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1919 for his role in its creation, but he failed to overcome Republican opposition and persuade an increasingly isolationist Congress to ratify the Treaty of Versailles, which would have led to American membership in the League. The American drafters of the United Nations

---

Charter were mindful of the inevitable opposition that any international organization whose decisions would be binding on the United States would encounter in Congress. They also had to overcome a baleful precedent – the League’s inability to influence the conduct of Germany and Japan after their departure from the organization in 1933. Italy would follow suit in 1937. The formation of the Axis by these three countries in 1940 met with no effective response.

“If the new organization was to do better, it would have to learn from its predecessor’s mistakes. The drafters of its charter had the daunting task of reconciling what struck many as irreconcilable. Since August 1943, the principal drafter of the document at the State Department had been Leo Pasvolsky, the head of the department’s Informal Agenda Group and Hull’s former personal assistant. A fifty-year-old Jewish émigré from Ukraine, Pasvolsky was no stranger to the subject of international peace organizations. Back in 1919 he had covered the Paris Peace Conference for the New York Tribune, and later he had campaigned for the admission of the Soviet Union, whose brand of socialism he rejected, to the League of Nations.

“Pasvolsky’s appointment as principal drafter of the charter was a testament of the triumph of Secretary of State Cordell Hull’s vision over an alternative model championed by Sumner Welles. Hull favoured a centralized structure, while Welles wanted the great powers to bear primary responsibility for security in their respective regions. Welles’s model followed FDR’s thinking of the role of the ‘four policemen’ – the United States, Britain, the Soviet Union, China – in the postwar peace arrangement. By the fall of 1943, with Welles resigning in the midst of a homosexual scandal, Roosevelt had opted for the centralized model. FDR’s decision was guided by the fact that his ‘four policemen’ would be permanent members of the UN Security Council…”127

After much argument with both the Russians and the British, Roosevelt finally achieved his principal goal at Yalta, the founding of the United Nations. He had been forced to concede to the Soviets that Ukraine and Belorussia should have seats in the General Assembly alongside Soviet Russia, which violated the principle that only sovereign states should sit there. But he more or less got his way with the most important of the six major organs of the United Nations, the Security Council. It was composed of fifteen members with five permanent members - the Big Three, China and France, - any of which could veto decisions of the Security Council, although unanimous decisions of the “Big Five” were deemed to be binding on other members. In this way Victors’ Justice continued to operate in the adjudication of international disputes in the post-war era.

The Security Council convened for the first time on January 17, 1946. However, in the atmosphere of the Cold War that developed very soon

thereafter (Churchill’s famous “iron curtain” speech was delivered on March 5, 1946), it showed its virtual impotence to achieve justice and peace when the interests of one of the Great Powers was affected. The old politics continued; the world was divided into two vast spheres of influence, the Communist East and the Capitalist West; and with the explosion of two atomic bombs over Japan in the summer of 1945 the very real prospect beckoned of world war between the two blocs leading to the annihilation of mankind. Never before in the history of mankind had it been so urgently necessary to find a solution to the problems of international relations, peace and justice. But clearly the plan of locking the most evil power in history into a quasi-world government in which it had the power of veto not only did not solve the problem, but made the task of taming and neutralizing that power far more difficult...

This potential strangle-hold exerted over the United Nations by the Soviets was revealed right as early as May, 1945, when the foreign ministers of the victor powers gathered in San Francisco to establish the organization’s ground rules. Molotov, as Martin Gilbert writes, “told his American and British opposite numbers – Edward Stettinius and Anthony Eden – that sixteen members of the all-Party Polish Government in Warsaw, who had gone to Moscow at the request of the American and British governments to negotiate a peace treaty, were all in prison. In the Daily Herald a future leader of the British Labour Party, Michael Foot, who was in San Francisco as a journalist, described the impact on the conference of Molotov’s announcement. The distressing news, wrote Foot, came ‘almost casually’ towards the end of an otherwise cordial dinner, Molotov ‘could hardly have cause a great sensation if he had upset the whole table and thrown the soup in Mr. Stettinius’s smiling face.’”

Churchill and Truman exchanged urgent telegrams; Truman wrote that if they did not hold the line against the Soviets, “the whole fruits of our victory may be cast away and none of the purposes of World Organization to prevent territorial aggression and future wars will be attained.” Churchill, of course, agreed...

“In San Francisco, on June 26, the United Nations Charter was signed. Even as bloody battles were being fought in the Pacific and the Far East, a blueprint for avoiding future war had been agreed upon by the victorious powers. But the power of the gun and the tank was still determining territorial change. Three days after the Charter was signed the new Czechoslovak government signed a treaty with the Soviet Union, ceding its eastern province of Ruthenia. The citizens of Ruthenia, having been annexed by Hungary during the war, became Soviet citizens, subjected overnight to the harsh panoply of Soviet Communism...”

128 Gilbert, op. cit., pp. 682-683.
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The United Nations did much valuable humanitarian work both in the immediate post-war period and for many decades after. Particular important for its work in Europe after VE Day was UNRRA (the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration). In fact, as Tony Judt writes, “there are actually many UNs, of which the political and military branches (General Assembly, Security Council, Peacekeeping Operations) are only the best known. To name but a few: UNESCO (the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, founded in 1945); UNICEF (the International Children’s Emergency Fund, 1946); WHO (World Health Organization, 1948); UNRWA (the Relief and Works Agency, 1949); UNHCR (the High Commission for Refugees, 195), UNCTAD (the Conference on Trade and Development, 1963), and ICTY (the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, 1993). Such international units don’t include intergovernmental programs under the UN’s aegis; nor do they cover the many field agencies established to address particular crises. These include UNGOMAP (the Good Offices Mission to Afghanistan and Pakistan that successfully oversaw the Soviet withdrawal there), UNAMSHIL (the Mission in Sierra Leone, 1999), UNMIK (the Mission in Kosovo, 1999) and many others before and since.

Much of the work done by these units is routine. And the ‘soft’ tasks of the UN – addressing health and environmental problems, assisting women and children in crisis, educating farmers, training teachers, providing small loans, monitoring right abuse – are sometimes performed just as well by national or nongovernmental agencies, though in most cases only at UN prompting or in the wake of a UN-sponsored initiative. But in a world where states are losing the initiative to such nonstate actors as the EU or multinational corporations, there are many things that would not happen at all if they were not undertaken by the United Nations or its representatives – the UNICEF-sponsored Convention of the Rights of the Child is a case in point. And while these organizations cost money, we should recall that UNICEF, for example, has a budget considerably smaller than that of many international businesses.

“The United Nations works best when everyone acknowledges the legitimacy of its role. When monitoring or overseeing elections or truces, for example, the UN is often the only external interlocutor whose good intentions and rightful authority are acknowledged by all the contending parties. Where this is not the case – at Srebrenica in 1995, for example – disaster ensues, since the UN troops can neither use force to defend themselves nor intervene to protect others. The reputation of the UN for evenhandedness and good faith is thus its most important long-term asset. Without it the organization becomes just another tool of one or more powerful states and resented as such.”131

In spite of this innate weakness, the United Nations has exercised an influence in one area that is enormous and, arguably, enormously equivocal. Through its Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was approved on December 9, 1948, it provided in essence a new moral code for the world, a code that has no religious base - unless atheism is considered to be a religion. However, this has not prevented the pseudo-Christian West from embracing it enthusiastically, considering it to be the culmination of Christian Capitalist culture.

According to Martin Gilbert, “the voice of the individual as enshrined in 1948 in the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, became the voice of dissent. The scrutiny carried out by organizations like Amnesty International brought the focus on human rights to a global public. Meeting in Geneva, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, and the Non-Governmental Organizations which represent specific minority interests at the Commission, cast a strong spotlight on human rights abuse. Two areas in which it was particularly active in the 1970s and 1980s were the inequalities and indignities of apartheid in South Africa, and the struggle of the Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union without harassment or imprisonment...”

The philosophy of human rights goes back a long way in western history – at least to Grotius in the seventeenth century and perhaps as far as the medieval scholastics. The French Declaration of Human Rights of 1789 located the source of human rights in the sovereign power of the nation. However, most human rights are universal, that is, they are framed in perfectly general terms that apply to all men and women; so to locate their obligatoriness, not in some supra-national or metaphysical sphere, but in particular nations or states that may, and often do, disagree with each other, would seem illogical.

The problem, of course, is that if we pursue this argument to its logical conclusion, it would seem to entail that all national states must give up their rights and hand them over to a world government, which alone can impartially formulate human rights and see that they are observed. This logic was reinforced by the first two World Wars, which discredited nationalism and led to the first international organizations with legal powers, albeit embryonic, over nation-states – the League of Nations and the United Nations.

One of the first to formulate this development was the Viennese Jew and professor of law, Hans Kelsen, in his work, A Pure Theory of Law. “The essence of his theory,” according to Michael Pinto-Duschinsky, “was that an obligation to obey the law does not stem from national sovereignty but from a fundamental norm. In practical terms, this led after the First World War to his

---

advocacy of an Austrian constitutional court as part of the Austrian constitution and, after the Second World War, to support for the idea of an international court with compulsory jurisdiction as a key part of the framework of the United Nations.”

Another Austrian Jewish academic in the same tradition was Hersch Lauterpacht. His dissertation “combined his interests in jurisprudence and Zionism with an argument about mandates granted by the League of Nations which implied that the mandate given to Britain to govern Palestine did not give Britain sovereignty. Rather, this rested, argued Lauterpacht, with the League of Nations...

“Despite the failure of the League of Nations to prevent Nazi aggression, the Second World War and the murder of his family in the Holocaust, Lauterpacht remained attached to notions of an international legal order. Before his early death in 1960, he served as a judge on the International Court at the Hague. Lauterpacht was devoted to the view that fundamental human rights were superior to the laws of international states and were protected by international criminal sanctions even if the violations had been committed in accordance with existing national laws. He advised the British prosecutors at Nuremberg to this effect. Together with another Jewish lawyer from the Lviv area, Raphael Lemkin, Lauterpacht had a major role in the passage by the United Nations General Assembly of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. Lauterpacht’s publication in 1945, An International Bill of Rights, also had a formative influence on the European Convention of Human Rights drawn up in 1949 and ratified in 1953.

“Lauterpacht’s public philosophy was based on the conviction that individuals have rights which do not stem from nation states. He was an internationalist who had a lifelong mistrust of state sovereignty which, to him, reflected the aggression and injustices committed by nation states and the disasters of the two world wars.”

However, as Pinto-Duschinsky rightly points out, while “international arbitration may be a practical and peaceful way to resolve disputes between countries, international courts which claim jurisdiction over individual countries do not coexist comfortably with notions of national sovereignty…”

133 Pinto-Duschinsky, “The Highjacking of the Human Rights Debate”, Standpoint, May, 2012, p. 36. “Central to the Pure Theory of Law is the notion of a ‘basic norm (Grundnorm)’ - a hypothetical norm, presupposed by the jurist, from which in a hierarchy all ‘lower’ norms in a legal system, beginning with constitutional law, are understood to derive their authority or ‘bindingness’. In this way, Kelsen contends, the bindingness of legal norms, their specifically ‘legal’ character, can be understood without tracing it ultimately to some suprahuman source such as God, personified Nature or a personified State or Nation” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hans_Kelsen).

134 Pinto-Duschinsky, op. cit., pp. 36-37.
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In spite of that, and in spite of the terrible destruction and blood-letting caused by the idea of positive freedom in the period 1917 to 1945, in 1948 the Universal Declaration of Human Rights declared: “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood... Recognition of the inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world”. While this is anodyne enough, even a superficial reading of history since 1789 should have convinced those who drew up the Declaration to be more specific about the meaning of the words “freedom” and “rights” here. They should have known that very similar statements had served as the foundation of the French revolution, and almost every other bloody revolution right up to the Russian revolution, which at that very moment was still destroying millions of souls in the name of “the spirit of brotherhood”... In any case, the Communists interpreted human rights in a very different way from the Capitalists. They saw in the theory merely a means of imposing the capitalist world-view. And there was some justification for this: the United Nations was, after all, the child of Roosevelt and his very American (but also leftist) world-view.

As John Gray writes, speaking of human rights in the context of global capitalism: “The philosophical foundations of these rights are flimsy and jerry-built. There is no credible theory in which the particular freedoms of deregulated capitalism have the standing of universal rights. The most plausible conceptions of rights are not founded on seventeenth-century ideas of property but on modern notions of autonomy. Even these are not universally applicable; they capture the experience only of those cultures and individuals for whom the exercise of personal choice is more important that social cohesion, the control of economic risk or any other collective good.

“In truth, rights are never the bottom line in moral or political theory – or practice. They are conclusions, end-results of long chains of reasoning from commonly accepted principles. Rights have little authority or content in the absence of a common ethical life. They are conventions that are durable only when they express a moral consensus. When ethical disagreement is deep a wide appeal to rights cannot resolve it. Indeed, it may make such conflict dangerously unmanageable.

“Looking to rights to arbitrate deep conflicts – rather than seeking to moderate them through the compromises of politics – is a recipe for a low-intensity civil war...”

Emerging at the same time as, and as a religious complement to, the United Nations was the World Council of Churches… In July, 1948, in Amsterdam, two movements, “Faith and Order” and “Life and Work”, were united into a new organization, the World Council of Churches, the ecclesiastical equivalent of the United Nations. Being the only Orthodox Church that had not participated in the council of Moscow that condemned ecumenism, Constantinople was the only Orthodox jurisdiction besides the Cypriot Church present at this essentially Protestant assembly.137 Moscow was invited, but declined, seeing in the WCC a plot by the Vatican and the western imperialists. Metropolitan (and MGB agent) Nicholas of Krutitsa berated his ecclesiastical opponents, expressing the hope that the World Council of Churches would not count as representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church either those Russian Orthodox believers who were under the omophorion of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, or the “schismatics” from the groups of Metropolitan Theodosius in America or Metropolitan Anastasy in Munich, who had nothing in common with the Russian Orthodox Church.138 In view of this, it is not surprising that ROCOR, too, was not invited. She would in any case have declined because “we do not participate in the ecumenical movement”.139 This decision was in line with a gradual disillusion with the ecumenical movement experienced in the inter-war years, culminating in the words of the Second All-Diaspora Council in 1938: “Resolutions of ecumenical conferences often suffer from vagueness, diffusiveness, reticence and a nuance of compromise…”140

139 Archive of the Hierarchical Synod, delo 5-48; Monk Benjamin, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 133. This remark was made by the Synod of Bishops on February 21, 1948 in response to a request from Professor M.V. Zyzykin that they participate in the Amsterdam Congress (Andrew Psarev, “The Development of Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia’s Attitude Toward Other Local Orthodox Churches”, http://www.sobor2006.com/printerfriendly2.php?id=119_0_3_0, p. 6).
140 Quoted in Ludmila Perepiolkina, Ecumenism – A Path to Perdition, St. Petersburg, 1999, p. 13. Cf. Archimandrite Kiprian (Kern) in 1947: “The state of ‘ecumenical’ meetings today is deplorable, noisy gatherings of all manner of activists lacking in theological authority, who meet without any common language of tradition or criteria, or any single plan or program. Attendees are people who are totally diverse in every way, placed on the same level—a Greek metropolitan, a liberalizing professor with a priestly title or simply a layman, an amateur church publicist lacking any claim to theological training, young students from Anglican colleges, young girls from nameless and mysterious world organizations, and official reviewers from the Intelligence Service. And all of them traveling at someone’s expense in sleeping cars and airplanes, staying in the best hotels, and announced by posters, brochures, speeches, meetings, etc. These meetings conclude with resolutions of some sort, premature recognitions of hierarchy and ordinations on the part of the Romanian Church or a liberalizing theologian from the Balkans—and all this in an atmosphere of international tension, a desire to guarantee one’s own boundaries and hastily acquired territories, a lust for oil and markets, and so on and so on.”
A.V. Soldatov has chronicled the progressive weakening in the Orthodox position: “At the conference [of Faith and Order] in Geneva in 1920 the spirit of extreme Protestant liberalism gained the upper hand. It came to the point that when the Orthodox Metropolitan Stephen of Sophia noted in his report: ‘The Church is only there where the hierarchy has apostolic succession, and without such a hierarchy there are only religious communities’, the majority of the delegates of the conference left the hall as a sign of protest. At the next conference on Faith and Order [in Lausanne] in 1927, victory again went to the extreme left Protestants. The Orthodox delegation, experiencing psychological pressure at this conference, was forced to issue the following declaration: ‘in accordance with the views of the Orthodox Church, no compromises in relation to the teaching of the faith and religious convictions can be permitted. No Orthodox can hope that a reunion based on disputed formulae can be strong and positive... The Orthodox Church considers that any union must be based exclusively on the teaching of the faith and confession of the ancient undivided Church, on the seven Ecumenical Councils and other decisions of the first eight centuries.’ But the numerous speeches of the Orthodox explaining the teaching of the Church on the unity of the Church seemed only to still further increase the incomprehension or unwillingness to comprehend them on the part of the Protestant leaders of Ecumenism. This tendency was consistently pursued by the Protestants at the conferences in 1937 in Oxford and Edinburgh. Summing up this ‘dialogue’ at the beginning of the century, Fr. Metrophanes Znosko-Borovsky remarks: ‘The Orthodox delegates at Edinburgh were forced with sorrow to accept the existence of basic, irreconcilable differences in viewpoint on many subjects of faith between the Orthodox East and the Protestant West.’

“After the Second World War, the World Council of Churches was created. It is necessary to point out that the movements ‘Faith and Order’ and ‘the Christian Council of Life and Work’ were viewed by their organizers as preparatory stages in the seeking of possible modes of integration of ‘the Christian world’. The World Council of Churches differed from them in principle. It set out on the path of ‘practical Ecumenism’ for the first time in world history, declaring that it was the embryo of a new type of universal church. The first, so to speak founding conference of the WCC in Amsterdam chose as its motto the words: ‘Human disorder and God’s house-building’. At it, as Archbishop Vitaly remarks, ‘every effort was made to destroy the teaching on the One, True, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church’. The leading theological minds of the Protestant world made a series of reports at the Amsterdam conference, in which they focused with particular clarity the whole depth of the dogmatic and theological disintegration of the Protestant faith and, in particular, ecclesiology. The conclusion of the report of Gustav Aulen became the basic, single dogma of the organization being created: ‘The Church is as it were a synthesis of all churches.’ Another speaker, Clarence Craig, somewhat deepened the arguments of his colleague with the help of a suggested variant translation of the word ‘catholic’ (or ‘conciliar’ in the Slavonic translation of the Symbol of Faith) as ‘integral’. But of particular
interest for us was the speech at this conference of the Orthodox priest, noted theologian and Church historian [of the Ecumenical Patriarchate], Fr. Georges Florovsky. Having noted that ‘the Bible, dogmatics, catechesis, Church discipline, Liturgy, preaching and sacrament have become museum exhibits’, Fr. Georges concluded: ‘the only salvation in the work of reviving the Church is in the ecumenical movement’. He affirmed that ‘the Church has not yet defined herself, has not worked out her own theological school definition, does not have her own definition, has not yet recognized herself.’”  

According to the rules agreed in Amsterdam, an applicant to the WCC must “recognize the essential interdependence of the churches, particularly those of the same confession, and must practise constructive ecumenical relations with other churches within its country or region. This will normally mean that the church is a member of the national council of churches or similar body and of the regional ecumenical organisation.” (Rules of the WCC) And article I of the WCC Constitution reads: "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the scriptures (sic) and therefore seek to fulfil together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit." And the Constitution also declares that the primary purpose of the fellowship of churches in the World Council of Churches is to call one another to “visible unity in one faith and in one eucharistic fellowship, expressed in worship and common life in Christ, through witness and service to the world, and to advance towards that unity in order that the world may believe”. Further, according to Section II of the WCC Rules, entitled Responsibilities of Membership, "Membership in the World Council of Churches signifies faithfulness to the Basis of the Council, fellowship in the Council, participation in the life and work of the Council and commitment to the ecumenical movement as integral to the mission of the church.”

Acceptance of these terms clearly entailed a Protestant ecclesiology. In fact, as time went on, the WCC became the home of almost every heresy (in 1968 the famous Serbian theologian and Archimandrite Justin Popovich counted 263 of them!142), earning its home city of Amsterdam the description that the English Catholic poet Andrew Marvell gave it in his poem, “The Character of Holland” in 1653:

Hence Amsterdam, Turk-Christian-Pagan-Jew,  
Staple of Sects and Mint of Schism grew;  
That Bank of Conscience, where not one so strange  
Opinion but finds Credit, and Exchange  
In vain for Catholicks ourselves we bear;  
The universal church is onely there.

141 Soldatov, "Pravoslavie i Ekumenizm" (Orthodoxy and Ecumenism), Mirianin (Layman), July-August, 1992, p. 8.  
But the universal Church – the One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church – is only there where there is no heresy. Therefore the struggle between the truly universal Church and the ecumenist World Council of Churches became the most important struggle on the planet in the second half of the twentieth century. For, as Fr. Justin put it: “We are renouncing the Orthodox Faith of the God-Man Christ, and organic ties with the God-Man and His Most Holy Body: we are repudiating the Orthodox Church of the holy apostles, the Fathers, and the Ecumenical Councils – and we wish to become ‘organic members’ of a heretical, humanistic, humanized and man-worshipping club, which consists of 263 heresies – every one of which is a spiritual death.

“As Orthodox Christians we are ‘members of Christ.’ ‘Shall I therefore take the members of Christ and make them members of a prostitute?’ (I Corinthians 6.15). We are doing this by our organic union with the World Council of Churches, which is nothing other than the rebirth of atheistic man, of pagan idolatry.

“The time has finally come for the patristic Orthodox Church of Saint Sabbas, the Church of the holy apostles and Fathers, of the holy confessors, martyrs and new-martyrs, to stop mingling ecclesiastically and hierarchically with the so-called ‘World Council of Churches’, and to cast off forever any participation in joint prayer or services, and to renounce general participation in any ecclesiastical dealings whatsoever, which are not self-contained and do not express the unique and unchangeable character of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church – the Orthodox Church – the only true Church that has ever existed.”

143 *A Time to Choose*, op. cit., p. 53.
12. THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The horrors of the Jewish Holocaust gave a great moral boost to the Zionist cause, and many thousands of survivors after the war decided to emigrate to what was shortly to become the Zionist state of Israel. However, the British, who still controlled the Holy Land under a UN Mandate, had had extreme difficulties in preserving the peace between the Jews and the Arabs, and now were determined to stop this new exodus from Europe into the country. Illegal immigrants were prevented from landing, and were deported – usually to detention camps in Cyprus. The Zionists of course protested against this, and world opinion, appalled at the revelations of the Holocaust, was on the whole on their side.

But the problem went deeper than a simple refugee crisis. During the war, the British and Americans had agreed on a plan to give refuge to displaced Jews – some to their former countries of origin, and very many to prosperous countries around the globe. Thus America under Roosevelt offered to take 100,000 Jews – an offer that was upped to 400,000 in 1947 in a bill put forward by Congressman William G. Stratton. But the Zionists would have none of it. To put displaced Jews anywhere other than Palestine would have endangered the plan of a Jewish state, for it would have eradicated the necessity for such a state. It also meant that there would be less money going from America to Israel – and the Jews there would have to live on remittances for the foreseeable future. So the real interests of the Jewish survivors of the Holocaust were sacrificed by Jews for the sake of the dream of a Zionist state.144

The powerful American Zionist lobby worked together with Zionist terrorism inside Palestine to undermine British resolve. Three future leaders of the Israeli state – David Ben-Gurion, Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir – at different times took up arms against the British in order to drive them out of their promised land and open the gates to unrestricted Jewish immigration. In July, 1946 Begin’s Irgun blew up the King David hotel in Jerusalem, and Shamir’s Stern Gang committed even worse atrocities against soldiers lying in their beds. The Zionist state of Israel would be brought into existence by Jewish terrorism against both British and Arabs...

Chaim Weitzmann and the Jewish Agency for Palestine, which represented the mass of Palestinian Jewry, denounced the violence. But it worked... For, as Martin Gilbert writes, “the British will to rule had gone: Jewish terror and heightened national aspirations, and Arab determination not to allow a Jewish State to emerge, created a situation where the British Army could no longer maintain control. A severe economic crisis in Britain added to the determination of the government in London not to be saddle with a growing burden, involving extra troops, mounting expenditure, and the anger of the British public that the terrorists and the agitators were not being crushed or

even curbed. If India and Burma could be given up, where Britain had been responsible for far greater numbers of people over a much longer period of time, and had been faced with problems on a much larger scale, then so could Palestine be given up. Attlee and his Cabinet decided to hand the problem to the United Nations.

“The British government in London had reached the end of its tether. Throughout the year [1947] there had been killings everywhere in Palestine which shocked both British and Jews... No more than 12,000 of the half million Jews in Palestine were believed to be members of the two terrorist organizations. But 100,000 British soldiers were employed searching for them. The Jewish Agency’s own defence organization, the Hagana, also found itself in a series of confrontations with the British. For their part, British soldiers were frequently called upon to help Jews who were being attacked by Arabs...”

Meanwhile, at the request of the British, the United Nations were working out a plan to partition the land between two states, one Jewish and one Arab, with an international zone in Jerusalem. The Zionists then put into motion “Operation Partition”. Enormous pressure – not excluding bribes and threats – were put on UN member nations to vote “the right way”. Thus “Bernard Baruch was prevailed upon to talk with the French who could not afford to lose interim Marshall Plan aid. Through former Ambassador William Bullitt, the adviser to Presidents passed a message in a similar vein to the Chinese ambassador in Washington.” On November 29, after many delegates had been “persuaded” to change their votes, thirty-three nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union and the entire Soviet bloc, voted in favour of the plan. Thirteen nations were against, including all the Arab states and Greece, while Britain was among ten states that abstained...

Stalin’s reason for accepting the plan, writes Paul Johnson, “seems to have been that the creation of Israel, which he was advised would be a socialist state, would accelerate the decline of British influence in the Middle East... Thereafter the Soviet and American delegations worked closely together on the timetable of British withdrawal. Nor was this all. When Israel declared its independence on 14 May 1948 and President Truman immediately accorded it de facto recognition, Stalin went one better and, less than three days later, gave it recognition de jure. Perhaps most significant of all was the decision of the Czech government, on Stalin’s instructions, to sell the new state arms. An entire airfield was assigned to the task of air-lifting weapons to Tel Aviv...”

If this seems surprising in view of Stalin’s violent turn against supposed Jewish conspiracies in the Soviet Union only a short while later, and the Soviets’ consistent support of the Arabs against Israel in later decades, we

---
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should remember the “dialectical” relationship between the two horns of the Jewish Antichrist, Israel and the Soviet Union, since their virtually simultaneous birth in November, 1917. The Bolshevik revolution was created mainly by atheist Jews who cared nothing for Jewish national aspirations. However, Zionist Jews came largely from the Soviet Union and shared its socialist ideals. Not that these East European Jews necessarily loved the Soviet Union – Begin was a survivor of the Gulag and the NKVD’s torture chambers. But the spirit of hatred and revenge, which can exist with equal virulence in a nationalist or internationalist culture, was passed from the Pale of Settlement in the west to the Soviet Union in the north to the State of Israel in the south…

Although the vote had been passed in the Zionists’ favour, the battle was not over. The Arabs indicated that they would invade the land immediately the Jewish state was proclaimed. Nor did Jewish terrorism stop. Thus in April, 1948 a joint Irgun-Stern operation massacred as many as 250 inhabitants of the Arab village of Deir Yassin. Begin crowed: “God, God, Thou hast chosen us for conquest.”

Realizing that partition was unworkable, and would lead to war, as well as having many other consequences incompatible with the interests of the United States (the hostility of the oil-rich sheikhs, the intervention of the Soviet Union in the region), President Truman changed tack and spoke in favour of a temporary UN trusteeship in Palestine, while insisting that he was in favour of partition in the longer term. However, extreme pressure from Chaim Weizmann and the Zionist lobby, combined with worries that he could lose the Jewish vote at the November election, persuaded Truman to change tack again and recognize the Jewish state already on May 14. There was consternation at the United Nations, which was still working out the conditions for the internationalization of Jerusalem, and in the American foreign-policy establishment…

The injustice perpetrated by the partition is made clear in a few statistics. At the time of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 there had been 600,000 Arabs living in Palestine next to 80,000 Jews. Thirty years later, the proportional gap had narrowed but was still large: 1.3 Arabs facing 650,000 Jews. “Under the partition plan,” writes Lilienthal, “56.4 percent of Palestine was given for a Zionist state to people who constituted 33 percent of the population and owned about 5.67 percent of the land… This is the ‘original sin’ which underlies the entire Palestinian conflict…”

The Arabs invaded Israel immediately after her declaration of independence in May, 1948. Nine bloody months later, the Jews emerged victorious. “A truce, supervised by the United Nations, followed (during
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which a Zionist terrorist murdered the United Nations mediator). In 1949 the Israeli government moved to Jerusalem, a Jewish national capital again for the first time since the days of imperial Rome. Half of the city [the old part] was still occupied by Jordanian forces, but this was almost the least of the problems left to the future. With American and Russian diplomatic support and American private money, Jewish energy and initiative had successfully established a new national state where no basis for one had existed twenty-five years before. Yet the cost was to prove enormous. The disappointment and humiliation of the Arab states assured their continuing hostility to it and therefore opportunities for great power intervention in the future. Moreover, the action of Zionist extremists and the far from conciliatory behavior of Israeli forces in 1948-9 led to an exodus of Arab refugees. Soon there were 750,000 of them in camps in Egypt and Jordan, a social and economic problem, a burden on the world’s conscience, and a potential military and diplomatic weapon for Arab nationalists....”

Many Jewish refugees were driven out from other Arab lands: between May, 1948 and the end of 1967 about 567,000 of them fled to Israel.152

“Between February and July 1949,” writes Peter Mansfield, “the new UN mediator, the American Ralph Bunche, succeeded in securing separate armistice agreements between Israel and Egypt and the Arab states (except Iraq, which nevertheless withdrew its troops). It was broadly agreed to fix a temporary frontier where the lines had been at the start of the negotiations, while certain border areas were demilitarized. Jerusalem was divided between the Arab east and Jewish west. The Gaza Strip came under Egyptian administration.

“No peace treaty was signed. In December 1948 the UN General Assembly appointed a three-member conciliation commission to promote a final settlement and to arrange an international regime for Jerusalem, but all its efforts were frustrated. The Arab states refused to consider a peace treaty unless the Israeli government agreed to accept all Arab refugees wishing to return to Israel. Resolutions demanding that the refugees should be given the option of return or compensation for their property were constantly reaffirmed by the UN General Assembly, and it was on this basis that Israel was admitted to the UN on 11 May 1949. But Israel maintained that the future of the refugees could be discussed only as part of a general settlement. Moreover, Talmudic law prohibited any surrender of land to non-Jews. Thus Israel Shahak expresses the opinion that many Israeli-Palestinian negotiations have failed simply because “displaying the flag of a ‘non-Jewish state’ within the Land of Israel contradicts the sacred principle which states that all this land ‘belongs’ to the Jews”.
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The impasse was complete. Half of the Palestinian Arabs had become refugees. Neither the new state of Israel nor its Arab neighbours could expect even a minimum of security and stability…”154

* 

What kind of state was, and is, the new Zionist state of Israel? Formally speaking, it is a democracy, albeit with minimal rights for the Arabs. In essence, however, it is an apartheid nationalist mini-empire, an “ethnocracy”, with international tentacles and underpinned by the Talmudic Jewish faith…

Paul Johnson has distinguished between four kinds of Jews: observant, assimilationist, Zionist and Non-Jewish Jews (non-nationalist atheists, socialists and Bolsheviks like Trotsky). 155 We can leave aside the assimilationists and Non-Jewish Jews, for whom their Jewishness was a matter of indifference, or even, sometimes, shame. The real question was: in what way did observant, religious Jewry differ from Zionist Jewry?

As we have seen, the leaders of Zionism were almost without exception East European Jews who had imbibed the socialist ideas of the Russian revolutionaries. However, they mostly came from religious families, and their Zionism required the familiar Biblical narrative of the chosenness, exile and return of the Jewish people as a justification for their violent acquisition of the land and refusal to share it on an equal footing with its Arab inhabitants. Whether they really believed in the stories of Abraham, Moses and Joshua is irrelevant (their attitude to them was often imbued with modernist skepticism common to most contemporary Europeans): the fact is that they needed to proclaim them for purely political reasons, and were prepared to make considerable concessions to the rabbis, the leaders of religious Jewry, for that purpose.

We see this especially in the Law of Citizenship, in the determination, as Shlomo Sand writes, of “who would be included among the authorized proprietors of the Jewish state that was being ‘reestablished’ after two thousand years in ‘Israel’s exclusive land’? Would it be anyone who saw himself or herself as a Jew? Or any person who became a Jewish citizen? This complex issue would become one of the main pivots on which identity politics in Israel would revolve.

“To understand this development, we must go back to the eve of the Proclamation of Independence. In 1947 it had already been decided that Jews would not be able to marry non-Jews in the new state. The official reason for this civil segregation – in a society that was predominantly secular – was the unwillingness to create a secular-religious split. In the famous ‘status quo’
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letter that David Ben-Gurion, as head of the Jewish Agency, co-signed with leaders of the religious bloc, he undertook, inter alia, to leave the laws of personal status in the new state in the hands of the rabbinate. For reasons of his own, he also supported the religious camp’s firm opposition to a written constitution. Ben-Gurion was an experienced politician, skilled at getting what he wanted.

“In 1953 the political promise to bar civil marriage in Israel was given a legal basis. The law defining the legal status of the rabbinical courts determined that they would exclusive jurisdiction over marriage and divorce of Jews in Israel. By this means, the dominant socialist Zionism harnessed the principles of the traditional rabbinate as an alibi for its fearful imaginary that was terrified of assimilation and ‘mixed marriage’.

“This was the first demonstration of the state’s cynical exploitation of the Jewish religion to accomplish the aims of Zionism. Many scholars who have studied the relations between religion and state in Israel have described them as Jewish nationalism submitting helplessly to the pressures applied by a powerful rabbinical camp and its burdensome theocratic tradition. It is true there were tensions, misunderstandings and clashes between secular and religious sectors in the Zionist movement and later in the State of Israel. But a close examination reveals that nationalism needed the religious pressure, and often invited it in order to carry out its agenda. The late Professor Yeshayahu Leibowitz was more perceptive than most when he described Israel as a secular state in religious cohabitation. Given the great difficulty of defining a secular Jewish identity, and the highly uncertain boundaries of this impossible entity, it had no choice but to submit to the rabbinical tradition…

“Just as Israel was unable to decide on its territorial borders, it did not manage to draw the boundaries of its national identity. From the start it hesitated to define the membership of the Jewish ethnos. To begin with, the state appeared to accept an open definition that a Jew was any person who saw himself or herself as a Jew. In the first census, held on November 8, 1948, residents were asked to fill out a questionnaire in which they stated their nationality and religion, and these were what served as the basis for civil registration. In this way the young state managed quietly to Judaize many spouses who were not Jews. In 1950, newborn children were registered on a separate page without reference to nationality and religion – but there were such forms, one in Hebrew and one in Arabic, and whoever filled out a Hebrew form was assumed to be a Jew.

“Also in 1950, Israel’s parliament – the Knesset – passed the Law of Return. This was the first basic law that gave legal force to what the Proclamation of Independence had declared. This law declared: ‘Every Jew has the right to come to this country as an aleh (immigrant)’ unless he ‘(1) is engaged in an activity directed against the Jewish people; or (2) is likely to endanger public health or the authority of the State.’ Then in 1952 came the law that granted automatic citizenship on the basis of the Law of Return.
“Beginning in the late 1940s, the world rightly viewed Israel as a refuge for the persecuted and the displaced. The systematic massacre of the Jews of Europe and the total destruction of the Yiddish-speaking people drew widespread public sympathy for the creation of a state that would be a safe haven for the remnant. In the 1950s, provoked by the Israeli-Arab conflict but also by the rise of authoritarian Arab nationalism, semireligious and not especially tolerant, hundreds of thousands of Arab Jews were driven from their homelands. Not all were able to reach Europe or Canada; some went to Israel, whether or not they wished to go there. The state was gratified and even sought to attract them (though it viewed with unease and contempt the diverse Arab cultures they brought with their scanty belongings). The law that granted the right of immigration to every Jewish refugee who was subject to persecution on account of faith or origin was quite legitimate in these circumstances. Even today such a law would not conflict with basic principles in any liberal democracy, when many of the citizens feel kinship and a common historical destiny with people close to them who suffer discrimination in other countries.

“Yet the Law of Return was not a statute designed to make Israel a safe haven for those who were persecuted in the past, present or future because people hated them as Jews. Had the framers of this law wished to do so, they could have placed it on a platform of humanist principle, linking the privilege of asylum to the existence and threat of anti-Semitism. But the Law of Return and the associated Law of Citizenship were direct products of an ethnic nationalist worldview, designed to provide a legal basis for the concept that the State of Israel belongs to the Jews of the world. As Ben-Gurion declared at the start of the parliamentary debate on the Law of Return: ‘This is not a Jewish state only because most of its inhabitants are Jews. It is a state for the Jews wherever they be, and for any Jew who wishes to be here.

“Anyone who was included in ‘the Jewish people’... was a potential citizen of the Jewish state, and their right to settle there was guaranteed by the Law of Return. A members of the ‘Jewish nation’ might be a full citizen with equal rights in some liberal national democracy, might even be the holder of an elected position in it, but Zionist principle held that such a person was destined, or even obliged, to migrate to Israel and become its citizen. Moreover, immigrants could leave Israel immediately after arrival, yet keep their Israeli citizenship for the rest of their lives...”156

This extraordinary inclusivity in definition was combined with an extraordinary exclusivity that excluded any Jew who embraced any other faith than Talmudism. Thus “in 1970, under pressure from the religious camp, the Law of Return was amended to include, finally, a full and exact definition of who is an authentic member of the people of Israel: ‘A Jew is one who was born to a Jewish mother, or converted to Judaism and does not belong to

another religion.’ After twenty-two years of hesitation and questioning, the instrumental link between the rabbinical religion and the essentialist nationalism was now well and truly welded…”

*

The State of Israel does not appear to fit into any usual categorization of statehood. It is neither autocratic, nor despotic nor democratic in the ordinary senses of these words. It is both secular and religious at the same time, both globally inclusive of all “Jews” throughout the world yet perversely exclusive of those who have the greatest right to live on its territory. It is nationalist, and yet its nationalism is not defined by territory or blood (much as many Jews would like to define it thus), but by religion. The only remotely similar states, paradoxically, are its fiercest enemies, Wahhabist Saudi Arabia and Shiite Iran. And yet neither the Arab nor the Iranian states have any Law of Return, any truly comparable myth of exile and return and redemption...

For fuller understanding, therefore, it will be worth examining what this single apparent exception to the main development of human history can mean, from the only point of view that would seem capable of comprehending it - the religious-eschatological.

A clue to our search may be found in the Abrahamic Covenant, in the relationship revealed at the very beginning of Jewish history between God, on the one hand, the sons of Abraham, Isaac and Ishmael, on the other. Isaac was the ancestor of the spiritual Israel, the Church of Christ, and Ishmael the ancestor of the carnal Israel, the people that fights God. Although the spiritual Israel is blessed, while the carnal Israel is accursed, still an important promise is given to the carnal Israel: that it will live in accordance with Abraham’s petition: “Let this Ishmael live before Thee” (Genesis 17.18). This life cannot be spiritual, because that is promised only to the spiritual Israel. So it must be carnal – physical survival and worldly power. At the same time, St. Ambrose admits the possibility that Abraham’s powerful petition could win spiritual life for some of the Jews – but only, of course, if they cease to belong to the carnal Israel and join the spiritual Israel through faith in Christ. For “it is the attribute of the righteous man [Abraham] to intercede even for sinners; therefore, let the Jews believe this too, because Abraham stands surety even for them, provided they will believe…”

The promise of physical life and prosperity has certainly been fulfilled in the extraordinary tenacity of the Jewish race, its survival in the face of huge obstacles to the present day, and - since its gradual emancipation from the ghetto in the nineteenth century, - its domination of world politics and business in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Moreover, since the carnal Israel is promised physical life and power, it is no wonder that since
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the Balfour Declaration of 1917, and especially since the foundation of the State of Israel in 1948, it has regained power over the land of Israel, driving out most of the Christians in the process, and may well recapture all the land from the Nile to the Euphrates, as was promised in the Abrahamic Covenant. But it is important to understand that such a re-conquest, if it takes place, will not be by virtue of the Jews being the chosen people, as they and their Evangelical allies believe, but by virtue of the exact opposite: of their being the accursed people – Ishmael rather than Isaac. For of the two covenant peoples the people that is carnal is given physical gifts that are appropriate to its carnal desires.

For the truth may be, as an anonymous Russian writer has suggested, “that the very preservation up until now of the Jewish people is a result not of their being ‘chosen’, but as a result of their apostasy”. For, having renounced their birth-right, the Kingdom of God, they have received a “mess of pottage” instead – the promise of physical survival and worldly power. “If the Jews, having repented of the crime committed on Golgotha, would have become Christian, then they would have made up the foundation of a new spiritual nation, the nation of Christians. Would they have begun to strive in this case to preserve their nationality and government? Would they not have dispersed among other nations as the missionaries of Christianity just as the Apostles? Would they not have been strangers in a foreign land, not having a fatherland, like unto Abraham, but in this case with a higher spiritual meaning? All this happened with the Jews, that is, they became wanderers, not in a positive spiritual sense, but due to a curse, that is, not of their own will, but due to the will of chastising Providence since they did not fulfil that which God intended for them. Would they not have been exterminated en masse during persecutions as the main preachers of Christianity? Would they not have been assimilated among other peoples, so that the very name ‘Jew’, ‘Hebrew’, as a national name, would have disappeared and would have only remained in the remembrance of grateful nations as the glorious name of their enlighteners? Yes, and the very Promised Land and Jerusalem were given to the Hebrews not as a worldly fatherland, for which they are now striving, but as a prefiguration of the Heavenly Kingdom and the Heavenly Jerusalem, as a token of which Abraham and through him all the Hebrew nation coming out

---

159 So great have been the worldly successes of the Jews that many Evangelical Protestants have been tempted to ascribe them, not to God’s promise to Ishmael, but to his promise to Isaac. Reversing the interpretation of the Apostle Paul, they have made of the carnal Israel “the chosen people”, “the blessed seed” - and this in spite of the fact that this “chosen people” has been the foremost enemy of those who believe in Christ for the last two thousand years! By elevating the carnal Israel into the spiritual Israel, the Protestants fill up a major spiritual and emotional gap in their world-view; for, having rejected both the concept of the Church, and the reality of it in Orthodoxy, they have to find a substitute for it somewhere else. And so we have the paradoxical sight of the State of Israel, one of the main persecutors of Christianity in the contemporary world, which forbids conversions of Jews to Christianity and has driven out the majority of the Orthodox Christian population, being ardently supported by the Evangelical Protestants of the Anglo-Saxon countries. There have even been several attempts by Evangelicals to blow up the mosque of the Dome of the Rock, in order to make it possible for the Jews to build their Temple again – the Temple of the Antichrist!
of Haran, renounced their earthly fatherland. For this reason the very significance of Jerusalem and the idea as a prefigurement would have passed away for the Jews, as soon as the Kingdom of God and the Heavenly Jerusalem would have become obtainable for them and would have become for them, as they are now for us, Christian holy places.”  

Tragically, however, it was not to be: the Jews remain unconverted to this day. Even many Orthodox Jews believe that the foundation of the Zionist State of Israel was a grave sin. So must the foundation of the State of Israel be necessarily evil – and its crowning glory the enthronement of the Antichrist?...

Before jumping to this conclusion, let us recall Alain Dieckhoff’s interpretation of the thought of the nineteenth-century “Forerunners of Zion”: “In Jewish tradition there was only one true remedy for sin: repentance (teshuva), i.e. explicit renunciation of evil and adoption of behaviour in accordance with the Law. The idea of inner repentance was so essential that it was supposed to have coexisted with the Law before the proclamation on Mount Sinai, and even to have existed before the creation of the world. This was above all of an individual nature in Talmudic literature, but took on a collective dimension from the sixteenth century, under the impetus of the Kabbala of Isaac Luria. After that the return to a life of holiness ensured not only the salvation of the individual soul, but also restored the original fullness of the world. Teshuva was no longer limited solely to the existential level, within the narrow confines of the individual; it also concerned the historic level of the national group, and beyond that the cosmic level of mankind. Alkalai went so far as to consider, differing from the classical idea, that collective repentance must necessarily precede individual repentance. There remained the final question: what did this general teshuva involve?

"It involved physical re-establishment of the Jews in the Land of Israel to recreate the national community. Playing on the double meaning of the word teshuva, which strictly means return, Kalischer stated that collective repentance meant a geographical return to Zion and not, at least not directly, a spiritual return. So Jews who returned to Palestine were not breaking the religious Law, since in the first instance their return was a purely material one. It was only later, when they were gathered in Zion, that by the grace of God the truly supernatural redemption would start, bringing with it the individual repentance of every Jew and union with God..."  

In other words, perhaps the return of the carnal Jews to their carnal homeland is a preparation, in God’s plan, a springboard, as it were, for their return to the spiritual Israel, the Church of God...

---
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13. THE KOREAN WAR

Immediately after signing the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights in 1948, the Soviet bloc countries showed their complete contempt for any such rights by increasing the cruel and relentless repression of all independent thought in Eastern Europe, raising the numbers of prisoners in the Soviet Gulag to five million, and attempting to overthrow the sovereignty of democratic South Korea.

“In 1945,” writes Henry Kissinger, “Korea, until then a Japanese colony, had been liberated by the victorious Allies. The northern half of the Korean Peninsula was occupied by the Soviet Union, the southern half by the United States. Each established its form of government in its zone before it withdrew, in 1948 and 1949, respectively.”162

“Rival regimes then emerged,” writes Norman Stone. “A leathery Methodist, Syngman Fhee, was promoted in the South, while the Communist North Korea formally became independent in 1948 under Kim Il Sung, a figure (also with a Protestant background) who emerged from Chinese shadows and had trained for a time at Khabarovsk in Siberia. Kim had megalomaniac qualities (he eventually proclaimed himself ‘President for Eternity’) and went to Moscow in March 1949, as Mao was winning in China. He wanted help to seize the South, where consolidation, with a small American presence, was ramshackle (as happened in Japan, there was a considerable enough Communist element there). That was refused: Stalin’s hands were full with the Berlin blockade. However, Mao was less discouraging, though he wanted action only ‘in the first half of 1950’, by which time he would control the whole of China. He even said that Chinese soldier might be sent in, because the Americans would not be able to tell them apart…”163

The North Koreans crossed the 38th parallel, their border with South Korea, on June 25, 1950. Their tanks were Soviet, as were their planes and some of their pilots. Why had the normally ultra-cautious Stalin allowed himself to be persuaded by the North Korean leader Kim-il-Sung into approving the invasion (in April, 1950)? Probably for two reasons: first because now the Soviets had the H-bomb, and secondly because, since October of that year, China had finally been conquered by the Chinese communists under Mao. World Communism was on the crest of a wave, and since Stalin believed that a Third World War was in any case inevitable, he probably reasoned that if risks had to be taken, now was the time to take them. Besides, he probably knew from his British spies in London and Washington Philby, Burgess and Maclean, that the Americans had ruled out the use of nuclear weapons. “Maclean’s deputy on the American desk, Robert Cecil, later concluded that the Kremlin must have found the documents provided by Maclean ‘of

inestimable value in advising the Chinese and the North Koreans on strategy and negotiating positions.” So with Soviet weaponry, and vast numbers of Chinese soldiers to help them, the North Koreans probably had a good chance of beating the Americans, whose lines of supply were, of course, far longer than those of the communists.

Kissinger adds another reason: Stalin “had learned from the defection of Tito two years earlier that first-generation Communist leaders were especially difficult to fit into the Soviet satellite system that he thought imperative for Russia’s national interest. Starting with Mao’s visit to Moscow in later 1949 — less than three months after the People’s Republic of China was proclaimed — Stalin had been uneasy about the looming potential of China led by a man of Mao’s dominating attributes. An invasion of South Korea might divert China into a crisis on its borders, deflect America’s attention from Europe to Asia, and, in any event, absorb some of America’s resources in that effort. If achieved with Soviet support, Pyongyang’s unification project might give the Soviet Union a dominant position in Korea and, in view of the historical suspicions of these countries for each other, create a kind of counterbalance to China in Asia. Mao followed Stalin’s lead — conveyed to him by Kim Il-sung in almost certainly exaggerated terms — for the converse reason; he feared encirclement by the Soviet Union, whose acquisitive interest in Korea had been demonstrated over the centuries and was even then displayed in the demands for ideological subservience Stalin was making as a price for the Sino-Soviet alliance…”

But Stalin had miscalculated. He did not realize that the American president was in his own way a man of steel — and some cunning also. On hearing the news of the invasion, President Truman, who was in his home state of Missouri, thought that World War III was about to begin. But on reaching Washington, he “told one of those who met him at the airport, ‘By God, I am going to let them have it.’ The United Nations Security Council, meeting that day, passed a resolution by nine votes to nil demanding the withdrawal of North Korean forces. There was no Soviet veto, as the Soviet delegate, Yakov Malik, had walked out of the Security Council five months earlier in protest at his colleagues’ refusal to give Communist China the Chinese Nationalist place on the Council…”

Since the invasion took place outside the North Atlantic area, it did not become the first test of the solidity of the NATO alliance. Instead, it was the United Nations that took on the responsibility of resisting Communist tyranny. And while, inevitably, the major burden of the war, both financial

---
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and military, fell on the United States, it has to be said that the international organization passed the test with flying colours as several nations gave troops in what was truly a war to defend freedom. Neither before nor since has the United Nations done so well in coordinating an effective resistance to totalitarian evil.

The fortunes of war swung wildly from one side to the other. In the early months, the UN forces were nearly forced to evacuate the whole peninsula. But then in a brilliant flanking movement at Incheon, the UN Commander General MacArthur drove the North Koreans up towards the border with China. Since the Chinese were now sending troops to help the North Koreans, MacArthur recommended carrying the war over the border and even dropping the hydrogen bomb on the Chinese. But President Truman, the man who had ordered the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, was not going to repeat the experience: firmly and wisely, he said no, and World War Three was averted. And he refused to panic when things started going badly some months later, but instead boldly sacked the very popular MacArthur and appointed General Ridgway, who reversed the tide once more, recaptured Seoul and made it possible for the two front lines to stabilize more or less where they had begun, on the 38th parallel, with a very heavily fortified demilitarized zone separating them.

In hindsight, we may see the Korean War as the beginning of the decline of Soviet power. For the two communist super-powers had failed to dislodge the Americans from a clearly weaker position, even though the Americans forswore their huge advantage in nuclear weapons. (The Soviets exploded their first nuclear device in August, 1949.) This was largely Stalin’s fault. By throwing in his own troops and planes, he could almost certainly have swung the war in the communist direction. But he wanted to manipulate Mao and Kim-il-Sung just as he manipulated his own European and Russian satraps. And so he insisted that the Chinese help the North Koreans, while providing only military equipment on his part – not the air power that the Chinese so desperately needed. Nor did he agree to a peace treaty in the peninsula; he preferred a war of attrition in which the North Koreans would have to continue fighting indefinitely, because, as he told Chou-en-Lai, “they lose nothing except for their men”.

In the event, as David Reynolds writes, “the Americans lost 33,000; the Chinese perhaps half a million, including one of Mao’s sons; and the overall Korean death toll was maybe 2.5 million, a 10th of the population…”

But in choosing a war of attrition, Stalin made another serious strategic error: it sowed seeds of distrust between the two communist super-powers.

Already at their first meeting, during Stalin’s 70th birthday celebrations in Moscow in December, 1949, Stalin had snubbed Mao. It was not that Stalin did not appreciate Mao’s achievement in making the world’s most populous state communist. Nor did he deny that China would now have to take the lead in the communist movement in the Far East. But he demanded veneration as the high-priest of the movement, and – now already in his 70s – he could not abandon the cunning and manipulative ways of his youth, which might be effective against Capitalist foes such as Churchill or Roosevelt but were less so with Communist “allies” hardly less cunning than himself such as Tito or Mao.

The Lord said that since the kingdom of Satan is divided against itself, it must fall (Matthew 12.26) And already before the death of Stalin, and in spite of the unparalleled power of his repressive apparatus, the communist movement was divided against itself. The differences between Stalin and Mao during the Korean War presaged the more serious split between the two powers in the 1960s - and the complete reversal of roles that we see today, when in spite of its bluster and posturing Putin’s Russia is clearly the junior partner to the enormous and continually rising power of still-communist and only superficially pro-Russian China...
DIVISIONS IN THE GREEK CHURCH

In the immediate post-war period, while the Greek True Orthodox increased in numbers, the divisions among them continued and intensified. Metropolitan Chrysostom of Florina and his two fellow bishops, called the “Florinites”, continued to argue that the new calendarists were potentially rather than actually schismatics, while the followers of Bishop Matthew, the “Matthewites”, insisted that they were already outside the Church.

On August 26, 1948, an assembly of the Matthewites decided “that our most Reverend Bishop Matthew of Brethena should proceed to the consecration of new bishops, insofar as the other pseudo-bishops of the True Orthodox Christians neither understand nor confess Orthodoxy, nor unite with us, nor even agree to make consecrations. We grant him the authority to proceed both to the election of people and to their immediate consecration, in accordance with the divine and sacred canons and the opinions of our canon law experts, and in accordance with the practice of the whole Church of Christ, which has accepted, in case of necessity (as is the case today) such a dispensation, as we have just heard from our Protosynkellos, Protopriest Eugene Tombros, who explained the validity of the consecration of one Bishop by one Bishop in accordance with the law of our Orthodox Church.”

In September, Bishop Matthew, after warning Metropolitan Chrysostom and Bishop Germanus of what he was about to do, consecrated Spyridon of Trimithun (Cyprus), and then, with Spyridon, Demetrius of Thessalonica, Callistus of Corinth and Andrew of Patras. By this time Bishop Matthew was half-paralyzed, so that his paralyzed right hand had to be lowered onto the head of the ordinand in the altar by Abbess Mariam! Strictly speaking, this consecration was uncanonical, not only because it was carried out by one bishop only, contradicting the First Apostolic Canon, but also because Matthew himself was a vicar-bishop – and vicar bishops can ordain nobody higher than a deacon without the permission of their metropolitan (Canon 10 of Antioch). However, the Matthewites argued that it was permissible by condescension because Bishop Matthew was the only true bishop in Greece at that time. This was rejected by the other Old Calendarist bishops.

On October 29, 1948, Metropolitan Chrysostom abandoned his previous ambiguity on the question of grace and declared unambiguously that the new calendarists had “separated themselves from the Unique Body of Orthodoxy... We consider and believe that the official Church of Greece is schismatic and that the services celebrated by its clergy are deprived of Divine grace.”

---

170 Bishop Andrew, Matthaios (Matthew), Athens, 1963, p. 82.
171 Metropolitan Calliopius, Nobles et Saints Combats des Vrais Chrétiens Orthodoxes de Grèce (Noble and Holy Struggles of the True Orthodox Christians of Greece), vol. I, Lavardac, p. 144.
This convinced another Old Calendarist Bishop, Germanus of the Cyclades, who had been in prison from January, 1948 to January, 1950, to re-enter communion with Metropolitan Chrysostom.

The Florinites and the Matthewites now had an identical confession. But no union took place because the Matthewites considered that Chrysostom had fallen away from Orthodoxy through his vacillations... “Although Bishop Matthew’s integrity, personal virtue and asceticism were admitted by all,” write the monks of Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Boston, “his course of action only widened the division between the ‘Matthewites’ and ‘Florinites’. “

“The ‘Florinites’ and the ‘Matthewites’ made many attempts at reconciliation, but all were unsuccessful. Stavros Karamitsos, a theologian and author of the book, The Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane, describes as an eye-witness the two instances in which Metropolitan Chrysostom of Florina personally attempted to meet with Bishop Matthew. Unfortunately, on both occasions – the first, which had been planned to take place on January 19, 1950, at the Matthewite Convent in Keratea at the invitation of [the Matthewite] Bishop Spirydon of Trimythus, and the second, which actually did take place at the Athens Metochion of the Keratea Convent – the abbess and senior nuns of that convent, at the prompting of the Matthewite protopresbyter Eugene Tombros, intervened and would not allow Metropolitan Chrysostom to speak with Bishop Matthew. On the second occasion, in May of 1950, when Bishop Matthew was on his deathbed and had been unconscious for three days, Metropolitan Chrysostom arrived at Bishop Matthew’s quarters and approached his bedside. Standing at his side, Metropolitan Chrysostom bowed down and quietly asked him, ‘My holy brother, how are you feeling?’ To the astonishment of all present, Bishop Matthew regained consciousness and opened his eyes. When he saw the Metropolitan, he sought to sit up out of deference and began to whisper something faintly. At that very moment, the Abbess Mariam of the Convent of Keratea entered the room with several other sisters and demanded that all the visitors leave. Only a few days later, on May 14[/27], 1950, Bishop Matthew died.”

On May 26, 1950, Metropolitan Chrysostom officially returned to the confession of 1937. Together with Bishop Germanus, he sent the following encyclical both to the State Church and to the Matthewites: “In the year of our Saviour 1935 we proclaimed the Church of the innovating new calendarists to be schismatic. We reiterate this proclamation and in consequence ordain the enforcement of the First Canon of St. Basil the Great that the sacraments celebrated by the new calendarists, in that the latter are schismatics, are deprived of sanctifying grace. Therefore no new calendarist must be received into the bosom of our Most Holy Church or be served without a prior confession by which he condemns the innovation of the new calendarists and

proclam[es] their Church schismatic. As regards those who have been baptized by the innovators, they should be chrismated with Holy Chrism of Orthodox origin, such as is found in abundance with us.

“We take this opportunity to address a last appeal to all the True Orthodox Christians, calling on them in a paternal manner to come into union with us, which would further our sacred struggle for patristic piety and would satisfy our fervent desire.

“In calling on you, we remove the scandals which have been created by us through our fault, and to that end recall and retract everything written and said by us since 1937, whether in announcements, clarifications, publications or encyclicals, which was contrary and opposed to the Principles of the Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ and the sacred struggle for Orthodoxy conducted by us, as proclaimed in the encyclical published by the Holy Synod in 1935, without any addition or subtraction, and including the scientific definition ‘Potentiality and Actuality’.”

This humble and thoroughly Orthodox statement persuaded a large number of Matthewites to rejoin Metropolitan Chrysostom. However, it did not satisfy the Matthewite hardliners. What disappointed them was that Chrysostom did not confess that he had been a schismatic since 1935 and turn to the Matthewites to be readmitted into the Church, but rather called on them to be reunited with him. In any case, they did not want to be subject to a hierarch who refused to act as the head of an autocephalous Church and consecrate bishops, thereby threatening the survival of the Church. However, Chrysostom was not a schismatic. He had not returned to the new calendarists, nor had he been tried or defrocked by any canonical Synod. And he still retained the support of the majority of the bishops and clergy, 850 parishes and about a million laypeople. Although he had wavered on the question of grace, this was neither heresy nor schism, and certainly not automatic apostasy. For, as Metropolitan Macarius (Nevsky) of Moscow, who was himself unlawfully removed from his see in 1917, said: “The Holy Church cannot allow an incorrect attitude towards its first-hierarchs, she cannot remove them from their sees without a trial and an investigation.”

Contrary to Matthewite teaching, not every division in the Church constitutes a full-blown schism leading to the loss of sacramental grace of one of the parties. The Apostle Paul speaks of “quarrels” and “differences of opinion” within the one Church of the Corinthians (I Corinthians 1.10-14, 11.19); and St. John Chrysostom says that these quarrels took place “not because of difference in faith, but from disagreement in spirit out of human vanity”.

---

173 Hieromonk Amphiloichius, Gnosthetin Alitheian (Know the Truth), Athens, 1984, p. 21.
174 Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia, letter to the author, February 5, 1991.
176 Quoted in Michael Podgornov, “Otpal li Arkheipiskop Andrej (Ukhtomskij) v staroobriadcheskij raskol?” (Did Archbishop Andrew (Ukhtomsky) Fall Away into the Old Ritualist Schism?), Russkoe Prawoslavie (Russian Orthodoxy), N 2 (11), 1998, p. 20, footnote 16.
Again, Protopriest Michael Pomazansky writes: “The unity of the Church is not violated because of temporary divisions of a non-dogmatic nature. Differences between Churches arise frequently out of insufficient or incorrect information. Also, sometimes a temporary breaking of communion is caused by the personal errors of individual hierarchs who stand at the head of one or another local Church; or it is caused by their violation of the canons of the Church, of the violation of the submission of one territorial ecclesiastical group to another in accordance with anciently established tradition. Moreover, life shows us the possibility of disturbances within a local Church which hinder the normal communion of other Churches with the given local Church until the outward manifestation and triumph of the defenders of authentic Orthodox truth. Finally, the bond between Churches can sometimes be violated for a long time by political conditions, as has often happened in history. In such cases, the division touches only outward relations, but does not touch or violate inward spiritual unity.”

The extreme Matthewite position leads to the following reductio ad absurdum. Let us suppose that Chrysostom was automatically defrocked in 1937 for calling schismatics Orthodox. It follows that all the bishops in the history of the Orthodox Church who transgressed in the same way were also automatically defrocked. Therefore Metropolitan Dorotheus and the Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate were also automatically defrocked in 1920 for embracing the western heretics. Moreover, all those who remained in communion with Dorotheus were also automatically defrocked. But that included the Eastern Patriarchs, the Patriarchs of Russia and Serbia and in general the whole of the Orthodox Church! But then we must conclude, in accordance with strict Matthewite reasoning, that the Church of Christ ceased to exist in 1920! But, of course, the Matthewites do not draw this logical conclusion from their own premises. Therefore their reasoning must be considered to be inconsistent.

* 

In June, 1950 the new calendarist Archbishop of Athens Spyridon Vlachos wrote to the Greek government that the Old Calendar movement was a form of pan-Slavism more dangerous to the nation even than communism! This was followed by a fierce persecution of the Old Calendarists, both Florinites and Matthewites. This community in persecution is a powerful argument that both factions communed of the True Body and Blood of Christ. And there were prominent Old Calendarists who refused to take sides. Thus on being asked which faction he belonged to, Hieromonk Jerome of Aegina replied: “I am with all the factions!”

---


The renewal of persecution against the True Church was clearly imminent in 1949, when, “the State Church elected Archbishop Spyridon to the primacy; he was to prove the fiercest persecutor yet of the Old Calendarists. Immediately after his election, he required his Bishops to submit details about Old Calendar clergy, parishes, and monasteries in their dioceses. The theological schools were forbidden in the future to accept Old Calendarist students (this order is still in effect, though heretics of various persuasions are not debarred). Finally, on January 3, 1951, at the request of the Holy Synod of the State Church, a decree was issued by the Council of Ministers as follows: ‘... It is decided that: 1) Old Calendarist clergy who do not have canonical ordination by canonical Bishops of our Orthodox Church, and who wear clerical dress, should be deprived thereof; 2) monks and nuns following the Old Calendar should be arrested and confined to monasteries, and those who bear the monastic dress uncanonically should be deprived thereof and prosecuted; 3) the Churches which have been illegally seized by the Old Calendarists should be returned to the official Church, as also the monasteries they possess illegally and capriciously; 4) the execution of the above be entrusted to the Ministries of Public Order, Justice, Religion, and Education.’

“The above plan was put into immediate effect. In a short while, the basement of the Archdiocese in Athens and other towns was filled with the clerical robes of the True Orthodox clergy who were taken there, shaved, often beaten, and then cast out into the street in civil dress; many Priests underwent this process a number of times, while others were arrested and sent into exile. One aged Priest, Father Plato, was beaten to death by the police in Patras, and then hastily buried in a field to cover up the crime. All the Churches in Athens were sealed and their vessels taken, and a few Churches in other parts of Greece were even demolished. Soon no True Orthodox Priest could circulate undisguised, and even monks and nuns were not immune to these profane attacks.

“The first victim was Bishop Germanus of the Cyclades, who died in the greatest grief when under house arrest on March 24, 1951, and was buried by the Faithful179; by the personal order of Archbishop Spyridon, they were not...

179 According to other sources, he was in hospital. “Spyridon Vlachos forbade his ecclesiastic burial and, deeming himself a worthy successor of Caiaphas, he ordered that the body of the deceased be guarded by gendarmes at the Clinic of Saint Helen in the Athenian suburb of Sepolia (where he was transferred from jail while breathing his last) in order to prevent the reading of a burial service by a Genuine Orthodox priest. God, however, arranged otherwise. During the same period, the Archimandrite Chrysostomos Kioussis [the future archbishop] was secretly in hiding to avoid capture and stripping by the police, and celebrated the Divine Liturgy in country chapels and in the houses of faithful Christians that had been transformed into catacombs, moving about only at night with great caution. In March of 1951, in one of those catacombs, he celebrated the Vigil of the Annunciation of the Theotokos along with the ever-memorable Archimandrite Petros Astyfidés (later, Bishop of Astoria), deeply grieved by the news of the passing of the ever-memorable Bishop Germanos. A white cloth with paper icons pinned to it separated the Holy Altar from the rest of the room. Two tables assumed the role of the Altar and the Table of Oblation. They celebrated the liturgy in this manner when
permitted to take the body to a Church, and no Priest was allowed to assist; even so, many were arrested at the cemetery. Soon the orphanage of the TOC was seized by the State Church. There is no space here, unfortunately, to describe all the heroic struggles of the Old Calendarists at this time, the demonstrations attended by thousands in the squares of Athens, the catacomb Church services and so forth, which are the glory of our Church.

“The eighty-one-year-old Metropolitan Chrysostom was arrested in February, 1951, and after repeated attempts to change his views, was exiled to the Monastery of St. John in Lesbos, situated on a remote 2,500-foot crag, where he was to remain for over a year. The monks of the monastery behaved sympathetically, but conditions were very hard for an infirm, elderly man. The Metropolitan, however, constantly expressed his joy at being found worthy to suffer for his Faith, and his satisfaction at the resistance and perseverance of the Faithful in the face of persecution. We have a precious proof of his holiness from this bitter time: the police officer whose duty it was to guard him, looked into the Bishop’s cell one evening and, to his amazement, saw him standing in prayer with his hands raised, surrounded by a blinding heavenly light. The guard fell at his feet to ask forgiveness and subsequently became one of his most faithful spiritual children.\footnote{During this period of exile, Metropolitan Chrysostom’s former deacon, now Patriarch Athenagoras, proposed that he return to the new calendarists and be “reinstated”. The metropolitan refused \textit{(Agios Kyprianos (St. Cyprian)}, N 298, September-October, 2000, pp. 350-351, 354. (V.M.)}

“Passion Week of 1952 saw fearful scenes of impiety perpetrated on the TOC, but it was rapidly becoming clear to all that the persecution was producing merely public disorder and complaint, and was achieving nothing in the way of ‘re-uniting’ the Faithful to the State Church; indeed, rather the opposite. Finally, in June, 1952, through the intervention of the new Prime Minister, Plastiras, Metropolitan Chrysostom and the other Bishops were released. Slowly the pressure was relaxed, much aided by the constant protests of Patriarch Christopher of Alexandria, a supporter of the Old

suddenly at two o’clock in the morning there was a knocking on the door! Fortunately, it was not the police but rather members of N.E.O.S., the youth organization of the Genuine Orthodox Church, who were seeking a priest to secretly conduct a burial service, having convinced the gendarme guarding the body of Bishop Germanos to “look the other way.” While Fr. Petros continued the Vigil, Fr. Chrysostomos went to read the funeral of the reposed hierarch. As the funeral approached its end the gendarme, who was following the service piously, warned that the time had come for him to be relieved. As Fr. Chrysostomos and his entourage were heading for their car, the oncoming gendarmes spotted him. A chase ensued. However, Pericles, the priest’s experienced driver, drove through the maze of Athenian streets and managed to escape, thus keeping Fr. Chrysostomos from being captured and stripped. The new calendarists placed guards over the dying confessor to see that no Old Calendarist priest was able to chant the funeral service over him. However, with the aid of a sympathetic guard, Hieromonk Chrysostom (Kiousis), later archbishop of the True Orthodox Church of Greece, was able to do just that. When a new shift of guards arrived, Fr. Chrysostomos was forced to flee, and a car chase ensued through the streets of Athens” (\url{http://www.ekklisiastikos.co}; \url{http://www.ecclesiagoc.gr/pegeng/h005/pegint.dll?faq0011.peg|14}).
Calendarists from the beginning, and eventually two Churches were permitted to function in the city of Athens…. However, it was not until 1954 that the violent measures finally came to an end and the Churches could be safely re-opened.”\textsuperscript{181}

It is perhaps no accident that the persecutions against the True Orthodox in Greece took place when the Greek civil war and the great political turmoil of the previous decade had come to an end. Freed from external enemies, the State Church could now return to “the enemy within”. Even some former communist hierarchs were re-employed in the struggle against the True Orthodox, such as Metropolitan Anthony of Elia, who joined the party in 1944 was deposed in 1946, but returned to his see after the amnesty of 1952.\textsuperscript{182}

By 1949, however, the communist threat had receded and Greece was firmly back within the sphere of western influence. The time was ripe for the State Church to go forward to full union with the western heretics - but only if its rear could be secured from snipers of the True Orthodox Church. Hence the significance of the election of the persecutor Archbishop Spyridon, who was entrusted with removing this, the main obstacle to the further development of Ecumenism in the western world.

In this period, unfortunately, Metropolitan Chrysostom again wavered in relation to the new calendarists. On December 11, 1950 he declared in the newspaper \textit{Vradini (Evening)} that the Old Calendarists were “a living artery through which clean Orthodox blood flowed into the heart of the Church”, and that the Old Calendarists had condemned the State Church as schismatic only because the State Church had done the same to them (in 1926). And in the same month he declared in the official organ of the Church, \textit{I Foni Orthodoxias} (The Voice of Orthodoxy): “In spite of the cruel persecution that the innovating Church has organized against us, we avoided, at the beginning out of respect for the significance of the Church, to pronounce her schismatic in an ecclesiastical encyclical, at the same time that she declared us to be schismatics in court, condemning our bishops of Megara and Diauleia, in order to justify their decision to depose them. But when we saw that the ruling Synod had decided, contrary to all the holy canons and the age-old practice of the Church, to consider the sacraments of us, the true Orthodox, to be invalid, then we, too, in defence issued this encyclical, so as to calm the troubled conscience of our flock, and not for the sake of acquiring the property of the monastery in Keratea…”\textsuperscript{183}

\textsuperscript{181} Archimandrite (now Archbishop) Chrysostomos, Hieromonk (now Bishop) Ambrose and others, \textit{The Old Calendar Orthodox Church of Greece}, Etna, Ca.: Center for Traditionalist Studies, 1986, pp. 15-18. The new calendarists did not allow any True Orthodox priests to bury Bishop Germanus.

\textsuperscript{182} Metropolitan Calliopius, \textit{Saint Joseph de Desphina} (St. Joseph of Desphina), Lavardac: Orthodox Monastery of St. Michael, 1988, p. 70, footnote 17.

\textsuperscript{183} Monk Benjamin (Gomareti), “Letopis’ tserkovnykh sobytij Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi nachinaia s 1917 goda” (Chronicle of Church Events, beginning from 1917), \url{www.zlatoust.ws/letopis.htm}, vol. 4, p. 9.
In March, 1951 the Greek Minister of Internal Affairs Bakopoulos issued the following statement concerning the negotiations between Metropolitan Chrysostom and the newcalendarist Archbishop Spirydon: “The negotiations... are going well and have reached the point that the former Bishop of Florina has completely recognized his error... The official Church has exceeded all limits in the concessions it has made. In time it would have rehabilitated the Old Calendar bishops, and ordained their priests... and recognized the sacraments accomplished by them as valid, and churches would have been offered for those who would want to celebrate according to the old calendar. Both the former Bishop of Florina and the other bishops (Germanos of the Cyclades, Christopher of Megara and Polycarp of Diauleia) agreed with all this, and, according to our information, their representatives, distinguished lawyers, had to formulate a corresponding act... Unfortunately, at the last moment irresponsible activists from the lay estate interfered... and influenced the weak character of the former Bishop of Florina, who rejected all that he had said earlier...”

One of the conditions of union with the official Church was the commemoration of the newcalendarist Archbishop Spirydon, on which Metropolitan Chrysostom commented: ‘Oldcalendarism in its essence is an invincibly strengthened protest... The only power which could review this protest and bring a final decision for or against the calendar innovation is a Pan-Orthodox Council... Our movement is not being stubborn... Our opinions differ from those of the leadership of the Autocephalous Church of Greece... The second reason for the failure is the strange and imprudent hastiness of the competent people to force any kind of decision on us. Thus they suggested that within three or six days the Old Calendarists should agree to commemorate the new calendarist metropolitan in their churches. We, for brevity’s sake, will omit all the other reasons which the making of this suggestion made unacceptable, and ask the Greek people: how is it possible for an Old Calendarist to change his psychological presuppositions so quickly as to consider as his president the metropolitan whom to this day he has considered to be his real enemy and persecutor, and from whom he has suffered much? We, at any rate, have not found this magic wand...”

Metropolitan Chrysostom’s inconsistencies could not fail to undermine the determination of his fellow bishops; and although Bishop Germanos of the Cyclades died as a confessor on March 24, 1951, the other three bishops resigned from their pastoral duties on November 6, 1952, “until a final resolution of the calendar question by a Pan-Orthodox Council”. This decision elicited demonstrations in the streets by the Florinites, which led Metropolitan Chrysostom to withdraw his resignation. However, Bishops

184 Ethnikos Kirikas (National Herald), March 9, 1951; Monk Benjamin, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 10.
185 Ethnikos Kirikas (National Herald), March 9, 1951; Monk Benjamin, op. cit., vol. 4, pp. 10-11.
Christopher and Polycarp remained as simple lay members of the True Orthodox Church until February, 1954, when they returned to the State Church and were received in their existing rank.\textsuperscript{187}

“As a result of this, Chrysostom of Florina remained alone as the head of the larger group of the True Orthodox Church until his death. Several candidates for the episcopacy were presented to him. Bishop Nikolaj (Velimirovich) of the Serbian Church, who was then residing in the United States, offered to help him consecrate new bishops. However, Chrysostom declined the suggestion\textsuperscript{188}. In answer to the pleas of his flock for bishops, he directed that they come to terms with the bishops Matthew had consecrated and have them somehow regularized according to the canons.”\textsuperscript{189}

“The death of the Metropolitan, which occurred on the Feast of the Nativity of the Mother of God, September 7, 1955 (old style), again permits us to glimpse his sanctity behind the veil of great modesty and privacy which he always maintained in his contacts even with his closest assistants. The Bishop, foreseeing his death, summoned his confessor, the Athonite Archimandrite John, on the night before, and made an hour-long general confession. Returning home that evening, he instructed his attendant to spread his bed with new white sheets and coverings. In the morning he was found with his hands crossed on his chest, reposed in the Lord, with no sign of illness. His will reveals that he had no money or possessions to dispose of. The funeral, held in the Church of the Transfiguration at Kypselli, Athens, was attended by tens of thousands who came in grief to venerate the body of their leader, which according to Byzantine tradition was seated in the center of the Church during the funeral; afterwards, the police had to drive back the crowds to permit the body to be taken to the place of burial, the Dormition Convent on Mount Parnes. By a curious coincidence, the bells of all the Churches in Greece were ringing mournfully as he went to his place of rest – the Synod of the State Church having so ordered as a sign of grief at the recent anti-Greek riots in Constantinople. When after six years, as is the custom in Greece, the bones of the Metropolitan were exhumed, the fragrance they produced filled the entire convent for several days, and is still often perceptible.”\textsuperscript{190}

In spite of his inconsistencies Metropolitan Chrysostom never entered into communion with the new calendarists. And there are other proofs of his

\textsuperscript{187} Monk Benjamin, op. cit., vol. 4, pp. 19-20.
\textsuperscript{188} Lardas, “The Old Calendar Movement in the Greek Church”, Holy Trinity Monastery, Jurdanville, 1983 (unpublished thesis), p. 16. In the opinion of Joachim Wertz (personal communication), it is very unlikely that Bishop Nikolai actually offered his help in this matter. (V.M.)
\textsuperscript{189} Holy Transfiguration Monastery, The Struggle against Ecumenism, pp. 73-74.
\textsuperscript{190} Archimandrite Chrysostomos, Hieromonk Ambrose, op. cit., pp. 19-20. According to Holy Transfiguration Monastery, the grave was opened in 1958, when the remains were found to be fragrant. “In fact, the fragrance was so strong that lay workers came to ask what the source was of this sweet aroma that had filled the entire surrounding area” (op. cit., p. 74). In 2016 Metropolitan Chrysostomos was canonized by the True Orthodox Church of Greece. His relics continue to be fragrant...
Orthodoxy. Thus Abbess Euthymia of the Dormition Convent writes: “When we buried the ever-memorable hierarch Chrysostom, since he was buried in our Monastery, the whole place was fragrant and the builders who were building the foundation of the church came down from there and asked our elder: 'Father, what is this fragrance which we can smell where we’re working?’ And they saw the exhumation and understood. I was the one who washed the bones of his Beatitude, and my hands were fragrant the whole night. And this fragrance was perceptible in our Monastery for forty days.

“One nun who had been in the Monastery since the age of seven… said that she had not been baptized… When the Bishop of Florina fell asleep, she sat for forty days at his tomb and besought him to enlighten the elder to baptize her. Then in her sleep she saw him sitting on a throne, and he told her that she was unbaptized and that the elder should look at the holy Rudder. And indeed they found that when there are doubts people should be baptized. And there was a consumptive girl who came and took some oil from the lamp of the tomb and smeared her breast with it and was healed.”

Summarising the discords between the bishops in this period, the words of the Athonite Elder Damascene, who shared a cell with Bishop Matthew in the 1920s but joined the “Florinites” in 1982, wrote: “The three ever-memorable Hierarchs Chrysostom of Florina, Germanus of the Cyclades and Matthew of Bresthena struggled for the traditions of the Fathers. But as men wearing flesh and living in the world they fell into error while in this life. However, the three finished their lives in the good Confession and passed away in repentance. And if someone wishes to represent one or other of the three as having been quite without reproach, and that he alone held the truth without any deviation, that man is, in the words of the divine Chrysostom, an erring scoffer, a deceiver and a base flatterer. That is, when he praises everything, both the good and the bad.”

* 

In Cyprus, the great majority of the Orthodox had accepted the new calendar in 1924. The centre of resistance to the innovation was the ancient monastery of Stavrovouni, where Hieromonk Cyprian and a few disciples continued to follow the Orthodox Calendar. In 1944, these monks were expelled, scattered round the island and founded some hermitages. But they had no bishops...

---

191 Karamitsos, O Synkhronos Omologitis tis Orthodoxias (The Contemporary Confessor of Orthodoxy), Athens, 1990, pp. 73-74.
193 However, the leading innovator, Archbishop Cyril, had a vision of angels on his deathbed which convinced him that he had committed a fatal error (Abbot Chrysostom of Galactotrophousa monastery, Cyprus, personal communication, January, 1981).
In 1946 Bishop Matthew sent five monks to Cyprus, and a little later, the protosynkellos of his Church, Fr. Eugene Tombros. In 1948, as we have seen, he consecrated Bishop Spyridon, a Greek, for the True Orthodox of Cyprus.194

Galactotrophousa monastery, near Larnaka, was the first monastery of the Cypriot True Orthodox and had been built at the direct command of the Mother of God. Monk Paul of Cyprus tells the story: “When the monastery was being built – in a poor way, like all the monasteries of the True Orthodox Christians, with mud bricks and straw – one of the monk-builders, a pious and very simple man, but ‘a bird of passage’, was thinking of going elsewhere. While he was relaxing under a tree at midday, the All Holy [Mother of God] appeared to him in majesty, as he told the story, and said: ‘Don’t go.’ He said to her: ‘Why are you standing in the sun? Go into the shade.’ But she said to him again: ‘Stay and build a church and cells for me, and I will bring my treasures here and will live here because they are persecuting me from all sides with their new calendar.’ And then she disappeared.” 195

Bishop Spyridon, after only nine months on Cyprus, was imprisoned and sent back to Greece by the British at the instigation of the new calendarists. While in prison, he told Abbot Chrysostom of Galactotrophousa monastery to go with him to Greece, where he would be consecrated bishop in his stead. However, the authorities denied him a visa. But in 1957 Monk Epiphanius arrived in Greece and was consecrated Bishop of Kiton – which consecration, however, was not recognised by Bishop Spyridon.196 This caused a schism in the Cypriot Church, and Abbot Chrysostom, who remained faithful to Bishop Spyridon, was defrocked by the Matthewite Synod in Greece. However, the schism was healed, and Abbot Chrysostom was reinstated, in the 1980s.197

As regards the new calendarist Church of Cyprus, it was British policy to hinder the consecration of new bishops on Cyprus. After the newcalendarist Archbishop Cyril III died in 1933, and until 1947, the British colonial government did not allow the election of a new first-hierarch. By this time all the metropolitans on the island had been exiled except Leontius of Paphos. In 1950 the new metropolitan became Archbishop Macarius III, who also became the head of the Cypriot government. In September, 1952 there began a struggle for national liberation from the British, and in 1959 independence for the island was achieved, although the British remained in possession of some military bases.

194 “Historie de l’Eglise des Vrais Chrétiens Orthodoxes de Chypre” (A History of the Church of the True Orthodox Christians of Cyprus), Foi Transmise et Sainte Tradition (Transmitted Faith and Holy Tradition), Lavardac, N 21/23, numéro special.
196 Abbot Chrysostom, personal communication, January, 1981.
197 On being exhumed, Abbot Chrysostom’s body was found to be partially incorrupt (Fr. Sotirios Hadjimichael, personal communication).
In 1949 there flew into Constantinople – on President Truman’s personal plane, “Air Force One” – the second Meletius Metaxakis, the former Archbishop of North and South America Athenagoras. In order to make way for Athenagoras, a Mason of the 33rd degree, Patriarch Maximus V was forced into retirement by his Synod on grounds of mental illness (although he was completely sane). The real reason for his removal was Maximus was his opposition to ecumenism. When they asked him in 1965 what had been the reason for his deposition, he replied: “It’s not worth commenting on how they deposed me.”

It was not only in the Soviet Union that psychiatry was used to get rid of dissenters...

In 1919 Athenagoras had been appointed secretary of the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece by Metaxakis himself.

By an extraordinary coincidence Athenagoras was a former spiritual son of Metropolitan Chrysostom of Florina, so that the leaders of the opposing sides in the Church struggle in the early 1950s were, like David and Absalom, a holy father and his apostate son. In his enthronement speech Athenagoras went far beyond the bounds of the impious Masonic encyclical of 1920 and proclaimed the dogma of ‘Pan-religion’, or “super-ecumenism”, declaring: “We are in error and sin if we think that the Orthodox Faith came down from heaven and that the other dogmas [i.e. religions] are unworthy. Three hundred million men have chosen Mohammedanism as the way to God and further hundreds of millions are Protestants, Catholics and Buddhists. The aim of every religion is to make man better.”

This astonishing apostasy from the Orthodox Faith roused hardly a murmur of protest from the autocephalous Orthodox Churches... On February 6, 1952 Patriarch Athenagoras wrote to all the Local Churches, mendaciously trying to convince them that membership of the WCC was not incompatible with Orthodoxy: “In accordance with its constitution, the WCC is trying only to unite the common actions of the churches, so as to develop cooperation in the study of the faith in a Christian spirit, in order to strengthen ecumenical thinking among the members of all the churches, and support a wider spreading of the Gospel, and finally to preserve, raise and regenerate spiritual values for humanity within the limits of general Christian standards... We, the members of the Orthodox Church, must take part in this common-Christian movement because it is our duty to share with our heterodox brothers the wealth of our faith, Divine services and Typicon, and our spiritual and ascetic experience...”

---
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In accordance with this instruction, the Orthodox delegates to the Faith and Order conference in Lund in 1952 declared: “We have come here not in order to condemn the other Churches, but to help them see the truth, in a fraternal way to enlighten their thoughts and explain to them the teaching of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, that is, the Greek Orthodox Church, which has been preserved without change since apostolic times.”

This supposed justification of the ecumenical movement – missionary work among the heterodox – has been repeated many times to the present day. But participation in such ecumenical organizations as the WCC not only has not helped Orthodox missionary work: it has quenched it. A clear proof of this was the statement of all the heads of the Local Orthodox Churches in Constantinople in 1992 renouncing missionary work among Western Christians...

The Orthodox ecumenists seemed to forget that one cannot hold the fire of heresy in one’s bosom and not be burned, and that the Protestants could use the ecumenical movement for their own missionary work among the Orthodox ... Thus 1955 the Faith and Order Working Committee of the WCC proposed an Orthodox consultation with the ultimate aim that, as Dr. M. Spinka put it, “at some future time of the hoped-for spiritual ‘Big Thaw’, when these communions have had a chance to think it over in a repentant or chastened mood, they might perhaps join us!” In other words, the Orthodox had to “repent” of their insistence that the Orthodox Church is the Church, in order to become worthy of entering the new pseudo-Church with the Protestants!

Nevertheless, until the late 1950s, the participation of the Orthodox Churches in the ecumenical movement was hesitant and strained. Athenagoras himself, contrary to his later practice, put restrictions on Orthodox participation in his 1952 encyclical: “Orthodox clergy must refrain from joint concelebrations with non-Orthodox, since this is contrary to the canons, and blunts consciousness of the Orthodox confession of faith”.

Again, at the Second General Assembly at Evanston (1954) the Orthodox delegates declared: “We are bound to declare our profound conviction that the Holy Orthodox Church alone has preserved in full and intact the Faith once delivered to the saints.”

---
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Again, at the Faith and Order conference at Oberlin (1957), which was centred on the theme, “The Unity we Seek”, the Orthodox declared: “‘The Unity we Seek’ is for us a given Unity which has never been lost, and, as a Divine gift and an essential mark of Christian existence, could not have been lost... For us, this Unity is embodied in the Orthodox Church.”

The Orthodox Churches were restrained especially by the fear that the Western Christians would use the ecumenical movement to achieve by peaceful means what they had failed to achieve by force (for example, in Serbia in 1941). In the case of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, the fear of losing the holy places to the Catholics and Protestants played an important role. And so widespread and whole-hearted participation of the Orthodox in the ecumenical movement had to wait until, on the one hand, the KGB masters of the East European Churches decided that their vassals’ participation in the movement was in the interests of world communism, and on the other, the Catholics themselves began to recognize the Orthodox as “equal partners” in the Second Vatican Council (1959-1964).

Towards the end of the 1950s Athenagoras began to make feelers towards Rome. Thus on March 17, 1959, at the request of Athenagoras, Archbishop James of North America (a Freemason of the 33rd degree) met Pope John XXIII, the first such meeting for 350 years. The archbishop said: “Your All-Holiness, my patriarch had entrusted me to inform you that the sixth verse of the first chapter of the Gospel of John speaks about you. He is convinced that the man sent from God is precisely you, and the seventh verse explains the meaning of his embassy – ‘he came for a witness, to witness about the light, that all should believe through him’. And so you were elected for this end, although in your essence you are not the light, but you were raised to the Roman see ‘to witness to the light’.

In April, 1961, Archbishop James began to develop a new theology of ecumenism, declaring: “We have tried to rend the seamless robe of the Lord – and then we cast ‘arguments’ and ‘pseudo-documents’ to prove – that ours is the Christ, and ours is the Church... Living together and praying together without any walls of partition raised, either by racial or religious prejudices, is the only way that can lead surely to unity.”

What could these “pseudo-documents” and “religious prejudices” have been if not the sacred Canons which forbid the Orthodox from praying together with heretics?

---
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In April, 1963, Archbishop James said: “It would be utterly foolish for the true believer to pretend or to insist that the whole truth has been revealed only to them, and they alone possess it. Such a claim would be both unbiblical and untheological... Christ did not specify the date nor the place that the Church would suddenly take full possession of the truth.”

This statement, which more or less denied that the Church is, as the Apostle Paul said, “the pillar and ground of the Truth” (I Timothy, 3.15), caused uproar in Greece and on Mount Athos. However, Athenagoras supported James, calling his position “Orthodox”.210 “Let the dogmas be placed in the store-room,” he said. “The age of Dogma has passed.”211

From this time on, the two Masons went steadily ahead making ever more flagrantly anti-Orthodox statements. There was some opposition from more conservative elements in the autocephalous Churches. But the opposition was never large or determined enough to stop them...

At a meeting of the Faith and Order movement in Montreal in 1963, a memorandum on “Councils of Churches in the Purpose of God” declared: “The Council [WCC] has provided a new sense of the fullness of the Church in its unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity. These marks of the Church can no longer be simply applied to our divided churches, therefore.” Although this memorandum was not accepted in the end because of Fr. Georges Florovsky’s objections, it showed how the WCC was encroaching on the Orthodox Church’s understanding of herself as the One Church.

Indeed, it could be argued that the Orthodox participants had already abandoned this dogma. For as early as the Toronto, 1950 statement of the WCC’s Central Committee, it had been agreed that an underlying assumption of the WCC was that the member-churches “believe that the Church of Christ is more inclusive than the membership of their own body”.212

At the Second Pan-Orthodox Conference in Rhodes, in September, 1963, the sending of observers to the Second Vatican Council was discussed. There was much disagreement, and eventually a compromise was reached: every Local Church should make the decision independently.213 It was unanimously agreed that the Orthodox should enter into dialogue with the Catholics, provided it was “on equal terms”. In practice, this meant that the Catholics should abandon their eastern-rite missions in Orthodox territories. The Catholics have never shown much signs of wishing to oblige in this, but they did help to make a dialogue easier by redefining the Orthodox, in Vatican II’s decree on Ecumenism, as “separated brethren” rather than “schismatics”.
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By this time the Orthodox had ceased to issue separate statements at ecumenical meetings outlining the ways in which the Orthodox disagreed with the majority Protestant view. “As Father Georges [Florovsky] put it, American Protestants were not alone in seeking within the World Council to stress common elements and to discount the issues that divide. There were also respected Orthodox leaders under the sway of the spirit of adjustment. Certainly on the Russian side there were roots for another approach. As Alexander Schmemann has said of the development of Russian theology in the emigration, in the 1920s and 1930s there had arisen two different approaches to the very phenomenon of the Ecumenical Movement and to the nature of Orthodox participation in it. On the one hand we find theologians who acknowledge the Ecumenical Movement as, in a way, an ontologically new phenomenon in Christian history requiring a deep rethinking and re-examination of Orthodox ecclesiology as shaped during the “non-ecumenical” era. Representative names here are those of Sergius Bulgakov, Leo Zander, Nicholas Zernov, and Pavel Evdokimov. This tendency is opposed by those who, without denying the need for ecumenical dialogue and defending the necessity of Orthodox participation in the Ecumenical Movement, reject the very possibility of any ecclesiastical revision or adjustment and who view the Ecumenical Movement mainly as a possibility for an Orthodox witness to the West. This tendency finds its most articulate expression in the writing of Florovsky.”

While chastising the West for its political sins, the MP continued to glorify Stalin in the most shameful way, having truly become the State Church of the Bolshevik regime. Already during the war, the cult of Stalin, probably the greatest persecutor in the history of the Church, reached idolatrous proportions. He was “the protector of the Church”, “the new Constantine”. The first issues of the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, as we have seen, were filled with oleaginous tributes to the “God-given Supreme Leader”.

And yet Stalin never changed his basic hostility to the Church. In 1947 he wrote to Suslov: “Do not forget about atheistic propaganda among the people”. And the bloodletting in the camps continued…

Together with the cult of Stalin went the enthusiastic acceptance of communist ideology and studied refusal to contemplate the vast scale of its blasphemies and cruelties. Thus just after the war the MP expressed itself as follows concerning the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR: “On this day in all the cathedrals, churches and monasteries of our country there will be offered the bloodless Sacrifice, whose beginning was laid by Him Who brought into the world the ideas of love, justice and equality. Deeply moved church-servers will come out onto the ambons and bless their children to hurry from the churches to the voting urns. They will bless them to cast their votes for the candidates of the bloc of communists… They themselves will cast their votes… The ideal of such a person is – Stalin…”

However, the apotheosis of the Moscow Patriarchate’s cult of Stalin came on the occasion of his birthday in 1949, when a “Greeting to the Leader of the peoples of the USSR” was addressed to him in the name of the whole Church. “Without the slightest hesitation,” write Fr. Gleb Yakunin and a group of Orthodox Christians, “we can call this address the most shameful document ever composed in the name of the Church in the whole history of Christianity and still more in the thousand-year history of Christianity in Rus’.”

---

218 Cited in Potapov, *What is False is also Corrupt*, p. 223. Texts in Russian in *JMP*, 1949, N 12, pp. 5-11; Babkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-5; Monk Benjamin, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, pp. 144-145. No less odious was the letter of congratulation sent by Catholicos Kallistrat of Georgia to Stalin: “On the day of your seventieth birthday, we, the believers and clergy of the Georgian Catholicosate, send you, our near and dear Joseph Vissarionovich, our ardent and heart-felt congratulations and wishes that your health remain unbroken and that you have a long life for the good of the whole of humanity. In the course of the first seventy years of your life, through unceasing activity and that immortal creation, your Constitution, you have strengthened in the hearts of the workers of the whole world the evangelical behests of brotherhood, unity and freedom, which elicits disagreement in those who consider themselves guides of the blind, light for
On March 5, 1953 the greatest mass-murderer and persecutor of Christians in history was dying. “His face was discoloured,” wrote his daughter Svetlana, “his features becoming unrecognizable... He literally choked to death as we watched. The death agony was terrible... At the last minute, he opened his eyes. It was a terrible look, either mad or angry, and full of the fear of death.”

“Suddenly,” continues Simon Sebag Montefiore, “the rhythm of his breathing changed. A nurse thought it was ‘like a greeting’. He ‘seemed either to be pointing upwards somewhere or threatening us all...’ observed Svetlana. It was more likely he was simply clawing the air for oxygen [or pointing at the demons coming for his soul]. ‘Then the next moment, his spirit after one last effort tore itself from his body.’ A woman doctor burst into tears and threw her arms around the devastated Svetlana...”

And therein lay the tragedy for Russia and the world: that so many still loved this most evil of men. For in the days that followed millions poured into Moscow to mourn over the destroyer of their country and their Church. The hysteria was so great that hundreds were crushed to death. Their grief was genuine – and therefore their guilt, and its punishment, continued. To this day the wrath of God over the Russian land continues unassuaged...

One of the few who did not lament Stalin’s death was Lavrenty Beria, the terrible Georgian executioner and head of the security services. It is possible that he killed Stalin. According to Molotov, Beria actually said: “I did away with him, I saved you all.” Certainly, he openly rejoiced in Stalin’s death, while even Molotov, whose beloved wife Polina was still in prison when Stalin died, genuinely mourned him. Moreover, Beria was probably the one satrap who really did not believe in communism – after all, he wanted his grandchildren to go to Oxford University!

The MP was quite different: it showed no let-up in its worship of Stalin, even after his death. Thus in Izvestia on March 10, 1953, there appeared Patriarch Alexis’ letter to the USSR Council of Ministers: “In my own name and in the name of the Russian Orthodox Church I express my deepest and sincerest condolences on the death of the unforgettable Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, the great builder of the people’s happiness. His death has been taken with deep grief by the whole of the Russian Orthodox Church, which those in darkness and instructors of the ignorant, and who try to suppress the consciousness that has awakened in men of their lofty human dignity.

“Knowing firmly that it is difficult to kick against the pricks, we hope that in the first years of your second seventy years, the opponents of truth and justice will recover their sight and say: you are right, Joseph Vissarionovich most wise, and righteous are your judgements...”

( Zhurnal Moskovskoj Patriarkhii (Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate), N 1, 1950.
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will never forget his benevolent attitude towards the needs of the Church. His radiant memory will never be erased from our hearts. Our Church intones ‘eternal memory’ to him with a special feeling of unceasing love.”\textsuperscript{221} And in 1955 he declared his church’s continued loyalty to Stalin’s successors: “The Russian Orthodox Church supports the totally peaceful foreign policy of our government, not because the Church allegedly lacks freedom, but because Soviet policy is just and corresponds to the Christian ideals which the Church preaches.”\textsuperscript{222}

The Catacomb Church condemned the MP’s cult of Stalin. \textsuperscript{223} So did ROCOR. In response to the MP’s description of Stalin as “the chosen one of the Lord, who leads our fatherland to prosperity and glory”, Metropolitan Anastasy, first-hierarch of ROCOR, wrote that this was the point “where the subservience of man borders already on blasphemy. Really – can one tolerate that a person stained with blood from head to foot, covered with crimes like leprosy and poisoned deeply with the poison of godlessness, should be named ‘the chosen of the Lord’, could be destined to lead our homeland ‘to prosperity and glory’? Does this not amount to casting slander and abuse on God the Most High Himself, Who, in such a case, would be responsible for all the evil that has been going on already for many years in our land ruled by the Bolsheviks headed by Stalin? The atom bomb, and all the other destructive means invented by modern technology, are indeed less dangerous than the \textit{moral disintegration} which the highest representatives of the civil and church authorities have put into the Russian soul by their example. The breaking of the atom brings with it only physical devastation and destruction, whereas the \textit{corruption of the mind, heart and will} entails the \textit{spiritual death} of a whole nation, after which there is no resurrection.”\textsuperscript{224}

\textsuperscript{221} The text of the patriarch’s speech at Stalin’s funeral on March 9 can be found here: \url{http://leontiev-danila.livejournal.com/10723.html}.

\textsuperscript{222} Quoted in Christopher Andrew and Vasili Mitrokhin, \textit{The Mitrokhin Archive}, London: Allen Lane the Penguin Press, 1999, p. 635.

\textsuperscript{223} According to Bishop Ambrose von Sievers (admittedly, a dubious source), it was anathematized by a Council in Chirchik, near Tashkent, in the autumn of 1948. It also anathematized the patriarchate’s 1948 council, and declared the canonical leader of the Russian Church to be Metropolitan Anastasy, first-hierarch of the Russian Church Abroad. This Council, which confirmed the decisions of the supposed “Nomadic Council” of 1928, was attended by thirteen bishops or their representatives, and was organized by Fr. Peter Pervushin, who had also played a major role in the 1928 Council (“Katakombaia Tserkov’: Tainij Sobor 1948g.” (The Catacomb Church: Secret Council of 1948), \textit{Russkoe Pravoslavie}, N 5 (9), 1997, pp. 12-27). In response to the increase in the infiltration of spies and provocateurs into the ranks of the True Church, the Chirchik Council passed the following canon: “We used to accept sergianist ‘priests’ and on the basis of the 19\textsuperscript{th} canon of the Council of Nicaea we even ordained some of them with the true ordination. But now we see that they all turned out to be agents of the antichristian power or traitors who destroyed a multitude of Christians. From now on we forbid this; whoever dares to violate our decision – let him be anathema.” (ibid., pp. 17-18). This decision was confirmed by a larger Catacomb Council at the Nikolsky Council in Bashkiria in 1961 (Bishop Ambrose (von Sievers), “Katakombaia Tserkov’: Tainie Sobory 1961-81gg.” (The Catacomb Church: Secret Councils, 1961-1981), \textit{Russkoe Pravoslavie}, 1998, N 1 (10), pp. 25-26).

\textsuperscript{224} I.M Andreyev, \textit{Is the Grace of God present in the Soviet Church?} Wildwood, Alberta: Monastery Press, 2000, pp. 32-33 (with some changes in the translation).
In the first half of the twentieth century, the major scientific discoveries had been made in the physical sciences and mathematics. In the second half, it was the turn of the biological sciences. For, as Eric Hobsbawm writes, “within ten years of the Second World War, the life sciences were revolutionized by the astonishing advances of molecular biology, which revealed the universal mechanism of inheritance, the ‘genetic code’.

“The revolution in molecular biology was not unexpected. After 1914 it could be taken for granted that life had to be, and could be, explained in terms of physics and chemistry and not in terms of some essence peculiar to living beings. Indeed, biochemical models of the possible origin of life on earth, starting with sunlight, methane, ammonia and water, were first suggested in the 1920s (largely with anti-religious intentions) in Soviet Russia and Britain, and put the subject on the serious scientific agenda. Hostility to religion, by the way, continued to animate researchers in this field: both Crick and Linus Pauling are cases in point. The major thrust of biological research had for decades been biochemical, and increasingly physical, since the recognition that protein molecules could be crystallized, and therefore analysed crystallographically. It was known that one substance, deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) played a central, possibly the central role in heredity: it seemed to be the basic component of the gene, the unit of inheritance. The problem of how the gene ‘cause(d) the synthesis of another structure like itself, in which even the mutations of the original gene are copied’, i.e. how heredity operated, was already under serious investigation in the later 1930s. After the war it was clear that, in Crick’s words, ‘great things were just around the corner’. The brilliance of Crick and Watson’s discovery of the double-helical structure of DNA [in 1953] and of the way it explained ‘gene copying’ by an elegant chemico-mechanical model is not diminished by the fact that several workers were converging on the same result in the early 1950s.

“The DNA revolution, ‘the greatest single discovery in biology’ (J.D. Bernal), which dominated the life-sciences in the second half of the century, was essentially about genetics and, since twentieth-century Darwinism is exclusively genetics, about evolution. Both these are notoriously touchy subjects, both because scientific models are themselves frequently ideological in such fields – we remember Darwin’s debt to Malthus – and because they frequently feed back into politics (‘social Darwinism’). The concept of ‘race’ illustrates this interplay. The memory of Nazi racial policies made it virtually unthinkable for liberal intellectuals (which included most scientists) to operate with his concept. Indeed, many doubted that it was legitimate even to enquire systematically into the genetically determined differences between human groups, for fear that the results might provide encouragement for racist opinions. More generally, in the Western countries the post-fascist ideology of democracy and equality revived the old debates of ‘nature v. nurture’, or heredity v. environment. Plainly the human individual was
shaped both by heredity and environment, by genes and culture. Yet conservatives were only too willing to accept of society of irremovable, i.e. genetically determined inequalities, while the Left, committed to equality, naturally held that all inequalities could be removed by social action: they were at bottom environmentally determined. The controversy flared up over the question of human intelligence, which (because of its implications for selective or universal schooling) was highly political. It raised far wider issues than those or race, though it bore on these also. How wide they were, emerged with the revival of the feminist movement, several of whose ideologists came close to claiming that all mental differences between men and women wer essentially culture-determined, i.e. environmental. Indeed, the fashionable substitution of the term ‘gender’ for ‘sex’ implied the belief that ‘woman’ was not so much a biological category as a social role. A scientist who tried to investigate such sensitive subjects knew himself to be in a political minefield. Even those who entered it deliberately, like E.O. Wilson of Harvard (b. 1929), the champion of ‘socio-biology’, shied away from plain speech…”225

However, the discovery of DNA had a far deeper and more fundamental effect than merely eliciting these debates on the relative roles of genes and environment in various human conditions and situations. Although this has not been recognized by most scientists to this day, the discovery of DNA undermined the theoretical basis of Darwinism itself. For it revealed an information-based mechanism for the transmission of the genome that could not possibly have come into existence by chance, but must have been created by an intelligent designer – in other words, God. Information is a concept that makes no sense without a mind possessing it. And the amount of information contained in just the simplest reproducible cell points to an infinite Mind…

As Raymond G. Halvorson writes: “The human body contains some 100 million cells, with the DNA divided into forty-six chromosomes. The total length of the entire DNA in one call is about three feet. The total DNA content in a human body is estimated to span the solar system. In terms of an analogy, human DNA is like a very large encyclopedia of forty-six volumes, with each one have 20,000 pages. Every one of the 100 million cells in a human body contains this entire library.

“As scientists began to decode the human genome they found it to be approximately three billion DNA base pairs long. ‘One of the most extraordinary discoveries of the twentieth century,’ says Dr. Stephen Meyer, director of the Center for Science and Culture at the Discovery Institute in Seattle, Washington, ‘was that DNA actually stores information – the detailed instructions for assembling proteins – in the form a four-character digital code.’

“David Coppedge, a systems administrator for the Cassini Mission to Saturn and Titan at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, NASA, made the following observation: ‘Life on the molecular level is incredibly complex. A symphony of proteins, enzymes and DNA work in harmony to permit rapid and precisely controlled chemical reactions. At least 239 proteins are required for the simplest conceivable living cell. The change of getting even one of these proteins, even under ideal conditions, is less than one in 10\textsuperscript{-161} (10 followed by 161 zeros). To get the simplest reproducible cell is one in 10\textsuperscript{-40,000}. Anything less likely than 1 in 10-50 is virtually impossible, anywhere in the whole universe.’…”

“Coppedge calculated the probability that the 200 trillion molecules arranged in perfect order within the walls of a cell would take trillions and trillions of years to generate spontaneously. That is well beyond the actual age of the earth. The immense complexity of a single cell precludes all possibility of life ever happening by chance…”

Darwinism already faced colossal difficulties. With the discovery of DNA, it became a statistical impossibility. Unfortunately, however, the world continued as if nothing had happened: Darwinism, impossible though it had been shown to be, remained the corner-stone, not only of biological science, but of the whole modern world-view, which now entered a less violent, but even more radical phase of its development...

Thus in 2016 it was reported: “From the earliest days of civilization, humans have considered themselves exceptional among living creatures. But a new survey by Discovery Institute of more than 3,400 American adults indicates that the theory of evolution is beginning to erode that belief in humanity’s unique status and dignity.

“According to the survey, 43 percent of Americans now agree that “Evolution shows that no living thing is more important than any other,” and 45 percent of Americans believe that ‘Evolution shows that human beings are not fundamentally different from other animals.’

“The highest levels of support for the idea that evolution shows that humans aren’t fundamentally different from other animals are found among self-identified atheists (69 percent), agnostics (60 percent), and 18 to 29 year-olds (51 percent).

“The theory of evolution is also reshaping how people think about morality. A majority of Americans (55 percent) now contend that ‘Evolution shows that moral beliefs evolve over time based on their survival value in various times and places.’

---

“Since the rise of Darwin’s theory, leading scientists and other thinkers have insisted that human beings are just another animal, and that morality evolves based on survival of the fittest,’ says historian Richard Weikart.”

The democratic victor powers in 1945 - the United States, Britain and France - were both more tolerant of traditional religion and less inclined to mix religion with politics than the totalitarian powers, both Nazi and Soviet, had been. Indeed, in hindsight we can now see that the fundamental contrast and antagonism was not between Fascism and Communism, as leftists tend to believe, but between these two aspects of the totalitarian revolution, on the one hand, and western democracy, on the other. For as Tony Judt writes, the ravages of Hitler and Stalin may be seen as complementing each other in their destruction of pre-war bourgeois civilization: “Hitler’s war amounted, de facto, to a major European revolution, transforming Central and Eastern Europe and preparing the way for the ‘Socialist’ regimes of the postwar years which built upon the radical change Hitler had brought about – notably the destruction of the intelligentsia and urban middle class of the region, first through the murder of the Jews and then as a result of the postwar expulsion of Germans from the liberated Slav lands.”

But it did not end there; for in the second half of the twentieth century the democracies carried on the antichristian revolution – known as “the New World Order” - with hardly less success than the anti-democratic totalitarian regimes of the first half, albeit in less violent ways. This should remind us that Fascism, Communism and Democracy all owe their origins to the first anti-Christian revolution, the French revolution of 1789…

The critical transitional period began in 1953, when, on the one hand, the violent, masculine phase of the revolution passed its peak with Stalin’s death, and on the other hand the seductive, feminine phase began with the discovery of the contraceptive pill… 1953 was also the year of the discovery of DNA. Theoretically, this made possible the abolition of disease and old age, even the changing of human nature itself through manipulation of the human genome. Thus the Nihilist dreams of Nechaiev and Nietzsche, which became nightmarish reality in the era of Stalin and Hitler, have given way to more peaceful visions of life without God (at least in any form recognizable to

---


228 Judt, “Downhill all the Way”, in When the Facts Change. Essays 1995-2010, London: Vintage, 2015, p. 22. As Fr. Seraphim Rose wrote: “The Nihilism of Hitler was too pure, too unbalanced, to have more than a negative, preliminary role to play in the whole Nihilist program. Its role, like the role of the purely negative first phase of Bolshevism, is now finished, and the next stage belongs to a power possessing a more complete view of the whole Revolution, the Soviet power upon which Hitler bestowed, in effect, his inheritance in the words, ‘the future belongs solely to the stronger Eastern nation.’” (Nihilism, Platina, Ca.: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 2001, p. 77)
traditional monotheism). Thus our ideals now are not salvation or the Kingdom of heaven but education and clean water, human rights and robots (including, human rights for robots\textsuperscript{229}), cloning and gene therapy.

The aim of this continuation of the revolution by non-violent means – its “positive”, “creative” phase, as opposed to its “negative”, “destructive” phase up to 1945 – is the same as before: to reconcile a renewed (or recreated or replaced-by-robots) mankind to a completely this-worldly faith and hope. The first, violent, nihilist phase of the revolution was necessary in order to root out the old, other-worldly faith. In Lenin’s famous phrase, “you can’t make an omelette without breaking eggs.” But now mankind can proceed to a new age of universal prosperity and happiness from which all sorrow and pain will have fled away and in which, consequently, the “opium” of traditional religion will no longer be necessary, being replaced by more this-worldly (but still “spiritual”) opiates...

These opiates are substances such as serotonin, which determine our mood levels. As Yuval Noah Harari writes: “Today, when we finally realize that the keys to happiness are in the hands of our biochemical system, we can stop wasting our time on politics and social reforms, putsches and ideologies, and focus instead on the only thing that can make us truly happy: manipulating our biochemistry. If we invest billions in understanding our brain chemistry and developing appropriate treatments, we can make people far happier than ever before, without any need of revolutions. Prozac, for example, does not change regimes, but by raising serotonin levels it lifts people out of their depression.

“Nothing captures the biological argument better than the famous New Age slogan: ‘Happiness begins within.’ Money, social status, plastic surgery, beautiful houses, powerful positions – none of these will bring you happiness. Lasting happiness comes only from serotonin, dopamine and oxytocin.

“In Aldous Huxley’s dystopian novel \textit{Brave New World}, published in 1932 at the height of the Great Depression, happiness is the supreme value and psychiatric drugs replace the police and the ballot as the foundation of politics. Every day, each person takes a dose of ‘soma’, a synthetic drug which makes people happy without harming their productivity and efficiency. The World State that governs the entire globe is never threatened by wars, revolutions, strikes or demonstrations, because all people are supremely content with their current conditions, whatever they may be. Huxley’s vision of the future is far more troubling than George Orwell’s \textit{Nineteen Eighty-Four}. Huxley’s world seems monstrous to most readers, but it is hard to explain why. Everybody is happy all the time – what could be wrong with that?”\textsuperscript{230}

In October, 1949 Aldous Huxley, prophet of the “positive”, “creative”, “New World” phase of the revolution, wrote to his former pupil George Orwell, denouncer of “negative”, “Old World” totalitarianism, after the publication of Nineteen Eighty-Four: “It was very kind of you to tell your publishers to send me a copy of your book. It arrived as I was in the midst of a piece of work that required much reading and consulting of references; and since poor sight makes it necessary for me to ration my reading, I had to wait a long time before being able to embark on Nineteen Eighty-Four.

“Agreeing with all that the critics have written of it, I need not tell you, yet once more, how fine and how profoundly important the book is. May I speak instead of the thing with which the book deals — the ultimate revolution? The first hints of a philosophy of the ultimate revolution — the revolution which lies beyond politics and economics, and which aims at total subversion of the individual’s psychology and physiology — are to be found in the Marquis de Sade, who regarded himself as the continuator, the consummator, of Robespierre and Babeuf. The philosophy of the ruling minority in Nineteen Eighty-Four is a sadism which has been carried to its logical conclusion by going beyond sex and denying it. Whether in actual fact the policy of the boot-on-the-face can go on indefinitely seems doubtful. My own belief is that the ruling oligarchy will find less arduous and wasteful ways of governing and of satisfying its lust for power, and these ways will resemble those which I described in Brave New World. I have had occasion recently to look into the history of animal magnetism and hypnotism, and have been greatly struck by the way in which, for a hundred and fifty years, the world has refused to take serious cognizance of the discoveries of Mesmer, Braid, Esdaile, and the rest.

“Partly because of the prevailing materialism and partly because of prevailing respectability, nineteenth-century philosophers and men of science were not willing to investigate the odder facts of psychology for practical men, such as politicians, soldiers and policemen, to apply in the field of government. Thanks to the voluntary ignorance of our fathers, the advent of the ultimate revolution was delayed for five or six generations. Another lucky accident was Freud’s inability to hypnotize successfully and his consequent disparagement of hypnotism. This delayed the general application of hypnotism to psychiatry for at least forty years. But now psycho-analysis is being combined with hypnosis; and hypnosis has been made easy and indefinitely extensible through the use of barbiturates, which induce a hypnoid and suggestible state in even the most recalcitrant subjects.

“Within the next generation I believe that the world’s rulers will discover that infant conditioning and narco-hypnosis are more efficient, as instruments of government, than clubs and prisons, and that the lust for power can be just as completely satisfied by suggesting people into loving their servitude as by flogging and kicking them into obedience. In other words, I feel that the nightmare of Nineteen Eighty-Four is destined to modulate into the nightmare of a world having more resemblance to that which I imagined in Brave New World. The change will be brought about as a result of a felt need
for increased efficiency. Meanwhile, of course, there may be a large scale biological and atomic war — in which case we shall have nightmares of other and scarcely imaginable kinds.”

“The new age,” wrote Fr. Seraphim Rose in the 1960s, “which many call a ‘post-Christian’ age, is at the same time the age ‘beyond Nihilism’ – a phrase that expresses at once a fact and a hope. The fact this phrase expresses is that Nihilism, being negative in essence even if positive in aspiration, owing its whole energy to its passion to destroy Christian Truth, comes to the end of its program in the production of a mechanized ‘new earth’ and a dehumanized ‘new man’: Christian influence over man and over society having been effectively obliterated, Nihilism must retire and give way to another, more ‘constructive’ movement capable of acting from autonomous and positive motives. This movement... takes up the Revolution at the point where Nihilism leaves off and attempts to bring the movement which Nihilism began to its logical conclusion.”
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II. THE AFFLUENT YEARS (1953-1973)
17. THE DECLINE OF ENGLAND

1953 was, as we have noted, a pivotal year: the year in which Stalin died, the Korean war came to an end and the first insurrections against Soviet power began, in which the Islamic revolution began in Pakistan and Iran, and DNA was discovered. In spite of the consolidation of a state of cold war between East and West, there was a certain relaxation of tension in the political sphere as Europe entered a new era of peace and prosperity that in the following decades spread to many other parts of the world.

The new era of peace, prosperity and decadence was heralded by the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II on June 2, 1953. Of all the important events of that year this was the richest in symbolism and nostalgia, almost the last splash of monarchical splendour in a world which, though richer in a material sense, had become poorer in a spiritual sense. As David Starkey and Katie Greening write: “Most of the great actors in the [1953] coronation ceremony – the peerage, the armed forces, the Church of England – are now pale shadows of themselves. Above all, we have lost the chief inspiration for the music of monarchy. Not, of course, the Queen, who happily is still with us. The difference is that today she is respected, rather than revered. The idea, alive and well in 1953, that monarchy has a sacred role and power, is gone…”233

As Norman Stone writes, “complete with archbishop, sacred oil, orbs and sceptres, it was an extraordinary spectacle, watched by tens of millions of the relatively new black-and-white television sets. A film-maker of genius, Lindsay Anderson, remarked, later on, that the monarchy was a gold filling in a mouthful of rotten teeth. That fitted the England that emerged, a generation after the coronation. However, the early fifties were a good time. Western Europe was not yet quite competitive, British exports did well, and there were good markets in the old imperial area. Decolonization during the 1950s had been, at least in comparison with French experience, a success, and the new Queen became a considerable expert in it. At home, taxes on income were absurdly high, but there was no tax on fortunes made out of equities, and the banks were generous with overdrafts, charging a low rate of interest. The old England (and Scotland) had an Indian summer, and the great Victorian cities, with Glasgow in the lead, were still the great Victorian cities of industry and empire. But the later fifties showed that this could not last…”234

Peter Hitchens nostalgically recalls that world: “By the early 1950s, most of the respectable English middle class had ceased to be especially religious, though they continued to respect faith. Church attendance had ceased to be normal in most of Britain around the time of the 1914–18 war, and had begun to be abnormal after the 1939–45 war. But parents brought up in the lost age of faith still felt it right that their children should be taught beliefs they themselves had lost, but be taught them by someone else.”

“So through various schools I was exposed to the last enchantments of Anglicanism as it once was, full of the might, majesty, dominion, and power granted to it by the first Queen Elizabeth. These men had crowned the second Elizabeth before an astonished world in 1953, and made an ordinary young woman our anointed monarch in a ceremony of grandeur, mystery, and poetry, a vast moth-eaten musical brocade that in those days still comfortingly covered up the peeling wallpaper and cracked plaster of our national home.

“I spent time as a non-singing pupil at a cathedral choir school in the softest corner of Southern England, what George Orwell called the sleekest landscape in the world. The cathedral cities of England are unknown elsewhere. Other countries may have cathedrals; one thinks of Chartres, Cologne, or Milan. But they do not have these uniquely English holy places. The great church broods over the small town, once a seat of power but long overtaken in size and importance by some shapeless industrial blob nearby. There is usually an elegant close of eighteenth-century gentlemen’s houses, breathing the sweet combination of Scripture, reason, and tradition which is the whole point of the Anglican compromise. There are gardens and trees almost as ancient as the buildings. All is regulated in an unworldly rhythm by bells and choirs, matins and evensong. They are shrines to a particular view of life, thought, and death.

“Here we were inducted into the mysteries of our national religion, reasonable, surprisingly masculine for a faith that might at first glance seem soppy and weak, confident, and perhaps above all things unself-consciously beautiful. The beauty came from elsewhere as a free gift, in the language of worship and Scripture chosen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For three hundred years it was just so, not especially treasured or remarked, but constant.

“Now it has almost entirely vanished. You can still catch it at Christmas in a village church when a small child with a strong country accent grapples for the first time with the nativity story in the King James Bible, and the music of the eternal flows into the silent building through his hesitating tongue. The tongue is a fire. Likewise, the voice of the dullest and most banal curate is forced to soar as he reads the unaffected, lovely, heartbreaking words of the 1662 order for Holy Matrimony, or its elegiac twin, the earthy, uncompromising burial service. But these treasures, intricate ancient workmanship polished in use to a soft, deep gleam, are now rarely heard. Blander, more diffident, and less disturbing. Rituals, substituting syrupy banality for alarming majesty, have replaced them.

“When I was small, these lovely, disturbing things were normal. There were no alternative modern services or sensible, rewritten Bibles from which every trace of poetry had been carefully removed. There were no jolly modern hymns. The bloodthirsty, vengeful bits of the Psalms were still sung in the
ancient monastic cycle inherited from the Romish past. Priests and ministers (the title depending on how Protestant they were) wore academic hoods and gowns to remind us that they were learned, thoughtful men. These flashes of red and blue were, in fact, their chief adornments, worn atop austere Calvinist black and white surplices. The cathedral into which we filed, sometimes twice a day, was both richly ornamented and austere, a combination I have found nowhere else and which satisfies a profoundly English desire for modesty and restraint, even in the presence of glory.

“I was brought up among such people, and I shared this taste. I still do. It is one of the most important things about me over which I have no control. Amid these crumbling arches stood and stands the Arundel Tomb which Philip Larkin was to make famous in his great poem, where he teeters (as he so often does) on the brink of faith before turning abruptly away . . . qualifying the seemingly confident, semi-biblical proclamation that ‘what will survive of us is love’ with the words ‘our almost-instinct, almost true.’

‘Almost’ is the word Larkin uses when he wants to believe, yet decides not to, as in ‘The trees are coming into leaf, like something almost being said.’ Actually, if the yearly revival of the woodlands catches you that way, as it does in my case, there is no “almost” about it. His hesitation, as he surely knew, was an Anglican characteristic. No minister or preacher, his bare dusty words surrounded by the ancient canticles and psalmody which were then the context of all our worship, would have dared to be emphatic, let alone enthusiastic. Ambiguity and loveliness helped us to accept, quite happily and without effort, something which is very difficult to credit. We believed completely in the entire creed, but poetically and musically and architecturally, in ways which naked prose cannot express.

“I have never understood why people jeer at this form of belief. ‘Oh,’ they say dismissively, ‘You just like the old buildings and the music, and the Shakespearean language.’ They say this as if ‘liking’ these things were a meaningless self-indulgence, an aesthetic fancy, like preferring China tea to Indian (which I don’t). My own view then and ever since is that the languages of architecture, music, and poetry work mightily on us when we are not aware of it, slip past our everyday defenses and so convey the unspeakable grandeur of God to us better than any other means. The haunting rhythms and shadowy shapes of the eternal disturb the banalities of the temporal, and no properly conscious human being comes out of a cathedral or ancient parish church the same as he or she went in. You might have thought that these were gifts we should take care to treasure and use aright. By themselves, simply by being there, they must have quietly wafted the spirit of God into millions of lives.

“Not now. If I go back (as I recently did), there are traces of what I saw then. But most of it has been tidied away, along with the crumbling and rather alarming tombs in the grass around the building, which always seemed about to open and disclose their shrouded occupants, climbing out into the
modern day like a Stanley Spencer resurrection. New glass doors, modern heating, modern lighting, welcome desks, tea-rooms, and bookstalls come between the visitor and the shadowed spaces. The services are shorter, the Bibles newer, the stone cleaner; the unsettling sweetish whiff of moldering coffins in ancient vaults has gone. So has the peace and so has the air of timeless authority. The modern world has got in. The particular place of which I speak is roiled by shame and anger about the abuse of children by priests, long unchecked and now belatedly acknowledged.

"When I experienced that cathedral and city as a child, I saw an ordered, peaceful, gentle England in which two things were entirely taken for granted among all classes: that the courts were just and that we were free people.

“I do not think my feeling of almost complete security, in a country where every road ended at the sea and even the worst enemy in the world had not managed to reach us or seriously damage us, was merely personal. I think it was true…”

The fall of the Anglican Church – not from a state of grace, for this Calvinist creation was never part of the One True Church, but from its former position of authority, security and dignity - was remarkably swift. It fell to a weapon that the English have always prided themselves on possessing – humour. Only that weapon now began to be turned, less than ten years after the coronation of Elizabeth II, on the Church that conducted that impressive ceremony – with devastating long-term results.

Hitchens again: “A vaguely conscious English person of 2016 probably associates the Established Church much more with sex than with God. Perhaps if I explain a little about a book that was recently withdrawn from publication due to certain disputed facts, I can also explain why the Church of England has passed in a generation from significance to insignificance. The book’s title, That Was the Church That Was, has a double meaning, open only to a certain generation of British persons. The title does not just mean “that was the church that used to be.” It is a conscious reference to a revolutionary moment in British culture, a short-lived TV program called That Was the Week That Was, also called TW3, which was screened late on Saturday evenings for a few short months in 1962 and 1963 and has never been forgotten by those (including this writer) who watched it.

“Before it was broadcast, we still had the ability to be shocked and scandalized. Afterwards, we had lost that capacity. We had passed through amazement into acceptance that we were not the country or the people we had once been. It was round about then that most of us probably accepted in our hearts that we would rather sink, giggling, into the sea than take part in any scheme aimed at national salvation.

“Every comforting belief, including religion, was turned into a huge joke. It was very funny, but we were a little ashamed of finding it so. Many subsequent TV programs have tried to emulate it, but they cannot, because such delicious shock is something you can only experience once, just as you can only lose your virginity once.

“During this brief time of transformation, a sex-and-espionage scandal called the Profumo affair accelerated the collapse, amid gleeful ridicule, of all that was left of Britain’s Victorian establishment. The program’s satire would not seem very potent now, but that is the point: It did then. The show began each week with the scratchy, raucous jazz-club voice of the red-haired singer Millicent Martin. (We somehow knew her hair was red even though our TV was all in black and white. Perhaps it sounded red.) ‘That was the week that was,’ she cawed. ‘It’s over, let it go.’ And then she dismissed the events and people of the previous week with cackling sarcasm.

“I remember, one week, that a Church of England vicar had written in to the BBC to complain. They broadcast his complaint in the strange medieval chant familiar to any Anglican churchgoer (however occasional). ‘Millicent Martin is simply repulsive,’ intoned an unseen voice, in the style normally used to plead each morning and evening the timeless and never redundant plea ‘Give Peace in Our Time, O Lord.’ The studio audience laughed mightily. The point about this is that, in 1963, even unbelievers knew and recognized what was being mocked. Now they wouldn’t have the faintest idea, and parsons don’t chant like that anymore. They’re too busy launching group hugs or devising rap liturgies.

“The shriveling of the majestic Anglicanism of my childhood into the unending quarrel about sex which it has become is a symbol of its decay. That Was the Church That Was (I think I can reveal without causing any grave difficulties to anyone) is dominated by factional differences between evangelical conservatives and liberal Catholics, by office politics, by money troubles, and by struggles over homosexuality and over the ordination of women. It is hardly at all about trying to maintain the Christian faith in an age of secularism. Nowhere does it discuss the mysterious but willful destruction of the mighty poetic force of the Bible and Prayer Book, which has turned the thunder and trumpets of Anglican worship into a series of squeaks and squawks, accompanied by tambourines and guitars. This rejection of solemnity and mystery helped to make possible the shrinking of a great Church into a series of squabbles. Both events are consequences of the general inability of a once important people to take themselves seriously anymore…

“So ended a global empire which dispatched fleets of giant gray warships round the world to secure its wealth and which needed to be underpinned by serious ideas, nobly phrased and spoken by serious people. A post-imperial country increasingly famous for the Beatles (for heaven’s sake) and the miniskirt did not need such things. Although the deep old sources of our wealth were drying up, we were for a time affluent. No other power could so
effectively have dispelled the austere, hollow-cheeked stoicism, the tolerance of bad food in inadequate amounts, the thin sour beer, watered to help the war effort, the national motto of ‘mustn’t grumble.’

“English Protestantism, with its secret enjoyment of the chilly, the grim, and the frugal, was killed in fifteen years by supermarkets and TV commercials, fake Italian restaurants, cheap holidays in Spain. The Church’s loveliest and most accessible service, Evensong, was killed off in many parishes because, in the days before VCRs, worshippers preferred to watch a dramatization of John Galsworthy’s *The Forsyte Saga* on TV. Thus do great traditions end, and a culture that in living memory still read *The Pilgrim’s Progress* and readily recognized quotations from Isaiah now watches *Sex in the City* and thinks *Vanity Fair* is a magazine. I have learned, in a time of loss where anything good and beloved fights to survive, to mourn such departures but not to imagine that, in this life, what is lost will ever return. It will not. But anyone who is pleased that it is gone for good is a fool…”236

The decline of Anglicanism continued unrelentingly in the following decades. A kind of climax was achieved in 1984, when David Jenkins, who did not believe in the Divinity of Christ or His Resurrection, was appointed Bishop of Durham. The people finally rebelled – and God supported their rebellion in a visible manner.

“Early in the morning of July 9, 1984, York Cathedral caught fire. The wooden vaulted roof of the south transept was destroyed. The interior suffered extensive damage.

“[…] Only three days before the blaze, Dr. David Jenkins was consecrated Bishop of Durham in the cathedral. Dr. Jenkins had been the center of much controversy in the Church of England. He had made public statements that left many wondering if he really believed in some of the fundamental tenets of his faith — especially the virgin birth of Christ and his resurrection from the grave.

“Dr. Jenkins was entitled to his doubts, said the critics, but he was not entitled to be a bishop. Nevertheless he was ordained in an impressive ceremony in the cathedral by the Archbishop of York, Dr. John Habgood.

“On the Sunday evening following the ordination, the Archbishop preached in defense of Professor Jenkins' appointment. A few hours later, lightning struck the cathedral! […]

“As the London *Times* pointed out in an editorial the next day: "A bolt from heaven the very night after the Archbishop preached in defence of his Durham appointment before the assembled synod: It is hard not to be reminded of Elijah and the priests of Baal.”
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The famous poet T.S. Eliot was one who still had hope for Christian civilization: "The World is trying the experiment of attempting to form a civilized but non-Christian mentality. The experiment will fail; but we must be very patient in awaiting its collapse; meanwhile redeeming the time: so that the Faith may be preserved alive through the dark ages before us; to renew and rebuild civilization, and save the World from suicide."

However, more influential in the long run than Eliot, and no less conservative, after the war were J.R.R. Tolkien, author of the famous novel, *The Hobbit*, and his friend C.S. Lewis. "Clyde Kilby, an English professor from Wheaton College, worked with Tolkien in the summer of 1966, helping him to organize the manuscript for *The Silmarillion*. ‘Tolkien was an Old Western Man who was staggered at the present direction of civilization,’ Kilby recorded after a summer of conversations with Tolkien. ‘Even our much vaunted talk of equality he felt debased by our attempts to “mechanize and formalize it.”’ Tolkien wrote that the saints living in the modern world were those ‘who have for all their imperfections never finally bowed head and will to the world or the evil spirit (in modern but not universal terms: mechanism, “scientific” materialism, Socialism in either of its factions now at war).’

“Like many Englishmen,” continues Bradley J. Birzer, Tolkien “feared a world divided in two, in which the smaller peoples would be swallowed. Only fifteen years earlier, in reaction to the Teheran Conference, Tolkien had written: ‘I heard of that bloodthirsty old murderer Josef Stalin inviting all nations to join a happy family of folks devoted to the abolition of tyranny and intolerance!’ One would be blind to miss Tolkien’s disgust. ‘I wonder (if we survive this war) if there will be any niche, even of sufferance, left for reactionary back numbers like me (and you). The bigger things get the smaller and duller or flatter the globe gets. It is getting to be one blasted little provincial suburb.’ Soon, he feared, America would spread its ‘sanitation, morale-pep, feminism, and mass production’ throughout the world. Neither ‘ism’ - corporate consumer capitalism or communism, both radical forms of materialism - seemed particularly attractive to Tolkien, a man who loved England (but not Great Britain!) and who loved monarchy according to medieval conventions, while hating statism in any form.

“In his politics, Tolkien greatly resembled his closest friend and fellow member of the Inklings (the famous Oxford literary group), C.S. Lewis. During England’s darkest days of World War II, hope emerged from an unlikely source. An Oxford don - a professor of English literature, who would later be best known for a seven-part children’s fantasy series - gave frequent public addresses to the English people. Their purpose was to bolster English

---
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spirits. In late February, 1943, he devoted three of his addresses to a philosophical rather than a theological question. These relatively heady lectures were entitled: ‘Men without Chests,’ ‘The Way,’ and ‘The Abolition of Man.’ In each, C.S. Lewis addressed the nature and the future of character in England. Rather than spending his address on buoying the optimism of the English during the war against the German National Socialists, Lewis decided to ask what the English were really fighting for. Freedom from Nazi brutality was good, of course, but not, he argued, if it merely led to the victory of the 'conditioners,' the democratic bureaucrats on the loose in England who served as an internal threat. The conditioners claimed to be liberating individuals from arbitrary restraints imposed by ‘religious sanction, and inherited taboos, in order that “real” and “basic” values may emerge.’ In other words, the conditioners needed to destroy history and faith, which they claimed as artificial shackles on the true, unadulterated self. Such debasement of tradition, Lewis argued, can only lead to the creation of man-made (and consequently, man-centered) philosophies, ignoring the Natural Law. But, the Natural Law, Lewis cautioned, ‘is not one among a series of possible systems of value. It is the sole source of all value judgements. If it is rejected, all value is rejected.’ Anything created outside of the Natural Law will simply be mere ‘ideologies,’ that is, finite systems created by finite minds, shadows of shadows of a complex and nuanced world. ‘The human mind has no more power of inventing a new value than of imagining a new primary colour, or, indeed, of creating a new sun and a new sky for it to move in,’ Lewis concluded.

“Two years later, Lewis published his ideas on character, virtue, and the Natural Law in novel form, That Hideous Strength, part three of his renowned space trilogy. Published two years before Orwell’s similar anti-totalitarian masterpiece, Lewis’s novel is a theistic 1984. The story revolves around a group of academic and bureaucratic conditioners—known as the N.I.C.E. (National Institute for Coordinated Experiments), who take over a small but elite English college as a prelude to a takeover of Britain. To stop ‘That Hideous Strength,’ a new King Arthur emerges in the form of a philology professor, Dr. Ransom. With the aid of small group of friends, he awakens Merlin from a fifteen-century long sleep. Modernity perplexes Merlin. In a telling conversation, Merlin states: ‘This is a cold age in which I have awaked. If all this West part of the world is apostate, might it not be lawful, in our great need, to look farther... beyond Christendom? Should we not find some even among the heathen who are not wholly corrupt? There were tales in my day of some such men who knew not the articles of the most holy Faith, but who worshipped God as they could and acknowledged the Law of Nature. Sir, I believe it would be lawful to see help even there. Beyond Byzantium.’

“Ransom responds: ‘The poison was brewed in these West lands but it has spat itself everywhere by now. However far you went you would find the machines, the crowded cities, the empty thrones, the false writings, the barren books: men maddened with false promises and soured with true miseries, worshiping the iron works of their own hands, cut off from Earth their
mother and from the Father in Heaven. You might go East so far that East becomes West and you returned to Britain across the great ocean, but even so you would not have come out anywhere into the light. The shadow of one dark wing is over all.’

“Lewis was virulently anti-Nazi and anti-communist, and, like Tolkien, he also knew that democracy has its own risks. The West has bred all three political/economic systems. As an ideology, man-made and man-centered, bureaucratic democracy may appear as a brightly-colored package, more pleasing to the eye than the grittiness of socialism, but it too desires to make man a means to an end, to make him a mere cog in a machine…”

England had lost her “hard” power – in part voluntarily, as when she gave independence to so many of her colonies around the world, and partly involuntarily, as when she was forced, under American pressure, to abandon the military attempt to recover the Suez Canal in 1956. However, what she lost in hard power, she unexpectedly gained in “soft” power – the extraordinary world-wide influence gained by the so-called “cultural renaissance” associated with “The Swinging Sixties”: in music, with the Beatles and the Rolling Stones, in fashion with the miniskirt and other innovations coming from London’s Carnaby Street, in several cult films, like the James Bond franchise, and most significantly in a general and spectacularly rapid collapse of sexual morality. Of course, England was not alone in this cultural revolution – so different, and in its own, subtler way just as damaging, although less violent, than the fearsome one taking place at the same time in Mao’s China. American Hollywood films and music, especially Elvis Presley, played their part, as did European and Indian influences. But England led the way – and rarely, if ever, has an empire collapsed so swiftly only to rise again in a completely different form, a new form of cultural imperialism.

And yet the real Anglo-Saxon empire now was not British, but American… America in the Fifties was seen by the world – or, at any rate, the Western world – as a kind of paradise on earth, a land of happiness, opportunity, prosperity, freedom. There was much that was true in this picture: America in this period probably represents the highest point of worldly well-being yet achieved in history. But as the Lord said, “It is hard for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of heaven”, and beneath the glamour and optimism purveyed by the Hollywood film industry there was a darker side to American life.

Important changes in faith and morality took place after the war. Perhaps the most important impetus to these was the “scientific” research of Alfred Kinsey on sexual behavior. Jonathan von Maren writes: “He is known as ‘The Father of the Sexual Revolution,’ and if you’ve ever taken a university course on 20th century history, you’ll have heard his name: Alfred Kinsey.

“Kinsey was not only the ‘father’ of the Sexual Revolution, he set the stage for the massive social and cultural upheaval of the ‘60s, ‘70s and ‘80s with his 1948 Sexual Behavior in the Human Male and his 1953 Sexual Behavior in the Human Female.

“These books revealed to a shocked and somewhat titillated population things they had never known about themselves: That between 30-45% of men had affairs, 85% of men had had sex prior to marriage, that a staggering 70% of men had slept with prostitutes, and that between 10 and 37% of men had engaged in homosexual behavior.
“Much less talked about were his other disturbing ‘findings’ - an in-depth study on the ‘sexual behavior’ of children, as well as claims that nearly 10% of men had performed sex acts with animals (as well as 3.6% of women), and that this number rose to between 40-50% based on proximity to farms.

“Kinsey’s research portrayed people as amoral and sex-driven, and is credited as fundamentally changing the way our culture views sex.

“But was he right?

“To begin with, the integrity of much of his work has long since been called into question: among his questionable practices, Kinsey encouraged those he was working with to engage in all types of sexual activity as a form of research, misrepresented single people as married, and hugely over represented incarcerated sex criminals and prostitutes in his data.

“But beyond this is the simple fact that Kinsey himself was a pervert and a sex criminal.

“For example, where did he get all of his data on the “sexual behavior of children”? The answer is nothing short of chilling. Dr. Judith Reisman (whose research has since been confirmed time and time again) explained in her ground-breaking work Sex, Lies and Kinsey that Kinsey facilitated brutal sexual abuse to get his so-called research:

“Kinsey solicited and encouraged pedophiles, at home and abroad, to sexually violate from 317 to 2,035 infants and children for his alleged data on normal ‘child sexuality.’ Many of the crimes against children (oral and anal sodomy, genital intercourse and manual abuse) committed for Kinsey’s research are quantified in his own graphs and charts…

“Kinsey’s so-called research was simply a quest to justify the fact that he himself was a deeply disturbed man. Dr. Reisman writes, ‘Both of Kinsey’s most recent admiring biographers confessed he was a sadistic bi/homosexual, who seduced his male students and coerced his wife, his staff and the staff’s wives to perform for and with him in illegal pornographic films made in the family attic. Kinsey and his mates, Wardell Pomeroy, Clyde Martin and Paul Gebhard, had ‘front’ marriages that concealed their strategies to supplant what they say as a narrow pro-creational Judeo-Christian era with a promiscuous ‘anything goes’ bi/gay pedophile paradise.’

“Got that? The Father of the Sexual Revolution was a sado-masochistic bisexual sex criminal who facilitated the sexual torture of infants and children. His goal was not just to engage in scientific research in order to see where the data took him, but rather, as one of his prominent biographers Michael Jones notes, to launch a crusade to undermine traditional sexual morality. He did so
to wild success—Kinsey’s influence on sex education and law in the Western world is absolutely staggering...”

Another important feature of the post-war world was the increasing popularity of psychotherapy as a substitute for faith. Thus the Jewish rabbi Joshua Liebman, whose book *Peace of Mind*, published in 1946, topped the *New York Times* bestseller list for 58 weeks, a record, compared analysis and the confessional, and came to the conclusion that analysis was superior in producing peace of mind. “‘The confessional only touches the surface of a man’s life,’ he said, while the spiritual advice of the church throws no light on the causes that lead someone to confession in the first place. Moreover, priestly strictures about confessants showing more ‘willpower’ were ‘ineffective counsels’.

“On the other hand, psychotherapy was, Liebman said, designed to help someone work on his (or her) own problems without ‘borrowing’ the conscience of a priest, and ‘offers change through self-understanding, not self-condemnation’. And this was the unique way to inner peace. The human self, Liebman insisted, was not a gift from God, as traditionally taught, but an achievement.

“The religion of the future, he declared, must poach from the psychotherapist’s armoury. He told his readers that henceforth it should not be ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself’ but ‘Thou shalt love thyself properly and then thou wilt be able to love thy neighbour’.”

We see here the beginning of that “psychology of self-worship” and self-obsession that became so dominant in the therapeutic culture of the 1960s and 70s. Liebman is as wrong as it is possible to be. First of all, it is the therapist, not the priest, who only touches the surface of a man’s life. Deep in man, deeper even than his passions, is his God-given conscience, which, as we have seen, is not a socially indoctrinated construct, but the eye of God in the soul of man. When a man transgresses his conscience he feels guilt, and no amount of psychotherapy can relieve him of that guilt but only the confession of his sins before God and a priest (whose conscience he does not “borrow”, although he may occasionally check his conscience against the priest’s).

Secondly, it is precisely self-condemnation, and not simply “self-understanding” that alone can relieve the penitent of his guilt, for “he who condemns himself will not be judged” — neither by his own conscience, not by God. Liebman regards the light of consciousness and rational discussion as the means of destroying the darkness of neurotic suffering. But the Christian regards the healing power to be the light of God Who alone forgives men their

sins and grants them healing. The analyst does not heal so much as help the patient to heal himself by becoming conscious of his inner state. But for the Christian, consciousness of his inner state is not enough: he must also condemn that which is sinful in that state, repent of it, and ask God to destroy it.

By 1950, as Peter Watson writes, “thanks to Liebman’s lead, four out of five theological schools had psychologists on their staff. 117 centres for clinical pastoral psychology had been established.

“At first the church showed resistance to, in particular, psychoanalysis. Ministers condemned it as an ‘unsatisfactory mix of materialism, hedonism, infantilism and eroticism’ and, in contrast to the confessional, therapy gave no norms or standards. This intransigence didn’t last, however, because in February 1954 Pope Pius XII gave pastoral psychology a tentative go-ahead.

“Other churches followed, and so one can say that the mid-1950s really marks the point at which a secular psychological model of ‘fulfillment’, ‘wholeness’ and ‘self-realisation’ in this life, began to outweigh a religious concept of ‘salvation’ in an afterlife. And it was this sanctioning of psychology by religious institutions that, as much as anything, encouraged the ‘therapy boom’ that blossomed in the 1960s. Psychotherapy was now proliferating internationally. It epitomized new ways of living and, for many, it replace religion.

“As the number of clergy plummeted – so much so that some people were predicting the extinction of the Anglican church within a generation – the ranks of counselors snowballed. In fact, by the end of the 20th century, the profusion of therapies constituted what the sociologist Frank Furedi identified as ‘therapy culture’.

“But therapy was only one of there developments that, for many people, replaced the role of religion following the Second World War. The other two were drugs and music – in particular, rock and roll. These together comprised what was called the counter-culture.

“It is worth pointing out that roughly one in four people born in the west after the Second World War has used illegal drugs – it is not a fringe activity. And it was against this background that, in 1960, Timothy Leary first ingested Psilocybe Mexicana, the mysterious magical mushroom of Mexico. As a result, Leary, a psychology lecturer at Harvard University, came to the view that these mushrooms – whose active ingredient was from the same family as LSD – could ‘revolutionise’ psychotherapy, bringing with it the ‘possibility of instantaneous self-insight’.”

If therapy could take the place of religion, it was logical that therapy could also become a religion. Thus in 1950 L. Ron Hubbard published *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, “considered the seminal event of the century by Scientologists”, which later metamorphosed (perhaps for financial reasons) into the “religion” of Scientology... “Dianetics uses a counseling technique known as auditing in which an auditor assists a subject in conscious recall of traumatic events in the individual's past. It was originally intended to be a new psychotherapy and was not expected to become the foundation for a new religion. Hubbard variously defined Dianetics as a spiritual healing technology and an organized science of thought. The stated intent is to free individuals of the influence of past traumas by systematic exposure and removal of the engrams (painful memories) these events have left behind, a process called clearing. Rutgers scholar Beryl Satter says that ‘there was little that was original in Hubbard’s approach’, with much of the theory having origins in popular conceptions of psychology. Satter observes that in ‘keeping with the typical 1950s distrust of emotion, Hubbard promised that Dianetic treatment would release and erase psychosomatic ills and painful emotions, thereby leaving individuals with increased powers of rationality.’ According to Gallagher and Ashcraft, in contrast to psychotherapy, Hubbard stated that Dianetics ‘was more accessible to the average person, promised practitioners more immediate progress, and placed them in control of the therapy process.’ Hubbard’s thought was parallel with the trend of humanist psychology at that time, which also came about in the 1950s. Passas and Castillo write that the appeal of Dianetics was based on its consistency with prevailing values. Shortly after the introduction of Dianetics, Hubbard introduced the concept of the ‘thetan’ (or soul), which he claimed to have discovered. Dianetics was organized and centralized to consolidate power under Hubbard, and groups that were previously recruited were no longer permitted to organize autonomously.”

Even more ambitious and power-seeking than Hubbard was Ewen Cameron, Scottish-born president of the American Psychiatric Association, president of the Canadian Psychiatric Association and President of the World Psychiatric Association. Such a distinguished leader of his profession might have been expected to insist on strictly human and humanitarian standards for his own work. But it was precisely Cameron who introduced torture into psychiatry, making America, not the Soviet Union, the pioneer in the use of psychiatry as an instrument of torture and brain washing in peacetime.

If there is an excuse for his behavior, it is that he was trying to understand the practice of brainwashing used by the Communists on American prisoners in the Korean War. This also explains the CIA’s interest in, and funding of his work. Nevertheless, his therapeutic methods can in no way be called

---


242 By “coincidence” the CIA also took an interest in Hubbard’s Dianetics. For Scientology’s links with the CIA, see Alexander Dvorkin’s “Scientology and the CIA”, *Espionage History Archive*, February 27, 2016.
beneficial for the patient; for, as Naomi Klein writes, “his ambition was not to mend or repair the patients but to re-create them using a method he invented called ‘psychic driving’.

“According to his published papers from the time, he believed that the only way to teach his patients new behaviors was to get inside their minds and ‘break up old pathological patterns’. The first step was ‘depatterning’, which had a stunning goal: to return the mind to a state when it was, as Aristotle claimed, ‘a writing tablet on which as yet nothing actually stands written, a “tabula rasa”. Cameron believed he could reach that state by attacking the brain with everything known to interfere with its normal functioning – all at once. It was ‘shock and awe’ warfare on the mind.”243

Cameron’s favoured methods were electric shock and drugs. Thus in order to “depattern” his patients, he “used a relatively new device called the Page-Russell, which administered up to six consecutive jolts instead of a single one. Frustrated that his patients still seemed to be clinging to remnants of their personalities, he further disoriented them with uppers, downers, hallucinogens, chlorpromazine, barbiturates, sodium amotal, nitrous oxide, desoxyxyn, Seconal, Nembutal, Veronal, Melicone, Thorazine, largactil and insulin. Cameron wrote in a 1956 paper that these drugs served to ‘disinhibit him [the patient] so that his defenses might be reduced.’

“Once ‘complete depatterning’ had been achieved, and the earlier personality had been satisfactorily wiped out, the psychic driving could begin. It consisted of Cameron playing his patients tape-recorded messages such as ‘You are a good mother and wife and people enjoy your company’. As a behaviorist, he believed that if he could get his patients to absorb the messages on the tape, they would start behaving differently.

“With patients shocked and drugged into an almost vegetative state, they could do nothing but listen to the messages – for sixteen to twenty hours a day for weeks; in one case, Cameron played a message continuously for 101 days.

“In the mid-fifties, several researchers at the CIA became interested in Cameron’s methods. It was the start of Cold War hysteria, and the agency had just launched a covert program devoted to researching ‘special interrogation techniques’. A declassified CIA memorandum explained that the program ‘examined and investigated numerous unusual techniques of interrogation including psychological harassment and such matters as “total isolation”’ as well as ‘the use of drugs and chemicals’. First code-named Project Bluebird, then Project Artichoke, it was finally renamed MKUltra in 1953. Over the next decade MKUltra would spend $25 million on research in a quest to find new ways to break prisoners suspected of being Communists and double agents.

Eight institutions were involved in the program, including forty-four universities and twelve hospitals.\textsuperscript{244}

Since publication of these methods would have caused a scandal, the CIA preferred to work with Canadian researchers, meeting them at the Ritz hotel in Montreal. One of these was Dr. Donald Hebb, director of psychology at McGill University, who had been given a research grant by Canada’s Department of National Defense “to conduct a series of classified sensory deprivation experiments. Hebb paid a group of sixty-three McGill students £20 a day to be isolated in a room wearing dark goggles, headphones playing white noise and cardboard tubes covering their arms and hands so as to interfere with their sense of touch. For days, the students floated in a sea of nothingness, their eyes, ears and hands unable to orient them, living inside their increasingly vivid imagination. To see whether this deprivation made them more susceptible to ‘brainwashing’, Hebb then began playing recordings of voices talking about the existence of ghosts or the dishonesty of science – ideas the students said they found objectionable before the experiment began.

“In a confidential report on Hebb’s findings, the Defense Research Board concluded that sensory deprivation clearly caused extreme confusion as well as hallucination among the student test subjects and that ‘a significant temporary lowering of intellectual efficiency occurred during and immediately after the period of perceptual deprivation.’ Furthermore, the students’ hunger for stimulation made them surprisingly receptive to the ideas expressed on the tapes, and indeed several developed an interest in the occult that lasted weeks after the experiment had come to an end. It was as if the confusion from sensory deprivation partially erased their minds, and then the sensory stimuli rewrote their patterns…”\textsuperscript{245}

*  

It is not difficult to see that the sexual and therapeutic revolutions in North America in the 1950s were leading to a new concept of man as a mere animal whose mental life could be erased and recreated at will by men in white coats. Men like Kinsey, Leary, Hubbard, Cameron and Hebb were the high priests of a new atheist religion who could sexually abuse, drug and torture their “patients”, all in the name of science and the further “progress” of the human race. Not coincidentally, in this period the extraordinarily primitive science of psychological behaviourism became dominant in the Anglo-Saxon countries. The whole emotional life of man was reduced to reflexes of an instinctual or learned kind.\textsuperscript{246} And yet the root cause of this move to a purely atheist,

\textsuperscript{244}Klein, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 32-33.
\textsuperscript{245}Klein, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{246}This was the teaching of an American behavioural psychologist whose course the present write attended at Oxford University in the late 1960s.
animalian anthropology lay, not in science (or the Korean War) as such, but in profound religious changes in Western society as a whole...

“In his 2009 book The Permissive Society,” writes Joel J. Miller, “historian Alan Petigny makes the case that the upheavals of the sixties were just manifestations of religious changes from the forties and fifties...

“Petigny describes what he calls the Permissive Turn, a liberalization of values that happened following World War II. Some of it came down to a ‘renunciation of renunciation.’ The war had demanded a great deal of austerity and self-sacrifice. But with Germany and Japan subdued, it was time to live it up. Americans plowed their prosperity into material self-gratification. But there was more.

“At the same time, the culture witnessed a shift in the way we viewed human nature. We swapped the traditional American view, grounded in a certain pessimism inherited from the Protestant understanding of original sin, for the newly refurbished and Americanized psychotherapy.

“Freud was no fan of faith, and the rivalry was both hot and clear in Europe. Not so in America, where advocates such as Joshua Liebman, Carl Rogers, Benjamin Spock, and others presented the benefits of psychotherapy without the thorny, antireligious aspects inherent to Freud’s vision. The effect was pronounced. Just two decades after WWII, sociology professor Philip Rieff could look back and talk about the ‘triumph of the therapeutic’ (emphasis added).

“No such triumph was obvious at the outset. In November 1949, Irving Kristol pointed to the incompatibility of psychotherapy and religion in an article for Commentary. The controversy was topical enough—and Kristol’s opinion notable enough—that Time magazine actually covered his article.

“How could Americans, particularly religious Americans, take psychotherapy’s rose and avoid the thorn? The answer, said Kristol, was to shift the conversation away from ultimate questions of truth and toward temporal questions of health and happiness:

“Most clerics and analysts blithely agree that religion and psychoanalysis have at heart the same intention: to help men “adjust,” to cure them of their vexatious and wasteful psychic habits (lasting despair and anxiety), to make them happy or virtuous or productive. In so far as religion and psychoanalysis succeed in this aim, they are ‘true.’

“What’s the problem with that? We made truth a question of outcomes. Does x make you happy? Then it’s probably good. Does y make you anxious? Then it’s probably bad.
“John Crowe Ransom argued in God Without Thunder (1930) that most Americans had already traded away the traditional view of God and replaced it with varying degrees of enthusiasm about science, progress, and the like. Here was the most definitive proof of his thesis. Religion, morality, even reality were now questions of self-fulfillment—making truth subjective and traditional truth claims irrelevant and meaningless.

“Over the course of his book, Petigny shows how this mindset swept the country, the culture, and the churches through the 1950s. ‘Americans,’ he says, ‘were coming to view the self as a boundless reservoir of inherent goodness and potentiality. . . .’ According to the new and prevailing view, ‘[T]he perspective of people who look inward to their hearts for moral guidance provides us with the best hope for the future of mankind.’

“Once self-fulfillment becomes the end towards which individuals are moving, then there is no longer any fixed council or direction to govern any particular individual’s choice—only what a person claims will lead to his personal betterment, as only he is entitled to determine. Individual autonomy and self-indulgence trump all else…”

With “the gospel of self-fulfilment” as the supreme end, it remained only to decide on means to that end. And the answer, in that supremely naïve period, was: science, and in particular the science of psychology. Psychology told you that you were an animal, created to fulfil your own desires and nothing else; that God, conscience and sin, including original sin, was a myth; and that if you couldn’t get satisfaction, you had to be “depatterned” and “reprogrammed” by - your friendly CIA-funded psychologist!

*

In Europe no less than in America, faith and morals were in steep decline. European social democracy assumed that society could be good without God, and that the only ultimately important thing was Mammon – provided it was distributed relatively equitably and there was a safety net for the poor. Not that religion was persecuted – outwardly, at any rate. But it was treated with condescension, as a relic of outdated modes of thought that would inevitably wither away in time. Even Christian parties such as the Christian Democrats of Germany and Italy put much more emphasis on the “Democrat” than the “Christian” part of their name. And if the Anglicans had once been “the Tory Party at prayer”, they were becoming less and less conservative (with a small ‘c’) as they rapidly lost their faith and abandoned their churches.

Catholicism was a harder nut for the secularist Weltanschauung to crack. And in Southern Europe, especially the Latin countries of Italy, Spain and Portugal, the Roman Catholic Church maintained its grip on the hearts and

---

minds – and voting patterns - of their flock throughout the pontificate of Pope Pius XII (1939-58). But Pius was the last of the really papist popes. His successor, John XXIII, declared his desire “to throw open the windows of the Church so that we can see out and the people can see in”. Both directions of openness proved unsettling and undermining of the Church’s reputation well into the twenty-first century. On the one hand, the world has seen into the darker crannies of the Roman Church, especially the abuse of children by priests. And on the other hand, the Catholics have seen out into the Protestant and non-Christian worlds and have been deeply influenced by them.

The Protestant countries of Northern Europe were undergoing a rapid transformation of morals that revealed a darker side of the all-embracing state. This was particularly true of that paragon of Social Democracy, Scandinavia. “Early twentieth-century confidence in the capacity of the state to make a better society had taken many forms: Scandinavian Social Democracy – like the Fabian reformism of Britain’s welfare state – was born of a widespread fascination with social engineering of all kinds. And just a little beyond the use of the state to adjust incomes, expenditures, employment and information there lurked the temptation to tinker with individuals themselves.

“Eugenics – the ‘science’ of racial improvement – was more than an Edwardian-era fad, like vegetarianism or rambling (though it often appealed to the same constituencies). Taken by thinkers of all political shades, it dovetailed especially well with the ambitions of well-meaning social reformers. If one’s social goal was to improve the human condition wholesale, why pass up the opportunities afforded by modern science to add retail amelioration along the way? Why should the prevention or abolition of imperfections in the human condition not extend to the prevention (or abolition) of imperfect human beings? In the early decades of the twentieth century the appeal of scientifically manipulated social or genetic planning was widespread and thoroughly respectable; it was only thanks to the Nazis, whose ‘hygienic’ ambitions began with ersatz anthropometrics and ended in the gas chamber, that it was comprehensively discredited in post-war Europe. Or so it was widely supposed.

“But, as it emerged many years later, Scandinavian authorities at least had not abandoned an interest in the theory – and practice – of ‘racial hygiene’. Between 1934 and 1976 sterilization programmes were pursued in Norway, Sweden and Denmark, in each case under the auspices and with the knowledge of Social Democratic governments. In these years some 6,000 Danes, 40,000 Norwegians and 60,000 Swedes (90 percent of them women) were sterilized for ‘hygienic’ purposes ‘to improve the population’. The intellectual driving force behind these programmes – the Institute of Racial Biology at the University of Uppsala in Sweden – had been set up in 1921, at
the peak of the fashion for the subject. It was not dismantled until fifty-five years later...”248

It was in Europe that the contraceptive pill was discovered. Norman Stone writes: “The fifties ended with optimism and in retrospect seem to have been the last gasp of the old world. Families stayed together, women in the home or aiming to be, and the laws governing divorce or contraception were sometimes ridiculously difficult. A Catholic hierarch in Paris remarked that it was all very well to say that an extra child might break the family’s budget and starve; it would die surrounded by love.”249

But at the beginning of the sixties came the contraceptive pill, and then everything changed... “The Pill’s effect on the relations of the sexes was, said Conrad Russell, like that of the nuclear bomb on international relations. On 1 June 1961 it came on the market in Germany (through Schering AG). It had origins going back to the early twenties, a time when ‘race improvement’ (eugenics) was fashionable, and the poor or stupid were supposed to be discouraged from procreating (in Sweden, up to the 1970s, Lapps were being sterilized on the grounds that they drank too much and were not very bright). German scientists received grants from American foundations for such research (the money was frozen in Germany under Hitler, and was used to pay for the experiments of Josef Mengele, at Auschwitz). Preventing ovulation has been done by natural methods in the past... In 1951 Carl Djerassi, of Bulgarian-Jewish and Viennese origins, working in Mexico and connected with the Swiss chemical firm Ciba, took out a patent, and experimented with the first synthetic compound in 1956 in Haiti. Germans marketed the Pill first, but it spread very rapidly. Freeing women from unwanted childbirth was equivalent to a new dimension in world history. Before 1914, in England, women doctors had not been allowed to contribute to medical journals because this was thought to be immodest, indicating an interest in the body that was improper. Fifty years later, women were establishing themselves in a man’s world – probably the single greatest change, among the very many that set in after the Second World War. In the next generation, even mothers of small children were going out to work, some of them very successful, and many others left with no choice but drudgery. Feminism became a fashionable cause...”250

David F. Prentis writes: “Although there has always been contraception, its acceptance and practice by society as a whole is a relatively new phenomenon. In the first part of the 20th century barrier methods became through mass production increasingly used. However, with the advent of the hormonal contraceptive pill in the 1960s the contraceptive era, ushering in the sexual revolution, really took off.

248 Judt, op. cit., p. 368.
249 Stone, op. cit., pp. 175.
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“The term ‘revolution’ is by no means exaggerated, for the result was a fundamental change in the understanding of human sexuality in society. With the pill, people thought, nothing can happen, i.e. no child could be conceived. Inhibitions broke down, so that there was an increase in adultery, living together before marriage and living together with no thought of marriage. Amoral sex education with the message, ‘You can do anything you like so long as your partner agrees and you use contraception. If there is an accident, have an abortion,’ promoted sexual promiscuity from puberty onwards. Sexual activity has been degraded into a form of entertainment.

“The immediate consequences of promiscuity starting in adolescence are obvious: the rampant increase of sexually transmitted diseases, infertility and the incapability of forming long-term relationships through frequent changes of partners and repeated disappointments.

“The assumption that ‘nothing can happen’ is erroneous, because contraceptives are by no means 100% effective. Children are conceived, and such ‘errors’ must be corrected – the child is aborted. The result has been devastating: the number of babies killed by abortion every year is about the same as the total number of deaths in the whole of World War II.

“Apart from the carnage, enormous havoc is created in the relationship of the parents, whether married or not, very often leading to its breakdown...

“The widespread practice of abortion leads to euthanasia. If it is acceptable to kill one category of people, then it is logically acceptable to kill others, specifically the ill, the handicapped and the old, for human life is no longer sacred. A chilling example of this kind of development can be seen in the National Socialist regime in Germany.

“The pill ‘culture’ leads to the rejection of children, small families, and a demographic winter. In the long-term it will be impossible to pay pensions...

“The separation of sexual activity from child-bearing leads to the acceptance of the production of children through assisted reproduction without recourse to the marital act in the case of infertility. Through IVF society is being led, inspired by Aldous Huxley’s Brave New World, to the acceptance of controlled reproduction. Human beings are reduced to products. They are mass produced, selected, rejected, frozen or used in experiments. They are treated as material goods, in short, as slaves...

“When the practice of sterilised sexual intercourse is accepted, it leads logically to the acceptance of all practices leading to orgasm: oral, anal, homosexual acts, etc. The whole homosexual movement has become possible only through the general acceptance of contraceptive practice and the reduction of sexuality to a source of entertainment...
“Contraception, which leads logically to other evils as described above, is destroying society. There are too few children and nations are dying out. It leads to abortion, as those who promote it concede. The combination of promoting promiscuity through Godless sex education, the long-term use of hormonal contraception with back-up abortions and the postponement of child-bearing leads to increased infertility...

“The long-term purpose of this policy could well be the desire to subject reproduction to state control, which would allow only those children to be born who pass quality control. At present this is illusory, but the tendency can be seen. It would appear that an elite group wishes to create a society of virtual slaves obedient to their desires. A new totalitarianism is being formed.

“To this end it is necessary to destroy or at least weaken marriage and the family. For this purpose contraception, especially the convenient hormonal forms, is eminently suitable. And those who pour their millions into the homosexual movement and the gender ideology are not concerned with helping homosexuals and those with problems of sexual identity. Rather they are using these people to extend the concept of marriage and ultimately to widen its meaning so much as to make it meaningless.”

The sexual revolution in the West was linked to other revolutionary changes of a more directly political nature in this period.

“Starting in the Sixties,” writes Peter Osborne, the liberal elite “captured first the universities, then the schools and then much of the mainstream media. It finally grabbed control of political parties and then the instruments of government (in the case of Britain, the Civil Service) and other key national institutions.

“Clever, chippy and articulate, this new ruling class mocked traditional notions of honour, duty and public service. It considered the nation state as an artificial construction — and continues to do so.

“Most crucially of all, the ruling elite has set out to destroy the two-parent family, a framework which for millennia has done more than any other to shape human society.

“It is important to point out that since the Sixties, laws have been passed that have made divorce much easier and there have been changes to the tax system which have encouraged single-parent families and marginalised fatherhood.

---

“As academic studies have shown, the human cost of this giant social experiment is beyond computation in terms of broken lives. With its insidious attacks on institutions such as the family and the Church, and by destroying people’s sense of community, the liberal elite has removed those traditional bulwarks against exploitation of the vulnerable.

“For it was families, community networks and church groups that came together to enforce standards of decency and morality. These also helped those who fell on hard times.

“Meanwhile, this state-driven attack on these institutions has coincided with a period when differences in the wealth of the rich and the poor are at levels not seen since the Victorian era. A new class of super-rich has taken advantage of cheap labour offered by mass immigration. This international elite has also shamelessly exploited the increasing sense that national boundaries don’t matter and have spirited their money away to places which impose less in taxes.”252
19. THE EUROPEAN UNION

Tony Judt writes: “The very scale of the collective misery that Europeans had brought upon themselves in the first half of the twentieth century had a profoundly de-politicizing effect; far from turning to extreme solutions, in the manner of the years following World War One, the European publics of the gloomy post-World War Two years turned away from politics. The implications of this could be discerned only vaguely at the time – in the failure of Fascist or Communist parties to cash in upon the difficulties of daily existence; in the way in which economics displaced politics as the goal and language of collective action; in the emergence of domestic recreations and domestic consumption in place of participation in public affairs... “In more ways than most contemporaries could possibly have foreseen, a new Europe was being born.”

In Western Europe, the post-war poverty and depression had been much greater than in the Anglo-Saxon countries (especially North America), and the consequent contrast as prosperity returned in the 1950s was therefore more striking. Thus while in the period 1913-50 the average growth rate in Britain, France and Germany was 1.3 percent, in the period 1950-73 “French growth rate per annum had averaged 5 percent, West Germany had grown at nearly 6 percent and even Britain had maintained an average rate above 3 percent. This extraordinary growth in prosperity, unparalleled in European history, could not fail to have an important and deleterious effect on the European psyche, accelerating its already pronounced turning away from religion and the spiritual life to Mammon and the pleasures of the flesh. The American gospel of self-fulfilment played its part in this change, as preached by the wave of Hollywood films that poured into Europe. But there were other, still more significant factors.

One was the increased size and influence of the state, not in the totalitarian form of the contemporary Soviet Union, but in the more subtle and beguiling form of the West European welfare state... West European welfarism, otherwise known as Social Democracy, was for the time being a great success. As Judt writes: “In the peak years of the modern European welfare state, when the administrative apparatus still exercised broad-ranging authority and its credibility remained unassailed, a remarkable consensus was achieved. The state, it was widely believed, would always do a better job than the unrestricted market: not just in dispensing justice and securing the realm, or distributing goods and services, but in designing and applying strategies for social cohesion, moral sustenance and cultural vitality. The notion that such matters might better be left to enlightened self-interest and the workings of the free market in commodities and ideas was regarded in mainstream European political and academic circles as a quaint relic of pre-Keynesian

times: at best a failure to learn the lessons of the Depression, at worst an invitation to conflict and a veiled appeal to the basest human instincts.

“The state, then, was a good thing; and there was a lot of it. Between 1950 and 1973, government spending rose from 27.6 percent to 38.8 of the gross domestic product in France, from 30.4 percent to 42 percent in West Germany, from 34.2 percent to 41.5 percent in the UK and from 26.8 percent to 45.5 percent in the Netherlands – at a time when that domestic product was itself growing faster than every before or since. The overwhelming bulk of the increase in spending went on insurance, pensions, health, education and housing. In Scandinavia the share of national income devoted to social security alone rose 250 percent in Denmark and Sweden between 1950 and 1973. In Norway it tripled. Only in Switzerland was the share of post-war GNP spent by the state kept comparatively low (it did not reach 30 percent until 1980), but even there it stood in dramatic contrast to the 1938 figure of just 6.8 percent.

“The success story of post-war European capitalism was everywhere accompanied by an enhanced role for the public sector. But the nature of state engagement varied considerably. In most of continental Europe the state eschewed direct ownership of industry (though not public transport or communications), preferring to exercise indirect control, often through autonomous agencies, of which Italy’s tentacular IRI was the biggest and best known…

“Doctrinal differences over the ostensible goals of the state might noisily oppose Left and Right, Christian Democrats and Communists, Socialists and Conservatives, but almost everyone had something to gain from the opportunities the state afforded them for income and influence. Faith in the state – as planner, coordinator, facilitator, arbiter, provider, caretaker and guardian – was widespread and crossed almost all political divides. The welfare state was avowedly social but it was far from socialist. In that sense welfare capitalism, as it unfolded in Western Europe, was truly post-ideological.

“Nevertheless, within the general post-war European consensus there was a distinctive vision, that of the Social Democrats. Social Democracy had always been a hybrid; indeed, this was just what was held against it by enemies to the Right and Left alike. A practice in lifelong search of its theory, Social Democracy was the outcome of an insight vouchsafed to a generation of European socialists early in the twentieth century: that radical social revolution in the heartlands of modern Europe – as prophesied and planned by the socialist visionaries of the nineteenth century – lay in the past, not the future. As a solution to the injustice and inefficiency of industrial capitalism, the nineteenth-century paradigm of violent urban upheaval was not only undesirable and unlikely to meet its goals; it was also redundant. Genuine improvements in the condition of all classes could be obtained in incremental and peaceful ways.
“It did not follow from this that the fundamental nineteenth-century socialist tenets were discarded. The overwhelming majority of mid-twentieth century European Social Democrats, even if they kept their distance from Marx and his avowed heirs, maintained as an article of faith that capitalism was inherently dysfunctional and that socialism was both morally and economically superior. Where they differed from Communists was in their unwillingness to commit to the inevitability of capitalism’s imminent demise or to the wisdom of hastening that demise by their own political actions. Their task, as they had come to understand it in the course of decades of Depression, division and dictatorship, was to use the resources of the state to eliminate the social pathologies attendant on capitalist forms of production and the unrestricted workings of a market economy: to build not economic utopias but good societies.”

The most sophisticated and complex organization of Social Democracy, creating a vast increase in state power, turned out to be supranational: the European Union, composed in the beginning of the six Benelux countries, but now (in 2016) encompassing twenty-seven states (excluding Britain, which voted to leave in 2016).

Ironically, it was probably an Englishman, William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania, who sketched the first plan for a united Europe as far back as 1693. His proposal was that the Sovereign Princes of Europe should “agree to meet by their stated deputies in a General Dyet, Estates or Parliament, and there Establish Rules of Justice for Soveraign Princes to observe one to another; and... before which Soveraign Assembly, should be brought all Differences depending between one Soveraign and another... Europe would quietly obtain the so much desired and needed Peace.”

Peace was certainly one of the many motivations for the creation of the European Union; as David Reynolds puts it, the formation of the EU’s predecessor, the European Economic Community in 1957 was “effectively a peace settlement for Western Europe”.

Many intellectuals in the early post-war generations believed that yet another war among the nations of Europe could be prevented only by uniting them in a new supra-nation. This, according to Michael McManus, was the motivation of Sir Edward Heath, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, who took his country into the Union in 1973.

---

Heath “had first-hand experience of a Nuremburg rally in 1937, of the
Spanish Civil War in 1938, and of combat in the Second World war itself. His
greatest fear was of a resurgence of nationalism in Europe and of another
ruinous war. European unity was, for him, first and foremost, the necessary
key to peace.

“This was the predominant view within the Conservative Party from the
mid-1950s until the mid-1980s including most of Margaret Thatcher’s
premiership. After the Berlin Wall came down in 1989, however, she
recognised a new reality and was fearful of a united Germany. But Sir
Edward’s needle had got stuck…”

But was it really the European Union or its embryonic predecessors that
kept the peace in Europe? Hardly… Certainly, the process was helped
forward by the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951 (it
was proposed by French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman on May 9, 1950)
with its embryonic supranational organization, commission and court of
justice. However, the real causes of the preservation of peace between the
West European countries were mutual exhaustion, the common threat of the
Red Army just over the Elbe – and the consequent felt need for the formation
of NATO. In fact, the real cause of peace was the American army, the core army
of NATO, together with other American institutions in Europe, which both
defended the West against the Soviets and constantly cajoled the Europeans,
especially the French, into working together for the common good.

In fact, the man usually credited with creating the EU, Jean Monnet,
worked for much of his life in America and has been considered by many as
almost an American spy. “It was Monnet,” write Lynn Picknett and Clive
Prince, “who had secured the Allies’ backing for General de Gaulle against
Roosevelt’s opposition, and in return, de Gaulle gave him responsibility for
rebuilding the French economy and industry – a position he used to achieve
his great dream, laying the foundations for the EEC.

“The ‘Schuman Declaration’ was the result of intrigue, trickery and
subterfuge by Monnet, his most audacious trick being to get French and West
German governments to set up a supranational organisation to co-ordinate
their industries without realising exactly what they had signed up to. This
radical new concept, of an organisation with control over individual nations’
industries but with its own, outside autonomy, laid the foundation for all that
came after. Unsurprisingly, Monnet became president of the new body, called
– with a chillingly Orwellian tone – the High Authority. Schuman became the
first president of the European Parliament in 1958.”

---
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Whether Monnet’s and Schuman’s motivation was a sinister as this is open to question. What cannot be denied is that, as Ambrose Evans-Pritchard writes, “The European Union was always an American project.

“It was Washington that drove European integration in the late 1940s, and funded it covertly under the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations.

“While irritated at times, the US has relied on the EU ever since as the anchor to American regional interests alongside NATO.

“There has never been a divide-and-rule strategy…

“The Schuman Declaration that set the tone of Franco-German reconciliation - and would lead by stages to the European Community - was cooked up by the US Secretary of State Dean Acheson at a meeting in Foggy Bottom. ‘It all began in Washington,’ said Robert Schuman's chief of staff.

“It was the Truman administration that browbeat the French to reach a modus vivendi with Germany in the early post-War years, even threatening to cut off US Marshall aid at a furious meeting with recalcitrant French leaders they resisted in September 1950.

“Truman's motive was obvious. The Yalta settlement with the Soviet Union was breaking down. He wanted a united front to deter the Kremlin from further aggrandizement after Stalin gobbled up Czechoslovakia, doubly so after Communist North Korea crossed the 38th Parallel and invaded the South.

“For British eurosceptics, Jean Monnet looms large in the federalist pantheon, the eminence grise of supranational villainy. Few are aware that he spent much of his life in America, and served as war-time eyes and ears of Franklin Roosevelt.

“General Charles de Gaulle thought him an American agent, as indeed he was in a loose sense. Eric Roussel's biography of Monnet reveals how he worked hand in glove with successive administrations.

“General Charles de Gaulle was always deeply suspicious of American motives...

“Nor are many aware of declassified documents from the State Department archives showing that US intelligence funded the European movement secretly for decades, and worked aggressively behind the scenes to push Britain into the project.

“As this newspaper first reported when the treasure became available, one memorandum dated July 26, 1950, reveals a campaign to promote a full-fledged European parliament. It is signed by Gen William J. Donovan, head of the American wartime Office of Strategic Services, precursor of the Central Intelligence Agency.

“The key CIA front was the American Committee for a United Europe (ACUE), chaired by Donovan. Another document shows that it provided 53.5 per cent of the European movement’s funds in 1958. The board included Walter Bedell Smith and Allen Dulles, CIA directors in the Fifties, and a caste of ex-OSS officials who moved in and out of the CIA.

“Bill Donovan, legendary head of the war-time OSS, was later in charge of orchestrating the EU project...

“Bill Donovan, legendary head of the war-time OSS, was later in charge of orchestrating the EU project...

“There is nothing particularly wicked about this. The US acted astutely in the context of the Cold War. The political reconstruction of Europe was a roaring success.

“There were horrible misjudgments along the way, of course. A memo dated June 11, 1965, instructs the vice-president of the European Community to pursue monetary union by stealth, suppressing debate until the ‘adoption of such proposals would become virtually inescapable’. This was too clever by half, as we can see today from debt-deflation traps and mass unemployment across southern Europe…”

However, the pursuit of political union by economic stealth was always the aim of the EU’s founders... As the present writer commented in 1995, "Stealthily, unnoticed even by the great majority of its own citizens, a totalitarian monster has been born in the heart of Western Europe. Although this monster, the European Union is the creation of a group of democratic states and is situated in the heartland of modern democracy, it has already to a large extent superseded the process of democratic decision-making in the member states and replaced it by an unelected body, the European Commission, which, together with the equally unelected European Court, has the power to issue directives that override all national legislation and which is steadily penetrating every nook and cranny of the political, economic, social and religious life of the member states, from the permitted shape of cucumbers to the date of Pascha. Moreover, the Maastricht treaty of 1992 legislated that by 1997 a single European Currency would be created run by a single (again unelected) European Bank – an institution the creation of which,

---


in the opinion of the president of the American Federal Reserve Bank, Alan Greenspan, must necessarily be accompanied by irreversible political union and the creation of a single European state.

“When national sovereignty has gone and national parliaments become emasculated talking shops (a process that is already far advanced), only the European Parliament may perhaps have the power to withstand the power of the Commission-Politburo. However, all the indications are that the European Parliament, like the Soviet Central Committee, will be a toothless institution populated by people who have already imbibed the socialist spirit of the European institutions and enthusiastically accepted the ideology of the European super-state. The only real function of the European parliament, according to the well-known Anglo-French industrialist and politician, Sir James Goldsmith, ‘is to provide cover for the Commission’262; and he argues that ‘at the moment the work of the European Parliament is overwhelmingly either a waste of time or downright destructive.’263

“Like all socialist revolutions, the modern European revolution claims to be democratic while actually working against the people and in secret from it. Thus Goldsmith writes: ‘The European Union was built in secret: not through carelessness or casualness, but in a deliberately planned and skilfully executed manner. Claude Cheysson, the former French Minister of Foreign Affairs and a member of the European Commission from 1985 to 1989, described the mechanism in an interview in Le Figaro on 7 May 1994. He explained proudly that the European Union could only have been constructed in the absence of democracy, and he went on to suggest that the present problems were the result of having mistakenly allowed a public debate on the merits of the Treaty of Maastricht.

“’The British newspaper The Guardian lodged a case before the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg complaining of the secrecy in which European decisions were taken. Lawyers for the European Council of Ministers responded by stating to the judges that “there is no principle of community law which gives citizens the right to EU documents.” They went on to make the astounding claim that although heads of government had repeatedly called for more openness in EU affairs, their declarations “were of an eminently political nature and not binding on the community institutions”. So they asked the judges to ignore the repeated declarations at EU summit meetings in the past two years in favour of greater openness. Statements by the twelve heads of government were no more than “policy orientations” and had no binding effect.
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“This belief that the nomenklatura knows best and that the public is no more than a hindrance explains why there now exists a profound and dangerous divorce between European societies and their governing elites.”

Jean Monnet put it best as early as 1952: “The nations of Europe must be guided towards a Superstate without their peoples understanding what is happening. This can be carried out in successive stages, each camouflaged as having an economic goal, but which will end up by leading them irreversibly into a federation.”

Monnet’s words were prophetic: during the course of the twentieth century the European superstate’s powers increased inexorably, being sanctified through a series of treaties signed by the heads of the Union’s national governments, including the Treaty of Rome in 1957, the Single European Act of 1985, the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, the introduction of the single currency in 1999 and the Lisbon Treaty of 2007. But these acquisitions of power by the supranational Union were not democratically debated or ratified in any real sense; and the lack of democratic consensus and of sustained economic growth in later decades has caused serious problems, leading to Britain’s decision to withdraw from the Union in 2016.

---

Creeping totalitarianism at the level of the EU superstate was not the only way in which East and West were beginning to converge. Also significant was the phenomenon of “Cultural Marxism”.

This began as the result of the evident failure of Western Marxism in the years immediately after the First World War. Reflecting on the reasons for this, two prominent Marxist thinkers, Antonio Gramsci and George Lukács, “concluded that the working class of Europe had been blinded by the success of Western democracy and capitalism. They reasoned that until both had been destroyed, a communist revolution was not possible.

“Gramsci and Lukács were both active in the Communist party, but their lives took very different paths.

“Gramsci was jailed by Mussolini in Italy where he died in 1937 due to poor health.

“In 1918, Lukács became minister of culture in Bolshevik Hungary. During this time, Lukács realized that if the family unit and sexual morals were eroded, society could be broken down.

“Lukács implemented a policy he titled ‘cultural terrorism,’ which focused on these two objectives. A major part of the policy was to target children’s minds through lectures that encouraged them to deride and reject Christian ethics.

“In these lectures, graphic sexual matter was presented to children, and they were taught about loose sexual conduct.

“Here again, a Marxist theory had failed to take hold in the real world. The people were outraged at Lukács’ program, and he fled Hungary when Romania invaded in 1919.

“All was quiet on the Marxist front until 1923 when the cultural terrorist turned up for a ‘Marxist study week’ in Frankfurt, Germany. There, Lukács met a young, wealthy Marxist named Felix Weil.

“Until Lukács showed up, classical Marxist theory was based solely on the economic changes needed to overthrow class conflict. Weil was enthused by Lukács’ cultural angle on Marxism.
“Weil’s interest led him to fund a new Marxist think tank—the Institute for Social Research. It would later come to be known as simply The Frankfurt School.”  

In the same year of 1923, according to Bernard Connolly, another of the founders of the Frankfurt School of social philosophy, Willi Munzenberg, “reflected on the failure of the ‘urban proletariat’ to mount successful revolutions in economically advanced countries in the way predicted by Marx. To counter that failure it was necessary, he proclaimed, to ‘organise the intellectuals and use them to make Western civilization stink. Only then, after they have corrupted all its values and made life impossible, can we impose the dictatorship of the proletariat.’ Corrupting the values of Western civilization meant undermining and, ultimately, proscribing all the institutions, traditions, structures and modes of thought (‘tools of oppression’) that underpinned that civilization. Once national sovereignty and political legitimacy were got out of the way, it would be much easier for a central, unaccountable and malign (‘politically correct’) government to proscribe all the other foundations of civilization.”

“In 1930, the school changed course under new director Max Horkheimer. The team began mixing the ideas of Sigmund Freud with those of Marx, and cultural Marxism was born.

“In classical Marxism, the workers of the world were oppressed by the ruling classes. The new theory was that everyone in society was psychologically oppressed by the institutions of Western culture. The school concluded that this new focus would need new vanguards to spur the change. The workers were not able to rise up on their own.

“As fate would have it, the National Socialists came to power in Germany in 1933. It was a bad time and place to be a Jewish Marxist, as most of the school’s faculty was. So, the school moved to New York City, the bastion of Western culture at the time.

“In 1934, the school was reborn at Columbia University. Its members began to exert their ideas on American culture.

“It was at Columbia University that the school honed the tool it would use to destroy Western culture: the printed word.

“The school published a lot of popular material. The first of these was Critical Theory.

---

“Critical Theory is a play on semantics. The theory was simple: criticize every pillar of Western culture—family, democracy, common law, freedom of speech, and others. The hope was that these pillars would crumble under the pressure.

“Next was a book Theodor Adorno co-authored, The Authoritarian Personality. It redefined traditional American views on gender roles and sexual mores as ‘prejudice.’ Adorno compared them to the traditions that led to the rise of fascism in Europe.

Is it just a coincidence that the go-to slur for the politically correct today is ‘fascist’?

“The school pushed its shift away from economics and toward Freud by publishing works on psychological repression.

“Their works split society into two main groups: the oppressors and the victims. They argued that history and reality were shaped by those groups who controlled traditional institutions. At the time, that was code for males of European descent.

“From there, they argued that the social roles of men and women were due to gender differences defined by the ‘oppressors.’ In other words, gender did not exist in reality but was merely a ‘social construct.’

“Adorno and Horkheimer returned to Germany when WWII ended. Herbert Marcuse, another member of the school, stayed in America. In 1955, he published Eros and Civilization.

“In the book, Marcuse argued that Western culture was inherently repressive because it gave up happiness for social progress.

“The book called for ‘polymorphous perversity,’ a concept crafted by Freud. It posed the idea of sexual pleasure outside the traditional norms. Eros and Civilization would become very influential in shaping the sexual revolution of the 1960s.

“Marcuse would be the one to answer Horkheimer’s question from the 1930s: Who would replace the working class as the new vanguards of the Marxist revolution?

“Marcuse believed that it would be a victim coalition of minorities—blacks, women, and homosexuals.

“The social movements of the 1960s—black power, feminism, gay rights, sexual liberation—gave Marcuse a unique vehicle to release cultural Marxist
ideas into the mainstream. Railing against all things ‘establishment,’ the Frankfurt School’s ideals caught on like wildfire across American universities.

“Marcuse then published *Repressive Tolerance* in 1965 as the various social movements in America were in full swing. In it, he argued that tolerance of all values and ideas meant the repression of ‘correct’ ideas.

“It was here that Marcuse coined the term ‘liberating tolerance.’ It called for tolerance of any ideas coming from the left but intolerance of those from the right. One of the overarching themes of the Frankfurt School was total intolerance for any viewpoint but its own. That is also a basic trait of today’s political-correctness believers.

“To quote Max Horkheimer, ‘Logic is not independent of content.’

“The Frankfurt School’s work has had a deep impact on American culture. It has recast the homogeneous America of the 1950s into today’s divided, animosity-filled nation.

“In turn, this has contributed to the undeniable breakdown of the family unit, as well as identity politics, radical feminism, and racial polarization in America.\(^{267}\)

* 

Cultural Marxism is closely related to the idea of political correctness. Angelo M. Codevilla explains this important idea in more detail: “The notion of political correctness came into use among Communists in the 1930s as a semi-humorous reminder that the Party’s interest is to be treated as a reality that ranks above reality itself. Because all progressives, Communists included, claim to be about creating new human realities, they are perpetually at war against nature’s laws and limits. But since reality does not yield, progressives end up pretending that they themselves embody those new realities. Hence, any progressive movement’s nominal goal eventually ends up being subordinated to the urgent, all-important question of the movement’s own power. Because that power is insecure as long as others are able to question the truth of what the progressives say about themselves and the world, progressive movements end up struggling not so much to create the promised new realities as to force people to speak and act as if these were real: as if what is correct politically—i.e., what thoughts serve the party’s interest—were correct factually.

“Communist states furnish only the most prominent examples of such attempted groupthink. Progressive parties everywhere have sought to monopolize educational and cultural institutions in order to force those under their thumbs to sing their tunes or to shut up. But having brought about the opposite of the prosperity, health, wisdom, or happiness that their ideology

---
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advertised, they have been unable to force folks to ignore the gap between political correctness and reality.

“Especially since the Soviet Empire’s implosion, leftists have argued that Communism failed to create utopia not because of any shortage of military or economic power but rather because it could not overcome this gap. Is the lesson for today’s progressives, therefore, to push P.C. even harder, to place even harsher penalties on dissenters? Many of today’s more discerning European and American progressives, in possession of government’s and society’s commanding heights, knowing that they cannot wield Soviet-style repression and yet intent on beating down increasing popular resistance to their projects, look for another approach to crushing cultural resistance. Increasingly they cite the name of Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), a brilliant Communist theoretician for whom ‘cultural hegemony’ is the very purpose of the struggle as well as its principal instrument. His writings envisage a totalitarianism that eliminates the very possibility of cultural resistance to progressivism. But owing more to Machiavelli than to Marx or Lenin, they are more than a little complex about the means and are far from identical with the raw sort of power over culture enforced by the Soviet Empire or, for that matter, that is rife among us today…”

Although Gramsci died before the war, he became influential only later. “Gramsci” started from mixed philosophical premises. First, orthodox Marxism: ‘There is no such thing as “human nature,” fixed and immutable,’ he wrote. Rather, ‘human nature is the sum of historically determined social relationships.’ The modern prince’s job is to change it. Wholly unorthodox, however, was his scorn for Marxism’s insistence that economic factors are fundamental while all else is superstructural. No, ‘stuff like that is for common folk,’ a ‘little formula’ for ‘half-baked intellectuals who don’t want to work their brains.’ For Gramsci, economic relations were just one part of social reality, the chief parts of which were intellectual and moral…

“Gramsci co-founded Italy’s Communist Party in 1921. In 1926, Mussolini jailed him. By the time he died eleven years later, he had composed twelve ‘prison notebooks.’ In private correspondence, he criticized Stalin’s literary judgment and deemed his attacks on Leon Trotsky ‘irresponsible and dangerous.’ But publicly, he supported every turn of the Soviet Party line—even giving his party boss, Palmiro Togliatti, authority to modify his writings. Imprisoned and in failing health, he was intellectually freer and physically safer than if he had been exposed to the intra-Communist purges that killed so many of his comrades.

“Gramsci’s concept of ‘cultural hegemony’ also swung both ways. Its emphasis on transforming the enemy rather than killing him outright was at odds with the Communist Party’s brute-force approach. His focus on cultural matters, reversing as it did the standard distinction between structure and superstructure, suggested belief in the mind’s autonomy. On the other hand, the very idea of persuading minds not through reasoning on what is true and
false, good and bad, according to nature, but rather by creating a new historical reality, is precisely what he shares with Marx and... with the fountainhead of modern thought, Niccolò Machiavelli.

“Gramsci turned to Machiavelli more than to Marx to discover how best to replace the existing order and to secure that replacement. Chapter V of Machiavelli’s *The Prince* stated that ‘the only secure way’ to control a people who had been accustomed to live under its own laws is to destroy it. But Machiavelli’s objective was to conquer people through their minds, not to destroy them. In Chapter VI of *The Prince* he wrote that nothing is more difficult than to establish ‘new modes and orders,’ that this requires ‘persuading’ peoples of certain things, that it is necessary ‘when they no longer believe to make them believe by force,’ and that this is especially difficult for ‘unarmed prophets.’ But Machiavelli also wrote that, if such prophets succeed in inculcating a new set of beliefs, they can count on being ‘powerful, secure, honored and happy.’ He clarified this insight in *Discourses on Livy* Book II, chapter 5: ‘when it happens that the founders of the new religion speak a different language, the destruction of the old religion is easily effected.’ The Machiavellian revolutionary, then, must inculcate new ways of thinking and speaking that amount to a new language. In the *Discourse Upon Our Language*, Machiavelli had compared using one’s own language to infiltrate the enemy’s thoughts with Rome’s use of its own troops to control allied armies. This is the template that Gramsci superimposed on the problems of the Communist revolution—a template made by one ‘unarmed prophet’ for use by others.

“Machiavelli is the point of departure in a section of Gramsci’s *Prison Notebooks* that describes how the party is to rule as “the modern prince.” But the modern prince’s task is so big that it can be undertaken seriously only by a party (in some 50 references he leaves out the word “Communist”), which he defines as “an organism; a complex, collective element of society which has already begun to crystallize as a collective will that has become conscious of itself through action.” This prince, this party, has to be “the organizer and the active expression of moral and intellectual reform...that cannot be tied to an economic program.” Rather, when economic reform grows out of moral and intellectual reform, from “germs of collective will that tend to become universal and total,” then it can become the basis of the secularization of all life and custom.

“The party-prince accomplishes this by being Jacobin ‘in the historic and conceptual sense.’ Gramsci writes: ‘that is what Machiavelli meant by reform of the militia, which the Jacobins did in the French Revolution.’ The party must gather consensus from each of society’s discrete parts by persuading—inducing—people who had never thought of such things to join in ways of life radically different from their own. The party develops ‘its organized force’ by a ‘minutely careful, molecular, capillary process manifested in an endless quantity of books and pamphlets, of articles in magazines and newspapers, and by personal debates repeated infinitely and which, in their gigantic
altogether, comprise the work out of which arises a collective will with a certain homogeneity.’

“The key to Gramsci’s generalities and subtleties is to be found in his gingerly discussion of the relationship between the party and Christianity. ‘Although other political parties may no longer exist, there will always exist de facto parties or tendencies... in such parties, cultural matters predominate... hence, political controversies take on cultural forms and, as such, tend to become irresolvable.’ Translation: the progressive party-state (the party acting as a government, the government acting as a party) cannot escape the role of authoritative—perhaps forceful—mediator of societal conflicts having to do with cultural matters and must see to it that they are resolved its way.

“Specifically: as Gramsci was writing, Mussolini’s 1929 Concordat with the Vatican was proving to be his most successful political maneuver. By removing the formal enmity between the Church and the post-French-Revolution state, making Catholicism the state religion and paying its hierarchy, Mussolini had turned Italy’s most pervasive cultural institution from an enemy to a friendly vassal. Thousands of priests and millions of their flock would bend thoughts, words, and deeds to fit the party-state’s definition of good citizenship. Gramsci described the post-Concordat Church as having ‘become an integral part of the State, of political society monopolized by a certain privileged group that aggregated the Church unto itself the better to sustain its monopoly with the support of that part of civil society represented by the Church.’ A morally and intellectually compromised Church in the fascist state’s hands, Mussolini hoped and Gramsci feared, would redefine its teachings and its social presence to fascist specifications. The alternative to this subversion—denigrating and restricting the Church in the name of fascism—would have pushed many Catholics to embrace their doctrine’s fundamentals ever more tightly in opposition to the party. The Concordat was the effective template for the rest of what Mussolini called the corporate state.

“Gramsci called the same phenomenon a ‘blocco storico,’ historic bloc, that aggregates society’s various sectors under the party-state’s direction. The intellectuals, said Gramsci, are the blocco’s leading element. In any given epoch they weld workers, peasants, the church, and other groups into a unit
in which the people live and move and have their being, and from within which it is difficult if not impossible to imagine alternatives. Power, used judiciously, acts on people the way the sun acts on sunflowers. Within this bloc, ideas may retain their names while changing in substance, while a new language grows organically. As Gramsci noted, Machiavelli had argued that language is the key to the mastery of consciousness—a mastery more secure than anything that force alone can achieve. But note that Machiavelli’s metaphors on linguistic warfare all refer to violence. How much force does it take to make this historic bloc cohere and to keep recalcitrants in it? Gramsci’s silence seems to say; ‘whatever may be needed.’ After all, Mussolini used as much as he thought he needed.

“In sum, Mussolini, not Stalin; forceful seduction, not rape, is Gramsci’s practical advice regarding ‘cultural hegemony.’ Gramsci means to replace Western culture by subverting it, by doing what it takes to compel it to redefine itself, rather than by picking fights with it…”

Following Gramsci’s lead, the post-war Cultural Marxists compelled Western culture to redefine itself – that is, adopt the language and values of “political correctness”. And the storm-centre of this cultural revolution moved, together with the leaders of the Frankfurt school of social philosophy, from Europe to America...

Let us briefly take this story up to the present day.

“Beginning in the 1960s, from Boston to Berkeley, the teachers of America’s teachers absorbed and taught a new, CliffsNotes-style sacred history: America was born tainted by Western Civilization’s original sins—racism, sexism, greed, genocide against natives and the environment, all wrapped in religious obscurantism, and on the basis of hypocritical promises of freedom and equality. Secular saints from Herbert Croly and Woodrow Wilson to Franklin Roosevelt and Barack Obama have been redeeming those promises, placing America on the path of greater justice in the face of resistance from the mass of Americans who are racist, sexist, but above all stupid. To consider such persons on the same basis as their betters would be, as President Obama has called it, ‘false equivalence.’

“Thus credentialed, molded, and opinionated, a uniform class now presides over nearly all federal, and state, government bureaucracies, over the media, the educational establishment, and major corporations. Like a fraternity, it requires speaking the ‘in’ language signifying that one is on the right side, and joins to bring grief upon ‘outsider Americans who run afoul of its members...

“No more than its European counterparts does America’s progressive ruling class offer any vision of truth, goodness, beauty, or advantage to attract the rest of society to itself. Like its European kin, all that American progressivism offers is obedience to the ruling class, enforced by political
correctness. Nor is there any endpoint to what is politically correct, any more than there ever was to Communism. Here and now, as everywhere and always, it comes down to glorifying the party and humbling the rest…

“The imposition of P.C. has no logical end because feeling better about one’s self by confessing other people’s sins, humiliating and hurting them, is an addictive pleasure the appetite for which grows with each satisfaction. The more fault I find in thee, the holier (or, at least, the trendier) I am than thou. The worse you are, the better I am and the more power I should have over you. America’s ruling class seems to have adopted the view that the rest of America should be treated as inmates in reeducation camps…”

Jean-François Revel writes: “In their first communiqué, on March 6, 1953, Stalin’s successors declared their support for a policy that could guarantee ‘the prevention of any kind of disorder and panic.’ Why those two words? A month and a half earlier, the Eisenhower-Dulles team had come to office in Washington brandishing the rollback policy they had proclaimed during the election campaign. Stalin’s heirs did not know much about the ‘imperialists’ facing them, and they had forgotten Lenin’s observations on the ‘deaf-mutes’ in the West. Except for Molotov, they had had almost no personal contact with Western political figures. But they did know how fragile the situation was within the Soviet system, including its satellites. They readily perceived how disadvantaged they were by the conjunction of three factors:

1. the overall balance of power favored the West;
2. the new team in the White House was calling for a rollback of communism;
3. Stalin’s death had created a situation of weakness in the Communist sphere, both at the party summit (as witness the trial and execution of First Deputy Premier Lavrenty P. Beria) and among the subject peoples (the East German uprising in June 1953).”

In fact, there was one successor who, as KGB head, knew the fragility of the Soviet empire well – Beria. He it was who now took first place in the system - temporarily. And it was he who probably initiated the “tidal wave of reforms”, in Robert Service’s words, that “crashed over Stalin’s policies in the USSR in the first week of March 1953. His successors were posthumously opposing him after decades of obedience. No member of the Party Presidium favoured the total conservation of his legacy; even communist conservatives like Molotov and Kaganovich approved some sort of innovation. Changes frustrated by Stalin at last became possible. Yet debate did not flood out into society. It was not allowed to. The last thing the ascendant party leaders wanted was to let ordinary Soviet citizens, or even the lower functionaries of the state, influence what was decided in the Kremlin.

“Molotov and Kaganovich could not prevent the reform projects of Malenkov, Beria and Khruschev. Malenkov wanted to increase payments to collective farms so as to boost agricultural production [the peasants had starved since the war]; he also favoured giving priority to light-industrial investment. Khruschev wished to plough up virgin lands in the USSR and end the decades-old uncertainty about supplies of bread. Malenkov and Beria were committed to making overtures to the USA for peaceful coexistence; they feared that the Cold War might turn into a disaster for humanity. Beria desired a rapprochement with Yugoslavia; he also aimed to withdraw privileges for Russians in the USSR and to widen the limits of cultural self-expression. Malenkov, Beria and Khruschev agreed that public life should be conducted on a less violent and arbitrary basis than under Stalin. They

supported the release of political convicts from the labour camps. Quietly they restrained the official media from delivering the customary grandiose eulogies to Stalin. If his policies were to be replaced, it no longer made sense to go on treating him as a demigod…”

However, reversing the work of “the greatest genius of all times and all nations” is not so easy. In July, 1953 Malenkov proposed unmasking the cult of personality. But he was supported only by Khruschev…

Certainly, ordinary citizens did not suddenly feel a noticeable access of kindness and mercy from their rulers. On May 16, 1954 there began the biggest rebellion of GULAG prisoners in the history of the Soviet concentration camps in Kengir, Kazakhstan. For forty days the prisoners – of all nationalities, but especially Ukrainians – held out. However, on June 26 the NKVD regained control of “Steplag” with the aid of the Red Army and T-34 tanks. Between 500 and 700 prisoners were killed. Again, in September, 1954, during military exercises in Orenburg province under the direction of Marshal Zhukov, an atomic bomb was dropped, causing 43,000 military and 10,000 civilian deaths. Of course, there were casualties also from western atomic tests. But the callousness of the Soviets – who kept this incident a strict secret for many years – was unequalled.

Nor, in spite of references to “coexistence” with the capitalist world – a phrase neither Lenin nor Stalin would ever have used – did the successors of Stalin hint at a renunciation of their faith. “If someone believes,” said Khruschev in 1955, “that our smiles involve abandonment of the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, he deceives himself poorly. Those who wait for that must wait until a shrimp learns to whistle…”

Nevertheless it was undeniable that a diminution of revolutionary ardour was taking place. And then the critical event took place: at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February, 1956, Khruschev read his secret speech exposing Stalin: “We are concerned with a question which has immense importance for the party now and for the future – with how the cult of the person of Stalin has been gradually growing, the cult which became at a

---

certain specific stage the source of a whole series of grave perversions of party principles, of party democracy, of revolutionary legality...”

Andrei Zubov writes that this event was “absolutely unprecedented, not only in the Soviet Union, but in the whole communist world movement. Because the main, axial figure of the whole communist movement supported by the Soviet Union (over there, there was another, Trotskyite movement), was, of course, Stalin. Stalin was its centre and essence. His methods of rule, his attitude to men, to the world – it was against all that this people with communist views throughout the world – in China, in Europe, and in Latin America, not to speak of the Soviet Union – measured themselves. And the condemnation of Stalin – for the first time, the demonstration of his crimes (almost exclusively with regard to members of the party – the repressions after 17th Congress of the Bolshevik Party, the “Leningrad Affair” of 1948) – this information completely blew people’s minds. Very many did not believe it. Others said that it was a provocation. A third group condemned Khruschev and said that he was a traitor to the cause of communism. And of course those who had previously had a negative attitude to Stalin or had suffered at his hands were in raptures.

“But to some degree clever people had noticed this process even earlier. In fact, the process of destalinization began with the death of Stalin – precisely in March, 1953. Because at first Beria, and then, after Beria’s overthrow, Malenkov and Khruschev began the process of the gradual release of people from the camps, the gradual improvement of the people’s situation in agriculture, the peasant collective-farmers, a relaxation in censorship – and stopped inflating Stalin’s cult of personality literally from the first days. Stalin had not yet been buried, but they already said: that’s enough, we must not have all these improbable panegyrics, these incredible verses, and they passed to the day-to-day affairs of state construction. Clever people noticed that Stalin’s closest colleagues absolutely were not intending to sing hosannas to Stalin as they themselves had sung them until the last day of his life. Naturally, the case of the Jewish doctors was cut short, as were many other cases. 1956 was both unexpected and expected for those who had a good understanding of the Muscovite political kitchen.

“How was destalinization carried out, and was it superficial? Of course it was not superficial. Yes, monuments were pulled down – that was very important; Stalin was thrown out of the mausoleum – that also was important. But much more important was what they said: under Stalin terrible crimes were carried out. And many people were rehabilitated posthumously. Most of these people were condemned according to article 58 as having acted ‘in a hostile manner’ (as spies, conspirators, terrorists) against Soviet power. A huge number of people killed by Stalin were rehabilitated, and those few who survived were rehabilitated in their lifetime, and a mass of people returned. In spite of Khruschev’s fantastic mistakes, in spite of the fact that he himself was just such a murderer and criminal as Stalin – both in the Ukraine and in Moscow, - a huge number of people of that generation were
grateful to him for liberating, justifying and returning the repressed from exile. And in general the epoch of total repressions then came to an end.”

But there were still rebellions..., the most serious of them in the Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe, where Soviet slavery was still a relatively new experience. “In June 1953,” writes Revel, “the people of East Germany rose against the occupying power, but the West failed to seize the opportunity to insist on peace-treaty negotiations that would have ended the dangerous division of Germany, still one of the Soviet Union’s principal means of blackmailing the United States and Europe. At the time, no Western government had yet officially recognized the East German Communist government.

“In the summer and fall of 1956, the Polish people rose; we let the Soviets arrange matters their way, by bouncing Bierut and replacing him with Wladyslaw Gomulka. Instead of acting like indifferent spectators, the West could have dusted off promises made at Yalta – the real ones – committing Stalin to organize free elections in Poland. The balance of power, then high favourable to the United States, would have made such a demand eminently realistic and, we must insist, in no way ‘imperialistic’; it would in fact have been the moral thing to do, in support of a people’s right of self-determination and in the interests of that peace that the Polish tragedy in the heart of Europe has continually threatened in the twenty-five years since then.

“Shortly after the Polish October came a new explosion, the even more widespread and more violent uprising of the Hungarian people, directly challenging the Soviet presence there and communism itself, without prompting from the West. With Moscow’s gent, the Stalinist Erno Gero, swept out of power, the most popular man in the country, the only one available in that time of disintegrating power structure, was old Communist Imre Nagy, a former Premier who had been ousted a year earlier. The only program he could come up with was a sort of neutralization of Hungary on the Austrian model approved the year before, which would have taken the country out of the Soviet bloc. A mere flip of the finger by the West could have been decisive then. Caught off balance, with their guard down, the Soviets were ging condemned throughout the world, and they were at a strategic disadvantage. Had the West overcome its irresolution and formulated its demands, it would not even have had to use its military power. Why, after all, was Khrushchev so frightened? Why did he fell a need to cover himself with Mao Tse-tung’s ‘authorization’, and why did he consult secretly with Tito? Why did he hesitate so long before moving, sending in his tanks only when he was sure the West would merely boo the play without interrupting the performance?”

Unfortunately, however, the West was distracted by the Suez crisis... The Hungarian revolution under Imre Nagy in 1956, and its ruthless suppression by the Soviets, showed that the relaxation of total repression introduced by Stalin’s successors by no means meant freedom. There was a red line that could not crossed; and when Nagy’s government tried to withdraw Hungary from the Warsaw Pact, the line had been crossed and Soviet tanks bloodily restored the status quo ante. However, Hungary was important in that it brought to an end the illusion entertained by many Western and Eastern European intellectuals that there could be a “good” Marxism that was not Stalinist. Among these were the historian François Furet in France and Leszek Kołakowski in Poland.277

This beginning of a shift in intellectual opinion would bear fruit in the Prague Spring of 1968 and the Solidarity Movement in Poland in the 1980s.

On August 13, 1961, in the course of a single night, the East Germans built a wall between East and West Berlin to stem the huge outflow of people from East to West. The West was caught napping, and did not respond, except verbally. This was a worrying precedent, because at a time when the West still enjoyed military superiority over the East, it failed to take the minimum measures – for example, sending a few tanks to disperse the civilian builders of the wall – that would have prevented this fragrant violation of the four-power treaties over Berlin. President Kennedy’s coming to Berlin and calling himself a Berliner hardly reversed what was an obvious triumph of Communist intelligence over Capitalist cowardice. And it could be argued that it was this display of Western pusillanimity – a precursor of the shameful appeasement of Soviet aggression in the 1970s - that encouraged Khrushev to initiate the far more dangerous Cuban crisis the next year...278

Meanwhile, in the Union itself all seemed peace and quiet on the surface. There were some rebellions, but until the late 1960s and outside the camps these were more about terrible living conditions than protests against the regime itself or its ideology. Thus in Novocherkassk on June 2, 1962 there were major demonstrations by workers against the authorities because of very sharp rises in prices on milk and meat and empty shelves in the shops. The tanks were brought in, and according to official statistics, 26 people were killed and 87 wounded, while many others were sent to the camps. In fact, the casualties were probably much higher, and when the authorities failed to scrub out all the blood stains in the main square it was asphalted over and dances on it were organized – so that the young people “could drive evil thoughts away from themselves”.279

277 See Tony Judt’s articles on these two in When the Facts Change, London: Vintage, 2015, chapters 26 and 28.
278 Revel, op. cit., chapters 19 and 20.
In the same year, the journal *Novy Mir* published *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, a description of life in the camps that led many in the West to think that a “thaw” in Soviet censorship was taking place. However, as Jean-François Revel writes, “it is the purest self-deception to note that Khrushchev, while ‘wiping a tear from his eye’, authorized the publication of *Ivan Denisovich* in 1962 unless we add the corrective note that the book was later officially declared harmful in the USSR and its publication repudiated as an error, one of the consequences of ‘voluntarism in literature’ (everything Khrushchev did would later be condemned in a bloc as ‘voluntarism’ and ‘subjectivism’); the offending edition of *Novy Mir* was removed from Communist libraries, and Soviet ‘newspapers’ were forbidden to mention its title…”280

---

280 Revel, op. cit., p. 132.
After the war, ROCOR had to face a difficult problem of self-definition. In her founding Statute or Polozhenie she had defined herself as that part of the Russian Church which was outside Russia while still remaining in communion with the “Mother Church” in the Homeland. Thus in 1945 Metropolitan Anastasy declared that the members of ROCOR “have never considered and do not consider themselves at part of the Orthodox Russian Church, for we have never broken canonical, prayerful and spiritual unity with our Mother Church... We do not cease to thank God for judging that we should remain the free part of the Russian Church. Our duty is to preserve this freedom until we return to the Mother Church the precious pledge entrusted by her to us. A completely competent judge between the bishops abroad and the present head of the Russian Church could be only a freely and lawfully convened All-Russian Council that is completely independent it its decisions, and in which as far as possible all bishops abroad and especially those now in prison will participate. We are ready to give an account before them of all our actions during our sojourn abroad.”

In this statement there was no official clarification of what ROCOR’s relations with other Local Orthodox Churches in the West were to be, nor precisely who or what constituted the “Mother Church” of Russia, nor who was to be admitted to this All-Russian Council or in what capacity. Nor did any of the ROCOR Councils of the next ten years clarify these matters, in

282 The 1946 Council declared that the election of Patriarch Alexis was uncanonical, and on May 10, it decreed: “The Higher Church Administration in Russia in the person of the current Head of the Russian Church Patriarch Alexius has more than once already addressed the bishops abroad with an exhortation to enter into canonical submission to the patriarchate, but, listening to the directions of our pastoral conscience, we do not find it morally possible to acquiesce to these appeals as long as the Higher Church Administration in Russia is found in an unnatural union with the atheistic power and as long as the whole Russian Church is deprived of true freedom, which is inherent in it by its Divine nature.”

The November, 1950 Council, after profusely thanking the Americans for the protection they afforded to refugees from religious persecution, and lambasting the “red dragon” of communism, continued: “Insofar as the present Moscow Patriarch, and the other senior hierarchs of the Church in Russia remain closely bound with the atheist Soviet power and are its helpers in its criminal activity, which is directed to the destruction of the Kingdom of God on earth, our Church Abroad remains as before out of all communion with them, praying the Lord only that He enlighten their spiritual eyes and turn them from that disastrous path on which they themselves have started and on which they are dragging their flock.

“At the same time we, her humble servants, kiss the confessing exploit of the Secret or so-called Catacomb Church, whether she is in the dens of the earth or conceals herself in the depths of the Russian people itself, preserving the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience and struggling with the lies spread by the Bolshevist authorities and by the Russian bishops and clergy who have betrayed her.

“The Russian Church Abroad is in unity, love and prayer with all the other Orthodox Churches which have preserved fidelity to the apostolic tradition, to whatever people their members may belong. Still more would she want to preserve unity of spirit in the bond of
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spite of the fact that clarification was becoming more and more necessary in view of the ever-increasing deviation of the Local Churches from Orthodoxy.

In view of these ambiguities, it is not surprising that some Catacomb Christians who had fled to the West felt that a different spirit was reigning in ROCOR. Thus Professor I.M. Andreyev wrote: “Not only were we ready to die, but many did die, confident that somewhere there, outside the reach of the Soviet authorities, where there is freedom – there the Truth was shining in all its purity. There people were living by it and submitting to it. There people did not bow down to Antichrist. And what terror overwhelmed me when, fairly recently, I managed to come abroad and found out that some people here ‘spiritually’ recognise the Soviet Church. Spiritually! Many of us there fell, ‘for fear of the Jews’, or giving in to the temptation of outward cooperation with the authorities. I knew priests of the official Church who, at home, tore their hair out, who smashed their heads making prostrations, begging forgiveness for their apostasy, calling themselves Cain – but nonetheless they did not recognise the Red Church. But these others abroad – it is precisely spiritually that they submit to it. What good fortune that our priest-martyrs, in dying, did not find out about this betrayal!”

Before the war ROCOR had had no conflicts with any other Local Church with the exception of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, with which there was conflict, not so much over the question of the new calendar as over the EP’s relations with the Russian renovationists and its “annexation” of large territories formerly belonging to the Russian Church. Although, from a strictly canonical point of view, the Russian refugees should have sought admission into the Local Orthodox Churches on whose canonical territory they lived, these Churches (primarily the Serbian, but also the Bulgarian, the Romanian and the Eastern Patriarchates, especially Jerusalem) did not insist on this, respecting the particular needs of the refugees to stick together in one ecclesiastical organization, and taking into account the desire of the refugees to return eventually to Russia (which most believed would be soon).
However, the triumph of the Soviets in the war dashed the hopes of an early return to Russia. So the refugees had to decide how they were to establish themselves in the West on a more permanent basis. This was made more difficult by the fact that the previously friendly attitude of the Local Churches was beginning to change, partly because they were coming under pressure from the MP to break links with ROCOR, and partly because they themselves, as we have seen, were losing the salt of True Orthodoxy and therefore had less sympathy for the True Orthodox Russians in their midst. But in any case, ROCOR showed no sign of wanting to disband its organization and merge with the Local Churches. Thus in 1947 Archbishop Tikhon, the head of the Paris Exarchate, suggested to Metropolitan Anastasy that his Synod come under the Ecumenical Patriarchate, after which he, Tikhon, would enter into submission to ROCOR. Anastasy refused...²⁸⁵

However, this suspension of normal canonical rules could not continue forever. In fact, there was only one completely canonical way for ROCOR to re-establish her canonical status while preserving the integrity of her flock under Russian bishops: to declare herself the only truly Orthodox jurisdiction in the West in view of the falling away of the Local Churches into the heresies of ecumenism and sergianism. However, the bishops of ROCOR were not prepared to make such a bold step.

The first reason for this was that they did not appreciate how far the new calendarist churches had departed from True Orthodoxy (they had no contact with the Greek Old Calendarists, who could have told them), and they still hoped for support from them and cooperation with them in matters that were of common concern. And secondly, they feared to repel the tide of Orthodox Christians fleeing from the communist nightmare in Russia and Eastern Europe by a too-strict attitude towards the status of the official churches there, to which most of the new wave of refugees had belonged. Instead, while continuing to berate (but not too strongly) the shortcomings of the MP, ROCOR positioned itself, not as the sole representative of True Orthodoxy in the West, but as the “anti-communist church”, that part of the Russian Church which was in freedom and able to tell the truth about the situation in Russia.

This was not a dishonourable position, but it did not resolve the canonical status of ROCOR, and it bore the not inconsiderable danger of exposing its flock to the winds of false doctrine. Anti-communism was part of a truly viable Orthodox ideology, but only a part. If it was allowed to assume a more

important role than the struggle against heresy in general, then ROCOR could well find herself dissolving into the modernist jurisdictions around it, and even, eventually, into the MP if the fall of communism in Russia was not followed by a real repentance in the Russian people.

This problem of self-definition was only partly eased by the transfer of the administration of ROCOR to New York in 1950. America was not, and is not now, the “canonical territory” of any single Local Church, so the anomalous position of ROCOR in America (and other western territories, such as Western Europe and Australia) was less prominent there in view of the anomalous position of all jurisdictions in the New World. For it is a fundamental tenet of Orthodox canon law that there should be only one bishop for one territory – the division of the Orthodox flock in one place into various jurisdictions along ethnic lines is forbidden, and was even anathematised by the Ecumenical Patriarchate as the heresy of “phyletism” in 1872.

As we have seen, at ROCOR’s first Council of Bishops in America in 1950, a relatively firm stand against ecumenism was adopted, and ROCOR sanctified its own chrism for the first time. Logically, this should have led to a stricter attitude towards the Orthodox Churches that took part in the ecumenical movement. But under Metropolitan Anastasy this did not take place...

It was at the Hierarchical Council of October, 1953 that the beginning of a real debate on this subject began to surface. Metropolitan Anastasy said: “Archbishop John [Maximovich] says that we have not deviated from the right path pointed out to us by Metropolitan Anthony. We are a part of the Russian Church and breathe with the spirit of the Russian Church of all ages. But it is dangerous to draw from this the extreme conclusion that we are the only Church, and that we need pay no attention to the others or reckon with them. We are going along the right path, and the others have declined from it, but we must not proudly despise the others, for there are Orthodox hierarchs and priests everywhere. The words of Maximus the Confessor are often cited: ‘if the whole universe were to communicate, I alone would not.’ But he said: ‘if’. And when the Prophet Elijah thought that he alone kept the faith, the Lord revealed to him that there were still 7000 others…”

However, Archbishop Averky, supported by Archbishop Leonty, suggested a sharper, more aggressive posture towards the MP, relating to them as to renovationists. Archbishop John replied that the Synod had recently decided to accept Archimandrite Anthony (Bartoshevich) from the MP in his existing rank. And he recalled, according to protocol N 5 for

---

286 Archimandrite Anthony later became Archbishop Anthony of Geneva, and the main supporter of the supposedly grace-filled nature of the MP in the 70s and 80s. This is likely to have had something to do with his own career, which was decidedly suspicious. In 1945, when the ROCOR Synod and chancellery fled from Yugoslavia to Germany, he remained behind and joined the MP. Then, in 1949, he crossed the iron curtain somehow (it was almost
October 3/16, “that the question of concelebrating with clergy of the Moscow Patriarchate had been discussed at the 1938 Council, and it had been accepted that only Metropolitan Sergius was out of communion.” When Archbishop Averky called the MP “the church of the evil-doers”, Archbishop John replied “that it was important to clarify whether this concerns all those in this Church. Among the rank-and-file hierarchs there are very good men, while a strict examination must be applied to those at the head.”

It has been the argument of this book that in this point Archbishop Averky was right and Archbishop John, great saint though he was, was wrong. By 1945 the great majority of the MP hierarchs were ex-renovationists, and “very good” hierarchs must have been very few and far between; and even if they were “good” in a moral sense, their submission to the MP’s submission to the Bolshevik authorities, and their rejection of the True Orthodox Church, could in no way be counted as good. Moreover, the great majority of the confessing hierarchs, who were in a better position to judge about the MP than the hierarchs abroad, considered the MP to be “the church of the evil-doers.”

impossible to do this without the blessing of the KGB) and was received back into the True Church by his brother, Bishop Leonty of Geneva.  

287 Monk Benjamin, op. cit., part 4, p. 21. Archbishop John continued to retain this “liberal” attitude toward the MP to the end of his life. Thus in a letter dated September 13, 1963 he wrote: “... When under Metropolitan Anastasy they began to speak about ‘the incorrect actions of the Church’, he used to stop them, pointing out that one must not ascribe the actions of the hierarchy to the Church, since the hierarchy is not the whole Church, even if it speaks in her name. On the see of Constantinople there were Paul the Confessor, Macedonius, Gregory the Theologian, John Chrysostom, Nestorius, Proclus, Flavian and Germanus. Some of them shone in sanctity and Orthodoxy, but others were the leaders of heresies. But the Church remained Orthodox. During iconoclasm after the expulsion of Severin, Nicephorus and others, not only their sees, but also the majority of Episcopal sees were occupied by iconoclasts. The other Churches did not even have communion with it [the see of Constantinople], according to the witness of St. Paul [patriarch of Constantinople], who abandoned the heresy and his see, since they did not wish to have communion via the iconoclasts. Nevertheless, the Church of Constantinople remained Orthodox, although part of the people, and especially the guards and the bureaucrats, were drawn into iconoclasm. So now it is understandable when people who are not familiar with the language of the Church use the expression ‘Soviet church’; but it is not fitting for responsible and theological discussions. When the whole hierarchy of South-Western Rus’ passed into uniatism, the Church continued to exist in the person of the believing Orthodox people, which after many sufferings restored its hierarchy. For that reason it is more correct to speak, not of the ‘Soviet church’, which is impossible in the correct understanding of the word ‘Church’, but of the hierarchy, which serves Soviet power. Our relationship to it can be the same as to other representatives of this power. Their rank gives them the opportunity to act with great authority and to substitute the voice of the suffering Russian Church, and it is leading into error those who think to learn from them the true position of the Church in Russia. Of course, among them there are both conscious traitors, and those who simply do not find in themselves the strength to fight with their environment and who go with the current – that is a question of their personal responsibility. But as a whole it is the apparatus of Soviet power, the God-fighting power. Being on the one hand a hierarchy in the sphere of Divine services, for grace works independently of personal worthiness, in the social-political sphere it is a cover for the Soviet God-fighting activity. For that reason those who are abroad and have entered its ranks have become conscious helpers of this power…” (Monk Benjamin, “Letopis’ Tserkovnoj Istorii (1961-1971)” (A Chronicle of Church History (1961-1971), http://www.zlatoust.ws/letopis5.htm, part 5, p. 13)
As for the necessity of applying a strict examination to those coming from
the MP, this had been dramatically proved by the large number of traitors
who had infiltrated ROCOR since the war. Already during the war, the
renovationist “Bishops” Ignaty (Zhebrovsky) and Nicholas (Avtonomov) had
been received, it appears, with the minimum of formalities, and appointed to
the sees of Vienna and Munich, respectively, before being removed at the
insistence of zealous laymen.288 Again, the former renovationist and leading
ROCOR hierarch in Western Europe during the war, Metropolitan Seraphim
(Lyade) of Berlin, secretly petitioned to be received into the MP “in his
existing rank” before his death in 1950 – but was refused.289 Again,
Metropolitan Seraphim (Lukyanov) of Paris joined the MP, was received back
into ROCOR in his existing orders, and then returned to the MP in 1954.
Again, among the twelve Belorussian and Ukrainian bishops who were
received “in their existing rank” by ROCOR in 1946, at least one proved to be
a Judas – Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk), whose immorality left a trail of
destruction in various countries before he, too, joined the MP.

Stung by these betrayals, on October 14/27, 1953, the Hierarchical Council
decreed that “in cases where it is revealed that those who have received their
rank from the hierarchy of the MP by the Communists with the intention of
preaching in holy orders the Communist principles of atheism, such an
ordination is recognized as neither grace-bearing nor legal.” Again, on
November 9, 1959 the Council decreed that “from now on, if clergy of the MP
want to enter into the ranks of our Church Abroad: (1) They must be carefully
checked to see whether they are conscious agents of the atheist authorities,
and if this is discovered, the Hierarchical Synod must be informed. It may not
recognize the validity of the ordination of such a person to the sacred rank; (2)
in cases where no such doubts arise, he who is petitioning to be received into
the clergy of the Church Abroad is to be received through public repentance.
Moreover, a penance may be imposed on him as the Diocesan Hierarch sees
fit; (3) such clergy must give a written declaration on their reception in
accordance with the form established by the Hierarchical Synod; (4) when
laypeople from the flock of the MP are received into the Russian Church
Abroad, spiritual fathers must try their conscience with regard to the manner
of their actions while they were under the atheist authorities.”

288 See Chernov, “Proniknovenie Obnovlchestva v Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi” (The
Penetration of Renovationism into the Russian Orthodox Church) (MS); letter of Archbishop
Averky to Metropolitan Philaret, September 14/27, 1966.
289 Chernov, “Proniknovenie Obnovlchestva...”, op. cit., p. 3. However, Archbishop
Ambrose (von Sievers), following Chernov, asserts that in July-August, 1950 Metropolitan
Seraphim was secretly received into the MP. This was followed by his mysterious death at the
hands of bandits on August 15, 1950. Archbishop Ambrose explains this by the fact that
ROCOR, being a “public-legal corporation” in German law, was the only organization that
guaranteed Russian emigrants freedom from deportation back to the USSR. The news that
Metropolitan Seraphim had secretly defected to the MP threatened all these emigrants
(“Bezobrazniki: K sobytiam v RPTsZ 1945-55gg.” (Hooligans: On Events in ROCOR from
1945 to 1955), Russkoe Pravoslavie (Russian Orthodoxy), N 2 (16), 1999, p. 17).
The Council confirmed the following text to be signed by those clergy being received into the communion: “I, the undersigned, a former clergyman of the Moscow Patriarchate, ordained to the rank of deacon (by such-and-such a bishop in such-and-such a place at such-and-such a time) and ordained to the rank of presbyter (by such-and-such a bishop bishop in such-and-such a place at such-and-such a time) and having passed through my service (in such-and-such parishes), petition that I be received into the clergy of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. I am sincerely sorry that I was among the clergy of the Moscow Patriarchate, which is in union with the God-fighting authorities. I sweep aside all the lawless acts of the Moscow hierarchy in connection with its support of the God-fighting authorities and I promise from now on to be faithful and obedient to the lawful hierarchy of the Russian Church Abroad.”²⁹⁰

These measures constituted important steps in the direction of greater strictness towards the MP. And at the 1954 Council of the North American and Canadian dioceses Metropolitan Anastasy declared: “[The MP] does not educate the Russian people, but corrupts it, introducing hypocrisy and lies. Historical trials have visited us, and from them there is no other exit than by way of repentance. But the corrupt authorities do not allow us to set out on this path, but inspire pride and lead to the path of destruction. And responsibility is shared with this corrupt authority by the Soviet Church.

“Let us keep away from her! We do not confuse her with the Mother Church...”²⁹¹

However, in relation to the American Metropolia Metropolitan Anastasy said at the 1953 Council: “They do not have the fullness of truth, they deviate, but this does not mean that they are without grace. We must maintain objective calm with regard to them. We must strive for such unity on the same fundamental concepts of the Temporary Regulations upon which we stand today. Yet it is fair to say that all unity begins with personal contact: Let us love one another that with one mind we may confess. But we seem to regret that the keenness of jurisdictional quarreling has been dulled. But our goal is unity. Certain boundaries were needed as for disciplinary purposes. Now, when many extremes were abandoned in the American Metropolia, we still sharpen the question and speak of them as heretics with whom we can have no contact. Bishop Nicon said that we are very weak. This is not quite true. But externally, we are weaker than our opponents, who have money and the press on their side. The battlefield is not even. If we elevate the conflict, a very difficult situation will arise.”²⁹²

So the metropolitan was advocating retaining contacts and not “elevating the conflict” because the position of ROCOR from an external point of view was weak. This policy could be justified at the time in view of the fact that the Metropolia had not yet been absorbed into the MP. However, ROCOR later abandoned it – when the Metropolia was absorbed into the MP in 1970.

With regard to the Eulogians, Metropolitan Anastasy was also lenient. Thus on October 19, 1956, in response to a statement by Bishop Leontius of Chile that ROCOR should treat the Eulogians as renovationists and not permit any concelebrations, the metropolitan said that the Eulogians were different, since they were not heretics.\(^{293}\) And yet ROCOR had herself condemned the Eulogians’ teaching on Sophianism as heresy!\(^{294}\)

Metropolitan Anastasy also said: “Metropolitan Anthony [Khrapovitsky] was guided by this rule of St Basil the Great when he said that he was prepared to accept through the third rite both Catholics and Anglicans. He was of the view that as soon as organic ties to heresy are torn and Orthodoxy is accepted, grace is received, as if an empty vessel were filled with grace. We hold to the principle that we can accept those through the third rite whose thread of succession had not been torn. Even the Armenians, who confess a definite heresy, are accepted in their existing rank. Concerning the Anglicans, the question arose because they themselves are not certain that they have succession. If we accept those who depart from heresy, how can we not accept our own? They say that Patriarch Alexy sinned more than his predecessor. Whether he sinned more or less, we cannot deny his ordination. Much is said of their apostasy. But we must be cautious. We can hardly make an outright accusation of apostasy. In no place do they affirm atheism. In their published sermons they attempt to hold to the Orthodox line. They took and continue to take very strict measures with regard to the obnovlentsy, and did not tear their ties with Patriarch Tikhon. The false policy belongs to the church authority and the responsibility for it falls on its leaders. Only heresy adopted by the whole Church tarnishes the whole Church. In this case, the people are not responsible for the behavior of the leaders, and the Church, as such, remains unblemished. No one has the audacity to say that the whole Church is without grace, but insofar as priests had contact with the devious hierarchy, acted against their conscience, repentance is necessary. There can be no discussion of ‘chekists in cassocks.’ They are worse than Simon the Sorcerer. In this regard, in every individual case, one must make a special determination, and, if there is suspicion that a chekist is asking to come to us, we must not accept him.”\(^{295}\)

---


\(^{294}\) True the Eulogian jurisdiction had obtained a retraction of his views from the leading Sophianist, Fr. Sergei Bulgakov. However, the Eulogians did not clearly condemn the heresy, and their jurisdiction continued to be a hothouse of heresy for decades. See Andrew Blane (ed.), Georges Florovsky, Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1993, p. 67.

\(^{295}\) Nun Vassa, \textit{op. cit.}
Metropolitan Anastasy’s liberal attitude towards the reception of Catholics, Anglicans and Armenians is perhaps excusable in that it reflects the extremely liberal attitude of the Russian Church as a whole just before the revolution. However, it disagreed not only with prior Russian practice, but also with the practice of the Greek Church, and with the holy canons themselves (for example: the canons decree that Armenians should be received by Chrismation). Fortunately, this illegitimate practice of “oikonomia” was officially rescinded by the ROCOR Synod under Metropolitan Philaret in September, 1971, when it was decreed that Catholics and Protestants should henceforth be received by baptism. And when the Copts were once allowed to conduct a service in Jordanville, Metropolitan Philaret ordered that the church be cleansed from the defilement of heresy by holy water!

As regards the Metropolitan Anastasy’s assertion that the MP took “very strict measures with regard to the obnovlentsy”, this, unfortunately, was not true. As is well-known, both the first “patriarchs” of the MP, Sergius and Alexis, were former renovationists (obnovlentsy), and, far from repenting of their renovationism, they transformed the MP into an institution that was “renovationist in essence” (St. Cyril of Kazan’s words). Still more seriously, as we have seen, it received into the episcopate a whole series of renovationist protopriests with the minimum of formalities.

In his assertion that “the false policy [of the MP] belongs to the church authority and the responsibility for it falls [only] on its leaders”, Metropolitan Anastasy was unfortunately contradicting the teaching of the Orthodox Church, which considers that lay Christians are rational sheep who can and must separate from heretical leaders. Similarly, his assertion that “only heresy adopted by the whole Church tarnishes the whole Church” would not have been accepted by the hierarchs of the Ecumenical Councils. If the hierarchy of a Church adopts a heretical or antichristian policy, then it is the responsibility of all the lower ranks to rebuke their leaders, and if the rebukes fail, to separate from them because they are no longer true bishops (15th canon of the First-and-Second Council of Constantinople).

The OCA Archbishop John (Shahovskoj) tried to argue that the position of ROCOR towards the MP in this period was hypocritical insofar as it simultaneously called the MP apostate and sorrowed over the persecutions in the USSR and the closure of churches, although, according to its logic, it should have rejoiced over the closure of apostate churches.

In reply, the secretary of the ROCOR Synod, Fr. George Grabbe, replied that while calling the MP “apostate” and even, in some cases, using the word “gracelessness”, ROCOR never, at any of its Synodal sessions, expressed any doubt that the pastors and laymen belonging to the MP who were faithful to God were true pastors. Then, citing examples of the infiltration of agents into the hierarchy of the MP, Fr. George continued: “That is the gracelessness we are talking about! We are talking about those Judases, and not about the few
suffering people who are vainly trying to save something, the unfortunate, truly believing pastors”. 296

Of course, this answer raised more questions than it answered. If all or most of the hierarchy were KGB agents, and therefore graceless, how could the priests whom they ordained and who commemorated them be true priests? And how could the laymen be true laymen if they communicated from false bishops and priests? Is it possible in general to speak about faithful priests and laity commemorating a faithless and apostate bishop? These questions never received satisfactory answers and continued to give ROCOR’s witness in relation to the MP an ambiguous character for decades to come. Only on one question was ROCOR clear: that it had no communion with the MP Synod. And so it left SCOBA (the Council of Orthodox Bishops of America) in 1956 when the MP became one of its members. 297

With regard to the other Churches of World Orthodoxy, a liberal policy was pursued until the retirement of Metropolitan Anastasy in 1964, and ROCOR hierarchs continued to concelebrate occasionally with both the Greek new calendarists and with the Serbian and Jerusalem patriarchates. Thus in 1948 Archbishop Vitaly (Maximenko) concelebrated at the consecration of Bishop Michael Konstantinidas of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, a friend of Metropolitan Anastasy from the days when the latter lived in Constantinople in the 1920s. Again, Bishop Leontius of Geneva concelebrated with Patriarch Timothy of Jerusalem at a Convent on the Mount of Olives in 1954. Jerusalem had promised Moscow that it would break with ROCOR, and Patriarch Timothy explained to Bishop Seraphim of Mahopac in 1952 that he could not serve at the Holy Sepulchre because the Jerusalem Patriarchate recognized the MP. On the other hand, all heads of ROCOR’s Ecclesiastical Mission, as well as the abbesses of the monasteries, were confirmed by official letters issued by the Jerusalem Patriarchate. 298 Archbishop John (Maximovich) of Western Europe consecrated several new-calendarist bishops, all of whom left ROCOR for “World Orthodoxy” after his death: Bishop Theophilus (Ionescu) of Detroit and his Romanian new calendarists to the Romanian patriarchate (ROCOR defrocked him in 1972), Bishop John-Nectarius (Kovalevsky) of Saint-Denis and his French mission (following the Gallican rite) to the Romanian new calendar church, Bishop Cyril (Ionev), who had ordained for the Bulgarian new calendarists in North America, to the OCA in 1976, and Bishop Jacob (Akkerduik) of the Hague to the MP in 1971 (he complained that ROCOR wanted to “russify” his flock).
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There was a moment, according to Fr. Roman Pavlov, when the Synod of ROCOR and Metropolitan Anastasy told Archbishop John that he was not right to receive into communion people who used the new Paschalia. Bishop Gregory Grabbe wrote: “The reposed Archbishop John received already organized groups of Frenchmen and Dutchmen whose life was conducted according to the new calendar and with the new Paschalia. However, the Council did not agree with this and obtained his renunciation of the latter.”

“After the death of Vladyka John, in September, 1966 the ROCOR Hierarchical Synod entrusted the leadership of the affairs of the French Orthodox Catholic Church to Archbishop Vitaly (Ustinov). On October 9 Archbishop Vitaly was present at a General Assembly of the FOCC, where he declared that it was necessary to stop celebrating the liturgy according to the western rite and insisted on the complete acceptance of the Byzantine rite. As a mark of protest, on October 19 Bishop John (Kovalevsky) declared that the FOCC was leaving ROCOR. Part of the communities of the FOCC refused to leave ROCOR, but the Gallican rite was preserved among them on condition that the Byzantine rite was used as the main rite (later most of these parishes left ROCOR and joined one of the Greek Old Calendarist Churches). At the end of the same year Bishop John (Kovalevsky) addressed the heads of the Local Orthodox Churches with a request that they receive the FOCC with the keeping of the Gallican rite.”

Thus ROCOR was neither in official communion with World Orthodoxy nor clearly separated from it: it existed in a kind of canonical limbo, a Church that consecrated her own chrism but did not claim to be autocephalous, a Church of almost global jurisdiction but claiming to be part of the Russian Church inside Russia. The question was: which Russian Church inside Russia was it part of – the MP or the Catacomb Church?

The answer to this question was left deliberately vague. On the one hand, there was clearly no communion with the hierarchy of the MP, which was seen to have compromised itself with communism. On the other hand, it was said that communion had never been broken with the suffering people of Russia. But which people were being talked about? Those who considered themselves citizens of the Soviet state, or those who rejected such citizenship?

In spite of his lack of communion with the MP, Metropolitan Anastasy appears to have considered it to be the “Mother Church”. Thus he wrote to Metropolitan Theophilus of New York: “Your proposed union with the Patriarchate has not only a spiritual, but a canonical character, and binds you with the consequences. Such a union would be possible only if the Mother Church were completely free…” In 1957, however, in his last will and testament, he clearly drew the boundaries as follows: “As regards the

300 Metropolitan Anastasy, in Fr. Alexis Young, The Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia, San Bernardino, CA: the Borgo Press, 1993, p. 47.
Moscow Patriarchate and its hierarchs, then, so long as they continue in close, active and benevolent cooperation with the Soviet Government, which openly professes its complete godlessness and strives to implant atheism in the entire Russian nation, then the Church Abroad, maintaining her purity, must not have any canonical, liturgical, or even simply external communion with them whatsoever, leaving each one of them at the same time to the final judgement of the Sobor of the future free Russian Church…”

Again, on October 18, 1959, in his address at the opening of the Hierarchical Council of ROCOR, he said: “We must not only teach others, but ourselves also fulfil [that which we teach], following the examples of the Moscow saints whom we have commemorated today. They stand before us as Orthodox zealots, and we must follow their example, turning aside completely from the dishonesty of those who have now occupied their throne. Oh if they could but arise, they not only would not recognise any of their successors, but rather would turn against them with severe condemnation. With what zeal would St. Philip be set aflame against the weak-in-faith representatives of the Church, who look with indifference at the flowing of the innocent blood of their flock, and yet do not condemn the enemies of the Church, but try in every way to flatter the atheistic authority. How the great adamantine St. Hermogen would have arisen in righteous indignation, seeing the hierarchy remaining deceitfully silent at a time when atheist propaganda is being widely disseminated, forgetting that by their silence they are betraying God. Let us in every way turn aside from them, but at the same time let us arm ourselves with apostolic zeal. We must avoid every kind of contact with them like the plague. You know that these people with their thoroughly burned consciences will never cease to wage war against us, although they constantly change their methods of warfare.”

In 1961, moreover, he showed that he had not forgotten the Catacomb Church, declaring in the name of ROCOR: “We consider ourselves to be in spiritual unity precisely with the Secret Church, but not with the official administration of the Moscow Patriarchate led by Patriarch Alexis, which is permitted by the atheist government and carries out all its commands…”

Noteworthy, is his saying that ROCOR was not in communion only with “the official administration of the MP”, not with the rank-and-file believers. And the Epistle of the Hierarchical Council of 1962, while rebuking the atheists, expressed sympathy for the simple believers and even for the simple priests, while the Great-Martyr Great Russian Church was identified with the whole of the church people, including those in the Moscow Patriarchate, but excluding “the small group of clergy having the right to a legal existence”.

---
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But how could the priests be inside the Church and the people they served outside it? This was ecclesiological nonsense! This kind of ambiguity in relation to the Church in Russia was displayed also by Archbishop Vitaly (Maximenko) of Jordanville, who had once served the liturgy on his own breast in a Polish prison. He could, in one and the same article, fiercely criticise Sergius’ policies as leading to the destruction of the Church and express “profound reverence before the exploit of Patriarch Sergius”.

However, his final verdict is fully in the spirit of the Catacomb Church: “They say: the patriarchate has changed nothing, in dogmas, services or rites. No, we reply, the patriarchate has destroyed the essential dogma of the Church of Christ, and has rejected Her essential mission – to serve the regeneration of men, and has replaced it by the service of the godless aims of communism, which is unnatural for the Church. This falling away is more bitter than all the previous Arianisms, Nestorianisms, Iconoclasm, etc. And this is not the personal sin of one or another hierarch, but the root sin of the Moscow Patriarchate, confirmed, proclaimed and bound by an oath in front of the world. It is, so to speak, dogmatized apostasy…”

This was an inspired definition: dogmatized apostasy. Not simply apostasy “for fear of the Jews”, but dogmatized apostasy – that is, apostasy raised to the level of a dogma. When apostasy is justified in this way, it becomes deeper, more serious and more difficult to cure. It becomes an error of the mind as well as a disease of the will. For it is one thing for a churchman out of weakness to submit himself and his church to the power of the world and of the Antichrist. That is his personal tragedy, and the tragedy of those who follow him, but it is not heresy. It is quite another thing for the same churchman to make the same submission “not for wrath, but for conscience’s sake” (Romans 13.5) – to use the words of the apostle as perverted by Sergius in his declaration. This is both heresy and apostasy – dogmatized apostasy.

However, at another time Archbishop Vitaly said that the Providence of God had placed before ROCOR the duty “of not tearing herself away from the basic massif, the body, the root of the Mother Church: in the depths of this massif, which is now only suffocated by the weight of Bolshevism, the spiritual treasures of Her millennial exploit are even now preserved. But we must not recognise Her contemporary official leaders, who have become the obedient instrument of the godless authorities.”

As V.K. writes: “In these words is contained a manifest incongruity. How did Archbishop Vitaly want, without recognising the official leadership of the MP, at the same time not to be torn away from its body? Is it possible ‘to preserve the spiritual treasures’ in a body whose head has become ‘the
obedient instrument of the godless authorities’ (that is, the servants of satan and the antichrist), as he justly writes of the sergianist leaders?... The Holy Scriptures say: ‘If the firstfruit is holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root is holy, so are the branches’ (Romans 11.16). And on the other hand: ‘A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, nor can a bad tree bear good fruit’ (Matthew 7.18).”
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In 1945 the Arab League was formed with British backing. “The British,” writes John Darwin, “intended the League to be a channel of their influence, a way of keeping the Arab states together under a British umbrella. But it might also serve as a vehicle for Arab cooperation to exclude or contain the influence of outside powers. The new geopolitical scene in which Soviet and American power was seen to balance (if not outweigh) that of Britain made this far less unlikely than it would have been before 1939. To many young Arabs, there seemed reason to hope that the post-war world would be a new ‘national age’. The false dawn of freedom from Ottoman power after 1918 – which had led instead to Britain’s regional overrule – might at last give way to the glorious morning of full Arab nationhood.

“Almost immediately the barriers piled up. The British rejected the ‘logic’ of withdrawal: instead they dug themselves in. Arguments of strategy... and heavy dependence on oil (still mainly from Iran) made retreat unthinkable. The strategic vulnerability and economic weakness with which Britain had entered the peace (London hope they were temporary) ruled out the surrender of imperial assets unless (as in India) they had become untenable. In the Middle East, the British still believed that they had a strong hand. Their position was founded on their alliance with Egypt, the region’s most developed state, with more than half the population of the Arab Middle East – 19 million out of some 35 million. The long-standing conflict between the Egyptian monarchy and the landlord class gave them enormous leverage in the country’s politics. If more ‘persuasion’ was needed, they could send troops into Cairo from their Canal Zone base in a matter of hours. To improve relations after the strains of war, they now dangled the promise of a smaller military presence. They assumed that sooner or later the Wafd or the king would want to come to terms, because Egypt’s regional influence, like its internal stability, needed British support. So, when negotiations stalled, the British stayed put, intending to wait until things ‘calmed down’. They could afford to do so – or so they thought. For they could also count on their close political friendship with the Hashemite monarchies in Iraq and Jordan. It was well understood that the cohesion of both states (demarcated by the British in the early 1920s) and the survival of their monarchs (installed by the British at much the same time) rested on the promise of British assistance against internal revolt as much as external attack. To the south and east lay the Persian Gulf, still a ‘British lake’. Along its Arab shore lay a string of small states from Kuwait to Oman bound to the British by the promise of protection against their potentially predatory neighbours. At Arabia’s southern tip lay an old British base at Aden, and a coastal strip under loose British rule. As if all this was not enough, the British were laying plans for bases in Libya, taken from the Italians and scheduled for self-rule under a British-backed king. It went without saying that the British exerted a prescriptive right to regulate the politics of the whole Middle East region. Diplomatic support in a quarrel between states, the offer of aid, and refusal to do business with an ‘unfriendly’ government were the classic techniques of quasi-imperial control.
The British had played this game for a generation or more. Driving them out was bound to be difficult, divisive and perhaps even bloody.

“To more radical Arabs the solution was obvious. The imperial juggernaut could be beaten only by the collective force of pan-Arab nationalism. A vision of shared Arab nationhood would discredit the bargains the British had made with the rulers and ‘big men’ in the Arab states. I would challenge the complacency of the landed elite and improve the social conditions that kept Arab life expectancy on a level with Indian. But as yet Arab unity was a distant dream. Ethnic, religious and social divisions – the legacy in part of Ottoman and European rule – were deeply entrenched. Pan-Arab nationalism had to compete with the endemic hostility between the region’s ruling elites. Nationalists in Egypt felt little in common with the other Arab states (‘a collection of zeroes’, sneered Saad Zaghlul in the 1920s). They dwelt on Egypt’s pharaonic glory (encouraged by the great Tutankhamun finds in the 1920s) and regarded themselves as the true custodians of Arab nationalism and culture in their highest form. Egyptian opinion dismissed the Hashemite rulers in Iraq and Jordan as puppets and parvenus, and their claims to leadership of the Arab world as absurd and impudent. The Hashemite kings were equally certain of their historic claim to head the Arab cause: it was they, after all, who had led the rising after 1916 and proclaimed an Arab nation. Their long-standing ambition was a great Hashemite state uniting Syria (lost to the French in 1920) and Palestine with Iraq and Jordan. Their fiercest enmity, returned with interest, was towards the house of Saud. It was the Saudi monarch who had seized the holy places of Mecca and Medina from their Hashemite guardian, and turned Hashemite Hejaz into a province of what became ‘Saudi’ Arabia. Much of the rivalry between Egypt, the Hashemites and the Sauds was focused on Syria, whose religious and regional conflicts made it a battle ground for influence from outside.”

An important factor in stirring up pan-Arab nationalism was the humiliating defeat of the Arab armies at the hands of Israel in 1948. This brought to the fore the first real leader of the movement, Gamal Nasser. Earlier, during the Second World War, writes Simon Sebag Montefiore, “hoping for a Nazi victory to overthrow British rule in Egypt, [Nasser] and [his friend] Amer worked to put together a group of like-minded officers. Faced with the UN plan to partition Palestine between Jewish and Arab states, Nasser was tempted to fight on the Arab side and finally got his chance when King Farouk of Egypt, obese, incompetent and debauched, joined the other countries of the Arab League in an attack on the nascent state of Israel. The Egyptians, including Nasser, advanced into the Negev but the young officer witnessed the ineptitude of the king and his officers as well as the lack of equipment and absence of proper preparation.

---

“By August 1948, Nasser was the deputy commander of Egyptian units surrounded by the Israelis in the so-called Falluja Pocket. It was a formative experience: Nasser was humiliated by the disastrous war effort and on his return he formed with his friend Amer and others the Association of Free Officers. Nasser consulted with the Muslim Brotherhood, but concluded early on that their Islamic programme clashed with his own Arab nationalism. The Free Officers selected General Muhammed Neguib to be their front man.

“When Nasser heard in May 1952 that Farouk was planning to arrest the Free Officers, he launched an almost bloodless coup d’état, allowing the king to depart from Alexandria in his yacht with full honours. The revolutionaries were unsure whether to create a democracy or a military regime. Since Nasser was only a lieutenant-colonel, Neguib became president of the new Egyptian Republic, but real power was in the hands of the Revolutionary Command Council, which was effectively controlled by Nasser in his role as deputy chairman.

“In 1954, as Nasser pushed land reforms and demanded that the alarmed British should leave the Suez Canal, he clashed with the more moderate Neguib. But he asserted his confidence by taking real power as prime minister. Nasser’s passionate and elegant oratory was already captivating Egyptian audiences. In October, as Nasser addressed a large crowd in Alexandria, a young Muslim Brother tried to assassinate him, but Nasser defiantly and courageously continued his speech...

“On his return to Cairo, Neguib was deposed. Nasser became the unrivalled president, a position he retained for the next fifteen turbulent years. He appointed his crony Amer commander-in-chief of the army before launching a massive crackdown on communists and, above all, the Muslim Brotherhood. He arrested 20,000 of their members and had their leader and ideologue Sayyid Quth executed.

“Henceforth Nasser, with his tall good looks and superb oratory, was immensely popular, but it was his embrace of pan-Arabist nationalism that excited not just Egyptians but the entire Arab world, which was emerging from a century of foreign domination. Nonetheless, he ruled an effective one-party state with the aid of a growing and brutal secret police, backed by an ever more corrupt and oligarchical military junta who swiftly became rich (though he himself had no interest in material matters).

“Nasser committed himself to the non-aligned movement, emerging as its leader alongside Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia and Nehru of India. [and began receiving arms from the Soviet Union]. In 1956 Nasser announced the nationalization of the Suez Canal, outraging British Prime Minister Anthony Eden who, facing the decline of British imperial power, now saw Nasser as a new Hitler. The British responded by putting together a secret deal with the
French and the Israelis to attack and destroy Nasser. The Israelis would invade Sinai, the Anglo-French would then ‘intervene’…”

The legal and moral arguments over the nationalization of the Canal were finely balanced, but there is no doubt that it was a serious blow to the economic, political and military interests of the West. As Robert Blake writes, “In 1955, 14,666 ships passed through the canal; three-quarters of them belonged to NATO countries and one-third of them was British. Annually, 70 million tons of oil came through from the Gulf, of which 60 million were in western Europe, constituting two-thirds of the area’s total oil imports. It would require twice the tonnage of tankers to bring it round the Cape. In these circumstances western alarm was understandable. Both Britain and France had further reason for perturbation. Nasser’s coup would give pan-Arabism a boost everywhere. In Algiers where France was fighting a bitter colonial war fuelled by Egyptian supplies and propaganda, the destruction of Nasser came more and more to be seen as a precondition of victory. Nasser’s success also threatened the Baghdad Pact the remaining pro-British regimes in the Middle East, especially Iraq. The French and British positions were, however, different in one important respect. France had cut her links with the Arab world and was on the very closest terms with Israel…”

After negotiations and an international conference failed, Britain decided to put the matter to the Security Council. The Russians vetoed the resolution. The British and French now decided on military action together with the Israelis, who were worried by the Soviet-supplied build-up of arms in Syria and Egypt. The result was a disaster, largely because the Americans, as always hostile to European colonialism, pulled the rug from under the feet of the British and French. There was no subterfuge about this: the Americans had been very clearly and consistently against the invasion from the beginning. More surprising in view of later developments, was the Americans’ refusal to help the Israelis too.

But it started well. As Norman Stone writes, “The Israelis staged a very clever operation, carried out with panache. Four Mustangs, flying only twelve feet from the ground, cut Egyptian telephone connections, and a few hundred paratroops secured the essential desert pass. By 5 November the Israelis were on the Canal, occupying also, the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba from which their shipping had been banned. It no doubt helped that, on 31 October, the British bombed Egyptian air bases. The day before, Eden had told the House

---
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of Commons that the Israelis and Egyptians would be told to stop while an Anglo-French force occupied the Canal Zone. He even tried to claim that this was not ‘war’, but ‘armed conflict’, and of all absurdities suspended deliveries of arms to Tel Aviv. Almost at once, problems emerged. The dollar reserves were declining, and in any case mobilization was a very slow business: the British had put resources into nuclear weaponry, and had run down the effectiveness both of their army and of their navy. They could not get troops to the Suez area inside a month, and though they did have troops at a base in Libya, they shrank from using these, for fear of offending wider opinion. In fact, the Chiefs of Staff object to an immediate action, threatening resignation: they were just not ready. A British force did eventually leave from Malta and Cyprus – bases both too far distant, given that speed was so essential: the world, confronted by the fact on the ground of an immediate occupation, might have accepted it (as Dulles [the American foreign secretary] later said, ‘Had they done it quickly, we’d have accepted it’ and Eisenhower shook his head: ‘I’ve just never seen Great Powers make such a complete mess’). Four days’ delay occurred, while British and American diplomats had a public wrangle. The First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Mountbatten, showed his usual instinct for the possible, and was only narrowly stopped from resigning as he sensed the unfolding fiasco. The Americans became incensed at being told such obvious lies by men whom they imagined they could absolutely trust, and as the Anglo-French force steamed forth, the American fleet in the area disrupted its radio communications and used submarines to shadow it. Then disaster went ahead. The Canal was blocked by the Egyptians, and oil imports dwindled, prices rising. Junior Foreign Office people threatened mass resignation. The Americans at the United Nations denounced the expedition, and that body produced a resolution in which all countries but a faithful few condemned the British and French: Eden even received a letter from Moscow 5 November, vaguely threatening retaliation, just as the paratroops at last landed. That was bluster, but a further move was not bluster. The pound sterling was an artificially strong currency, and now the Americans refused to support the pound. It fell – reserves dropping by $50m in the first two days of November, and by 5 per cent of the total in the first week. At that rate, there would be none left by the early weeks of 1957. The end was humiliating, as the American Secretary of State told the United Nations that he could not support his allies. Just as he said so, the landings at Port Said finally occurred on 5 November, but by then it was far too late, and a ceasefire had to follow by the evening of the next day. The broken Eden retired ill to the house on Jamaica where Ian Fleming wrote his James Bond books – one imperial fantasy meeting another. The conclusion at once drawn in London was that never again would the Atlantic link be risked…”

There were major consequences for the French also. They had joined in the assault on Nasser largely because he was stirring up Arab nationalism in their Algerian and North African colonies. Now they faced a full-scale insurrection in Algeria, which was only brought to an end eight years later, when a new
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president, De Gaulle, using a new constitution, recognized Algeria’s independence, leading to the exodus of one million French settlers. The war in Algeria had cost 30,000 French lives (the war in Vietnam, which ended in a similar way in 1954, had cost 90,000 lives).

Darwin writes: “Suez signaled the end of British ambition to manage the politics of the whole Arab world. It created a vacuum of great-power influence. It was the moment to forge a new Middle East order. Nasser stood forth as an Arab Napoleon. His prestige was matchless: he was the rais (boss). With its large middle class, its great cities and seaports, its literature and cinema, its journalists and teachers, Egypt was the symbol of Arab modernity. Nasser’s pan-Arab nationalism (formally inscribed in Egypt’s new constitution) chimed with a phase of sharp social change in most Middle Eastern states. To the new urban workers, the growing number of students, the expanding bureaucracy, the young officer class, it offered a political creed and a cultural programme. It promised an end to the Palestinian grievance, through the collective effort of a revitalized nation. Within less than two years of his triumph at Suez, Nasser drew Syria into political union, to form the United Arab Republic. The same year (1958) saw the end of Hashemite rule in Iraq. Nasser still had to reckon with American power (the United States and Britain intervened jointly to prevent the overthrow of Jordan and Lebanon by pro-Nasser factions). But American fears of rising Soviet influence and Nasser’s opposition to Communism allowed a wary rapprochement. It looked indeed as if Nasser had achieved a stunning double victory. He had displaced the British as the regional power in favour of a looser, more tolerant American influence. He had made himself and Egypt the indispensable partners of any great power with Middle East interests. Pan-Arab solidarity under Egyptian leadership (the new Iraqi regime with its Communist sympathies had been carefully isolated) opened vistas of hope. It could set better terms with the outside powers. It could use the oil weapon (oil production was expanding extremely rapidly in the 1950s). It might even be able to ‘solve’ the question of Palestine.

“But, as it turned out, the Middle East’s decolonization fell far short of this pan-Arab ideal. Nasser might have hoped that the oil-rich sheikdoms of the Persian Gulf (especially Kuwait) would embrace his ‘Arab socialism’ and throw off their monarchs. But the British hung on in the Gulf and backed its local rulers against Nasser’s political challenge. Secondly, the pan-Arab feeling on which Nasser relied faced a powerful foe. In the early post-war years the new Arab states seemed artificial creations. The educated Arab elite moved easily between them. So did their ideas. State structures were weak, and could be easily penetrated by external influence. By 1960 this had begun to change. New ‘local’ elites began to man the states’ apparatus. Every regime acquired its mukhabarat – a secret police. The sense of national differences between the Arab states became clearer and harder: the charismatic politics of Nasser’ pan-Arabism faced an uphill struggle. His union with Syria broke up after three years. Thirdly, the Israeli state proved much more resilient than might have been hoped, and its lien on American sympathy showed no sign
of failing: if anything, it was growing steadily stronger by the early 1960s. Fourthly (and largely in consequence), the pan-Arabist programme could not be achieved without help from outside. The search for arms, aid and more leverage against Israel (and their own local rivalries) drew the Arab states into the labyrinth of Cold War diplomacy. Lastly, a twist of geological fate placed the oil wealth of the region in the states least inclined to follow Cairo’s ideological lead: Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Britain’s Gulf protectorates. Nor did oil become (as coal had once been for Britain) the dynamo of social and industrial change. In fact Arab prosperity (or the prospect of it) seemed grossly dependent on an extractive industry over which real control lay in foreign hands – the ‘seven (multinational) sisters’ who ruled the world of oil.

The second catastrophe of the 1967 Six Day War, fought between Israel and Egypt, Jordan and Syria, was a savage reminder that mineral wealth was not the same as power, and that oil dollars did not mean industrial strength. By 1970, the year of Nasser’s premature death, the promise of post-imperial freedom had become ‘the Arab predicament’.”

After his humiliating defeat in the Six Day War, Nasser turned to the Soviets for help, bringing them into the Middle East as never before... Alexander Shulman writes: “Nasser often approached the leadership of the USSR requesting that they send Soviet armies to save his country. In December, 1969 Nasser made a secret visit to Moscow for a personal meeting with L. Brezhnev.

“Nasser besought Brezhnev to send to Egypt regular Soviet forces with for air defence and aviation. At a session of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the USSR together with the commanders of the Armed Forces it was decided to satisfy his request...

“The operation to create a group of Soviet armies for Egypt composed of 32,000 military personnel received the name ‘Kavkaz’. It was led by Marshal P.F. Batitsky. In the first days of March, 1970 the armies with their military hardware set off from the port of Nikolaev in an atmosphere of complete secrecy. The men were dressed in civil clothing and had no documents of any kind. A very strict command was given to shoot without hesitation anyone who ‘tried to jump overboard’.”

In July, 1970 the Israeli Armed Forces engaged in battle with Soviet airmen over Suez. In the course of the battle five Soviet MIGs were downed... Undismayed, the Soviets became even more committed to helping their Arab allies...
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24. THE COMMUNISTS BECOME ECUMENISTS

So far it had been the Ecumenical Patriarchate that had made the running in Orthodox ecumenism. However, in 1959 the MP sent its representative, Metropolitan Nicholas of Krutitsa, to the Orthodox consultation proposed by the Faith and Order Committee near Athens, which indicated that the communists had changed their minds about ecumenism, and decided that the Russian Church’s participation in it would further their cause.

This change of mind was partly because they suddenly realized the opportunities for espionage among leftist Western churchmen, and partly because, as Fr. Georges Florovsky lamented, from the time of the Evanston conference a progressive takeover took place of the “Faith and Order” concerns by the “Life and Work” concerns. That is, of the two strands of ecumenical activity that had existed before the war – the resolving of dogmatic differences among Christians, and “concern for the world and its problems” – it was the latter that was becoming dominant.

And this was of great interest to the communists.

We have seen that, as late as the Moscow council of 1948, the MP, in obedience to its communist masters, had adopted an anti-western and anti-ecumenical position. However, this position began to change in the late 1950s, when the MP began to be pushed into joining the WCC by the Council for Religious Affairs. Thus on January 16, 1958, Metropolitan Nicholas asked the Council how he was to reply to the suggestion of the WCC general secretary that he meet representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church. Comrade Karpov, head of the Council for Religious Affairs, said that he should reply that they in principle agreed to a meeting in June-July of that year.

And so on May 13 Metropolitan Nicholas asserted that “in the last ten years, thanks to the participation of some Orthodox Churches and the non-participation of others in the ecumenical movement, significant changes have taken place witnessing to its evolution towards churchness [tserkovnosti]. Very indicative in this respect have been huge movements in the sphere of German Protestant theology revealing the mystical depths of Orthodoxy and overcoming its traditional rationalism... On coming into contact with our ecclesiastical life, many actors in the ecumenical movement have completely changed their idea of Orthodoxy... Evidently approving of the declaration of the Orthodox participants in the Evanston assembly, we agree to a meeting with the leaders of the World Council of Churches exclusively in the name of our Pan-Orthodox duty – to serve the reunification of all Christians in the bosom of the Church of Christ.”
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In 1959, as a sign of the changing times, the MP joined the European Conference of Churches... Then, on June 15, 1960 the new head of the Council for Religious Affairs, Kuroyedov met Patriarch Alexis. As Fr. Sergius Gordun writes, “Kuroyedov declared that he had carefully studied the external activities of the Patriarchate and he had come to conclusion that the situation was quite unsatisfactory. ‘In recent years the Patriarchate has not undertaken a single major initiative for the unification of the Orthodox Churches around the Russian Orthodox Church headed by the Moscow Patriarchate – initiatives, that is, aimed at exposing the reactionary activities of the Pope of Rome and the intensification of the struggle for peace. The Patriarchate is not using those huge opportunities which she enjoys; she has not undertaken a single major action abroad… The Russian Orthodox Church is not emerging as a unifying centre for the Orthodox Churches of the world, usually she adopts a passive stance and only weakly exposes the slanderous propaganda concerning the position of religion and the Church in our country... The Council recommended to Metropolitan Nicholas that he work out suggestions for intensifying external work. However, Metropolitan Nicholas has not fulfilled this request of the Council and has put forward suggestions which in no way correspond to the requirements discussed with the metropolitan in this regard.’ Then Kuroyedov suggested that Metropolitan Nicholas be released from his duties as president of the Department of Foreign Relations and that they be imposed on another, more fitting person.”

The “suggestion” was accepted, and Metropolitan Nicholas was retired on June 21. In July, he asked Archbishop Basil (Krivoshein) of Brussels to tell the world that a new persecution was beginning, and in August repeated this message to western church leaders. In August, Kuroyedov suggested to the patriarch that he retire Metropolitan Nicholas from the Moscow diocese. The patriarch suggested to the metropolitan that he accept the Leningrad diocese, but the latter sharply rejected the offer. On September 9, Metropolitan Nicholas sent a letter to Khruschev. On September 19, the MP Synod retired him. On December 13 he died in suspicious circumstances; many believe he was murdered.

Some believe that Metropolitan Nicholas was removed because in 1959 KGB defector Major Peter Deriabin had exposed him before a U.S. Senate Subcommittee as a KGB agent. There is no doubt that he was an agent, as we have seen; but it also appears likely that he sincerely wanted to protect the Church. In any case, his career is yet another illustration of the Lord’s words that one cannot serve two masters, God and Mammon...

---
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The new foreign relations supremo turned out to be Bishop Nikodem (Rotov), who was born in 1929, made priest at the extraordinarily young age of 20, and Bishop of Podolsk on July 10, 1960, at the age of 31.

His arrival on the scene marks a new advance in the apostasy of the MP. For his personality, as Fr. Sergius continues, was “linked with the change in the position of the Moscow Patriarchate in relation to the ecumenical movement. As is well known, the Conference of the heads and representatives of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches, which took place in Moscow in 1948, accepted a resolution declaring that ‘the aims of the ecumenical movement... do not correspond to the ideals of Christianity and the tasks of the Church of Christ as those are understood by the Orthodox Church’. In this connection particular mention was made of the ecumenical movement’s turn towards involvement in social and political life, which was not acceptable for Orthodoxy. This position was maintained by the Moscow Patriarchate until 1960. In a conversation which took place on April 2, 1959, his Holiness Patriarch Alexis informed the Council about the attitude of the Russian Church to the ecumenical movement, and declared that she intended gradually to increase her links with the World Council of Churches and to send her observers to its most important conferences, but would not become a member of this organization. However, a year and a half later this position changed. In the notes of a conversation which took place between Patriarch Alexis and V.A. Kuroyedov on September 15, 1960, there is the following phrase: ‘The Patriarch accepted the recommendation of the Council concerning the entry of the Russian Orthodox Church into the membership of the World Council of Churches and evaluated this as a major action of the Russian Orthodox Church in its activities abroad.’ What was the aim of the Council for the affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church in recommending that the Russian Church enter the World Council of Churches? To conceal, it would seem, the anti-ecclesiastical policy of the Soviet government. Having cornered the Church, the Council wanted to create the image of a free and active Russian Church abroad...”

In November-December, 1960 Patriarchs Alexis and Athenagoras met in Constantinople, and discussed questions related to the Second Vatican Council After their meeting Bishop Nikodem, now president of the MP’s Department of External Relations, gave a press conference at which he said: “The Russian Church has no intention of taking part in the Council, since the union between Orthodoxy and Catholicism cannot take place unless the Vatican renounces from the beginning certain principles – for example, the infallibility of the Pope.” However, as we shall see, this was by no means to be the last world in MP-Vatican relations...
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On March 30, 1961 the MP Synod resolved “to consider the entry of the Russian Orthodox Church into the World Council of Churches to be timely, and to ask his Holiness the Patriarch to send a letter to the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches declaring the desire of the Russian Orthodox Church to become a member of the World Council of Churches.”

From September 24 to October 1 the Orthodox Churches in the WCC met on Rhodes under the presidency of Metropolitan Chrysostom of Athens. One of its participants, Archbishop Basil of Brussels, recalls that “the relations of the Orthodox Church with the rest of the Christian world were reviewed in detail. With regard to the Catholic Church, the majority of participants in the conference expressed themselves ‘for the development of relations in the spirit of the love of Christ, with particular reference to the points envisaged by the 1920 encyclical of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate.’”

Also discussed was a catalogue of topics for a future Pan-Orthodox Council. The MP tried hard to ensure that no topic that might prove embarrassing to the Soviet government was included. For, as Gordienko and Novikov write, “in the course of the debate on the catalogue, the Moscow Patriarchate’s delegation [led by Nikodem] suggested the removal of some of the subjects (The Development of Internal and External Missionary Work, The Methods of Fighting Atheism and False Doctrines Like Theosophy, Spiritism, Freemasonry, etc.) and the addition of some others (Cooperation between the Local Orthodox Churches in the Realisation of the Christian Ideas of Peace, Fraternity and Love among Peoples, Orthodoxy and Racial Discrimination, Orthodoxy and the Tasks of Christians in Regions of Rapid Social Change)… Besides working out the topics for the future Pre-Council, the First Conference passed the decision ‘On the Study of Ways for Achieving Closer Contacts and Unity of Churches in a Pan-Orthodox Perspective’, envisaging the search for contacts with Ancient Eastern (non-Chalcedonian) Churches (Monophysites), the Old Catholic, Anglican, Catholic, and Protestant Churches, as well as the World Council of Churches.” In other words, the Orthodox were to abandon the struggle against Atheism, Freemasonry and other false religions, and were to engage in dialogue towards union with all the Christian heretics – while at the same time persecuting the True Orthodox and using ecumenical forums to further the ends of Soviet foreign policy in its struggle with the Capitalist West!

The argument used by Nikodem for removing atheism from the agenda was that discussion of this question might elicit persecution against the Church in Russia. As for Masonry, “it does not exist in contemporary Russia,
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we don’t know it, Masonry exists only in the West. Consequently, this question is not of general, but only of local Orthodox interest, and for that reason it should not be included in the programme of a general Orthodox Council...”\(^\text{326}\)

He omitted to mention that the February revolution in Russia had been created by 300 Russian Masons...

In November, 1961 the newly promoted Archbishop Nikodem, accompanied by Bishop Anthony (Bloom) of Sourozh, who lived in London, Bishop (and future Patriarch) Alexis (Ridiger) and “a Russian government courier who is responsible for their comfort and all their expenses”\(^\text{327}\), went to New Delhi for the Third General Assembly of the WCC. On December 6-7, the MP was accepted as an official member of the WCC at its Third General Assembly in New Delhi. 142 churches voted for, 4 abstained and 3 voted against.

The Vatican immediately warned that the MP’s membership was aimed “at the fulfilling of plans hatched in the Kremlin, which are bound to assist the triumph of Soviet propaganda through ecumenical Christianity”. And sure enough: when an attempt was made to condemn communism, Archbishop Nikodem immediately proposed a resolution listing the vices of capitalism, as a result of which both resolutions were withdrawn.\(^\text{328}\)

The KGB-enforced entry of the MP into the WCC, which was followed by the entry of the Romanian Church (in 1961) and of the Georgian Church (in 1962), had a devastating effect on the Orthodox position. For the Soviets not only constituted numerically by far the largest single Church in the WCC; they also controlled, through the KGB, all the other delegates from behind the iron curtain. Communism and Ecumenism therefore met in an unholy union which has been called “Ecucommunism”.\(^\text{329}\) As Deacon Andrew Kuraiev writes: “Sergianism and Ecumenism intertwined. It was precisely on the instructions of the authorities that our hierarchy conducted its ecumenical activity, and it was precisely in the course of their work abroad that clergy who had been enrolled into the KGB were checked out for loyalty.”\(^\text{330}\)

The Orthodox delegates at New Delhi signed a summary statement which declared, among other things: “We consider that the work of creating the One, Universal Church must unfailingly be accompanied by the destruction and disappearance of certain outmoded, traditional forms of worship”. The idea of “creating” the One Church was blasphemous, and the idea of destroying certain “outmoded” forms of worship - an outright challenge to
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the Holy Tradition of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church! And, having delivered it, the Orthodox delegates seemed to lose all restraint; for within a decade or two of the New Delhi congress, the ecumenical movement had climbed into the realm of “Super-ecumenism” – relations with non-Christian religions.

The General Assembly of the WCC in New Delhi was closely followed by the opening of the Second Vatican Council in 1962, an event as important for ecumenism in the West as had been the founding of the WCC. Vatican II opened the floodgates to Ecumenism in the western world. For, as Malachi Martin writes: “Before the end of the fourth and final session of Vatican II – presided over by Pope John’s successor, Paul VI – some bishops and Vatican personnel had already adopted entirely new and innovative meanings for the idea of ecumenism. The powerful Augustin Cardinal Bea, for example, was a leading figure at the Council and a close adviser to Paul VI, as he had been to Pope John. Bea was seen as the Vatican’s own spearhead in what came to be nothing less than an ecumenical revolution. The Cardinal organized ‘ecumenical gatherings’ that included not only Roman Catholics and Protestants as usual, but Jews and Muslims as well. In time, as was only logical, Buddhists, Shintoists, animist and a host of other non-Christian and even non-religious groups would find a place in the poorly and broadly defined new ‘ecumenism’.”

During the New Delhi Assembly, Nikodem announced that the Vatican had invited the MP to send observers to the Second Vatican Council; but that the MP had laid it down as a condition that there should be “no declarations hostile to our beloved country”. So for most of the next year, the MP chose to emphasise, albeit in a gentle way, the dogmatic differences between the two Churches. However, in September-October, at the Second Pan-Orthodox Conference on Rhodes, it was decided to begin a theological dialogue with the Catholic Church. Moreover, - still more importantly, - at the beginning of October the Council for Religious Affairs told the Central Committee that the participation of observers at the Second Vatican Council would assist the establishment of useful contacts with the Vatican and would bind the Vatican in its promotion of hostile activity against the USSR. This official address of the Council to the Central Committee completed a process of change in attitude towards the Catholic Church and the question of the presence of observers at the Vatican Council from originally negative to a positive

---

332 Thus in September, 1962 Patriarch Alexis in an interview with a French journalist said the following on the participation of MP representatives at the Second Vatican Council: “The Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches are close to each other in the spheres of faith and liturgics, and we believe that those differences that divide them can, with the help of God and mutual good-will, can be overcome in time. In respect of dogmatics, the main points dividing us are the infallibility of the pope and his headship in the Church, some questions of Mariology, the question of the Filioque and some other particularities.” (Zhurnal Moskovskoj Patriarkhii (Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate), 1962, N 9, pp. 14-16; Monk Benjamin, op. cit., part 5, p. 6).
recognition of benefit for the Soviet government and for the MP of an improvement in their relations to the Vatican. The decision to allow the sending of observers to the Second Vatican Council was taken at the highest level of Soviet power, the Politburo, on October 10, 1962 (N 58/30).333

The arrival of Russian Orthodox observers at the Council produced consternation in French Catholic circles, which accused the Vatican of “selling out” to communism. But the French communist press was delighted: “Since the world socialist system shows its superiority indisputably and enjoys the approval of many hundreds of millions of men, the Church can no longer rest content with crude anti-communism. She has even given an undertaking, on the occasion of her dialogue with the Russian Orthodox Church, that there should be no direct attack on the communist regime at the Council.”334

Why did the Vatican accept this condition, which so damaged her standing in the anti-communist West? Probably for the same reason that the MP-KGB agreed to send observers – to infiltrate the camp of the enemy. And the possibility exists that their main agent of infiltration was precisely the MP’s Metropolitan Nikodem... This at first sight unlikely hypothesis gains credibility from the career of Fr. Michael Havryliv, a Russian priest who was secretly received into the Catholic Church in 1973. Fr. Serge Keleher writes: “The Capuchin priest told Havryliv that Metropolitan Nikodem [of Leningrad] was secretly a Catholic bishop, recognized by Rome with jurisdiction from Pope Paul VI throughout Russia. This assertion is not impossible – but neither is it entirely proved.

“On September 6 1975 Havryliv made a sacramental general Confession before Metropolitan Nikodem, who then accepted Havryliv’s monastic vows and profession of Faith to the Apostolic See and the Pope of Rome. Kyr Nikodem commanded Havryliv to order his monastic life according to the Jesuit Constitutions, and presented him with a copy of this document in Russian. This was all done privately; four days later the Metropolitan tonsured Havryliv a monk. On 9 October Kyr Nikodem ordained Havryliv to the priesthood, without requiring the oaths customary for Russian Orthodox candidates to Holy Orders.

“In 1977 Havryliv was reassigned to the Moscow Patriarchate’s archdiocese of L’viv and Ternopil... In Havryliv’s final interview with Kyr Nikodem, the Metropolitan of Leningrad ‘blessed me and gave me instructions to keep my Catholic convictions and do everything possible for the growth of the Catholic cause, not only in Ukraine, but in Russia. The Metropolitan spoke of the practice of his predecessors – and also asked me to be prudent.”335
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These words indicate the truth behind the mask of the Vatican’s ecumenism; and the fact that Havryliv was reordained by Nikodem show that Rome accepted the sacraments of the Orthodox for only as long as it suited her. The Orthodox were, from Vatican II, not heretics, but “separated brethren”. However, the “separated brethren” still had to return in repentance to their father, the Pope...

The Vatican also decided to invite ROCOR to send observers to the Council. This decision, writes Andrew Psarev, “was a precursor to a lively discussion of the [ROCOR] council session in 1962, where the so-called defensive point of view collided with the ‘missionary’ point of view. An ardent advocate of the ‘defensive’ point of view was Archbishop Averky of Syracuse and Holy Trinity Monastery, who saw the Second Vatican Council as a step in the direction of global apostasy. An opposite point of view was expressed by Bishop Savva of Edmonton, who saw declining the invitation as a loss of an opportunity to bear witness to the truth using a forum provided an opportunity to talk about Orthodoxy, the situation in the Orthodox world, and about the persecuted Russian Church. The support given by Metropolitan Anastasii to the missionary point of view regarding the sending of representatives to the Vatican was the last major influence he had on relations between ROCOR and the non-Orthodox world during the period of his service as the first hierarch.”

And so when the Second Vatican Council opened on October 12, 1962, the only Orthodox present were the MP delegation headed by Metropolitan Nikodem, and the ROCOR delegation headed by Archbishop Anthony of Geneva...

Ludmilla Perepiolkina, “the Catholic Journal Truth and Life published the memoirs of Miguel Arranz, in which this Jesuit, who in Nikodem’s time taught at the Leningrad Theological Academy, told, among other things, that with Nikodem’s blessing he celebrated ‘the Eastern Rite Liturgy’ in Nikodem’s house church at the Leningrad Theological Academy.” (Ecumenism – A Path to Perdition, St. Petersburg, 1999, p. 276, note). Again, Hieromonk Tikhn (Kazushin) writes: “In 1989 during a reception at the French embassy an elderly man, Czech by nationality, came up to me and introduced himself as head of the Jesuit pension for Russian youth in Medon near Parish and as a high-ranking officer of the [Jesuit] order. Thus he said that Nikodem was their man and also a high-ranking officer in the Order close to the General. It is know that in his cell Nikodem almost everyday performed a so-called ‘spoken mass’” (communication on Facebook, 24 January, 2015, https://www.facebook.com/lregelson/posts/98142948851934?comment_id=983137605047789&offset=0&total_comments=96&notif_t=feed_comment_reply).
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25. THE "THEOLOGY OF PEACE"

Paralleling the Soviets’ new-found enthusiasm for ecumenism was their rather older enthusiasm for “peace”. The origins of the so-called “movement for peace” and “theology of peace” can be traced at least to the founding of NATO to defend Europe against Soviet aggression in 1949: from the viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism, NATO was not a defensive organization but a threat to world peace. The Soviets proved masters at insinuating the idea that they were the real peacemakers – while steadily and consistently pursuing war against the free world. In this connection, Revel points to “the KGB’s slow penetration of Christian churches, panicked by their declining spiritual influence over modern societies, nudging them into adopting a fresh theme, one more ‘public-spirited’ than religion: the struggle for peace, or, in the Third World, the ‘theology of liberation’. A bishop is always a bigger draw on such subjects than the Soviet embassy’s press attaché.”

Thus the MP – which, as we have seen, is not so much “penetrated” by the KGB, as a branch of it - organized a series of ecumenical conferences “in defence of peace” with representatives not only of the Christian confessions, but also of Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Islam, Shintoism and Sikhism. Insofar as these religious “fighters for peace” worshipped completely different gods or (in the case of Buddhism) no god at all, there was no place at these conferences for the specifically Christian understanding of peace. Thus there was no mention of the fact that peace on earth is possible only if there is peace with God, which is obtained only through faith in the redeeming work of Christ, Who “is our peace” (Ephesians 2.14), and through a constant struggle with evil in all its forms, including atheism and communism. Moreover, as P.K. Kurochkin writes, “on the pages of the ecclesiastical press and on the lips of those speaking before the believers, the similarity and closeness of the communist and Christian social and moral ideals was proclaimed more and more often.” And so the cult of Stalin was transformed into the cult of communism; for “the patriarchal church, having conquered the renovationists, was forced to assimilate the heritage of the conquered not only in the field of political re-orientation, but also in the sphere of ideological reconstruction.”

The gospel of “Communist Christianity” appeared in an encyclical of the patriarchate “in connection with the Great October Socialist Revolution”, which supposedly “turned into reality the dreams of many generations of people. It made all the natural riches of the land and means of production into the inheritance of the people. It changed the very essence of human relations, making all our citizens equal and excluding from our society any possibility of enmity between peoples of difference races and nationalities, of different persuasions, faiths and social conditions.”

---
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Insofar as the MP confessed that the revolution “changed the very essence of human relations” for the better, it renounced the Christian Faith for that of the faith of the Antichrist. This aspect of the MP’s apostasy is often forgotten. And of course now, since the fall of communism, the MP no longer talks about its enthusiasm for the antichristian creed of communism. But by any normal definition of words, the hierarchs of the MP ceased to be, not only Orthodox in any meaningful sense, but also Christian at this time…

“The so-called ‘theology of peace’,“ wrote Protopresbyter George Grabbe, “is in essence the chiliastic preaching of the Kingdom of God on earth, with the help of the planting of communist socialism. In their address to the Moscow council before the election of the patriarch in 1971 the Priest Nicholas Gainov and three laymen raised questions in relation to the speeches of Metropolitan Nikodem [of Leningrad] and his co-workers. They cited his words on the union of people amongst themselves in ‘the service of reconciliation’ with the aim thereby of ‘seizing the Kingdom of God that is coming in strength’. The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate wrote: ‘For the Christian religion there can be no indifferent or neutral spheres of activity. The changes that are taking place in the world are viewed by Christianity as the action of the Providence of God, the manifestation of the power of God with the aim of establishing the Kingdom of God on earth’ (1962, № 12, p. 12).

“The peace which the Moscow patriarchate is clamouring for is not spiritual peace, but political peace, and moreover, a false peace, for the so-called ‘theology of peace’ is linked with the deceptive propaganda of the Soviets. In trying to echo communist propaganda, the patriarchate is involuntarily falling into the preaching of a certain kind of chiliasm, that is, the attainment of a golden age and general peace by human means of a political character. If the Saviour said: ‘Seek first of all the Kingdom of God, and all the rest will be added to you,’ the Moscow patriarchate puts the question in the reverse order: the Kingdom of God must be attained through the external means of the communist social order.

“That is why, in his report ‘Peace and Freedom’ at the local conference of the movement for peace in Holland in 1963, Metropolitan Nikodem called for the Church to come closer to this world. ‘From ancient times,’ he said, ‘the apologists of the unchangeability of social relations have begun to incline the thoughts of Christians to complete alienation from the world with the aim of drawing them away from burning social problems, for the struggle for the reconstruction of society on the principles of justice. Under the long influence of this pseudo-Christian preaching whole generations of narrow fanatics have been educated and grown up with distorted ideas about Christianity’ (J.M.P., 1963, № 1, p. 40).

“What is Metropolitan Nikodem renouncing in these words? He is renouncing the patristic and ascetic past, he is trying to turn the Church from striving for heaven to the path of earthly social tasks. His Kingdom of God on earth is the
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communist order.

“He is echoed by Protopriest V.M. Borovoj, who expressed himself still more vividly: ‘Systematic theology and the historical churches have never been on the side of the revolution for the simple reason that they were prisoners of the cosmo-centric understanding of reality, prisoners of the static understanding of an order established once and for all on earth. Only in the last decades, when profound changes, a kind of revolution, have taken place in philosophical, theological and scientific thought as the result of an anthropocentric view of the cosmos, an evolutionary conception of the universe and a new rethinking of the whole history of humanity – only after all this has there appeared the possibility of working out a theology of development and revolution’ (J.M.P., 1966, № 9, p. 78)…”

“By moving in this apostatic direction the Moscow patriarchate has already lost Christianity itself, replacing it with the religion of this world. Contrary to the word of the Saviour (Matthew 6.24), it is trying to serve two masters, and, as the Saviour warned, it has arrived at the point where it is careless with regard to Christianity but ardent in serving atheist communism.”

340 Grabbe, Dogmat o Tserkvi v sovremennom mire (The Dogma of the Church in the Contemporary World), report to the Third All-Diaspora Council, 1974.
26. NUCLEAR WAR AND THE CUBAN CRISIS

American power reached its peak in the 1950s. As John Darwin writes, “in dynamic sectors like air transport and mass entertainment, American products were almost unbeatable. The ‘soft power’ of economic and cultural influence underwrote the ‘hard power’ of strategic might. No country that relied on a trading currency could risk Washington’s displeasure, lest in moments of strain the support of the dollar might be withheld.

“The huge zone where America provided – or imposed – its strategic protection (by 1955 the United States had 450 bases in 36 countries) overlapped with the sphere of the new international economy of which America was the pivot. Together they formed the Pax Americana. In the 1950s it was consolidated rapidly, though not without friction. A critical year was 1956. Washington’s refusal to help the Hungarian revolt against Soviet hegemony marked a tacit acceptance of the European partition of 1945-8. Almost simultaneously, by forcing the British and French (through financial pressure) to abandon their effort to destroy Nasser’s regime, Washington served notice that its European allies must manage what remained of their imperial space in ways that conformed with its grand design. The general return to convertibility among the Western currencies in 1958 signalled the end of ‘emergency economics’ and the normalization of the global trading economy. In the Middle East and South East Asia, it seemed that limited intervention was enough to forestall the expansion of Soviet influence and stabilize the frontier between the superpower spheres. With the line of ‘containment’ now tightly drawn across much of Eurasia, and the strategic means (by a nuclear onslaught) to deter a Soviet breakout into Western Europe, the global balance now looked firmly tilted towards American primacy…”

341 However, continues Darwin, that American primacy would begin to look very shaky very soon. For “like the German empire before 1914, the Soviet Union sought a ‘place in the sun’ and the right to shape the emerging world order. By 1960 the signs of rivalry were coming thick and fast. When Washington tried to crush Castro’s revolution in Cuba by barring the import of sugar is proven tactics), Khrushchev promised to buy it instead. When the Congo exploded, he denounced the failure to support Lumumba’s government and portrayed the UN as a tool of the West needing drastic reform. In London and Washington there was deep alarm. In 1961 a new front opened in South East Asia when Ho Chi Minh launched the struggle against the Diem regime in south Vietnam. The Yemen revolution in 1962, and the civil war that followed, made it seem likely that Nasser (who intervened massively on the revolutionary side) would become much more dependent upon Soviet aid and that the Yemeni war would unsettle South Arabia. With great reluctance, the Americans promised their help against any attack on the

Saudi state by Nasser’s Yemeni clients. Most dramatic of all, was the dispatch of Soviet missiles to Khrushchev’s new ally in Latin America…”

* 

The Cuban crisis was notable for bringing about a nuclear confrontation, and the imminent possibility of nuclear war between the superpowers for the first time...

By the late 1950s, not only the United States (in 1952), but also the Soviet Union (in 1953) and Britain (1957) had acquired, not only the atomic bomb, but also the far more powerful thermonuclear weapons capable of inflicting hitherto unimaginable destruction and death. “The race” writes David Reynolds, “was then to upgrade their ‘delivery systems’ from the era of air power into the missile age. This time the Soviets beat the Americans. Their launch of a man-made satellite, Sputnik, in November 1957 was both a technological humiliation for the USA and also a sign that the USSR had a sufficiently powerful rocket to launch a nuclear missile all the way to America. Eisenhower’s administration hastily accelerated its own missile programme and implemented a major scheme of civil defence.”

The two superpowers had adopted a system of deterrence called “Mutually Assured Destruction” (MAD). As Kevin Ruane writes, Churchill also embraced this mad system. By the time he retired as prime minister in April, 1955, “he had concluded that nuclear arms, especially the genocidal H-bomb, were a potentially stabilizing element in world affairs...

“The ‘annihilating character of these agencies may bring an utterly unforeseeable security to mankind,’ he predicted. If the nuclear arsenals of the superpowers could be balanced, then by a ‘sublime irony... safety will be the sturdy child of terror, and survival the twin brother of annihilation’.”

“The nuclear age,” writes Henry Kissinger, “posed the dilemma of how to bring the destructiveness of modern weapons into some moral or political relationship with the objectives that were being pursued. Prospects for any kind of international order – indeed, for human survival – now urgently required the amelioration, if not elimination, of major-power conflict. A theoretical limit was sought – short of the point of either superpower using the entirety of its military capabilities.

“Strategic stability was defined as a balance in which neither side would use its weapons of mass destruction because the adversary was always able to inflict an unacceptable level of destruction in retaliation. In a series of

---
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seminars at Harvard, Caltech, MIT, and the Rand Corporation among others in the 1950s and 1960s, a doctrine of ‘limited use’ explored confining nuclear weapons to the battlefield or to military targets. All such theoretical efforts failed; whatever limits were imagined, once the threshold to nuclear warfare was crossed, modern technology overrode observable limits and always enabled the adversary to escalate. Ultimately, strategists on both sides coalesced, at least tacitly, on the concept of a mutually assured destruction as the mechanism of nuclear peace. Based on a premise that both sides possessed a nuclear arsenal capable of surviving an initial assault, the objective was to counterbalance threats sufficiently terrifying that neither side would conceive of actually invoking them.

“By the end of the 1960s, the prevailing strategic doctrine of each superpower relied on the ability to inflict an ‘unacceptable’ level of damage on the presumed adversary. What the adversary would consider unacceptable was, of course, unknowable; nor was this judgement communicated…

“Many efforts were undertaken to avoid the dilemma of possessing a huge arsenal that could not be used and whose use could not even plausibly be threatened. Complicated war scenarios were devised. But neither side, to the best of my knowledge – and for some of this period I was in a position to know – ever approached the point of actually using nuclear weapons in a specific crisis between the two superpowers. Except for the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, when a Soviet combat division was initially authorized to use its nuclear weapons to defend itself, neither side approached their use, either against each other or in wars against non-nuclear third countries…”

That the crisis which nearly led to MAD should have taken place in Cuba was a function both of that country’s geographical closeness to the United States and of its recent history, alternating between rightist and leftist governments. Protopresbyter James Thornton writes: “In 1933, a leftist revolutionary uprising overthrew the administration of President Gerardo Machado and put Ramón Grau San Martín in power as the head of what came to be called the ‘One Hundred Days Government.’ Grau himself was a moderate reformer but was surrounded by radicals in his administration. That government was overthrown in January 1934 by Army Chief of Staff Colonel Fulgencio Batista, who installed a series of provisional governments throughout the remainder of the decade.

“In the election of 1940, which was reportedly open and fair, Batista won the presidency. He was succeeded in office by Grau, who was elected in 1944, and Carlos Prio Socarrás, elected in 1948. Prio’s period in office was marred by a substantial increase in government corruption and political violence.

Consequently, in March 1952, Batista, in concert with leaders of the military and police, seized power to prevent the country from sinking into complete chaos. The outcome of free elections in 1953, which made Batista legally the president, seemed to signal the approval of most Cubans of the coup of the previous year, since the country had grown impatient with the seemingly endless disorder.

“About Batista’s administration one can say both bad things and good. On the bad side, corruption was not eliminated and organized crime, which had gained a considerable toehold in Cuba immediately after the Second World War, continued to thrive. On the good side, the nation enjoyed tremendous prosperity in the 1950s. Wages in Cuba were the eighth highest in the world. The country was blessed by a large and growing middle class, which constituted approximately one-third of the population. Social mobility (the ability of members of one class in the social strata to rise to higher levels) became a genuine reality. Of the working class, more than 20 percent were classified as skilled. During the Batista years, Cuba enjoyed the third-highest per-capita income in Latin America and possessed an excellent network of highways and railroads, along with many modern ports. Cubans had the highest per-capita consumption in Latin America of meat, vegetables, cereals, automobiles, telephones, and radios, and was fifth highest in the number of television sets in the world.

“Cuba’s healthcare system was outstanding, with one of the highest numbers of medical doctors per capita in the world, the third-lowest adult mortality rate in the world, and the lowest infant mortality rate in Latin America. Cuba during the 1950s spent more on education than any other Latin American country and had the fourth-highest literacy rate in Latin America.

“President Batista built part of his following through an alliance with organized labor. As a result, workers by law worked an eight-hour day, 44 hours per week. They received a month’s paid vacation, plus four additional paid holidays per year. They were also entitled to nine days of sick leave with pay per year. In short, while things were not perfect in all of the areas just noted, they were nevertheless remarkably advanced and were gradually improving. Yet, much work remained to be done in rural regions, where poverty and the lack of a complete modern infrastructure remained a problem...

“In July 1953, a little-known revolutionary named Fidel Castro, his brother Raúl, and a small group of rebels attacked a military barracks in the southeast of the country hoping to spark a revolution, but were defeated. The Castro brothers were captured and sentenced to 15 years in prison. Unfortunately for Cuba and its people, President Batista declared a general amnesty in 1955, which set the Castros free. The two then travelled to Mexico where they, in conjunction with Argentinian Marxist terrorist Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara, organized a revolutionary group known as the ’26th of July Movement,’ the aim of which was to overthrow the Cuban government and seize power. In
December 1956, the group of some 82 fighters boarded a yacht and sailed to Cuba, where they were confronted by elements of Batista’s armed forces. In the ensuing clash, most of the insurgents were either killed or captured. However, the Castro brothers, Guevara, and a small group of about 12 others escaped and fled into the Sierra Maestra mountains, where they launched the beginnings of the revolution that would bring Fidel Castro to power.

“Castro portrayed himself at that time as a devotee of democratic rule, contrasting that with Batista’s non-democratic authoritarianism, and promised American-style freedoms and an end to dictatorship. Some members of his 26th of July Movement, and even a few members of the leadership corps of that organization, were actually anti-communists, misled by Castro as to the true nature of his ultimate goals. The propaganda about a return to a representative and just government was widely believed, particularly among the poorer classes, students, and some intellectuals. Consequently, Castro’s movement grew as people hoped for an end to corruption, political upheaval, and revolutionary violence. Those people were soon to be sorely disappointed.

“During the late 1950s, after Castro had begun his revolutionary activities in the mountains of southeastern Cuba and up until Castro grabbed the reins of power, two men served as U.S. ambassadors to Cuba: Arthur Gardner, who served from 1953 to 1957, and Earl T. Smith, who served from 1957 to 1959. In testimony before the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Ambassador Gardner declared on August 27, 1960 that ‘U.S. Government agencies and the U.S. press played a major role in bringing Castro to power.’ He also testified that Castro was receiving illegal arms shipments from the United States, about which our government was aware, while, at the same time, the U.S. government halted arms sales to Batista, even halting shipments of arms for which the Cuban government had already paid. Senator Thomas J. Dodd asked if Gardner believed that the U.S. State Department ‘was anxious to replace Batista with Castro,’ to which he answered, ‘I think they were.’

“ Ambassador Earl T. Smith testified before the same committee on August 30, 1960. He declared in his testimony that, ‘Without the United States, Castro would not be in power today.’ Smith wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Times in September 1979 in connection with the communist revolution in Nicaragua that put the Sandinista regime in power. Smith wished to illustrate how forces within the U.S. government brought both ultra-leftist governments to power. He wrote: ‘After a few months as chief of mission [that is, as Ambassador to Cuba], it became obvious to me that the Castro-led 26th of July movement embraced every element of radical political thought and terrorist inclination in Cuba. The State Department consistently intervened … to bring about the downfall of President Fulgencio Batista, thereby making it possible for Fidel Castro to take over the Government of Cuba. The final coup in favor of Castro came on Dec. 17, 1958. On that date, in accordance with my instructions from the State Department, I personally conveyed to President Batista that the Department of State would view with
skepticism any plan on his part, or any intention on his part, to remain in Cuba indefinitely. I had dealt him a mortal blow. He said in substance: “You have intervened in behalf of the Castros, but I know it is not your doing and that you are only following out your instructions.” Fourteen days later, on Jan. 1, 1959, the Government of Cuba fell.’

“In Ambassador Smith’s book, *The Fourth Floor*, he lists the many actions by the United States that led to the fall of the Batista government. Among these were suspending arms sales, halting the sale of replacement parts for military equipment, persuading other governments not to sell arms to Batista, and public statements that assisted Castro and sabotaged Batista. These actions and many others, he wrote, ‘had a devastating psychological effect upon those supporting the [pro-American, anti-Communist] government of Cuba.’

“Left-leaning journalists were as ubiquitous in the 1950s as they are today. One of these, *New York Times* reporter Herbert Matthews, interviewed Castro in February 1957, reporting that Castro ‘has strong ideas of liberty, democracy, social justice, the need to restore the Constitution, to hold elections.’ Matthews went on to say that Castro was not only *not* a communist, but was definitely an anti-communist. That story, and other similar stories, created a myth that Fidel Castro was actually a friend of the United States and its way of life, that he was the ‘George Washington of Cuba’ (as television entertainer and columnist Ed Sullivan called him), and that what he fought for was a program of mild agrarian reform, an end to corruption, and constitutional representative government. The myth also claimed that after his victory in January 1959, he was driven into the arms of the USSR by the uncooperative and even hostile attitude of the United States. Curiously, that myth is still repeated to this day. However, the truth about Castro is as far from that myth as possible, as we shall now see.

“Cuba officially established diplomatic ties with the Soviet Union in 1943, during the Second World War. Among the functionaries of the Soviet staff sent to Cuba was one Gumar W. Bashirov, an official of the NKVD, the Soviet secret police (later known as the KGB). Bashirov’s job was to recruit a group of Cuban youths who, over time, could be used to subvert Cuban society and thereby advance the cause of world communism. Among those almost immediately recruited was the young Fidel Castro.

“Castro himself admitted in an interview with leftist journalist Saul Landau that he had become a Marxist when, as a student, he first read the *Communist Manifesto*. For that reason he willingly became a Soviet agent in 1943, when he was only 17 years of age. After the Soviet conquest of Eastern Europe in 1944-45, some of Bashirov’s young recruits were sent to Czechoslovakia for training. But the Soviets forbade Castro himself from joining the Communist Party or any communist front organizations so that he would remain untainted by such associations. Instead, they placed him in reserve, saving him for future eventualities. We see, therefore, that Fidel
Castro was a Communist and a Soviet agent long before he took power in 1959.”

In April, 1961 President John F. Kennedy made a bungled attempt to topple Castro in the Bay of Pigs invasion. This was followed by farcical attempts to assassinate Castro. Encouraged by the President’s mistakes, and also by false intelligence reports that the Pentagon was planning to initiate a war with the Soviet Union “as soon as possible”, Khruschev decided in May, 1962 to construct nuclear missile bases in Cuba.

The crisis came to a head at the end of October, when Khruschev backed down and accepted Kennedy’s terms: Cuban territorial integrity in exchange for the withdrawal of “all Soviet offensive arms” from Cuba.

* 

The Cuban missile crisis very nearly brought the world to nuclear war and MAD. As American secretary of state Dean Rusk put it, the two superpowers had been “eyeball to eyeball” and in the end it was the Soviets who “blinked”. Some have attributed its aversion to Kennedy’s coolness, others – to a principled refusal of a Soviet submarine officer to follow orders.

However, there is another more probable cause of the world’s salvation: the mercy of God in response to the intercession of His saints on earth – specifically, one of the great confessors of the Catacomb Church, Bishop Michael (Yershov) of Kazan. Stories about him began to seep out to the West towards the end of his life and after his death in 1974. But it was not until a full (739-page) biography of him appeared recently that his full stature and importance became apparent.

However, the intelligence experts Christopher Andrew and Vasily Mitrokhin write that “the word ‘socialism’ did not appear in any of Castro’s speeches until 1961. Castro had a privileged upbringing in an affluent Cuban landowning family, and drew his early political inspiration not from Lenin but from the radical nationalist Partido del Pueblo Cubano and the ideals of its anti-Marxist founder, Eduardo Chibas.” (The KGB and the World, London: Penguin, 2006, p. 33) 
348 Reynolds, op. cit. 
349 According to the PBS documentary, “The Man Who Saved the World” (http://video.pbs.org/video/2295274962), at the height of the Cuban Missile Crisis, second-in-command Vasili Arkhipov of the Soviet submarine B-59 refused to agree with his Captain’s order to launch nuclear torpedos against US warships and beginning a nuclear war between the superpowers. The US had been dropping depth charges near the submarine in an attempt to force it to surface, unaware it was carrying nuclear arms. The Soviet officers, who had lost radio contact with Moscow, concluded that World War 3 had begun, and 2 of the officers agreed to ‘blast the warships out of the water’. Arkhipov refused to agree - unanimous consent of 3 officers was required - and thanks to him, we are here to talk about it.
Michael Vasilyevich Yershov was born in 1911 into a poor family. His father became a Bolshevik and beat his son, but was later converted by him and repented. In 1931, Michael was imprisoned for the first time for his rejection of the Sovietized Moscow Patriarchate. Apart from a short period in the early 1940s, he remained in the camps for the rest of his life, being transported from one end of the GULAG to the other and dying, still in prison, on June 4, 1974. He presented an astounding image of patience and suffering that converted many to the Faith. He was a wonderworker and had the gifts of healing and prophecy. But perhaps his most astounding miracle was worked in the Mordovian camps together with his fellow inmate and secret bishop, Basil Vasilyevich Kalinin.

“It was August, 1962. The Cuban crisis! The attention of the world was glued to it, and it affected even the special section hidden in the Mordovian forests. ‘It has to be...! Khruschev has penetrated into the bosom of the Americans!’ That was how the zeks [criminal inmates] interpreted it. People living beyond the barbed wire admitted the possibility that in time of war the local authorities would annihilate them, as the most dangerous politicos, first of all.”

“At the special section the zeks insisted that Moscow had issued an order that in time of war the politicos and recidivists would be annihilated first of all. The Cuban crisis was soon resolved, and our camp calmed down. Many years later I heard that the fears of the zeks in 1962 had not been without foundation. They had really been threatened with annihilation at that time.”

“In 1964, soon after the fall of Khruschev, a colonel from the Georgian KGB came to our camp. And he said, among other things: ‘Khruschev adopted the policy of the complete physical annihilation of the politicos, and first of all the recidivists. During the Cuban crisis everything was prepared for your shooting – even a pit was dug’.” [Bishop] Basil Vasilyevich Kalinin remembered that the holy hierarch [Michael] once unexpectedly aroused him from sleep with the words: “Six minutes are remaining. Get up, Basil, and pray! The world is in danger!” And then he learned that this was the critical moment in the Cuban crisis...350

Truly, “the effective, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much” (James 5.16). For “when Moses prayed to the Lord, the fire was quenched” (Numbers 11.2), and when Elijah prayed to the Lord the heavens were closed and again opened (James 5.17). And when the two True Orthodox bishops Michael and Basil prayed to the Lord, the world was saved from nuclear holocaust...

“Let the world mock us,” wrote Bishop Michael, “but we, poor people, must give all our strength and desire in prayer to God”. “We must strictly

watch over ourselves, that we do not fall under the condemnation and wrath of God. We must pour out the balsam of our strength and purity of heart whenever happens, our simple, true and holy prayer to God, which is bound by nothing except simplicity and belief in our eternal inheritance. For the Lord looks on the righteous and on their holy appeals, so that the prayer offered may be the earnest of our strength and the balsam of purification, by which the world might be preserved and the catastrophe which cannot even be expressed in words – God forbid! – might be averted.”

“You yourselves know that a city is preserved if a righteous man is praying in it. Once the righteous man has left the city, the elements rule in the city. And so, dear ones, remember this one thing, that now is not that day on which the universe was created, and everything was brought into being, but now is the day on which danger menaces the creation…”

Besides this pure prayer of a righteous man, Bishop Michael insisted on the pure confession of the True Orthodox Faith. “Between the Church of the Tikhonite orientation [the True Orthodox Church] and the legal church [the Moscow Patriarchate] there is the following difference. The Church of the Tikhonite orientation zealously fulfils all the laws and rules that are prescribed by the Holy Fathers, while the legal church tolerates atheism, does not struggle against iniquity, but is reconciled with it. I recognize the One Apostolic Church. The legal church recognizes Lenin and Stalin, and serves Soviet power and carries out the orders of the atheist antichrists.”

“Do not believe any sects: this is a cunning contemporary politics that has come out from the West. There are even some that are like the Orthodox faith. But you, my brothers and dear ones, must not go anywhere – may the Lord keep you! There are also many enemies of our Orthodox Christian faith, we have many enemies. The first is Catholicism, our most cunning and evil enemy, and the Lutherans, and all the sects, which came out of America and now, like dirt, have spread through the whole earth. It is difficult for us poor people now, we have no defence from men, everyone wants to offend us. But we are faithful. We are the most true patriots of our Mother, the Holy Orthodox Christian Eastern Apostolic Church. We are patriots of Holy Rus’ and we know the tricks of all kinds of people, and we will not deviate in any direction: for Holy Rus’ is sanctified by the sufferings of her own people. Every foot is creeping into Russia and wanting to defile her. No, Russia will preserve all the holy mysteries, even if through small, simple people, but she will show the whole world light, and strength, and greatness. Dear ones, the Orthodox Church will conquer the whole universe. Fear not, my dear ones, the Lord will conquer evil. Amen.”
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“In my lifetime,” said Bishop Michael, “I have not studied the sciences, but I have come to know the keys of the universe and have reached the depths of the abyss. It is hard and difficult without the Supreme Creator. With the Creator and His Life-giving Spirit and the righteousness of Christ I have passed through the arena of an indescribable life…”

* 

After the Cuban crisis, the Cuban revolution developed on conventional Soviet lines. Thus “during the repressions of the 1960s”, write Pascal Fontaine, Yves Santamaria and Sylvain Boulouque, “between 7,000 and 10,000 people were killed and 30,000 people imprisoned for political reasons.” Conditions in the prisons were appalling, torture was normal. Much of the economy was run on slave labour provided by prisoners.

Cuba also has its boatpeople on the Vietnamese model, called balseros. Although about one third of balseros have died at sea, “over thirty years, approximately 100,000 have attempted the journey. The result of this exodus is that out of 11 million inhabitants, 2 million now live in exile. Exile has scattered many families among Havana, Miami, Spain, and Puerto Rico.” For it is an inexorable law of all communist states, that very large numbers of those who have tasted of their delights try to flee from them if they can, becoming the most fervent anti-communists in the states that give them refuge…

---
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27. THE KHRUSHCHEV PERSECUTION

As we have seen, one of the aims of the MP’s entry into the WCC was to mask a new persecution against the MP inside the Soviet Union. The ultimate intention of the Soviet authorities – the complete destruction of the Orthodox Church – remained unchanged in the post-war period; but their tactics showed some flexibility. The Khrushchev persecution demonstrated how fragile and one-sided was the State-Church accord, and how easily the State’s concessions could be retracted without compunction or compensation.\footnote{Pospielovsky, Russkaia Mysl’ (Russian Thought), N 3698, 5 November, 1987.}

Until the death of Stalin, while True Orthodoxy was persecuted as violently as ever, “Soviet Orthodoxy” enjoyed a comparatively peaceful period. However, on July 7, 1954 the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party issued a document entitled “On Major Inadequacies in Scientific-Atheist Propaganda and Measures for its Improvement”, which called for a return to the pre-war course of “attacking religious survivals”. That summer some parishioners were prosecuted and some churches closed. Public criticisms of this new course were issued by Metropolitan Gregory of Leningrad and Archbishop Luke of Simferopol.\footnote{A.B. Vinnikov, Ottepél’ 1943-1960 (The Thaw of 1943-1960); Monk Benjamin, \textit{op. cit.}, part 4, pp. 22-23, 24.}

However, in November the Central Committee began to change course again, in 1955 the number of registered churches began to rise, and in 1956 a print-run of 50,000 Bibles was permitted.\footnote{Monk Benjamin, \textit{op. cit.}, part 4, p. 27.} Then came Khrushchev’s famous speech to the 20\textsuperscript{th} Congress of the Communist Party in 1956, at which the cult of the personality of Stalin was condemned. Soon thousands of people who had been condemned for their religious or political beliefs were returning from the camps, including 293 clergy of the MP and unknown number from the Catacomb Church. In July G. Karpov informed Patriarch Alexis that he did not need to worry about the question of the opening of churches, since this process would now be uninterrupted…\footnote{Monk Benjamin, \textit{op. cit.}, part 4, p. 27.}

On October 4, 1958 the Central Committee sent a secret letter to the Union Republics called “On the inadequacies of scientific-atheist propaganda”. All party and public organizations and state organs were required to attack the Church.

There followed the Khrushchev persecution of the years 1959-64, when most of the seminaries and monasteries and 12-15,000 of the parish churches, “religious survivals” of Soviet people, were destroyed. In accordance with the instructions of the Central Committee and of Khrushchev personally, on October 16 the Council of Ministers accept the first anti-ecclesiastical resolutions: “On Monasteries in the USSR” and “On Taxing the Income of Enterprises of Diocesan Administrations, and also the Income of...
Monasteries”. In the first of these the monasteries were forbidden to take on hired labour, and a significant diminution of land holdings was envisaged, as also of the numbers of communities. Moreover, the 1945 tax on building and land rent was re-introduced, and the tax rate on plots of land was sharply increased. A heavy blow was dealt to the material base of the patriarchate. Raising the tax on the income from candle factories touched every parish. The factories were forced to raise their output prices, but at the same time it was forbidden to change the old prices in the churches. An absurd situation was the result – the parishes, on acquiring the candles, were forced to sell them to themselves at a loss. To make up for this, in many parishes they began to disband the paid choirs and economize on repairs and the upkeep of the churches. The clergy fell into poverty. The patriarchate was flooded by desperate pleas for help from the hierarchs. As a result of the new regulations, all the dioceses found themselves in debt to the state and on the edge of complete insolvency. An appeal was made to the Council for the Affairs of the Orthodox Church, but it was firmly rejected. An appeal to put off the introduction of the new taxes until January 1, 1959 was also rejected.

In November and December a massive purge of Church libraries was carried out; many books were removed, and all foreign literature was placed under censorship. On November 28, the Central Committee accepted a resolution “On Measures to stop pilgrimages to so-called ‘holy places’.” Various methods were used to stop pilgrims visiting 700 such places. In 1958 91 church communities were deprived of registration; the tolling of bells was forbidden; hierarchs were deprived of their telephones, churches were cut off from the water system, repairs were forbidden.

In January, 1959, at a closed session of the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church, the president, G. Karpov was attacked by I. Sivenkov for having been “too soft” in relation to the Church. In March Karpov, having recovered from illness, counter-attacked. He declared: “Out of the 14 autocephalous Orthodox Churches in the world 9 completely support the initiatives of the Moscow Patriarchate... Now there is a suggestion to prepare and convene, in the course of one or two years, an Ecumenical Council or congress of all the Orthodox Churches in the world... How shall we carry out this work... if we encourage crude administrative methods in relation to the Church and do not react to the distortions in scientific-atheist propaganda?... I consider such actions as the blowing up of church buildings to be inadmissible.” Karpov went on to speak of the mass discontent of the clergy, and of the fact that the patriarch was thinking of retiring; and even suggested making some concessions to the Church. As a result, he kept his post for another year, and a temporary departure from extreme forms of anti-religious aggression was observed in the country.
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Nevertheless, by November, thirteen monasteries had been closed, and another seventeen by January, 1960. In spite of a prior agreement between the patriarch and the Council for Religious Affairs, some communities were closed, not gradually, but almost immediately – sometimes within 24 hours. In this period about 200 clergy were compelled by various means to renounce their rank.\footnote{Vinnikov, \textit{op. cit.}}

Another aspect of the Khrushchev persecution (so called because he was the chief inspirer and strategist of it) was the infiltration of agents into the ranks of the Church. Anatoly Golitsyn, who defected from the KGB in 1961, writes: “As part of the programme to destroy religion from within, the KGB, in the late 1950s, started sending dedicated young Communists to ecclesiastical academies and seminaries to train them as future church leaders. These young Communists joined the Church, \textit{not} at the call of their consciences to serve God, but at the call of the Communist Party in order to serve that Party and to implement its general in the struggle against religion.”\footnote{Golitsyn, \textit{The Perestroika Deception}, London and New York: Edward Harle, 1998, p. 116.} As regards the ordinary priests, Fr. Alexander Borisov writes: “Almost everyone was recruited into the KGB. I myself was recruited, and I know that our other priest, Fr. Vladimir, was also recruited. I think those who say they were not recruited are deceiving us… After all, in earlier times one could not become a bishop without making some compromise, it was simply impossible…”\footnote{Anatoly Krasikov, “‘Tretij Rim’ i Bol’sheviki” (The Third Rome and the Bolsheviks), in L.M. Vorontsova, A.V. Pchelintsev and S.B. Filatov (eds.), \textit{Religia i Prava Cheloveka (Religion and Human Rights)}, Moscow: “Nauka”, 1996, p. 204.}

Schema-Monk Epiphany (Chernov) recounts the following story about a communist party member and his wife, who was secretly a member of the Catacomb Church. When their son was born, she wanted to have him baptised – but not in the Moscow patriarchate. He then “tried to convince his wife of a truth which she was well aware. But in the given case the husband’s words were very convincing and concrete:

“‘So you have firmly decided to baptise the child?’

“‘Yes, of course!’

“Well, that’s your affair. Only I would like to introduce into this matter a certain correction or rationalisation.’

“‘Please, I’m listening.’

“‘Well, here it is. Tell me, please, have you saved an extra seven rubles which you’re intending to give our ‘pope’ or ‘priest’? If they are extra, give them to me, and I will drink them away, and I’ll baptise the child for you… Tell me, what’s the difference: either he’ll drink them away, or I will. He and I
are absolutely the same. And we sit next to each other at party gatherings.... Whether you give the child to him to be baptised or to me, we are both atheists. So it would be better and more humane for you to give the seven rubles to your atheist husband that to an atheist stranger. And listen: your husband is more righteous and decent that that atheist. After all, he pretends to be a believer. But he’s an atheist! Moreover, he pretends so much that he’s even become a priest! While I, honourably and in the sight of all, am an atheist! But I can baptise our child with the same effect as he...

"'Well, tell me, have I convinced you?'"

While Patriarch Alexis and Metropolitan Nicholas protested against the persecution, they remained completely loyal to Soviet power. Thus in January, 1960, Karpov wrote to the Central Committee: “The patriarch is completely loyal with regards to the authorities, always and not only in official declarations, but also in his entourage he speaks sincerely and with exaltation about the government and Comrade Khrushchev. The patriarch does not pay enough attention to work abroad, but even here he accepts all our recommendations...”

* *

Meanwhile, the pressure on the MP was increasing. On March 16, 1961 the Council of Ministers passed a resolution “On the strengthening of control for the fulfilment of the legislation on churches”, which gave power to the local authorities to close churches and remove registrations. On April 18, 1961 the MP Synod decided to present the resolution “On Measures to Improve the Existing Order of Parish Life” for discussion at the Council in July. This measure, which had been imposed on the Church by the Council for Religious Affairs, deprived the priest of all financial and administrative control of his parish, passing it instead to councils of twenty (the dvadtsatky), which were easily controllable by the authorities.

As Victor Aksyuchits writes, this “reform” “presented them with new possibilities for destroying the organism of the Church from within. The priests were completely separated from the economic and financial administration of the parishes, and were only hired by agreement as ‘servants of the cult’ for ‘the satisfaction of religious needs’. The diocesan organs of administration of the life of the parishes were suspended... Now the atheist authorities not only carried out the ‘registration’ of the priests and ‘the executive organs’, but also took complete control of the economy and finances of the parishes, appointing the wardens and treasurers, and using all their rights, naturally, to promote the atheists’ aim of destroying the Church.”

---
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Fearing that the July Council might oppose this “reform”, the authorities did not invite to the Council three hierarchs who had expressed themselves against it. Most of the hierarchs were invited, not to a Council, but to a celebration in honour of St. Sergius, and were amazed to learn that a Council was about to be conducted. Archbishop Hermogen of Kaluga, who appeared without an invitation, was not allowed at the session on the grounds that he was not a ruling hierarch. In the absence of all potential opponents, the parish reform was passed. It was also decided that all clergy should be banned from becoming members of the dvadtsatky or the parish councils. Patriarch Alexis cooperated with the parish statute and with other measures harmful to the Church during the Khrushchev persecution.

Meanwhile, in the single year of 1961, 1500 churches were closed in the Soviet Union. In 1963 the Kiev-Caves Lavra was closed. Attempts were made to close the Pochaev Lavra, too, but determined action by the monks and the local inhabitants, some of whom were imprisoned or exiled, saved the day.

On October 14, 1964, Khrushchev fell from power, and the persecution against the MP ceased. The main party ideologist and secretary of the Central Committee, Suslov, thought that it necessary to continue a decisive “struggle against religion”, but in such a way as not to turn the West against them and “not to give rein to all kinds of extremists”. Illegalities, it was agreed, had been committed, and several people were freed from the prisons and camps.

The years 1959-64 were years of persecution throughout Eastern Europe. We shall see how the True Orthodox suffered in Romania. In Bulgaria many priests and monks were held in the approximately 30 death camps, where prisoners were brought up one by one to be slaughtered.

---
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THE PASSPORTLESS MOVEMENT

After Khrushchev’s 1956 speech against Stalin, and especially by the beginning of the 1960s, the pressure on the Catacomb Church was beginning to wane. Thus “when, in 1961,” writes Archbishop Lazarus (Zhurbenko), “the priests’ rights were taken away from them and given to the church council, they quieted down and it was easier for us; at least we could get to our priests and priests began more freely to come to us, to confess and commune us. From 1961 the Moscow Patriarchate calmed down in its attitude towards us. Of course, when foreigners asked representatives of the M.P., ‘Does a catacomb church exist?’ the answer was always ‘No’. That was a lie. There were catacomb believers all over Russia, just as there are today…”

The relaxation of pressure from the patriarchate was almost certainly a result of the fact that the patriarchate was now the object of persecution itself. Although the numbers of believers killed and imprisoned was only a fraction of the numbers in earlier persecutions, the Khrushchev persecution of 1959-64 closed some thousands of patriarchal churches and forced many patriarchal priests to serve illegally. These “pseudo-catacombs” did not merge with the True Church and continued to commemorate the Soviet patriarch. However, in 1961 new legislation against secret Christians was passed, of which the most important was the legislation on passports. This measure paradoxically served to swell the numbers of the True Orthodox...

Now passportisation had been introduced into the Soviet Union only in 1932, and only for the most urbanized areas. Already then it was used as a means of winking out Catacomb Christians. Thus M.V. Shkarovsky writes: “Completing their liquidation of the Josephites, there was a meeting of regional inspectors for cultic matters on March 16, 1933, at a time when passportisation was being introduced. The meeting decided, on the orders of the OGPU, ‘not to give passports to servants of the cult of the Josephite confession of faith’, which meant automatic expulsion from Leningrad. Similar things happened in other major cities of the USSR.”

Most Catacomb hierarchs did not bless their spiritual children to take passports because in filling in the forms information making them liable to
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persecution. Some leaders, such as Schema-Abbess Michaela of Kiev, sent her nuns out to convince people that the passport was the seal of the Antichrist. Many Catacomb Christians refused passports, not wishing to declare themselves citizens of the antichristian kingdom.

In the 1930s the peasants had not been given passports but were chained to the land which they worked. They were herded into the collective farms and forced to do various things against their conscience, such as vote for the communist officials who had destroyed their way of life and their churches. Those who refused to do this – refusals were particularly common in the Lipetsk, Tambov and Voronezh areas – were rigorously persecuted, and often left to die of hunger. Thus passportisation in the cities and collectivisation in the countryside constituted two forms of the Bolsheviks’ struggle to force everyone in the country to accept the Soviet ideology.

On May 4, 1961, however, the Soviet government issued a decree on “parasitism” and introduced a campaign for general passportisation. In local papers throughout the country it was announced that, in order to receive a Soviet passport, a citizen of the USSR would have to recognize all the laws of Soviet power, past and present, beginning from Lenin’s decrees. Since this involved, in effect, a recognition of all the crimes of Soviet power, a movement arose to reject Soviet passports, a movement which was centred mainly in the country areas.

E.A. Petrova writes: “Protests against general passportisation arose among Christians throughout the vast country. A huge number of secret Christians who had passports began to reject, destroy and burn them and loudly, for all to hear, renounce Soviet citizenship. Many Christians from the patriarchal church also gave in their passports. There were cases in which as many as 200 people at one time went up to the local soviet and gave in their passports. In one day the whole of a Christian community near Tashkent gave in 100 passports at once. Communities in Kemerovo and Novosibirsk provinces gave in their passports, and Christians in the Altai area burned their passports... Protests against general passportisation broke out in Belorussia, in the Ukraine, and in the Voronezh, Tambov and Ryazan provinces... Christians who renounced their Soviet passports began to be seized, imprisoned and exiled. But in spite of these repressions the movement of the passportless Christians grew and became stronger. It was precisely in these years that the Catacomb Church received a major influx from Christians of the patriarchal church who renounced Soviet passports and returned into the bosom of the True Orthodox Church.”
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However, not all Catacomb Christians refused to have passports – to be consistently and completely outside Soviet society was, after all, exceedingly difficult. Some Catacomb leaders considered it permissible to be a Soviet citizen with a passport so long as one did not sympathize with Soviet power or help it, and criticized those who rejected Soviet citizenship as sinful but accepted its (admittedly very meagre) benefits. Thus in 1960 Archimandrite Hilarion (Andrievsky), leader of the Catacomb Church in Voronezh, wrote to a “hardline” nun as follows: “To call oneself ‘a citizen of the Soviet state’ by no means signifies recognizing oneself to be ‘a Soviet person’. It does not signify agreement with the communists, it does not signify going together with them, it does not signify working in concert with them and sympathizing with all their undertakings… ‘A citizen of the Soviet state’ and ‘a Soviet person’ are by no means identical concepts: the first is recognition and submission to Soviet power, and the second – is an inner content, a feeling in the soul of man. There is a huge difference between these concepts. I experienced this myself in 1928, thirty-two years ago. When, after a long convoy, I was waiting for a decision on my fate together with other prisoners in Samarkand prison, I was told that I had been left to serve my term of exile in the city of Samarkand itself. Several people in the prison envied me because this, being the former capital of Central Asia, was a large, cultured, interesting city with ancient sites. But then, when I was summoned to the GPU to fill in a questionnaire, my position suddenly changed sharply – it appeared that my replies did not please them. To the question: ‘What is your relationship to the authorities?’, I replied: ‘I recognize them and submit to them in civil matters’. Then they said that ‘this is not much’. But when I asked: ‘What more do you need?’ they replied with another question: ‘But do you sympathize with them?’ I replied directly: ‘No, I do not sympathize with them, and as a believer I cannot sympathize with them in general. Moreover, how can I sympathize with them personally, when they brought me here completely against my will, tearing me away from my relatives and friends!…’ To this they said: ‘You probably need the Tsar’s authority?’ I replied: ‘No, you are mistaken. Read history, and you will see that there were times when the Tsars also fiercely persecuted the Christians.’ All these replies of mine were written down and signed. A little later I was told that there would be a sharp change in my place of exile: from the big beautiful city that I had been assigned to before I was sent to the remote steppe, whence after a five-year stay I was despatched to another exile – in distant Siberia. Thus it became clearly evident from this questionnaire that Soviet power makes a profound distinction between ‘citizenship’ and ‘sympathy’ and does not necessarily merge and confuse these two concepts into one. Otherwise, after my reply about recognizing and submitting to Soviet power, they would not have gone on to ask me about my ‘sympathy’, if this ‘sympathy’ was truly linked with ‘citizenship’. After all, they not only asked me about ‘sympathy’, but punished me for my negative reply, and changed the place of my exile from Samarkand to the remote steppe four hundred kilometres away from it.
“So a ‘citizen’ is not always and necessarily a ‘sympathizer’ with all the communist undertakings, for the concept of ‘citizen’ in itself does not contain this ‘sympathy’; and for that reason there was absolutely no sin in taking part in the census and giving a positive reply to the question about ‘citizenship’ in the Soviet state, in which, as you well know, there are citizen-communists who are completely devoted and sympathetic to it, and there are simply citizens in the sense only of subjects – and the latter are the absolute majority, in whose number are you and I, which is clearly witnessed by your passport, which you yourself took, and you live through it with the rights of ‘citizenship’ in necessary cases (reception of pension, etc.). It is more than strange to say that to take advantage of the rights of a citizen here is not a sin, but to call oneself a ‘citizen’ is, in your opinion, such a terrible sin that you have even excluded all those who took part in the census from Orthodoxy! What amazing light-mindedness! It is this that has engendered such a profound error, which even contradicts simple common logic, not to speak of the greater error that I wrote to you about earlier and which I will not repeat. I will only add that such a spiritual double-mindedness is not pleasing to God. If, in your opinion, it is sinful merely to call yourself a ‘citizen’ of the Soviet state in a census, then to take advantage, as you do, of this citizenship is a still more bitter and responsible act, although you don’t recognize it. (Your passport, your pension, etc. They reproach you!) What use is this?! And how much is said in the Divine services of the December Menaion concerning the participation of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself in the census of Herod, which proves the sinlessness of our participation in the census that has taken place. And in the Menaion for January 5 it is said of Christ: ‘He was registered, but did not work, obeying the commands of Caesar.’ As you can see, here ‘registration’ was in no way bound up with ‘work’ for Caesar. Thus our participation in the census does not necessarily oblige us to work for Soviet power, the more so in that we do not sympathize with communism, as you mistakenly think. In conclusion I want to cite one more argument in favour of our positive reply to the question on ‘citizenship’. We Russians received our holy Orthodox faith from the Greeks, from Constantinople, while the Greeks were in a condition of civil subjection to the Turks – Muslims. However, this Turkish citizenship did not hinder the Greeks from preserving the Orthodox Faith in the course of many centuries. Constantinople is considered to this day to be a cradle of Holy Orthodoxy, a Centre of the Universal Church of Christ. And this historical example clearly shows that Turkish citizenship did not necessarily contain within itself sympathy with the Muslims, just as Soviet citizenship does not necessarily contain within itself sympathy with Communism – which is sinful.…”

Fr. Hilarion’s point is well taken. Nevertheless, he erred in seeing no essential difference between the regimes of Pagan Imperial Rome and the Turkish sultanate, on the one hand, and Soviet power, on the other. Perhaps one could indeed be a Soviet citizen without sympathizing with, or helping,
Soviet power in any way. But it was extremely difficult; and if “recognition” involved accepting the *legitimacy* of the Soviet regime, then this in itself helped Soviet power to a certain degree. Moreover, any kind of recognition or submission was in direct contradiction with Patriarch Tikhon’s anathema of 1918, which called on the Orthodox to obey the Soviet *in no way whatsoever*…

In the 1970s the detailed questionnaires required in order to receive passports were abandoned, but in 1974 it was made obligatory for all Soviet citizens to have a passport, and a new, red passport differing significantly from the old, green one was issued for everyone except prisoners and the hospitalized. Its cover had the words: “Passport of a citizen of the Soviet Socialist Republics”, together with a hammer and sickle, which was still unacceptable to the passportless, who therefore continued to be subject to prison, exile and hunger. Those who joined the Catacomb Church at this time often erased the word “citizen”, replacing it with the word “Christian”, so that they had a “Passport of a Christian of the Soviet Socialist Republics”.

The issue of passports came down to the question whether the Soviet State should be considered to be “Caesar”, to which “the things of Caesar” are due (payment of taxes, army service), or “the collective Antichrist”, obedience to whom involves compromises unacceptable for the Christian conscience. Although the majority of members of the True Russian Church in this century have not made an issue of this, it remains debatable whether obedience to the 1918 anathema against the Bolsheviks does not in fact require rejection of the Soviet State, Soviet passports, Soviet army service, etc., in a way that only the passportless demonstrated. Certainly, experience demonstrated without a doubt that all attempts of Christians to cooperate in any way with the Soviet regime were worse than useless and only led to compromises in the faith… Since the fall of communism in 1991, as we shall see, the possession of passports has ceased to be such a burning issue. However, the question whether the Soviet Union was a state “established by God” (*Romans* 13.1), or, on the contrary, an anti-state established by Satan (*Revelation* 13.2), remains a critical one. The True Orthodox position is that since the Soviet State has been anathematised by the Church, neither it, nor any modern state claiming continuity from it, can command the allegiance of Orthodox Christians. To this day the Russian True Orthodox Church does not commemorate the authorities of the post-Soviet Russian Federation...

---
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29. THE OLD CALENDARISTS RESTORE THEIR HIERARCHIES

After the repose of Metropolitan Chrysostom of Florina, on September 16, 1955, 92 of his 150 priests gathered together and established a twelve-member Commission to administer the Church. On January 10, 1957 a second Clerical Assembly was held, attended by all the Florinite priests and several zealot monks from Mount Athos. A new twelve-member commission was appointed and three archimandrites – Akakios (Pappas), Chrysostom (Kiousis) and Chrysostom (Naslimes) – were voted worthy of receiving the episcopal rank. Acacius was elected president of the Commission, Auxentios Pastras – deputy president, and general secretary – Chrysostom (Kiousis). The Commission then began to search for a way of restoring their hierarchy.382

The Florinites finally succeeded in the following way. First, Archimandrites Akakios Pappas (the nephew of Akakios the elder) and Chrysostom Kiousis were sent to ROCOR’s Archbishop John Maximovich in Brussels. He looked favourably on their request, but said that they would need to obtain the blessing of the ROCOR Synod in New York. The Florinites then sent Archimandrite Akakios the elder to Metropolitan Anastasy in New York. But the metropolitan refused to consecrate him.

Nun Vassa writes that “at the Council of 1959, following the opinion of Metropolitan Anastasy, the Council decided to once again decline the request of the Old Calendarists. While considering this matter, the opinion was expressed that through the principle of oikonomia, they could help their Greek brethren. Metropolitan Anastasy rejected this oikonomia, finding that the ordination of a bishop in this instance would not be constructive but destructive for the Church, first of all because of the condemnations such an act would invoke among the other Local Churches and the Moscow Patriarchate.”383 So vital brotherly help to the persecuted Greeks was refused on the grounds that it would irritate the heretics of World Orthodoxy…

In December, 1960 Archimandrite Akakios again arrived at the ROCOR Synod with his nephew, Archimandrite Akakios, and was again refused. According to Akakios the younger384, Metropolitan Anastasy refused to

---
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participate himself in the consecration of Akakios the elder for fear of upsetting the Ecumenical Patriarchate, but did not discourage the consecration in another city and at the hands of other bishops. According to other sources, however, the metropolitan had insisted that no ROCOR bishop take part in such a consecration.\textsuperscript{385}

In any case, on December 22, 1960, Archimandrite Akakios Pappas was consecrated as Bishop of Talantion in Detroit, by Archbishop Seraphim of Chicago and the Romanian Bishop Theophilus (Ionescu) of Detroit. As Anastasios Hudson writes, “this was a secret consecration, and was thus of questionable canonicity, given that the canonical literature presupposes that an ordination is approved by the bishops of the province [cf. I Nicaea, Canon 4]. Akakios, now styling himself Archbishop, returned to Greece and was later joined by ROCOR Archbishop Leonty of Chile, who helped him consecrate six [correct: four] more bishops.

“The committee of archimandrites initially did not accept the consecration, as Archbishop Akakios refused to divulge his consecrators and the circumstances surrounding the event. Members of the committee and laymen proficient in English wrote the ROCOR Synod several letters asking if Fr. Akakios had indeed been consecrated. Not having the knowledge that in face the consecration had occurred, Fr. George Grabbe wrote to Archimandrite Kalliopios (Yannacoulopoulos): ‘Archimandrite Akakios Pappas visited our Synod when he was in the United States and presented a petition for consecration. However, our Synod did not agree to his request. Therefore his consecration by Bishops of our Church did not take place.’ [The new calendarist] Archbishop Iakovos, hearing of the rumors, wrote a letter to Metropolitan Anastassy on June 13, 1961, where he inquired if Archimandrite Akakios (Pappas) had been consecrated. Metropolitan Anastassy confirmed in his reply that Archimandrite Akakios did visit and request consecration, but stated that ‘... our Synod rejected his plea because it did not find it possible to interfere with internal matters of another Orthodox Church, namely the Church of Greece, and had no information about Archimandrite Akakios.’

“In addition to the consecration of Akakios (Pappas), and the ordinations performed in Greece, Bishop Petros [Astifides] of Astoria was also consecrated on November 29, 1962 [old style] at Saint Markella’s Church by Bishop Leonty of Chile and Bishop Seraphim of Caracas. This was also a secret ordination...”\textsuperscript{386}

For taking part in the consecration of Akakios, Archbishop Seraphim of Chicago was reprimanded by the ROCOR Synod, but not further punished. Moreover, the Matthewites bitterly contested its canonicity, saying that Akakios the elder had bribed Seraphim. But this accusation is firmly rejected
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by Akakios the younger, who accompanied his uncle throughout the trip. The Matthewites also asserted that Theophilus was a new calendarist, having been appointed to look after the new calendarist Romanian parishes which had joined the Russian Synod. This was true, but did not necessarily invalidate the consecration because he was a member of a Synod which followed the Orthodox Calendar. In other words, his following the new calendar was uncanonical, but insofar as he was a member of a True Orthodox Synod which, for reasons of pastoral condescension, tolerated it for a certain group, he was to be considered a true bishop. Another problem was the fact that in 1971, in a letter to Metropolitan Philaret, Bishop Theophilus denied that he had taken part in the consecration. However, his participation was witnessed both by Archbishop Seraphim, and by Archimandrites Peter and Akakios the younger.

On returning to Greece, Bishop Akakios administered the Church with the aid of a Commission of archimandrites. As we have seen, in May, 1962, Bishop Akakios and the Commission invited ROCOR’s Archbishop Leonty of Chile to Greece. These two bishops then consecrated: Parthenios (Skurlis) as Bishop of the Cyclades, Auxentios (Pastras) as Bishop of Gardikion, Akakios the younger as Bishop of Diauleia and Gerontios (Margiolis) as Bishop of Salamis. It was also decreed that the newly consecrated bishops should consecrate Archimandrites Chrysostom (Naslimis) and Chrysostom (Kiousis). Chrysostom (Naslimis) was duly consecrated the next year. However, Chrysostom (Kiousis) was not consecrated...

“Later Archbishop Leonty ordained Akakios Douskos a priest in New York. This Akakios was a subdeacon of Archbishop Vitaly of Montreal, and he was ordained without Archbishop Vitaly’s consent. Later he returned to Montreal where he set up a Greek Old Calendar parish independent of Archbishop Vitaly.”

For some years the ROCOR Synod did not recognize the consecrations carried out by Archbishops Seraphim and Leonty... But during the ROCOR Hierarchical Council on November 17/30, 1962, Archbishop Averky of Syracuse and Jordanville said: “I myself would not have decided to carry out the consecration of the Greek Old Calendarists. But at the same time, in the depths of my soul, I cannot help being delighted at the boldness with which Archbishop Leontius carried out this act to which his conscience called him.

“We emphasize that we do not recognize Patriarch Alexis, while all the patriarchs recognize him. We talk about communion with these patriarchs, and thereby we turn out paradoxically to be in communion with Moscow. A vicious circle is the result. In view of this irrational position, it is especially important for us to stand on a firm canonical foundation, preserving the essence, and not the letter, which can lead to the worship of Satan...

“He [Vladyka Leonty] carried out a courageous act of assistance to a fraternal Church, which is now the closest to us in spirit. The Greek Church is now attacked and persecuted. It was a great mistake that we in our time were too condescending to the introduction of the new style, for its aim was to introduce schism into the Orthodox Church. It was the work of the enemies of the Church of Christ. Its fruits are already evident. Even in America there are Greek clergy whose conscience torments them for accepting the new style. The keeping of various traditions in various spheres is bound up with following the old style. With the expulsion of the old style from the church the ascetic principle is also expelled. The Old Calendarists are the closest to us in spirit. The only ‘but’ in the action of Archbishop Leonty consists in the fact that he acted as it were in a non-fraternal manner, contrary to the decision of the council, although from good motives.”

At the same session Archbishop John Maximovich noted: “… The Old Calendarists have been knocking on our doors for six years. The Hierarchical Council cannot take the decision upon itself, since it recognizes that this is an internal matter of the Greeks. We must accept Archbishop Leonty’s explanation as satisfactory, and with that bring our arguments to an end.” Vladyka John also recalled that in the past century there had been similar disturbances in the Antiochian Church. At that time the Constantinopolitan Church had intervened. In the same way the Greek Church had helped the Church of Cyprus. The Council expressed its regret to Archbishop Leonty with regard to his participation in the consecrations of the bishops for the Greek Old Calendarists. Archbishop Leonty, in his turn, expressed his regret that he had not been able to ask Metropolitan Anastasy.

* 

After the war, the Romanian Old Calendarists led by Hieromnonk Glycherie continued to be fiercely persecuted. Nevertheless, as Metropolitan Cyprian writes, “the work of building churches was begun anew, since all of those formerly built had been demolished. In as short an interval of time, between the end of the war and 1950, almost all of the razed churches, as well as the ruins of the Monastery of Dobru, had been rebuilt. Between 1947 and 1948, the large Monastery of Slatioara (for men) was constructed, along with the monasteries of Bradatel Neamt and Bradatel Suceava (both for women).”

Metropolitan Blaise writes: “In 1947 some people from our village went to Archimandrite Glycherie and said: something like freedom has come. The point was that the communists at first tried to win over the people to their side. They told them that they could come out of the woods and build a
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monastery. And in 1947 they built the monastery of Slatioara – the spiritual centre of our Church.

“It is difficult to say whether our position got worse under the communists or not. But essentially things remained the same – the persecutions continued. The communists destroyed only eight of our churches – not all of them. They were comparatively moderate.

“Before the war the Church was almost completely annihilated. Before the coming of the communists in 1944 we were accused of being Bolsheviks because we had the same calendar as the ‘Russians’. Under the communists, after 1944, they called us followers of Antonescu, Iron Guardists, fascists, enemies of the people. In fact we took part in no political movements or parties. We entered into agreements neither with the civil authorities, nor with the monarchy, nor with the Iron Guardists, nor with the communists, nor with the Masons…

“1947-52 was a period of comparative freedom. The communist authorities even compelled the official church to return to us the icons, iconostases, bells and church utensils which they had removed. But in 1952, at two o’clock in the night of February 1st to 2nd, two lorries loaded with security police came to the monastery and arrested almost all the young monks together with the igumen, sparing only the very aged. They were sentenced to two years’ imprisonment. Four of them died in camp.”

“The aim of this raid,” writes Constantin Bujor, “was to destroy the organization of the Old Calendarist Church, to put a stop to her activities, and thus to abolish her. Arrests were carried out in an abusive manner because the Securitate had unlimited powers – it was a manifestation of Communist totalitarianism under the notorious ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ promoted nationwide by the Romanian Workers’ Party. During these years, thousands of arrests were made without any legal warrant in order to populate the forced labor camps. But the inhuman treatment of those detained in prisons and labor camps – the nation’s leaders had always turned a blind eye to these abuses – had a negative impact on foreign relations for Romania, which was striving at the time to become a member of the United Nations. In order to extricate themselves from this mess, the Communist leaders sought a scapegoat by organizing a secret trial for a group of officers in charge of the labor camps. One of these officers, Cormoş from Cluj, testified that the officers did not consider themselves culpable, since they were under direct order from the higher authorities, who now were trying to wash their hands of any guilt. Needless to say, the leadership of the country accepted no culpability, and instead condemned the officers either to death or to years of harsh imprisonment. Then, in 1954, after two years, all of the Old Calendarists arrested were set free, together with numerous other political prisoners.
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“While the clergy and some of the Faithful of the Old Calendar Church were serving time in prisons and labor camps, in Ardeal more and more believers were returning to the Church Calendar…

“[Nevertheless,] a careful analysis of the situation demonstrated that the persecution was now being intensified, especially against the leaders of the Church, who had already undergone years of harsh imprisonment and other sufferings at the hands of the previous regime. In order to ensure continuity in the leadership, it became necessary to Ordain Priests and Hierarchs to take up the banner of the struggle for the truth. The presence of a Hierarch was absolutely indispensable for the Old Calendar Church. To this end, contact was established with Bishop Galaction in Bucharest, who had in the past expressed his attachment to the Old Calendar, for which he had been condemned at the time of the German Occupation during the First World War.\textsuperscript{392} He promised that when conditions at the Slatioara Monastery were favourable, he would come and assume the leadership of the Old Calendar Church. Thus, a delegation of Priests who formed part of the leadership and were personally known to Bishop Galaction was sent to Bucharest – Father Dionisie, Father Evloghie, and Father (later Metropolitan) Silvestru \textemdash, and persuaded him to come to Slatioara Monastery.”\textsuperscript{393}

On April 5/18, 1955 Bishop Galaction publicly declared in a letter to the newcalendarist synod that he had accepted to be the head of the Old Calendarist Church, and on May 8/21 he arrived in Slatioara Monastery, where the people greeted him with the cry: “Axios!”, “He is worthy!” Thus was fulfilled a prophetic vision that Hieromonk Glycherie had had during the war, while in a forest being pursued by enemies: “It was night. Before him, he saw a beautiful Church. Metropolitan Galacteon (Cordun)... appeared. Vladyka was holding Icons and a Cross in his hands, and he was giving each believer in the Church an Icon. When he reached the pious Father Glycherie, he gave him the Cross.”\textsuperscript{394}

In November Metropolitan Galaction and Fr. Glycherie were summoned to the police to register and legalise the Church. The faithful were against them going, sensing a trap, but the metropolitan insisted. The result: he was placed under house arrest in the monastery of St. Callinicus at Cernica, while Fr. Glycherie was exiled. However, under the pretext of visiting his doctor, the

\textsuperscript{392} Bishop Ambrose of Methone writes: “[Galaction] was Bishop of Silistre, which after the war was, with Southern Dobrogea, ceded to Bulgaria. He was thus left without a diocese, and having been the confessor of the royal family, was a persona non grata who could not possibly be appointed to another see. He was thus a bishop in retirement, who continued to serve as invited (he in fact consecrated Teoctist, the present Patriarch, bishop) until 1955” (personal communication, 28 August, 2005). (V.M.)

\textsuperscript{393} Bujor, Resisting unto Blood: Sixty-Five Years of Persecution of the True (Old Calendar) Orthodox Church of Romania (October 1924 – December 1989), Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 2003, pp. 113-114, 115-116.

\textsuperscript{394} Metropolitan Blaise, The Life of the Holy Hierarch and Confessor Glycherie of Romania, Etna, Ca.: Center for Traditionalist Studies, 1999, p. 50.
metropolitan went several times to Moarea Domneasca, which belonged to the Old Calendarists, and consecrated two bishops (Evloghie and Meftodie) and several priests. When this was discovered, about a year later, he was placed under stronger observation in a monastery. But on Good Friday, 1959, Metropolitan Galaction was abducted by Fr. Pavel Mogârzan, Georghe Hincu and the advocate Albu, disguised as Securitate agents. He went the next day to Slatioara... “When, two or three hours [later], the patriarch phoned to find out what the metropolitan was doing, they told him that two officers of the security police had taken him. The patriarch shouted: ‘I didn’t send any officers!’ But the metropolitan was already far away.”

This was not the first dramatic abduction carried out by the Romanian Old Calendarists in this period... “During the night of November 17, 1956, Archimandrite Glycherie, who had been abducted from his forced labour, was secretly consecrated a bishop [in Moara Domneasca]. Then they hid in our monastery [of Slătioara], where every day ordinations took place. A year later they were again arrested.”

At about this time, the future Bishop Pahomie “and Hierodeacon Paisie (Urdâ) travelled to Alba County to celebrate the Feast of Saint Nicholas at one of the Churches there. It was soon after the anti-Communist uprising in the Third Hungarian Revolution (October 10/23-October 22/November 4, 1956), had been crushed by Soviet tanks. The Romanian Securitate was monitoring all activities, making arrests, and trying and sentencing individuals. The intention of the monks was apparently known to Securitate forces, because on the way to Râmeț, Fathers Pahomie and Paisie were detained and taken to Securitate headquarters in Alba Iulia. After a few hours of interrogation, the Fathers were transported later than same night to Aiud, where, the next day, the interrogation continued. The monks began a hunger strike to protest their innocence. After five days of questioning, Father Pahomie was granted a vision at night in his cell, in which the Holy Hieromartyr Cyprian (+304) appeared to him and said, ‘Brother, why have you been arrested, and why are you so distressed?’ Father Pahomie replied that he was distressed because he had been illegally detained. Saint Cyprian told him not to be upset, but to pray to him, and they would be allowed to go home. With much difficulty, Father Pahomie succeeded in communicating his vision to Father Paisie, and both agreed to spend the whole night in prayer. In the morning, they were interrogated once more, signed the transcripts, and were then taken to the prosecutor’s office. After their dossiers had been examined, the monks were

395 Bishop Evloghie was consecrated in 1955 and died in 1978. He had previously spent seven years in prison after declaring his adherence to the True Orthodox Church, and spent 14 years in prison in all. Bishop Meftodie was consecrated in 1956 and died in 1977. Metropolitan Galaction himself died in 1959. See Foi Transmise et Sainte Tradition (Transmitted Faith and Holy Tradition), N 79, November, 1994, p. 15; Bujor, op. cit., pp. 133-145.


397 Metropolitan Blaise, op. cit.
released, although by that time it was too late for them to perform the Divine Services for Saint Nicholas’ Day as they had planned…

“The monks returned to Bucharest, where they celebrated the Divine Services for Theophany. The news that in the Bucharest area a ‘hotbed’ of Old Calendarists had been established under the leadership of Bishop Evloghie swiftly reached the Patriarchate, which in turn notified the Securitate. Thus, Father Pahomie and Father Paisie were arrested again, while Bishop Evloghie went into hiding. Taken back to Aiud, where only two months earlier they had been set free, they were sentenced to eight months in prison…”

After being abducted from captivity, Metropolitan Galaction “returned to Slatioara, where he was so weighed down with his sufferings that he was unable to serve the Divine Liturgy”, and died on July 12, 1959. The majority of the clergy who had been ordained were however arrested, and were not finally liberated until the amnesty of 1963, when Ceaucescu came to power. In 1958, the Romanian authorities ordered that all the monks under 60 and all the nuns under 55 should leave their monasteries, but, as always in these cases, the order had to be given through the local Metropolitans. Those of the new calendar complied (with one exception) and thousands of monks and nuns found themselves on the streets after a lifetime in their monasteries; the authorities, however, met with an absolute refusal from Saint Glicherie, who declared himself happy to return to prison rather than betray those under his care. Before this, the authorities bowed, though harassment of the monasteries continued, and several monasteries were closed by force…”

One of those who suffered at this time was Father (now Bishop) Demosthenes (Ionita): “In 1957 Metropolitan Glicherie ordained him to the priesthood. Within a month after his ordination, Fr. Demosthenes went to Bucharest to assist Bishop Eulogius who was in hiding. There he was betrayed by an Old Calendar priest and arrested. The authorities demanded that Fr. Demosthenes reveal the whereabouts of the bishop, which he refused to do.

“On July 23, 1958, Fr. Demosthenes was again arrested. He, with a group of chanters, had served a funeral for his cousin in a closed church. A New Calendar priest reported this to the authorities, which resulted in his and the chanters’ arrest. Six officers took Fr. Demosthenes to the city Tirgu-Mures. Upon his arrival, he was led to a room where several guards took off his

---
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clothes, and later shaved off his hair and beard. His prison cell had a cement bed with no covers. For five months the civil authorities investigated and interrogated Fr. Demosthenes in an attempt to find some excuse to have him sentenced. The first round of questioning went along these lines:

“Interrogator: What activity does Glycherie have in this country? What measures does he plan against the Communists?

“Fr. Demosthenes: The Metropolitan teaches us to work, pray, and obey the laws of the state.

“Interrogator: Where are you hiding your guns?

“Fr. Demosthenes: Our guns are our church books.

“Chief Interrogator: Why doesn’t he tell us where the guns are? Hang him!

“At this point Fr. Demosthenes lost consciousness and fell to the floor. When he awoke, he found himself in his cell with a doctor. The doctor asked where he hurt and why he had fallen. Fr. Demosthenes responded, ‘I don’t remember.’ The doctor kicked him and responded, ‘This is our medicine for Old Calendarists who want to kill Communists.’

“Fr. Demosthenes spent the next seven years in concentration camps. His experience could comprise a chapter of Solzhenitsyn’s *Gulag Archipelago*. The prisoners were starved, tortured, and denied any form of comfort. At one point Fr. Demosthenes was so exhausted that he could not even remember the Lord’s Prayer. In 1959 the authorities promised all religious prisoners from his camp freedom if they signed a declaration of apostasy. Out of 2,000 prisoners only 90 agreed to sign. In the prison camp in Salcia, Fr. Demosthenes saw prisoners being trampled by horses as he and others worked on building canals and other projects in the freezing winter. Many years later, Fr. Demosthenes met one of the prison guards of Salcia, who informed him that it was indeed a miracle he had survived, for the guards had orders that no one was to leave that camp alive.

“In 1964 Fr. Demosthenes was freed from prison. When his mother saw him for the first time in seven years, she asked, ‘Why did they release you, did you compromise the faith?’ His mother was relieved to hear that her son had not betrayed the Church; this was her main concern. After three weeks he was again under house arrest. Fr. Demosthenes fled to the forests and lived in hiding for five more years.”

While Soviet Communism proceeded relatively peacefully in this period, it was a completely different story in the Far East, where new nation-converts to Communism such as China and Vietnam were in a state of almost constant revolutionary turmoil. As we have noted, this was in part owing to important differences between Soviet and Far Eastern Communism. In particular, unlike Marx and Engels, but more like Lenin or Stalin in the 1930s, the Eastern Communist leaders did not believe that everything was determined by an economic base, but rather insisted on the primacy of faith in the triumph of the revolution and sheer willpower over all material obstacles, in despite of all political and economic theory. And the results, if possible, were even more horrific than those of “orthodox communism”. Thus Mao’s “Great Leap Forward” (1958–62) claimed, by conservative estimates, 45 million lives, and quite possibly – between 50 and 60 million.402

As Maria Hsia Chang writes, “By the late 1950s, bolstered by the results of the socialist transformation of China, Mao thought that the transition to communism was imminent. Between 1953 and 1957, the Chinese economy registered an annual real rate of growth of 6.2 percent, the gross value of industrial output increased by 128 percent and agriculture by 24.8 percent. Mao was convinced that what was needed was a concerted effort to mobilize China’s human resources to accelerate the pace of economic development, so that production itself doubled in a single five-year period. With that, China would leapfrog over the Soviet Union by making ‘a great leap forward’ from socialism into utopian communism.

“The leap forward would be effected through the sheer will and enthusiasm of the masses. Notwithstanding its unskilled populace and backward technology, Mao believed that China could conquer its poverty if only the people had sufficient faith and commitment. Industrial development would not be confined to the urban centers; instead, the peasants would produce steel in backyard furnaces. Impassioned by his vision, millions of Chinese were mobilized to undertake massive programs of excavation, construction, reforestation, and water control – a modern analogue of the corvée labor enterprises of dynastic China. To free men and women for this heroic purpose, peasant families were merged into gargantuan communes, each comprised of thousands of households. In anticipation of the imminent arrival of communism, private property ownership was totally abjured, including farm tools and draught animals.

“Rather than the realization of utopia, the Great Leap Forward ended in signal disaster. The ‘steel’ produced in backyard furnaces turned out to be entirely useless. To curry favor with Mao, commune cadres exaggerated their farm production figures, on the basis of which Beijing exacted its quote of

grain harvest to feed China’s urban populace, leaving little for the peasants. The result was a famine that ended the 1950s in which at least 15 million starved to death – a direct consequence of misguided policies and wasted resources.

“In the cost accounting that followed, Mao relinquished his post as head of state to Lii Shaoqi (while retaining his chairmanship of the party) and retreated from active governing. Liu, with Deng Xiaoping as his assistant, took over the affairs of governance. The new leadership eschewed the more radical features of Maoism. Instead of ideological appeals, the party turned to capitalist measures to revive the economy: Peasants could own small private plots, and material incentives of differential wages were used to spur production.”

As we have seen, at the Asia-Africa Conference in Bandung in 1955, Chou En-lai had claimed to support the oppressed victims of colonialism in the region. However, China was not averse to some imperialist activity herself, pushing forward in Korea, in the South China Sea, in Vietnam – and in Tibet. In 1959 China invaded Tibet. “Testimony by travelers returning from Tibet to Nepal, Bhutan and northern India indicates that, incredible as it may seem, up to 80 percent of the population remaining after the invasion died; in many cases, families of six children were left with only one survivor. Victims who were not murdered outright were felled by those other great pillars of communism: famine and forced labour. Of perhaps one thousand refugees who reached India and Nepal in 1981, more than half had served prison terms; some three hundred had been in prison uninterruptedly since 1959. Working conditions were so hard, both day and night, and food so scarce (a handful every twenty-four house of tsampa, the flour of grilled barley that is Tibet’s staple food) that there were always a few people who failed to reply at evening roll call in the camps; they had died, the fugitives said, of exhaustion.

“The massacres were particularly ferocious among Tibetan monks. Two hundred of them who remained in the Sechen monastery in eastern Tibet were slaughtered in one day, and this is merely one of many such examples. The Chinese tortured clerics and lay believers who refused to abjure their religion. If the victims moved their lips in prayer under torture, they were beaten to death. One witness told a relative of mine, who is an expert on Tibet and speaks the language fluently, that he had been assigned for a full months to the job of tossing bodies into a gigantic pit. Accused one day of having failed to stack the corpses correctly, which obviously required a certain level of Maoist training, he was forced to go down into the pit, where he sank into the heap of decomposing flesh. He was hauled out just in time to avoid asphyxiation.

“The obliteration of Tibet’s culture was carried out with almost insane violence, especially after the Cultural Revolution’s Red Guards arrived to lend a ‘spontaneous’ hand to the occupation army... More than thirty thousand of the country’s monasteries and temples were destroyed; hundreds of thousands of woodblocks for printing ancient Tibetan scriptures were used as firewood or to build army barracks. The great monasteries at Sechen, Zongsar, Kathog, Dzochen, to cite only the main ones, were razed; only plains are there now that give no hint that the greatest treasures of Tibetan architecture once stood on those sites. Of Ganden, Turphu, Mindroeing, Palpung, nothing but ruins remain. Gone, too, are the five-storey Riwoz monastery in the Kham and the thousands of old manuscripts it contained. Over one hundred thousand woodblocks at the great Dershe print shop were saved from burning by a popular uprising that Peking elected not to crus. The sole surviving monastery is the one the world knows, the Potala in Lhasa; damaging it would have been too noticeable...”

Jonathan Mirsky writes: “Ceaseless repression has led to the self-immolation of thousands of monks and nuns as well as laypeople in recent times.”

China’s invasion of Tibet also led to a worsening of relations with another Asian power, India, that was complicated by India’s dispute with Pakistan over Kashmir. The Chinese had isolated and weakened the Tibetans by cutting their links through the Himalayas to India. “The two main routes between India and Tibet lay through Sikkim to the south and Leh in Kashmir to the west. Military activity on an ill-defined border was a source of Sino-Indian tension, and eventually war. India’s defeat (in 1962) was aptly symbolic of Nehru’s grander ambitions. India’s political system (which dispersed considerable power and resources to state-level governments), the threat ‘at home’ of war with Pakistan, and the lackluster progress of the Indian economy (India’s share of world trade fell by two-thirds in the 1950s and 1960s) conspired to frustrate India’s claim, at this stage, to be an Asian ‘great power’. China, on the other hand, was now poised to become the hegemon in South Asia – if Mao had not decided on yet another disastrous internal upheaval.

The next great stride in Mao’s revolution was the Cultural Revolution, which began in 1966, four years after the end of the Great Leap Forward. Frank Dikötter has put forward the interesting thesis that it was caused, first of all, by Mao’s fear that the revolution in China might adopt a revisionist course similar that adopted in the Soviet Union after Khruschev’s speech against Stalin. “In August 1963, Chairman Mao received a group of African guerilla
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fighters. One of the young visitors, a tall, square-shouldered man from Southern Rhodesia, had a question. He believed that the red star shining over the Kremlin had slipped away. The Soviets, who used to help the revolutionaries, now sold weapons to their enemies. ‘What I worry about is this,’ he said. ‘Will the red star over Tiananmen Square in China go out? Will you abandon us and sell arms to our oppressors as well?’ Mao became pensive, puffing on his cigarette. ‘I understand your question,’ he observed. ‘It is that the USSR has turned revisionist and has betrayed the revolution. Can I guarantee to you that China won’t betray the revolution? Right now I can’t give you that guarantee. We are searching very hard to find the way to keep China from becoming corrupt, bureaucratic and revisionist.’

‘Three years later, on June 1st, 1966, an incendiary editorial in the People’s Daily exhorted readers to ‘Sweep Away all Monsters and Demons’. It was the opening shot of the Cultural Revolution, urging people to denounce those representatives of the bourgeoisie who were trying to lead the country down the road to capitalism. As if this were not enough, it soon came to light that four of the top leaders in the party had been placed under arrest, accused of plotting against Mao. The mayor of Beijing was among them. He had tried, under the nose of the people, to turn the capital into a citadel of revisionism. Counter-revolutionaries had sneaked into the party, the government and the army. Now was the beginning of a new revolution in China, as the people were encouraged to stand up and flush out all those trying to transform the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

‘Who, precisely, these counter-revolutionaries were and how they had managed to worm their way into the party was unclear, but the leading representative of modern revisionism was the Soviet leader and party secretary, Nikita Khrushchev. In a secret speech in 1956, which shook the socialist camp to its core, Khrushchev had demolished the reputation of his erstwhile master Joseph Stalin, detailing the horrors of his rule and attacking the cult of personality. Two years later, Khrushchev proposed ‘peaceful coexistence’ with the West, a concept that true believers around the world, including the young guerilla fight from Southern Rhodesia, viewed as a betrayal of the principles of revolutionary communism...

‘.... In 1956, some of Mao’s closest allies, including Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping, had used Khrushchev’s secret speech to delete all references to Mao Zedong Thought from the party constitution and criticize the cult of personality. Mao was seething, though he had little choice but to acquiesce. The biggest setback came in the wake of the Great Leap Forward, a catastrophe on an unprecedented scale directly caused by his own obstinate policies. At a conference held in 1962, as some 7,000 leading cadres from all over the country gathered to talk about the failure of the Great Leap Forward, Mao’s star was at its lowest. Rumours were circulating, accusing him of being deluded, innumerate and dangerous. Some of his colleagues may have wanted him to step down, holding him responsible for the mass starvation of ordinary people. His entire legacy was in jeopardy. Mao feared that he would
meet the same fate as Stalin, who was denounced after his death. What would become China’s Khrushchev? The Cultural Revolution, then, was also a long and sustained effort by Mao to prevent any party leader from turning against him...”407

Chang continues: “Mao became increasingly troubled by the direction of the new leadership, convinced that the party under Liu had betrayed the revolution by conceding to selfish capitalist appetites and corroding the egalitarian ideal. Most alarmingly, Mao discerned in the apparatchik of the rapidly mushrooming government bureaucracies nothing less than the formation of a new ruling class. To stem the erosion, Mao emerged out of his sabbatical. When he failed to correct his errant colleagues through the customary method of a rectification campaign within the party, he resolved that the apparatchiks would have to be dislodged. In the gathering storm of what became the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (1966-1969), he brought together his lieutenants: a small coterie composed of his wife, Jiang Qing, and Defense Minister Lin Biao. To dislodge the apparatchiks, Mao used his charismatic authority to mobilize the masses with the Red Guards, the naïve and impressionable youth of China, at the fore.

“In the hysteria that ensued, entire provinces were engulfed in a frenzy of recrimination and destruction. Bands of Red Guards roamed the country, laying waste to life and property. Schools and universities were closed and productivity declined in critical sectors of the economy. ‘Enemies of the people’ were subjected to public vilification and abuse: In some areas, the vengeful masses took to cannibalism against their presumed class enemies. Finally, even Mao thought the chaos and mayhem had exceeded all limits. The military was brought in to rein in the revolution. The Red Guards, for their part, who had only sought to do their revered Chairman’s bidding, were banished in permanent exile to the remote countryside.

“Costly though the Cultural Revolution was, Mao achieved his objective of removing his opponents in the party. Countless numbers of them, including ‘capitalist roader number one’ Liu Shaoqi, perished from the abuse. Others, like Deng Xiaoping, survived but were removed from public office. Once again ensconced in power, Mao seemed to lose active interest in politics. The affairs of state devolved to Jiang Qing and her cronies – collectively known as the Gang of Four – who went about reinstituting the substance of Maoist socialism. The Chairman himself sank into increasing senescence. The lone moderate in government was Zhou Enlai, veteran survivor of political campaigns and longtime premier of the State Council. He struggled to introduce some modicum of rationality into policy deliberations, particularly in the area of foreign relations where the impact of Mao’s radicalism had been as disastrous as in the domestic arena.

“Maoist foreign policy was predicated on the assumption that history ordained the certain triumph of the ‘proletarian’ less developed countries over the capitalist industrialized states. To foster this historical inevitability, China would aid and support revolutionary communist movements in the Third World – in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. But that effort met with little success. In one case in particular, China’s complicity in the subversive activities of the Indonesian Communist Party resulted in a major policy debacle. Only in Vietnam, where China had contributed to the defeat of the United States, could Beijing claim success.

“More ominously, along the long Sino-Soviet border in the north, there were developments that threatened the very survival of China. Since the death of Stalin in 1953, relations between Beijing and Moscow had become increasingly strained. From the perspective of the Chinese, Nikita Khruschev’s denunciation of Stalin reflected badly on the cult of Mao. For their part, the Soviet leaders harbored increasing reservations regarding the direction of Mao’s foreign policy. At a time when Moscow began to entertain the possibilities of a peaceful coexistence with the preeminent capitalist power, the United States, Mao agitated instead for the active promotion of the ‘proletarian’ world revolution. He expected that nuclear war between the two superpowers was inevitable and that China, with its massive population, would survive the devastation and emerge the victor. While Moscow was ill-disposed toward adventurism, Mao sought every opportunity to provoke foreign confrontations. In 1958, the PLA fired at the ROC’s off-shore islands of Quenny and Marsu in the Taiwan Strait, inciting a crisis that almost engaged the United States. In 1961, border disputes between China and India erupted into open conflagration. Not surprisingly, Beijing received scant support from Moscow in both incidents. More than that, the Soviet Union so distrusted China that it decided it would not share nuclear weapons technology with its socialist brother.

“The already strained friendship between Moscow and Beijing was further attenuated during the Cultural Revolution when a band of Red Guards, armed with the ‘mighty atom bomb’ of Mao Zedong thought, challenged Soviet troops along a contested sector of the border. In March 1969 a new phase of the simmering dispute erupted when Chinese irregulars ambushed a Soviet border patrol in Zhenbao Island and killed a number of Soviet troops. Two weeks later, Moscow responded by savaging Chinese border troops with massive artillery and rocket attacks that destroyed Chinese emplacements within PRC territory.”

According to Vasily Mitrokhin and Christopher Andrew, “Henry Kissinger, recently appointed as President Nixon’s National Security Advisor, was originally inclined to accept Soviet claims that these clashes were started by the Chinese. When he looked at a detailed map of the frontier region, however, he changed his mind. Since the clashes occurred close to Soviet
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railheads and several hundred miles from any Chinese railway, Kissinger concluded that ‘Chinese leaders would not have picked such an unpropitious spot to attack.’…

“In August and September Moscow began sounding out both Washington and European Communist parties on their reaction to the possibility of a Soviet pre-emptive strike against Chinese nuclear installations before they were able to threaten the Soviet Union. A series of articles in the Western press by a journalist co-opted by the KGB, Victor Louis (born Victor Yevgenyevich Lui), mentioned the possibility of a Soviet air strike against the Lop Nor nuclear test site in the XUAR [Xinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region]… In retrospect, the whole exercise looks more like an active-measures campaign. Though the Soviet Defence Minister, Marshal Andrei Grechko, appears to have proposed a plan to ‘get rid of the Chinese threat once and for all’, most of his Politburo colleagues were not prepared to take the risk…

“As a result of the lack of any high-level Soviet intelligence source in Beijing, Moscow seems to have been unaware of the dramatic secret response by Mao to its campaign of intimidation after the border clashes. Mao set up a study group of four marshals whom he instructed to undertake a radical review of Chinese relations with the Soviet Union and the United States. Marshals Chen Yi and Ye Jianying made the unprecedented proposal that the PRC respond to the Soviet threat by playing ‘the United States card’. Fear of a pre-emptive Soviet strike seems to have been a major reason for the Chinese decision to enter the secret talks with the United States which led to Nixon’s visit to Beijing in 1972 and a Sino-American rapprochement which only a few years earlier would have seemed inconceivable. During Nixon’s visit, Kissinger gave Marshal Ye Jianying an intelligence briefing on Soviet force deployments at the Chinese border which, he told him, was so highly classified that even many senior US intelligence officials had not had access to it.

“There was prolonged discussion in the Centre [of the KGB in Moscow] in the early 1970s as to whether the PRC now qualified for the title ‘Main Adversary’, hitherto applied exclusively to the United States. In the end it was relegated in official KGB jargon to the status of ‘Major Adversary’, with the United States retaining its unique ‘Main Adversary’ status. For China, by contrast, it was clear that the Soviet Union had become the Main Adversary…”

Both Mao and Zhou died in 1976, bringing to an end the most horrific period in Chinese history. “Not until 1976,” writes Revel, “did the West learn that Mao’s Great Leap Forward caused massive death and the death of at least sixty million Chinese and that the Cultural Revolution was precisely the explosion of bloody barbarity Mao had sought. But in 1976, the revelation

came too late to expunge from Western minds the image formed in 1960-75 of a ‘progressive’ China, a model of an allegedly non-Stalinist breed of communism, a champion of development to be imitated by the whole Third World. Maoist ideology largely helped create the political climate in those years, the attitudes and sensibilities of the time, the fanatical criticism of capitalism prevailing then – even though working class living standards in the capitalist had never before climbed so high. The showdown among the ruling bureaucracy in Peking after Mao’s death left Western Maoists peering into a vast, black hole fully of wretchedness and stupidity where had thought to see a brilliant El Dorado, but this did not efface the past ravages wrought by the Chinese illusion. For fifteen years, a lie on a global scale had again distorted public debate, falsified thinking on the fate of humanity by faking the basis of discussion with non-existent ‘facts’: the supposed success of China’s socialist economy and the false legend of a highly civilized Chinese communism…”
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The French had always had a snobbish attitude towards American Hollywood and Coca-Cola “culture”, and a none-too-grateful attitude to the nation that had not only liberated them from the Nazis in the Second World War, but had also lifted the whole of Western Europe off its economic feet and created a wall of steel against the Soviet threat at very little cost to the Europeans themselves. In a sixties book called *Le Défi américain* Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber elaborated on various threats supposedly posed by the Americans, but, as Norman Stone points out, “failed to notice that French industry, far from languishing, was doing better than it had done since the 1890s, when the arrival of electrical energy had enabled it to bypass the coal in which France was poor. Quite soon France was going to overtake England, for the first time since the French Revolution itself.

“All of this allowed de Gaulle to appear as a world statesman, to put France back on the map. Now, he, many Frenchmen and many Europeans in general resented the American domination. There was not just the unreliability, the way in which the USA, every four years, became paralysed by a prospective presidential election. France’s defence was largely dependent upon the USA, and, here, there were fears in Paris and Bonn. They did not find Washington easy. The more the Americans became bogged down in Vietnam, the more there was head-shaking in Europe. They alone had the nuclear capacity to stop a Russian advance, but the Berlin crisis had already shown that the Americans’ willingness to come to Germany’s defence was quite limited, and they had not even stood up for their own treaty rights. Now, in 1964, they were involved in a guerrilla war in south-east Asia and were demonstrably making mess of it: would Europe have any priority? Perhaps, if West Germany had been allowed to have nuclear weapons, the Europeans could have built up a real deterrent of their own, but that was hardly in anyone’s mind. The bomb was to be Anglo-American.

“At the turn of 1962-3 the British Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan, had met Kennedy (at Nassau) and agreed to depend upon a little American technology [Polaris nuclear missiles] on condition that the French got even less. There would be no Franco-British nuclear link and as far as de Gaulle was concerned, France would have to make her own way forward. He got his own back. The Americans were trying to manoeuvre Great Britain into the EEC, and, conscious now of their comparative decline, the British reluctantly agreed to be manoeuvred. At a press conference in January 1963, de Gaulle showed them the door. Europe was to be a Franco-German affair, and de Gaulle was its leader. France could not go it alone. If she had seriously to offer a way forward between the world powers, she had to have allies, and Germany was the obvious candidate. Adenauer, too, needed the votes of what, in a more robust age, had been called ‘the brutal rurals’, and the Common Agricultural Policy bribed them. In return for protection and price support, they would vote for Adenauer, even if they only had some small plot that they worked at weekends.
“France, with a seat on the Security Council and the capacity to make trouble for the USA with the dollar and much else, mattered; the Communists were a useful tool, and they were told not to destabilize de Gaulle. He was being helpful to Moscow. In the first instance, starting in 1964, the French had made problems as regards support for the dollar. They built up gold reserves, and then sold dollars for more gold, on the grounds that the dollar was just paper, and inflationary paper at that. There was of course more to it, in that there was no financial centre in France to rival that of London, and the French lost because they had to use London for financial transactions; by 1966 they were formally refusing to support the dollar any more, and this (an equivalent of French behavior in the early stages of the great Slump of 1929-32) was a pillar knocked from under the entire Atlantic financial system.

“De Gaulle had persuaded himself that the Sino-Soviet split would make the USSR more amenable, that it might even become once more France’s ideal eastern partner. There were also signs, he could see, of a new independence in eastern Europe. The new Romanian leader, Ceaușescu, looked with envy on next-door neighbour Tito, cultivated and admired by everybody. Romania had been set up by France a century before, and French had been the second, or even, for the upper classes, the first language until recently. Now, de Gaulle took up links with her, and also revisited a Poland that he had not seen since 1920, as a young officer. In March 1966 he announced that France would leave the NATO joint command structure, and the body’s headquarters were shifted to Brussels, among much irritation at French ingratitude. In June the General visited the USSR itself, and unfolded his schemes to Brezhnev: there should be a new European security system, a nuclear France and a nuclear USSR in partnership, the Americans removed, and a French-dominated Europe balancing between the two sides. He had already made sure of Europe’s not having an American component, in that he had vetoed British membership of the Community. Now he would try to persuade Brezhnev that the time had come to get rid of East Germany, to loosen the iron bonds that kept the satellite countries tied to Moscow, and to prepare for serious change in the post-war arrangements. Brezhnev was not particularly interested, and certainly not in the disappearance of East Germany; in any case, although France was unquestionably of interest, it was West Germany that chiefly concerned Moscow, and there were constant problems over Berlin. De Gaulle was useful because, as Brezhnev said, ‘thanks to him we have made a breach, without the slightest risk, in American capitalism. De Gaulle is of course an enemy, we know, and the French Party, narrow-minded and seeing only its own interests, has been trying to work us up against him. But look at what we have achieved: the American position in Europe has been weakened, and we have not finished yet.’”

France had indeed acted ungratefully and treacherously, and a serious breach in the Western alliance could well have emerged. But her behavior

was more the result of De Gaullé’s ever-prickly personality and national pride than any deeper shift in interests; Brezhnev was right to see in him more a useful, but still essentially Capitalist idiot than a real convert to the Communist International. In any case, hubris was soon to be followed by humiliation…

*  

For, as Stone continues, in 1968 “de Gaulle received, out of the blue, a vast humiliation. In a moment that summed up the sixties, the students of Paris rebelled against him, and would have brought him down if the Communist Party had not, for Moscow’s sake, saved him. The episode in itself was farcical, but it was a farce with a sinister side, edging into terrorism; it also did great damage to education in general, and particularly in European universities, which since then have declined…”

“Gregres Pompidou, the Gaullist Prime Minister, rapidly took the measure of the troubles. After the initial confrontations he withdrew the police, despite criticism from within his own party and government, leaving the students of Paris in de facto control of their university and the surrounding quartier Pompidou – and his President, De Gaulle – were embarrassed by the well-publicized activities of the students. But, except very briefly at the outset when they were taken by surprise, they did not feel threatened by them.
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When the time came the police, especially the riot police – recruited from the sons of poor provincial peasants and never reluctant to crack the heads of privileged Parisian youth – could be counted on to restore order. What troubled Pompidou was something far more serious.

“The student riots and occupations had set the spark to a nationwide series of strikes and workplace occupations that brought France to a near-standstill by the end of May. Some of the first protests – by reporters at French Television and Radio, for example – were directed at their political chiefs for censoring coverage of the student movement and, in particular, the excessive brutality of some riot policemen. But as the general strike spread, through the aircraft manufacturing plants of Toulouse and the electricity and petrochemical industries and, most ominously, to the huge Renault factories on the edge of Paris itself, it became clear that something more than a few thousand agitated students was at stake.

“The strikes, sit-ins, office occupations and accompanying demonstrations and marches were the greatest movement of social protest in modern France, far more extensive than those of June 1936. Even in retrospect it is difficult to say with confidence exactly what they were about. The Communist-led trade union organization, the Confédération du Travail (CGT) was at first at a loss: when union agreement reached between government, unions and employers was decisively rejected by the Renault workers, despite its promise of improved wages, shorter hours and more consultation.

“The millions of men and women who had stopped work had one thing at least in common with the students. Whatever their particular local grievances, they were above all frustrated with their conditions of existence. They did not so much want to get a better deal at work as to change something about their way of life; pamphlets and manifestos and speeches explicitly said as much. This was good news for the public authorities in that it diluted the mood of the strikers and directed their attention away from political targets; but it suggested a general malaise that would be hard to address.

“France was prosperous and secure and some conservative commentators concluded that the wave of protests was thus driven not by discontent but by simple boredom…”

Boredom, anomie, frustration with nobody knew exactly what – this was the existential crisis of comfortable Western Social Democracy in the 1960s. It suggested that the West’s problems were not primarily political or economic, but “existential” - the result of the expulsion of religion from the Social Democratic project.

The young perhaps felt it most acutely, but they were simply expressing a general malaise that went deeper as one went further down the scale of class.

---
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and up the ladder of age. The very *frivolity* and sheer ignorance of their attachments – their passion for Mao and Che Guevara, for example, without knowing anything about the mind-boggling evil that such men were accomplishing, or their mindless slogan, ‘It is forbidden to forbid’ – paradoxically highlighted the *seriousness* of the malaise.

* 

The Prague Spring – the brief but highly significant semi-democratization of Czechoslovakia - came to a country that had suffered more than other East European nations from post-war Soviet repression.

“As late as 1954,” writes Norman Stone, “several months after the USSR had started to release Stalin’s victims, there was a minor purge trial, and a commission in 1957 even reaffirmed the guilt of the 1950-51 victims, though some were released. A huge Stalin statue even went up in 1955, demolished only when Khruschev insisted, along with the removal of Klement Gottwald from his mausoleum. In an obscure place, much later, there was still a little ‘Stalin Square’. In Czechoslovakia there was nothing like the Polish peasantry, stubbornly stuck in subsistence agriculture; nor was there anything like the Polish Church, the Czechs having inherited a powerful anti-clerical tradition. Opposition to the Communists was enfeebled from the outset because it was itself largely Communist.

“Still, there were signs of trouble in the woodwork, and a Party congress was postponed for several months in 1962. The 1951 purge trials continued to be a cause of unease, and there was a new commission to investigate them. In 1963 it pinned the blame on Gottwald, and by implication his close colleagues, still in high places. A Slovak journalist – Miroslav Hysko – publicly denounced them, and was not himself arrested: the old trial verdicts were, instead, cancelled. All of this was evidence of much deeper currents. Further evidence came when a report late in 1963 stated that the campaign against Slovak nationalism in 1951 had been unjustified…”

The calls of Slovak Communists for federalization of the country was an important stimulus to what followed. Another was a student demonstration for “More Light!” (both physical and spiritual) in the Strahov district of Prague. But the critical event was the election, on January 5, 1968, of a new First Secretary of the Party after Novotný, Alexander Dubček.

“The new man,” writes Judt, “was young (at 47 he was sixteen years Novotný’s junior), from the reform wing of the Party and, above all, a Slovak. As leader of the Slovak Communist Party for the past three years he appeared to many to be a credible compromise candidate: a longstanding Communist *apparatchik* who would nevertheless support reforms and appease Slovak resentments. Dubček’s early moves seemed to confirm this reading: a month

---

after his appointment the Party leadership gave its unstinting approval to the stalled economic reform program. Dubček’s rather artless manner appealed to the young in particular, while his indubitable loyalty to the Party and to ‘Socialism’ reassured for the time being the Kremlin and other foreign Communist leaders looking anxiously on.

“If Dubček’s intentions were obscure to observers, this is probably because he himself was far from sure just where to go. At first this ambiguity worked in his favour, as different factions competed for his support and offered to strengthen his hand. Public rallies in Prague in the weeks following his election demanded an end to censorship, greater press freedom and a genuine inquiry into the purges of the fifties and the responsibilities of the old guard around Novotný (who remained President of the country even after being ousted from the Party leadership). Carried on this wave of popular enthusiasm, Dubček endorsed the call for a relaxation of censorship and initiated a purge of Novotnýites from the Party and from the Czech army.

“In March 22nd Novotný reluctantly resigned the presidency and was replaced a week later by General Ludvík Svoboda. Five days after that, the Central Committee adopted an ‘Action Program’ calling for equal status and autonomy for Slovakia, the rehabilitation of past victims and ‘democratisation’ of the political and economic system. The Party was now officially endorsing what the Program called ‘a unique experiment in democratic Communism’: ‘Socialism with a human face’ as it became colloquially known. Over a period of time (the document spoke of a ten-year transition) the Czechoslovak Communist Party would allow the emergence of other parties with whom it would compete in genuine elections. These were hardly original ideas, but publicly pronounced from the official organs of a ruling Communist Party they triggered a political earthquake. The Prague Spring had begun.

“The events of the spring and summer of 1968 in Czechoslovakia hinged on three contemporary illusions. The first, widespread in the country after Dubček’s rise and especially following publication of the Action Program, was that the freedoms and reforms now being discussed could be folded into the ‘Socialist’ (i.e. Communist) project. It would be wrong to suppose, in retrospect, that what the students and writers and Party reformers of 1968 were ‘really’ seeking was to replace Communism with liberal capitalism or that their enthusiasm for ‘Socialism with a human face’ was mere rhetorical compromise or habit. On the contrary: the idea that there existed a ‘third way’, a Democratic Socialism compatible with free institutions, respecting individual freedoms and collective goals, had captured the imagination of Czech students no less than Hungarian economists.

“The distinction that was now drawn between the discredited Stalinism of Novotný’s generation and the renewed idealism of the Dubček era, was widely accepted – even, indeed especially, by Party members. As Jiří Pelikán asserted, in his preface to yet a third report on the Czech political trials
(commissioned in 1968 by Dubček but suppressed after his fall) ‘the Communist Party had won tremendous popularity and prestige, the people had spontaneously declared themselves for socialism’. That is perhaps a little hyperbolic, but it was not wildly out of line with contemporary opinion. And this, in turn, nourished a second illusion.

“If the people believed the Party could save Socialism from its history, so the Party leadership came to suppose that they could manage this without losing control of the country. A new government headed by Oldřich Černík was installed on April 18th and, encouraged by huge public demonstrations of affection and support (notably in the traditionally May Day celebrations), it relaxed virtually all formal controls on public expressions of opinion. On June 26th censorship of press and media was formally abolished. The same day it was announced that Czechoslovakia was to become a genuine federal state, comprising a Czech Socialist republic and a Slovak Socialist republic (that was the only one of Dubček’s reforms to survive the subsequent repression, becoming law on October 28th 1968).

“But having relaxed all control on opinion, the Communist leadership was now pressed from every side to pursue the logic of its actions. Why wait ten years for free and open elections? Now that censorship had been abolished, why retain formal control and ownership of the media? On June 27th Literárny Listy and other Czech publications carried a manifesto by Ludvík Vaculík, ‘Two Thousand Words’, addressed to ‘workers, farmers, officials, artists, scholars, scientists and technicians’. It called for the re-establishment of political parties, the formation of citizens’ committees to defend and advance the cause of reform, and other proposals to take the initiative for further change out of the control of the Party. The battle was not yet won, Vaculík warned: the reactionaries in the Party would fight to preserve their privileges and there was even talk of ‘foreign forces intervening in our development’. The people needed to strengthen the arm of the Communists’ own reformers by pressing them to move forward even faster.

“Dubček rejected Vaculík’s manifesto and its implication that the Communists should abandon their monopoly of power. As a lifelong Communist he would not countenance this crucial qualitative shift (‘bourgeois pluralism’) and anyway saw no need to do so. For Dubček the Pary itself was the only appropriate vehicle for radical change if the vital attributes of a Socialist system were to be preserved. But as Vaculík’s manifesto made cruelly clear, the Party’s popularity and its credibility would increasingly rest upon its willingness to pursue changes that might ultimately drive it from power. The fault line between a Communist state and an open society was now fully exposed.

“And this, in turn, directed national attention in the summer of 1968 to the third illusion, the most dangerous of all: Dubček’s conviction that he could keep Moscow at bay, that he would succeed in assuring his Soviet comrades that they had nothing to fear from events in Czechoslovakia – indeed, that
they had everything to gain from the newfound popularity of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and the renewed faith in a rejuvenated socialist project. If Dubček made this mortal miscalculation it was above all because the Czech reformers had crucially misinterpreted the lesson of 1956. Imre Nagy’s mistake, they thought, had been his departure from the Warsaw Pact and declaration of Hungarian neutrality. So long as Czechoslovakia stayed firmly in the Pact and unambiguously allied to Moscow, Leonid Brezhnev and his colleagues would surely leave them alone.

“But by 1968, the Soviet Union was worried less about military security than the Party’s loss of monopoly control...”415

And so to the tragic denouement... Brezhnev hesitated, knowing the unpopularity this would bring to his regime. But the decision was finally made, and on August 21, Soviet tanks invaded the country, restoring “normality” – that is, unformed Communism - at the barrel of a gun.

“The Kremlin had made its point – that fraternal socialist states had only limited sovereignty and that any lapse in the Party’s monopoly of power might trigger military intervention. Unpopularity at home or abroad was a small price to pay for the stability that this would henceforth ensure. After 1968, the security of the Soviet zone was firmly underwritten by a renewed appreciation of Moscow’s willingness to resort to force if necessary. But never again – and this was the true lesson of 1968, first for the Czechs but in due course for everyone else – never again would it be possible to maintain that Communism rested on popular consent, or the legitimacy of a reformed Party, or even the lessons of history...

“The illusion that Communism was reformable, that Stalinism had been a wrong turning, a mistake that could still be corrected, that the core ideals of democratic pluralism might somehow still be compatible with the structures of Marxist collectivism, that illusion was crushed under the tanks on August 21 1968 and it never recovered. Alexander Dubček and his Action Program were not a beginning but an end. Never again would radicals or reformers look to the ruling Party to carry their aspirations or adopt their projects. Communism in Eastern Europe staggered on, sustained by an unlikely alliance of foreign loans and Russian bayonets: the rotting carcass was finally carried away only in 1989. But the soul of Communism had died twenty years before: in Prague, in August 1968...”416

“The Soviet tanks rolling into Czechoslovakia,” writes Revel, “failed to open De Gaulle’s eyes to the nature of communism and the Soviet system. He attributed that ‘accident en route’ to the ‘policy of blocs’ and the damage done by the ‘Yalta agreements’, thus again displaying his ignorance of just what those agreements were, since the Czech question was not touched on at Yalta.
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His dream of a Europe in harmony ‘from the Atlantic to the Urals’ seemed no more unlikely to him after the Red Army occupied Prague than it had before. ‘Let us guard against excessive language,’ the general said at a French cabinet meeting on August 24. ‘Sooner or later, Russian will return [to its old ways]…. We must build Europe. We can construct something with the Six [of the original Common Market], even build a political organization. We cannot build Europe without Warsaw, without Budapest, and without Moscow.’

“All the future illusions and surrenders in détente are contained in that statement: De Gaulle’s acceptance of Moscow’s fait accompli, his unwillingness to consider sanctions to punish a crime against freedom, his de facto alliance with Soviet imperialism, which he forgave all sins. Add to this his lack of understanding of Communist reality, in short, his incompetence and his blind trust in the Soviet Government’s desire and ability to become part of a harmonious and homogeneous Europe – which, be it noted, General de Gaulle thought Britain had no right to join!”

De Gaulle died in 1970. He had built his career on rudeness and treachery to Anglo-Saxons who had helped him, and friendship to Soviets who wanted to destroy his nation. In the end he had no answer to the Maoist youth who humiliated him, or to the tanks that rolled into Prague for the second time in thirty years...

---
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32. THE LIFTING OF THE ANATHEMAS

The process of creeping anti-authoritarianism and anti-traditionalism that we have observed in western political and social life was also taking place in religious life. This was manifest above all in the ecumenical movement, which, as we have seen, began to gather pace with the Second Vatican Council and the entry of the Moscow Patriarchate (at the behest of the KGB) into the World Council of Churches in 1961. The chief defenders of Orthodoxy remained ROCOR, the Catacomb Church, and the Greek and Romanian Old Calendarists.

On May 14/27, 1964, ROCOR’s Metropolitan Anastasy retired (he died in 1965). There were two candidates for the vacant post, Archbishops Nicon and John Maximovich, but the animosity between their two sets of supporters was so great that, to avoid a schism, Archbishop John withdrew his own candidature and put forward in his place the youngest bishop, Philaret (Voznesensky) of Brisbane. In fact, Fr. Christopher Birchall writes that Philaret’s election was “entirely due to the prompting and influence of Archbishop John”.

The suggestion was then universally accepted, and Bishop Philaret was enthroned by Metropolitan Anastasy himself in a service that used the ancient text for the enthroning of a metropolitan of Moscow for the first time in centuries.

The new metropolitan’s endurance of torture for Christ at the hands of the Japanese pagans in Manchuria has already been described. During the Soviet occupation he continued to show great courage, refusing to accept a Soviet passport or commemorate the authorities, although he unwillingly found himself in the Moscow Patriarchate. Later, the Chinese even unsuccessfully tried to blow up the confessor in the house in which he was living.

Archimandrite Philaret left China in 1961, only after almost the whole of his flock had left Harbin. “While striving to guard my flock from Soviet falsehood and lies,” he recounted, “I myself sometimes felt inexpressibly oppressed – to the point that I several times came close to the decision to leave altogether – to cease serving. And I was stopped only by the thought of my flock: how could I leave these little ones? If I went and stopped serving, that would mean that they would have to enter into service to the Soviets and hear prayers for the forerunners of the Antichrist – ‘Lord, preserve them for many years,’ etc. This stopped me and forced me to carry out my duty to the end.

“And when, finally, with the help of God I managed to extract myself from red China, the first thing I did was turn to the First Hierarch of the Russian Church Abroad, Metropolitan Anastasy, with a request that he consider me again to be in the jurisdiction of the Russian Church Abroad. Vladyka Metropolitan replied
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with mercy and love, and immediately blessed me to serve in Hong Kong already as a priest of the Synodal jurisdiction, and pointed out that every church server passing into this jurisdiction from the jurisdiction of Moscow must give a special penitential declaration to the effect that he is sorry about his (albeit involuntary) stay in the Moscow jurisdiction. I did this immediately."

Soon Fr. Philaret flew to Australia and arrived in Sydney. The ruling Archbishop of Australia accepted him with joy and love, and already in the first weeks of Fr. Philaret’s stay in Australia began to speak about the possibility of ordaining him as a Bishop. In 1963 he was ordained Bishop of Brisbane, a vicariate of the Australian diocese. In his sermon at his nomination as Bishop Archimandrite Philaret said to the Archpastors who were present:

“Holy Hierarchs of God! I have thought and felt much in these last days, I have reviewed and examined the whole of my life – and… I see, on the one hand, a chain of innumerable benefactions from God, and on the other – the countless number of my sins… And so raise your hierarchical prayers for my wretchedness in this truly terrible hour of my ordination, that the Lord, the First of Pastors, Who through your holiness is calling me to the height of this service, may not deprive me, the sinful and wretched one, of a place and lot among His chosen ones…

“One hierarch-elder, on placing the hierarchical staff in the hands of a newly appointed bishop, said to him: ‘Do not be like a milestone on the way, that points out for others the road ahead, but itself remains in its place…’ Pray also for this, Fathers and Archpastors, that in preaching to others, I myself may not turn out to be an idle slave.”

The new metropolitan faced a daunting task. On the one hand, he had to lead his Church in decisively denouncing the apostasy of World Orthodoxy, communion with which could no longer be tolerated. And on the other, he had to preserve unity in his own Synod, some of whom were in spirit closer to “World Orthodoxy” than True Orthodoxy… He continued the tough anti-communist line adopted by Metropolitan Anastasy. But it was above all for his zeal against the ecumenist hierarchs of the West that Metropolitan Philaret would become especially renowned…

Since the founding of the World Council of Churches in 1948, the leader of the ecumenical movement on the Orthodox side had been the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras. The key figure on the Catholic side was Pope John XXIII, who early in the 1960s convened the three-year Vatican II Council, which thrust forward an ecumenist agenda. “One of the council’s key documents, Unitatis Redintegratio (Restoration of Unity), issued in 1964, identified “restoration of unity among all Christians” as a key long-term goal. The document described baptized Christians who profess faith in another church as “separated brethren”, not as “heretics”, the term commonly used for centuries prior.”

---

Olga Chetverikova writes: “Setting as one of its central aims the leadership of Catholicism in the movement for Christian unity, the Council formulated its own ecumenical conception, as an alternative to the way of the Protestants, which allowed it to open itself out to dialogue to other religions, while keeping untouched its position on the power of the pontiff. In the dogmatic constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium), it was affirmed that the Church of Christ, ‘established and constructed in this world as a community remains in the Catholic Church ruled by the successor of Peter and the bishops in communion with him’, but now it was added that ‘even outside her membership there exist many principles of sanctification and truth, which, being gifts, are proper to the Church of Christ, and propel towards Catholic unity’. Thus the Council defined two basic points in its relations with other churches. It affirmed that it was possible to receive ‘the whole fullness of means of salvation’ only through the Catholic Church, but at the same time it recognized that other ecclesiastical communities, linked to her by virtue of baptism, ‘can, in different ways, corresponding to the particular situation of each church or community, truly engender the life of grace’, and ‘they are capable of opening access to saving communion’. Although the latter ‘suffer from certain faults, nevertheless they are endowed with significance and weight in the mystery of salvation’. The main reversal in ecumenical consciousness consisted in the conclusion that ‘those who believe in Christ and have been baptized in the right manner are in definite communion with the Catholic Church, albeit not complete, while full communion is possible only with the recognition of the power of the successor of Peter, that is, the Pontiff of Rome.’”

The new ecumenist course was sealed on January 5 and 6, 1964, when Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople met in Jerusalem and prayed together. This was a clear transgression of Apostolic canon 45 concerning relations with heretics. Archbishop Chrysostom of Athens said: “While the Pope is going to the Holy Land to kneel before the Saviour’s sepulchre, you (Athenagoras) are going to kneel before the Pope and bury Orthodoxy.”

On January 23 / February 5, 1964 a large number of Athonite monks, including the abbots of four monasteries, protested against this ecumenical activity: “the undersigned Fathers of the Holy Mountain, abbots, priest-monks and monks, learning of the recent machinations and plots against our blameless Orthodox Faith by the Papal insurrection and of the pro-uniate actions and statements of the Ecumenical Patriarch and his co-workers, do proclaim with a stentorian voice that we denounce these uniate tendencies and leanings, and remains steadfast and unshaken in our Orthodox Faith...” Unfortunately, however, this “stentorian voice” became more and more muted, until only the

420 Chetverikova, Izmena v Vatikane ili Zagovor Pap protiv Khristianstva (Betrayal in the Vatican, or the Conspiracy of the Popes against Christianity), Moscow, 2011, p. 35.
Monastery of Esphigmenou remained out of communion with the Ecumenical Patriarchate...

The calendar question again reared its head during this period. Thus during the Second Pan-Orthodox Conference, the Church of Greece had threatened to boycott the meeting if the calendar question were raised. “But the representatives of the Jerusalem Patriarchate,” writes Bishop Ephraim, “insisted that the calendar be placed upon the agenda for discussion, and with good reason. The Jerusalem Patriarchate is especially interested in settling the calendar issue because of its position as a place of pilgrimage. When Athenagoras met Pope Paul in Jerusalem, he went afterwards to Bethlehem to attend the service for Christmas (which, of course, is celebrated there according to the Old Calendar). In the meantime, the new calendarists were celebrating Epiphany in Constantinople. By the time Athenagoras returned to Istanbul, Epiphany had already been celebrated. In other words, Athenagoras himself, because of this calendar confusion, celebrated two Christmases but did not celebrate Epiphany that year. Also, many pious pilgrims came from Greece to celebrate Christmas in Bethlehem, not knowing that the Jerusalem Patriarchate follows the Old Calendar... They arrive in Bethlehem and discover that it is only St. Spyridon’s day and that Christmas is two weeks away. They have only arranged to stay for a few days, and few are those who have made the provisions or have the money to wait for two weeks. In their dismay, they beg the priests there to chant a few Christmas troparia and, of course, the priests refuse, because not only is it not Christmas according to their reckoning, but they are also in the midst of the fast. The pilgrims return to Greece confused and disheartened since they did not get to celebrate Christmas, even in Bethlehem, and Christmas has already been celebrated in Greece. Therefore, that year they do not celebrate Christmas anywhere. This happens annually there – hence Jerusalem’s concern.”

“Immediately after the Holy Land meeting,” writes Fr. George Macris, “a proclamation of the whole monastic community of Mount Athos to ‘the pious Orthodox Greek people and the whole of the Orthodox Church’ denounced the ‘pro-uniate actions and statements’ of the Patriarch and his co-workers.”

In 1964 several parishes in the USA, Canada and Australia left the Ecumenical Patriarchate, complaining of the dependence of the patriarchate on the Turks, the rapprochement with the Catholics, and the dictatorial behaviour of Archbishop James. The Turks promptly increased their harassment of the Patriarchate in Constantinople; much property was confiscated, and 15,000 Greeks were deported. This led some to speculate that the Patriarch’s rapprochement with the Pope was elicited by his need to find powerful friends to support him in the West. Thus in April, 1965, Archbishop James pleaded with the Pope to help the
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Patriarch, as in 1274 and 1438. The Pope promised his support, whereupon the two hierarchs prayed together.

Further intense activity led, on December 7, 1965, to the “lifting of the anathemas” of 1054 between Orthodoxy and the Papacy. The announcement was made simultaneously in Rome and Constantinople. It included the following words: “Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras I with his synod, in common agreement, declare that: a) They regret the offensive words, the reproaches without foundation, and the reprehensible gestures which, on both sides, have marked or accompanied the sad events of this period [viz. in the 11th century]. b) They likewise regret and remove both from memory and from the midst of the Church the sentences of excommunication which followed these events, the memory of which has influenced actions up to our day and has hindered closer relations in charity; and they commit these excommunications to oblivion. We must recognize that the sentences were directed at particular persons and not at the Churches, and did not aim to break ecclesiastical communion between the sees of Rome and Constantinople.”

“In short,” writes Peter Hebblethwaite in his biography of Paul VI, “1054 had been an accident, much ado about nothing very much, frozen into permanent schism only by later ‘non-theological’ events.”

The Tomos was historically inaccurate: both sees recognized in 1054 that a break in ecclesiastical communion had taken place between them; this is an historical fact that cannot be denied. Moreover, in saying that the schism of 1054 was based on “reproaches without foundation”, the Patriarch was in effect saying that the Papacy was not, or never had been, heretical – although the Papacy had renounced none of its heresies, and Pope Paul VI had reasserted papal infallibility as recently as the Second Vatican Council. Thirdly, while relations with excommunicated individuals or Churches can be restored if those individuals or Churches repent, anathemas against heresies cannot be removed insofar as a heresy remains a heresy forever. And yet in December of 1968 Athenagoras announced that he had inserted Pope Paul VI’s name into the Diptychs, thereby signifying that the Pope was not a heretic and was in communion with the Orthodox Church. And he made the following formal renunciation of True Christianity: “We must pray and struggle that Jerusalem becomes a place of dialogue and peace. So that together we may prepare the way for the return of Jesus, the Mahdi of Islam, the Moshiach [Messiah] of Israel, our Lord”.

Archbishop Chrysostom of Athens protested the Patriarch’s action, but other Greek Churches supported him. Thus in March, 1966 the Synod of the new calendarist Church of Cyprus approved the lifting of anathemas.

---

ROCOR had three observers at the Vatican Council who witnessed the ceremony of the “lifting of the anathemas”. One of them, Archimandrite Ambrose (Pogodin), after describing the ceremony with evident sympathy, wrote: “The Russian Church Abroad did not recognize the actions of Patriarch Athenagoras, considering that the patriarch was obliged to do this only with the agreement of all the Orthodox Churches, because the matter of the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches concerned all the Orthodox Churches – it was not only the personal relations between the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople. We, observers from the Russian Church Abroad, received by telephone the order from our ecclesiastical authorities not to be present at the ceremony of the mutual lifting of the anathemas between the Constantinopolitan and Roman Churches. But we, having taken counsel amongst ourselves, thought that such a demonstration would have been harmful for our Church, which we represented with dignity. However, our demonstration would have remained unnoticed: what would the absence of three people in a mass of tens of thousands of people signify?!”

At this critical moment, on December 15, 1965, Metropolitan Philaret issued the first of a series of “Sorrowful Epistles” designed to warn the Orthodox against ecumenism. First, he wrote to Patriarch Athenagoras protesting against his action: “The organic belonging of the Orthodox to the union of the contemporary heretics does not sanctify the latter, while it tears away the Orthodox entering into it from Catholic Orthodox Unity… Your gesture puts a sign of equality between error and truth. For centuries all the Orthodox Churches believed with good reasons that it has violated no doctrine of the Holy Ecumenical Councils; whereas the Church of Rome has introduced a number of innovations in its dogmatic teaching. The more such innovations were introduced, the deeper was to become the separation between the East and the West. The doctrinal deviations of Rome in the eleventh century did not yet contain the errors that were added later. Therefore the cancellation of the mutual excommunication of 1054 could have been of meaning at that time, but now it is only evidence of indifference in regard to the most important errors, namely new doctrines foreign to the ancient Church, of which some, having been exposed by St. Mark of Ephesus, were the reason why the Church rejected the Union of Florence… No union of the Roman Church with us is possible until it renounces its new doctrines, and no communion in prayer can be restored with it without a decision of all the Churches, which, however, can hardly be possible before the liberation of the Church of Russia which at present has to live in the catacombs… A true dialogue implies an exchange of views with a possibility of persuading the participants to attain an agreement. As one can perceive from the Encyclical Ecclesiam Suam, Pope Paul VI understands the dialogue as a plan for our union with Rome with

---
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the help of some formula which would, however, leave unaltered its doctrines, and particularly its dogmatic doctrine about the position of the Pope in the Church. However, any compromise with error is foreign to the history of the Orthodox Church and to the essence of the Church. It could not bring a harmony in the confessions of the Faith, but only an illusory outward unity similar to the conciliation of dissident Protestant communities in the ecumenical movement.”

Tatiana (now Nun Cassia) Senina writes: “Metropolitan Philaret sent a similar address to another leader of the ecumenical movement – the American Archbishop James. However, the apostate hierarchs paid no attention to his exhortations. The ecumenical movement continued to gather speed. The holy Hierarch Philaret looked with sorrow on the falling away from the faith of the once Orthodox Churches. And he called the epistles which he sent to all the hierarchs of the Orthodox Church just that – ‘Sorrowful Epistles’. In his first Epistle, written in 1969, St. Philaret says that he has decided to turn to all the hierarchs, ‘some of whom occupy the oldest and most glorious sees’, because, in the words of St. Gregory the Theologian, ‘the truth is betrayed by silence’, and it is impossible to keep silent when you see a deviation from the purity of Orthodoxy – after all, every bishop at his ordination gives a promise to keep the Faith and the canons of the holy fathers and defend Orthodoxy from heresies. Vladyka quotes various ecumenist declarations of the World Council of Churches (WCC) and clearly shows, on the basis of the patristic teaching and the canons, that the position of the WCC has nothing in common with Orthodoxy, and consequently the Orthodox Churches must not participate in the work of this council. The holy Hierarch Philaret also emphasises that the voice of the MP is not the voice of the True Russian Church, which in the homeland is persecuted and hides in the catacombs. Vladyka calls on all the Orthodox hierarchs to stand up in defence of the purity of Orthodoxy.

“Vladyka Philaret wrote his second ‘Sorrowful Epistle’ on the Sunday of Orthodoxy, 1972. In it he noted that although in the last two years hierarchs had made declarations about the heterodoxy of the ecumenical movement, not one Orthodox Church had declared that it was leaving the WCC. Vladyka placed as the aim of his Second Epistle ‘to show that abyss of heresy against the very concept of the Church into which all the participants in the ecumenical movement are being drawn’. He recalled the threatening prophecy of the Apostle Paul that to those who will not receive ‘the love of the truth for salvation’ the Lord will send ‘strong delusion, that they should believe a lie. That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness’ (II Thessalonians 2.10-12). St. Philaret’s third Epistle was devoted to the so-called ‘Thyateira Confession’ of Metropolitan Athenagoras [of Thyateira and Great Britain], the exarch of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate in Europe – a document written in a completely heretical spirit, but which did not elicit any reaction from the leaders of the ‘official churches’. Evidently Vladyka Philaret hoped at the beginning that at any rate one of the bishops of ‘World Orthodoxy’ might listen to his words, which is why he addressed them in his epistles as true

Archpastors of the Church. Besides, attempts at exhortation corresponded to the apostolic command: ‘A man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself’ (Titus 3. 10-11). It was fitting, before accepting an anathema against the apostates, to try and convert them from their error.

“Alas, no conversion took place, and the ecumenical impiety continued to pour out. Vladyka addressed his word not only to bishops, but also to their flock, untiringly explaining the danger of the new heresy. While telling about the zeal of St. Nicholas the Wonderworker, who slapped the face of Arius when he blasphemed against the Son of God, Vladyka said: ‘O how often we do not have enough of such zeal when it is really necessary to speak for the insulted and trodden-on truth! I want to tell you about one incident that took place not long ago and which it would have been difficult even to imagine several years ago – and now we are going further and further downhill all the time. One man came from Paris and said that the following incident had taken place at a so-called “ecumenical meeting”. Of course, you know what ecumenism is; it is the heresy of heresies. It wants to completely wipe out the concept of the Orthodox Church as the guardian of the Truth, and to create some kind of new, strange church. And so there took place this ‘ecumenical meeting’. Present were a so-called Orthodox protopriest from the Paris Theological (more exactly, heretical) Institute, a Jewish rabbi, a pastor and a Catholic priest. At first they sort of prayed, and then began the speeches. And then (forgive me for saying such things from the holy ambon, but I want to show you what we have come to) the Jewish rabbi said that the Lord Jesus Christ was the illegitimate son of a dissolute woman…

“‘But that’s not the main horror. The Jewish people has opposed God for a long time… - so there’s nothing surprising in this. But the horror was that when he said this everyone was silent. Later, a man who had heard this terrible blasphemy asked the ‘Orthodox’ protopriest: ‘How could you keep silent?’ He replied: ‘I didn’t want to offend this Jew.’ It’s wrong to offend a Jew, but to insult the All-Pure Virgin Mary is permitted! Look at the state we have come to! How often does it happen to us all now that we do not have the zeal to stand up, when necessary, in defence of our holy things! The Orthodox cleric must zealously stand up against blasphemy, just as the holy Hierarch Nicholas stopped the mouth of the heretic… But now, unfortunately, we have become, as the saying goes, ‘shamefully indifferent to both the evil and the good’. And it is precisely in the soil of this indifference, of a kind of feeling of self-preservation, that the heresy of ecumenism has established itself – as also apostasy, that falling away which is becoming more and more evident… Let us remember, brethren, that Christian love embraces all in itself, is compassionate to all, wishes that all be saved and is sorry for, and merciful to, and love every creature of God; but where it sees a conscious assault on the truth it turns into fiery zeal which cannot bear any such blasphemy… And so must it always be, because every Orthodox Christian must always be zealous for God.”
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“Patriarch” Athenagoras expressed, perhaps better than any contemporary church leader, what ecumenism really means for its adherents. As Basil (now Bishop Gregory) Lourié writes: “Athenagoras … did not consider [the Latins] to be heretics. But his denial of their hereticalness was not the manifestation of a special love for them: Athenagoras did not recognise the existence of heresy in general! On hearing of a certain man who saw heresy everywhere, Athenagoras said: ‘I don’t see them anywhere! I see only truths, partial truths, reduced truths, truths that are sometimes out of place…”

“The teaching of the Church, of the Holy Fathers, is based on the rock of the confession of the fullness of the Truth incarnate in Christ, which is organically incapable of being mixed with lies. The ecumenists consciously choose the sand of ‘partial truths’ cemented by the lie of the denial of Christ as the true Son and Word of God.

“Why can Athenagoras and people like him, who are characterised by their own kind of deep faith, asceticism and even capacity for sacrifice, completely consciously go against, not simply individual Fathers, but even all of them taken together? Why have they come to the decision that certain decrees of the Fathers in relation to the Church and the dogmas may supposedly have lost their force in our time? There can only be one answer: their Orthodox faith was been mixed with certain tares, which have grown up and suffocated the shoots of Truth. The tares are faith in something about which the Lord did not announce to the Church. This is what we read in this connection in Athenagoras himself: ‘Palestine has again become the centre of the world… We must pray and struggle that Jerusalem may again become a place of dialogue and peace. So that we may together prepare the way for the return of Jesus, the Mahdi of Islam, the Messiah of Israel, our Lord.’ ‘In Jerusalem Abraham met Melchizedek, a priest of the Most High God, a mystical foreshadowing of the Word which is present in all peoples and in all religions.’ (This is how Athenagoras explains why he and the Roman Pope Paul VI decided to meet in Jerusalem.) The union with the Latins was seen by Athenagoras in connection with this coming advent of the person he called Jesus: ‘Unity may be attained unexpectedly, as is the case with everything great. As can happen with the return of Christ, Who, as He said, will come as a thief. Catholicism is now in a vortex. Everything is possible.’ Neither Athenagoras nor the other ecumenists refer to any other positions based on Church Tradition. And not surprisingly. The teaching of the Church foresees the union of all peoples, not around Christ, but around him whom the Jews call the Messiah, and the Muslims Mahdi [the Antichrist]. ‘When the Son of Man comes will He find faith on the earth?’ (Luke 18.8).

“But this Tradition of the Church has ceased to be of interest to them because they have accepted another: faith that some special age has dawned precisely now. If all the people of this age understand its content, they will turn out to be much more closely united with each other than with their co-religionists of previous ages. The people of this age are united by certain ‘pan-human’, as they put it, values of their own, values which are much more important to them than the heritage of the past, which disunites them. This is that age of which the
bearers of the so-called ‘Russian religious philosophy’ (particularly Soloviev, Berdyaev, Florensky and Bulgakov) became the heralds throughout the world. These people expressed in a pseudo-Christian language the idea of the coming of a ‘new age’ – the age of some new, post-New Testament ‘revelation of the Holy Spirit’, which would be given in the last times, and which they borrowed from occult teachings. (See, for example, the letter on the Holy Spirit in Florensky’s The Pillar and Ground of the Truth.) For these people there exists some kind of special ‘age of the Fathers’, which is already completely past. With it have also gone into the past the canons of the Fathers. In our time, instead of the Fathers there are those who have received the new revelation of the new age. And so for the Orthodox Church today ecumenism is not a particular problem which might pass some countries by. But at the same time it is only a particular case of a more widespread phenomenon – the placing of the whole of contemporary civilisation on a new principle of unity. It is on this principle that the universal religion which Hieromonk Seraphim Rose of blessed memory (+1982) called ‘the religion of the future’, the religion of the Antichrist, is being created at the present time.

“This principle is much more clearly formulated in various movements of the ‘New Age’ and Masonry type, while ecumenism is called to carry out only one particular task: force the entry into this new unity of such people as would wish to preserve their unity with traditional forms of religion. The Antichrist will have to satisfy everyone…”432

Hieromonk Seraphim wrote with regard to an article written by Archbishop James entitled “A New Epoch?”: “I suddenly felt that I had found an insight into the ‘essence of Iakovism’. Is it not, indeed, the basic heresy of chiliasm? What else, indeed, could justify such immense changes and monstrous perversions in Orthodoxy except the concept that we are entering entirely new historical circumstances, an entirely new kind of time, in which the concepts of the past are no longer relevant, but we must be guided by the voices of the new time? Does not Fr. Patrinacos, in past issues of the Orthodox Observer, justify Patriarch Athenagoras – not as a theologian, not as a traditionalist, but precisely as a prophet, as one whose heresies cannot be condemned because he already lives in the ‘new time’, ahead of his own times? Patriarch Athenagoras himself has been quoted as speaking of the coming of the ‘Third Age of the Holy Spirit’ – a clearly chiliasitic idea which has its chief recent champion in N. Berdyaev, and can be traced back directly to Joachim of Fiore, and indirectly to the Montanists. The whole idea of a ‘new age’, of course, penetrates every fiber of the last two centuries with their preoccupation with ‘progress’, and is the key idea of the very concept of Revolution (from French to Bolshevik), is the central idea of modern occultism (visible on the popular level in today’s talk of the ‘age of Aquarius’, the astrological post-Christian age), and has owed its spread probably chiefly to Freemasonry (there’s a Scottish Rite publication in America called ‘New Age’). (I regret to say that the whole philosophy is also present in the American dollar bill with its masonic heritage, with its novus ordo saeculorum and its unfinished

pyramid, awaiting the thirteenth stone on top!) In Christian terms, it is the philosophy of Antichrist, the one who will turn the world upside down and ‘change the times and seasons.’… And the whole concept of ecumenism is, of course, permeated with this heresy and the ‘refounding of the Church’.”

---

After 1945 the struggle to keep the Orthodox Church in the Balkans free from Communist control continued for a few years. But it eventually failed…

According to a report dated October 18, 1961 and prepared by the United States Senate’s Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, in 1950, on the death of Patriarch Gabriel of Serbia, the Communists “made certain that the new patriarch would be a ‘cooperative’ one, and forced the election of a weak man, Bishop Vikentije Prodanov, who became a manageable tool of communist propaganda.”

He was elected patriarch, as Hieroschemamonk (now Bishop) Akakije writes, “with heavy pressure from the secret police” and “by one episcopal vote only. Even though he was very obedient to the authorities, the newly chosen Patriarch Vikentije resisted some of Tito’s plans, for example, the forming of the Macedonian Church. So he didn’t last long on the patriarchal throne. He died eight years later.

“After Vikentije, the communists needed a completely loyal person, who would bring the Serbian Church in service to the atheist regime. Such a candidate they found in the person of the widowed priest Chranislav Djorič, who became a monk with the name German and in 1951 became Vikentije’s vicar-bishop. In the campaign electing German as patriarch, the communist regime did not hide its active participation. All the memories of the electing council were very thoroughly worked upon by the secret police. The boss of the Serbian secret police Milan Velić openly said to the members of the electoral council: ‘We want German to be chosen, and he will be chosen, whether you vote for him or not. We want in the person of the patriarch to have a safe and sound friend, and with Vikentije we were too credulous.’ Everyone received an envelope with money. One of the examples of various blackmailing and threats was Abbot Platon Mlevoyević of Studenitsa, to whom the bloody boss of the Belgrade secret police, Miloš Minić, came with one associate and told him he would be arrested for public immorality and misuse of money in selling the monastery’s woods unless he voted for German. The secret police claimed that they had all the proofs of all his weaknesses, having mistresses in the monastery, several children born outside wedlock, and so on.”

“Father Macarius, abbot of the famed Dechani Monastery, was given 200,000 dinars ($650) as payment for his coerced vote for Germanus. He came

---

back to his monastery after the election and threw the money at his monks, telling them that he ‘felt like Judas’.

“Many delegates to the Electorate were given a special pen and paper on which they were to cast their ballots, in order to show whether they had kept their promise to the agents of the Secret Police. (Two sworn statements by witnesses).”436

According to witnesses in the patriarch’s house, he had a party card. And when he was once accused of embezzling a very large sum of money and was threatened with a court trial, the Serbian equivalent of the KGB (UDBA) saved him and paid the money themselves. Thereafter he was completely “their man”.437 The Belgrade newspaper Telegraf recently confirmed that German was elected by UDBA.438

As Archimandrite Justin Popovich wrote in 1960: “… The atheist dictatorship has so far elected two patriarchs… And in this way it has cynically trampled on the holy rights of the Church, and thereby also on the holy dogmas.”439

In this period, the communists tried to break down the resistance of all those bishops who opposed them. In most cases they succeeded. But there were some exceptions. For example: “The Bishops’ quarters in Novi Sad, in which Bishop Irenaeus (Tsilits) of Bachka lived, became the target of ‘national rage’ – communist demonstrations that threw a large number of stones at the building with terrible exclamations. During a festal litiia in 1946 in one village, when the bishop came out from the church in full vestments, the organized communist crowd threw a number of stones at him. Being hit on the back of his head, Bishop Irenaeus fell on the ground. The raging crowd attacked the bishop, and the priest who was trying to defend him was stabbed by knives. Severely hurt, all covered in blood, his beard pulled out, his vestments torn, spat upon and insulted, Bishop Irenaeus was taken to Novi Sad during the night. As a consequence of these heavy wounds, he spent the rest of his life mostly in his sickbed.

“Metropolitan Nectarius was lynched by the communists. In August 1953 a group of about 150-250 communists (including some women) arrived unexpectedly in the monastery of Osren. They forced their way into the monastery guest-house, and uttering terrible words they came to the bishop’s cell, where they started to hit and push him until he fell to the ground. One of the women was pulling his beard. The calls for help of an old bishop, who
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was at that time 75 years old, were heard by nobody. They kept on tearing his ryasa, pushing and torturing him. Heavily wounded, he had to leave Tuzla, and go to Belgrade, where he lay in hospital for several months. Metropolitan Nectarius was the spine of the resistance to the communists in the Serbian Orthodox Church. Before the election of German as patriarch, the president of the socialist republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina – his name was Djuro Putsar, his nickname was “the old one” – said to Metropolitan Nectarius and Bishop Basil: ‘The two of you represent 80% of the Council, and if German is not elected, we know who is responsible.’ Metropolitan Nectarius called patriarch German ‘Judas’ son’.

“In 1944 Metropolitan Arsenije was condemned in Cetinje by the national court to ten-and-a-half years’ hard labour for anti-state activities because he did not carry out various requests made by the communists and because he said in his sermons that the Catholic Church did very evil things to Orthodox people. Together with him, seven old Montenegrin priests were condemned too. In 1960, due to serious illness, he was released at the age of 77. Rejected by all, his last days were spent with his daughter and son-in-law. He reposed, humiliated and persecuted by Patriarch German, whom he cursed on the last day of his life. Up to his last hour he rejected the communists and German. Even on his deathbed, the communists asked him to sign a statement by which he approved of the official policy of Patriarch German. Under the pressure of the communists, his funeral was conducted in secret.

“Bishop Vasilije was forced to leave Banja Luka by the communists. At his question whether there was any written document by the state authorities about his ban from Banja Luka, the communists answered: ‘The people does not give written decisions, and it does not make any such decisions. The people has the right to make such decisions, because it is above the authorities, and each authority originates from the people.’ After constant threats to lynch him, he decided to leave for Belgrade. On his way to the railway station, a lot of men and women ran after him, shouting: ‘You wanted it written, here it is written, you will get it from the people, who are waiting for you. Down with the bearded man! Down with the people’s enemies and the collaborators of the occupiers!’ One of them attacked the car and started to curse God. When the bishop had hardly reached the station, an even larger mass of people were waiting for him there. They started to throw tomatoes and stones at him, and when they had surrounded him completely they started to spit at him, pull his beard and hit his head and body. The police was present all the time, but did not react to this public violence. One communist sub-officer kept on getting close to his face, and saying: ‘We are materialists, we only believe in matter, and not in the immortality of the soul, as you priests teach. Confess that it is senseless. You collaborated with the occupiers, and you don’t want to collaborate with today’s authorities. That is why people are making you leave. Confess that you were wrong, and repent.’ He was so badly hurt that he twice fell on the ground. Then they dragged him over the railway line and tore his sleeveless coat and his mandiya. In the train all the passengers kept on insulting him, and as he sat by the window it was
broken from the outside. The reason for this lynching was his resistance to compromise with the godless authorities. Still, he couldn't withstand the communist tortures to the end, and under UDBA pressure he gave his support to Bishop German as candidate for patriarch.

“Bishop Varnava (Nastić) was condemned in 1948 by a communist court to ten years’ hard labour for the ‘crime of treason: he helped to weaken the economy and the military power of the state, he helped terrorist bands, he published enemy propaganda, and he was a spy for the Anglo-Americans.’ He suffered his punishment in Zenitsa jail. All the time he was in total isolation in a dark and damp cell under the greatest affliction of soul and body. The communists immediately cut his hair off and shaved his beard to humiliate him and make him a laughing-stock. They made him do the hardest jobs because they knew he was physically sensitive and weak in health. They starved him of food and water, tortured him with loneliness and deprived him of information from books or newspapers, with no communication with the outer world, just in order to break down his morale and subject him to their godless commands. In reply to all those tortures, he chanted church songs in his cell. Since no torture could break his spirit, the spirit of Bishop Varnava, the UDBA planned his so-called transfer in 1949 and arranged a traffic accident by crashing a locomotive into a parked, locked railway car in which he and a number of other political prisoners were bound. The impact was so powerful that out of a full car only eleven prisoners survived. Bishop Varnava was thrown through the window while tied together with a Catholic priest who died immediately as they fell. Bishop Varnava stayed alive, but both legs and one arm were broken. People from the train station and other trains ran to help, but police surrounded the car and would not allow anyone to come close to the wounded, and one policeman even turned an automatic gun against the people. One hour later, the UDBA came and took all the wounded to the city hospital nearby, where the doctors immediately started to help. Suddenly an UDBA man came back to the hospital and ordered the doctors to stop helping the wounded and to take them off the operating tables. The protests of the doctors were not considered. Bishop Varnava at that moment was on the operating table with a hole in his heel where a metal rod was to be inserted to help his broken leg heal. All the wounded were put in an army truck on wooden planks and they were driven at a horrific speed over very bad roads, so that two of them died during the trip. In 1960, after several transfers, from one prison to another, where he became severely ill, the much-suffering Bishop Varnava came to the end of his term of punishment. At that moment he submitted a plea to the Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church to be reactivated. Patriarch German did not take his plea before the Synod, but sent him a message: ‘It is necessary that you first regulate your relationship with the authorities’, which practically meant that he had to give a statement of loyalty to the communist regime. From that time the UDBA started to pressure him again. The boss of the religious section of the UDBA Milan Velić sent him a letter signed by about ten hierarchs recommending that he sign the statement of loyalty to the authorities and request that the Holy Synod retire him. Velić brought him the prepared text of
his statement, a very cunning document prepared by Bishop Vissarion Kostić in which, among other things, they asked him to praise Tito’s regime, be one with the official position of the Church and to fence himself off from the work of the emigration. When he strongly resisted, the UDBA officer told him: ‘That means you are condemning Patriarch German and the other bishops who have already given such statements.’ Bishop Varnava said: ‘Everybody shall answer before the Last Judgement for his deeds on earth.’ Then the UDBA officer said: ‘You think Patriarch German will answer before the Last Judgement?’ Bishop Varnava answered: ‘The first and the hardest!’

“When Patriarch Vikentije went to Moscow and laid flowers at the tomb of Lenin, Bishop Varnava under his full signature from prison sent a letter saying: ‘In whose name did you go, who did you represent, and who authorised you to put the flowers on the tomb of Lenin? From that wreath that you laid on Lenin’s tomb, take off one leaf in the name of the Serbian priesthood, one leaf in the name of Serbian bishops, one leaf in the name of the Serbian people, and the remaining six leaves will represent you and the members of your delegation.’ Because of this letter, the Hierarchical Synod gathered and pronounced him irresponsible and irrational. That was when his real spiritual torments began, because his brother hierarchs became his enemies. The notorious Bishop Vissarion led the systematic action against Bishop Varnava, who often used to say: ‘Being imprisoned by the communists was sweet for me, but now it is not the communists who are persecuting me, but my brother bishops.’ Lonely, and surrounded by the iron wall of the communist police, Bishop Varnava died in unexplained circumstances.

“During his ordination, on the Feast of the Transfiguration, 1947, in the Saborna church in Belgrade, the newly ordained Bishop Varnava uttered the following prophetic words: ‘When our Lord Jesus Christ sent his apostles into the world, he put before them sacrifice as the programme and way of their lives. And only readiness for apostolic sacrifice made the Galilaean fishermen receive apostolic honour. Lofty honour in the Church of Christ means lofty sacrifice. The Holy Hierarchical Council led by the Holy Spirit chose my unworthiness as bishop of the Church of Christ. By that choice they condemned me to the sacrifice of Christ’s Golgotha. And in condemning me to that highest sacrifice they gave me the loftiest honour that can be given to a mortal man. All I can say is that I shall gladly climb my Golgotha, and I shall never trade that honour for any other under the sun of God. The bishop’s position is a sacrifice on Golgotha because the bishop’s service is apostolic service, and to the apostles the Lord said: “The cup which I am drinking you will drink, and the baptism which I am being baptised with you will be baptised with” (Mark 10.39). And the cup which our Lord drank and the baptism with which he was baptized, what else could it be but the cup of Golgotha and the bloody baptism in His own Blood?... And that is why, though I know the weaknesses of the soul, I am not afraid that my leg will shatter on the road of Golgotha strewn with thorns that I am today undertaking. Even if it wanted to shatter, the light and the warmth of innumerable examples of Christ’s heroes will bring back to it firmness and
might.’ This sermon by Bishop Varnava was fulfilled completely through his much-suffering hierarchical service and struggle to defend Church freedom.

“This was the way they prepared the total collapse of the Serbian Church. First by removing unfitting [bishops], and then carefully choosing new bishops sympathetic to the regime, or at least those who would accept the new kind of situation. In the period after the war the existence of the Serbian Church depended on the way the patriarch and the bishops treated Tito’s regime. In the time of Metropolitan Joseph, the patriarchal locum tenens, the Church still, regardless of external persecution, enjoyed internal freedom, because his firm position, if we exclude his lukewarm and flexible position towards the MP, let everybody know that he would firmly hold to the Church canons. And he succeeded. Much more modest, but still firm, was the position displayed by Patriarch Gabriel. The two of them represented the last defence of Church freedom.

“As we have seen, after the death of Patriarch Gabriel, the situation in the Church became more difficult. Using the UDBA, the communists choose Vikentije as patriarch, who did many favours for them. In 1958 the act of the destruction of the Serbian Orthodox Church came to its end when the UDBA imposed as patriarch German, who was an absolutely submissive tool, accepted all the requests of the regime. The first big concessions to Tito were the act of forming the Macedonian Autocephalous Church and the blessing of the pro-communist association of priests (partisans), through which the possibility of total control of the Church was created. Patriarch German told the priesthood in Belgrade: ‘Whichever priest insults Tito, insults me.’ Really the position of the Serbian patriarchate was harder than at any time in its long-lasting history, because for the first time its patriarch and bishops joined the enemies of the Church. In the years after the war most of the Serbian bishops obviously had no ecclesiological consciousness, which is a confessing position of struggle for the purity of the Orthodox faith, which was best illustrated by the presence of the Serbian Church at the councils of Moscow in 1945 and 1948, as well as the fact that not a single bishop or clergyman – though many of them were against the communists and criticised the behaviour of Patriarchs Vikentije and German, - never thought of stopping communion with the red patriarch in Belgrade, which all this time was in full eucharistic communion with the new calendarists…”

From the time of the election of Patriarch German in 1958, and with the exception of a very few clergy, the communists were now in complete control of the Serbian Patriarchate. Archimandrite Justin Popovich wrote on the catastrophic situation of the Church at this time: “The Church is being gradually destroyed from within and without, ideologically and organizationally. All means are being used: known and unknown, open and secret, the most subtle and the most crude... And all this is skilfully dissolved, but in fact it is the most deadly of poisons with a sugar coating...

---

The most elementary and rudimentary logic demonstrates and proves: cooperation with open atheists, the cursed enemies of Christ and the Orthodox Church of Christ, is illogical and anti-logical. We ask those who seek such cooperation, or already cooperate, or – terrible thought! – compel others to cooperate, with the words of Christ: ‘What communion can there be between righteousness and lawlessness? Or what is there in common between light and darkness? What agreement can there be between Christ and Belial?’ (II Corinthians 6.14-15). Do you not hear the Christ-bearing Apostle, who thunders: ‘If we, or an angel from heaven begins to preach to you that which we have not preached to you, let him be anathema!’ (Galatians 1.8). Or have you, in the frenzy of the atheist dictatorship, gone completely deaf to the Divine truth and commandment of Christ: ‘You cannot serve God and Mammon’ (Matthew 6.24)?"  

The result of the subjection of the Serbian Church to the communists was predictable: “an alarming tendency on the part of the hierarchy of the ‘Mother Church’ to abandon true Orthodoxy and embrace heresy... the worst heresy that has ever assaulted the Orthodox Church – the heresy of ‘ecumenism’.”

In 1965 the Serbian Church entered the World Council of Churches. In September, 1966, two inter-Orthodox Commissions were established in Belgrade to negotiate with the Anglicans and the Old Catholics. In 1967 Patriarch German said to the Roman Catholic bishop of Mostar: “The times are such that our sister Churches have to lean on each other, to turn away from that which divided us and to concentrate on all that we have in common.” The next year he recognized Catholic marriages, and became one of the presidents of the WCC. In 1985, at a nuns’ conference, he welcomed two Catholic bishops “with special honour” into the sanctuary, and then all the conference members (Orthodox, Catholics and Protestants) recited the Creed together in the Liturgy. In 1971 he signed the following WCC statement in Geneva: “The powerful Breath of renewal will blow into the mighty arena of the Church, as well as into each of her communities; for these are not simple administrative units, but they all constitute
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443 Joachim Wertz has provided another possible motive for the Serbian Church’s entry into the WCC. He considers that ‘the main ‘practical’ reason why the Serbian Orthodox Church joined the WCC was that that body would provide the Serbian Church with visibility in the West and thus forestall any liquidation of the Church by Tito. Also the WCC would contribute to the rebuilding of many of the churches destroyed by the Croatian Ustasha in WWII. The rebuilding of these Churches was very high on the agenda of the Serbian Church. The Croatians wanted to erase the presence of Orthodoxy. The Serbian Church felt it imperative to bring back that presence and VISIBILITY. Similarly the WCC, and individual Western protestant Churches contributed to the building of the new Theological Faculty in the Karaburma section of Belgrade. This can be viewed as a posthumous slap in the face of Tito, who forbade the construction of any church in that neighborhood. He wanted it to be an ideal progressive, socialist community of ugly high rise apartments with no trace of the Church.” (“Re: [orthodox-synod] Strange letter”, orthodox-synod@yahoogroups.com, 26 February, 2003).  
a part of the one great Christian Church.”

Patriarch German liked to justify his ecumenism by quoting the Serbian proverb: Drvo se na drvo naslanja; a čovek na čoveka – “Tree leans on tree and man on man.” But the Free Serbs had an answer to this. “We can also quote the proverbs of our people: S’kim si, onaki si. – ‘You are like those with whom you associate.’ If you find your fellowship with heretics, you begin to share their erroneous thinking and eventually become a heretic. As an American proverb goes: ‘Birds of a feather flock together.’”

Commenting on the decision of the Orthodox Churches to become “organic members” of the WCC, Fr. Justin wrote: “Every true Orthodox Christian, who is instructed under the guidance of the Holy Fathers, is overcome with shame when he reads that the Orthodox members of the Fifth Pan-Orthodox Conference in Geneva [in June, 1968]... on the question of the participation of the Orthodox in the work of the World Council of Churches, considered it necessary ‘to declare that the Orthodox Church considers itself to be an organic part of the World Council of Churches.’

“This assertion is apocalyptically horrifying in its un-orthodoxy and anti-orthodoxy. Was it necessary for the Orthodox Church, that most holy Body of the God-Man Christ, to become so debased to such a pitiful degree that its theological representatives – some of whom were Serbian bishops – have begun to beg for ‘organic’ participation and membership in the World Council of Churches, which will supposedly become a new ‘Body’ and a new ‘Church’, which will stand above all other churches, in which the Orthodox Churches and the non-orthodox churches will appear only as parts. God forbid! Never before has there been such a betrayal and abandonment of our holy Faith!

“We are renouncing the Orthodox Faith of the God-Man Christ, and organic ties with the God-Man and His Most Holy Body: we are repudiating the Orthodox Church of the holy apostles, the Fathers, and the Ecumenical Councils – and we wish to become ‘organic members’ of a heretical, humanistic, humanized and man-worshipping club, which consists of 263 heresies – every one of which is a spiritual death.

“As Orthodox Christians we are ‘members of Christ.’ ‘Shall I therefore take the members of Christ and make them members of a prostitute?’ (I Corinthians 6.15). We are doing this by our organic union with the World Council of Churches, which is nothing other than the rebirth of atheistic man, of pagan idolatry.

“The time has finally come for the patristic Orthodox Church of Saint Sabbas, the Church of the holy apostles and Fathers, of the holy confessors, martyrs and new-martyrs, to stop mingling ecclesiastically and hierarchically with the so-called ‘World Council of Churches’, and to cast off forever any participation in joint prayer or services, and to renounce general participation in any ecclesiastical
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dealings whatsoever, which are not self-contained and do not express the unique and unchangeable character of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church – the Orthodox Church – the only true Church that has ever existed.”

ROCOR’s attitude towards the Serbian Church now began to change. Thus on September 14/27, 1967, Archbishop Averky of Jordanville wrote to Metropolitan Philaret: “With regard to the question of the Serbian Church, whose Patriarch German is a stooge of the communist Tito, as the Serbs themselves are convinced, calling him ‘the red patriarch’. We have heard this from many clergy and laity who have fled from Serbia. How can we recognize, and have communion in prayer with, ‘the red patriarch’, who maintains the closest friendly relations with red Moscow? Cannot our Hierarchical Council make erroneous decisions? Do we in the Orthodox Church have a doctrine about the infallibility of every Council of Bishops?”

Archbishop Averky’s attitude to the Serbs was confirmed by the ROCOR Council of Bishops in 1967, which resolved to annul the resolution of the Council of Bishops in 1964 on the preservation of prayerful communion with the hierarchy of the Serbian Orthodox Church.

Metropolitan Agathangel (Pashkovsky) of New York writes: “Already on May 19 / June 1, 1967 the following resolution marked “Top Secret” was accepted by our Hierarchical Council in connection with [the Serbian Church’s] ecumenical activity: ‘In addition to the resolution of the present Council of Bishops on relations with the Serbian Orthodox church, the suggestion of his Eminence the First Hierarch and President of the Council of Bishops Metropolitan Philaret has been accepted and confirmed, that all the Reverend Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad should refrain from concelebration with the hierarchy of the Serbian Orthodox Church.’ As far as I know, this resolution has never been repealed in a council.” Early in 1970, Metropolitan Philaret of New York announced to the members of the ROCOR Synod that since the Serbian Patriarch German had chosen to serve as Chairman of the World Council of Churches, ROCOR should avoid joint prayer and service with him, while at the same time not making a major demonstration of the fact.

Nevertheless, communion with the Serbs continued. For many hierarchs and priests of ROCOR had been brought up in Serbia, and out of gratitude felt that the Serbs should not be condemned or excommunicated. To what extent this attitude was truly motivated by gratitude, and to what extent simply by fear of ROCOR’s losing its last friends in “World Orthodoxy”, is a moot point. In any case, it was contrary to the canons of the Church, which require the breaking of communion with all those in communion with heresy. Such an act would have been truly loving, for true love for the Serbs dictated that it should be pointed out

---
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to them into what an abyss their ecumenism was leading them, an exhortation which would have acquired greater weight by a full break in communion...

Did any of the Serbs break from the now definitely heretical patriarchate? Inside Serbia, nobody broke completely, although in 1971 Archimandrite Justin broke off relations with the patriarch, while retaining contact with the other bishops. In the Serbian emigration, there was a bigger rebellion in 1963, when Germanus and his Synod decided to divide the diocese of Bishop Dionysius of America and Canada into three. Claiming to see in this a communist plot, Dionysius refused to accept the decision, made his diocese autonomous and broke communion with the patriarch and his synod. On March 27, 1964 the Serbian Synod defrocked Dionysius. Then three pro-Belgrade priests were ordained bishops -in his place. Dionysius and his supporters refused to recognize these acts, for which the patriarchate condemned them as graceless schismatics.

However, this rebellion was not all that it seemed. Fr. Joseph of Avila writes: “In 1963 the American-Canadian diocese left the patriarchate of Belgrade. The American-Canadian diocese headed by Bishop Dionisije (Milivojević) belonged to the Serbian Church in the United States. Besides Bishop Dionisije, since 1946 in the US there lived the Serbian Bishop Nikolai Velimirović. Several years after the war, he was active in events in the Serbian emigration in the USA, he was rector of the theological school at Libertyville, and associate lecturer at the Academy of St. Vladimir and at the theological school in Holy Trinity monastery in Jordanville. In the 50s Bishop Nikolai withdrew from public life and he started living in the Russian monastery of St. Tikhon in Pennsylvania, where in the monastery theological school he lectured Pastoral and Dogmatic Theology and Homiletics, and later in 1955 he became rector of the theological school.

“Several Serbs at that time went to the Russian Church Abroad, among them former judge of the church court of the diocese of Žiča Jovan Saračević. Under the name of Savva he was made a monk by Archbishop Leonty of Chile, was ordained as hieromonk in Argentina and later was chosen as a bishop of ROCOR in Edmonton, Canada.

“At the beginning of the 1950s, because of the bad situation in the Serbian Church, Michael Tošović joined the Russian Church Abroad. He was one of the important people in Serbian True Orthodoxy. In the year 1952 he was chosen as teacher and lecturer of the Holy Bible and Greek language in the Russian seminary of Holy Trinity in Jordanville. In Jordanville he became a monk with the name Arsenije. Later he became a hieromonk and after that an archimandrite. In the middle of the 50s, with the blessing of Metropolitan Anastassy, he began to publish the theological journal, Srpski misionar, in which he revealed the falling away of the Serbian Church, the Moscow Patriarchate and World Orthodoxy. Fr. Arsenije tried to convince the Serbs that since the Serbian patriarchate was

---
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enslaved by the communists, it was necessary to separate from the patriarchate and was in favour of founding a Serbian Church Abroad like the Russian Church Abroad.451 Bishop Nikolai Velimirović supported this idea of Fr. Arsenije, but in 1956 he reposed. Bishop Nikolai died under very suspicious circumstances, and there is very serious supposition that he was killed.452

“In 1963 the American-Canadian diocese with Bishop Dionisije left the Serbian patriarchate. The direct cause for the split was Bishop Dionisije’s suspension in May, 1963 because of moral and disciplinary transgressions. Dionisije claimed that he was suspended because he was anti-communist and that all the accusations were made up by the communist authorities, who were aiming to remove him and enslave the Serbian Church in the States using bishops loyal to the communists.

“In August, 1963 the clergy-laity assembly of the American-Canadian diocese refused obedience to the Serbian patriarchate. The followers of Dionisije claimed that the guilt of their bishop was invented, and they themselves brought up several accusations against the patriarchate, such as accepting Patriarch German from the communist authorities and his submission to those authorities, the foundation of the Macedonian Orthodox Church, the splitting of the American-Canadian diocese into three parts and the enthroning of three new bishops, all at the orders of the communists, as well as the accusations that the new bishops were loyal to the communists, etc.

“Although most of the accusations against the patriarchate were well-founded, and for that reason Dionisije had more than enough reasons to separate, many facts indicate that his sincerity was questionable.

“In 1963 Djoko Slijepčević, a Church historian with an anti-communist orientation, but at the same time the follower of Patriarch German, wrote: ‘Dionisije is trying to defend himself by his anti-communism, which was quite problematic for a long time, and later nothing else but a pile of empty phrases. What is really anti-communist about Bishop Dionisije?’ On June 28, 1962, Srpska Borba, Bishop Dionisije’s main ally and defender today, stated several of his ‘anti-communist’ slips. These are: in his article on November 7, 1957 but published in Amerikansky Srbobran on January 16, 1959, Bishop Dionisije was telling the chetniks about Karl Marx’s example of unity. The newspaper Srpska Borba explains: ‘Maybe there is some logic in this act of Bishop Dionisije, because even the manner in which he led the action for a ‘Serbian gathering’ and the ideas that he disclosed in his article on the foundation of the Association of Ravnogortsy, really are much closer to Karl Marx and his proletarians than to the holy things and interests of the Serbian nation and Serbian Orthodox Church.
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“It could be said that in this case Bishop Dionisije was a victim of confusion both in a logical and an ideological sense: he was confused, but later ‘he gained his eyesight and found the right way’. The facts tell a completely different story: Bishop Dionisije sent his regards to Stalin, praised and glorified Tito and his People’s Liberation Army, and of course was for a long time on the payroll of Tito’s embassy in New York.

"‘Glas Kanadskikh Srba twice, on July 25 and September 12, 1963, openly stated that Bishop Dionisije ‘in the autumn of 1944 through Dr. Šubšić greeted Marshal Tito and his courageous People’s Liberation Army in a telegram. He was on the payroll of the Yugoslav communist embassy in Washington until the leaders of Serb nationality in the US promised that they would give him financial support. He was the only one of the Serbian bishops who, on October 23, 1958, delightedly greeted the foundation of the Macedonian Orthodox Church as ‘a grand act and very useful for our Church’ (Glas Kanadskikh Srba, September 12, 1963).

"‘In the same article in which he revealed this opinion, and which is entitled ‘His Holiness Kir German, the fifth patriarch of the renewed patriarchate of Peć’ (Glas Kanadskikh Srba, October 23, 1958) Bishop Dionisije had this to say in trying to praise the new patriarch: ‘The first great act of the new patriarch, which is perhaps of ultimate importance for the whole of the Serbian Orthodox Church, was the satisfactory solution of the question of the so-called Macedonian Church’. At that time, Bishop Dionisije had not the slightest doubt as regards the regularity of the election of Patriarch German, because he wrote this as well: ‘And so the Holy Spirit and the electoral council of the Serbian Orthodox Church has decided that on the throne of the Serbian patriarchs should come Bishop German of Žiča, indisputably a very capable and gifted man, active and full of every virtue’ (Glas Kanadskikh Srba, October 23, 1958).”

"Slobodan Drašković, who in 1963 was one of the main followers of Dionisije and played a major role in the National Church Council of the American-Canadian diocese at which this diocese decided to disobey the patriarch, wrote in 1967: ‘There is no need to talk a lot about Bishop Dionisije. His policy, not only until May, 1963, but later as well, was marked by a policy of co-existence with the hierarchy of the enslaved and enchained Orthodox Church in Yugoslavia, in contrast with the very clear and strong decisions of the National Church Council. On March 1966, after almost four years of struggle against the Joseph Broz’s Patriarch German, he complained against German to the notorious Soviet agent, the ‘Russian Patriarch’ Alexis, and sought justice from him.’

"The fact that Dionisije split from the Church only for personal reasons is shown by the fact that he several times stated he was against any split from the Mother Church - until he was suspended and understood that he would be condemned.

---

“Besides this, it was not only the anti-communism of Bishop Dionisije that was problematic. In 1957 the American-Canadian diocese of the Serbian Orthodox Church headed by Bishop Dionisije became a member of the heretical church organization, the National Church Council of America. Dionisije did not stop at that, but already then (in the 50s) he started to practise the most extreme ecumenism.

“In Orthodox Russia (no. 17, 1959) the following note was printed: ‘On Sunday, 15/28 August in Buffalo (Lakavana) there took place the consecration of the newly built Serbian church of St. Stefan. The all-night vigil was served by the parish priest Miodrag Djurič, accompanied by two Serbian priests and one Anglican priest. In the morning the triumphant reception of Bishop Dionisije and Anglican Bishop Scafe took place. 15 priests were serving, among them Serbs, Anglicans, Belorussians, Ukrainian samosviat and Ukrainians under Archbishop Palladius. Besides Bishop Dionisije, as the oldest hierarch, Bishop Scafe also took part in the service. He made some exclamations in the service, kissed Bishop Dionisije, and they said: ‘Christ is among us, He is and will be’. He-communed together with Dionisije in the Holy Gifts, and after that Bishop Dionisije gave communion to all the serving priests. At the banquet Bishop Scafe spoke of his admiration for Orthodoxy and how happy he was that America was having a chance to see beautiful Orthodox services on its land. He stated that in accordance with his abilities he was making a donation of $2500.

“… Just before the consecration of the church Bishop Scafe called Bishop Dionisije and the local priest of Lacavan to his side and showed them that the Episcopalians had sent $75,000 to our church in Yugoslavia. At this point Bishop Scafe showed pictures of those in the Orthodox world with whom he had communed before: the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople, as well as our Vikentije. As he was going to commune with Bishop Dionisije the next day, at the banquet he gave a gift of $2500 for the church in Lacavan.”

“Concerning the Church situation among the Serbs abroad, Fr. Arsenije Tosovich wrote in 1964: ‘Bishop Dionisije recently for the first time referred positively to Misionar for its writing about separating from the enslaved patriarchate in Yugoslavia and for the letter Bishop Nikolai.’ And then he condemned Hieromonk Arsenije as the one who was ‘for the separation from the patriarchate’. And it was only when he was suspended and it was clear that he would be condemned, that he reminded us that the Church in Yugoslavia was not free and that he was being persecuted not only because he was guilty but because the communists wanted it. To tell the truth, nobody did more for the communists and for dissolving the Serbs in America than that same great Serb and great anti-communist Dionisije. If Tito was looking all over the world for a man for this job, he could not find a better one than this Dionisije, even if we don’t mention his blessing telegrams on the occasion of the liberation of Belgrade ‘to the father of the people, Stalin’....
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“... And so if Bishop Dionisije was wrong, it doesn’t mean that the patriarchate was right and that the Serbian Church in Yugoslavia was free and that we should unconditionally submit to its decisions. On the contrary. Everything was said about that in the above-mentioned article of 1954, including the fact, for example, that all candidates for the hierarchy had to be approved by the communist central committee. The central committee of course would approve only of those candidates who were theirs or at least did not have any dispute with them. We, who are free, and who don’t want to put our necks under the communist yoke, cannot and should not accept in any way the communist choice of hierarchs. That would mean those candidates first have to receive Satan’s blessing and seal, and then be consecrated as hierarchs!...

“So far the American diocese and the whole emigration has had one unsuccessful bishop, Dionisije Milivojevich, and now there are five of them: three sparrows and two Dionisijes. Stefan, Firmlian and Grigorije, because of their dependence on the enslaved patriarchate, and his dependence on the communist godless authorities, will be obliged, whether willingly or not, ‘to fly over the sea’, keep in touch with the patriarch, and through him with the religious commission and communist authorities...

“... Since these three hierarchs are willingly going into communist enslavement, and thereby have to submit to the godless authorities, there arises the question of their grace and the question of our submission to them. Of course, the answer to both questions can be only no. ‘For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?’ (II Corinthians 6.14-15).

“We have two Dionisijes, that is, Dionisije Milivojević and Irinej Kovačević, who are both illegal and graceless. The first was condemned by the authority that enthroned him and which he constantly acknowledged. It is understandable that now he is trying to deny the right of that authority to condemn him, but that does not save him. Irinej Kovačević was consecrated by Ukrainian samosvyaty, who themselves are not lawful and have no grace, so they could not give him what they themselves did not have. In his message for the Nativity of the Lord Dionisije has promised us more of these samosvyaty hierarchs. For this consecration Bishop Dionisije turned to the ROCOR and American Metropolia, but only the samosvyaty accepted.

“With regard to that subordination of the official church to the godless authorities, we should do as the Russians did in the same case. Will we found a Catacomb Church, as it was in Russia, which will not acknowledge the official Serbian Church and its capitulation before the godless authorities? We don’t know. But we know what the emigration should do, it is the foundation of the Serbian Church Abroad. What Bishop Dionisije is doing now is nothing, since he is under suspension and he is guilty of many things and should have been defrocked long ago. For two decades he has been leading the American-Canadian
diocese, and now we see her pitiful end. And the same thing would have happened with the Church Abroad if he had been the leader. But will the Serbian emigration do something in this direction, or will it go on following the leader without a head? We cannot tell for sure. In any case, honourable and God-loving Serbian emigrants, who have God and faith in the Church in the first place in their lives, should remember that each hierarch who comes to freedom but out of submission of Patriarch German and in connection with the godless communist authorities and their representatives, is not a real hierarch and has no grace of God in him. In the same way, the suspended Bishop Dionisije and his samosvyat Irinej and all the others whom he may invent are not real and have no grace. To the Serbian God-loving emigration it is left that until the foundation of the Serbian Church Abroad the Serbian God-loving emigration should turn for their spiritual needs to the representatives of our sister Church, the Russian Church Abroad. She is the only one in the world that has remained faithful and undefiled as the Bride of Christ.456"457
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457 Monk Joseph of Avila, Serbia, in Moss, Letopis Velike Bitke, op. cit., pp. 399-404. Joachim Wertz (private e-mail communication, February 4, 2001) writes: “You ask me about my attitude toward the ‘Free Serbs’, by which I understand what has become the New Gracanica Metropolia. The schism has been overcome, but the healing continues. Therefore I am reluctant to speak on this matter (and also because I do not have first-hand experience of that tragic time). Nevertheless it is something that needs to be discussed, especially for the benefit of non-Serbian Orthodox. I have read on the matter, but much of what I know comes from others who were either involved in the issue or who were witnesses. Most of these people were very close to Vladika Nikolai [Velimirovich]. And I personally trust them. Complaints were made against Bishop Dionisije to the mother Church in Belgrade long before the events of 1963. He was accused of conduct unbecoming of a Bishop. People are willing to suggest financial misconduct, but certainly moral misconduct is implied (one of these areas where Serbs are not too open). Dionisije had successfully established for himself his own domain in North America ‘from the Atlantic to the Pacific’ that was untouchable. Perhaps much like Archbishop Iakovos did. No one doubts the sincerity of his anti-fascism or his anti-communism. During WWII he did much to publicize the plight of the Serbs. But he had his ‘own little thing going’ and no one could intrude. Problems began happening after the war when the Serbian émigrés, including Bishop Nikolai, started to arrive. Many of these émigrés, several of whom I know or knew personally, had various levels of theological education. Their services were not welcomed by Dionisije. Neither was Vladika Nikolai. He was treated rudely and often ignored. Dionisije perceived him as a threat, though Nikolai always deferred to him as the ruling Bishop. Eventually Vladika Nikolai accepted the offer of the rectorship of St. Tikhon’s Seminary and virtually ‘retired’ from American Serbian Church life. In short, Dionisije was threatened by the potential for spiritual and ecclesiastical ‘revival’ that came with the émigrés. (Please bear in mind that Vladika Nikolai, while in exile, was still the ruling bishop of the diocese of Zhicha. He remained such until his repose. He could not have been a canonical threat to the bishop of another diocese). In a remarkable example of bad timing, the complaints to the Patriarchate against Bishop Dionisije reached a crescendo at the very time Dionisije was most vocally anti-communist. Pressure on the Patriarchate to remove him came from two sources: his own flock and the Tito regime. Several bishops were sent to investigate him and they were treated not in a dignified manner. Dionisije refused to cooperate. There was no choice but to remove him. (Note this happened in 1963, Bishop Nikolai having died in 1956). Dionisije wrapped himself in anticommunism to conceal other matters. This is my understanding and opinion. Left on his own, at one point he even applied to be accepted by the Moscow Patriarchate! He was refused, as he was by the Synod Abroad. To create a hierarchy, he resorted to uncanonical Ukrainian bishops. Fortunately his successor, Bishop Irinej (Kovachevich), later Metropolitan of the New Gracanica Metropolia, was a much more Church centered man. Later when the diocese became ‘the Free Serbian Church’ and he had contacts with
Cast out in this way, three dioceses and about forty parishes of the Free Serbs, as they now called themselves, applied to join ROCOR. Two archbishops – Averky of Jordanville and John (Maximovich) of San Francisco - supported them. However, other bishops, including Archbishop Vitaly of Canada, were opposed, and the Free Serbs’ petition was rejected. The quarrel was so heated that two Russians were excommunicated.\textsuperscript{458} After being rejected by ROCOR, the Free Serbs then briefly came into communion first with two Ukrainian bishops of the Polish Orthodox Church and then with the Patriarchate of Alexandria. Fleeing the Ecumenism of the latter, they briefly found refuge with the “Florinite” Greek Old Calendarists led by Archbishop Auxentius, on September 11/24, 1981.

Whatever their canonical status, the Free Serbs did oppose ecumenism – until their reabsorption into the patriarchate in 1991. Moreover, not all the Free Serbs joined the patriarchate, and some parishes remain independent to this day. Moreover, there were some anti-ecumenists in the patriarchate. Thus in November, 1994 Bishop Artemije of Raska and Prizren, in a memorandum to the Serbian Synod, said that ecumenism was an ecclesiological heresy, and that the Serbs should withdraw from the WCC.\textsuperscript{459}

More recently, he has written: “The result of this participation [of the Serbs in the WCC] was reflected in certain material aid which the Serbian Orthodox Church periodically received from the WCC in the form of medicine, medical care and rehabilitation of some individuals in Switzerland, student scholarships, and financial donations for certain concrete purposes and needs of the SOC, such as the construction of a new building by the Theological School. We paid for these crumbs of material assistance by losing, on the spiritual plane, the purity of our faith, canonical consistency and faithfulness to the Holy Tradition of the Orthodox Church. The presence of our representatives (and Orthodox representatives in general) at various and sundry ecumenical gatherings has no canonical justification. We did not go there in order to boldly, openly and unwaveringly confess the eternal and unchangeable Truth of the Orthodox Faith and Church, but in order to make compromises and to agree more or less to all those decisions and formulations offered to us by the non-Orthodox. That is how

the Greek Old Calendarists (at that time it was with Paisios of Astoria and whatever Synod he was part of), and also with the anti-ecumenist Patriarch of Alexandria Nicholas VI (under whose jurisdiction he was for a brief time), he and some of the clergy became more traditionalist (although I can't say how well this trickled down). It does seem that Metropolitan Irinej did leave a traditionalist legacy. As I said above, the schism is over, but is still healing. All of the antagonism now revolves around property claims and money. I should point out that I believe it is true that Fr. Justin Popovich truly believed that Bishop Dionisije was being persecuted because of his anti-communism. I feel he only knew, or was willing to believe, only one aspect of the story.”


\textsuperscript{459} “The arrangements were made by Bp. Paisius of Astoria acting as Auxentius’ representative... The decision is signed by Abp. Auxentius, Metr. Paisius of North and South America and Metr. Euthymius of Thessalonica” (George Lardas, “The Old Calendar Movement in the Greek Church”, Holy Trinity Monastery, Jurdanville, 1983 (unpublished thesis), p. 22).
we ultimately arrived at Balamand, Chambésy and Assisi, which taken as a whole represent infidelity and betrayal of the Holy Orthodox Faith.”

Logically, in order to make his actions conform with his words, Bishop Artemije should have left the Serbian Synod. Nevertheless, his words remain true, and constitute a clear condemnation of the position of the Serbian Church since its entry into the WCC in the 1960s. At the present time, Bishop Artemije is in schism from the official Serbian patriarchate, but not for reasons of ecumenism; and he claims to be still in communion with the rest of World Orthodoxy…

In 1968 the Bulgarian Church adopted the new calendar. The change was imposed, according to one account, at the insistence of the WCC, which in 1965-66 had sent letters on the subject to the churches; but according to another account – on orders from the Moscow Patriarchate, which wished to see how the people reacted to the change in Bulgaria before proceeding with the same innovation in Russia. In the event, only the Russian Women’s Monastery of the Protecting Veil in Sophia refused to accept the change.

Bishop Photius of Triaditza writes: “For some months before the introduction of the reform, Tserkoven Vestnik informed the astonished believing people that the reform was being carried out ‘in accordance with the ecumenist striving of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church…’ The Bulgarian clergy and even episcopate were completely unprepared to resist the calendar innovation, while the people, suspecting something amiss, began to grumble. The calendar reform was introduced skilfully and with lightning suddenness by Patriarch Cyril – an ardent modernist and ‘heartfelt’ friend of the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras! Everyone knew that the patriarch was on good terms with the communist authorities (for his ‘services’ to it he received the title of ‘academic’ – member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences!) Everyone also knew of his despotic temperament: he did all he could to persecute and annihilate his ideological opponents.”

In fact, the Bulgarian Church’s change to the new calendar had been dictated by the Russian communists, who wanted to introduce the innovation into the Russian Church, too, but wanted to “test the waters” by trying it out on the Bulgarians first. But when the only Orthodox in Bulgaria who rejected the

462 Pravoslavnaia Rus’ (Orthodox Russia), № 21 (1522), November 1/14, 1994, pp. 8, 9.
463 Archimandrite Porphyrius of Sofia, personal communication, February, 1981. This was confirmed by the HOCNA (now TGOC) Bishop Sergius of California, who writes: “In 1971 Metropolitan Nikodem of Leningrad visited Alaska in order to venerate the relics of St. Herman. In an effort to distance itself from the MP, the then-new OCA had not invited the MP hierarchs to participate in the August, 1970 canonization of that Saint. Metropolitan Nikodem (and his OCA guide, Father Kyril Fotiev) spent 5 days in Sitka en route to Kodiak and I was the local host. During several long conversations, Metropolitan Nikodem mentioned that he was intent on adopting the civil calendar for the MP, and as a test case, had brought about Bulgaria’s switch
innovation turned out to be the Russian women’s monastery at Knyazhevo, Sophia, the Russians decided to hold back from introducing it in Russia...

However, the MP had already, in 1967, declared: “Bearing in mind the practice of the Ancient Church, when East and West (Rome and the Asian bishops) celebrated Pascha at different times, while preserving complete communion in prayer between themselves, and taking into account the experience of the Orthodox Church of Finland and our parishes in Holland, as also the exceptional position of the parishioners of the church of the Resurrection of Christ amidst the heterodox world, [it has been resolved] to allow Orthodox parishioners of the Moscow Patriarchate living in Switzerland to celebrate the immovable feast and the feasts of the Paschal cycle according to the new style.”

In 1964, some parishes of the Bulgarian patriarchate in the USA petitioned ROCOR to ordain their leader, Archimandrite Cyril (Ionchev), to the episcopate. The petition was granted, and in August Metropolitan Philaret and four other bishops ordained him. However, in 1968 the Bulgarian patriarchate adopted the new calendar, and soon the Bulgarian parishes began to agitate that they be allowed to use the new calendar. In 1971 Bishop Cyril gave a report on this subject to the Hierarchical Council in Montreal, and in 1972 he and his parishes joined the American Metropolia with the permission of ROCOR.

Concerning the correctness of the Julian calenar, the Bulgarian Old Calendarist Archimandrite Sergius (Iazadjiev) relates the following: “In August of 1971, Nikolai [now Hieromonk Theophan] and I were coming back from rest and medical treatment at Narechen. Passing through the town of Plovdiv, we called in at the Metochion of Zographou to venerate the tomb of the Holy King Boris [+906]. Schema-monk Seraphim of Zographou was in attendance at the tomb. He told us that recently (1969-70), under pressure from the Geneva-based World Council of Churches, the Jerusalem Patriarchate had introduced the 'New Julian' Calendar (as had the Bulgarian, Macedonian, and other Patriarchates, since there was overwhelming pressure at the time to introduce the New Calendar). That same year, on Great Saturday, when from time immemorial the Holy Fire descends on the Lord's Sepulchre, this year the Fire did not appear. Shocked, Patriarch Benedict of Jerusalem commanded that the Old Calendar, which had been in use until then, be restored immediately in the jurisdiction of his Patriarchate. The next year, the Holy Fire once again descended on the Lord's Sepulchre on Great Saturday; the same occurs even until the present.”

---

464 Zhurnal Moskovskoj Patriarkhii (Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate), 1967, № 8, p. 1; Monk Benjamin, op. cit., part 5, p. 36.
466 Hieromonk Cassian, A Scientific Examination of the Orthodox Church Calendar, eds. Archbishop Chrysostomos and Hieromonk Gregory (Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1998), Ch. 9.
34. “THE HERESY OF HERESIES”

In the second half of the 1960s opposition to Ecumenism in the Local Orthodox Churches was gradually suppressed. Some conservative hierarchs died, such as Patriarch Christopher of Alexandria (in 1967); others were more forcibly removed or replaced, such as Archbishop Chrysostom of Athens and the leaders of some of the Athonite monasteries. Others were effectively silenced by bribery, such as the Orthodox Church of America. The Greek State Church was worn down by a mixture of bribes and political arm-twisting. The bribes came from the Vatican in the form of the return of the relics of Saints Andrew, Titus and Isidore to the Greek Church (and of St. Sabbas to the Jerusalem Patriarchate). The Greeks found it difficult on the one hand to give thanks for the return of these relics, and on the other hand to put up a firm resistance to the lifting of the anathemas against Rome.

Another clever move on the part of the Vatican was to allow 3000 Catholics in Corfu and on the Ionian islands to celebrate Pascha in 1967 on 30 April, the Orthodox date. As the journal Ekklesia pointed out: “The decision evokes natural suspicion that fundamentally this is a propaganda move and an attempt to proselytize the Orthodox population of Corfu.” As full union beckoned, it became less important to the papists on which day they and the Orthodox celebrated the feasts as long as it was the same day.

There is other evidence that the Pope was attempting to force the pace in this year. Thus in May the Catholic Ecumenical Directory was published, which allowed Catholics to take communion in Orthodox churches if they were isolated or could not receive Catholic sacraments for a long period. And yet in March Patriarch Athenagoras had said that Orthodox could not (yet) receive “sacramental grace from a priest who is not himself Orthodox”. Then in July the Pope travelled to Constantinople, where he prayed together with the Patriarch. This visit was returned in October, when Athenagoras visited Rome, and the two prelates sat on equal and identical thrones – “an event which must be unprecedented in the annals of papal Rome, and for which there was certainly no parallel at the Council of Florence in 1438-9.”

This exchange of visits was made easier by the fact that on April 21 a military coup had taken place in Greece. On May 10 the newly established government promulgated a “compulsory law” which dismissed the Synod, replaced it by a Synod chosen by the government, retired Archbishop Chrysostom as being too old, and replaced him with Archimandrite Jerome, who had been a member of the central committee of the World Council of Churches since 1954. This act was very reminiscent of the way in which the revolutionary government chose Chrysostom Papadopoulos in 1922 and must be presumed to have had the same aim – the replacement of the existing incumbent by one more closely identified with the West and Ecumenism.

The new archbishop quickly showed his credentials by coming to “full agreement” with the Ecumenical Patriarchate and issuing the following statement in his enthronement address: “Our relations with non-Orthodox confessions must be marked by Christian love and by mutual respect, so as to foster friendship; but at the same time we must preserve our dignity and our firm adherence to the Orthodox faith and teaching. As a pre-condition for any closer relations, we must insist on the condemnation of proselytism.”

The only problem about this seemingly conservative statement was that “firm adherence to the Orthodox faith” and “the condemnation of proselytism” are incompatible, in that if we believe that the Orthodox Faith is the True Faith we are bound to hope and work for the conversion of people of other faiths. We condemn proselytism among the Orthodox, not because it is “unfair” and goes against some kind of ecclesiastical non-aggression pact, but because it takes people away from the saving ark of the One True Church. By the same token we support Orthodox missionary work among the heterodox because it brings the heterodox to salvation, in fulfilment of the Saviour’s words: “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations” (Matthew 28.19).

Archbishop Jerome of Athens also introduced several innovations, as Fr. Basile Sakkas writes:

“(a) that the priests cut their hair and their beards and go about in civilian dress.

“(b) that the use of organs and mixed choirs singing in harmony be adopted in the churches, although this is in contradiction of the Tradition of the sacred music of our Church.

“(c) that Mattins be suppressed and two Liturgies be served instead ‘in order to facilitate the faithful’. In this manner, anyone can enter in the middle of the first Liturgy and leave in the middle of the second, just like in the cinema. Hence, we adopt the practices and conceptions of the Latins.

---

470 As St. Anatolius the Younger of Optina (+1922) said: “My child, if you see some people of another faith quarrelling with an Orthodox and wanting by flattery to tear him away from the Orthodox Church, help the Orthodox. In this way you will deliver a sheep from the jaws of a lion. But if you are silent and leave him without help, this is the same as if you took a redeemed soul from Christ and sold him to Satan.” “If somebody tells you: ‘Both your and our faith is from God,’ you, child, reply as follows: ‘Corrupter of the faith! Or do you consider God also to be of two faiths! Haven’t you heard what Scripture says: “There is one God, one Faith, one Baptism” (Ephesians 4.5).’... Amen.”
471 Archimandrite John Lewis of Holy Theotokos Monastery, North Fort Myers, Florida related to the present author how he had once visited Patriarch Athenagoras in August, 1967, when he was a subdeacon in the Ruthenian Byzantine Catholic Church but was seeking to convert to Holy Orthodoxy. Athenagoras discouraged him, saying that he had to stay in the Uniate church and act as a "bridge" between Catholics and Orthodox!
“(d) that there be a change of the Paschalia (this is still being debated furiously). The proposal here is that the date of the celebration of Pasch be fixed so that it always occurs on the second Sunday of April.

“(e) that for ‘archaeological’ concerns, the iconostases in the churches be taken down.

“(f) that the sacrament of Holy Baptism be changed (read ‘mutilated’) little by little. Forget for a moment that the triple repetition of the Symbol of Faith has almost everywhere fallen into oblivion and instead of blessing the waters used for the baptism with the appropriate prayers, previously blessed holy water is simply added (as though the Fathers who prescribed that the Symbol of Faith be recited three times and that the waters be blessed directly knew nothing and we are therefore obliged to correct them). Moreover, the exorcisms are suppressed and the children are made to sit in the baptismal font and then water is poured upon their heads by the hands of the priest and thus there is no immersion…”

There were other, more political reasons for the coup in the Church. Athenagoras was favoured by the Americans as being the man best able, on the one hand, to effect a rapprochement between Turkey and Greece, and, on the other, to resist the influence of the Soviet-dominated Moscow Patriarchate. So his opponents in the Greek Church had to be removed.

But the majority of the monks on Mount Athos were still fiercely opposed to the lifting of the anathemas. Therefore in November, 1967, an exarchate consisting of three bishops of the newly constituted Greek Church was sent to Athos to try and reconcile the monks and bring those monasteries that had broken communion with the ecumenists back into obedience to the patriarchate. In this mission, however, they failed – for the time being.

In 1968 the Fourth General Assembly of the WCC took place in Uppsala. As we have seen, Patriarch German of Serbia was one of the six presidents, and remained in that post for the next ten years. Uppsala considerably furthered the ecumenical movement. The Orthodox, as the new general secretary Carson Blake joyfully pointed out, were now taking full part in all the sections and committees and not, as often in the past, issuing separate statements disagreeing with the majority Protestant view.

Now only ROCOR, the Russian Catacomb Church and the Greek and Romanian Old Calendarists stood in the way of the complete triumph of Ecumenism. It was time for this last remnant of the True Church of Christ to renounce all hesitations, all false hopes, all temptations to compromise in the face of the completely unambiguous apostasy of the official churches of “World Orthodoxy”. It was time to declare that Ecumenism was not simply uncanonical,

but heresy, and not simply heresy, but “the heresy of heresies”.

This definition came in a report that Archbishop Vitaly (Ustinov) of Canada gave to the Synod of ROCOR on the Uppsala Assembly of the WCC: “At the opening of the Assembly an ecumenical prayer was read in the name of all those assemblies: ‘O God our Father, You can create everything anew. We entrust ourselves to You, help us to live for others, for Your love extends over all people, and to search for the Truth, which we have not known...’ How could the Orthodox listen to these last words? It would have been interesting to look at that moment at the faces of the Orthodox hierarchs who had declared for all to hear that they, too, did not know the Truth. Every batyushka of ours in the remotest little village knows the Truth by experience, as he stands before the throne of God and prays to God in spirit and in truth. Even The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, which is completely subject to the censorship of the communist party, in citing the words of the prayer in its account of this conference, did not dare to translate the English ‘truth’ by the word ‘istina’, but translated it as ‘pravda’ [‘righteousness’]. Of course, everyone very well understood that in the given case the text of the prayer was speaking without the slightest ambiguity about the Truth. Perhaps the Orthodox hierarchs have resorted, in the conference, to the old Jesuit practice of reservatio mentalis, but in that case if all these delegates do not repent of the sin of communion in prayer with heretics, then we must consider them to be on the completely false path of apostasy from the Truth of Orthodoxy... Ecumenism is the heresy of heresies because until now each heresy in the history of the Church has striven to take the place of the true Church, but the ecumenical movement, in uniting all the heresies, invites all of them together to consider themselves the one true Church.”

On December 16, 1969, the MP Synod resolved to allow Catholics and Old Ritualists to receive communion from Orthodox priests if they ask for it.475 The MP’s Archbishop Basil of Brussels recalled: “It fell to me to defend the good name and Orthodoxy of the Russian Church at the Pan-Orthodox conferences (those like the Pan-Orthodox commission for dialogue with the Anglicans) with the following argumentation: ‘This resolution of the Synod was elicited by a completely special situation of believers, and in particular of Catholics in the Soviet Union. Where there is not one Catholic church of priest for thousands of kilometres. Such a resolution was made by the Synod of Constantinople and Patriarch Joachim II in 1878 in relation to the Armenians. Theologically, it is difficult for me to justify such oekonomia, but I cannot judge the Russian hierarchs who live in contemporary Russia in difficult conditions. They know better than we what they are doing.’ This argumentation satisfied everyone, even on Athos, but everything was destroyed by Metropolitan Nicodemus giving communion [to Catholic students] in Rome. ‘What ‘pastoral oikonomia” forced him to commune Catholics where there are so many Catholic churches?’ they asked me. The only reply that I could give was: ‘Your hierarchs even worse when

475 Zhurnal Moskovskoj Patriarkhii (Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate), 1970, № 1, p. 5.
they give to communion to everyone indiscriminately.’ ‘Our hierarchs, like Archbishop James of America or Athenagoras of London, are traitors to Orthodoxy, we have known that for a long time (replied to me Abbot George of the monastery of Grigoriou on Athos). But that the Moscow Patriarchate, the Russian Orthodox Church, which we respect for her firmness in Orthodoxy, should act in this way in the person of Metropolitan Nicodemus, shocks us and deeply saddens us.’ I recounted this reaction to Metropolitan Nicodemus. He even became angry: ‘It’s not important what they say on Athos. Athos is not an Autocephalous Church.’”

Neither side in this argument seemed to understand that the giving of communion to a heretic in any circumstances is harmful for that heretic so long as he remains in his heresy. More Orthodox, therefore, was the robust response of the ROCOR Synod, which on March 31, 1970 condemned the MP resolution as follows: “The decision of the Moscow Patriarchate to give access to Roman Catholics to all the sacraments of the Orthodox Church... both violates the sacred canons and is contrary to the dogmatic teaching of Orthodoxy. By entering into communion with the heterodox, the Moscow Patriarchate alienates itself from unity with the Holy Fathers and Teachers of the Church. By this action it does not sanctify the heretics to whom it gives sacraments, but itself becomes a partaker of their heresy.” Archbishop Averky (Taushev) of Jordanville commented: “Now, even if some entertained some sort of doubts about how we should regard the contemporary Moscow Patriarchate, and whether we can consider it Orthodox after its intimate union with the enemies of God, the persecutors of the Faith and Christ’s Church, these doubts must now be completely dismissed: by the very fact that it has entered into liturgical communion with the Papists, it has fallen away from Orthodoxy and can no longer be considered Orthodox.”

This stronger attitude to the MP was paralleled by a reiteration of the Russian Church’s originally very uncompromising attitude towards the revolution. Thus on January 1, 1970 the ROCOR Synod confirmed Patriarch Tikhon’s 1918 anathema against the Bolsheviks, adding one of its own against “Vladimir Lenin and the other persecutors of the Church of Christ, dishonourable apostates who have raised their hands against the Anointed of God, killing clergymen, trampling on holy things, destroying the churches of God, tormenting our brothers and defiling our Fatherland.”

It should be pointed out that at this time of rapprochement between the MP and the Vatican, the KGB had managed to penetrate the Vatican. As I.I. Maslova writes, in August, 1970, “the KGB informed the Central Committee that ‘in the course of carrying out the given undertakings the agents of the organs of state security succeeded in making personal approaches to Pope Paul VI and his immediate entourage’. “Useful influence” was exerted, and specially prepared

materials were “put forward” in which the thought was emphasized that hostile actions on the part of the Vatican and its centres (especially in the emigration) against the USSR would complicate the position of believers and clergy in the country and, in particular, hinder the establishment of closer relations between the ROC and the Catholic Church.”  

35. MOSCOW AND THE METROPOLIA

On the very same day that ROCOR condemned the MP for “partaking in heresy” through its relationship with the Vatican, Metropolitan Irenaeus of All America and Canada and Metropolitan Nikodem (Rotov) of Leningrad signed an Agreement giving autocephaly to the American Metropolia – a deal which was rejected by all the other Autocephalous Orthodox Churches. On April 2, a delegation of the Japanese Orthodox Church set off for Moscow, where on April 10 it received from Patriarch Alexis a Tomos of Autonomy. On the same day Archbishop Nicholas (Kasatkin) of Japan was canonised.480 In this way, as part of the deal with the Metropolia, the Japanese Church, which formerly had been under the Metropolia, came under Moscow’s jurisdiction. However, the MP’s parishes in North America, which were supposed to come under the Metropolia – or the Orthodox Church of America, as it was now called – did not do so.

On June 24 Patriarch Athenagoras in a letter to Patriarch Alexis touched on two important questions: the authority competent to grant autocephaly, and the factors and conditions necessary for a correct proclamation of autocephaly. With regard to the first question he declared that “the granting of it is within the competence of the whole Church.” But to a Local Church “is proper only the right to receive the first petitions for independence from those concerned and to express whether the bases suggested for it are worthy of justification”. With regard to the second question, Patriarch Athenagoras expressed the opinion that in order to announce an ecclesiastical autocephaly that aims to satisfy purely ecclesiastical needs, the opinion of the clergy and laity, the judgement of the Mother Church and the expressed will of the whole Church is required. Considering that these conditions had not been fulfilled in the giving of autocephaly to the Orthodox Church in America, the patriarch called on the Russian Church to apply “efforts to annul the canonical confusion that has been created”. Otherwise, he threatened to regard the action “as if it had never taken place”.481

Of course, the patriarch had a point. But since his own patriarchate, by creating a whole series of unlawful autocephalies since the 1920s, was the first sinner in this respect, it is not surprising that his voice was not heeded...

Hieromonk Seraphim Rose wrote of the union of the Metropolia with Moscow: “The American Metropolia doubtless fell into this trap out of naiveté, and already its hierarchs are demonstrating that its so-called ‘independence’ conceals a subtle form of psychological dependence.” Newspaper articles showing that Metropolitan clergy and bishops had begun to apologize, not only for the Soviet domination of the church organization, but even for the Soviet system itself. One priest “admits some Soviet bishops are Soviet agents, that the whole autocephaly follows political trends set forth by the Soviet government; Bishop ____ is quoted as saying that he found the Soviet people to be happy and well dressed, and if

480 Monk Benjamin, op. cit., part 5, p. 43.
481 K.E. Skurat; Monk Benjamin, op. cit., part 5, p. 44.
some complain about the Government, well, so do Americans.” Elsewhere Fr. Seraphim quoted the same bishop as saying, “As Americans we have to reassess our ideas of life in the Soviet Union.” Such statements, Fr. Seraphim wrote, “reveal the ‘autocephaly’ as an important tool for Moscow in politically ‘neutralizing’ public opinion in the West.”

Asserting that it was far worse to capitulate to a nihilist state in freedom than under compulsion, Fr. Seraphim wrote to a priest of the Metropolia: “You will find in our midst great sympathy and pity for all but the leading hierarchs of Moscow – and even for some of them you will find fellow-feeling owing to the inhuman circumstances under which they have been forced to betray Orthodoxy… But this fellow-feeling cannot allow us who are free to... place ourselves in the same trap she [the MP] was forced into! And this the Metropolia has done... With every fiber of our being and every feeling of our soul we are repulsed by this free act of betrayal... Do you not grasp the immensity of your spiritual bondage?”

“Is ‘stepping out onto the world Orthodox scene’ really so important to the Metropolia that it must do it at the expense of the suffering Russian Orthodox faithful? To give one small example: Metropolitan Nikodem is the Metropolia’s great ‘benefactor’, and no one can doubt that his success with the Metropolia has strengthened his position with the Moscow Patriarchate. On the other hand, the layman Boris Talantov in the USSR has openly called Metropolitan Nikodem a betrayer of the Church, a liar, and an agent of world anti-Christianity, for which statements (among others) he was imprisoned by the Soviets; Metropolitan Nicodemus tells the West that he was in prison for ‘anti-governmental activities’. On January 4 of this year Boris Talantov died in prison, undoubtedly the victim of Metropolitan Nikodem (among others). Can the Metropolia feel itself to be on the side of this confessor? I don’t see how it can.”

In March, 1969, the Great Council of the Metropolia made a last Orthodox statement on Ecumenism before succumbing to the heresy:-

“The basic goal of the ecumenical movement... is the unity of all Christians in one single body of grace. And here the Orthodox Church firmly confesses that such a genuine unity is founded, above all, on the unity of faith, on the unanimous acceptance by all of the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Traditions as they are wholly and integrally preserved by the Church. Real love for brothers separated from us [sic – a misleading description of heretics, who are not our brothers in Christ] consists therefore not in silencing all that divides us, but in a courageous witness to the Truth, which alone can unite us all, and also in a common search for the ways to make that Truth evident to all. Only in this way did the Orthodox Church always understand her participation in the ecumenical movement...

“However, within the ecumenical movement there has always existed another

482 Fr. Seraphim, in Hieromonk Damascene, op. cit., pp. 400-401.
understanding of unity. This other understanding seems to become more popular today. It recognizes virtually no importance at all in agreement in faith and doctrine, and is based on relativism, i.e., on the affirmation that the doctrinal or canonical teachings of the Church, being ‘relative’, are not obligatory for all. Unity is viewed as already existing, and nothing remains to be done except to express it and strengthen it through ecumenical manifestations or services. Such an approach is totally incompatible with the Orthodox concept of the ecumenical movement.

“The differences between these two approaches is best illustrated by the attitudes towards concelebration and intercommunion among divided Christians. According to the Orthodox doctrine, the prayers and the sacraments of the Church, especially the Divine Eucharist, are expressions of full unity – in faith, in life, in service of God and man – as given by God. This unity with other Christians we seek, but we have not reached it yet. Therefore in the Orthodox understanding, no form of concelebration, i.e., no joint participation in liturgical prayer or the sacraments, with those who do not belong to the Orthodox Church can be permitted, for it would imply a unity which in reality does not exist. It would imply deceiving ourselves, deceiving others, and creating the impression that the Orthodox Church acknowledges that which in fact she does not acknowledge.”

483 The Orthodox Church, May, 1969; Eastern Churches Review, Autumn, 1969, pp. 425-26. “It is natural to surmise,” writes Andrew Psarev, “that this epistle, to a certain degree, appeared as a result of the private meetings held at the time between Metropolitans Philaret and Irinei, first hierarch of the North American Metropolia” (op. cit., p. 7)
36. RUSSIAN AND GREEK COUNCILS

In May-June, 1971 there was a council of the MP attended by 75 hierarchs, 85 clergy and 78 laymen, representatives of many other Orthodox Churches and the general secretary of the WCC. It confirmed all the previous decisions made by the MP since 1945. Only one candidate for the patriarchate (Patriarch Alexis had died in April) was put forward: the weak Metropolitan Pimen, who was elected unanimously in an open ballot (a secret ballot was not allowed by the all-powerful Metropolitan Nikodem).484

The Council also confirmed the 1961 statute taking control of the parishes away from the bishops and clergy as well as Metropolitan Nikodem’s report on the decision to give communion to Catholics, in which he said that the measure was justified “insofar as we have a common of faith with them in relation to the sacraments”.485

In his Memoirs Archbishop Basil of Brussels recalls asking the formerly Catacomb Archbishop Benjamin (Novitsky) of Irkutsk why he had not spoken against this measure. Benjamin replied: “You know, I did 12 years forced labour in Kolyma. I don’t have the strength at my age to start that again. Forgive me!” 486

The MP council also resolved: “to entrust to the higher ecclesiastical authority of the Russian Orthodox Church to continue efforts to reunite with the Mother Church the so-called Russian Orthodox Church Abroad (the Karlovtsy schism), the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church Abroad and other scattered children of hers... In view of the fact that the activity of supporters of the so-called Russian Orthodox Church Abroad... against the Mother Russian Orthodox Church and against the Holy Orthodox Church as a whole is harming Holy Orthodoxy, the higher ecclesiastical authority of the Moscow Patriarchate is entrusted with realizing in the nearest future the necessary canonical sanctions in relation to the apostate assembly..., the Karlovtsy schism and its unrepentant followers.”487

*

484 Former KGB Lieutenant-Colonel Constantine Preobrazhensky writes: “They say that the first Communist within the church was Patriarch Pimen. He was a Senior Officer of the Red Army, and joined the Communist Party at the front. There could not have been any officers who believed in God, nor officers who were not Communist Party members. More than that, they were all forced to fight religion. That means that the future patriarch of the MP renounced his faith” (“Putin’s Espionage Church”, http://portal-credo.ru/site/print.php?act=english&id=281). In the same article Preobrazhensky points out not only that all MP bishops were KGB agents, but also that they engaged in espionage. Thus in 1969 Metropolitan Irenaeus of Vienna and Austria recruited the American military intelligence officer George Trofimov, who served a sentence in the United States.


486 Monk Benjamin, op. cit., part 5, p. 47.

487 Monk Benjamin, op. cit., part 5, p. 49.
ROCOR’s Hierarchical Council reacted to the MP council by passing two resolutions. The first, dated September 1/14, 1971, declared: “The free part of the Russian Church, which is beyond the frontiers of the USSR, is heart and soul with the confessors of the faith who... are called ‘the True Orthodox Christians’, and who often go by the name of ‘the Catacomb Church’... The Council of Bishops recognizes its spiritual unity with them...”

The second, of the same date, is called "Resolution of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia Concerning the Election of Pimen (Izvekov) as Patriarch of Moscow": "All of the elections of Patriarchs in Moscow, beginning in 1943, are invalid on the basis of the 30th Canon of the Holy Apostles and the 3rd Canon of the 7th Ecumenical Council, according to which, ‘if any bishop, having made use of secular rulers, should receive through them Episcopal authority in the Church, let him be defrocked and excommunicated along with all those in communion with him’. The significance that the Fathers of the 7th Council gave to such an offence is obvious from the very fact of a double punishment for it, that is, not only deposition but excommunication as well, something unusual for ecclesiastical law. The famous commentator on Canon Law, Bishop Nicodemus of Dalmatia, gives the following explanation of the 30th Canon of the Holy Apostles: ‘If the Church condemned unlawful influence by the secular authorities in the ordination of bishops at a time when the rulers were Christians, then it follows that She should condemn such action all the more when the latter are pagans and place even heavier penalties on the guilty parties, who were not ashamed of asking for help from pagan rulers and the authorities subordinated to them, in order to gain the episcopate. This (30th) Canon has such cases in view’. If in defence of this position examples are given of the Patriarchs of Constantinople who were placed on the Throne at the caprice of the Turkish Sultans, one can reply that no anomaly can be regarded as a norm and that one breach of Canon Law cannot justify another.

"The election of Pimen (Izvekov) as Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia at the gathering calling itself an All-Russian Church Council in Moscow the 2nd of June of this year, on the authority of the 3rd Canon of the 7th Ecumenical Council and other reasons set forth in this decision, is to be regarded as unlawful and void, and all of his acts and directions as having no strength."

However, in 1974 ROCOR did confirm one measure adopted by the MP’s 1971 Council: the removal of the curses on the old rites and those who observed them. This did not by itself make the Old Ritualists Orthodox; but it removed the main obstacle to their rejoining the Orthodox Church, taking to its logical conclusion Tsar Paul’s introduction of the yedinoverie in 1801, which allowed Old Ritualists who joined the Orthodox Church to retain their use of the Old Rites.

On September 28, 1971, ROCOR’s Hierarchical Council decreed: “The lack of

---

accord of the decree of the Moscow Patriarchate, concerning the granting of communion to Roman Catholics, with Orthodox dogmatic teaching and the Church canons is completely clear to any person even slightly informed in theology. It was justly condemned by a decree of the Synod of the Church of Greece. The holy canons do permit the communication of a great sinner who is under penance (epitimia) when he is about to die (I Ecumenical 13, Carthage 6, Gregory of Nyssa 2 and 5), but there is not a single canon which would extend this to include persons foreign to the Orthodox Church, as long as they have not renounced their false doctrines. No matter what explanation Metropolitan Nicodem and the other Moscow hierarchs might try to give of this act, it is completely clear that by this decision, even though with certain limitations, communion has been established between the Moscow Patriarchate and Roman Catholics. Furthermore, the latter have already made the decision to permit members of the Orthodox Church to receive communion from them. All this was particularly clearly demonstrated in the service held on December 14, 1970, in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, when Metropolitan Nicodem gave communion to Catholic clerics. It is perfectly clear that this act could not be justified by any need. By this act the Moscow Patriarchate has betrayed Orthodoxy. If the 45th Canon of the Holy Apostles excommunicates from the Church an Orthodox bishop or cleric who has ‘only prayed together with heretics’, and the 10th Apostolic Canon forbids even prayer together with those who are excommunicated, what can we say about a bishop who dares to offer the Holy Mysteries to them? If catechumens must leave the church before the sanctification of the Gifts and are not permitted even at point of death to receive communion until they are united to the Church, how can one justify the communicating of persons who, being members of heretical communities, are much farther away from the Church than a catechumen, who is preparing to unite with her? The act of the Moscow Synod, which was confirmed by the recent Council of the Moscow Patriarchate in Moscow, extends the responsibility for this un-Orthodox decision to all participants of the Moscow Council and to their entire Church organization. The decision to admit Catholics to communion is an act that is not only anticanonical, but heretical as well, as inflicting harm on the Orthodox doctrine of the Church, since only true members of the Church are called to communicate of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. The Moscow decree, logically considered, recognizes as her members those who, through their doctrinal errors, in both heart and mind are far from her.”

On the same day the Council issued an important statement on the reception of heretics, considerably “tightening up” its practice: “The Holy Church has from antiquity believed that there can be only one true baptism, namely that which is accomplished in her bosom: ‘One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism’ (Ephesians 4.5). In the Symbol of Faith “one baptism” is also confessed, while the 46th canon of the Holy Apostles indicates: ‘We order that a bishop or priest who has accepted (that is, recognized) the baptism or sacrifice of heretics should be deposed.’

“However, when the zeal of any heretics in their struggle against the Church weakened, and when there was a question of their mass conversion to Orthodoxy, the Church, to ease their union, accepted them into her bosom by
another rite. [There follows a discussion of St. Basil’s first canonical epistle.]

“And so St. Basil the Great, and through his words the Ecumenical Council, in establishing the principle that outside the Holy Orthodox Church there is no true baptism, allowed out of pastoral condescension, so-called oikonomia, the acceptance of certain heretics and schismatics without a new baptism. And in accordance with this principle, the Ecumenical Councils allowed the reception of heretics by various rites, taking account of the weakening of their fierceness against the Orthodox Church.…

“In relation to the Roman Catholics and Protestants who claim to preserve baptism as a sacrament (for example, the Lutherans), the practice was introduced from the time of Peter the First of receiving them without baptism, through the renunciation of heresy and chrismation of Protestants and unconfirmed Catholics. Before Peter Catholics were baptised in Russia. In Greece the practice also changed, but for almost three hundred years, after a certain break, the practice of baptising those who came from Catholicism and Protestantism was again introduced. Those who are received by another rite are not recognized as Orthodox in Greece. In many cases also such children of our Russian Church were not even allowed to receive Holy Communion.

“Bearing in mind this circumstance, and the present growth of the ecumenical heresy, which tries completely to wipe out the difference between Orthodoxy and every heresy, so that the Moscow Patriarchate, in spite of the sacred canons, has issued a resolution allowing Roman Catholics to be communed in certain cases, the Hierarchical Council has recognized the introduction of a stricter practice to be necessary, that is, that all heretics coming to the Church should be baptized, and that only insofar as it is necessary and with the permission of the bishop, from considerations of oikonomia, should another practice be allowed in relation to certain people, that is, the reception into the Church of Roman Catholics and Protestants who have been baptised in the name of the Holy Trinity through renunciation of heresy and chrismation.”

This decision brought the practice of ROCOR back into line with the practice of the Russian Church under Patriarch Philaret in the early seventeenth century, and of the Greek Church since 1756. “It should be noted,” writes Psarev, “that, within the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, it was Bishop James of Manhattan, who led the American Orthodox Mission for a period of time, who first began the reception of Catholics by baptism, regarding which he informed the Council of Bishops in 1953.” Now the Russian bishops followed the lead taken by their “convert” colleague…

*  

489 Tserkovnata Zhizn’ (Church Life), July-December, 1971, pp. 52-54; Monk Benjamin, op. cit., part 5, pp. 52-53.  
490 Psarev, op. cit., pp. 7-8.
This decision was also undoubtedly influenced by the happy fact that at the same time ROCOR had achieved union with the second Greek Old Calendarist Synod, that of the Matthewites. For the practice of both Greek Old Calendarists, both Florinites and Matthewites, was stricter in relation to the reception of heretics than ROCOR’s. However, most ROCOR hierarchs paid scant attention to this decision…

On December 18/31, 1969, Metropolitan Philaret and his Synod officially recognized the Florinite hierarchy led by Archbishop Auxentius⁴⁹¹, and wrote to him: “The many trials which the Orthodox Church has endured from the beginning of its history are especially great in our evil times, and consequently, this especially requires unity among those who are truly devoted to the Faith of the Fathers. With these sentiments we wish to inform you that the Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad recognizes the validity of the episcopal ordinations of your predecessor of blessed memory, the reposed Archbishop Acacius, and the consequent ordinations of your Holy Church. Hence, taking into account also various other circumstances, our hierarchical Synod esteems your hierarchy as brothers in Christ in full communion with us.”⁴⁹²

The Matthewites continued to denounce the Florinites as schismatics, but for the rest of the True Orthodox world this act by the ROCOR Synod dispelled any lingering doubts about their canonicity. So on September 1/14, 1971, the Matthewites sent an exarchate, consisting of Metropolitans Callistus of Corinth and Epiphanius of Kition (Cyprus) and the Chancellor, Protopriest Eugene Tombros, to the Synod of ROCOR in New York.⁴⁹³ They went, as the Matthewites wrote to the Russians some years later, “in order to come into contact with your Synod and regularize spiritual communion with you for the strengthening of the Holy Struggle of Orthodoxy”.⁴⁹⁴

Or, as Metropolitan Epiphanius put it in a letter to Metropolitan Philaret, “I went to carry out with you a common duty 48 years late. I went with the conviction that, through human weakness, we carried out in 1971 what we should have done in 1924... I believed that in entering into sacramental communion with you I became with you the same Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.”⁴⁹⁵

⁴⁹¹ In 1964, after the death of Archbishop Acacius (the elder), Bishops Gerontius and Acacius (the younger) elected Auxentius as archbishop – but without the agreement of Bishop Chrysostom (Naslimes), whose fears about the fitness of Auxentius were soon to prove tragically justified… Bishop Acacius the Younger also came bitterly to regret his putting forward the name of the relatively unknown Auxentius (Bishop Photius of Marathon, personal communication, July 11/24, 2005).
⁴⁹³ Metropolitans Callistus and Epiphanius had already visited the ROCOR in America in 1969, as guests of Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Boston.
⁴⁹⁴ Letter of February 20, 1976 from the Matthewite Synod to the Russian Synod, Kyrix Gnision Orthodoxon (Herald of the True Orthodox Christians), February, 1976, pp. 5-12.
⁴⁹⁵ Letter of Pascha, 1979 from Metropolitan Epiphanius to Metropolitan Philaret (in French).
But the Matthewites, according to their own account, did not immediately seek communion in prayer with the Russians. First they asked what the Russians’ attitude to the new calendarists was. The Russians replied that the introduction of the new calendar was a mistake, and promised, in the person of Archbishop Philotheus of Hamburg, that they would not henceforth concelebrate with the new calendarists. However, they did not say whether they regarded the new calendarists as having valid sacraments.

Apparently satisfied with this reply, the Matthewites asked for the Russians to pass judgement on their own canonical situation. More precisely, the exarchate in their letter of September, 1971 wrote that their Synod had entrusted them “to enter into negotiations with your Holy Synod with regard to the sacred struggle for Orthodoxy. As regards the question of our ordinations (the ordination of a bishop by one bishop) we communicate the following to your Holy Synod.”

There then followed a short justification of Bishop Matthew’s ordinations, concluding that “there could not remain any doubt” about their canonicity. “In view of this,” they concluded, “we present the present petition for the review of your Holy Synod, and we are ready to accept any decision it makes on the basis of the holy canons”.

But if there could be no doubt about Matthew’s ordinations, what, precisely were the Matthewites asking the Russians to do? Simply to agree with them, and then enter into communion with them without more ado? But in that case their readiness “to accept any decision [they made] on the basis of the holy canons” was somewhat disingenuous, since they had already made it clear that, in their opinion, the only canonical decision was to accept their point of view…

Having examined the Matthewite case, on September 15/28, the Russians presented, in writing, a dogmatic-canonical examinat...
“1. To recognize the possibility of fulfilling the petition of Metropolitan Callistus and Epiphanius. To that end, two bishops must perform the laying-on of hands over them. They, in turn, must subsequently perform the same over their brethren, and all bishops [must perform the same rite] over the priests.

“2. To oblige Metropolitan Callistus and Epiphanius, as well as their brethren, to take all possible steps to unite their hierarchy, clergy, and people with those who are headed by his Beatitude, Archbishop Auxentius.

“3. To inform his Beatitude, Archbishop Auxentius, concerning the aforesaid [decision].

“4. To delegate the Most Reverend Archbishop Philotheus and Bishop Constantine to fulfil the provision of paragraph one of this Resolution at Transfiguration Monastery in Boston.”

It must be recognized that with regard to the vital question whether Matthew’s original ordinations were valid or not this Definition was ambiguous – probably deliberately so. On the one hand, it cited canons, such as the 8th of the First Ecumenical Council and the 79th of the Council of Carthage that related originally to schismatics. On the other hand, it deliberately rejected comparison with these schismatics, saying: “it is evident that the Old Calendarists led by the hierarchy of Matthewite ordination cannot be compared with such schismatics as the Donatists and Novationists”. So were the Matthewites schismatics or not, in the Russians’ opinion? We cannot say for certain...

The laying on of hands, together with the reading of several prayers from the service for the consecration of bishops497, duly took place, on September 17/30 and September 18 / October 1.

On the same day (October 1) Metropolitan Philaret wrote to Archbishop Auxentius: “They [Metropolitans Callistus and Epiphanius] laid before us the question of their hierarchy, and declared that they relied completely on the decision of our Council, which they were obliged to accept whatever it might be.

“We rejoiced at the humility and firm Orthodox faith with which they came to us. Therefore we treated them with brotherly love and the hope that their good feelings would serve the affair of a general union. We based our decision also on the fact that the indicated hierarchs agreed to do all they could to unite with your Church. That is, what seemed to you and us unrealizable, with the help of the grace of God turned out to be possible. We hope that your Beatitude, being led by the Holy Spirit, will treat them with brotherly love and that through your and our joint efforts all will be united by you…”

496 Vozdvizhenie (Exaltation), 1999, № 8 (28), pp. 10-15; The Struggle against Ecumenism, pp. 95, 97.
497 This is according to Anastasios Hudson, Metropolitan Petros of Astoria, USA, 2014, p. 22.
For a very short period the two Greek Synods called each other “brothers in Christ”, and in the opinion of the present writer this is what they in fact were (and are). For it makes no ecclesiological sense to claim that two Churches which derive their orders or correction of their orders from the same source, are in communion with each through that source, and have the same confession of faith, can be of a different status ecclesiologically. That there was no difference in faith between the two Synods was confirmed on June 5, 1974, when, in an encyclical to its clergy, the Auxentiite Synod reaffirmed that the new calendarists were schismatics with no grace of sacraments and should be received into the True Church by chrismation: “The ministration of the Holy Gifts to the new calendarists has been forbidden since the beginning of the schism of the official Church; and you must observe this line of conduct unswervingly in a spirit of discipline towards our ecclesiastical traditions. If someone joins our ranks from the new calendar, an indispensable condition of his acceptance is the confession of faith and the condemnation of every heresy and innovation, including the new calendar, by the acceptance of which the Greek Church became schismatic from 1924, as the reformer Archbishop Chrysostom Papadopoulos himself averred, and in consequence of which its sacraments are deprived of sanctifying grace. If people who have been baptised in that Church convert to the Faith, they must again be chrismated with holy chrism of canonical origin, in accordance with the First Canon of St. Basil the Great.”

This confession of the faith removed the main obstacle to union with the Matthewites – the suspicion that the Auxentiites recognised the new calendarists. However, it had no effect on the Matthewites, who went even further to the right by rejecting the 1971 kheirothesia, declaring: “1. We accepted spiritual communion with the Russian Synod after an oral declaration-assurance with regard to agreement and unity in the faith, i.e. the confession-ecclesiology of the True Orthodox Church. 2. We accepted the kheirothesia as an external act – and wholly formal, in order to efface the pretext of anticanonicity which the followers of the former [Bishop] of Florina, i.e. the Acacians, had put forward in opposition to unity, and not as something that affected the Hierarchy, which was dogmatically complete and perfect. 3. We accept that there were canonical breaches (irregularities), but what moved us was the fact that the Russians, in accordance with the declarations of the Exarchate, had confessed the True Confession. However, when the opposite started to reveal itself, after desperate attempts which lasted for approximately four years, we were compelled to break off spiritual communion, being indifferent to the issue of the kheirothesia, because neither had anything been added to us, nor subtracted from us. ... 4. Yes, as has been revealed, the act of 1971 was a robber act, which had been previously

498 Full text in The Struggle against Ecumenism, pp. 99-100. A footnote to the encyclical declared: “The present encyclical was ready to be issued on April 4, 1973. It has been postponed until now awaiting his Eminence, Bishop Peter of Astoria, who, though invited repeatedly to endorse the encyclical, refused to do so. On this account, in its meeting of June 5, 1974, the Holy Synod struck him from its membership and removed him from the exarchate of the True Orthodox Christians of America.” (p. 100). According to Lardas (op. cit., p. 21), Bishop Peter refused to sign the encyclical “on advice from the Synod of the ROCA”.

304
constructed by the enemies of the Church.”

Much later, on November 28, 2007 the Matthewite Synod under Archbishop Nicholas declared: “The so called *laying-on-of-hands* which was performed by the ROCOR in 1971, according to the faith of the Genuine Orthodox Church of Greece and according to its ecclesiastical totality, neither added to, nor gave legitimacy, wholeness, grace or power to the high-priesthoodness of the Bishops of the Church of the GOC of Greece - and in a strict *canonical review* should never have been permitted to have taken place.”

---

499 *Kirix Gnision Orthodoxon* (Herald of the True Orthodox Christians), March, 1984, pp. 102-103, Epistle № 1897 of March 1; *The Struggle against Ecumenism*, pp. 87-100.

Now the lifting of the anathemas in 1965 had caused the majority of monasteries, sketes and dependencies of Mount Athos – always in the forefront of the struggle for the faith against ecumenism - to cease commemorating the patriarch. On November 13, 1971 a special session of the Holy Assembly, the governing body of Mount Athos, resolved that “on the issue of resuming the commemoration of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, each Holy Monastery, as a self-governing entity, is to remain free to choose a course of action in accordance with its conscience”. 501 However, although Esphigmenou, along with other monasteries, remained faithful to this resolution, the abbots of St. Paul’s and Xenophontou monastery were removed and replaced by hand-picked appointees.

In 1972 Esphigmenou raised the flag “Orthodoxy or Death” over the monastery in protest against the joint prayer service held by Athenagoras and the Pope, and broke communion with the other monasteries. However, in July Athenagoras died, and hopes were raised that his successor, Demetrius, would abandon his predecessor’s uniatism and return to Orthodoxy. But these hopes were dashed when, at his enthronement speech on July 5/18, the new patriarch affirmed his commitment to Ecumenism and the WCC, and spoke about “the pressing need to initiate dialogues first of all with Islam, and then with the other great monotheistic religions.” 502 Later that year Demetrius addressed the Mohammedans on one of their feasts: “The great God whose children we all are, all of us who believe in and worship him, wishes us to be saved and to be brothers. He wishes this to be so even though we belong to different religions. In these religions, however, we have learned both to recognize the holy God as the beginning and end of all, to love each other and to think only good things – which things let us practise towards each other.”503

This did not prevent the Sacred Community of the Holy Mountain from issuing an encyclical to the monasteries on July 8/21, instructing them to resume the commemoration of the Ecumenical Patriarch. “A new climate has been established between the Holy Mountain and the Ecumenical Patriarchate,” the encyclical stated. “With the death of Patriarch Athenagoras, the reasons which led certain holy monasteries to break off the commemoration of their bishop’s name now exist no longer.”

Nevertheless, even after this statement and the visit to the Holy Mountain of an exarchate from the Ecumenical Patriarchate in September, seven monasteries still refused to commemorate the patriarch. And one of them, Esphigmenou, began to commemorate the Old Calendarist Archbishop Auxentius instead.504

503 The Zealot Monks of Mount Athos, Phoni ex Agiou Orous (Voice from the Holy Mountain), 1988, p. 73; Ekklesiastiki Alitheia (Ecclesiastical Truth), № 70, 1972.
In September, 1973, another exarchate arrived on the Holy Mountain. It condemned Esphigmenou’s rebellion. Then, “on 11 March 1974 the Ecumenical Patriarch wrote to the Holy Community, announcing his decision. Penalties were imposed on thirteen monks. These included Archimandrite Athanasius, Abbot of Esphigmenou, the two epitropoi and the secretary of the monastery, who were to be expelled immediately from the Mountain... Archimandrite Eudocimus, Abbot of Xenophonos, was to be deposed and expelled from his monastery, but permitted to live in some other Athomite House. The abbots of the two other communities – Archimandrites Dionysius of Grigoriou and Andrew of St. Paul’s – were to be deposed unless within two months they resumed the commemoration of the Patriarch’s name...

“On the arrival of the Patriarch’s letter, the police cut the telephone line to Esphigmenou and installed a guard outside the monastery. Meanwhile the monks kept the gates closed and hung from the walls a large black banner inscribed ‘Orthodoxy or Death’. They warned the civil governor that they would resist any attempt to effect a forcible entry. In a declaration smuggled to the outside world, they stated that they continued to regard themselves as canonically subject to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, but did not recognize the present occupant of the Patriarchal throne, since ‘he is an enemy of Orthodoxy’.”\(^{505}\)

The monks of Esphigmenou were encouraged in their stand by a great miracle worked by the Holy Martyr Agathangelus, a monk of Esphigmenou. At the most critical moment in the struggle, the monks on entering the sanctuary were met with a great fragrant cloud. On examination, they found that the cloud was coming from the relics of St. Agathangelus; and they took this to mean that the saint was approving of their struggle against the greatest heresy of the age...

\(^{505}\) *Eastern Churches Review*, vol. IV, № 1, Spring, 1974, pp. 109-110.
The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia may have crushed the Czechs temporarily, but in the Soviet Union it gave new zeal to the dissident movement. Thus already on August 25, 1968 a small demonstration by Pavel Litvinov and Larisa Daniel against the invasion took place on Red Square. In their trial, to which no Western correspondents were allowed, they were each sentenced to several years of exile. In the same year Anatoly Kuznetsov fled to the West, declaring: “It is impossible to be at the same time a Soviet citizen and a decent person.”

Dissidence took several forms: movements for freedom from literary and artistic censorship (Solzhenitsyn, Rostropovich, Sinyavsky and Daniel), for national liberation (Jews, Ukrainians, Crimean Tatars), for religious freedom (Catholics in Lithuania, Baptists in the Volga region and Siberia, Orthodox in the major Russian cities). While all these various movements were tinged with dissatisfaction with the Soviet order and all appealed to the concept of human rights, they did not at any time coalesce into a movement to overthrow the Soviet order, that is, into counter-revolution. But this did not stop the Soviet authorities from treating them as rebels and counter-revolutionaries. A particularly alarming development became publicly known at this time: the detention of dissidents in special psychiatric hospitals, where they were injected with drugs in order to destroy their minds and their faith. In June, 1971 the ROCOR Synod of Bishops issued a special statement condemning this barbaric practice.506

The only movement that radically rejected the legitimacy of the Soviet regime while embracing the pre-revolutionary ideology of the Russian Orthodox Autocracy was the True Orthodox or Catacomb Church. They were supported by ROCOR in the West. But the True Orthodox Christians remained in the underground without engaging in open dissident activity...

The dissident movement in the official Orthodox Church began, among the clergy, with the 1965 open letter of the Priests Nicholas Yeshliman and Gleb Yakunin to President Podgornyi, in which they protested against the subservience of the Church to the State, particularly in not resisting the Khrushchev persecution, in giving control of the parishes to the State-controlled dvadsatsky, in the handing over of lists of those baptized to the local authorities, in not letting children and adolescents under 18 participate in church life, and in ordaining only those candidates to the episcopate and priesthood who were pleasing to the Council for Religious Affairs. This letter was ignored by the patriarchate, and in 1966 both priests were forbidden from serving.

506 “Soviet Psychiatric Torture”, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mJ8rYeQrSak&list=PLjJEXmzbyxxXqtIw8KV2XHGsDyfCEjzXy&index=2.
Among the laity, the most significant dissident was the philosopher Boris Talantov, who was imprisoned for exposing the activities of the Kirov Bishop John in the closing of churches and suppression of believers. He was slandered publicly on the BBC by Metropolitan Nicodem of Leningrad, and was eventually sent to prison in Kirov, where he died in 1971.

In an article entitled “Sergianism, or adaptation to atheism”, which had the subtitle “The Leaven of Herod”, Talantov denounced Metropolitan Sergius’ 1927 declaration as a betrayal of the Church, and the MP as “a secret agent of worldwide antichristianity”. Sergianism had not only not “saved” the Church, but, on the contrary, had assisted the loss of true ecclesiastical freedom and turned the Church administration into the obedient tool of the atheist authorities. “Metropolitan Sergius,” he wrote, “by his adaptation and lies saved nobody and nothing except himself.”

In another samizdat article entitled “The Secret Participation of the Moscow Patriarchate in the struggle of the CPSS against the Orthodox Christian Church” Talantov wrote: “The Moscow Patriarchate and the majority of bishops participate in organized activities of the atheist authorities directed to the closing of churches, the limitation of the spreading of the faith and its undermining in our country... In truth the atheist leaders of the Russian people and the princes of the Church have gathered together against the Lord and His Christ”.

In 1972, Alexander Solzhenitsyn wrote an open “Lenten Letter” to Patriarch Pimen, describing the patriarchate as being “ruled dictatorially by atheists - a sight never before seen in two millenia!” “The Russian Church,” he wrote, “expresses its concern about any evil in distant Africa, while it never has anything at all to say about things which are wrong here at home.” And he went on: “By what reasoning is it possible to convince oneself that the planned destruction of the spirit and body of the church under the guidance of atheists is the best way of preserving it? Preserving it for whom? Certainly not for Christ. Preserving it by what means? By falsehood? But after the falsehood by whose hands are the holy sacraments to be celebrated?”

Solzhenitsyn’s appeal “not to live by the lie” was seen by some to lead logically to the adoption of a catacomb existence for the Church. Thus Fr. Sergius Zheludkov replied: “What are we to do in such a situation? Should we say: all or nothing? Should we try to go underground, which in the present system is unthinkable? Or should we try somehow to accept the system and for the present use those opportunities that are permitted?”

---

507 Talantov, in “Tserkov’ Katakombnaia na zemle Rossijskoj (III)” (The Catacomb Church in the Russian Land (III), Pravoslavnaia Zhizn’ (Orthodox Life), № 12 (635), December, 2002, pp. 10-11.
509 Ellis, op. cit., p. 305. However, Solzhenitsyn himself neither belonged to the Catacomb Church nor even believed in Her existence.
Two main streams were discernible in the religious dissident movement, who may be called, recalling the debates of the nineteenth-century intelligentsia, the Westernisers and the Slavophiles.\textsuperscript{510}

The Westernisers were mainly concerned to correct abuses within the Church, to re-establish freedom of conscience and freedom of expression. They sought and received much support in the West, and were in turn much influenced by modern western modes of thought, especially – and in this they departed from traditionally Orthodox modes of thought – Ecumenism. The Slavophiles were less well received and understood in the West. Their main emphasis was on the restoration of traditional Russianness – Russian religion, Russian art and architecture, Russian culture in all its forms, which Soviet culture had so damaged and distorted.

The two streams were not always sharply differentiated and could fuse together in the thought and activity of a single man. Thus Solzhenitsyn, though usually considered to be a Slavophile, nevertheless shared many of the characteristics of the westernizing dissidents, not only in his human rights activity, but also in his Ecumenism. And, purified of their heterodox elements, both streams could be said to tend (unconsciously as yet) towards the True Orthodox Church, which remained more radical and still more courageous in Her confession than the dissidents and more truly representative of the best of Old Russia than the Slavophiles.

39. THE VIETNAM WAR AND THE SIXTIES GENERATION

If the history of Communism could be counted as anything but profoundly abhorrent and evil, then we would have to accord some honour to the Vietnamese Communist movement. For it defeated not one, but two Capitalist enemies. Under its leader, Ho Chi Minh, a founder of the French Communist Party and then founder of the Vietnamese Party, they first defeated the French colonial masters of the country in 1954, and then repeated the trick against the Americans in 1973...

An important cause of Ho’s success was his exploitation of the West’s hypocrisy in relation to its own ideals. Thus after conquering Hanoi in August, 1945, he quoted the American Declaration of Independence and the Franch Declaration of Human Rights as “undeniable truths”. “Nevertheless,” he went on, “the French imperialists, abusing the standard of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, have violated our Fatherland and oppressed our fellow citizens. They have acted contrary to the ideals of humanity and justice. In the field of politics, they have deprived our people of every democratic liberty…” 511

Of course, democratic ideals of liberty were far more harshly violated by Communist leaders such as Ho than by any western leader. For, as Revel writes, “the Communists excel in converting ingrained feelings, such as nationalism, and such humanitarian causes as combating racism into instruments for furthering totalitarian expansion, although when they are in power they respect neither the national independence of the countries they control, nor human rights.” 512 Nevertheless, so long as the western powers clung on to colonies which they had stolen from the native peoples, the Communists retained an important propaganda advantage.

Another striking aspect of Ho’s success was that it was achieved independently of the great Communist super-power in the region, China, which traditionally had seen Indo-China as a tributary region. “After the Korean War,” writes J.M. Roberts, “the Chinese began to supply arms to the communist guerilla forces in Vietnam for what was less a struggle against colonialism – that was decided already – than about what should follow it. In 1953 the French had given up both Cambodia and Laos. In 1954 they lost at a base called Dien Bien Phu a battle decisive both for French prestige and for the French electorate’s will to fight. After this, it was impossible for the French to maintain themselves in the Red River delta. A conference at Geneva agreed to partition Vietnam between a South Vietnamese government and the communists who had come to dominate the north, pending elections opened in Indo-China what was to become the fiercest phase since 1945 of the Asian war against the West begun in 1941.
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“The western contenders were no longer the former colonial powers but the Americans. The French had gone home and the British had problems enough elsewhere. On the other side was a mixture of Indo-Chinese communists, nationalists and reformers supported by the Chinese and Russians. American anti-colonialism and the belief that the United States should support indigenous governments led it to back the South Vietnamese as it backed South Koreans and Filipinos. Unfortunately neither in Laos nor South Vietnam, nor, in the end, in Cambodia, did there emerge regimes of unquestioned legitimacy in the eyes of those they ruled. American patronage merely identified them with the western enemy so disliked in east Asia. American support also tended to remove the incentive to carry out reforms which would have united people behind these regimes, above all in Vietnam, where de facto partition did not produce good or stable governments in the south. While Buddhists and Roman Catholics quarreled bitterly and the peasants were more and more alienated from the regime by the failure of land reform, an apparently corrupt ruling class seemed able to survive government after government. This benefited the communists. They sought reunification on their own terms and maintained from the north support for the communist underground movement in the south, the Vietcong.

“By 1960 the Vietcong had won control of much of the south. This was the background to a momentous decisions taken by the American president, John Kennedy, in 1962, to send not only financial and material help, but also 4,000 American ‘advisers’ to help the South Vietnam government put its military house in order. It was the first step towards what Truman had been determined to avoid, the involvement of the United States in a major war on the mainland of Asia (and, in the end, the loss of more than 50,000 American lives).”513

*

While the Communists were gaining ground in Vietnam, they were losing it in another important and populous part of South-East Asia – Indonesia. “Since the Second World War,” writes Naomi Klein, “the country had been led by President Sukarno, the Hugo Chavez of his day (though minus Chavez’s appetite for elections). Sukarno enraged the rich countries by protecting Indonesia’s economy, redistributing wealth and throwing out the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which he accused of being facades for the interests of Western multinationals. While Sukarno was a nationalist, not a Communist, he worked closely with the Communist Party, which had 3 million active members. The U.S. and British governments were determined to end Sukarno’s rule, and declassified documents show that the CIA had received high-level directions to ‘liquidate President Sukarno, depending upon the situation and available opportunities’.

“After several false starts, the opportunity came in October 1965, when General Suharto, backed by the CIA, began the process of seizing power and eradicating the left. The CIA had been quietly compiling a list of the country’s leading leftists, a document that fell into Suharto’s hands, while the Pentagon helped out by supplying extra weapons and field radios so Indonesian forces could communicate in the remotest parts of the archipelago. Suharto then sent out his soldiers to hunt down the four to five thousand leftists on his ‘shooting list’ as the CIA referred to them; the U.S. embassy received regular reports on their progress. As the information came in, the CIA crossed names off their lists until they were satisfied that the Indonesian left had been annihilated. One of the people involved in the operation was Robert J. Martens, who worked for the U.S. embassy in Jakarta. ‘It really was a big help to the army,’ he told the journalist Kathy Kadane twenty-five years later. ‘The probably killed a lot of people, and I probably have a lot of blood on my hands, but that’s not all bad. There’s a time when you have to strike hard at a decisive moment.’

“The shooting lists covered the targeted killings; the more indiscriminate massacres for which Suharto is infamous were, for the most part, delegated to religious students. They were quickly trained by the military and then sent into villages on instructions from the chief of the navy to ‘sweep’ the countryside of Communists. ‘With relish,’ wrote one reporter, ‘they called out their followers, stuck their knives and pistols in their waistbands, swung their clubs over their shoulders, and embarked on the assignment for which they had been hoping. In just over a month, at least half a million and possibly as many as 1 million people were killed, ‘massacred by the thousands’, according to Time.”

The events in Indonesia were a timely reminder that the war against Communism, while necessary, was no simple conflict between good and evil, but stained the hands and consciences of the anti-Communists as well.

*  

Meanwhile, President Kennedy was thinking of withdrawing all American help from the South Vietnamese by the end of 1965. But from the time Lyndon Johnson became president after Kennedy’s assassination in 1963, the American commitment inexorably increased. However, the results were poor – for several reasons: the incompetence of the South Vietnamese government, its hostility to the Buddhist minority, the advantages enjoyed by guerillas that could retreat into safe-havens in neighbouring Laos and Cambodia, the failure to have the struggle blessed by the United Nations or persuade other western nations (besides Australia and New Zealand) to join it, the fact that the war in all its horrors was broadcast by television into the homes of millions of Americans, eliciting disgust and disillusion, but above all the fanatical determination and courage of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese.

---

For the first time, many people in the West began to have doubts whether the worldwide war against Communism was really worth fighting. Paradoxically, leftist and neo- or Euro-communist ideas were becoming popular in the West just as disillusion with Communism was setting in in the East. When Solzhenitsyn emigrated to America in the 1970s, he speculated that there were more true believers in Marxism in the West than in the East, and that the West would never understand the reality of Communism until they had experienced it on their own backs...

True, economic growth in the Soviet bloc had been reasonable in the 50s and 60s, and technological achievements such as inter-ballistic missiles and sputniks were impressive. But these only served to hide the major advantages that the West still enjoyed over the Communist East in terms of vastly superior economic performance and technological creativity of the West. This forced the Communists to pour proportionately far greater resources into the military and space. In spite of this disadvantage, the East did achieve something like parity in the 1960s – much to the alarm of the Americans – and even began to pull ahead in some spheres in the Brezhnev years. In the long term, however, and in spite of high world prices for Soviet gas and oil in the 1970s, the effort exhausted them: by the time Gorbachev came to power in 1985, Soviet Communism was on its last legs.

Moreover, the ever-increasing disparity in living standards between East and West could not be hidden and eventually undermined the resistance of all but the most isolated and fanatical Communist societies (like North Korea). Stalin had been right (from his point of view) in punishing his soldiers who had caught a glimpse of prosperous Germany in 1944-45 (in case they began to ask why “advanced socialism” was so much poorer); and his successors continued to allow only the most “reliable” of their citizens out to the West. The point where the contrast could be seen most glaringly was Berlin, which is why the Berlin wall was built in 1961 to stop the constant flow of émigrés from East to West. For until its final completion on January 5, 1964, “an astonishing 1,283,918 East Berliners and East Germans had crossed to the West. With the wall in place, the East German police showed no compunction in shooting dead anyone who attempted to scale the wall.”515

The appeal of the West was not only economic, but also cultural. Although the Soviets held their own in the performing arts, such as ballet and classical music, this did not prevent leading performers such as Nureyev and Rostropovich from emigrating to the West, while in popular culture the appeal of blue jeans and the Beatles (and even, in restricted showings for the KGB, the ultra-capitalist and decadent James Bond films) was very wide, especially on the younger generation. The main direction of influence was from West to East. There was some influence in the opposite direction, as in

the fashion for new revolutionary idols such as Mao and Che Guevara. However, as we have seen, this fashion was not really serious, but was rather a manifestation of the deeper cult of youth and general denigration of authority and all received wisdom and morality.

That anti-authoritarianism began in America, with the student protests against the Vietnam War, the burning of draft cards, and the opening up of serious divisions between the media and the government, on the one hand, and between some senators, such as Senators Fulbright, McCarthy and Robert Kennedy, on the one hand, and President Johnson, on the other. This led to Johnson announcing that he would not be standing as a candidate at the next election. Meanwhile, as political protest descended into hippiedom, the drug culture and the practical (and sometimes public) expression of the slogan “Make love, not war”, it could be seen that the seriousness of the events was not so much in any specific ideas or plans of the youthful “revolutionaries” as in a general sapping of authority in the western world. The new president, Richard Nixon, caught the essence of the situation well in his inaugural in 1969: “We are caught in war, wanting peace. We are torn by division, wanting unity. We see around us empty lives, wanting fulfillment…”516

The Vietnam War was unique in that, perhaps for the first time in history, we see the youth of a country forcing its leaders to change course on a major issue of war and peace. For it was the prolonged demonstrations of American youth against the war that finally wore down the administration, first the Senate and then the presidency, leading to the final withdrawal of American involvement in 1975 and a serious undermining of the nation’s unity and self-confidence worldwide. Nor was it only in America that revolutionary youth seemed to take control (if anarchy can be called control), but also in France (in the events of May, 1968), in Czechoslovakia (where students played an important part in the Prague Spring), in England (where the “Swinging Sixties” were largely led by young people) in China (in the rampaging young Red Guards of China’s Cultural Revolution) and in Cambodia in the 1970s (where the majority of Pol Pot’s soldiers were extraordinarily young).

Not coincidentally, the first generation to be born after the Second World War was coming of age at the same time; this was the first generation that had taken no direct part in that titanic struggle between Fascism, Communism and Democracy, who had not shared in the sufferings or the ideological enthusiasms of their parents. They did not have their own enthusiasms, but these were of a different kind – essentially anarchical, anti-authoritarian, anti-traditional, unfocussed and frivolous. Of course, youth have always played an important part in revolutions, being drawn by the whiff of violence and sexual licence. But earlier revolutions had an ideological content or vision of the future that supplied testosterone-fuelled zeal with a certain backbone, self-sacrificial discipline and quasi-justification. Not so with most of the revolutions of the Sixties. Whether in Mao’s China or Johnson’s America, the
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revolutionary young could think of no better ideology than Feminism or the Thoughts of Chairman Mao’s Little Red Book to justify their sickening abuse of almost everything that previous generations had considered sacred.

The youth protests against the Vietnam War had the appearance of greater seriousness. For after all, young men were being sent to fight and die in a particularly bitter war on the other side of the world. But some of the same frivolity and adolescent anti-authoritarianism that we detected in the May Events in Paris could be seen – albeit with greater real passion, and over a longer period and with far greater long-term consequences - in the disturbances on the American campuses. Thus there was remarkably little real debate about the true evil of Communism, and the consequences of defeat, not only for the Vietnamese people, but also for the whole world. Too late, after the Americans had withdrawn, did the tragedy of the Vietnamese boat people, or the unbelievably brutal killing fields of Cambodia (one third of the whole population killed in the space of four years of Khmer Rouge rule!) register – or rather, failed to register – with an increasingly inward-looking, cynical and divided American and Western public.

In hindsight, of course, it is easy to assert that the Vietnam War was a foolish venture. Khruschev had said to Dean Rusk in 1961: “If you want to, go ahead and fight in the jungles of Vietnam. The French fought there for seven years and still had to quit in the end. Perhaps the Americans will be able to stick out for a little longer, but eventually they will have to quit too.”

They quit on January 15, 1973, suspending all military action against North Vietnam as the Senate cut off all further funding for the war. “Twelve days later, in Paris, the long-awaited ceasefire agreement was signed by all the contending parties: the United States, North Vietnam, South Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Council of South Vietnam (the Communist Vietcong’s political arm). The United States had given up Vietnam, on behalf of whose government it had fought so long and suffered so much – including the disillusionment with the South Vietnamese leaders....

“The ceasefire agreement of January 27 enabled the Americans to begin to pull out their remaining forces, and to end their effective state of war – although there had never been a declaration of war – with North Vietnam, against which no further bombing raids were mounted. The United States Defence Department, at the time of the ceasefire agreement, published the statistics of the war, first and foremost the numbers of those killed in Vietnam since the United States became involved in the war on 8 March 1965. In order of magnitude the highest death toll was that of the North Vietnamese civilians and soldier, and Vietcong, 922,290 in all. The South Vietnamese armed forces lost 181,483 men, in addition to whom 50,000 South Vietnamese civilians were killed. The United States war deaths were 55,337.
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“More than 150,000 American soldiers had been wounded, some terribly. As the American public turned against the war, it also seemed to turn against the search for adequate provision for the veterans, for adequate recognition of what they had been through. On their return to the United States, many of those who had fought felt spurned and scorned, their suffering of no interest to those among whom they lived and worked. The war had been lost; for millions of Americans it had become a source of shame. Those who had fought it felt that they had been cast as villains and pariahs. It took a decade and more before there was a change. At the turn of the century, at the Vietnam War memorial in Washington, visitors walk in shocked silence along the long list of names. That memorial was not created until 1982…”

However, in 1975, “with the consent of Congress, 132,000 Vietnamese refugees were offered sanctuary in the United States. Some faced cries of ‘Go home!’ when they reached the town of their destination – especially if it was an area of high unemployment. But many more were met by town bands that marched in parade to welcome them.”

The loss of Indo-China in 1973 has been compared to the loss of China in 1949. But its impact on the American psyche was much more profound; it could be said to have marked the beginning of the end of American democracy. America is still with us at the time of writing, and still powerful; but the freshness, the faith and the idealism had gone by the time helicopters lifted the American ambassador off the roof of his embassy in Saigon in April, 1975...
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“As the 1970s began,” writes Chang, “China seemed beset by external and internal crises. Domestic politics took a bizarre turn in 1971 when it was revealed that Mao’s designated heir, Lin Biao, had perished in a plane crash in Outer Mongolia after twice attempting to assassinate the Chairman himself. At the same time, the Soviet Union was threatening to use its most ‘modern and devastating weapons’... and target specific nuclear strikes against China. Mao’s foreign policies had created a threat environment that jeopardized the very continuity of the People’s Republic. Clearly, China’s foreign posture required reassessment...

“That reassessment was undertaken under the direction of Zhou Enlai. The Manichaean notion that the world was divided into a capitalist and a socialist camp gave way to a conviction that reality was complex, where socialist China could be threatened by socialist Russia in league with socialist Vietnam. Suggestions began to be bruited that appeals be made to the capitalist powers for capital, technology transfers, and security assistance. Finally, Beijing announced that it no longer considered the United States to be China’s ‘number one enemy’. With that, China’s rapprochement with the West began – a process that spanned Mao’s remaining years, culminating in the normalization of relations between the United States and the People’ Republic of China on January 1, 1979.”

The United States under Nixon and his crafty Secretary of State Henry Kissinger were quick to exploit the Sino-Soviet quarrel. After the clash on the Ussuri river in March, 1969, writes Stone, “Moscow asked Nixon to condemn the Chinese nuclear tests; there were hints at a nuclear strike to destroy the Chinese ‘facilities’; and the Chinese were refusing the Russians the right to fly supplies to Vietnam or to use their airfields. The Chinese needed America against Russia. There was room, here, for clevercleverness, and in April 1971 the world was surprised when an American table tennis team went to Peking. It was even more taken aback a year later, when Nixon followed, on 21 February 1972...”

This moment of détente between the US and China was no less important than the other détente taking place between the US and the USSR. The latter was expressed mainly in open and business-like arms-control agreements and some loans from western banks to the Soviets. In the Chinese-American negotiations, however, everything was conducted in secret; neither side wanted to appear too eager to get together with the other. After all, Nixon had built his political career since the time of McCarthy on his anti-Communism, while Mao could not afford not to appear anti-American. In the event, both sides – but especially the United States – made unprecedented concessions they would not have dreamed of only a few years before.
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Kissinger himself pointed out the importance of these events. “While I was on the way to China on the so-called secret trip in July 1971, [Nixon], addressing an audience in Kansas City,... argued that ‘Chinese domestic travail’ – that is, the Cultural Revolution - should not confer ‘any sense of satisfaction that it will always be that way. Because when we see the Chinese as people – and I have seen them all over the world... - they are creative, they are productive, they are one of the most capable people in the world. And 800 million Chinese are going to be, inevitably, an enormous economic power, with all that that means in terms of what they could be in other areas if they move in that direction.’

“These phrases, commonplace today, were revolutionary at that time. Because they were delivered extemporaneously – and I was out of communication with Washington – it was Zhou Enlai who brought them to my attention as I started the first dialogue with Beijing in more than twenty years. Nixon, inveterate anti-Communist, had decided that the imperatives of geopolitical equilibrium overrode the demands of ideological purity – as, fortuitously, had his counterparts in China...”

The winner, unquestionably, was Mao. For the Chinese-American détente followed the pattern observed that in all negotiations between the Capitalist West and the Communist East at least until the Reagan-Gorbachev summits, of the West conceding more than it gained. As Jung Chang and Jon Halliday write, “Mao’s change of mind [about relations with America] changed his fortunes. The invitation [to the American table-tennis team], the first ever from Red China to an American group, caused a sensation. The fact that it was a sports team helped capture the world’s imagination. Chou En-lai switched on his charm, and his totalitarian regime’s meticulously orchestrated theatre, to produce what Kissinger called ‘a dazzling welcome’ for the ping-pong team. Glowing and fascinated reports littered the American and major Western press day after day. Mao the old newspaperman had hit exactly the right button. ‘Nixon’, wrote one commentator, ‘was truly amazed at how the story jumped off the sports pages and onto the front page.’ With one move, Mao had created the climate in which a visit to China would be a political asset for Nixon in the run-up to the 1972 presidential election.

“'Nixon was excited to the point of euphoria,' Kissinger wrote, and now wanted to skip the emissary state lest it take the glow off his own journey. By the end of May it was settled, in secret, that Nixon was going.

“Mao had not only got Nixon, he had managed to conceal that this had been his objective. Nixon was coming thinking that he was the keener of the two. So when Kissinger made his first, secret, visit in July 1971 to pave the way for the president, he bore many and weighty gifts, and asked for nothing in return. The most startling offer concerned Taiwan, to which the US was

---

bound by a mutual defence treaty. Nixon offered to abandon Washington’s old ally, promising to accord full diplomatic recognition to Peking by January 1975, provided he was re-elected in 1972.

“Nixon was accepting Peking’s position wholesale and cutting Taiwan loose. By the end of the trip Chou was talking as if pocketing Taiwan was a matter of course. It was only at this point that Kissinger made a feeble gesture: ‘We hope very much that the Taiwan issue will be solved peacefully.’ But he did not press Chou for a promise not to use force.

“As part of the recognition package, Nixon offered to get Peking into the UN straight away: ‘you could get the China seat now’, Kissinger told Chou when proposing the behind-the-scenes fix, adding that ‘the President wanted me to discuss this matter with you before we adopted a position.’

“And there was more, including an offer to tell the Chinese everything about America’s dealings with Russia. Kissinger: ‘Specially, I am prepared to give you any information you may wish to know regarding any bilateral negotiations we are having with the Soviet Union on such issues as SALT [Strategic Arms Limitation Talks]. A few months later Kissinger told the Chinese: ‘we tell you about our conversations with the Soviets; we do not tell the Soviets about our conversations with you’...

“Kissinger also made two huge commitments on Indochina: to pull out all US forces, mentioning a twelve-month deadline; and to abandon the South Vietnamese regime, promising to withdraw ‘unilaterally’ even if there were no negotiations – and that US troops would not return. ‘After a peace is made,’ said Kissinger, ‘we will be 10,000 miles away, and [Hanoi] will still be there.’ Kissinger even made a promise that ‘most, if not all, American troops’ would be out of Korea before the end of Nixon’s next term, without even trying to extract any guarantee that Mao would not support another Communist invasion of South Korea.

“Mao was being given a lot, and on a platter. Kissinger specifically said that he was not asking China to stop giving aid to Vietnam, and Mao was not even requested to soften his bellicose anti-American tone, either in the world at large or during the meetings. The minutes show that Chou was hectoring (‘you should answer that question... you must answer that question’), and constantly referring to ‘your oppression, your subversion, and your intervention’. He in effect suggested that Nixon must make more and more concessions for the privilege of coming to China, and being allowed to recognise Peking. Kissinger did not ask for reciprocal concessions. Chou’s outlandish claim that China was not ‘aggressive’ – ‘because of our new [Communist] system, no less – went unchallenged. And Chou’s reference to American ‘cruelties’ in Vietnam earned no reproof about Mao’s cruelties in China. On a different occasion, when North Vietnam’s negotiator had obliquely criticized the Nixon administration, Kissinger had shot back: ‘You
are the representative of one of the most tyrannical governments on this planet...’ Now, Kissinger described Chou’s presentation as ‘very moving’.

“When Mao heard the report of the first day’s talks, his ego soared, and he remarked to his top diplomats that America was ‘changing from monkey to man, not quite man yet, the tail is still there... but it is no longer a monkey, it’s a chimpanzee, and its tail is not very long,’ ‘American should start its life anew,’ he proclaimed, expanding on his Darwinian approach, viewing America as a slowly evolving lower primate. ‘This is evolution!’ Chou, for his part, compared Nixon to a loose woman ‘tarting herself up and offering herself at the door’. It was now, during this first Kissinger visit, that Mao drew the conclusion that Nixon could be manipulated, and that Peking could get a lot out of America without having to modify its tyranny, or its anti-American ranting...”523

The taunts were deserved. America had betrayed all its Far Eastern allies for a mess of Chinese pottage. The undignified and hypocritical grovelling of the world’s most powerful nation and the supposed number one champion of human rights in the world before one of the most evil and murderous regimes in history was worthy of scorn and boded badly for the situation of Capitalism in the coming decade.

“Immediately after Kissinger’s secret visit,” continue Chang and Halliday, “it was announced that Nixon had been invited to China and had accepted. Kissinger returned to Peking in October 1971 to prepare for the president’s visit. His second trip coincided with the annual UN voted on China’s seat, which Taiwan held, and the public presence in Peking of the president’s top adviser turned the tide. On 25 October, Peking displaced Taipei in the UN, giving Mao a seat, and a veto, on the Security Council.

“This was just over a month after the flight and death of Lin Biao. The news that there had been a plot to kill him had left Mao in a state of deep depression. Taiwan’s defeat and Nixon’s coming visit lifted his spirits immeasurably. Laughing broadly and joking, he talked for nearly three hours in full flow to his top diplomats. Looking at the UN vote, he declared that: ‘Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Canada, Italy – they have all become Red Guards....’

“Before China’s delegates left for the UN, Mao made a point of reminding them that they must continue to treat the USA as Public Enemy no. 1, and fiercely denounce it ‘by name, an absolute must’. He wanted to make his debut on the world stage as the anti-American champion, using the UN as a new platform.

“Nine days before Nixon was scheduled to arrive in China on 21 February 1972, Mao passed out, and came very close to death. The prospect of Nixon’s imminent arrival helped to restore him…”524

And indeed, it could be argued that America’s support for China brought the evil dragon back from the dead...

“During the relatively brief 65-minute (the only one between Nixon and Mao on this trip), Mao parried every attempt to engage him in serious issues. This was not because he had been ill, but because he did not want to leave a record of his positions in the hands of the Americans. Nothing must damage his claim to be the global anti-American leader. He had invited Nixon to Peking to promote that claim, not to waive it. So when Nixon proposed discussing ‘current issues like Taiwan, Vietnam and Korea’, Mao acted as if he were above such lesser chores. ‘These questions are not questions to be discussed in my place,’ he said, conveying an impression of lofty detachment. ‘They should be discussed with the Premier,’ adding that: ‘All those troublesome problems I don’t want to get into very much.’ Then he cut the Americans short by saying: ‘As a suggestion, may I suggest you do a little less briefing?’ When Nixon persisted in talking about ‘common ground’ and building a ‘world structure’, Mao ignored him, turned to Chou to ask what it was, and said: ‘Haven’t we talked enough now?’

“Mao was especially careful not to pay Nixon any compliments, while Nixon and Kissinger both flattered Mao fulsomely. Nixon told Mao: ‘The Chairman’s writings moved a nation and have changed the world.’ Mao returned no thanks, and made only one, condescending comment on Nixon: ‘Your book, Six Crises, is not a bad book.’...

“Mao clearly felt he could push Nixon quite far. At the end of the visit there was to be a joint communiqué. Mao dictated one in which he could denounce America. ‘Aren’t they talking peace, security... and what not?’ he said to Chou. ‘We will do the opposite and talk revolution, talk liberating the oppressed nations and people all over the world...’ So the communiqué took the form of each side stating its own position. The Chinese used their space for a tirade against America (though not by name). The American side did not say one word critical of Mao’s regime, going no further than a vague and much qualified platitude about supporting ‘individual freedom’.”525

But in a world turned truly upside down, while the powerful Americans groveled to the starving Chinese who so feared a Soviet invasion (which was their real reason for seeking relations with the Americans), the Chinese themselves were vulnerable to some of their lowly satraps – like Albania...
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“In spite of all his efforts to come across as the champion of anti-Americanism, Mao caught a lot of flak from his old allies. The fiercest came from Albania, which mattered to Mao because it was the only East European regime he had detached from Russia’s orbit. Albania’s dictator, Hoxha, penned Mao a nineteen-page letter expressing his fury over what he called ‘this shitty business’. Actually, Hoxha cunningly used rhetoric to extract colossal amounts of extra aid, basically saying: You are consorting with the enemy, but you can buy our silence for more money. Mao paid up.

“The biggest problem was Vietnam, which counted far more than Albania internationally. The Vietnamese were worried that Mao was trying to use them as a bargaining chip with the US. [They needn’t have worried: the Americans had given everything to the Chinese already.] When Chou went to Hanoi immediately after Kissinger’s first visit, to explain Peking’s move, he got an earful from North Vietnam’s leader. ‘Vietnam is our country.’ Le Duan protested; ‘you have no right to discuss the question of Vietnam with the United States.’… Mao tried to salvage some influence by pouring in even more aid, which rose to unprecedented levels from 1971, peaking in 1974.

“All these bribes to keep old allies quiet meant a tighter squeeze on the Chinese population. Nor did its extra burdens stop there. As more and more countries recognized Peking in the wake of Nixon’s visit, the number of states to which China sent aid jumped from 31 prior to 1970 to 66. On tiny and immeasurably more prosperous Malta (pop. c. 300,000), Mao lavished no less than $25 million in April 1972. Its prime minister, Dom Mintoff, returned from China sporting a Mao badge.

“Mao often had to pay over the odds to buy himself back into favour with states he had earlier tried to subvert. One former target, President Mobutu of Zaire, told us how generously he was funded by Mao, who – unlike the IMF and the World Bank – let him defer loans indefinitely, or repay them in worthless Zairean currency. In the years 1971-5, foreign aid took up a staggering average of 5.88 per cent of China’s entire expenditure, peaking at 6.92 per cent in 1973 – by far the highest percentage in the world, and at least seventy times the US level.

“While Mao dished out money and food, and built expensive underground railway systems, shipyards and infrastructure for countries far richer than China, most of the 900 million Chinese hovered just above survival levels. In many areas, peasants recall that the hungriest years after the Great Famine of 1958-61 were those from 1973 to Mao’s death in 1976 – the years immediately after Nixon’s visit.

“Nixon had often been credited with opening the door to China. Inasmuch as a number of Western statesmen and businessmen, plus some press and tourists, were able to enter China, he did increase the Western presence in China. But he did not open the door of – much less from – China, and the increased Western presence did not have any appreciable impact on Chinese
society while Mao was alive. Mao made sure that for the vast majority of the population, China remained a tightly sealed prison. The only people who benefited at all from the rapprochement were a small elite. Some of these were allowed to see relatives from abroad – under heavy supervision. And a tiny number could lay hands on the half-dozen or so contemporary Western books translated in classified editions, one of which was Nixon’s own *Six Crises*. From 1973 some foreign-language students were sent abroad, but the very few who were lucky enough to be allowed out had to be politically ultra-reliable, and lived and worked under the closest surveillance, forbidden even to step out of their residence unescorted.

“The population as a whole remained rigidly quarantined from the few foreigners allowed into China, who were subject to rigorous control. Any unauthorized conversation with them could bring catastrophe to the locals involved. The lengths to which the regime would go were extraordinary. For Nixon’s one-day visit to Shanghai, which coincided with Chinese New Year, the traditional occasion for family reunions (like Christmas), thousands of rusticated youths who were visiting their families were expelled back to their villages of exile, as a precaution against the extremely remote possibility of any of them trying to complain to the president.

“The real beneficiaries of Nixon’s visit were Mao himself, and his regime. For his own electoral ends, Nixon de-demonised Mao for mainstream opinion in the West. Briefing White House staff on his return, Nixon spoke of the ‘dedication’ of Mao’s cynical coterie, whom Kissinger called ‘a group of monks... who... kept their revolutionary purity’. Nixon’s men asserted, falsely, that ‘under Mao the lives of the Chinese masses have been greatly improved’. Nixon’s favourite evangelist, Billy Graham, lauded Mao’s virtues to British businessmen. Kissinger suggested that Mao’s callous crew would ‘challenge us in a moral way’. The result was an image of Mao a whole lot further from the truth than the one that Nixon himself had helped purvey as a fierce anti-Communist in the 1950s.

“Mao became not merely a credible international figure, but one with incomparable allure. World statesmen beat a path to his door. A meeting with Mao was, and sometimes still is, regarded as the highlight of many a career, and life…”

“Nixon’s visit also opened up for Mao the possibility of laying his hands on American nuclear weapons.

“Obtaining nuclear secrets had always been central to Mao’s American policy. ‘The only objective of these relations,’ he told the North Korean dictator Kim, ‘is to obtain developed technology.’ Mao knew that he could only achieve his goal if America considered him an ally...

---

526 Chang and Halliday, op. cit., pp. 607-609.
“The Russians were alarmed by Mao’s overtures towards the Americans. In June 1973 Brezhnev warned Nixon and Kissinger that (as Kissinger paraphrased it to China’s liaison): ‘if military arrangements were made between the US and the PRC [People’s Republic of China], this would have the most serious consequences and would lead the Soviets to take drastic measures.’ This conversation with Brezhnev, which concerned US national security, was promptly related to Mao’s envoy, who was present at the Western White House during Nixon’s talks with Brezhnev, but not to America’s allies – or to the US government itself. ‘We have told no one in our government of this conversation,’ Kissinger confided to Mao’s envoy. ‘It must be kept totally secret.’

“One ostensible purpose of Nixon’s journey to Peking had been to lessen the danger of war with Russia. Thanks to Mao, this danger had if anything increased...”527

At the same time, both China and the Soviet Union continued to supply arms and food to the North Vietnamese in the Vietnam War. So while international politics was becoming more complex and multi-polar, the Communist-Capitalist struggle remained primary.

527 Chang and Halliday, op. cit., pp. 610, 613.