

**1973–2003**

## **Thirty Years of Ecclesiastical Developments**

### **Trials, Captivity and Deliverance**

*By Bishop Makarios of Petra*

#### PROLOGUE

By the grace of God, we are publishing this, my humble submission, to the Pan-Hellenic Clerical Conference of our all-holy Church which took place on April 25/May 8, 2003. This publication is made after and not before the Conference because, as I explained at that time, I requested all the holy brethren present there for their observations and corrections of anything — of course due to ignorance and not to ill will — which I did not correctly relate. I verified with great joy that no one pointed out to me anything significant that needed to be corrected, whereas many (many of whom lived out the described events) expressed to me their total satisfaction with the accuracy of the submission.

Glory to God for all things!

The present submission is the result of at least four months of continuous work and pain which had only one purpose: the service of the unaltered truth and the most sincere and objective relating of the matter which the Holy and Sacred Synod assigned to my lowliness for the benefit of the Body of the Church. For this reason I had to run back through and explore carefully an almost numberless amount of ecclesiastical documents of various types and not only ours, but those of the New Calendarists of the last forty years, so that I might uncover and prove as much as possible the unbiased truth.

Assuredly I left out certain events that do not add anything to my presentation in order that my submission is not endless. The present publication is being circulated as a historic submission and for this reason it is lengthy, important, and based on a multitude of written evidence so that it may be a source of study and consideration—reevaluation for all, especially for our bishops and priests, many of whom requested it in written form.

I declare in writing and without guile that all of which has been presented was not written out of some self-interest or self-pleasing profit, but rather constitutes my unshakable belief and my deep conscientious witness independent of ecclesiastical outcomes. I naturally remain open and eager to whatever suggestions or corrections any of the faithful would like to make. However these must be based on hard facts and events and they have to do with as much as what I narrate, the help of our Holy God. I sincerely

feel my conscience at ease—even though, intellectually, I am totally fatigued—because I brought to a satisfactory end the work that was placed upon me, serving God and His Holy Church and no one else.

I especially thank from the bottom of my soul and ask forgiveness from my dear brethren in Christ and audience whom I tired and who patiently listened to me for six consecutive hours (!) at the Conference since that was the amount of time I needed.

I close with my whole-hearted prayer that our Holy God not allow us to involve ourselves any longer with things of the past which bleed us of all of our strength, but rather that we may move on dynamically and with self-renunciation to the God-pleasing work of building the present and the future which require so much of us, having the total conscientiousness of who we are and of our many-faceted responsibilities, needs, and shortfalls and which we are called to satisfy and fulfill as shepherds, having always as a criterion the wise words of our Holy Father Theodore the Studite:

*"The Church of God has remained invulnerable, even though many attacks have been made against Her. The gates of Hades have not been able to defeat Her. She does not allow anything to be done or said contrary to the already set boundaries and laws, even though many shepherds in many ways proved to be out of their minds, organizing great synods comprised of multitudes and called themselves the Church of God and appeared to be working for the Canons, but actually moving against the Canons....*

*"A Synod, therefore, Master, is not just an assembly of hierarchs and priests, even if they be many. For the Holy Scripture says: 'One doing the will of the Lord is better than thousands violating it' (Wisdom of Sirach 16: 3). However the assembly in the name of the Lord in peace and observation of the Canons, does not only possess the right to hold and release, but can do fittingly according to truth, the Canon and the meter of preciseness... No authority has been given to hierarchs to commit any violation of any Canon whatsoever, but rather only to follow as much as has already been set and to correctly follow the previous... It is therefore impossible, O Master, for our Orthodox Church and any other to act contrary to the set laws and Canons. Otherwise, if this be allowed, the Gospel is empty and the Canons in vain and everyone during his time of being a bishop allowing himself and those with him to act as he wills, let him become a new evangelist, another apostle, and another law-maker. No not at all. We have a command from the very Apostle himself that says, whoever dogmatizes, or orders you to do something that is against that which we have received, against that which the Canons of the varied in time holy, general and local synods, let us not accept him, nor consider him Orthodox, and I avoid saying the severe word that the Apostle said..., that is 'let him be anathema'..."\**

**\* From the 24th Letter of Saint Theodore the Studite to "Theoktistos the Magistrate" printed by Orthodoxos Kypseli, 1987, pp. 107–108, in a simple translation.**

## 1973–2003

# Thirty Years of Ecclesiastical Developments: Trials, Captivity and Deliverance

Your Eminence the Holy President of our Sacred Synod,  
Your Graces Holy Brethren, my fellow Bishops,  
The Sacred Presbyters, the Diaconate in Christ,  
Blessed Monastics, representatives of absent priests and deacons of our Church,

Christ is risen!

Our Holy God knows how much I am spiritually made joyful and glorify His most splendid name for the opportunity of today's gathering in love and truth! I wish from the bottom of my heart that God may make us worthy to enjoy each other more often in such general meetings, putting our minds together for the course of our sacred struggle for Holy Orthodoxy.

First of all, I desire to truly thank the Holy and Sacred Synod of our Church which entrusted my humility with the honor of introducing our most important subject, which is, concerning the events that have taken place in our Church during the last thirty years.

I beg your God-pleasing prayers, holy brethren and fellow hierarchs, that I may, with the help of God, bring to a transparent and edifying result the thorny and complex subject of this report.

Since our subject is concerned with the Church, bishops, synods, and synodal judgments and decisions, allow me to say first of all, some things concerning the meanings of these terms, not by my own words and thoughts, but rather using that which our Holy Fathers and our pious Tradition has handed down to us.

## INTRODUCTION

The *Confession of Saint Dositheos* [1672], Patriarch of Jerusalem, which is respected throughout all of Orthodoxy, teaches that the Church is comprised only of all the faithful that believe and profess correctly the blameless Faith that was handed down to us and preached and explained by our Lord, God and Savior Jesus Christ, the Holy Apostles and their successors, the Holy Fathers and the Ecumenical and Local Synods. And even if the faithful be responsible for whatever sin, as long as they have not fallen into despair and they retain the pious Faith and are members of the Orthodox Church and are known as such, they are judged and led to repentance by the Church.

The universal head of the Orthodox Church is our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, our true God, and He Himself holds the rudder of the Church and shows the way through the Holy Fathers and successors of the Holy Apostles, leading the Church through the Holy Spirit to the "fulfillment of the truth." This is why, according to him who was lifted up to the

heavens, the Apostle Paul, that the Holy Spirit assigned bishops over local Churches as visual authorities and heads shepherding Christ's rational flock.

According to Apostolic Tradition, Orthodox bishops gathering together in synods would find answers to every developing dogmatic, spiritual, and administrative problem and issue, discussing and deciding with great deliberation and without passion, private interest and persuasion, but rather with the enlightenment of the Holy and Sanctifying Spirit, as the words of the Apostle says: "as it seems fit to the Holy Spirit and so unto us."

However they did not have uncontrolled authority and unlimited power, but rather they were obliged to act according to the boundaries of the Sacred Canons and Traditions. According to the late and most wise Serbian Canonist Bishop Nikodim Milaš, in the counter case, "every episcopal act is invalid and nothing and no one is required to heed it if it is contrary to the Canons; if it contains something that the Canons do not include; if it does not express whatever the Local Synods have determined and have been proclaimed as institutions; and lastly, if they are in opposition to civil laws that are not contrary to the spirit of the Church."

Saint Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, for these reasons proclaims with surety, "Those things that are not in agreement with the Canons are not only powerless, but are also disregarded and stripped of all good as impious and abominable." In other words they are lamentably discarded. Thus the synod that decides such matters is considered non-canonical and a fake robber synod.

There is no such thing as the infallibility of anyone, no matter how high ranking he is in the Orthodox Church. And therefore, from the above cited, we can say that no hierarchical or synodal decision can be accepted as lawful and canonical if it does not agree when examined with the very Sacred Canons and found in agreement with that which we have received from the Holy Apostles and the Fathers. Then and only then when it is in agreement is it considered to be canonical, respectable, and applicable. We would desire from the very beginning to stress something that is very important for the matter that we are examining and we will return to this. It is that which Saint Nikodimos the Athonite expressly stresses in the *Holy Rudder* and which before him the venerable practice of Orthodoxy stresses: "As much is incorrectly judged and printed, is not affirmed neither by a Canon, nor law, nor time, nor custom."

Be attentive, my dear brethren, to keep in mind the saying, "Neither time, nor custom, nor authority can affirm and establish as canonical that which is non-canonical, nor make the unlawful legal, but rather an Orthodox Synod of canonical and conscientious bishops coming together can void and displace as much as is non-canonical and has been decided on in the past, even if these things have been put into effect for some period of time due to the then given circumstances. Think of, for example, the situation in the year 1833 of the arbitrarily "founded" Greek Church. Examining it, that great confessor Protopresbyter Konstantinos Oikonomos, ex-*Oikonomos* says, "the formation of this body from an ecclesiastical point of view was invalid and non-existent and deposed by the holy Canons, for this reason during its seventeen years of existence it was unacceptable to all

of the Churches of the Orthodox and no synod was in communion with it. Its formation had to be examined in the light of the Canons..." and that is exactly what was done in 1850.

This is why the Fourth Ecumenical Council in her fourth act, discussed the non-canonicity of the establishment of new diocesan boundaries which had taken place some years before this, and it nullified that which was non-canonical, as the bishops cried out, "According to the Canons nothing in actuality (in other words no act) exists. The Canons of the Fathers prevail... In this way the Faith is preserved and each Church is safeguarded."

I thought it necessary to begin my humble submission with these patristic words and sacred heritage, so that they might be for me a criterion and guide of judgment for the events that we will now narrate. I would like to ask forgiveness in advance, as I begin this matter, from as many of my holy brethren that I might hurt with that which I must say, because they personally took part in these events. In accepting the responsibility of this report and taking the floor here, I decided to tell the truth and the whole truth, which in any regard was the reason that this meeting was called for and not for covering people and things.

I am prepared to accept every correction based on founded proof and witnesses of which I might not be aware, and I will restore the truth if unwillingly I have been unfair to anyone saying what I know about certain events.

### **THE PERIOD BEFORE 1979**

In the last thirty years of our Church's life, my reverend Fathers and Brethren, we happen upon four stations or street signs as we might call them in the road of our Church.

First, the repudiations of 1979;

Second, the general union of the bishops of 1985;

Third, the defrocking of Archbishop Auxentios of blessed memory and the proclamation of the new "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kioussis in the year 1985–1986;

Fourth, the division of the Sacred Synod in the year 1995.

The period of time before the year 1979 was a contradictory situation. We say a contradictory time because during that time we were respected by those innovator New Calendarists, whereas internally we were bombarded with a variety of trials, recriminations, and temptations. So as the innovators were all the more sinking into Ecumenism, many New Calendarists were finding refuge in our Church. At that time, there were only two "groups" of Genuine Orthodox Christians, our own under Archbishop Auxentios and the so-called Matthewites. The sobriety and dynamism that

embellished the personality of Archbishop Auxentios had brought forth much fruit. We then won the constitutional recognition of our right to worship including:

- a) the dissuasion of the overt persecution by the New Calendarist "Archbishop" Ieronymos Kotsonis of our monasteries and institutions;
- b) the legal recognition of the canonicity of our ordinations and the establishment of our holy monasteries;
- c) the establishment of brotherly relations in Christ with the Sacred Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia under the leadership of the most saintly Metropolitan Philaret;
- d) the registration of the Mysteries we perform by the state registry;
- e) the dynamic demonstrations of our Church in important social matters, such as the automatic divorce controversy, by means of official appearances before state officials;
- f) the strengthening of our Synod by means of the consecrations of new bishops: in 1971 of the Archimandrites Paisios Evthymiadis as Bishop of Evripos, Chysostomos Kiouisis as Bishop of Thessalonica, Kallinikos Haniotis as Bishop of Thavmakos, Akakios Douskos as Bishop of Canada and, in 1973, of the Archimandrites Antonios Thanasis as Bishop of Megara and Gabriel Kalamisakis as Bishop of the Cyclades;
- g) the growth of our Church outside of Greece through the establishment of exarchates;
- h) the economic and administrative strengthening of the General Benevolent Fund of our Church;
- i) the economic aid from this fund for our needy clergy;
- j) the building of a long list of sacred temples, halls, and institutions, and in general the distinction and approval of our sacred struggle.

A faint picture of the general growth of our Church at that time can be seen glancing through the volumes of the official publication of our Church *The Voice of Orthodoxy* in which the festival of the Holy Theophany and the rite of the Blessing of the Waters in Piraeus is described as being met with enthusiastic oceans of people and ceremonies that were hailed throughout Greece!

At the same time however, the internal problems of our Church were neither few nor small. One of the four most senior bishops of the Sacred Synod, Akakios, Metropolitan of Attica and Diavleia, from 1970 on, was protesting and separating, mainly due to the reception of no more than two or three clergymen from the new calendar. This is the beginning of a new epoch for our much-suffering Church. This new epoch reaches its height during the years 1973–1974, in which certain bishops of our Church separated themselves and formed cliques calling for "cleansing" and making accusations against a few clergymen in the beginning, without often times having any evidence.

Addressing this, Archbishop Auxentios did not intend to begin canonical proceedings for the punishment of someone without evidence. Little by little after 1973, the Bishops

Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica and Gabriel of the Cyclades, who were consecrated in 1971, joined Metropolitan Akakios. Both of these latter two have their headquarters not in their dioceses, but rather in their women's convents in Attica! These three above-mentioned bishops liked to appear as the new "Three Hierarchs," proclaiming that they were rescuing the Church. Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica, in particular, began to inform his elite members and special co-workers (the brothers Laskaris and Hatzigiannakis, Basil Byros, Alexander Kalomiros, etc.) that the new "Three Hierarchs" were going to denounce the rest of the hierarchy and that they would begin the reshaping and reorganization of the Church in order to bring about moral cleansing and healing. The impetuosity of these presumptive "new *kathari*" or "new cleansers" was cut short by a written charge of many brethren from Thessalonica sent to the Sacred Synod in April 1974, in which they protested more non-canonical activities of Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica (including: his residing outside his diocese in Athens, his peculiar friendship and cooperation with only one parish, that of the "Three Hierarchs," and with movements that were friendly towards Ecumenism) and they stressed that even though they had happily accepted him as their metropolitan, he repelled them with his irresponsible and arrogant attitude, "biting instead of shepherding, scandalizing instead of supporting..."!

During this exact same period, the now late Bishop Petros of Astoria refused to sign the encyclical, which was the *Confession of Faith*, of June 5, 1974, and which was entitled *So Do We Believe, So Do We Proclaim (Outo Phronoumen, Outo Laloumen)*, even though the Sacred Synod was patient with him for a whole year (from 1973) to conform with the correct profession of the faith of our Church.

Therefore the Sacred Synod, as it was obliged to do, "removed his name from the list of its members and took away from him the exarchate of our Church in America." Some of our clergy also disagreed with this encyclical and struck out disturbing the accord, even though this encyclical simply repeated the already crystallized position of the profession of the faith of our Sacred Struggle as it was handed down to us by the confessor of faith our First Hierarchy the former Metropolitan of Florina, Chrysostomos Kavouridis.

The Synod was also obliged to punish these clergymen. Unfortunately, His Eminence Akakios, Metropolitan of Attica and Diavleia, who again due to other circumstances had chosen to take positions that were different from the rest of the body of the Sacred Synod, came into ecclesiastical communion with those outside of the Church and the Church's profession of faith, Bishops Petros of Astoria as also did Metropolitans Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica and Gabriel of the Cyclades, even though these three had already signed the encyclical *So Do We Believe, So Do We Proclaim!*

It came to be known from a letter of 1986 written by the late priest Fr. Antonios Papakalousiou, at that time a parish priest in the city of Larissa and a supporter of Metropolitan Akakios, that these four bishops had entrusted the well known New Calendarist "theologian" Athanasios Sakarellos with the revision of this encyclical which

was completed but was never published nor distributed. However a clique was indeed created.

In a general "Encyclical Addressed to the Christian Flock of our Most Holy Church" of 1974 (not bearing however an exact date), these four bishops, protesting and to a certain extent defending themselves, wrote the following: "...The life of our Church has been alienated from its essence, being limited to only some dry types of worship. Calling upon zealotism, it has been left with the only difference from the innovators' church being that of thirteen days. This sadly transformed state, dear children in the Lord, in no way is related to the title of Genuine Orthodox Christians and puts our Church outside the law, and its every act and activity is made VOID as being contrary to the Sacred Canons... This mournful state is due mainly to the lack of an existing constitution. Absolutely no organization can have life without a constitution... We pursue and desire the recovery of our Church, the safeguarding of the validity of the bishop's rank according to the dictates of the Church, the good order, modesty and the union in God of all the separated members of the G.O.C...."

We believe that from the above cited that the ideological deviation and confusion of these four bishops is made apparent to all, in which they proclaim *a priori* every act of "our Most-Holy Church" unlawful, null, and non-canonical, as if they were the superior court of the Synod. They speak of recovery and authority and good order and canonical order when they themselves from their youth lived in women's convents and divided the unity of mind of the bishops on the matter of the profession of faith ignoring their own signatures.

In another letter that circulated called "A Needed Answer to the 'Cry of Pain' of the Reverend Monk Fr. Simon of the Monastery of Simonos Petras," which was an article published in *The Voice of Orthodoxy*, the metropolitans of Attica, Thessalonica and the Cyclades, defending themselves for serving with those who had been declared "outside the Church" by the Sacred Synod, dared to write: "... Be aware of the fact that our hierarchy, meeting in the totality of its members, decided by its majority that the exarchate be taken from the Bishop of Astoria, Petros, without any decision being made that would forbid us from still serving with him." [ !!!]

Here these three bishops know that they were lying, hiding the fact that the Synod did not simply remove the Exarchate of America from Bishop Petros of Astoria, but that they "removed his name from its list of members," as we above stated.

What is the source from which they drew the right to serve with a bishop that was outside both the Synod and the Church and had a completely different profession of Faith?

In the meanwhile, in October of the same year of 1974, the charges of the faithful of Thessalonica against Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis were examined by the Sacred Synod in the presence of some of the faithful of Thessalonica and Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis who denied all of the charges even though many witnesses were



present. In the long run, the Sacred Synod encouraged a reconciling solution seeking peace and love and not bringing the matter to judgment and clarification for reasons of *oikonomia* and in order to cover Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis, as can be witnessed in the minutes # 20/15-28/10/1974.

The hostile and hateful atmosphere, however, grew worse. In 1975, Metropolitan Akakios of Attica in an act of adversity and revenge, made charges against the most important economic source of our Sacred Struggle, the Benevolent Fund. However after an intense examination by the legal officials, everything was found to be in total agreement with the law.

A great wound to the cohesiveness and the outward appearance of our Sacred Struggle was a disreputable newsletter that was published, fortunately only in a small number of issues, with the title *Orthodox Word*. The publishers and instigators of this newsletter were a few lay "theologians" who also followed the New Calendarists (such as Harisis, Batistatos, and the like) and fewer Athonite fathers, who were openly partisans of Metropolitans Akakios of Attica and Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica.

This pseudo-signed newsletter, especially from the year 1974, spouted accusations of crimes of a moral nature supposedly committed by many clergymen and holy monasteries and even against Archbishop Auxentios himself without any proofs whatsoever. Its basic plan was to create a climate of aversion towards Archbishop Auxentios and a spurious evaluation of our Sacred Struggle, which was totally nonexistent. The majority of the zealot fathers of Mount Athos condemned this booklet in writing stressing that "we recommend that the faithful throw it in the garbage can as soon as they receive it."

Archbishop Auxentios tried through official and public communications to call those separated belligerent bishops of Attica and Thessalonica to peace and unity, but his call was in vain. These two then began to say that they were separating themselves from the rest of the Synod "because of the delay in the moral cleansing of the clergy" shamelessly speaking of "garbage cans" and "dens of orgies." Unfortunately they didn't do what they did through direct recommendations to the Sacred Synod but rather through open letters and publications, even in public newspapers, at a time when even the opportunist New Calendarists did not dare find such things to speak against us.

Through these events a new period of hatred was inaugurated in our Church in imitation of the so-called New Calendarist (i.e., Protestant-style) "brotherhoods" and of the same taste as that of the Junta-imposed New Calendarist "Archbishop" Ieronymos Kotsonis [1967–1973]: the revolution of the supposed "cleansers." In other words, as soon as the new calendar schism was freed from the pharisaically setup gang of the "house of the faith of Ieronymos" and the "brotherhoods," which tried under the guise of recovery, purging and cleansing to oversee the new calendar schism and its bishops with supposed "angels in the flesh," as Father Theoklitos Stragkas so graphically puts it, then this Ieronymos/brotherhood pharisaism of the fraudulent "cleansing" was "invisibly transferred" to *our* Church by those four apostate bishops (especially through Akakios of Attica and Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica) and their co-workers (Sakarellos-

Harisis-Batistatos and the like) who, as it was known to all, had excellent relations with the New Calendarists and were at the very same time members of organizations and committees of the new calendar schism!! In this way our Church was being betrayed from the inside by an ingenious method imported from the outside!

These things that were being shamelessly proclaimed forced Archbishop Auxentios to publish from time to time that which was necessary in order to heal the scandal that was being created. So, for example, in an article entitled *Open Letter* written in March of 1975 and addressed to the flock of Christ in general he writes, "In the meeting of May 11, 1974, in the presence of all of the bishops except Their Eminences Akakios, Chrysostomos Kiouisis and Gabriel, His Eminence Metropolitan Kallinikos asked the question if any of the bishops knew anything wrongful about the archbishop. And then I (Archbishop Auxentios) provoked them all saying: 'Holy Hierarchs, if you know anything incriminating about me and you hide it, you will be responsible for it before both God and man. Very well, let us move forward and stop our whispering and let every one of us proclaim with boldness what we know. I will be forever grateful to you for this.'"

In the minutes, the answer of each of the bishops to the question if they knew anything inappropriate is negative and all of the bishops signed the minutes.

"Chrysostomos Apollonatos was never under my protection. I neither knew him, nor did he know me. In synod we decided to accept him after having ascertained that he had no impediments to the holy priesthood as is the case anyway with all those clergymen who come to us from the new calendar. His Eminence Metropolitan Akakios came into conflict with him later on for reasons of self-interest and more exactly because of his spiritual son John Marmarinos... It was from that time on that Metropolitan Akakios was telling me that I should get rid of him because he was immoral, etc. Having as one of my principles to never believe anything without definite, responsible and written facts, I was waiting for these from His Eminence (Akakios) that I might judge the case. Until this very day I have not received any such information from anyone, not even from His Eminence Metropolitan Akakios ... Much later ... this man was uncovered and it was printed in the newspapers ... Now having this as a fact, I immediately asked in Synod that he be removed from our Church ... But may I ask: Should there have been such a fuss made over Apollonatos and should so many people have been made to get carried away by the systematic intrigues of His Eminence (Akakios) stating that I was covering for him (Apollonatos) and that I myself am also "one of those types" and so much more... However one might see that God allowed His Eminence to be humbled by his ordaining with his own hands "one of those types" that was caught by the police in the same way that Apollonatos was. Not one other of us bishops fell so low. However not one of us used this as an opportunity to find fault with His Eminence, not even I, who was called by the police to identify the clergyman when he was arrested and to hear his statement. I then suggested to the police that they call His Eminence Metropolitan Akakios who had ordained him. I later learned that in front of the police this clergyman incriminated other clergymen, friends of Metropolitan Akakios, making statements and providing them with information. And this Metropolitan, who pretends to be struggling for the cleansing of

the Church, keeps these clergymen by his side as his own, using the incriminating evidence that was stated in front of the police... The same thing was committed earlier by Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica when he ordained a deacon who had an impediment to the priesthood. We never insulted them for these infractions believing that they did not do them intentionally. I won't answer the other accusations made against me, but will rather allow God to judge them..."

Greatly saddened by all of this, this is what Archbishop Auxentios complained about in the official periodical of our Church. The Sacred Synod in the beginning of the year 1975 suspended for an uncertain time span Metropolitan Akakios of Attica, having earlier summoned him repeatedly to defend himself without ever receiving a response from him.

Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis was also called to defend himself for the canonical misdeeds that he had committed. He not only refused to, but also sent out in June of 1975 an "open" accusation against Archbishop Auxentios to our Synod, to the hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia and to all of the "faithful of the Church of the G.O.C. of Greece." In this accusation, using something he wanted to demonstrate as an invasion into his diocese by the Archbishop, and some homilies of the Archbishop that were against him he denounced the Archbishop as "the cause of every disorder and misfortune in our Church, and the creator of (as a result of his former misdeeds and antinomies) the most recent separations of the bishops."

Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica of course forgot that he himself was not blameless, and so the words of the Sacred Canons that say "a guilty man cannot find someone else guilty" were applicable to him, whereas he used these words in his accusation in referring to others (not thinking that they applied to himself first of all) since it is not possible for "those that are being tried for the most severe penalty of being defrocked to judge and decide on the misdeeds of their brother bishops." So therefore it was neither possible nor fair that as a distraction the last minute accusation of Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica be used as an attempt to hold off his long-before-scheduled canonical trial which met on July 4, 1975, with all of the members of the Sacred Synod present except for the four members of the known gang, condemned (extremely leniently in my personal opinion), Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica, to a three month suspension based on the 16th and the 74th Sacred Canons of the Holy Apostles and the 20th of the Fourth Ecumenical Council for:

- a) "the unfit and imprudent contempt of the higher ecclesiastical authority, that is of the Sacred Synod of the G.O.C. of Greece, considering and proclaiming its decisions as void, non-canonical and unacceptable, even though when these decisions were made he was present at the assembly and *voted in favor of these decisions and even helped format them*;
- b) the scandalizing of the faithful and for concelebrating with those that were under suspension or expelled by the decision of the Sacred Synod (i.e., Petros of Astoria)."

As could be expected, Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica totally ignored and never fulfilled the three month suspension that was placed on him. The Sacred Synod was silent in this matter, even though it had the right to immediately defrock him if not for anything else, at least for disregarding his suspension.

Unfortunately, down into such pitfalls of deontology and non-canonical autonomy did those who supposedly struggled for canonical order and righteousness fall! We stress that *all* the members of the Sacred Synod took part in the trial except for the four clique members (the bishops of Astoria, Attica, Thessalonica, and the Cyclades), proving that that which Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica often used to emphasize and which he wrote in his so-called accusation that supposedly Archbishop Auxentios had dissolved the Sacred Synod and used to settle all issues by himself with the Metropolitans Gerontios of Piraeus and Kallinikos of Phthiotis to be a manifestly false accusation.

Also concerning the so-called invasion into his diocese that Metropolitan Chrysostom Kiouisis refers to, it should be noted that in June of 1974, following a unanimous decision, the Sacred Synod published an encyclical that stated that all the holy monasteries, hesychast foundations and institutions "be under the direct care of the Sacred Synod, and will henceforth commemorate the name of Archbishop Auxentios and any member of them will be granted the right to appeal directly to the Sacred Synod whenever such a need would occur." This encyclical was also signed by Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis, but shortly after he retracted his signature calling upon the Eighth Canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, and began to demand in writing, that it be annulled.

In agreement with this encyclical (which was not annulled), Archbishop Auxentios in June of 1975 traveled to Thessalonica and performed services in the boarding house of St. Irene of Chrysovalantou.

We are making an honest attempt to tell as many important elements and events as possible based on credible sources, that one may get a full and, as much as possible, unbiased picture of the events.

In another article of *The Voice of Orthodoxy*, of September, 1975, from the offices of the Sacred Synod is recorded the situation of my late elder Archimandrite Iakovos Papadelis of whom the "witch hunt" for moral misdeeds was started again by the personalities of the metropolitans of Attica and Thessalonica, and their followers photocopied and purposely handed out copies of the incident. When, however, the Sacred Synod proceeded to try the archimandrite, these three accusers, the metropolitans of Attica, Thessalonica, and the Cyclades, never showed up for the trial. [!]

These "Three Hierarchs" were intimidated by the actual evidence that was published against them by *The Voice of Orthodoxy* as it was obliged to do, repelling the insults and slander of our whole Church. Then these three relaxed their machinations for a while. In the first part of the year 1976, the Metropolitans of Thessalonica and of the Cyclades circulated a leaflet titled, "An Answer to the Official Periodical of the G.O.C. *The Voice of Orthodoxy*."

Unable to defend themselves, as they certainly had no acceptable arguments or proofs, they simply complained of "the embezzlement of the periodical and the unacceptable display of such unworthy articles" and in the end, they request that "we stretch out to one another a sincere hand of love and unity, removing with care all of the added impediments if we really have inside us the burning desire for the advancement of our sacred struggle."

It should be noted however, in order for us to be fair and truthful in all matters, that Metropolitan Gabriel of the Cyclades was always the most lenient and wise out of the team of these three bishops, Attica-Thessalonica-Cyclades, and it is for this reason that he was never punished by the Sacred Synod as were the other two.

In September, 1977, a happy occurrence took place that gave new hope to everyone: Metropolitan Kallistos of Corinth, who belonged to the Matthewites, came over to our Sacred Synod, accusing the Matthewites of continuously working to retain division. Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis, because of this event, drew closer to the Synod due to the fact that he always maintained fraternal relations with Metropolitan Kallistos.

At this point, we must remind the audience that in 1971 when the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia laid hands (*heirothetisan*) on the two representatives of the Matthewites, Metropolitans Kallistos of Corinth and Epiphanius of Cyprus, they expressly put as a stipulation that the Matthewites of Greece must unite with our own Synod. The Matthewites disregarded this stipulation which resulted in many Matthewite clergy and laity leaving them and joining us.

The Matthewite bishops in 1976–1977 reached the point of even denying the laying on of hands (*heirothesia*) that they received and broke off communion with the ROCOR. Therefore, Metropolitan Kallistos, no longer able to stand this mockery and this self-interest joined us.

During this period (1977–1978) Metropolitan Akakios of Attica and Diavleia was continuously in a state of disagreement and outside the Sacred Synod with the penalty of suspension, and so the Synod declared him deprived of his throne and gave the title of "Attica" to the Bishop of Megara, Antonios. The Metropolitan of the Cyclades took part from time to time in the affairs of the Sacred Synod, while Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica is found to be outside the Synod, continuing, however, to create scandals and disturbances. He continually refuses to conform to the above-mentioned encyclical concerning the holy monasteries and philanthropic institutions in all of Greece commemorating the Archbishop demanding that *his* own name be commemorated in all of Northern Greece (and not only there)! He continued to send insulting letters to the Sacred Synod, disseminating them throughout all of Greece, continuously refusing to attend synodal meetings.

In a letter of complaint, dated January 2, 1978, written basically with the excuse of planned episcopal consecrations, calling upon the motivations of "peacemaking and the

uplifting of the hierarchy and of our sacred struggle, long suffering for the Church and purity of emotions" he again boasted of "non-canoncities and misdeeds" and that he was being unjustly charged, and he wrote, "The matter, which touches upon the moral character of the very Synod itself and certifies unfortunately that which from time to time have already been said or written against the Synod!"

It was the opinion, it therefore seems, of Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis that with such trickery, the rumors and whispers even about the most sacred things could be made reality, whereas the words of the Seventh Ecumenical Synod should here be enforced which state, "Circulating words we do not believe."

The Sacred Synod called him to come to his senses, to attend the meetings of the Synod and to defend himself, but he continued to refuse and to write letters of complaint. On former occasions he had outdone himself concerning the subject of "unworthy clergy that belong to us" and now pretended that his problem was the ordination of clergy that have lost their "outward good image." He is rightfully justified, but in his vehemence however, he falls into blasphemy saying, "the Grace of God is given to those who have correct faith, but not however His goodwill when the work is infected by the unworthiness of His celebrants. The Grace of God and His blessing can be found only where the laws are kept."

Again blaspheming holy temples where the Holy Mysteries and services were performed and the "Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" was laid out, Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis wrote, "Recently a second trapdoor to hell itself with a fanatic priest was opened in the headquarters of my diocese with your blessing..."!

"A trapdoor of hell" according to Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica, was the most holy temple, only because it's priest obeyed the encyclical of the Sacred Synod concerning the holy monasteries and institutions, and therefore commemorated the Archbishop's name instead of the Metropolitan of Thessalonica. Imagine the height of blasphemy.

As far as the "outward good image" goes, on account of which Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis found an excuse to slander as many as he would like without any true evidence, we ask the following: which sacred canon punishes someone with the only accusation being the loss of his "outward good image"? In the two thousand year history of our Church when was a clergyman punished for this accusation alone? Never. Only during the recent miserable reign of New Calendarist Ieronymos Kotsonis and the "brotherhood's" ecclesiastical dictatorship with the help of the political Junta dictatorship, did an infamous law exist which gave the right of punishment by canonical trial for mere accusations alone in order to give power to the "brotherhoods" to get rid of those who did not belong to them and put their own people in their places (law #214/1967).

What was the result? Someone, anyone, appeared, made a public, baseless, groundless claim against some bishop or clergyman, madness took over and so ... that

person who was accused automatically lost his "outward good image" and was dethroned and defrocked. Alas! Is this the way we will lower ecclesiastical matters? Not even everyday common criminals are tried without some proof.

This is why the Sacred Canons at many times and in many places safeguard the truth and the sobriety of an individual requiring that "caught in the very act" proof be found for each misdeed that has been said to have taken place through reliable first-hand witnesses that saw or heard the said crime.

It is for this reason that we will come across such things in the pious rules of emperors of old such as, "Be it better for sins to remain un-judged than for people to be unfairly punished," or as it is said in legal circles today, "better for a guilty man to be free, than an innocent one to be in prison."

Then again, was it correct for the then metropolitan of Thessalonica to speak of moral cleansing and recovery? He himself was actually years before "caught in the very act," which is punishable by defrocking, of living with women who are not immediate relatives (i.e., with his nuns). This, according to the Sacred Canons, is a great scandal the first reason of suspicion and in everything a loss of one's "outward good image," and thus in first line for defrocking are those who live with women and prove themselves to be lawless and passion-filled... This is what Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica, who boasted about good order and canonicity, did not understand or perhaps he made such accusations to cover up his own illegal living with women.

Having been summoned countless times and having countless times ignored his summons, he was finally not defrocked by the Synod (which had every right to do), but rather the penalty of suspension and excommunication for an indefinite period of time until his repentance was placed upon him in June, 1978.

Totally disdaining the Sacred Synod's judgment and decision, Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica answered in writing again stating that "we always sought the moral elevation of our sacred struggle," and that he never insulted nor disobeyed anyone, at the very time, in the very letter with which he begins with insults and undermining the history of the Church and our Sacred Synod writing, "Nothing has been maintained by our Sacred Synod that was ecclesiastically established and sanctioned by the age-old acts of the Church, but rather *all* of its works from the very beginning are marked with the stamp of irregularity and lawlessness ... Thus we can conclude that the synod that acts outside of ecclesiastical lawfulness is therefore outside the Church and all its decisions lack validity as being non-canonical." [!!!]

It is certain that the very enemies of our Church could not have found a better collaborator to slander our Church. Putting aside now that professional and continuous insulter of our Church, that revolutionary and disturbance-maker, at that time metropolitan of Thessalonica and later illegitimate "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kiouisis, we will resume our narrative of the greatest tragedy that our Church suffered in the beginning of the year 1979 and which God allowed due to our sins. It was a one of a kind

schism within the bosom of our Church, bringing back to life in many ways, among us, that fraudulent morality of Ieronymos Kotsonis.



## THE TRIAL REACHES ITS PEAK: THE APOSTASY OF 1979

Towards the end of the year 1978 Metropolitans Antonios of Attica and Kallistos of Corinth along with conniving ambitious archimandrites, namely: Kyprianos Koutsoubas, Kalliopios Giannakolopoulos, and Kallinikos Sarantopoulos, were secretly preparing their truly unrepeatable coup. They were approaching various archimandrites and hieromonks of our Church and without revealing their plans were researching through various inappropriate conversations how willing they would be to take part in a dynamic rebellion against His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios and the Sacred Synod.

One of those who conscientiously refused to aid them was, at that time Archimandrite, and now Metropolitan of Thessalonica, Efthymios. My own humility was an eye and ear witness to the triple recruitment attempts of the then Archimandrite Efthymios. At three different times and places did Metropolitan Kallistos and his disciple Archimandrite Kallinikos Sarantopoulos (later Metropolitan of Achaia) together with the Archimandrites Kalliopios and Kyprianos try to recruit him.

We may learn from a letter of the Matthewite Bishop Epiphanius of Kition to a certain Athonite elder that shortly before the schism those alike former Matthewites, Metropolitans Kallistos and Antonios had tried to form a partnership with Metropolitan Epiphanius, manipulating his burning desire for the unity of the G.O.C. Metropolitan Antonios himself traveled to Cyprus and asked Metropolitan Epiphanius to participate in a good number of episcopal consecrations of so-called blameless and irreproachable archimandrites and hieromonks and then in the gathering of a "healthy" synodal body ready to work honorably for the so-called cleansing of the Church from the so-called immoral and lukewarm in the Faith.

Metropolitan Epiphanius absolutely refused to take part in this scheme. Metropolitans Kallistos and Antonios fearing that Metropolitan Epiphanius might reveal their plans, immediately moved forward in their profane act, in the midst of the Great and Holy Fast! Their motivation was the control of the total Church Administration in order to lead the Church exactly where and how they wanted. So beginning on February 7/20, 1979, and for the next three days (up until February 10/23) these two actual members of the Sacred Synod, Kallistos of Corinth and Antonios of Attica, without the least knowledge much less approval of the Sacred Synod or the Archbishop, but rather as a lightning bolt out of the sky, consecrated *eight* archimandrites to the episcopate!! Their order of consecration is as follows: Kyprianos Koutsoubas "Bishop of Oropos," Maximos Tsitsibakos "Bishop of Magnisias," Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "Bishop of Achaia," Mattheos Langis "Bishop of Oinois," Germanos Athanasiou "Bishop of Aiolia," Kalliopios Giannakouloupoulos "Bishop of Pentapolis," Merkourios Kaloskamis "Bishop of Knossos," and Kallinikos Karaphyllakis "Bishop of the Dodekanisos."

The organizers of the schism, Kallistos, Antonios, Kyprianos, Kallinikos, and Kalliopios, together with their close and well known advisor and "organizing brain" New Calendarist theologian Athanasios Sakarellos worked so deceitfully and with such stealth

that some of those themselves being consecrated were not aware of the fact that the consecrations were taking place without the knowledge or approval of the Sacred Synod and of Archbishop Auxentios. Here is what one of the deceived, Kallinikos of the Dodekanisos, had to say about his consecration in the periodical of his diocese:

"Then (in 1979) I who am writing this was urgently summoned to Athens, knowing nothing about what was going on, and with great surprise I heard my Elder Kyprianos tell me to prepare to be consecrated a bishop during the vigil that would be beginning in a short while. At the obvious question of the author why should not he himself (Fr. Kyprianos) or this or that hieromonk (I named a few names) be consecrated, I learned that Fr. Kyprianos as well as the other hieromonks I mentioned had *already* been consecrated and that Archbishop Auxentios was aware of the consecrations!!"

We may learn the following from another recollection concerning the same bishop who was the last of the eight consecrated: "After his consecration when all the new bishops were in the altar taking off their vestments, Kyprianos said to a bishop: "Now how are we going to explain all of this to Archbishop Auxentios?" When Kallinikos of the Dodekanisos heard this, he realized that he had been deceived by his own spiritual father. He then thought that this whole new synod was a mental invention of Kyprianos." Also, as it later came to be common knowledge, in order to totally deceive those who were being consecrated out of ignorance, those two consecrators, Kallistos and Antonios were commemorating out loud the name of Archbishop Auxentios during the very consecrations!

This, my dear brethren, was the spiritual state of those so-called guardians and saviors of Orthodoxy! The newly consecrated immediately called His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios and requested that he recognize the consecrations that had taken place without his approval and that of the Sacred Synod! This logically was impossible for the Archbishop to accept and so immediately on February 14/27 the dividers of the Church's body moved on renouncing and dividing themselves from the canonical synod and the Church and inaugurating their own new synod with Metropolitan Kallistos as its president and presenting themselves as "The G.O.C. Church of Greece" and the lawful synod of His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios as being dissolved! They also fraudulently defrocked eight archimandrites with the "Brotherhoods" excuse of having lost their "outward good image," because they knew that Archbishop Auxentios planned on consecrating these eight to the episcopate, including some of those that they had tried to persuade to come over to their side, amongst whom was Eftymios of Thessalonica who was an archimandrite at that time.

In all truth, holy fathers and brothers, having read so many events in the two-thousand year history of the Church (and they are not few), such a hideous and indescribable ecclesiastical coup as this one cannot be found!! Naturally, those who consecrated and were consecrated are condemned to defrocking by no less than some *twenty* sacred canons, while those consecrations are proclaimed as invalid and powerless. They themselves didn't even deny this, but rather with unlimited brazenness did they try in any way whatsoever to cover up for themselves accusing everyone and everything.

It is necessary that I present to you my dear audience, a few quotes from their first announcements and encyclicals so that you yourselves may get a picture of their mannerisms and nature of these criminals who, unfortunately, in the near future would again become part of our canonical Sacred Synod and cause new disturbances and divisions.

They wrote: "Having total knowledge of what we have done, we proclaim that this step of ours is in actuality a temporary and curable diversion from the canonical order, but is not unto death. We are not the first, nor the only ones that dared to make such a diversion looking unto the greatest good for our Sacred Struggle ... It has been some time now that within our own lines there has occurred a moral loosening. The clergy's lifestyle has become careless. A lack of fear of God exists and, worse of all, men have been raised to the levels of the priesthood that are both unworthy and incapable. Sodomy in all its disgustingness is continuously gaining ground ... We called attention to this many times but to no result. Lately we learned that those three tyrants surrounding Archbishop Auxentios with the ring leader being the Metropolitan of Salamina, Gerontios, are planning to consecrate some unworthy personalities in order to pollute even more the all-blameless sanctity of the Church of the Genuine Orthodox Christians."

"When Gordian knots cannot be untied they are cut! Only Pharisees and exploiters will accuse us, because their private sinful interests are at stake. Our purpose is as clear as crystal: Cleansing! ... The illegality of the new consecrations is of little importance if we compare it with all the past illegalities. The only ones who have no right to protest them are that pair of Auxentios and Gerontios who never respected any canon whatsoever ... We preferred to give our all, that we might help our Sacred Struggle to be saved ... May our own salvific illegality be the first and last one that takes place among us ... People of God, blessed and betrayed ... Auxentios and his clique committed everyday thousands of iniquities that were burying our Sacred Struggle. Forgive one more illegality that will prove to be salvific for our Church ... If the people want, O let it never come to be, Orthodoxy to die, we will move on to Mount Athos and there will we lock ourselves up for the rest of our lives and we will forget the world, that the world may rejoice in the reign of the Antichrist ... People of God! The moment has arrived to prove that when you were seeking good and virtuous clergymen, you believed what you were asking for, or were you trying to fool the world ... Our Sacred Struggle is celebrating from today on ... the triumph of Orthodoxy. Due to the fact that today the reign of impiety, of god-playing, of indecency, of criminal activity in our Sacred Struggle has been put to an end, and we have restored virtue, piety, order, faith and Orthodoxy which we will never deny whatever we may suffer here on Earth. **ORTHODOXY WILL BE VICTORIOUS.**"

This is what the self-designated saviors of Orthodoxy proclaimed provocatively, those, first in Church history, pirates, speaking about piety and order those schismatics and disturbance makers, "not knowing either what they are saying, nor what they are reassuring of" according to the words of the Apostle, not knowing that they are making themselves worthy of every mockery. Also one can observe that in their denouncement of the synod, for the first time in Church history, they cited no sacred canon whatsoever to support their action.

His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios almost died (I was a first-hand witness to this) before this first historic ecclesiastical mutiny. He wanted to defrock those who had dared do such a thing; however he thought it good to supplement the Sacred Synod through new consecrations, making it a full thirteen member synod as the 12th Holy Canon of the Sacred Synod of Carthage stipulates. Thus, with the agreement of the remaining faithful bishops (Gerontios of Piraeus, Kallinikos of Phthiotis, Paisios of Euripos, and Akakios of Canada), they legally and canonically consecrated ten archimandrites to the episcopate. The order of the consecrations was as follows: Efthymios of Stavropolis (later Thessalonica), Paisios of Gardikion (later America), Theophilos of Christianopolis (later Patras), Athanasius of Platamon (later Larissa), Maximos of the Eptanisos, Stephanos of Kardamila (later Chios), Paisios of Aigina, Gerasimos of Talantios (later Thebes), Athanasius of Grevena (later Acharnai) and Justinos of Marathon (later Euripos) and immediately called a synod meeting and most righteously tried and defrocked the ten dividers of the Church's body for the charges of being, "conspirators, gangsters, and schismatics."

The Sacred and Canonical Synod's answer to the many-paged ranting and blasphemies of the schismatics was a simple two-page *Ecclesiastic Encyclical* explaining the events.

Knowing that they were caught in their lies, these new schismatics began searching for new excuses for their brazenness. So they stated that the reason for their actions had to do with our Synod's break in communion with the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia. This was an all out lie. Up until that time on the part of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia towards us there simply existed a cooling down of relations and a wariness towards us due to the fact that, on the one hand they had been unsuccessful in uniting the Matthewites with us, and on the other hand because they were troubled by the divisive spirit that existed between our Synod members, and finally due to an event that took place in 1978.

In 1978, His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios had received into our Church the former papist Gabriel Rosa of Portugal. Unfortunately the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia had received this papist into Orthodoxy without ever baptizing him as was the old, but according to the Sacred Canons incorrect, practice of the Russians and had ordained him a priest. Archbishop Auxentios baptized him from the very beginning and eventually had him consecrated as Bishop of Portugal. However an official break in ecclesiastical communion between our two synods had not taken place, except for a local and personal announcement by the well-known innovator Archbishop Antony of Geneva of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, which was published in any case after the schism of Kallistos and Antonios.

Later and right up to the present time, some of their supporters spread the word that the consecrations of Antonios and Kallistos were done by verbal order and encouraged by His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios, as Kallistos of Corinth had written in his letter to His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios in 1986.

Let those who support this belief first of all think about the above-mentioned proclamation of Kallinikos of the Dodekanisos as well as the statement of Bishop Epiphanius of Kition. Secondly, these same dividers had admitted, many times and boldly, that the consecrations were a deviation from the canonical order and that they took place "after they had cleared their position from that of Archbishop Auxentios" so it is impossible for them to have had in reality even the slightest agreement of Archbishop Auxentios who participated in not one of those consecrations. If they had such an agreement, then they would have used this from the very first moment and they would not have had the need to defend themselves in those two mammoth encyclicals and in so many other publications appearing guilty and non-canonical.

My personal opinion of Metropolitan Kallistos of Corinth is that he being both simple and elderly was "used," the Lord knows through what lies and distortions of the truth, by the rest of them and especially by his most devious (as the events shout out) chancellor Kallinikos Sarantopoulos, later "Bishop of Achaia."

We would like to present only one more of the many events that show the ulterior motives and the perversion of truth that was used by the members of the *coup d'état*, the usurpers.

Only two months before their hideous schism (in December, 1978) the then Archimandrites Kalliopios and Germanos, answering a New Calendarist bishop's publication that accused us of supposedly receiving immoral clergymen defrocked by the New Calendarists, wrote the following: "Since we do not know these clergymen, we beg the editor, His Eminence, and we will be forever indebted to him, if he could publicly name them ... We have had enough to do with reporters who irresponsibly sling mud at clergymen."

Unfortunately, two months later these very same men were irresponsibly slinging mud at clergymen and at the entire Church! Exactly in the same way that the Metropolitans of Attica (Akakios), Thessalonica, and the Cyclades were internally "mud-slinging," these ones in 1975 were externally proclaiming in a public newspaper which was reproaching our clergy: "the people that publish articles in your reliable newspaper, scandalized by some unworthy clergymen who can be counted on the fingers of one hand, forget such people as Judas, Dimas and others who were unworthy and contrary to Scripture. Perhaps they do not exist in the new calendar also? "

When the accusers themselves admitted to the fact that their claims were baseless, we need no greater proof of the truth. Finally, even the Matthewites were shocked by this daring schism and they officially condemned the usurpers, perhaps feeling themselves a little guilty, since most of them originated from their Matthewite group. They wrote: "Lacking every form of an ecclesiastical conscience, some brazenly dangerous clergymen have appeared ... their first of a kind criminal activity they display as being virtuous, calling themselves the "saviors of Orthodoxy," whereas they neither suffer for Orthodoxy ... Even though this schism is not our own, we condemn it and its creators as traitors to

Orthodoxy ... Perhaps they are working for another side? ... Perhaps they are the internal destroyers of our struggle? "

History proved, as we will cite immediately further down, that these thoughts of the Matthewites were totally accurate and just.

My dear Fathers and brethren, I am required to make lengthy my speaking of this schism because as an Athonite elder and hieromonk states speaking of this schism, blaming it for: "ALMOST ALL OF THE CALAMITIES AND PROBLEMS THAT TROUBLE THE HOLY STRUGGLES OF THE GENUINE ORTHODOX CHRISTIANS! "

More precisely:

1) It brought into our Church of the G.O.C. the Protestant heresy of the incorporation of the Church. The founder of this was no other than the "bishop of Pentapolis" Kalliopios, who in the year 1961 as an archimandrite dividing himself from the rest of the Genuine Orthodox Christians, founded together with a married priest named Fr. Michael Koulouris his own private church corporation with the stolen title of the "Greek Church of the Genuine Orthodox Christians." This was a Protestant, presbyterian style church company without any bishop, but rather having only the two aforementioned priests. In the year 1979 this presbyterian church beast gained bishops, in other words all ten members, the ring-leaders of the schism, as its administrative officers. Our Sacred Synod, in a well researched encyclical, and I, the least of all, in two separate leaflets, denounced this hideous incorporation of the Church and showed that it is totally contrary to so many patristic directives and how many blasphemous teachings it gives birth to. Here it is enough for us to state that this schismatic "Greek Church of the G.O.C." is in operation up until the present time and its heads Kalliopios of "Pentapolis" and Kallinikos Sarantopoulos of "Achaia" together with their permanent collaborator and theologian-lawyer, Mr. Athanasios Sakarellos, are the ones who, immediately after the division of 1995, persuaded "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kiouis and his fellow bishops to found a *new* Church corporation entitled the "Church of G.O.C. of Greece" against which, as it is our duty, do we struggle up to the present time.

2) It is from then on that our Sacred Struggle began to become divided in all the more parts, jurisdictions, groups and synods, since up until that time there existed only ourselves and the Matthewites. The "Kallisto-Antonites" became the third group from which sprung the so-called "resisters" of Kyprianos. Also those head-dividers of 1979 Kalliopios of "Pentapolis" and Kallinikos Sarantopoulos of "Achaia" were the ones who were mainly responsible for the split with His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios and thus so for the split of 1995, as we will prove farther down. These former Matthewites then introduced into our Church the Matthewite spirit of brotherly hatred and of maliciously doing away with people through hurried and unadjudicated judgments and penalties, defrocking and so on, as the above-mentioned events of 1979, 1986, 1995, and so forth show and which we will mention.

3) In order to justify their self-interested decisions, they filled the air with the pharisaic spirit that said, "I am not like this Publican! " in other words with the spirit of Ieronymos Kotsonis and the "brotherhoods" and falsely and after the fact divided the members of our Church into "clean-genuine-super-duper-orthodox" and "unclean-immoral-lukewarm-orthodox," a state which is similar to the ancient schismatics that were known as Novatianists "the Clean" (*Katharoi*). Their leader Novatian, as *The Rudder* mentions, a presbyter of the Roman Church, "even if he did not make a dogmatic mistake, nor was he a heretic, but only a schismatic ... due to his hatred of his brethren and his pitilessness and pride, was anathematized by the Synod in Rome under Pope Cornelius" and by other synods. Listen to some more quotations from the prudent new calendar archimandrite-historian, who evaluated the Kotsonis storm that broke out in the State Church from 1967 on, that you might exactly pinpoint the introduction of the pharisaic spirit into our own Church from the year 1979 and its hideous consequences. We believe that this introduction was part of a sly plan of the enemies of our church in order to defeat it (in the same way that the new calendar church was conquered in the year 1967!) with the decisive help of Kallinikos Sarantopoulos of "Achaia", who as a New Calendarist was the spiritual son of the Kotsonis "brotherhoods" own Bishop of Attica, Nikodimos Gatziroulis, and his close co-worker New Calendarist theologian Athanasios Sakarellos. "It should be noted that with that very same Kotsonis Bishop Nikodimos, the theologian Stavros Karamitsos had many contacts and through him many messages of pharisaic "cleansing" were passed over to our bishops... " "... The Kotsonis dictatorial Synod" we are told by the Reverend Archimandrite Fr. Theoklitos Stragkas, "committed many injustices and illegalities, making useless and murdering the reputations of clergymen of lower and higher ranks that were experienced, dynamic, and able to offer their good services to the Church ... they were removed as if satraps, deceitfully, and with an evil and sly manner ... The spies of those days described the Metropolitans of Corinth and Phthiotis as garbage-dumps because they philanthropically tried to heal all those that had mindlessly, madly, and unmercifully been described as having lost their "outward good image" and were being persecuted up unto their very disappearance, lost to all, suffering, hurt, and mocked as scapegoats ... especially if some mean-spirited individual had the ability to make an accusation against someone that might be as flimsy as a sheep's fleece seem as strong as a cable! ... It is fearful to become the bait of peoples' tongues, and especially when those tongues have the blessing of the Church's administration and it publicly insults its clergy as "impotent and incapable" to perform the duties that were assigned to them or as having lost that "outward good image," as being horrible rotting members of the Church and even more so dangerous and in need of been swept away from the Church in the most aggressive and sudden manner, that She may be freed from them for they are Her unacceptable and unbearable plague and Her frightful cancer ..."

At that time there was a rumor that "Ieronymos Kotsonis had begun to clean the Augean Stables of dung [like Hercules]"...however "out of self-interest, that he might fulfill the desires and the passion of those who needed to see some empty positions and the bishop-making of certain clergymen, and in order to have more bishops on his side ... Unfortunately, "Archbishop" Ieronymos Kotsonis did not have administrative abilities and gifts nor the ability to distinguish honest co-workers from opportunists who might be well-versed on Church matters, he was thus mislead believing that he should entrust the

good foundation of his archiepiscopal throne and the cleansing and recovery of the Church's hierarchy to the wings and sickles of his winged "angels in the flesh" and to those who had the same faith as he did, that is the Kotsonis faith, forgetting not only the Founder of the Church JESUS CHRIST Who said and says (so much about judging and condemning and about the weeds and the wheat and that we must have selfless love for everyone), and the divine Apostle Paul who speaks (of humility towards those who have gone astray and who do not know any better and about the sinfulness of all), but also the Sacred Canons, even though they are the creations of the Holy Fathers, were placed under one in order to be humane that is the twenty-fifth of the Holy Apostles that speaks of being "caught in the very act" as a means of cleansing the clergy of the Church and not according to the "outwardly bad image" to be cleaned and the Church and clergy to be renewed through the "outwardly good image," also forgetting the words of the author of the liturgy which are repeated by the serving priest or bishop standing in front of the Holy Altar saying mystically, "*No one is worthy ...*," of the golden-mouthed St. John Chrysostomos who wrote those sincere words of truth and reality (as so for those who say "like the harlot and the sinner!") and stood sincerely and not hypocritically that truly holy enlightener of truth, even though no one like this hierarch of Orthodoxy during the past 1575 years battled for the cleansing of the Church from its rotten and disgusting members, died, however in exile in the year 407 and even more so as a defrocked bishop of a synod of bishops having the "good witness" of the ruling worldly authority! Truly unrepeatable in holiness, that martyr and hierarch St. John Chrysostomos who said, "I fear nothing more than bishops, with only a few exceptions!" That giant Enlightener and Divine Father, Hierarch, and Archbishop was himself not able to cleanse the Church, and yet the Orthodox Church even unto this very day is not decomposed. It is and remains that living and present ORTHODOX CHURCH of Christ against which the very gates of hell will not prevail, even though some of its higher and lower clergy, who were admired by various fortune seeking, truly disgusting flatterers who belonged to the world of betrayal, who are disgusting forms of cancerous growths, were rotten, they don't destroy the Church, but rather they are self-destroying, when the Founder of the Church at an unannounced time should decide on it as the Prophet says, 'their days were spent in vain and their years quickly wore away.'

We have gone into such depth concerning the matter of the "brotherhood/pharisaical" spirit of the unclean and the schismatic/heretical hateful cleansing, dear Fathers and Brothers, because not only the usurpers, prattling on about "good outward images" and "unworthy in all the ranks of the clergy" and pollution of the spotless holiness of the Church, but also before and after Metropolitan Akakios of Diavleia and Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica, presented it as the greatest reason for the schism. Remember during the days of the first schism these two also were carrying on about (in their very own words), "persons who didn't have good external and internal witness." Who were the ones who were protesting? *Those very bishops who were under their own curse; those that were living with women.* Seeing the "splinter in their brother's eye" they could not "see the beam in their own eye." Such pharisaical hypocrisy! The later "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kiouisis is so far in word, deed, life and ideology from the Saint whose name he bears and whose golden heritage we just enjoyed hearing!



It must be said that the next "slap" that the Sacred Synod received from these two (Akakios and Chrysostomos Kiouisis) was a somewhat silly one, since the Synod which they now stated they were now cutting off from ecclesiastical communion, had already long before suspended and excommunicated them, so either way they were already out of ecclesiastical communion.

Unfortunately, in their denouncement these two bishops brazenly equated the victim with the victimizer, condemning the schismatic Kallistos of Corinth and Antonios of Attica together with the canonical ecclesiastical administration of Archbishop Auxentios and those with him, because they supposedly consecrated unworthy men to the episcopate quickly and without their agreement!

It is true that Archbishop Auxentios did act in a rather hurried manner, but this could be expected when matters were in such a wild and unexpected state of being. It is not true, however that the consecrations were performed without the joint agreement of the bishops. More precisely, of the eleven Hierarchs that were in 1979, five of them were already outside the Sacred Synod, namely; Petros of Astoria, Akakios of Diavleia, Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica, Kallistos of Corinth, and Antonios of Attica and Megara. The Archbishop was not in any way obliged, as one can logically conclude, to ask *their* opinion. Three of the remaining six bishops (Archbishop Auxentios, Metropolitan Gerontios of Piraeus, and Metropolitan Kallinikos of Phthiotis) performed the consecrations with the knowledge and approval of Metropolitan Paisios of Euripos, who had already retired due to health problems before the schism, and Metropolitan Akakios of Canada. So only Gabriel of the Cyclades as it seems was not asked, but we are not sure at that time (February, 1979) what sort of relations he even had with the Sacred Synod, since his relations with the Synod were never stable due to his, frequent erratic alliances with Akakios of Diavleia and Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica.

Therefore Archbishop Auxentios acted quite legally with as many bishops as he had at that time. In any case, it was terribly bold as well as a sad unfair distortion of the truth to equate that which was illegal with that which was legal, even if the proceedings of the legal were in some ways imperfect as far as their conception and performance are concerned.

We must however, for history's sake display to your kindness a few quotations from the four-page denouncement of the Metropolitans of Diavleia and Thessalonica:

"As a heavy stroke" they wrote, "and as a lightning bolt on a very cloudy day did we hear the news of the first time and most impious audacity that surpasses all ecclesiastical memories of consecrations to the episcopate, disregarding abilities and gifts unto the total mockery and ridicule of the highest apostolic rank by a portion of the leadership of the G.O.C. whose hypocrisy concerning the safeguarding of Church tradition surpasses all pharisaism. The Master's voice saying, "Woe unto the Pharisees and hypocrites" rings forth in the ears of all those both in the Greek and foreign lands for those "genuine Orthodox bishops" who committed such acts... Since you the above-mentioned "Three Hierarchs" (Archbishop, and Metropolitans of Piraeus and Phthiotis) blatantly and

scandalously nourished for years the ground for the creation of such suitable conditions for the consecrations, which now have already taken place, of persons not having a good external and internal image...

Because you removed synodal hierarchs for the only reason that they sought the moral and legal order in Church administration and the cleansing of the clergy.

Because you displayed unbelievable revenge against those hierarchs who revoked your iniquities...

Because you firstly dissolved the Sacred Synod, as we have already stated, only the three of you performed the non-canonical consecrations of those that were pleasing unto you, in this way you are denounceable for having acted with intrigue which is contrary to the Holy and Sacred Canons 18 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council and 34 of the Fifth-Sixth Council...

Because you consecrated out of a pile without any examination the uneducated, the paralyzed elderly, and others who were weighted down by accusations concerning moral and other crimes that were officially charged in the Sacred Synod and finally

Because you created more schisms in the Church of the Genuine Orthodox Christians, the sin of which the divine Chrysostomos says can only be washed away with the blood of martyrdom,

Therefore:

We the below-signing bishops, members of the remaining hierarchy that has had no part in inappropriate activities that hurt our long-suffering Church, and realizing that "it is better to obey God than men," as has been the age-long practice of the Church, we OBJECT TO AND DENOUNCE all the above non-canonical activities of yours, including the latest illicit and indiscreet act performed by you and other bishops a profane *coup d'état* that is unacceptable to the Church, leaving you the bishops who performed this act as judgeable in a local and larger synod that has the ability to judge you and for this reason making you here forth unable canonically to perform any legal act according to Church law.

We judge your act worse than the non-canonical act of the Bishops Antonios and Kallistos, leading up to the point of intrigue which we have already mentioned, due to the separation and disdain of six of the remaining bishops.

IT IS FOR THIS REASON THAT WE STOP ALL SPIRITUAL COMMUNION WITH YOU up until the time of your canonical and legal trial and we leave you to the impartial judgment of God and history.

the remainder of the Hierarchy of the G.O.C.

The Metropolitan of Attica and Diavleia, AKAKIOS

The Metropolitan of Thessalonica, CHRYSOSTOMOS

As I believe you can tell by yourselves, my dearest audience, the denouncement of this famous remainder of the hierarchy of the G.O.C. is a monument of depravity, malevolence, vindictiveness and self-interest, for the reasons that I have already gone into. The most amazing thing is that this two-member hierarchical remainder never troubled themselves to write and send a similar letter of protest to those first responsible

and first-time usurpers, Bishop Kallistos of Corinth and Antonios of Attica! Why? Perhaps because they had the same, I cannot say philosophy which is literally the "love of wisdom," but more precisely the same "love of stupidity," concerning cleansing and immoral morality as can be seen from the official documents of both groups. As we well know, both groups had the same advisor, the renowned new calendarist theologian Athanasios Sakarellos, who probably led both groups into the same moral revolution inspired by the so-called "Christian brotherhoods"! Immediately following their denouncement, the Bishops of Diavleia and Thessalonica sent out in the beginning of March a many-paged encyclical addressed to the sacred clergy and laity of our Church with the grandiose title concerning themselves of "those maintaining exactly the Tradition and the canonical order of the G.O.C. of the Church of Greece!" In this encyclical, regurgitating the same material as in their denouncement, they encourage every pious person to become an apostate from the Sacred Synod "that he might not become jointly liable by being a communicant of theirs ... through silence and through an indifferent obedient stand to those who committed these acts," stressing that "the things which took place can only be described as forsaking God."

After all of this, we believe that the words of Archimandrite Fr. Theoklitos Stragkas about "Archbishop Ieronymos Kotsonis" fittingly describe these two bishops when he wrote such things as, "he [Kotsonis] was absorbed by the mania and passion of revenge, in other words to revenge upon most of the members of the hierarchy that had stood absolutely indifferent towards his personality, perhaps because he himself stood indifferent to the brilliant personalities of the hierarchy of Greece. He hated the hierarchy because there were weeds in it? And he thought, in love with himself, that - as he was being hailed as "an angel in the flesh - he was worthy and similar to an angel of God, "that will in time be sent as a reaper" to mow down the weeds of the hierarchy? ... However the Holy Spirit was also enlightening the majority of the bishops to not sympathize with him as being truly a hypocrite and hateful, passionately self-centered and sly, and lacking the required ability to work with people, who he regarded as worthless weeds ..."

Finally, the Sacred Synod, basing itself on the 31st Canon of the Holy Apostles which commands that in the case of renegades who separate themselves from their bishop, first "the bishop should try to persuade them with sweetness and calmness three times that they might abandon their endeavor" and then the bishop should proceed to condemn them, decided to "with brotherly love and concern ask these bishops to control themselves and to reexamine their decisions, seeing how difficult things were and come to work together again with our Sacred Synod for the good of our Sacred Struggle and the unbreakable unity of our Church."

Certainly these controlled measures were not applicable to the case of those who broke off with Metropolitan Kallistos of Corinth, due to the fact that they were not simply conspirators, but rather had performed unheard of consecrations by themselves and immediately formed a new synod/church, without anything having first happened that could have recommend such a step.

In this matter, Bishops Akakios and Chrysostomos Kiouisis proved to be superior and truly praiseworthy since during their years of being separated from the Sacred Synod they never performed a single consecration to the episcopate, nor did they form another synod. Enacting the decision of the Sacred Synod concerning approaching these two, (whom the followers of Kallistos had in writing called to unite with them, without success) His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios sent a supplicatory letter, as a sign of amazing brotherly love, long-sufferance, and pastoral wisdom.

Among other things His Beatitude writes:

*"Your Eminences and Holy Brothers Akakios and Chrysostomos, moved by fraternal love, I am sending you this, my personal letter, as a response to the denouncement that you have sent ... I do not think that really down deep you believe everything you wrote is actually the way things are ... The best thing for you to do is to come to our Sacred Synod and be regulated by it and then joined together we can continue our Sacred Struggle, no longer to destroy each other, but rather for the glory of God ... Denouncements and coup d'états are not the answer, my beloved. In actuality, they complicate things and scandalize to the maximum the flock of Christ ... Let us put aside our passions, self-centeredness, and our pertinacity which spiritually eat away at us and eternally damns us. Let us raise ourselves to the height of the circumstances and let us take a fearless and brave decision to trample the devil and creator of schisms and divisions. That will be the greatest victory which will surprise everyone and make joyful both heaven and earth. Therefore let us move forward, my beloved brothers. Come and be united unto our Sacred Synod taking back denouncements and the like. This will be your greatest honor and glory.*

*In anticipation of your arrival, I remain in brotherly love,  
+ Auxentios of Athens*

The two bishops sent nothing in response to this exemplary paternal letter. The Sacred Synod then, on June 2/15 sent a second letter to them in which they again pleaded with them to return "to the side of our Sacred Synod that together we may forgetting past and looking forward to future things continue the uphill course of our Sacred Struggle." It reassures that this will "bring a solution to the unresolved that might exist, as well as an answer to whatever problems might come up with objectivity, due to the existence of 'the vote of the majority rules' as the Holy and Sacred Canons prescribe." Amongst the continued courteous exhortations, full of brotherly love, of course, the Sacred Synod politely showed them what would happen if they remained immovable and separated, saying that it would come to "the unfortunate position of moving forward to the required punishments and measures that are foreseen by the Sacred Canons ..." Two weeks after sending out of this letter of the Sacred Synod Bishops Akakios of Diavleia and Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica answered in writing, without addressing the second letter - who knows for what reasons - but rather only to the personal letter of Archbishop Auxentios.

Unfortunately however, they, displaying only once again their idiorrhhythmic and difficult natures, were not satisfied by simply responding negatively to the noblest offers of their fellow bishops, but rather let loose another answer, a bomb in all actuality, a ten-paged libel that was filled with insults, manias, slandering, and rants that only perverted hearts could write. All of their answer was decorated with adjectives such as "cynical hypocrisy," "brother-loving cunning," "shameless opportunism," "self-mockery," "deep darkness," "naked of all shame and humanity" and finally ending with the following:

*Let it be known to you for one more time that we the below-signed, the remainder of the healthy hierarchy, the ones who have remained unharmed from the leprosy of your crimes, DO NOT BELONG TO YOU since we have cut off spiritual communion with you from the time we sent you the document of denouncement of your illegal consecrations dated February 27, 1979 and WE ARE NOT DEPENDENT ON YOU FROM THEN ON ... We do not acknowledge consecrations that were done secretly from us, nor a "Synod" that was non-canonically gathered without us ... This is the reason why we want to retain the ability to be independent for reasons of conscience at a time when our Church is in an immediate state of need after your coup d'états, until they can be lawfully judged by its correct ecclesiastical authority or by a greater Synod of similar believers. As awaiting judgment on this account, you can act in no lawful or valid way. This is our final answer.*

Even after this indescribable reply, the Sacred Synod did not proceed to punish them in any way and in just a short while guilelessly approached them yet again! At the invitation of His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios an "urgent Clerical Council" of our Church was called on October 5 – 8, 1979. At this assembly among others were Bishop Gabriel who at that time had not followed Bishops Akakios' and Chrysostomos Kiouisis' leaving the Synod and was not - due to his humility - punished in any way. In his introductory speech, His Beatitude the Archbishop stressed among other things, the following:

*Is it possible, Brothers and Fathers, for them to defile the names of selected co-workers, both clergymen and laymen, only based on the hearsay of the uncontrollable mouths of women or men that are well-experienced in this kind of gossipy rumors and slanders? It is my duty therefore, not only to defend my co-workers both clergy and laity from this floor, but also to express MY COMPLETE EPISCOPAL SATISFACTION with them, because they are ready at every call and request of mine to offer their conscientious and prompt presence resulting in the recognition of the clergy, good communication with the authorities, the growth and improvement of the Sacred Temples that belong to Our Benevolent Society, and the independent path of our finances...*

The council discussed the problems that were caused by the division and also the matter of Bishops Akakios of Diavleia and Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica. It was unanimously decided that a committee of dialogue and reconciliation be sent to those bishops at their residences in women's convents on the outskirts of Athens. It was also decided that this would be the final attempt (already the *third* one) to settle the division of these particular bishops.

The committee consisted of Their Eminences Metropolitans Kallinikos of Phthiotis and Theophilos of Patras, the Protopriest Michael Savvopoulos, the Hierodeacon Ambrosios (now Bishop of Philippi) and the Athonite Elder Iakovos and decided that it would visit on that very day both of these women's convents of the two bishops. The result of this committee is described in the official periodical of the Holy Synod as follows:

"The Sacred Synod, upon the return of the committee from His Eminence Akakios, was informed that nothing was accomplished even though the committee had been persistent. Metropolitan Akakios had not only refused to work at all with the members of the Sacred Synod, but had insulted and slandered the hierarchy and our Church in general. His Eminence Chrysostomos Kiouisis had not even presented himself to the committee at all, though he was in his [permanent] dwelling in this convent [outside his diocese] at the time. It is obvious that they are not willing to return.

"It was suggested that His Eminence Gabriel of the Cyclades should take under his care the shepherding of the flock as exarch of the Diocese of Magnisia. It was also suggested that he accompany the committee that visited Bishops Akakios and Chrysostomos Kiouisis, but, strangely enough, he refused both suggestions, even though the body of the priests were insistent, at the same time depositing a document in which he sought answers to questions concerning some past matters. The Hierarchy in its next meeting would involve itself with this document."

This is what the "old warrior" *The Voice of Orthodoxy* noted. In its next issue of November 1979, trying to put a stop to the gossiping slanders of the "newly clean," it published an article by His Eminence Metropolitan Athanasios of Acharnon which stressed "the process of that much desired ecclesiastical cleansing and curing of our clergy of all ranks has already begun. Everyone who truly desires that recovery, and also all those who for the sake of making a scene scream about it, are called to make their WRITTEN statements as soon as possible before the first-level Synodal Court and to SIGN them using whatever evidence they possess in order to establish their case well against any clergyman so that this can be a well rooted regulation of this much discussed matter."

I am obliged to quickly mention these publications in order that they might undoubtedly prove that our Sacred Synod under that struggler Archbishop Auxentios did, before and after the schism, not overlook the matter of that notorious "moral cleansing," as much as was possible, but those deceitful enemies of our Sacred Synod lied and exaggerated both about persons and things since they could find no other excuse for their mutiny.

Towards the end of 1979, the at that time Chief Secretary of the Sacred Synod, the Very Reverend Archimandrite Fr. Nicholas Liappidis, circulated a booklet entitled, *The Great Scandalmongers of the Church of the G.O.C.*, mostly opposed to Metropolitans Akakios of Diavleia and Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica. In this booklet, the author summarized in general the lives and times of these two clergymen, citing a list of

canonical misdeeds and shortcomings of these two and various events that prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that if anyone had lost their "outward good image" it was these two bishops.

Especially concerning Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica, whose case is particularly interesting to us, since in a few years, for what sins only the Lord knows, he would become the adulterously usurper of the Archbishop's throne. Father Nicholas relates that as an archimandrite he served in Jerusalem with a Presanctified Lamb that had been consecrated by a priest of the Jerusalem Patriarchate while a new calendar bishop was presiding at the bishop's throne and was very leniently punished by the Sacred Synod with a twenty-day suspension which he never performed! He was craving so much to be consecrated a bishop even then that he sought to be consecrated in a *coup d'état* even with a new-calendar bishop but was not successful. Once a bishop, he made multiple invasions into the dioceses of other bishops. He conspired with Bishop Petros of Astoria who was both outside of the Sacred Synod and outside of the true profession of Faith. (We here note that their first concelebration took place in Thessalonica in the end of 1974.) Having missed many meetings of the Sacred Synod without any excuse, he could have been excommunicated only for this reason alone and punished in other ways as the Sacred Canons specify. That he himself enough times ordained people to the priesthood who were assuredly unworthy and closely worked with such clergymen. That he often systematically defamed clergymen who had proven to be blameless. That he in general was the greatest scandalmonger of our Church, forever rebellious and trampling upon his written promise to Archbishop Auxentios to never act in favor of a faction and to never have a close working relationship with Metropolitan Akakios, for whom, we must note, he had a great aversion and vice-versa right up to the year 1972-1973. Who is this man who in the long run appears to be struggling for and boasting about the fulfillment of the Sacred Canons, good order, lawfulness, and moral cleansing? Woe unto us if that was the healthy remainder of the Hierarchy of the G.O.C. of Greece, having performed so many canonical misdeeds and imprudent acts!

This is a summary of what the Chief Secretary, Father Nicholas Liappidis, wrote. It is true that someone should take the trouble to write a similar booklet that would prove to everyone and point out to them themselves, the true picture and state of these two Bishops Akakios and Chrysostomos Kiouisis. These two, of course, objected to the circulation of this particular booklet of Father Nicholas (without being able to prove that what he wrote was not all absolutely true) and especially because it was signed by the Sacred Synod's Chief Secretary.

**1980-1984**  
**PRO-UNIONISTS AND ANTI-UNIONISTS**  
**DISINTEGRATION OF THE "KALLISTITES"**  
**THE GROWTH OF THE DIVISIONS**

In every division three ideological groups are formed. One portion is with one side, the other with the other side, and the third is neutral and can thus be called union-favored. The same is true concerning the divisions of 1979. The largest part of the clergy and laity were, as can be expected, on the side of the Canonical Sacred Synod. Few were with the usurpers. Somewhere in the middle of these two groups were the ones who were in favor of a union and they organized a committee to which bishops also joined in the year 1981. The existing conflict, especially during the years 1980-1982, between the pro and anti-union groups became apparent in the periodical of the Sacred Synod, *The Voice of Orthodoxy*, which in one issue would publish a pro-union article and in the next issue an anti-union article, both of which bore the signature of bishops!

In the beginning of 1980, Archbishop Auxentios together with Metropolitans Kallinikos of Phthiotis and Efthymios of Stavropolis visited Metropolitan Akakios of Diavleia in his convent in Paiania to beg him for the fourth (4th) time to come to terms with the Synod. This attempt was, once again, unsuccessful.

Immediately following this, on January 28, this Metropolitan Akakios together with his co-worker Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouis circulated a leaflet composed of a four-page letter addressed to His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios, entitled, *The Correct Road that Will Lead Out of the Dead End*.

The "prologue" of this leaflet is quite insulting to the Archbishop and those with him, referring to them as impious and devious. This letter on the one hand objects to the booklet of Father Nicholas Liappidis, on the other hand it praises the pro-union moves of His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios, with the note that they should have taken place earlier, before the new consecrations. It stresses that the Archbishop (in order to bring peace, of course) stated that he "takes responsibility for all the past!" They used this statement to say that they were justified. Later, regarding the consecrations of the Sacred Synod as an "anti- *coup d'état*" and therefore regarding everyone except themselves as pending judgment, and again equalizing the victim to the victimizer, they suggest that the help of the Sacred Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia be sought to try the case of the *coup d'état* and their so-called "anti- *coup d'état*" and declare who is innocent.

As a second suggestion, they wrote the following:

"In the circumstance that the above-mentioned Synod should reject our petition, our opinion is that all the bishops should abdicate. We will all live private lives from here on ... Three hieromonks who are known for their morality, decency, and faith, preferably from Mount Athos, should be consecrated bishops to shepherd and administer the Church, by those bishops who had not taken part in the *coups*. In this way will the



divisions, personality struggles, and counter-accusations cease and that troubled people of the G.O.C. be united ... We personally, for the peace of the Church and the spiritual unity of the flock, will be the first ones to give our places over to the new spiritual leaders and live private lives. We pray that all the others will follow us ..."

As far as we know no specific official response to this letter, whose suggestions required much reflection, was given. As far as the booklet of Father Nicholas Liappidis goes, he stated in writing that he was forced to write what he did by the continuous provocative stand of the two mentioned bishops and that he at any moment was ready to prove the truth of everything and all he wrote, but would recall everything if the two bishops would agree to return. Under pressure, the Sacred Synod stated that "his writings did not reflect the opinion of the Sacred Synod."

Here we must note that the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, in its April 28/ May 11, 1979 meeting, not denying the guilt of His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios in certain consecrations (in particular that of Gabriel of Lisbon, Portugal), gave the following advice as a solution to the problems of our Sacred Struggle: All the bishops that are above reproach should come together and divide amongst themselves the dioceses according to size. The rest of the bishops should be pleased to retire. Only after the elimination (they wrote) of all bishops conspicuous of canonical misdeeds could a beginning be made of a correct canonical organization of the Church of G.O.C. in Greece..."

The Russians wrote this without explaining which bishops were non-canonical (or at least more so than the others) according to their opinion, or at how we could recognize them. At that time, a large number of Athonite fathers together with the Holy Monastery of Esphigmenou appeared asking for a union of the divided bishops and that they sit down at the round table and discuss things. Answering them Bishops Akakios and Chrysostomos Kiouis rejected their idea as improbable and anti-ideological saying, "a helter-skelter union of all for the forming of an absurd mixture of uncertain bishops for the "unity of the struggle" does "of course fall short of that famous zealotism reaching areas of reprehensible accommodations of conscience. In other words it loses its value and destination."

Also, probably being swept away by the darkness of their pride and hatred, they fell into two dogmatic deceptive deferments. First into the dogmatizing (which even the New Calendarists would be jealous of) of "the taking away of divine grace, which in the beginning had shown itself through signs from God, from our sacred movement" due to inability and self-interest!

And secondly, they lay aside that universal patristic teaching that reassures that through all those priests who have a canonical Orthodox ordination "including those who are unworthy grace is active" up until the time they are deposed. Thus they write inside of quotation marks and with an exclamation mark, "pillagers wearing cassocks that "bless and sanctify" (!) those unfortunate G.O.C."

These were the accomplishments of the traditional "newly-clean!"

The Sacred Diocese of Thessalonica could not remain forever without a canonical shepherd, in the unaccountable hands of the unrepentant clique-master Chrysostomos Kiouisis. So the Sacred Synod called him for the last time to return to the Canonical Synod, so that it would not be forced to penalize him. He responded through an extrajudicial notification (dated September 3, 1980) in which he threatened to make charges against Archbishop Auxentios in the state courts!

The Sacred Synod believing that it had done everything it could in the difficult situation of the stubborn Metropolitan of Thessalonica Chrysostomos Kiouisis moved along, as was its duty, with its mission. On September 3/16, 1980, "after proving him guilty of the canonical crimes of plotting, making cliques, illicit assembly and contempt of one's superior authority" declared the Metropolitan of Thessalonica dethroned. It avoided defrocking him probably in order to make it easier for him to return at some point.

A month later, the Sacred Synod elected the up till that time suffragan Bishop Efthymios to fill the empty Metropolitan's see of Thessalonica and he was enthroned on October 23, 1980.

Naturally, the now declared dethroned Metropolitan of Thessalonica never accepted his dethronement, or any other punishment that was placed on him by the Sacred Synod for canonical misdeeds, becoming a ring-leader of a first time rebellion in the bosom of our Sacred Synod. Before, and especially after his dethronement, he retained a large portion of the clergy of Northern Greece (not only of Thessalonica, but outside it in the other counties of Kavala, Serres, Drama, and so on) in a rebellious condition against their superior authority, the Sacred Synod. He had as his co-defender the ever-problematical guild of the parish of the "Three Hierarchs" of Thessalonica, which had not even accepted that very same Metropolitan Chrysostomos during the beginning of his rule in 1971. Even our eternally memorable confessor of the Faith and First-Hierarch, former Metropolitan of Florina, Chrysostomos Kavouridis, who was so meek and lenient, was himself forced, during the very time the liturgy was taking place, to excommunicate two superiors of the parish because they were disturbing the peace of the Sacred Mystery carrying on against one of their fellow servers, the late Hieromonk Fr. Gabriel Liveris.

Unfortunately, all the more this established the rebellious situation with the innately dissident former Metropolitan of Thessalonica Chrysostomos Kiouisis, which in turn served the passions of the power-hungry parish council members of the above-mentioned guild for the control of all of Northern Greece, and if it were possible for all of the Sacred Struggle, and because of their hatred and spitefulness of the canonical Metropolitan of Thessalonica Efthymios, would bring about many tribulations for the unity and the progress of the hierarchy of our Church as we will relate.

Exemplary of this irregular state was the denouncement of the lawful Sacred Synod on November 23, 1980, by ten priests from Katerin, Messoropi and Sidirokastron who went over to the camp of the former Metropolitan of Thessalonica Chrysostomos Kiouisis.

Towards the end of 1981, a unification committee was formed including the following members: Archbishop Auxentios, Metropolitans Theophilos of Patras and Athanasios of Acharnon, Archimandrites Dionysios Kalargyros, Efthymios Bardakas, Panaretos and some laity. Following the report of the committee, the Sacred Synod decided in a ruling of the majority vote (7 in favor, 4 against) "in a show of good will" to remove all penalties that were placed upon Bishops Akakios of Diavleia and Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica. At the same time, an effort was made to approach Bishop Petros of Astoria. Unfortunately, Bishops Akakios and Chrysostomos Kiouisis on the one hand thanked the committee for its good will but on the other hand remained separated from the Sacred Synod.

The Sacred Synod a year later under pressure due to the disagreement of a large fraction of the synodal members, lifted the penalties placed on those two bishops, announcing that from here on they would remain suspended and dethroned.

In the mean time, on March 19, 1981, Bishop Gabriel of the Cyclades in a document officially and permanently renounced Archbishop Auxentios and the Sacred Synod, calling upon the same excuses as Metropolitans Akakios and Chrysostomos Kiouisis and joining their camp. He also made accusations against the Archbishop in writing to the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia and stated that he considered them [the Russians] to be the "the administrating exarchs of the Church of the G.O.C. of Greece," a theory which is canonically and logically bizarre and peculiar.

My soul is truly saddened when I see bishops like these, who were so guilty of not respecting, and answerable for so many things that are foreseen by, the Sacred Canons, then boast about Sacred Canonicity, when "every violation of the Sacred Canons is ... equal to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit ... and disintegrates not only every ecclesiastical institution, but also every vindication we have before the Lord" and so forth, criticizing the Archbishop and the Sacred Synod as being non-canonical.

This Bishop Gabriel that made these statements, besides other canonical infractions which as a human being he had committed during the years of his service as a bishop, had committed one that no other of our bishops had committed to such an extent. Being the Metropolitan of the Cyclades and Islands from the year 1973, he rarely (so that I won't say ever, except only for the day of his enthronement) visited his diocese always residing in his women's convent in Lykovrisi Attica! Many people often reproved him for this. The Sacred Synod being gracious unto him never defrocked him for this even though they could have done so empowered by a number of Canons that forbade bishops being absent from their dioceses for more than as little as three to six months, when Bishop Gabriel was absent for years on end, living in another's diocese in Attica!

This was what was going on around the Canonical Sacred Synod of His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios.

Those who separated themselves from the Synod through the *coup d'état* with so many boastful announcements, assurances and promises, to make a long story short, failed miserably. God, the clergy, and the laity, in a short period of a few years, forsook them as Kalliopios the "bishop of Pentapolis" often said himself to many of us and especially in front of His Eminence Bishop Ambrosios of Philippi.

Merkourios "Bishop of Knossos" (a saintly figure and a warrior for our Church, who, I believe, was one of those hoodwinked into being consecrated like Bishop Kallinikos of the Dodekanisos) fell asleep in the Lord in 1980 and the other nine began to dissolve.

These so-called exact "guardians of Orthodoxy" became estranged and ended up isolating one of their leaders and the president of their church-corporation, Kallistos "of Corinth" because he remained firm in the profession of Faith of 1935, which regarded the mysteries of the New Calendarists devoid of divine grace whereas those around the other ring-leader Kyprianos of "Phili" did *not* accept this. This division spread through their small number of clergy. Some, like Kalliopios of "Pentapolis" were indifferent and declared that each one could believe whatever he wanted to as long as they just remained united!!!

Kallistos of "Corinth" disenchanted by the laxity of those he consecrated withdrew in 1983 to live a private life in convents until his repose in 1986. At this time, Maximos of "Magnisia" was sent by the others to come in contact with the Canonical Sacred Synod of His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios. Soon, however, this messenger having made a petition to the Sacred Synod, joined the Synod after a Synodal decision, as took place for all the returning schismatics from the *coup d'état* of 1979. They all received a laying on of hands (*heirothesia*) and were given, if possible, a different episcopal title.

In this way in June, 1983, Maximos of "Magnisia" was accepted, given the *heirothesia* and renamed Bishop of Dimitrias. He was immediately followed by both Kallinikos of the Dodekanisos (with the title of Kalymnos) and Germanos of Aiolia who received canonical *heirothesia* according to the previous canonical, fair, and necessary decision of the Sacred Synod. Also these three bishops received the last places in the order of consecrations, as was fitting, even though they had technically been consecrated before the others who were consecrated in 1979 by Archbishop Auxentios and the Sacred Synod.

In September, 1984, Kyprianos of "Oropos" departed, founding his famous "Synod of the Resisters" ganging up with John of "Sardinia" together with whom he consecrated the rest of the "resisting" bishops. Who was this John of "Sardinia"? He was an Italian ordained a priest in 1965 by some bogus bishop who proclaimed himself to be the ...Archbishop of Rome! He was again ordained by an unknown Russian and later joined the Patriarchate of Moscow being accused of "abnormal lifestyle and under police surveillance." These unmatched "guardians of Orthodoxy" in 1982 ordained this John

"Bishop of Sardinia and Exarch of all Italy!" Kyprianos seduced John into helping him found those lukewarm and double-talking "resisters" which exist up until today adding a schism to a schism and forming yet another new church corporation, the so-called "Church of Orthodox Christians of Greece!!" Congratulations to the profession of faith and to their "God-pleasing resistance!"

Let those who have an ordination that descends from these truly worthy of sorrow "resisters" see where they come from and let them lament for themselves as all those usurpers did in 1984 seeing that after only five years their established church corporation fell apart by itself into ruins.

Unfortunately both for themselves and the Church, not one of them left in repentance to Mount Athos as they had promised to do, if they were not successful, in their second encyclical of February, 1979. Only Kallistos of "Corinth" kept his promise in part at least, as we have already noted, privately living monastically from 1983 on. All of the rest of them, however, did not keep their promise because the schism and their consecrations had not taken place by chance. They took place that they might, in a dictatorial way take control of the Church's administration and to satisfy their power-hungry souls and who knows for what other reasons...And these events had to take place. The other four defrocked usurpers remained lamenting over their ruins. Antonios of "Attica", Kalliopios of "Pentapolis", Kallinikos Sarantopoulos of "Achaia", and Mattheos of "Oinoi" were literally abandoned by clergy and laity and stood looking back at those they, five years earlier, had denounced as incapable, immoral, lukewarm and so on and so forth. In other words they were left gazing at the Canonical Synod under His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios, hoping to become a part of it that they might ecclesiastically be saved so that they might finish their plan of swindling the whole of the ecclesiastical administration of the G.O.C.

In the mean time a division broke out, the Lord alone knows for what reason He allowed it, in the canonical Sacred Synod. I don't think it is necessary for us to spend any more time on this short division. What is important here is that this division enlarged the opposition to and the general, as we might call it, scandalization with His Beatitude. The faithful were to find themselves before a polymorphic division and were led to amazement and disenchantment.

My personal opinion, based, however on the proven events is: the remaining 79-ers wanted to join the canonical Synod in order to save themselves, but they in no way were willing to have the laying on of hands *heirothesia* like schismatics as the Synod had decided for the other three (the Bishops of Dimitrias, Dodekanisos, Aiolia). So what did they plot? They schemed, by the means they well knew, discord and division between the President of the Synod, Archbishop Auxentios and the Vice-President, Metropolitan Gerontios, so that the Synod would be split and they could invade it, demanding an unconditional acceptance from the split and weakened Synod members! They later could use, as a previously judged event, their lawless recognition by half of the Synod's members!

**1984-1986 ANTICANONICAL UNIONS INAGURATE  
THE CAPTIVITY OF OUR CHURCH  
BY THE HEAD DIVIDERS OF 1979**

In September, 1984, at the trial that was taking place concerning the alteration of some articles of the Benevolent Fund (and especially the article that defined the President of the Fund to always be the Archbishop of our Church), Metropolitan Kalliopios "of Pentapolis" together with that permanent advisor of the "coupes" Mr. Athanasios Sakarellos unexpectedly showed up at the court. Mr. Sakarellos during the trial approached Metropolitan Efthymios of Thessalonica and asked him his opinion on how to possibly unite the four remaining usurpers, Antonios "of Attica," Kalliopios "of Pentapolis," Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "of Achaia," and Mattheos "of Oinoi," with the portion of bishops surrounding Metropolitan Gerontios of Piraeus.

Within a month, in a totally impromptu and non-canonical manner, forgive me for telling the truth, disregarding the 1983 collective and in all ways righteous Synodal decision concerning the manner of reception, following their repentance, of usurpers through *heirothesia* and placing them last in order, the late Metropolitan Gerontios of Piraeus and those with him received into their bosom, without any of the agreed upon requirements, these four hard-core usurpers, unrepentant and defrocked *without heirothesia*!

Unfortunately, those surrounding Metropolitan Gerontios of Piraeus, with ambitions of a frivolous reinforcement of their faction against the Archbishop, agreed to the demands of those four to be accepted as canonical bishops, in the name of a poorly thought out union!

I remember one meeting of ours with them, when, referring to the manner of their being accepted, that the loquacious Kallinikos Sarantopoulos of "Achaia" said, "we could not accept anything being done to us, since the day of our consecrations, we have the moral sense that we are completely bishops"!

As I was a deacon at the time, being unable to listen to his nonsense, in front of one of our bishops, who unfortunately remained silent, I indignantly answered: "Well we also had the moral sense that *we* were *inside* the Church and *you* were *outside* all those years!"

However being reprimanded by a bishop-friend I was forced to be silent, from that time never being able to reveal my thoughts from the fear that some day we would suffer much from those roughneck schismatics, whom we without any examination had then accepted, and that we would sorely repent of it. Unfortunately, my fear would tragically come true in the next years. I am an eye-witness to the truly total abandonment of these usurpers by the faithful. During the unification celebration preceded over by Metropolitan Gerontios of Piraeus in the Holy Temple of the Dormition of the Theotokos in Piraeus, these last four schismatics had only two priests with them!

The late Metropolitan Gerontios of Piraeus before the outcry and disenchantment of the faithful due to the many-formed divisions, himself desiring peace in the Church, having already in any old way collected the ship-wrecked leftovers of the usurpers, immediately turned to Archbishop Auxentios and the bishops with him asking to unite with them also. I can not contradict the fact that it is obviously good for all of the Genuine Orthodox to be united, but here the saying of the Fathers is well put, "Nothing is good, if it is not well done." Unfortunately the subsequent good of the general unity proved not to be good, because it was not well done, since it mixed that which cannot be mixed, i.e. canonical bishops with non-canonical, lawful with defrocked.

Therefore near to the feast of the Holy Theophany, His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios and those six bishops who remained with him (Athanasios of Larissa, Gerasimos of Thebes, Maximos of Cephalonia, Paisios of America, Germanos of Aiolia, and Kallinikos of the Dodekanisos) received, again in an arbitrary way, the union with the ten-member episcopal faction of Metropolitan Gerontios of Piraeus, in a general meeting on January 4/17, 1985, so that in only two short days they could in unity celebrate the Feast of the Holy Theophany with the annual procession and submerging of the Holy Cross in the sea at the harbor of Piraeus.

The Minutes of this disastrous meeting, which non-canonically, unjustly, and unacceptably abolished the decision in 1983 concerning the acceptance of the schismatics of 1979 were found published in a leaflet of Kallinikos Sarantopoulos of "Achaia" entitled *That all may be one*.

In that leaflet, are the following which are unacceptable in every way:

#### "MINUTES OF THE UNITY

... (the bishops) unanimously decided and accepted the following:

- a) The consecrations of 1979 of both sides are recognized.
- b) The penalties inflicted by both sides are considered to have never been applied.
- c) The accusations hurled out by both sides are retracted ..."

At the end of the Minutes, the bishops sign, but the usurpers of the *coup d'état* sign *before* the Canonical Bishops of 1979 as supposedly being consecrated first and having the "rights of seniority"!

In the beginning of the Minutes, where the names of the bishops who are present are recorded, the naked eye can detect the following strange thing: The names of the bishops of the *coup d'état* of 1979 have properly been placed AFTER the names of all the Canonical Bishops of our Sacred Synod. The numeration, however, is corrected, being written over by hand! Numbers 5 through 9 have been given to the usurpers who were written last in the list, while to the Canonical Bishops that defiled hand has given the numbers 10 to 14, even though they were first in the list.

What happened?

Probably, without the knowledge of His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios who signed first and departed, the other bishops cliqued together and reversed the seniority, in defiance of a large number of Sacred Canons which command, "do not do anything without the knowledge of the President."

This can be seen again in the Minutes of the next meeting (January 16/29), where once again the names of the canonical bishops are written first, and again the numbers are roughly corrected by hand making the first last!!

We read the following:

"1) General information concerning the unity given by His Beatitude.

"2) The Holy President cites some observations in the Minutes of the unity in certain places.

His Eminence Kalliopios objects to this, as far as the matter of the recognition goes, he recognizes both sides as having canonical consecrations.

His Eminence of Piraeus says that everything should be erased and that we should start our course of the Sacred Struggle from the beginning.

His Eminence of Cephalonia says that the Minutes should remain as they are in order to avoid disagreement.

His Eminence of Acharnon suggests that the words "consecrations that were made on both sides" be stricken from the records.

DECISION: It will remain as is."

My dear Fathers and Brothers, it truly saddens me that my here present Fathers and concelebrants, Their Eminences of Phthiotis, Thessalonica, and Acharnon were also members of those false-unification ill-fated meetings, but I have to state the truth.

When I think of the recognition on "both sides" of the consecrations and the lifting of the "one to another" penalties I lament! I see the changing of the order of episcopal seniority of our bishops and I become vexed! I see the trampling down of the most canonical decision of 1983 by our Sacred Synod in order to admit these usurpers and I am amazed!

Holy Brothers, in agreement with the ancient observed order in Orthodoxy and based on so many Sacred Canons, those who are cut off from the Church through schism, and in particular their bishops, who are in all actuality defrocked, should be accepted into the Church only under the following conditions, which are:



- a) outstanding repentance asking for forgiveness from the canonical bishops,
- b) renunciation in writing of their every illegal act and perhaps deception and impiety,
- c) reassurance of their future obedience and clique-free subordination to the Church,
- d) the placing on of hands (*heirothesia*) by the First (Hierarchy),
- e) being placed after the canonical and Orthodox bishops in the order of seniority,
- f) and if possible changing the name of the diocese they had seized while they were in schism.

And I ask the following:

Which if any of all of these conditions commanded by the Sacred Canons were observed in the acceptance of those last four hard-core schismatics: Antonios "of Attica," Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "of Achaia," Kalliopios "of Pentapolis," and Mattheos "of Oinoi"?

Woe unto us! *Not even one!* This was done in total defiance of the former reception of Maximos of Dimitrias, Kallinikos of Dodekanisos, and Germanos of Aiolia, , which was based on correct canonical conditions and resolved by the Sacred Synod in 1983!

I am simply dumbfounded:

Why did those bishops then accept this non-canonical and humiliating decision? How did they through the "both sided," accept those godless penalties that were placed upon them by the schismatics? How did they accept the recognition, contrary to some fifteen Sacred Canons, of their illegitimate consecrations, annulling the previous correct synodal decisions against them? How did they accept to be placed second in seniority to the unrepentant and incomparable schismatics, not fearing the reality that let our Church come under the destroying will and captivity of these power-hungry schismatics? Why didn't anyone defend His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios in the meeting of January 16/29, when he, most correctly, protested those non-canonical decisions of "both-sidedness," except for His Eminence Metropolitan Athanasius of Acharnon, and in this way drowning all righteousness?

How did they not, at least, demand the dissolving of their freakish, outside the Church "church corporation" of the "Greek Church of the G.O.C." of 25 Koumoudourou Street, allowing them to continue their gang-rule? How did they not demand at least a sincere repentance for all the slanderous and insulting things they had vomited, from 1979 on, against them?

Immeasurable grief takes hold of my heart!

I ask forgiveness, but my conscience does not allow me to accept that defiled false-union reversing every form of canonical order. Allow me to place myself with that illustrious Dositheos of Jerusalem and let me say with him, "Everything that is not in agreement with the Canons is powerless, and is disregarded as impious and loathsome."

And with the Fourth Ecumenical and Holy Synod: "Nothing contrary to the Canons is valid." And with Saint Nikodimos the Athonite: "Everything that was incorrectly judged and published, is not reassured; neither by a Canon, nor by time, nor by custom."

The incontestable history shows the unity of the bishops, as well as the acceptance as canonical bishops of the last four defrocked schismatics, of whom only Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "of Achaia" survives today, which took place during two meetings of January, 1985, to be non-canonical and illegitimate, and therefore impious and rejectable.

The great question is:

After so many years of ecclesiastical communion and unity why do we say all of this?

I answer, not by my own words, but through the words of the New Calendarists who more correctly stated in defiance of the bishops of the "Ieronymos Kotsonis brotherhood movement," who tried for seven years to usurp in a *coup d'état* manner the total new calendar church administration as our usurpers also tried to do:

"If it be possible that they with reservations or under pressure or through being duped achieved a communion of canonical with non-canonical bishops, as if by magic, they only established the non-canonical as canonical."

In any case, I, the least one, had nothing to do (glory to God) with those things that took place then, being a simple deacon at that time. It is for this reason that I eagerly accepted the weight of preparing this present report, that I might through it research and discover for myself and for history's sake, and for the Church, and for our ecclesiastical genealogy the unhampered truth. According to the words of the Lord, "every good tree bears good fruit. The rotten tree bears evil fruit." In this same way, the rotten tree of the above-mentioned union bore from then on evil fruit of discord, injustice and non-canonicity, found in the captivity of unrepentant ecclesiastical trouble-makers. These ones freely came to the "state of impiety, god-playing, indecency, and criminality" (as they themselves proclaimed in 1979), against which they had first rebelled! Proving that, they then became impious, God-mockers, indecent, criminal, and as much as they vomited through their writings so many years was false and the slandering of power-hungry opportunists...

### 1985-1995: THE CAPTIVITY OF OUR SACRED SYNOD

The first evil fruit of our captive Sacred Synod was the non-canonical defrocking of His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios whose precise objection to the roughly made gluing together of a unity (at the assembly of January 19/29), the trouble-makers could not forgive. Therefore they took leading roles in the process of the unlawful defrocking of the much-suffering Archbishop Auxentios. That indescribable Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "of Achaia" as Chief Secretary, his zealous collaborators Kalliopios "of Pentapolis" as a self-proclaimed examining magistrate, and behind them both that unending advisor, the New Calendarist theologian Mr. Athanasios Sakarellos, misleading all of the body of the synod unto an unrighteous judgment!

I glorify God, the Holy Spirit guiding us "in all truth," that He enlightened our Sacred Synod to re-examine this most unrighteous judgment, and in March of 1997 to entrust to my own humility the work of examining what happened at that time, so that we might rush to give that much obliged reinstatement to our common Father and Arch-shepherd, the late Ever-memorable Archbishop Auxentios, who toiled so much from his very youth for Holy Orthodoxy.

Holy Brothers, I do not deny that His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios as a man also like everyone else was not sinless, also made mistakes and had short-comings, especially after 1985. I am sickened though by the slanderous campaign against him, which was cunningly directed by those perennial trouble-makers and truly unworthy bishops of our Church, in order that they might appear good and legitimate.

It is known that His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios was defrocked for the matter of the consecration of Dorotheos Tsakos. Even if we should accept that the late Archbishop Auxentios actually did give an order that Dorotheos Tsakos be consecrated a bishop, was the trial and condemnation of Archbishop Auxentios based on this matter canonical and fair?

By God's Grace, as a researcher into this whole matter I reassure you and shout out many times: NO!

I here enumerate the main reasons, based on the published results and the remaining decisions that appeared in the periodical of the Sacred Synod, *The Voice of Orthodoxy*, November, 1985:

- 1) After the departure of the Archbishop from the assembly of July 6/19, 1985, only eight bishops, under the initiative of that gang-master Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "of Achaia," managed to worm a new and important statement from the late Bishop Gerasimos of Thebes, which they never presented to the Sacred Synod in a full session of its members and in the presence of the Archbishop himself.

2) Immediately afterwards, as *The Voice* mentions, Kalliopios of "Pentapolis" "took up his responsibilities as examining magistrate," whereas in the aforementioned assembly with the initiative of His Beatitude (another example of his good will) there had been assigned a three member examining council made up of the Metropolitans of Acharnon, "Oinoi," and "Pentapolis" which was pushed aside in favor of Kalliopios of "Pentapolis" alone.

3) In the examination of Kalliopios, he "overlooked" receiving a statement from the immediately interested party of Dorotheos Tsakos.

4) It was based on the examination of hieromonks who had no immediate relation to the event.

5) It was not even possible for them to pinpoint when the consecration was supposed to have taken place, in 1984 or 1985, before or after the union!

6) It was schizophrenic for a case to be based on a person like Bishop Gerasimos of Thebes who would at one time state that the particular misdeed took place and at another time that it had not taken place.

7) Its decision, which was a unique one in the two thousand year history of the Church, of condemning to defrocking only with a single meeting of the synodal court, without any publication so that the accused might be recalled at least two more times as the Sacred Canons demand, worked as a type of black-mailing that said, "you either come or you are automatically defrocked!"

8) Lastly it goes beyond every boundary of forbearance, justice, and canonicity to place as inquisitors and witnesses against the canonical Archbishop, those and only those schismatics who only a few months before were outside the Church and who got in again the unrepentant and clique-members, who by their cunning managed to do from inside that which they did not accomplish from outside in 1979: to toss the canonical Archbishop out the window.

However, the synodal body was deceived and His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios was tossed out, naturally not accepting that which was done in such a gangster-like and non-canonical way against him, and continued to rule with those bishops who remained with him, the Bishops Athanasios of Larissa, Maximos of Cephalonia, Gerasimos of Thebes, and Germanos of Aiolia.

Unfortunately, that synodal remnant of the late Archbishop undertook a series of hurried defrocking of many of our hierarchs, for reasons which are not relevant to our present study. Later they undertook various other acts in order to reinforce the Sacred Synod, which in general made reconciliation more difficult.

In the meantime, those power-hungry and unrepentant usurpers, and especially the maniacal Kallinikos Sarantopoulos of "Achaia" and Kalliopios of "Pentapolis," having

already achieved an "any old way" recognition, dared to move forward towards the fulfillment of their God-hated plan of the total grasping of the ecclesiastical administration. Their next big problem was: Who was going to get the empty throne of the archbishop? They did not dare offer one of themselves immediately for election since they did not have the majority of the synodal members on their side and also fearing that their plans for grasping authority might be revealed. At any price they did not want to see as archbishop anyone of those that had opposed them during 1979 (the canonical Sacred Synod) since they could not control them. Therefore they had to find someone who had the same malevolence that they had towards Archbishop Auxentios' portion of bishops. That is why the election of the new archbishop was delayed for three months (from October to January). Who else was left except for the four bishops who were outside the synod, namely Akakios of Diavleia, Chrysostomos Kiouisis formerly of Thessalonica, Gabriel of the Cyclades, and Petros of Astoria?

First of all they tried to accomplish the readmittance into the synod of their friend Petros of Astoria who had justly been excommunicated for his refusal to sign the *Profession of Faith* of 1974. I call him "their friend" because immediately after their schism, Bishop Petros had praised them in a publication of his, and in April of the same year, had received them in his cathedral of St. Markella "with all his clergy and the ringing of bells!" Periodically Bishop Petros had ecclesiastical contact with them as, for example, at the funeral of Merkourios "of Knossos" in 1980.

Also, through the situation with Petros of Astoria, one can again see through that fake exactness of Faith that "the bishops of Pentapolis and Achaia" and those with them were supposed to have *as they accepted him without his ever accepting the true Profession of Faith!*

Bishop Petros was suddenly seen after thirteen years (from 1973) as a full member of the synod in 1986 taking part in the celebration of the Holy Theophany at Piraeus, without his correcting the reason for which he was for so many years separated! These are the kind of miracles that are performed by the hunger for power and self-interest!

Metropolitans Akakios and Gabriel, two of the remaining three, did not seem eager to work with the captive synod, even though they had been begged many times during 1985 to unite. Chrysostomos Kiouisis formerly the Metropolitan of Thessalonica also was not eager to unite in the beginning. What the dethroned Chrysostomos Kiouisis wrote to an Athonite hieromonk in March, 1985, is typical of his disposition and thoughts. This letter which became very well-known is as follows:

"My dear Father Savvas,

Fortunately, even at this late time, you understood what is going on at 32 Kaningos Street. What is hiding behind those "saints," as well as what is the role that "His Beatitude" is playing ... The illustrious Archbishop with his colleagues who maniacally grabbed the episcopal miter in order to clean the dung-hill of Augeas, as they announced in their "proclamation" on 14-2-1979 ... and who call upon GOD as the witness of their

pure intentions! Now that they have accomplished the true reason for their participation in the *coup d'état* (that is the usurpers, with their entrance as canonical bishops), because "other things are said and other things are meant," they tear up accusations with terrible revelations concerning, in all truth, the dung-hill of Kaningos Street in order to put into effect the "cleansing" that they had proclaimed ... As a greater proof of their belief, they are fearlessly concelebrating with and being seen with those whose names they had specifically tarnished and "defrocked," in our city, neither fearing God nor being embarrassed before the people!

"See, my beloved, the seriousness of such people! See the mockery of God and the self-violation of laughable 'bishops' who call me to their synod...!! See for whom you intermediated that we might unite ... I cannot trust that pair of Auxentios and Gerontios at all ... and knowing you to be a man of morals, I am amazed at how you can group yourselves with these sorts.

With love and blessings,

+ Chrysostomos of Thessalonica 5-3-1985"

That was what the former Metropolitan of Thessalonica wrote and we should confess that, not taking into account his obvious contempt for absolutely everyone, he was totally right to deride the unity of 1985 which took place without canonical conditions as we have already demonstrated. When, however, the throne of the archbishop was emptied in October, the appetite of the suspended, dethroned, and excommunicated Chrysostomos Kiouisis was wetted as the expression goes!

So, answering the invitation of Metropolitan Gerontios to return to the synod after the "defrocking" of Archbishop Auxentios, Chrysostomos Kiouisis wrote in November, 1985:

"To everyone's general consolation, we saw in this a turn in the right direction for our much-suffering Sacred Struggle, through the elimination of negative elements ... beginning with the former Archbishop Auxentios ... Firstly, we four bishops would then like to thank you for your recognition of the righteousness of our break in relations with the synod and secondly for your noble invitation for us to resume relations for the salvation of the Sacred Struggle ... I desire the responsible assurance that certain obstacles, which I mentioned verbally to some of your bishops, have been removed. This includes the elimination of Bishop Efthymios from my diocese, as he himself stated during his visit together with other bishops. As far as the position goes that we retained up until this time concerning certain old non-canoncities and the consecrations in both of the factions that followed them, in order for us to unite, we will base ourselves on the written opinion of theologians in regard to how much *oikonomia* can be applied, due to the extremely detailed deadlock into which our Sacred Struggle has come...

"This written advice we will soon pass on to you ... Besides all of this, we would like in the future the canonical recognition of this union by the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, for the sake of legality and history ...

“The least among bishops, + Chrysostomos”

Here we must note that, as always, before and after 1985 and up until today the (then) former Metropolitan of Thessalonica Chrysostomos Kiouisis considered that he himself *never* had committed any mistakes during his ecclesiastical life, that others were responsible for everything and that he was utterly blameless! He did not even call to mind the Lord's words to those Pharisees like him: "You are the ones who make yourselves righteous before God, but God knows your hearts. Whoever is proud among men is an abomination before God."

This self-justification of Chrysostomos Kiouisis was also prevalent in this referenced reply of his. I, the lowly one, am myself a witness to his prideful character. When we visited the women's convent in which he lives in the summer of 1985, together with Metropolitans Gerontios of Piraeus, Petros of Astoria, Kallinikos of Phthiotis, Athanasios of Acharnon, Efthymios of Thessalonica, and others, in order to discuss issues in the spirit of unity, he boasted about himself, saying that he was finally supposedly justified and as one wiser than all others he would correct the things of the Church! In 1985 the former Metropolitan of Thessalonica Chrysostomos Kiouisis sent his promised “opinion of theologians,” prepared by Fathers Chrysostomos Spyrou, Chrysostomos Oikonomakou, Theodoritos the Athonite, and the lay-theologians Stavros Karamitsos, Basilios Primbos, and Abraham Tsimirikas, to the synod. This exceedingly daring document gave the opinion that due to the special circumstances our Sacred Struggle had come to, "only under certain conditions could the union (of the four bishops) with the inviting bishops be possible.

We feel it needless to say that one of the conditions should of course have to do with the ecclesiastical interpretation of the Encyclical of May 14, 1935, about which we have come to the relative deduction that expresses our belief from the very beginning, while another is that concerning those who were barred as candidates for the presidency of the synod, i.e., any bishop having had anything to do with the *coup d'état* and the anti-*coup d'état* of 1979.

To make it short, in other words these four bishops (of Astoria, Diavleia, the Cyclades and formerly of Thessalonica) along with their theologians sought to put aside the pure profession of Faith of our Sacred Struggle by means of an "ecclesiastical interpretation," more correctly called a "misinterpretation."

When empty thrones beckon, and especially archiepiscopal thrones, many miracles take place, as we have said before.

In this way, without the synod ever receiving any written confirmation to satisfy even one of their conditions, after the feast of the Holy Theophany, because of Metropolitan Petros of Astoria's insistent instigations, the former Metropolitan of Thessalonica Chrysostomos Kiouisis came over to the synod in an impromptu and non-canonical manner, just like those four remaining rough necks of 1979, without the fulfillment of

any canonical order concerning illicit assemblies and schismatics that we have listed earlier!

He showed up without true repentance, without renouncing any of the many insulting and slanderous things he had said and written about the members of the synod, without any reassurance that he would no longer connive in cliques, without any proclamation of the correct profession of Faith for which just days before he had demanded it being put aside and finally, without any synodal decision whatsoever that would have lifted the serious penalties that had been imposed on the former Metropolitan of Thessalonica years before!

Then that strange and lamentable event took place: the suspended, excommunicated and dethroned former Metropolitan of Thessalonica appeared, for the first time in so many years, on January 15/28, brazenly breezing in as a canonical member and placing himself forward as the candidate for the archiepiscopal throne.

Oh what a mockery of God and what a scene of parody!

Now the game was afoot as the saying goes: eight "Auxentiites" up against eight usurpers and fellow trouble-makers. The bishops of Piraeus, Phthiotis, Thessalonica, Acharnon, Euripos, Chios, America, and Avlon up against the bishops formerly of Thessalonica, of Astoria, "Attica", "Achaia", "Pentapolis", "Oinoi", Dimitrias, and of the Dodekanisos.

The two candidates were Gerontios of Piraeus and Chrysostomos Kiouisis formerly of Thessalonica, not however as the former Metropolitan, but as the canonical Metropolitan of Thessalonica. The secret ballots, 10 to 6, elected Chrysostomos Kiouisis as archbishop!

What happened? Backstage, as we later learned, the usurpers insured the victory of their candidate by obtaining the votes of two bishops from the faction of Metropolitan Gerontios of Piraeus, thereby breaking the tie. When the results came to be known, the euphemisms and laudatory speeches about "Divine Providence and will in the Holy Spirit" of the election began.

My Fathers, I pray that God forgive those who, perhaps out of pure motives to assure peace, took part in this illicit and hypocritical election. We repeat: any and all non-canonical decisions are to be tossed out as impious, powerless, and to be utterly disregarded even after a lengthy time which in no way confers canonicity.

My conscience forces me to condemn the election of Chrysostomos Kiouisis as archbishop as totally non-canonical because:

First and foremost, it was made as a result of the non-canonical defrocking of the canonical Archbishop Auxentios, whose throne Chrysostomos Kiouisis seized while the Archbishop was still alive, making him an adulterous freeloader. "Void in essence," and to be thrown out is the adulterous freeloader, the Sacred Canons command.



Secondly, during the proceedings of the election, there were present *two* Metropolitans of Thessalonica, Chrysostomos Kiouisis and Efthymios, *and both of them voted as such*, something that is totally contrary to the Sacred Canons. Two bishops in one and same diocese is something that is strictly forbidden and punishable with defrocking.

Thirdly, the archbishop was elected by a difference of two votes. Two of the bishops (Petros of Astoria and Chrysostomos Kiouisis formerly of Thessalonica) did not have a canonical right to even take part in the synod since they were in actuality outside of the synod due to decisions that had been made by the synod. The synodal decisions that had been made against them had never been nullified by an official synodal reexamination as is required by the order of both the Sacred Canons and the law. Bishop Petros was outside for reasons of faith and Chrysostomos Kiouisis was dethroned.

Let no one think that we are exaggerating or that this is not significant. For this reason alone the entire proceedings of the election of an archbishop was nullified sixty years ago in Greece. During the election of the New Calendarist Archbishop Damaskinos in 1943, because one and only one of the many bishops who took part and voted was under charges and already dethroned, the election was declared totally void and the election for archbishop was repeated. As one historian of that period wrote concerning those events; "if those who are dedicated had had enough fear of God and a religious and ecclesiastical conscience without swaying, they would not have allowed the election of the Archbishop to be affected by the vote of one tainted ... bishop and especially of one who was dethroned and awaiting sentencing."

Fourthly, a greater misdeed was committed, which only in the case of the arch-heretic Meletios Metaxakis had been committed. The, up till the last minute, suspended, excommunicated, and dethroned former Metropolitan of Thessalonica Chrysostomos Kiouisis not only voted but was himself a candidate and elected Archbishop!! In the same way, Meletios, defrocked by the hierarchy of the Church of Greece, burst forth as Patriarch of Constantinople by means of a clique! Behold to whom the "fighting for Sacred Canonical Order" Chrysostomos Kiouisis can be compared!

Fifthly, that Chrysostomos Kiouisis had denounced the Sacred Synod, in particular from the year 1979, for supposedly canonical reasons. He, however, jumped at the opportunity to become Archbishop from those very bishops whom he had just denounced with the worst accusations imaginable which he never ever officially retracted.

Based on all this, the elevation of Chrysostomos Kiouisis to the archiepiscopal throne is shown to be an unrepeatable monstrosity, a many-sided over-turning of the Sacred Canons, a brazen provocation to the legality of our Church, for all these reasons, it is abjunctory and unacceptable.

In order that you will not think that what we are saying is due to self-interest, let us give the position taken by the Reverend Father Georgios Kepapoglou who reproved the

events of that time in a letter of his, showing how God-fearing people of that time colored that freakish election of an archbishop:

"At that time (1980) you rejected the unity proposal," Father Georgios wrote to Chrysostomos Kiouisis, "because such words of love were disgusting to God, and because the consecrations which had taken place on both sides were uncanonical and void. You described those consecrations as the 'unmasking of their impiety towards the Holy and Sacred Canons.' My astonishment, Your Eminence, is what has taken place from then until today that made you now accept this collaboration? Who set those 'usurpers' in order that you believed to be incurable? After all those things that you wrote and more, Your Eminence, I again ask, what made you collaborate with those 'pharisaical pretenders' and those who 'make fun of the divine? Your love of being in charge? That is the conclusion we come to. After everything you wrote, and after your former refusal to a proposal of unity (at that time they had not proposed to you that you become archbishop), we may come to the conclusion that you move only out of the love of being in authority, and every other excuse is from the evil one, as time in any case will prove. Even though you had denied it in the past, writing concerning this in an answer to the *Cry of Pain* of the Monk Simon, 'we inform you and everyone who desires to know the truth, that our aim is not the removal of the Archbishop (for this you and every other slanderer will have God as your judge), but rather the administration of ecclesiastical matters in a Godly manner, according to the commands of the Holy and Sacred Canons...'. How is it that now, Your Eminence, you accept their proposal of the replacement of the Archbishop? Who is lying, Fr. Simon or you? Perhaps your action betrays opportunism? Otherwise your actions are inexplicable. You cannot be excused saying that you are offering yourself as a sacrifice joining their ranks. It would be more correct to say that you are offering the Sacred Struggle as a sacrifice on the altar of your love of glory ... Perhaps the personalities have changed that comprise the synod with which you now wish to work and at the head of which you want to be placed? The personalities that you reproved and denounced to the people as "frauds, mocking the Holy and Sacred and wounding the conscience of the people" are, after all, one and the same ... Your Eminence you are inconsistent, you went over to the party that you had only just denounced, so knowing your vain glory, knowing your weakness, they suggested to you the possibility of electing you their new archbishop. What excuse will you find to give to Fr. Savvas when on March 5, 1985 you wrote him: 'See, my beloved, the seriousness of such people! See the mockery of God and the self-violation of laughable "bishops" who call me to their synod...!!' So much derision? Don't you realize that they made you appear absurd? Isn't this the mockery of God, isn't this the 'self-defilement of a silly bishop,' your going over to their synod? That which you wrote about them has turned against you. Your Eminence, as many know what you had written and at the same time see you being ridiculed together with 'that kind' as you referred to them, are put in the difficult position of figuring out if you are the same person or not. I confess that I find it hard to believe that we are talking about the same person...

"P.S. I just learned that your vanity has been satisfied. You have been elected 'Archbishop' of the 'illegal and judgment-pending.' You are satisfied now since for the first time they proved to be faithful to their promises ... As far as can be seen in the

periodical and newspapers, and also in your Encyclical #2452/a, *two* Bishops of Thessalonica voted. How can that be? Which Sacred Canon allows such iniquities? What bargaining did you do to mix the unmixable? Bargains like if you weren't elected archbishop then you would remain Metropolitan of Thessalonica, and if you were elected then the present Metropolitan of Thessalonica would remain as such? ... What monstrous things are these, Your Eminence? And after all of that, you boast that you were elected "by the grace of the all-Holy and Ceremony-Presiding Spirit?' A greater mockery and insult couldn't have happened. And I will repeat using a quote from ... your four-page leaflet *The Correct Road...*: 'That is the aftermath of the iniquities, the greatest blasphemy of the All-Holy Spirit...' Your Eminence, you have become an adulterous freeloader. You were illegally elected by the illegal. This is an act hateful to God. An act which was opposed equally by the Holy Apostles and the God-bearing Fathers, and which you yourself fought against when the synod, which you now head, placed another bishop in your diocese. Have you forgotten? We beg you to read your encyclical that you sent out on 4-3-1979 ... perhaps you will COME TO YOUR SENSES. I will conclude here with that hope, not having the desire to come back again."

In a similar fashion Metropolitan Germanos of Aiolia (who remained faithful to His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios and proved to be the most conscientious and law-abiding of the usurpers) wrote in an extrajudicial statement to the new "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kiouisis, two months after his election:

"What ecclesiastical authority tried you and why did it declare you thrown out of your diocese...? What appellate court then tried your case and declared you innocent? Or were you simply satisfied with the result of your election? But the big question is: Who voted for you? The ones of Kaningos Street? If so, a letter of yours dated 5-3-1985 and addressed to a priest friend of yours comes to mind, in which you describe Kaningos as a *dung-hill*! Did you agree to set your throne on a dung-hill? Did you ever think about that?!?! If you dare to take out the dung you risk falling into it. And if you don't take it out you will at any rate be full of it. Since the dung now surrounds you, are you firmly established on it? We await your response."

Similarly, Bishops Akakios of Diavleia and Gabriel of the Cyclades, who refused to follow the new synod headed by their old and now former friend "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kiouisis, answered to many who accused them of being anti-unionist through a thirteen-page leaflet entitled *A Loosening of Silence*.

In this leaflet they condemned their former collaborator Bishop Chrysostomos Kiouisis of having trampled down and disregarded that which they had said and written and that, "'he didn't respect the sacredness of our Sacred Struggle ... He hurried after the very first invitation to eagerly answer and unwisely accept the leadership of the segment, not being aware it seems that he brings red hot coals upon his head, and that the Sacred Canons vindicate those who ignore them. These Canons stress that no one can set another foundation for unity other than the one that exists, in other words our Lord Jesus Christ... Your Eminence Bishop of Thessalonica, for what traditions were you struggling for up to this time, instead now having replaced that which is in favor of the Ecclesiastical

Tradition with the awards of precedence and the love of being first? ...We regard the formation and gathering of a new "Sacred Synod of the Church of the G.O.C. of Greece", in the way in which it was formed and gathered, to be without basis, uncanonical, harmful to the highest well-being and validity of our Sacred Struggle and therefore completely unacceptable ... This new faction is not the awaited solution to the tragedy of our Sacred Struggle. It is not a condition which leads towards cleansing, since already the judges are mixed with the defendants, the obedient with the disobedient, the lawful with the lawless. And especially – this curious mixture came about through the drunkenness of superficiality and an unbridled enthusiasm, without the judgment of the appropriate body or administrative authority ... The aim was not of some reorganization of the ecclesiastical administration of that tired Sacred Struggle of ours in order to make impressions, but rather the through repentance return to canonical order and decency as the Sacred Canons and the Gospel's ethics specify, and only in this way can a cooperation of all be possible that will bring about a moving advancement of our Sacred Struggle ... The Church, as a treasury of Holy Grace and salvation of the world, is not subject to human bargaining ..., it is not a battlefield of human vainglories and conceits, it is not saved by people, but rather saves people as the Ark of Salvation. The unity of the Church is not a human conquest, it is not a creation of a certain group of people, it is not the fruit of back room dealings, but rather a DIVINE GIFT ... How then is it possible for unity of the Church of the G.O.C. when each one believes his own thing, when each one disregards the work of the Holy Spirit in the history of salvation, when everyone is shaped by this evil age.. Without the Sacred Canons whatever sort of unity is a human creation will be DISSOLVED with the first difficult situation. Without the Sacred Canons any unity is simply a CONTRACT OF PERSONAL INTERESTS AND VAINGLORIES, which is based on the PERJURY of those who have professed before God and man during their consecration that they would defend the canonical order until death. This sort of unity IS NOT PLEASING TO GOD and does not serve our Sacred Struggle since the Sacred Canons are the guide posts of the divine will and the boundaries set by our Fathers for the CORRECT COMPLETION of the mission of the Church. Let's not move ancient boundaries that our Fathers have set, that we may not be disgraced before the judgment seat of the Lord ... Good is only good "when done in a good manner" as noted by that great Father of the Church St. John of Damascus. We know that, according to human judgments, we also could place ourselves with the many in order to in the eyes of the world have greater strength and power over the affairs of our Church. If we do this however, we would not have with us the witness of our ecclesiastical conscience and we would then not be able to give witness to whoever asks us concerning the hope that exists among us."

This is how Bishops Akakios and Gabriel, whom I was forced to reprove earlier in my presentation, protested when the truth of the events demanded. Now I must proclaim enthusiastically that according to what they wrote above, they proved to be the wisest of the bishops at that time (1985-1986), since their forecast that this strange unity had no future came true and I would dare to say that with the pen that the two of them wrote, God Himself spoke.

I must also confess that I was amazed when I observed that in the letter that Metropolitan Akakios of Diavleia sent to “Archbishop” Chrysostomos Kiouisis in February, 2000, he called Chrysostomos, "Your Eminence" instead of "Your Beatitude." I incorrectly thought that this stemmed from some disagreement between them. Now I understand that Bishop Akakios had, long before us, come to the conclusion which we now do, that he was unable to recognize the appointment of Chrysostomos Kiouisis as archbishop and he therefore continued to call him "Your Eminence" which is objectively correct.

"The Canons are vindicated," as Bishop Akakios together with the now late Bishop Gabriel wrote most correctly and the epilogue of the Apostolic Constitutions warns, and "the disobedience to the Sacred Canons will begin "an everlasting war" between bishops." What growth, therefore, and what advancement could be expected from a synod in which a uniquely pharisaical rebel, more than any other bishop of our Church, the greatest "teacher of disorder," according to the 16th Apostolic Canon, was elevated to the exalted position of First and having as its senior members those very bishops who remained unrepentant of their criminal fall, which they had not stopped considering to be "salvific," which overturned the entire direction and shape of our Church since 1979? Was it possible from the very beginning for this kind of synod to bear fruitful works? Before the end of 1986 the first monstrous and despicable united synodal act was perpetrated: the defrocking of the already defrocked (in 1979) "Bishop of Oropos" Kyprianos! Certainly this contradictory act was a natural result of the baseless lifting of defrockings "on both sides," as was agreed on during the union so that Kyprianos was not defrocked but subsequently re-defrocked!

Reading the nauseous synodal decision of May, 1986, as related in the periodical of the synod, one is made to wonder. There the event of the schism of 1979 is not mentioned at all, along with the fact that from then up until 1985 most of the usurper bishops had nothing to do with the rest of our canonical bishops. It is very falsely presented that the defendant Kyprianos was most canonically consecrated in 1979 by Metropolitans Kallistos and Antonios, and regardless of whatever these schismatics had done, they were portrayed as canonical members of the synod and of our Church!

They write for instance:

"Already as a member of the synod of our Church, he (Kyprianos) proceeded to form a corporation without the knowledge of the Synod ... on October 20, 1982”!

Also, the two first reasons (from a total of four), for which his defrocking was decided upon, were recorded as follows:

"a) Because he fell from Orthodox Belief ... and embraced the ecumenist errors, in which it is believed that the schismatic New Calendarists make up the unaltered One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which is the treasury of saving Grace ...

“b) Because he without discernment gives the Holy Mysteries of our Church to modernizing, schismatic and ecumenist New Calendarists.”

*Nevertheless a) and b) were exactly what Bishop Petros of Astoria believed and did (as everyone knew), but without any reaction these very same bishops who a few months later would call upon these as reasons for defrocking Kyprianos hoisted Bishop Petros into their Synod!*

Can there exist any greater mockery of justice? And can there be any more tragic self-mockery of the self-advertised usurpers having a pure profession of Faith "the Guardians of Orthodoxy"?

Kyprianos, because of the above mentioned points, "proclaims heresy and does so openly" and "fell from the Orthodox Faith" as they wrote, but Petros of Astoria through the very same things did not proclaim heresy or fall from the Orthodox Faith? If so, then why are there two different sets of standards? If not, then why did they totally accept, according to the above, the heretical and fallen Petros in as a fellow communicant up until the time of his falling asleep in the Lord?

These unrepentant usurpers, especially the three-some of Kalliopios "of Pentapolis"-Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "of Achaia"-Matthew "of Oinoi," lead the whole body of the synod into such self-denying and opposing ecclesiastical parodies. These three always took care to be appointed special members in the most important tribunal proceedings so that they could condemn or find innocent whomever they wanted to! Kalliopios and Kallinikos Sarantopoulos as inquisitors and instigators in the case of Auxentios, Kalliopios instigator in the case of Kyprianos, Kallinikos Sarantopoulos inquisitor in the case of Paisios, Mattheos in the case of Yiosakis, in the cases of Efthymios and Northern Greece, bizarrely proclaimed "inquisitor-instigator", and probably capable of manipulating both, speculated Kallinikos Sarantopoulos with a second instigator Mattheos, being paired always. And they belonged to a sixteen member synod!

Need there be more certain proof of the captivity of the synod which took place under these unrepentant usurpers? It was well known that behind them and always working for them was that New Calendarist lawyer and "theologian" Athanasios Sakarellos, or more probably even darker forces from unknowable sources.

The greatest problem in all the years of this united synod was created by the rebellious corporation of the "Three Hierarchs" in Thessalonica, the ringleader of a general state of disobedience to the synod and to the canons of a good portion of the flock of Northern Greece, having as its tireless protector the "Archbishop" who took care that the real instigators of discord never be punished. These are the results of the rough and irresponsible gluing together. The "Archbishop" particularly asked the synod from the very first minute that the parishes that belonged to him before as Metropolitan of Thessalonica (and which he continued in any case to shepherd after his dethronement in 1980, reigniting and reinforcing their rebellious spirit), be allowed through *oikonomia* to continue to commemorate his name and not that of Efthymios of Thessalonica for another

year, until they got used to the idea of unity and they settled into the new state of affairs. This was totally uncanonical but accepted by the synod as a sign of good will and of which the above-mentioned Father Georgios wrote:

"You fool the people saying that you struck an agreement that for one year you won't allow "His all-Holiness of Thessalonica" [i.e. the disparaging reference of Chrysostomos Kioussis to Efthymios] to visit the parishes you used to serve, and on the other hand you concelebrate with him and allow his anthem [i.e., the *Fimi* which acknowledged liturgically Efthymios to *be* the Metropolitan of Thessalonica] to be sung. What type of agreements are these, I simply can't understand. He is either the Bishop of Thessalonica or he isn't. Truly we are talking about a hoodwinking of both clergy and laity and of the synod with the Archbishop's support and cloaking! For a period of ten years and right up until the division of 1995 the "dynasty" of the "Three Hierarchs" and those parishes of Thessalonica with them never accepted their canonical shepherd Metropolitan Efthymios of Thessalonica, even though he complained many times to the Sacred Synod. What did they invent together so that they might at least have a fake excuse? They rummaged out of the garbage can an unmatched trickery, the accusation of Yiosakis against Metropolitan Efthymios which had been referred to the Sacred Synod in 1983, and which had been unanimously dismissed for the first time in 1983, and again for the second time after the union of 1985 with His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios, as lacking substantive evidence or proof. However those above-mentioned lay members of the guild of Thessalonica, dragged it up again before their year's allowance of time to commemorate Chrysostomos was up and they presented it once again before the Sacred Synod in an accusation asking for a *third* trial of the matter, and continued, based on this charge, to still not commemorate Metropolitan Efthymios of Thessalonica, supposedly calling upon the 31st Apostolic Canon, as erring in "piety and justice."

However, one accusation of a moral nature that is unsubstantiated and even more so thrown out of court *twice* by the synod had nothing to do with "piety and justice." "Piety and justice" has to do with personal crimes that a bishop might have committed and which are specified in the Thirteenth Sacred Canon of the First-Second Sacred Synod, and which condemned as a schismatic any presbyter or deacon who "supposedly based on crimes of the bishop, dares to cut off communion before a synodal diagnosis, examination and final condemnation takes place, and not mentioning his [i.e., the bishop's] name in the sacred prayers of the liturgies, is subject to defrocking and every other deprivation of priestly honor. "The one who is placed in the rank of presbyter," this canon continues to explain, "and seizes the judgment, and before the judgment condemns his local father and bishop for this, is not worthy at all of the honor and name of a presbyter. Therefore, such a one if he belongs to the ranks of the clergy falls from its honor. If they are monastics or laymen, they are excommunicated totally from the Church up until the time they spit upon their association with the schismatics and return to their local bishop."

The Sacred Canons are strict and clear, as we now see, for without order and respect how can the Church stand? But the synod was sleeping in the much-lamented captivity of the hard-hearted trouble-makers, i.e., the "Archbishop" and the three-some of the

usurpers. Together with the schismatic (according to the previous canon) Thessalonians, they secretly plotted a new intrigue: that the case never be tried, firstly because they didn't have enough evidence of guilt (even though they had a bulky folder of many accusing false-witnesses, at the time when the Sacred Canons only needed at most five), secondly, so that the Thessalonians would never be forced to commemorate Metropolitan Efthymios of Thessalonica, thirdly, that the innocent Metropolitan could continuously be defamed, having an untried case of a disgusting charge and accusation hanging over him.

However, because of the poor outcome "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kiouisis is up until today neither repentant nor embarrassed to call upon other inflammatory words in order to cover up his part in the conspiracy, let us give the position of the State Public Prosecutor Mr. Nicholas Athanasopoulos, who having researched the Yiosakis case following a charge against him by some layman just two years earlier, gave his opinion of the whole case as follows to be:

"a product of the cliques and internal differences of the Old-Calendarists out of ill will towards Metropolitan Efthymios Orphanos of the G.O.C. of Thessalonica, who was elected in 1979 as Bishop of Stavropolis ... who came into a clash and conflict with the former Metropolitan of Thessalonica Chrysostomos Kiouisis who from 1975 on was dethroned and suspended ... and also with the corporation-parish of the "Three Hierarchs" of Thessalonica which he (Chrysostomos) guides and which supported the dethroned Chrysostomos not for the good of the faithful of the Church of the G.O.C., but for the sake of the peculiar self-interests of the above-mentioned parish, of which their hatred towards Efthymios Orphanos is widely spread."

This is what the unsuspecting Public Prosecutor writes and adds:

"The desire of these above-mentioned Chrysostomos Kiouisis, Mattheos Langis, and Kallinikos Sarantopoulos, the last two working as ecclesiastical prosecutors, as we have above stated, against Efthymios, is to make the case eternal, and that is apparent from the fact that in their attempt to defame the above-mentioned Metropolitan, they ignored Sacred Canons which are safeguarded by the Greek Constitution and more precisely the 74th of the Holy Apostles, the 9<sup>th</sup> of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, and the 12th, 27th, and 36th of the Synod of Carthage which specifically commands that in the case of accusations against a bishop, they must be tried as quickly as possible "that he may not remain in the crime..." and this is publically displayed due to his pending judgment. "

Therefore, in spite of the dark wishes and plots of the "Archbishop" and the others, God willed that the justice of the nation shed full light on the matter which for years they were illegally exploiting and prove: the hideous letter of Yiosakis to be a forgery and rejected, and Metropolitan Efthymios of Thessalonica to be innocent and a victim of those who plotted against him.

However, the demon of revenge and hatred could not be made to rest. The outright malevolence towards Metropolitan Efthymios of Thessalonica and the circumstantial situation in Northern Greece was growing worse by the day with "Archbishop"



Chrysostomos Kiouisis constantly invading the diocese as if he had never stopped being the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, "to the good of the peculiar self-interests" of the guild of the "Three Hierarchs" and those surrounding it as the Public Prosecutor verified.

This totally unacceptable situation, which became a basic reason for the polarization and division of our hierarchy as recited in a tragic tone in a letter to the "Archbishop" in 1988 by an Athonite hieromonk that stated:

"Are you the Archbishop of Athens as you tout yourself, or the Bishop of Thessalonica, you being thirty-two days a month in Thessalonica? Since there already exists in your party a Bishop of Thessalonica (and in fact, he voted for you and even nicely addressed you at your enthronement!!), how can you a great Canonist overlook this all??? In Athens you concelebrate with Efthymios, but not in Thessalonica!!! Why? Because he is the Bishop of Thessalonica? ... Why don't you let him serve in all the Churches of Thessalonica, but rather you yourself serve? How do you invade the diocese of another bishop? Isn't that against the Sacred Canons of which you are such a strict follower? Perhaps you could explain all of this to me?? One more question: how come your Bishop Efthymios allows another bishop (I mean you) to invade his diocese? "Two heads in one miter"? So this is your solid and one-minded synod that observes all the canons??"

The truth is that many times Metropolitan Efthymios of Thessalonica protested before the synod about this but was not heard ... Unfortunately, the same one that had been outside the synod boasting about good order and canonicity, was found to be quite incapable and inept in administration, and thus could not give a canonical and righteous solution to this or any other occurring problems. Instead of canonical solutions, he reverted to the dark alleys of conspiracy and treachery in perfect cooperation with the guilds of Thessalonica which he protected, so that the words of the Gospel that say: "and the last deception will be worse than the first" were fulfilled in him.

Then from the summer of 1993, with a cunning that was worthy of "Archbishop" Ieronymos Kotsonis of the New Calendarists, these above-mentioned contrived an unrepeatable judicial *coup d'état* against Metropolitan Efthymios of Thessalonica based on the accusations of an unsavory young man, who was inadmissible from the very beginning as a accuser, based both on ecclesiastical canons and civil laws.

I truly shudder, my brothers, before the reality of this episcopal conspiracy, comparable to that of the so-called "brotherhoods," passing by unobserved and unpunished, which in actuality is not against just one person only, but against our whole Church for mainly two reasons.

The first reason is if such judicial crimes are ratified, then every member of the Church is in immediate danger. Whenever anyone becomes an "obstacle" to gloomy and power-hungry plans of some bosses, they can be totally degraded and destroyed by such a judicial crime, just as what happened over and over again throughout the reign of

"Archbishop" Ieronymos Kotsonis of the New Calendarists as we have already written about.

The second reason is that the Church's entire organism could be turned into a disturbed field of hatred and warfare as the Apostolic Constitutions warn us from the depth of the ages that the malevolent and unjust trial and judgment by false brethren is the creation of that friend of Satan's called endless anger "which will never allow harmony to exist in the Church."

In order that no one believes that I am exaggerating, as a prologue of this brief parenthesis of the misdeeds which took place, I offer the witness of Father Nikodimos the monk of Gortynia, who on the one hand clearly stood opposed to the Metropolitan of Thessalonica and cooperated in his condemnation, and on the other hand confessed that, "The totality of their judicial activities are full of hypocrisy, malevolence, iniquities, lies, hatred and in general the passions that are instigated by vainglory and lawless self-interest."

In particular, as I demonstrate in my humble study called *An Enlightened Re-examination*, fulfilling a pastoral obligation before God and man, the clique in the matter of Koutsogiorgis (the name of the above-mentioned young man) i.e., the "Archbishop"- "Achaia"- "Oinoi" and in a second place "Pentapolis" committed the following crimes related to legal procedures:

1) Simply because that's the way they wanted it, they deprived His Eminence the Metropolitan of Thessalonica his basic right of legal procedure, without which not even the worst scum of society is put on trial. These are the rights to defend one's self, the examination of his own witnesses for the defense, the handing over to him of the file of the legal documents and the barring of obvious enemies and opponents as judges. It suffices in order for you to understand the lawlessness of their clique for us to mention that the requested barring of certain people was never discussed by all the bishops, but rather those who were to be barred conspired to discard the request, supposedly calling upon the Holy Canons saying that the canons in no place barred a bishop as a judge!

Not exactly - clearly the Sacred Canons 16 and 105 of the Sacred Synod of Carthage, which deals with the matter of "eligible judges," speaks of the selection by the accused of their judges while barring others. In the footnotes of the 74th Apostolic Canon and the 4th Canon of Antioch, *The Rudder* mentions the right of the barring of judges, which Saints John Chrysostomos, Pavlos of Constantinople and Athanasios of Alexandria unquestionably used. Even though the Metropolitan of Thessalonica went to the spiritual court on the day of the trial, again these clever "Divine-Inquisitors" refused to hand over the file of the legal procedures.

2) The pseudo-canonist Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "of Achaia," controlled by Sakarellos by telephone who was assigned to be the investigator of the matters of Northern Greece, transformed himself into the examining magistrate with one report-deduction that was innovative and unrestrained, which, as he himself declared had

nothing to do with what the Sacred Canons command, nor with that which the relative laws of the state define. And while he was using the investigations that had been performed by the police authorities concerning the case of Koutsogiorgis, he omitted and did not mention the deduction and resolution of the police, public prosecutors and judges that was based on these investigations! Why?

Because these authorities proclaimed the Metropolitan of Thessalonica *innocent* of every accusation and the victim of libel and black-mailing by an individual who was notoriously dangerous to public order and safety! Whereas that unbridled "Metropolitan of Achaia" and his fellow conspirators wanted at any cost to finally condemn their fellow bishop as guilty. So they hid the above-mentioned findings of the authorities, and reversing the conditions and without even the slightest proof or even suspicion, they condemned the innocent as guilty, and the truly dangerous slanderer and extortionist they flaunted as worthy of belief and an innocent victim!!

3) Speaking in general, those countless plots and criminal intrigues of those three above-mentioned schismatics of 1979 in league with "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kiouisis in the whole matter worked in a way in which they trampled upon the Sacred Canons, such as the 74th and 75th of the Holy Apostles, the 6th of the Second Ecumenical Council, the 9th, the 18th, and the 21st of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, the 34th of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, the 9th, 12th, 27th, 36th, 136th, and 138th of the Synod of Carthage, the 25th of the Synod of Ankara, the 9<sup>th</sup> of Theophilus, and so on, while their scheming demanded a relentless defrocking.

Also according to the penal code of worldly justice the above-mentioned bishops collectively committed the crimes of abuse of authority, breach in fulfilling one's duty, cooperation in a crime, aiding and harboring a criminal, falsification of documents and the covering up of crimes, *all* of which combined are punishable by at least 15 years of imprisonment for those who are responsible. These things were pointed out to us by examining magistrates and lawyers, one of whom became tiresome repeating to the Metropolitan of Thessalonica the words, "Place charges on them so that I can break their arrogance and criminality!"

My own lowliness, during the second meeting of the Spiritual Court (November, 1994) appearing as a witness, strongly censured them for two hours for all their daring misdeeds, without even one of them daring to refute the least of the truths which I laid out, but on the contrary they stared at me thrown off balance and disconcerted. Also the majority of the synod bishops did not attend the trial, probably because they had realized the treachery and intrigue (accountable through certain documents, complaints, etc. of His Eminence of Thessalonica, for example #2600/11-8-1994 and #2610/3-9-1994), fearing perhaps they also be found guilty of filthy fratricide. The only ones who were present on the days of the trial were those four marvelous conspirators: the "Archbishop", the "Metropolitans" of "Achaia," "Pentapolis," and "Oinoi"!! (and at one of them Bishop Vikentios of Avlon). Some of them such as Metropolitan Gerontios of Piraeus and the current President of our Sacred Synod Metropolitan Kallinikos of Phthiotis declared in writing their abstentions due to the uncanonical legal procedures.

## THE INTENSIFICATION OF THE CAPTIVITY OF THE SYNOD UNDER THE CONSPIRACY OF THE GANG OF FOUR LEADS TO DELIVERANCE

The truth is that a division existed inside the synod at least two years before it was made final in July of 1995.

In November, 1993 for the first time the "Archbishop" invited me to his nunnery's festival in Megara. I went and when I entered the sanctuary, the priest Father Athanasios from the "Three Hierarchs" of Thessalonica was performing the *proskomidi* i.e., the Preparation of the Gifts. As soon as he saw me he stopped what he was doing, took off his priestly vestments and exited the sanctuary murmuring. Such vehemence and hatred consumed the clergy of the "Three Hierarchs!" The next year (1994) the Metropolitan of Thessalonica received a letter from the "Archbishop" asking him to not permit me to come to his festival, because "some people" had been scandalized by my presence.

Another event that was indicative of our separation was that before the Feast of the Holy Theophany in 1994, the "Archbishop" was passing along the word that he would not take part in the established ceremony of the Blessing of the Waters at the port of Piraeus if Efthymios of Thessalonica was going to be there. The Metropolitan of America Paisios tried to manipulate this simmering enmity and encouraged the Metropolitan of Thessalonica to condemn and isolate the "Archbishop" using non-canonical means, which Metropolitan Efthymios refused to do, preferring the canonical road to confront difficulties and accusations made against him.

The Metropolitan of America, fearing that the Metropolitan of Thessalonica might reveal his revolutionary plan, immediately proceeded to send his "conscientious telegram" through which he announced his decision to discontinue ecclesiastical communion with the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, as supposedly accused and awaiting judgment, whereas up until that time the synod had not decided anything concerning the Metropolitan of Thessalonica! However no one reprimanded the Metropolitan of America for his uncanonical and unacceptable telegram which violated the 27th Sacred Canon of the Synod of Carthage, but instead, the guild members of the "Three Hierarchs" celebrated the telegram, whereas the "Archbishop" received it with pleasure and hurried to resurrect the moribund synod which he had not called together in over half a year, fearing the reactions of the synodal bishops against him.

We simply record just one event so that it will be evident to what extent the paralysis and self-interest of synodal matters had reached from the middle of 1993 on and the reason was one and only one: the now proven INCOMPETENCE OF ADMINISTRATING even the simplest ecclesiastical matters by "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kiouis whose undeniable vehemence and self-interest made even the simplest and easily understood things difficult and unsolvable. So he found a new cowardly method of "solving" synodal problems: not calling the assembly of the synod for two entire six month periods, even though many synod members were persistently requesting meetings.

The first time, during the period from October 1993 until February 1994, Chrysostomos Kiouisis did not call one assembly hoping to avoid his own pending judgment, which many synodal members (the (Metropolitans of Thessalonica, Euripos, Acharnon and others) had sought against him for his repeated invasions into dioceses of other bishops, his dereliction of responsibilities, his blockage of synodal matters, his hiding of important documents and other similar misdeeds, from which we should note he was only saved by Kallinikos Sarantopoulos, the "Metropolitan of Achaia," with his fickle and contradictory conclusion, an event which forced even his friends to accuse him of a scandalous, selected and biased judicial *coup d'état* of unforeseen results with an evident lack of self-control, objectivity, seriousness and a rudimentary knowledge of the Sacred Canons.

The second time, from January until June of 1995, he would not call an assembly because the majority of the synod was in favor of his perennial competitor, His Eminence Metropolitan Efthymios of Thessalonica.

In this way the voice of the synod was silenced because of the intentions and desires of the "President."

The synod's state of laxity and being on the verge of death was intensified by the unsuspected duo of Paisios and Vikentios, with whom the "Metropolitan of Attica" "of 1979 fame" Antonios had sided and given his proxy vote to because these two had many times assisted him with his health problems by taking care of him in America. All of the synodal bishops were in need of their three votes because these votes would settle the difference between the two sides of the synod, either for or against His Eminence of Thessalonica.

This is how the already mentioned refrains of the synod members, the covering up of their various misdeeds, as well as the placement of Bishop Vikentios from America as vicar-bishop of the widowed diocese of Piraeus with the *unanimous* decision of the synod can be explained, even though the majority of the clergy of the Holy Diocese of Piraeus had requested that His Eminence Metropolitan Kallinikos of Phthiotis be placed as their vicar.

We should stress that the greatest defender of the vicariate of Vikentios was Kalliopios of "Pentapolis," who later threatened any clergymen who refused to commemorate Vikentios, and was the *only* bishop (of the remaining 11 bishops) who was present at the inauguration of the Diocesan Offices of the supposedly temporary vicar Vikentios.

Thus we enter the year 1995 without the experienced Metropolitan Gerontios of Piraeus who had suffered much concerning matters of administration as the vice president of the synod and who had reposed in the midst of this tense and swampy atmosphere.

Those lay members of the guild of the "Three Hierarchs" of Thessalonica that had always initiated all of the matters concerning His Eminence Metropolitan Efthymios, showing more prudence and fear of God during that time period than those maniacal persecutors, the "Archbishop" and the "Metropolitans of Achaia and Oinoi," and seeing through the dead end of the attempted judicial *coup d'état*, having been totally frustrated themselves by that conspiracy, approached my lowliness in the attempt of finding a solution somewhere in the middle.

The negotiations over many months concluded in a joint proposal to the "Archbishop" and the synod, that His Eminence of Thessalonica be exonerated as innocent due to the lack of evidence and that he be placed in the empty diocese of Piraeus thereby restoring peace and unity to all the separated G.O.C. of Northern Greece and that a new mutually accepted Metropolitan of Thessalonica be elected.

His Eminence Metropolitan Efthymios of Thessalonica happily accepted that which had been decided upon and for this alone he was praiseworthy, not rejecting his abdication due to the injustices of others. He even prepared the relative document of abdication, which I, my wretched self, made known to the brethren of the "Three Hierarchs, and then all of us together to the "Archbishop" in May, 1995. I must note here that this abdication and transfer is extremely rare, but foreseen in the history of the Church and by the Sacred Canons, when there could occur a great benefit, as in this case with the peace-making of the whole Church. The "Archbishop" also accepted this as allowable.

Finally, however, the continuation of that common effort was stopped, firstly because the "Archbishop" did not want to hear proposals for the Holy Diocese of Piraeus and, secondly, because the unspeakable Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "Metropolitan of Achaia," as if he was a special consul of the "Archbishop," absolutely voted against the proposed solution and by whom the "Archbishop" was convinced in the end. It was impossible for him, of course, to accept the eradication of the judicial *coup d'état* for which he had worked so hard for over a year and a half and which was already on the road to realization.

Definitely the "Archbishop" had to bring the proposition to the synod for discussion, but he never actually did, because he himself and his private and public counselors did not agree since they had other plans. I will refer to the more recent events in brief, because of our time constraints and because, as more recent they are better known and because we have made references to them frequently, in writing and by word.

After five months of synodal inactivity, the "Archbishop" called a meeting in early June, 1995, to discuss the problem with the national electronic cards, about which many of the lay members of our Church were disturbed. Three weeks after, he called a second meeting with the same topic first, the constitutional charter second, the trial of the Metropolitan of Thessalonica third, the separation of Metropolitan Petros of Astoria fourth, the filling of the empty diocese of Piraeus fifth, and sixth one more topic that was not discussed.

In this second meeting the administrative incompetence of the "Archbishop" and his secret treason with the unrepentant trio of the "Metropolitans" of "Achaia," "Oinoi" and "Pentapolis" became even more obvious, and because of this they later twisted the facts and denied them by writing crude lies since the simple pure truth proved them undoubtedly treacherous.

Ignoring their habitual bottomless lies, we bring forth as a true witness the official acts of the synod, signed by the very hand of "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kiouisis

Through those acts, any objective person draws the following conclusions:

a) The aforementioned treacherous trio prevented the circulation of the already approved synodal encyclical against the national electronic cards and the "Archbishop," acting in their favor, withdrew it.

b) Exactly the same happened with the issue of the filling or not of the empty diocese of Piraeus. That same quartet insistently supported the opinion that a constitutional chart should be created first and then the see should be filled, but the rest of the synod's bishops disagreed with that. When this was put to a vote, in a total of 12 bishops, seven voted to proceed as soon as possible with the election of the new metropolitan. But after Kallinikos Sarantopoulos, the "Metropolitan of Achaia," objected again, the "Archbishop" immediately dissolved the meeting, putting obstacles again to the work of the synod, since he and those with him did not want anything to be decided about the filling of the vacancy.

By these actions, the provocative attitude of the "Archbishop" and the three aforementioned bishops became obvious, as well as their existing badly concealed treason and cooperation, which grew first by their various judicial crimes in the issue of the Metropolitan of Thessalonica. Encouraged by those, they were now trying to impose themselves on the whole synodal body, overcoming and brutally ignoring the majority of the synod. In this way they were obviously trying to seize the whole Church administration, dragging and taking it wherever they wanted, with various tricks and schemes. Who? Those who by *oikonomia* (but rather non-canonically and unrepentantly) entered from the year 1985 a synod and a Church which they always accused and fought!

But their treacherous, non-canonically turn would show off more and more in the following days. The rest of the bishops, through long meetings and talks, even though they were scandalized and hopeless, tried to find a way of releasing the synod from the bonds of the above-mentioned four and finally ended up with a very lawful move: to send a document of protest and arraignment to the "Archbishop" and the rest of the bishops, denouncing the above-mentioned acts and the four responsible for them, also asking that the synod meet for an examination of those synodal dormancies.

This canonical and gentle arraignment was finally signed on June 27/ July 10 in the Holy Convent of Metropolitan Stephanos of Chios in Koropi, Attica, by six bishops (in a

total of fourteen, four of them being accused), and those were: the Vice-President of the Synod, Metropolitans Kallinikos of Phthiotis, Efthymios of Thessalonica, Stephanos of Chios, Justinos of Evripos, Paisios of America and Vikentios of Avlon. Afterwards, it was handed to the Bishop of Avlon and *locum tenens* of Piraeus Vikentios and to the Chancellor of the Diocese of Piraeus Archimandrite Gerontios (Loudaros) to be forwarded to the "Archbishop."

The crisis of the circumstances demanded now the most careful and measured actions possible, but again the "Archbishop" acted superficially and irresponsibly.

First, he sent to the offices at Kaningos St. the encyclical concerning the national identity cards, adding in by his own will the names of the bishops the three who had objected against it and that of Metropolitan Petros of Astoria, who had at that time cut off relations with the synod because of his concelebration with ROCOR (which was officially united with Kyprianos) and of the pro-ecumenist acts and statements of the then Archimandrite Pavlos Stratigeas.

In a phone conversation, the "Archbishop" alleged that he had received personally the acquiescence of the three who had disagreed with the Encyclical in the synod, but the name of Petros of Astoria he had placed by mistake and it should be erased by corrective fluid (i.e., white out, liquid paper)!

That was just another proof of the administrative incompetence and ineptitude of the "Archbishop."

On the morning of July 4/17 the Administrative Council of the General Fund of our Church was in session at 32 Kaningos St. to approve the expenditure for 30,000 copies of the encyclical as the "Archbishop" had requested and for some other issues. Present, as members of the Council, were five out of six bishops who had signed the arraignment. Then a fax from the "Archbishop" was received, calling the synod to a meeting.

Dear brothers, imagine the surprise of those bishops, who after all the pressure and tension of those days and while they naturally expected the "Archbishop" to call a meeting of the synod to discuss their arraignment, read in the fax that the "Archbishop" was calling a session with a different topic: another arraignment! Which one? An arraignment made as *a posteriori* by the already accused Kalliopios "of Pentapolis," against three of the six bishops who had already accused him, Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "Metropolitan" of "Achaia," and the "Archbishop!"

The instant reaction and guile of the aforementioned traitors was marvelous! They hid as if they had not received the documented accusation against them and instead they cooked up one of their own, reverted, accusing... the accusers!! Obviously hoping that in this way their patience would have been exhausted and that they would have such indignation as to be forced to extreme acts, or that they would subtly eliminate them, bringing forth and arraigning another issue which nobody would be able to deny as being truly an issue of faith, that is the well-known issue of Paisios and Vikentios in Jerusalem.



But this issue had already been solved in synod two years prior - and not "recently" as Kalliopios deceptively wrote - who as a matter of fact was himself also a few months before the most enthusiastic supporter of Vikentios for Piraeus! In any case, invoking that issue at that specific time was obviously motivated out of ill will and self-interest and not for any real concern for the Faith.

The five bishops in the General Fund were actually in shock. For whole hours they discussed how they would confront the audacious traitors who in such an impudent manner violated every semblance of canonicity, justice and order. They became even more indignant when they read the attached arraignment by Kalliopios, which in the title of his diocese did not display the legal title of our Church: "Church of G.O.C. of Greece," but rather "Greek Church of G.O.C." Which of these two was that "Church" in the name of which Kalliopios "of Pentapolis" acted? It was the stumbling false-church- corporation of 25 Koumoundourou St. founded in 1979, which up to today treacherously continues to exist. In which the permanent members (forming thus a para-synod) are the four recent dictators who unrepentantly entered our synod in 1985, "Metropolitans" of "Achaia," "Attica," "Pentapolis" and "Oinoi!"

Functioning during all the years of the remarkable unity in two Churches, two synods, two ecclesiastical bodies, one evident and public and the other hidden and clandestine! The latter's officers: President Antonios "of Attica," Vice-President Kalliopios "of Pentapolis," First Secretary Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "of Achaia" and Treasurer Mattheos "of Oinoi."

Is there a greater treason, a worst ending up than this of those pharisaically self-advertised as honest warriors and self-conscientious pastors of the One, Holy, Universal and Apostolic Church?

The rest of the bishops knew of this aberration also, but they remained silent in good will, not realizing what kind of snakes they had raised in their midst, ready at any time to consume mercilessly their own mother, that is the synod which amended them unfortunately to the episcopal rank, without which, they would have been long ago unimportant and ignored. But it is difficult for the good and simple man to understand the eccentricity and cunning plot of his evil and sneaky fellow man. After many hours of discussion, the five bishops, Vice-president Kallinikos of Phthiotis, Efthymios of Thessalonica, Stephanos of Chios, Justinos of Evripos, Vikentios of Avlon and, by phone, Paisios of America, decided that they should stop the maniacal rush of the four traitors by severing ecclesiastical communion with them, judging that they could do nothing else to make them prudent and bring them back to order.

Thus, they wrote, signed and sent to the "Archbishop," in the afternoon of that day (July 4/17), the simple text of excommunication against him and those with him (known as a "denouncement"), underlining to the "Archbishop" that this was thought of as unavoidable, "after your repeated para-synodal ... (after) your attempt to blame honorable

bishops ... and snatching up of the whole Church to be governed by three dictatorial bishops who are also your close collaborators and counselors.”

This was exactly the desired point of dispute.

This was what they were after. This was their fierce end. This was their ferocious purpose since 1979, since 1985 and even after 1995: HOW WOULD THEY SEIZE THE WHOLE ECCLESIASTICAL GOVERNMENT, by devious means, with hypocrisy and great pharisaism, so that, if possible, nobody would realize it, but, to the contrary, everybody would think of them as struggling confessors, reliable in their duties!

Thus, after receiving the telegram of the excommunication, they actually celebrated; because they were convinced that with an excuse like this they could rid themselves of the others, the Auxentians and they would then have a formal reason to accuse and eliminate them, advertising themselves as righteous, being in truth "whitened sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Thus ye also outwardly appear righteous to men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity," according to the saying of our Lord.

I wrote and pronounced those words with great sorrow in my heart, my holy brothers, lamenting for our many sins, because of which our good God allowed us and His Holy Church to be tried by such power-hungry, ambitious, and Lord knows with what inner desires men. Because we should not forget that during this same period of June-July 1995 not only our bishops, but also the Matthewites were divided (and after only half a year the Auxentians' of Maximos of Cephalonia), at the same time when the Ecumenical Patriarch venerated the two-headed beast of Rome. Thus anybody justly wonders - and it is impossible to exclude this possibility – maybe this was an orchestrated devious plan of the ecumenists against us, so that they would not have a serious opponent in their ecumenist outbreak? It is also known that one of their own pawns, the notorious lawyer and theologian Mr. Athanasios Sakarellos was a very close counselor of the three unrepentant, former Matthewite dictators.

But blessed be the name of our God!

The All-Good God often derives the profitable from the opposite and the sweet from bitter, or, according to the Apostle "for there must also be heresies among you that they who are tried may be made manifest among you."

Through those events, God rid His Church of those He knew that had remained all those past years unrepentant, hating their brothers and, as the Apostle says, "stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears." And it was wondrous for one to see that of the fourteen bishops of the time, two remained neutral (Antonios of "Attica" and Athanasios of Acharnon). From the other twelve, two groups came into existence of which, ours was of pure Auxentian descent, and the other descended clearly from the "coup," consisting of the permanent disturbance-makers, the "adulterer" "Archbishop" and five from the *coup* of 1979!

Thus from the motley elements of the united synod was reduced down to its ingredients: the unlawful with the unlawful, and the lawful with the lawful!

Thus also was fulfilled the "prophecy," if I am allowed to say, of Metropolitans Akakios of Diavleia and Gabriel of the Cyklades in their *Lysis Siopis (Break of Silence)* of 1986, which said that the then uncanny union of bishops "is a human concoction, and will be dispersed at the first objective situation."

Maybe someone will say to me: "Why are you so subtly dividing the bishops into parties?"

My answer is: my worthlessness does not divide them. I simply ascertain the division in the aforementioned "parties," if you will. And I do this only after the passing of eight years from that time, ascertaining that they remain unrepentant, making true in themselves as if they were popes, the pharisaical: "Ye are they who justify yourselves before men; but God knows your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men, is an abomination in the sight of God."

They made this distinction officially and immediately from the very first moment of division, those same unrepentant schismatics of 1979, celebrating and shouting: "Glory to God!" and: "they were an alien body in the Church of G.O.C.!" And other times: "they rid our Church... from the sinful era of Auxentios ... (and from) *those* people!!"

Thus was verified in them that which many Fathers teach: that the fornicator and the thief accuse others as such, so that they cover up their own sinfulness. In the same way, those who were always an "alien body" from the Church, being at one time Matthewites, at other times schismatics, at other times defrocked and deprived of their rank, they now criticize others as an "alien body." Who? Those who out of improper and superficial, unfortunately, sympathy made them what they are!!

But in this way was fulfilled in them the evangelical parable of the wicked servant owing ten thousand talents, who, after being saved with the cancellation of his debt of the ten thousand talents, was strangling his fellow servant, who owed him only ten dinars, and for this he was handed over "to the torturers."

Secondly, through the separation that took place, God arranged that they who were approved would show up and "the thoughts of many hearts" might be revealed.

Because, what are the works of the two sides?

On the one hand, the true traitors and creators of the *coup* of 1979, who shouting loudly created their own 666, that is 6 bishops, in 6 days "defrocked"(supposedly) 6 other bishops (an unheard of thing in bi-millennial ecclesiastical history), first brought completely back to life the *coup* of 1979, with their hating and pharisaical teachings and texts and, second, deserted obviously by God, did not stop from that moment on to agitate

and afflict the body of the Church with Church-corporations, constitutional charts, an industry of defrockings and persecutions of honorable clerics and bishops, unorthodox blasphemies, sudden consecrations, among which is the one of the ecumenist Pavlos Stratigeas and other acts like these.

At the same time our Holy Church and Synod, according to common acknowledgement from all of us, found peace and entered a canonical and God-pleasing path, with many pious and careful steps, proving thus that the Spirit of God truly finds rest in it.

But all these things are the subject of the submissions of other holy brothers. I would only like to stress that our Holy and Sacred Synod finally was THE FIRST AND ONLY who clearly and without prevarication, ignoring the consequences, dared to condemn, clearly for reasons of faith, our former Bishops Paisios and Vikentios, since they proved to be ecumenists, by their hideous interview in America, in August 1995. While the fallen in many ways Chrysostomos Kiouisis synod NEVER did condemn those bishops for matters of faith, despite their hypocritical arias about Orthodoxy and false protests and arraignments of Kalliopios and company, who remain up to date inactive and stuck to what they wrote in September, 1995 about them: "The synod has not yet decided!!"

Maybe they were waiting to see if they would join them again, since we drove them out. Vikentios, before he left definitely for America, cooperated and handed the keys of the luxury Metropolitan Offices to the "Archbishop" and their own "Metropolitan of Piraeus" Gerontios settled into them, being to the end a close collaborator and chancellor to the fallen Vikentios!

Before I pass on to the final conclusions and suggestions of my humble submission, I would like to answer a question that for a good reason interests many people. Was it in accordance with the Sacred Canons to break off ecclesiastical communion with the "Archbishop" and the treacherous trio of the rebels? I'm not saying with the synod, because the six bishops did not cut off from the synod, but the President and the other three who worked against the synod. Of the other four bishops synod, two (Antonios "of Attica" and Athanasios of Acharnon) remained neutral, while the other two (Maximos of Magnesia and Kallinikos of the Dodekanesos) stuck with their old collaborators from 1979.

I answer the question directly, because it would be unjust to mention the canons only in relation to the others, setting aside our own situation! I submit my personal opinion, based on everything I have studied and researched up to this day, not having immediately taken part in the events of 1995 since I was not a bishop then.

The pronounced cessation of ecclesiastical communion of the six bishops with the "Archbishop," and the "Metropolitans" of "Achaia," "Oinoi" and "Pentapolis" is based safely and canonically on Apostolic Canon 31, which allows such an act when any bishop "is mistaken evidently in piety or in justice." Because the aforementioned four bishops must have evidently sinned and were mistaken in many ways in JUSTICE with the

express parody of a court, against a member of the synod, their fellow bishop, Metropolitan Eftymios of Thessalonica.

Specifically, the document of the excommunication of July 4/17, 1995, is referring to the unjustness of this court, as an "operation defaming honorable bishops," "after repeated para-synodal activities."

Also, from the very start of the separation and before the year 1995 ended, obviously deserted by God, the Kiousites declared officially various misbeliefs, faltering obviously also in PIETY. This falling away from piety grew worse soon after with the Church-corporation, the constitutions, the covering up of ecumenist scandals in their ranks and other things like these, all of which we repeatedly denounced out of pastoral duty with official encyclicals and publications.

As we saw, the immediate reason for the act of excommunication was the continued disregard against the majority of the synodal body of our Church, the impeding of the execution of synodal decisions and of the uninterrupted synodal function and as a result of this, the heavy offense to the synod system of the Church by the "Archbishop" and the three rebels with him, as we said before. According to this the rest of the members of the synod had the sacred duty to reestablish the synodal order and protect it from the arbitrariness of the "Archbishop," especially after out of ill will he hid the documented arraignment by the Vice-President of the synod and the five synodal bishops who signed with him.

Many older and more recent Orthodox researchers and spiritual men underlined and stressed the great significance of the institution of the synodal arrangement of Church matters, and for this it must remain untouched and well-functioning. I will be content to refer to your love a few distinctive words from the well known Serbian Canonist Bishop Nikodim Milaš of Zara:

"The entirety of Church authority is concentrated in the synod of bishops and specifically, in such an absolute sense, that the Church without this arrangement would cease to be what She is, Her system, on the other hand, would not be such as the Founder of the Church wanted and instituted.

"The bishop is the (visible) head of his Church and has the whole authority that the Apostles also had, that is, the whole of the Church authority. But the bishop is exercising this authority, because it was given to him by the synod of bishops, which at his consecration called upon the blessing of the Holy Spirit, thus appointing him a lawful successor of the Apostles.

"This teaching of the Eastern Orthodox Church is the basis of all Her laws, verified firstly by the Holy Scriptures and following this by the canonical constitutions and practice of the Church and custom of all the centuries.

"... There is no Canon which does not bear the stamp of synodal authority. The Canons of the Holy Fathers which we today accept and recognize, we accept them and think of them as valid because they were validated by the synods, which gave to them a compulsory character. The matters concerning Church government are completely under the decisions of the synodal authority and only in the name of that authority can Bishops exercise the executive authority in the Churches that were trusted unto them."

After those wise words, I believe that we fully understand the importance of synodality, because of which, I declare in great certainty, that the six bishops acted very well and God-pleasing in June, 1995. Due to this action, among others, they preserved and insured the unchangeable and uninterrupted functioning of the synod from the maniacal attack and self-interest of the unsuccessful "Archbishop" and those three who were always being treasonous with him, who sought only what and how they wanted would be made, trespassing audaciously the synodal will and majority.

Concerning the need and the correct functionality of the Sacred Synods the following canons refer: the 34th and 37th Apostolic Canons, and also many more based on them, like the 6th of the First Ecumenical Council, the 9th of the 4th, the 19th and 20th of the Council of Antioch, 40th of the Council of Laodicea, the 26th, 81st and 84th of the Council of Carthage, of which especially the last one commands "that they should remain excommunicated from all the others" those who ignore and do not present themselves before the synods. According to the 6th Canon of the Seventh Ecumenical Council "if any of the Metropolitans (that is, the First of the synods) would neglect (to call a synod session) to be made, unless there is no need or force or any serious cause, may he be under penalty," and in the same way "if any ruler be found putting obstacles to this, let him be excommunicated."

These Holy and Sacred Canons speak against those who put obstacles or act against the canonical synodal functioning like the trio of the rebels together with the "Archbishop" did, ignoring the canonical institutions: "neither may he (that is, the President) do anything without everyone's consent" and "the vote of the majority should rule." And because of this they rightfully found the reaction and opposition of the rest of the members of the synod.

We, however, Holy and Sacred Synod and sanctified presbyters, having rode for long the chariot of speech and passed through by God's Grace so many historical stops in our recent Church History, let us now pause and rest, after we first extract the right and useful conclusions and submit based on them the correct propositions.

## CONCLUSIONS – PROPOSALS

Holy and Sacred Congregation,

Honorable and God-renowned Fathers,

Honestly, I speak truly, I am disgusted with talking about the past and, for my part, I hope that I never again will have to get involved with it. We must now occupy ourselves with the present and the future, with wise power, decisively and with Orthodox boldness. However, any action of the present and any plan for the future that is not based upon lessons from past circumstances are dangerous.

For this reason, when the Sacred Synod assigned me the burden of the present report, at first I was saddened, thinking of the responsibility - but also the discomfort - of examining the recent past again. On the other hand I was gladdened, thinking of the burden of my report as a wonderful chance for the restoration of people and events, which up to this day, have been tarnished by those who have sinned against the holy body of the Church in many ways, unrepentantly and for their own interests, twisted and distorted matters, pharisaically justifying themselves.

I boldly declare *a priori*, that I was not self-anointed as the righteous judge of Church matters. But, since I am being obedient to my Synodal Fathers by accepting this report, and having from my youth, by God's Grace, been a servant of the unadulterated truth, anything else, but to say the truth and that only, was impossible for me. Even more since I took into consideration the danger of adulterating our Church's History either by misguided people, or by self-interested, or by those "Speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron."

My conclusions and judgments came to be based on every fact and truthful source in my possession. But if somewhere I have not been fair with someone (and this surely is not out of ill-will, but from human imperfection), and it be proved from other facts and sources I may not be aware of, I am always willing and ready to restore the truth after it has been shown to me with reliable proof.

But I cannot bear the liability of silence concerning the unrepentant Church mongers of our time who at one time babbling through the mouth of Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "of Achaia" stated that "the uncompromising struggle for truth and justice of the Church" and the "crowning of virtues" is the accomplishment of the "active participation in the Ecclesiastical developments of 1979" of the unrepeatable rebels which tore apart the "seamless robe" of the Church's body.

At some time, through the mouth of the unfortunate "Archbishop" Chrysostomos Kiouisis, in love with himself, we hear the following: "WE DECLARE categorically that a schism NEVER OCCURED due to us as some babblers and arrogant ones who fight the Church say;" and other similar words derived from a lack of conscience.

And so the systematic forgery of history goes on in the condemnable website of Chrysostomos Kiouisis on the Internet where the faithful are ill-informed that the consecrations of the head schismatics of 1979 were most canonical, and that Metropolitan Eftymios was elected as Metropolitan of Thessalonica not in 1980 as he was, but in 1986! But let the subtle forgers be silenced by the events that are being shown here which shine forth brighter than the sun the following real facts.

The tormented Church of the Genuine Orthodox Christians of Greece since 1974 was roughly abused and was hit unmercifully by a treacherous team of four of Her bishops who set aside even the unadulterated confession of our Sacred Struggle, with the then Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kiouisis of Thessalonica as its head. Our Holy Church through that pack was invaded by the Ieronymos Kotsonis "brotherhood" – Neonavatianist storm of the pharisaical cleansing of the judgmental "outwardly good witness." Through whom? Through those very bishops who convicted themselves by living among women.

This spirit of rebellion and pharisaism in our Church matters was definitely revived with an unprecedented and never heard of in the bi-millennial Church History schism, which had as its only goal the seizing of the entire Church authority and administration in the year 1979 in which the former Matthewite "Metropolitans" Antonios "of Attica," Kallistos "of Corinth," Kallinikos Sarantopoulos "of Achaia," Kalliopios "of Pentapolis," Mattheos "of Oinoi" and Kyprianos "of Oropos" were the protagonists.

The results of that condemned schism was the Protestant heresy of the Church-corporation, the permanent, since then, division of the synod, the hateful spirit of Matthewite origin, revenge and fighting with each other and the intensifying of the neo-Navatian heresy of the pharisaic "*Katharoi*."

Tragically a few years later our canonical bishops, acting on an urge of wrongly conceived, lacking discernment and contradictory unity, mixed up the lawful and the unlawful fallen, deprived of their duties, defrocked, heretical pirates of the Church, together with canonical and unrebelling bishops who in every good will restored without discernment the general unity in the years 1985-6, their good and simple heart not being able to imagine the fraud and the hypocrisy of the unrepentant disturbers, who putting the synod in hostage, acted slowly (so that they would not be understood) but steadily towards the completion of the inner desire they had from the very start: THE SEIZURE OF THE WHOLE CHURCH AUTHORITY AND ADMINISTRATION.

This hermaphrodite synodal creation was established on a rotten foundation, that is, the unjust throwing out of the canonical Archbishop Auxentios, and the election of an adulterer "Archbishop" (through a completely uncanonical election) that of the excommunicated, deprived of his duties and see, Chrysostomos Kiouisis, formerly of Thessalonica. The up to this very day slander of our Father Archbishop Auxentios by those ungrateful people (without whom, they would not be where they are today) has one and only one goal: to justify their own long term crimes and rebellions, supposing that he was, as they claim, a bad Archpastor.



I do not believe, of course, neither did I ever claim that the late Archbishop Auxentios did not, as a human, make mistakes. But he was not as they present him to supposedly have been. And never did His Beatitude the late Archbishop Auxentios make non-canoncities, frauds, treacheries and Church rebellions of such impact, undermining the future of our Sacred Struggle.

But all those from outside the synod, shouting unashamedly for whole years about non-canoncity, cleansing and order; that is the new "Archbishop" and the schismatics of 1979, from their acts, now from inside the synod, were proven the worst uncanonical men, without order and always unrepentant rebels; and since they never enforced any lawful prosecution against any immoral or unclean (because there were not, with substantial proof at least, any such persons), they condemned themselves as bad-mouthers, having previously for so long of a time remained outside the synod as a cover and banner of their rebellion having the excuse of the Neo-Navatian false-catharsis, which they invoke up to this day!

The conclusion of the failed Kioussite "archiepiscopal" administration was the peak of the hostage of the synod by them, and their arrogant and treacherous imposition on the synod during the years 1993-95, first by orchestrating a vicious judicial dictatorship against their fellow Bishop Efthymios of Thessalonica, insulting immediately and brutally the whole canonical system concerning justice, creating thus a dangerously bad precedent.

Secondly, through their treacherous trespassing and strangling of the synodal will and majority, threatening to dissolve the canonical synodal system of Orthodoxy, without which is impossible the functioning according to God and the adjusting of Church matters. These things led those of our bishops who had a correct and canonical consecration to make a protest based on the immovable foundation of the Sacred Canons. This protest was lead by the Vice-president of our synod, who has a special responsibility in every case of a short-coming or misdeed of the President, Metropolitan Kallinikos of Phthiotis who, not long after due to the perseverance in conspiracy and arrogance of the "Archbishop" and those three trouble-makers who were with him, together with those bishops who surrounded him moved forward to the cutting off of ecclesiastical communion with them, in this way delivering our Holy Church from their evil plots and indirectly challenging their recognition as full and canonical bishops that had taken place a decade before through "*oikonomia*."

We loudly proclaim these things, only after the passing by of eight full years of separation, during which time we moved "earth and heaven" trying to help them repent, to come to their senses and to feel the cesspool into which they had fallen. They, however, proving from the very beginning who were the ones who wanted the division, unrepentantly and continuously trying with every form of treachery to bring about a split, proclaimed from the very first weeks of the separation: "We got rid of those people who were a foreign body in the Church of the G.O.C. of Greece!...They spared us the trouble of throwing them out!"

Who proclaims this? The ones who were truly a foreign body in our Church, which using "*oikonomia*" only accepted them with the vain hope that they would correct themselves. However, they ungratefully broke the womb of that Church in 1995 and came out as hallucinations of ecclesiastical vipers that earlier were vainly dressed with this recognition, so that they now in writing could boast moving the crowds that they, who were once upon a time thrown out and disregarded as ecclesiastical pirates, now in a miraculous way "shepherd the Church of the G.O.C. of Greece" monopolizing oneness again and again.

After all of this, and having as a fact the unchanging lack of repentance and insistence of the fallen Kioussites in their Church-battling heresy of Protestant-style church companies, completing my humble submission, I would like to suggest and respectfully propose to our gathering the following:

- 1) That the non-canonical appointment of the former Metropolitan of Thessalonica Chrysostomos Kioussis to the throne of the Archbishop be proclaimed in Sacred Synod as unacceptable and void with a permanent and irreversible decision.
- 2) That the uncanonical synodal recognition in the year 1985 of the only surviving of the three head conspirators and scandal-makers, "Metropolitan of Achaia" Kallinikos Sarantopoulos be lifted and his canonical synodal defrocking of 1979 be reconfirmed. Concerning the other two who have already passed away, Kalliopios "of Pentapolis" and Mattheos of "Oinoi," let us leave things to the judgment of God, in Whose hands they already are.
- 3) That the pending case of His Eminence Efthymios of Thessalonica be finally tried based on the Sacred Canons by our Canonical and Synodal Authority, through a decision that will explain simply and briefly the attempted judicial crimes of that case.
- 4) Having proclaimed the adulterous freeloading of the Archbishop's throne by Chrysostomos Kioussis as non-canonical, unacceptable and having already lifted the defrocking of His Beatitude Archbishop Auxentios as being uncanonical, we would logically have to join with, at every cost, the canonically gathered synod of the successors of the late Archbishop Auxentios, accepting the mistakes of the past. Such a synod, however, God only knows why, not existing, we have the most sacred obligation to do whatever we can to unite with Metropolitan Athanasios of Larissa who I believe to be the only healthy remainder of the successors of Auxentios.
- 5) To cease our diminishing as a Church and Synod, which was retained up to now for pro-unity reasons, and with a great voice finally proclaim our ecclesiastical conscience, that we are not the "resisters" nor the "resistors" of the Kioussites, as some people criticize us, but rather by the grace of God, **THE CANONICAL CHURCH OF THE GENUINE ORTHODOX CHRISTIANS OF GREECE DOGMATICALLY INTACT AND AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE STANDING BY THE CANONS**, naturally as people not infallible, which in any cause we never professed.

6) That the Kioussites be proclaimed schismatic-heretics officially and finally up until the time at least that they dissolve their Church-battling and blasphemous Church corporation.

7) That we undertake with care the abolishing of the scandalous canonical misdeed of the living with women both at the level of the clergy and bishops, that every clergyman who lives with women be cut off irreversibly from the candidacy of archbishop, that we not become ridiculous before angels and man, as my own wretchedness often became receiving thousands of complaints about Chrysostomos Kioussis' living in a nunnery.

8) That we might all study, bishops and clergymen alike with the opportunity of my report if it is necessary or not the election of an Archbishop, an event which would very greatly aid our ecclesiastical organization and will make our Church visible. I also should state that many of our God-fearing clergymen have begged me that we move forward to such an election.

9) That it be assigned to a synodal committee the gathering and codifying of all the Sacred Canons that have to do with the procedure of accusing and trying a clergyman, with an added basic covering of the relative Orthodox ecclesiastical act, not only to protect the body of the Church from judicial terrorism of the neo-Navational pharisaical Ieronymios Kotsonis type but also because all of the divisions and fighting of our bishops in the last years has to do with self-established, uncanonical, and rejected judicial procedures and decisions due to a general vehemence, but also professedly through a lack of knowledge of many of our fellow bishops of the canonical procedures.

10) That a catalogue be written based on the Sacred Canons and the age-old practice of the Church of the responsibilities of the President of the Sacred Synod and of the manner of confronting him when he does not fulfill them, since in the past many times many differences of opinion and splits occurred due to the lack of knowledge and reaction to the fulfillment of this matter.

This list of ten things would I like to propose to your sincerity. Since I am sure that some opposing demagogues who appear to be serious will say: "Now after so many years of ecclesiastical communion you remembered all of that against them?" And perhaps because some of my humble proposals might appear to be daring, I remind you again that I personally have the right according to the dictates of my conscience to ask for the correction of effectual uncanonicalities of the past which greatly damaged our Church and in which my wretchedness took no part in as a bishop, and by the given fact that from the very beginning we stated, "whatever has been wrongly judged and printed, neither a canon, nor a law, nor time, nor habit can make it certain" and that the communion of canonical with uncanonical bishops that is achieved either with cautiousness or through oppression or through trickery" can make "simply is if by magic the uncanonical ones canonical . And that one crime repeated many times or prolonged does not cease to be a crime." The canonically and in an Orthodox manner gathered and laboring Sacred Synod which possessed by divine justice every right to correct every crime and uncanonicity that is found to harm the Church in the long run.

Finally, having with great sorrow ascertained that up until and including the year 1995, at least for a period of twenty years, an unfortunate hatred, an animosity, an unfounded sense of competition, a self-pleasing attitude, a jealousy and other similar things, had been dominant among the synodal bishops and having with great happiness tasted of, and helped in a certain way to bring about, the elimination of this malevolent climate, and the securing amongst synodal bishops of love in Christ, mutual understanding and cooperation without self-interest, I beg you on my knees:

Holy Bishops, my brothers, let us heed as the pupil of our eye, to suffer every sacrifice and toil, that we may maintain and enlarge even more so the brotherly love and support that we have, for which I glorify our all-good God "from Whom every perfect gift" comes and I see the All-Holy Spirit resting upon us. From this love the greatest good can come to our Church and to Orthodoxy in general, and which is in any way the basic sign of the true disciples of Christ according to His words, "that by this all will come to know that you are My disciples, if you have love for one another."

Forgive me for tiring you by making my speech so long, but it was necessary in order to complete in a dignified and complete manner the work which was assigned to me.

May the grace and enlightenment of our Holy God, protect all of us in every way unto the ages of ages Amen.

#### **THE END**

**AND TO GOD THE LOVER OF MANKIND WHO WORKS AMONG THE  
GOOD BE GLORY DOMINION AND PRAISE UNTO THE AGES AMEN.**

*Translated from the Greek. The Greek original has copious references and footnotes here.*