



Matthew Raphael Johnson, PhD  
1165 McKinley Ave  
Johnstown, PA 15905  
fr\_raphael@yahoo.com  
st\_sava (skype)

To All Bishops, Priests, Deacons and Laymen of the  
True Orthodox Church (Autonomous):

I.

For 25 years, I have been a political person. A former musician, I changed to politics and history when I watched Nikolai Ceaucescu executed by his own army on December 25 1989. As a naive young man, I believed that if I had sufficient evidence, logic and presentation, I would win the day. Eventually, my opponents would be forced to eventually convert to my ideas. To this day, I struggle to understand how this is only rarely the case. People, especially the debased and corrupted American, care nothing for the truth. Rather, self-interest and financial demands are the criteria of not only truth, but reality.

I received my doctoral in the history of political ideology in 1999. My views have taken many years to mature and develop, and as of 2016, I've not an unpublished thought. The issues about which I'm apparently being denounced are a lifelong focus of mine. My detractors better have done their homework before confronting me, or it will take a small army of self-esteem counselors to put them back together again. Relevant terms will be defined beforehand and used consistently. Mainstream media sources, on these issues, are laughably biased and are not acceptable evidence. That I need to explain this makes me sad, and leads me to believe that those making these claims have no idea what they're talking about.

My phone and address are public, and though my 6 books, hundreds of articles and hundreds of podcast lectures, I've hidden nothing. My views are informed, coherent and correct. When I discover an error, I quickly correct it. My conversion to the Orthodox church is one of those corrections. I struggle to banish self-interest as much as possible from my studies. Apparently, however, I am almost alone in this attitude.

Matthew Heimbach (MH) has become an object of great scrutiny in our tiny church as well as in Orthodox groups (largely internet-based) globally. This is solely due to fear: the fear that such radical thinking will lead to trouble, name calling or even a "loss of credibility." Unlike the readers of this essay, I have read everything MH has written over the last few years. I have had many, many private conversations over issues concerning the faith, politics and the state. I find him to be a brave idealist, a firm adherent for the True Orthodox conception of the world long forgotten by modern church groups in the US and elsewhere. According to him, I introduced him to the Orthodox faith and Christian

nationalism. Since then, I've heard from thousands of young people telling me that they had no idea what Orthodoxy was until they heard it from me. How many have others brought in recently? Tell me about their missionary outreach.

Personal and political attacks on MH have gone on for well over a year and I've yet to receive a single offending sentence. Of course, even receiving one is meaningless, since we all misspeak, make mistakes and say the wrong thing. This is especially the case in our youth. Churches have thrown him out, cursed him and threatened him due to his adherence to the traditional teachings of Orthodoxy in the political realm. On social matters, few even realize the ancient Orthodox teaching on social life. This is my academic specialty and has been the focus of all my studies, writing and speaking since the 1990s. I have brought out the political in the eastern Orthodox world through the saints, traditions, historical events, laws, policies and philosophical doctrines. True Orthodox people, including Gavin Fetter (now Fr. Enoch) have given me great praise. I cannot see a difference with the work of MH.

The ignorant and self righteous should be ashamed of themselves. First, because they are motivated by fear, not any interest truth. Second, that they speak of him largely behind his back. Some, when speaking to him personally, take on a pleasant demeanor, then revert to their slander behind the safety of their keyboards. Third, that they have no grounds for complaint, as no evidence has ever been produced against him, and none will ever be produced. The social doctrines of the great saints and prophets are the focus of our ideological struggle and are as important as anything else the faith teaches. Condemning ecumenism is easy. Condemning usury and the organized invasion of aliens is not. Fourth, that many have sided with communist and anarchists in their pompous denunciations of doctrines largely a product of their imaginations. They have done little to support justice in this country or elsewhere. How dare they presume to attack those who struggle to do what they refuse to.

Fifth, none of those (known to me) complaining have any real historical knowledge of nationalism or its ideological development. They use labels and pop-culture slang such as "racist" or "fascist" as if they mean anything in our era. They try to make use of conceptions of which they are only dimly aware, yet they pretend to speak with authority. Sixth, that "charges" have been invented out of whole cloth, such that he sees the Orthodox faith and "paganism" as the same, or that he wants non-whites out of the church. This latter is a problem for us, I must admit, especially since we're already overwhelmed with the influx of Afro-Cubans in our tiny house parishes. I also await functional definition of paganism so we can all be on the same page in future discussions.

Seventh, that certain benighted clergymen have threatened MH with excommunication and other nightmarish punishments on the internet. They have created scandal and division where none existed before. Had they not pontificated online, no one would even have realized a problem existed. It is an artificially created problem forced into the public eye largely by Joseph Suaiden and his acolyte, Fr. Enoch (Fetter). Neither are qualified to discuss nationalism from a political point of view. In general, I have no personal animus against either man. Suaiden has helped me edit and publish my books. Since I refuse to read the gossip blogs they frequent, I'm not sure what's being said. I prefer to remain ignorant. It is important that I've not spoken out in the least, since all I've heard was second hand talk. Now, of course, I'm forced to, which is not in anyone's interest.

The truth is that there is no excuse to ignore the immense witness to the faith that Matthew has brought us. We are lucky that, though my efforts, MH has come to our little group. He has brought more catechumens to the church than all of my readers put together. Since I've know him, I've received inquiries about the faith from over 100 individuals from all backgrounds. These are sincere seekers who thought Christianity was just another liberal creed. When faced with the ideology of the prophets, Filaret of Moscow or John of Kronstadt, they see the true faith: communitarian, nationalist, agrarian and royalist (in a broad sense). This sort of missionary record should put his detractors to shame. It is evidence that God is blessing his work.

With this mind, to arrogantly drive him out because a self-appointed guardian of religious purity has read on a Facebook post reprinted from a blog cited by a friend of a friend on the internet that might imply that he "hates niggers" is stupid, damaging and profoundly sinful. Matthew, a struggling father and husband, highly educated and sensitive, has been personally shaken by these attacks on him and it has

taken its toll. You've not stopped to think of what this backbiting might do to someone. When you seek to destroy a man and his reputation, it's usually a good idea to actually have evidence. Third-hand slogans, vague labels and fear of being called names do not, generally speaking, count as evidence. MH deserves a heartfelt apology. Due to personal arrogance and guile, he will never receive one.

The attacks on him, those I've recently heard about from Canada, are driven by no facts, understanding or good intentions. Rather than lash out, his detractors could have easily picked up the phone and called him. If that was too much work, they could have called me. Rather than make statements, they might have asked questions. I would have answered those questions politely but condescendingly, and the matter would have been put to rest. My phone number and address are public, as is my email and Skype. It is proof of his detractors' guile that they have not availed themselves of this obvious solution to their sudden interest in multiculturalism. Yet, if they insist on leaving, I believe the Orthodox world will survive the loss of the 10-15 souls involved. They might find a home in a more socially respectable church group.

## II.

Our little group is almost totally unknown to Orthodoxy and barely known even to traditionalists. The jurisdiction has no real identity: it has many ethnic groups, liturgies, political views, and backgrounds. Some members are strict traditionalists, others still "world Orthodox" in their views. Its name is ridiculously long and cumbersome, so no one even knows what to call it. I love my father Metropolitan John. I always will. However, the main monastery is a humiliation to the church. I'm embarrassed by the condition of the place. So is everyone else, but no one will say much about it. It's harmed the church.

The intellectual brilliance of the metropolitan has led to not a single article or book. No journals, intellectual websites or anything that every other group has has been published, but a huge, absolutely unnecessary church was the priority. There are no camps, no apologetics, no mission societies, no charitable organizations. Zero. The website is not updated regularly and the present parish list is unreliable. No one is trying to change this.<sup>1</sup> Few know anything about our father John. His knowledge of the western rite alone would fill volumes, and yet, not a syllable about this published anywhere, even though the Christian world desperately needs to hear his vision. My podcast, pathetically enough, is the only well known aspect of the synod. If it were not for Joseph Suaiden's NFTU and myself, the synod would be totally invisible.

At one point, we had a large organization, our "intercommunion," that showed great promise. All told, we had something like 300 parishes worldwide and many monastics. Then, apparently, a Gregory Lourie talked Metropolitan Raphael into some variation of "name worship," and that communion ended. This is where I get foggy.

As of now, it seems that the accusations of "Kabbalistic name worship" destroyed this church. I've yet to see evidence that anyone over there believed in what we think "Name Worship" is. I'm pretty sure they never did. Furthermore, there is no one at Holy Name nor in the synod in general sufficiently well versed in the arcane symbolism such an accusation would require. I've noticed that the term "Kabbalah" has been removed from the text of the anathema and replaced with the more vague "esoteric desire."

The synod accused Raphael of a "Kabbalistic" worship of names, sounds and material letters. This is not true and no evidence has been produced otherwise. No one believes that God's name is God. Anyone who does would be locked up in a sanitarium. Or at the very least, they would no longer try to form a church, since with God in the name, why have a church at all? If the name of God is God, then there is no need for sacraments.

Raphael asked for a council to hash this out, we did not attend. Our church now is in isolation and as of today, it's been two years since I've asked for evidence that anyone in Angelos' or Raphael's group believes in the Gemmatia. Without meaning any harm, this immensely important intercommunion was

---

<sup>1</sup> Much of the above is from the late Hieroschemamonk Brendan (Williams), but I generally concur with it.

destroyed through a false accusation. No one has taken responsibility for this.

### III.

Some time ago, I restarted my Orthodox Nationalist podcast which, for reasons unknown, has made me quite prominent. My first lecture was debunking the “Phyletism” idea and the synod that allegedly pronounced the anathema. One day after it was released, I read this from the synod's website:

As Orthodox Christians, we respect the diversity of political opinions among our brethren on all matters other than the permissibility of endorsing the practice of any form of abortion, or other views contrary to the long standing teachings of the Holy Orthodox Church, but we do not believe in the exclusion of any person of any race or mixed racial heritage (or of former religious affiliations who chose to fully become Orthodox Christians) from the communities of any of our churches or the participation in any of the Mysteries in any of our Churches on the basis of said racial or mixed racial/ethnic heritage. We further affirm the decision of the 1872 Council of Constantinople which ruled against phyletism as in any manner acceptable in the Orthodox Church of Christ, namely, the following statement: “We censure, condemn, and declare contrary to the teachings of the Gospel and the sacred canons of the holy Fathers the doctrine of phyletism, or the difference of races and national diversity in the bosom of the Church of Christ.”

I was embarrassed. No attempt at grappling with the facts was made. Every sentence is incorrect or a misinterpretation. At no time has anyone sought to exclude anyone based on race, though plenty have demanded people be excluded based on what they heard someone thinks on politics. I have yet to receive an explanation of how this “issue” ever came to be the subject of an “statement” since no one advocates it. To put the authority of the “synod” behind it is a parody. Might the next synodal statement be a strict condemnation of the exploitation of child labor on the moon? Sure, if the moon had factories employing child labor, there is no question that we should inform the faithful that we disapprove of their exploitation.

The last sentence is incoherent. Is the “difference of races” the definition of “Phyletism?” It says that we condemn the “difference of races.” Does that mean that different races do not exist? It reads, with the central clause removed: “We censure, condemn, and declare contrary to the teachings of the Gospel and the sacred canons of the holy Fathers the difference of races and national diversity in the bosom of the Church of Christ.” This is embarrassingly disjointed, since it says that the “difference of races” and “Phyletism” are the same thing. So the condemnation doesn't even condemn what its meant to.

Abortion is arbitrarily singled out, then followed by the vague “or other views contrary to the long standing teachings of the Holy Orthodox Church.” This is not exactly controversial, and renders the entire passage meaningless. The affirmation of the 1872 synod is historically illiterate, as I have repeatedly shown it to be a fraud. Its not a hard thing to do. Had the readers of this letter bothered to read my work or hear the lecture, they would know that almost the entire Orthodox world condemned this synod at the time, including the Patriarch of Alexandria, who rightly referred to it as a reaction to the potential loss of Phanar incomes. Constantinople alone adhered to its conclusions, though during the Soviet period, the language of the anathema became common at elite meetings and clerical cocktail parties. The interpretation of this synod's pronouncement is even worse than the pronouncement itself. Generally, imposing one's own prejudices upon historical documents is a very poor way of reaching the truth. Phyletism and nationalism are not the same, and no attempt is made to define either.

More seriously, the publication of this has led to many Orthodox, and with reason, to take it as a personal attack on me. To be honest, I'm more insulted with how little effort was put into its composition than the actual content. At least be funny about it. Accuse me of being a porn director or running a pyramid scheme from Nigeria. Maybe running a militia defending blood diamonds in the Congo would be entertaining. At least that's interesting.

#### IV.

There was a time when Christian monarchies struggled to rule according to the Gospel of Christ, which of course, includes the Prophets of the Old Testament. We no longer live in that time. Governments of the western world are not legitimate because they are not founded on the will of God, the Gospel or even the people: they are founded on money.

Racism is the belief that another race has a genetic predisposition to irrational behaviors. This is to say that their very race makes them stupid, immoral or whatever. It is a product of the Enlightenment. This is unacceptable, but there is no specific condemnation of such views. Its wrong whether or not the church has legislated on it. God has created all human beings that are equal in their ability to act morally and to please God.

Under no circumstances can a honestly seeking convert be turned away due to their racial or ethnic background. Orthodoxy comes first, the political nation or race comes second. However, the church of Syria in America dismissed and anathematized MH solely based on his commitment to ethnonationalism and natural law. This is a worse sin because it, at least, is the actual teaching of the Scriptures. It happens to be a correct political view, the idea of which I've defined many times in writings and speeches. These remain conveniently unread by my and his detractors.

Christ said very little in the New Testament. That fact is remarkable. His utterances were a few parables, but little direct instruction. He said nothing directly political (though everything has political connotations). Why? This is because the prophets said it all. They laid down the political and ethnic view that is binding on us. The church holds to their social ideas. This is why Christ did not speak much on ethics or economics. The views of the prophets were familiar to most of Christ's hearers since they were raised in the mind of the Old Testament and the law.<sup>2</sup>

Deuteronomy 32:8 is a key political passage in the Old Testament. The historical books of the OT state over and over again that nations are biological entities coming from the sons of Adam and Noah. The nation exists not merely as a post-Nimrod punishment, but is the locus for virtue. Civic life is the same as the religious faith in Old Israel. Only the modern world makes faith a "private issue." The ancients and writers of the canons had no conception of this egocentric bias.

Nationalism is not only accepted by the Orthodox church, but celebrated by it. The Black Hundreds had their own churches as did the Cossack Host. The latter existed to celebrate the warrior ethos of the Cossack brotherhood, especially in cleaning Poland of its Jewish infestation in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. This is the norm for the church. The bourgeois, individualistic, ecumenical "Orthodoxy" of today is a perversion.

The alternatives to the biological nation is the class or the individual. In modernity anyway, these have been the two alternatives, with the west backing the latter and the former USSR allegedly backing the former. Both were equally hostile to the nation as a concept since it competed with their civic foundation. The individual is an absurdity since man is born into a family and requires a society for even the most basic action. The class is more serious, but it is merely a negation. It is formed subjectively as the pain of oligarchy and monopoly keep food off the table. In itself, this is legitimate, but contains no positive program. This anger is insufficient to hold a society together. Globalism cannot be fought except by the ethno-nation, since it alone provides a coherent platform of personal identity and civic action. If there's another feasible way, I await the treatise explaining it to me.

There is no theological demand for the belief in the mathematical equality of ethnic groups or races. No two people are equal as none are the same. Its a stupid point of view demanded only to be imposed on whites. Whites alone are expected to be color blind. This we do not accept. Behavior is the ultimate ground of moral life socially, not race or ethnicity. However, in America, violent crime is almost

---

2 Consult McConville, JG (2006) *God and Earthly Power: An Old Testament Political Theology, Genesis-Kings*. T & T Clark and Latvis, K (1998) *God, Anger and Ideology: The Anger of God in Joshua and Judges in Relation to Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writings*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 279*. I'm certain you will consult neither.

exclusively non-white. Gang culture is non-white. The criminal underclass in the USA is nonwhite.<sup>3</sup> Our churches will and must keep this in mind, especially if situated in nonwhite areas. Covering over this truth is dangerous and, since it is a lie, sinful.

V.

When ancient Israel began to worship the idols of commerce and class rule – the Gods of contemporary America – God raised up the empires of Babylon and the Persia to conquer it. Free trade, individualism, oligarchy and a crude universalism caused God to destroy Israel, as the US is presently disintegrating from within. It was loyalty to race, nation and faith that the prophets sought to integrate and make the sole focus of loyalty. We do the same.

Acts 17:26 states that “God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.” David Carlton writes in his “A Biblical Defense of Ethno-Nationalism”:

The Bible places familial authority in the hands of husbands and fathers. This is considered “sexist” or “chauvinistic” by today’s standard, but God does not answer to man’s opinions! In the Bible, civil authority is a natural outgrowth of familial authority. The foundational text for this position is Deuteronomy 17:15, which states that Israel should set one from among their brethren to be king over them, and that they were not to put a stranger over them who was not their brother. It’s important to keep in mind that brothers does not always refer to Christians in the Bible. Num. 20:14, Deuteronomy 1:16, 23:7, 2 Kings 10:13-14, Neh. 5:7, Jer. 34:9, and Rom. 9:3 are examples of it being used in the ethnic sense in terms of Israel’s identity.<sup>4</sup>

Now, either Orthodox abandon the Old Testament entirely or accept the notion that not only is nationalism, defined in this way, acceptable, but to reject it is heresy. There are no multitude of opinions of Orthodox to follow. There is one view, that of natural law. This is why the Old Testament is included in scripture. This author has not the slightest doubt that the next stupid “trend” in the church will be a movement to de-canonize the Old Testament.

Carlton continues,

Is. 56:3 is a good example of strangers/foreigners joining God’s covenant. Samuel Rutherford also uses Deuteronomy 17:15 as the foundational text of his classic magnum opus on civil government in which he comments, “The king is a relative.” I would also point out that strangers could be circumcised, but were still reckoned apart from the children of Israel, and were not made civil magistrates. The nation of Israel was based upon heredity. Lev. 18:26 is particularly informative because those who keep God’s law and statutes are said to be of the Israelite nation (ethnos) and the strangers (non-Israelites)

---

3 Fox, James (2007) Bureau of Justice Statistics. Homicide Trends in the U.S.: Trends by Race <http://bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/htius.pdf>; FBI 2011 National Gang Threat Assessment. Compiled by the National Drug Intelligence Center, the National Drug Threat Survey, Bureau of Prisons, State Correctional Facilities, and National Gang Intelligence Center <http://info.publicintelligence.net/NGIC-GTA-2011.pdf>; and the raw data itself comes from the FBI’s city by city breakdown of violent crime. The NYPD has its similar figures here: [http://www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/downloads/pdf/analysis\\_and\\_planning/year\\_end\\_2015\\_enforcement\\_report.pdf](http://www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/downloads/pdf/analysis_and_planning/year_end_2015_enforcement_report.pdf). However, there is a trend to make Hispanics “whites” so as to mask the racial nature of crime. This is shown, for example, here: <http://newobserveronline.com/us-government-blames-whites-for-nonwhite-crime-wave-through-deliberate-racial-misclassification/>

4 It is tedious to cite sources, especially when I know my readers will never consult them. But Carlton’s work can be found here: <http://faithandheritage.com/2011/01/a-biblical-defense-of-ethno-nationalism/>  
<http://faithandheritage.com/2012/02/the-law-of-kin-rule/>  
<http://faithandheritage.com/2014/02/kinism-in-the-early-church/#fn-8315-1>

that dwell among them. This is a solid example of how the nation of Israel was considered to be hereditary, not solely covenantal or spiritual.

The civil power is part of God's creation. This is not the same as the modern state. Amateurs in history often cannot make fine (or sometimes, even obtuse) distinctions. The state, the Constitution, the civil power, the crown and the society are all different, but related, objects. Justice is not a political issue if politics is defined as mere campaigns and elections. Nationalism deals exclusively with peoples and the nature of communal standards. It has no immediate relationship to states. The Kurds are a cohesive nation who have never possessed a state.

The Bible treats society as a family. Civil power grows out of the family and is thus part of natural law. One will notice that in 2 Sam. 5:1<sup>5</sup> and 1 Chr. 11:1 the claim to legitimacy is based on ethnic and genetic foundations. This is not the only foundation, but clearly an important one. Carlton and others point out that the nature of political rule is not unlike that of marriage, as even the “flesh and bone” metaphor is used for both.

Nations (ethnic groups) are creations of God and exist at the same level of as families. They should be maintained in their purity no differently than the individual personality or the family. Not until the 1960s in the west has this obvious statement been challenged. Again,

Civil consideration also prevented marriage with people who were Israel's enemies. The law in Deuteronomy 23:1-8 was applied by Ezra and Nehemiah to prevent marriage to those who would seek Israel's harm. The practical reasons for this rule in Deuteronomy 17:15 is obvious. If a stranger governs a nation then he will naturally expropriate the wealth and property of the native people for the benefit of those who are of his own bone and flesh. This applies both to Christians as well as non-Christians since multiple nations will always exist within the Church, even in heaven. There can be exceptions to this rule. God temporarily used Joseph as a wise regent to Pharaoh in Egypt, and King Cyrus' righteous decree allowed the Israelites to return to their homeland under his protection. These are exceptions to the rule and are a clear case of God bringing the best out of a less than ideal situation.

Christ revealed himself as God only within the context of Israelite prophesy, which is why the Presentation feasts to the Temple are so important. When the Holy Spirit descended on Pentecost, how many languages were heard? As many as there were people present. If universalism were the goal, then only one language would have been spoken and the people would have been miraculously granted the ability to understand them. “Multinational” is healthy, it implies nations existing in cooperation. “Cosmopolitanism” is not healthy. It is alienation and spiritual death. It is the extinguishing of culture.

The concept of a national church implies the formerly obvious position that all civic life needs to take place in an ethnic context: one language, one faith, one tradition. No one argued against this until the 1960s. The prophets said the same, adding that the economic foundation of each family must be basically equal (as was done every 50 years at the jubilee, where all debts were canceled). Oligarchy and imperialism are condemned and go hand in hand. Even before the prophets, we read in Deuteronomy:

[Y]ou shall surely set a king over you whom the Lord your God chooses; one from among your brethren you shall set as king over you; you may not set a foreigner over you, who is not your brother (Deut. 17:15).

In New Testament times, St. Cyprian writes:

---

5 You are my brethren, you are my bone and my flesh. Why then are you the last to bring back the king? And say to Amasa, 'Are you not my bone and my flesh?' (2 Sam. 19:12-13).

If it is a source of joy and glory to men to have children like unto themselves – and it is more agreeable to have begotten an offspring than when the remaining progeny responds to the parent with like lineaments – how much greater is the gladness of God the Father, when any one is so spiritually born that in his acts and praises the divine eminence of race [genus] is announced! (The Treatises of Cyprian, p 1012).

The first citation connects brotherhood to co-national (and by implication, fellow Israelite in theology). The second takes for granted the natural order that God has ordained we love those like us before those unlike us. Clearly, we're not speaking of DNA, but all forms of cultural contentedness. This is a rational view.

St. Jerome says:

And the Apostle Paul says, Romans 9:3-4: "I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites." Moreover they are called brethren by kindred who are of one family, that is *πατρία*, which corresponds to the Latin *paternitas*, because from a single root a numerous progeny proceeds. (Jerome, Against Helvidius, paragraph 16).

The nation here is seen as the literal extension of the family. They are kinsmen and brethren because they are of the same nation. Those not in its service are responsible for what happens when its neglected.

VI.

St. John of Kronstadt was both a royalist and nationalist. He blessed the banners of the Union of the Russian People. We hold to his basic view. He writes, just to use one example:

What would you be without a Tsar, O Russians? Your enemies would try to destroy even the very name of Russia, for the guardian and protector of Russia after God is Russia's Sovereign, the Royal Tsar, and without him Russia is not Russia. . . Our current restless and unacknowledged politicians desire a constitutional or republican form of rule in Russia, but they do not understand the history and character of the Russian people, who cannot be without a Tsar, who live only by him, and who, after God and the Heavenly Queen, place their hopes in him alone. Thus let us venerate the Tsar as a ruler given by God for the good of Russia.

Clearly, no "diversity of political opinions" is possible in Russia. Politics and theology are not separable ideas in the sense that theology and justice are not separable. Rejecting this notion is to reject Chalcedon. "Human nature," the last we checked, includes culture, economics, politics and statecraft. This is the very human nature that exists on the right hand of the father today. There is no "diversity" of "political opinions" permitted in Orthodoxy. Including the Old Testament in the canon of Scripture is not an accident. The prophets were deeply political and hence, our vision must have its roots there. Rather than change their views to conform to the church, now, there has been a claim that the Old Testament is not binding on us. Strange, all those patristic commentaries for nothing. There is no heresy they won't commit for the sake of placating the system.

St. Nikolai of Serbia says to the assembled clergy of the Cathedral of Canterbury in England:

You have heard talk of Greater Serbia. I personally think that Serbia can never be greater than in this solemn hour of her supreme suffering, in which all the civilized world in both hemispheres trembles because of her catastrophe and sympathies with her. I personally love my little country just because it is so little; and just because its deeds are greater than its size. I am not sure that I should love it so much should it happen to become

territorially so big as Spain or Italy. But I cannot help it; I must say that our Irridentists in Austro-Hungary are more numerous than our population in Serbia. Eight millions of our Serbo-Croat and Slovene brothers have been looking towards Serbia as towards their Piedmont, waiting their salvation from Serbia, as Alsace-Lorraine is waiting its salvation from France, and being proud of Serbia as all slaves are proud of their free kinsmen. All the slaves from Isonzo to Scutari are groaning under the yoke of an inhuman Austro-Magyar regime, and are singing of Serbia as their redeemer from chains and shame. Little Serbia has been conscious of her great historic task, to liberate and unite all the Southern-Slavs in one independent being; therefore she, with supreme effort, collected all her forces to fulfill her task and her duty, and so to respond to the vital hopes of her brethren.

This is a fairly mild nationalist statement from Nikolai. From his youth as a liberal ecumenist, experience hardened him into a firm Serbian nationalist and traditionalist. Concerning his Serbian nation, Bishop Anastassy (Jevic) writes,

Five centuries our people have been murdered by strangers, never fully free, but never completely enslaved nor alienated from God and their identity. Suffering from every evil invasion from the East and from the West, but the worst from the last fifty years of occupation by those alienated from God and the nation. These are the ungodly and inhumane Communists and neo-communists who ruled with the Western heathens and the Antichrist, of which we, and again, through them, come and this evil, the worst of all (Bishop Atanasije Jevtic. *The Cry of the Serbs of Kosovo and Metohija*. Gračanica, 1999).

Multiculturalism, in its present, ideological sense, has never been preached by the Church. Diversity is in the ethnic churches (Romanian, Serbian, etc). That's more diversity than we can handle. Otherwise, it's a difference in our separate functions and specialties. National churches are the norm. Monarchy as an ideal is a part of Orthodoxy and is not optional.

St. Nikolai of Serbia writes:

Nemanja was a lord; he was also a captive. He waged war against brothers and non-brothers. He fought with Orthodox and heretics. He had a traitor among his own natural brothers. Against the Orthodox Greeks he waged war in defense of his country and his national identity; i.e., in defense of the Serbian name, which the Greeks wanted to drown in Hellenism because of the sameness of faith. Against the Latin and Bogomil heresies he fought in defense of the true and pure faith (Serbian People, 14).

The medieval poetry in both Serbia and Montenegro is loaded with specifically ethnic markers as the foundation for political action. It is the locus for Christian action as it was in under the Old Law though this time, freed from its specific strictures. The spirit, rather than the letter, rules now. And again more generally, St. Nikolai writes,

Serbian patriotism is universally Christian, never narrow and crass chauvinism. Thus could one define the Serbian patriotism of Saint Sava: to put his own household in order and with the rest of his strength and resources to help every people to put its house in order, or: to serve Christ his God in his own land and in the land of his fathers, and insofar as he was able with the remainder to serve Christ his God in other lands also, both near and far, all the way to Russia and Mount Sinai, and even to the ends of the inhabited world. Christian patriotism in universality, and universality in Christian patriotism. The Serbs alone are bearers of this ideal, even to this day realized in large part, and along with the Serbs only the Russians among the members of the Orthodox

family of peoples on earth. Is there anything more salutary for the whole world? (52).

There is one faith and one church. There are many families and peoples. Each come to the faith differently and express its essential truths differently. This is not a matter of opinion, but the very structure of creation. Alienated and culture-less Americans often cannot fathom real, actual identity and recoil in horror at reading about it.

Let us be clear: no Orthodox can accept liberal democracy, capitalism, usury, modern banking, mass production, materialism, mass society, hedonism, Enlightenment-era rights, communism or individualism, just to name a few. These are based on non-Christian and anti-Christian conceptions. They are not compatible with anything the Church teaches. Rejecting these views, together known as “modernism” is essential to our self-centered mentality and the beginning of our repentance. Politically, nationalism is the only coherent alternative to it. Globalism cannot be fought with good intentions. Strong, moral and unified families – and their extension into nations – can effectively fight the regime.

The present rule of global oligarchy was prophesied by St. Seraphim of Sarov, St. Lawrence of Chernigov and many others. Metropolitan Hilarion (Alfeyev) states in the online journal Pravoslavie.ru:

Multiculturalism, so popular in Europe, presupposing not only the equality of all religions but also their absence from the public space, has fully exhausted and discredited itself today. Ideologically Europe has nothing to set against terrorists. It is only a Europe, strong and not ashamed of her roots and her own religious identity, that will be able to oppose fanatics who are so sure of their rightness that they do not spare their own lives to destroy the lives of others (Alfeyev, 2015).

Irrational antisemitism is also condemned. Hatred of Jews as Jews is irrational, though I've yet to come across someone who hates Jews solely for being Jews. They are hated for specific reasons, whether true or false. However, Jewish supremacist ideologies were condemned in the three synods in Russia (starting in 1471) which were aimed at the Judaizers (led by the Karaite Shariya) in Novgorod. These were called under St. Gennadius the Metropolitan with the cooperation of St. Joseph of Volokomansk. It condemned the concepts of Jewish oligarchy, the occult, Zionism and the belief that they are a “chosen people.” Those too frightened to offend Jews also sin grievously. These are not optional opinions, but facts of Church life.

National Socialism, or the political organization of the nation in times of severe stress, is the doctrine of the Old Testament, albeit updated for the modern state. St. Nikolai spoke of Dimitrije Ljotić, the best known Serbian National Socialist: “Dimitrije Ljotić was a statesman, a teacher and a Christian. He was not only a statesman, he was a Christian statesman. . . He is the Minister of Justice as adding a censor to the priest in the church.”

A nation without a strong sense of ideological identity and moral unity is not a society, not a people and is easily dominated by others. The bearers of the purity of the national idea and national logos, by and large, can only be the holy ascetics. These are the soldiers of the idea. From the secluded hermit to the warrior, asceticism is one and the same.

Politics is not campaigns and voting, but the understanding and promotion of the national idea and the Christian faith (as if they can be distinctive). St. John of Kronstadt saw a direct threat to the Russian nation. He said in one of his sermons in 1907: “The Russian realm is unsteady, it is close to disintegration. The anarchists and atheists will impose their will the moment the state is no more. Russia must be cleared of its weeds and the sins that create them.” Only then can morality thrive.

St. John consecrated the banner of the Union of the Russian People as the bearer of the national idea. At his home in May 1908, he hosted a meeting of 49 royalist and nationalist deputies of the Duma. Among the hosts were the Bishop of Kholm Evogius, warning them about the Jews and encouraging their nationalist, royalism and high moral standards. The slogan was “Russia: One and Indivisible.”

In another meeting in Saratov, John said,

The implementation of the work of Christ in today's society more and more complicated, because, on the one hand, people's lives are complicated and, on the other, the enemies of the Church, striving to shake this eternal pillar and ground of the truth, have resorted to a new, more sophisticated methods of struggle. That is why modern pastors, like the builders of the work of Christ on earth, and in addition to the extensive and broad education, need a great caution and firmness and fidelity to his duty to adequately keep the charge entrusted to them by God the flock.

The synodal system established by the Mason, Emperor Peter I of Russia, was a great evil. His open persecution of the Russian church took a century to rebuild. In no way was Peter, nor his “wife” remotely a legitimate tsar. The Time of the *Bironovshchina* (that is, the period of German, Masonic rule in Russia under Lord Ernst Johann von Biron in the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century) showed no functional monarchy or legitimate government. The church was reduced to a shadow of its former self. It was persecuted en masse from the period of Peter I straight until Emperor Paul, receiving a respite only under the government of Elizabeth. The church was restored only with great effort after the death of Catherine II, herself sending many new martyrs to the gallows, St. Arsenius of Rostov chief among them.

Usury, defined as any economic rent, is illegitimate according to natural law and the law of the Church. No one can be a part of the Church while living off these forms of income or arguing that those who do are righteous. The canons condemning this practice are numerous and the church fathers have written whole treatises condemning this sin. The struggle against usury, for some reason, has not the same vehement force as the struggle against ecumenism.

We stand with Metropolitan St. Filaret (Drozdov) in his political views. This includes his condemnation of Freemasonry and all forms of ecumenism (as defined in the 1983 ROCOR Anathema). He states,

The State is a union of free moral beings, united among themselves with the sacrifice of part of their freedom for the preservation and confirmation by the common forces of the law of morality, which constitutes the necessity of their existence. The civil laws are nothing other than interpretations of this law in application to particular cases and guards placed against its violation. . . As heaven is indisputably better than the earth, and the heavenly than the earthly, it is similarly indisputable that the best on earth must be recognized to be that which was built on it in the image of the heavenly, as was said to the God-seer Moses: 'Look thou that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount' (Exodus 25.40). In accordance with this, God established a king on earth in the image of His single rule in the heavens; He arranged for an autocratic king on earth in the image of His almighty power; and He placed an hereditary king on earth in the image of His imperishable Kingdom, which lasts from ages to ages (Metropolitan Filaret. Sermon on the day of his Most Pious Majesty Emperor Nicholas Pavlovich, 1848 edition of his Works, Volume II, pp 24ff).

What is the nature of this “unity?” Sheer will? It must be at a minimum, common language and faith. The “common forces of law and morality” must be accepted by all and thus, all forms of liberal democracy must be rejected. The monarch rules the ethno-nation in the same sense that the father rules over the family. Why would anyone part with their freedom unless it was for a common sense of faith and tradition? The ethno-nation, faith and common culture are assumed, since one cannot talk of a “people,” “society” or “unity” without it.

He writes to the Emperor again:

Russia! You participate in this good more than many kingdoms and peoples. 'Hold on to that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown' (Revelation 3.11). Keep and continue to adorn your radiant crown, ceaselessly struggling to fulfill more perfectly the crown-

giving commandments: 'Fear God, honor the king' (We Peter 2.17). Turning from the well-known to that which has perhaps been less examined and understood in the apostle's word, We direct our attention to that which the apostle, while teaching the fear of God, reverence for the king and obedience to the authorities, at the same time teaches about freedom: 'Submit', he says, 'to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether to the king, as being supreme, or to governors as being sent through him as free'. Submit as free men. Submit, and remain free. . . But how are we more correctly to understand and define freedom? Philosophy teaches that freedom is the capacity without restrictions rationally to choose and do that which is best, and that it is by nature the heritage of every man. What, it would seem, could be more desirable? But this teaching has its light on the summit of the contemplation of human nature, human nature as it should be, while in descending to our experience and actions as they are in reality, it encounters darkness and obstacles (Metropolitan Filaret. Sermon on the day of his Most Pious Majesty Emperor Nicholas Pavlovich, 1848 edition of his Works, Volume II, pp 24ff).

Freedom here is seen as autonomy. If self-interest get in the way of deliberation, then the choice is not free and is not just. It will reach truth only accidentally. Here, freedom has a purpose: it is to deliberate on and bring justice into action. Also, Ivan Kireyevsky, a central figure in 19<sup>th</sup> century Russian theology, contributed mightily to this understanding. We accept both the spirit and the letter here:

True love for the Tsar is united in one indivisible feeling with love for the Fatherland, for lawfulness and for the Holy Orthodox Church. Therefore this love can be magnanimous. And how can one separate in this matter love for the Tsar from the law, the Fatherland and the Church? The law is the will of the Tsar, proclaimed before the whole people; the Fatherland is the best love of his heart; the Holy Orthodox Church is his highest link with the people, it is the most essential basis of his power, the reason for the people's trust in him, the combination of his conscience with the Fatherland, the living junction of the mutual sympathy of the Tsar and the people, the basis of their common prosperity, the source of the blessing of God on him and on the Fatherland (Ivan Kireyevsky. On Our Relation to the Tsar. Moscow, 2002, pp. 51-53 and 62).

The nation, church and crown are all one and the same. Like St. Filaret, he assumes that no one will sacrifice for anything other than his own family. Our freedom is made perfect only when we reach sobornost' the community of believers united in language and faith. There is no other form of unity of value at the political or legal level.

But to love the Tsar separately from Russia means to love an external force, a chance power, but not the Russian Tsar: that is how the Old Ritualist schismatics and Balts love him, who were ready to serve Napoleon with the same devotion when they considered him stronger than Alexander. To love the Tsar and not to venerate the laws, or to break the laws given or confirmed by him under the cover of his trust, under the protection of his power, is to be his enemy under the mask of zeal, it is to undermine his might at the root, to destroy the Fatherland's love for him, to separate the people's concept of him from their concept of justice, order and general well-being – in a word, it is to separate the Tsar in the heart of the people from the very reasons for which Russia wishes to have a Tsar, from those good things in the hope of which she so highly venerates him. Finally, to love him without any relation to the Holy Church as a powerful Tsar, but not as the Orthodox Tsar, is to think that his rule is not the service of God and His Holy Church, but only the rule of the State for secular aims; it is to think that the advantage of the State can be separated from the advantage of Orthodoxy, or even that the Orthodox Church is a means, and not the end of the people's existence as a whole, that the Holy Church can be sometimes a

hindrance and at other times a useful instrument for the Tsar's power (Ivan Kireyevsky. *On Our Relation to the Tsar*. Moscow, 2002, pp. 51-53 and 62).

This is the same view held to by St. John of Kronstadt and the Optina Elders. The Tsar is the monarch of something specific: the people. Not a random collection of egos, but Russia, that chosen group of people who, like Israel before it, err in their political views quite often. Other subject peoples might be part of the realm and traditionally are autonomous as nations.

There is no such thing as a "secular order." All is theological and all is the creation of God either directly or indirectly. Terms like "law" meant something quite different before the 20<sup>th</sup> century. They were never merely written or "passed" by a legislature, but were discovered in historical circumstance that has been arranged by God. There are no accidents at this level. Laws are discovered and clarified, never just written down. Even the use of the phrase "canon law" is improper when uttered by modernists, since "law" has so radically changed its meaning over time. The true sense of law is never arbitrary but derive from human nature, the nation and the church. When the church is taken from the nation, it becomes little more than a set of propositions on paper.

For Orthodoxy is the soul of Russia, the root of the whole of her moral existence, the source of her might and strength, the standard gathering all the different kinds of feelings of her people into one stronghold, the earnest of all her hopes for the future, the treasury of the best memories of the past, her ruling object of worship, her heartfelt love. The people venerates the Tsar as the Church's support; and is so boundlessly devoted to him because it does not separate the Church from the Fatherland (Ivan Kireyevsky. *On Our Relation to the Tsar*. Moscow, 2002, pp. 51-53 and 62).

This differs in no way from the views of Moses and the prophets. The Israelite nation was the ethno-nation, the people, the faith and a way of life. This is the political life of the church. The Church is political to the extent that justice is political. While we eschew campaigns, parties and elections, politics is certainly broader than these. Kireyevsky continues,

All its trust in the Tsar is based on feeling for the Church. It sees in him a faithful director in State affairs only because it knows that he is a brother in the Church, who together with it serves her as the sincere son of the same mother and therefore can be a reliable shield of her external prosperity and independence... He who has not despaired of the destiny of his Fatherland cannot separate love for it from sincere devotion to Orthodoxy. And he who is Orthodox in his convictions cannot not love Russia, as the God-chosen vessel of His Holy Church on earth. Faith in the Church of God and love for Orthodox Russia are neither divided nor distinguished in the soul of the true Russian. Therefore a man holding to another confession cannot love the Russian Tsar except with a love that is harmful for the Tsar and for Russia, a love whose influence of necessity must strive to destroy precisely that which constitutes the very first condition of the mutual love of the Tsar and Russia, the basis of his correct and beneficent rule and the condition of her correct and beneficent construction (Ivan Kireyevsky. *On Our Relation to the Tsar*. Moscow, 2002, pp. 51-53 and 62).

Orthodoxy is inherently ethnic because all thought and social life is. How could the faith even exist outside of a common language and legal tradition? The Roman church forced Latin upon all peoples regardless, creating an alien clerical class radically different from the people. This was rejected by the east. The Petrine state destroyed this, introducing French and German as the languages of the elite. It is easier to drive serfs to an early death if they are seen to be alien to yourself. Ivan Kireyevsky of Optina continues:

Therefore to wish that the Russian government should cease to have the spirit and bear the character of an Orthodox government, but be completely indifferent to the confessions, accepting the spirit of so-called common Christianity, which does not belong to any particular Church and was thought up recently by some unbelieving philosophers and half-believing Protestants – to wish for this would signify for the present time the tearing up of all bonds of love and trust between the government and the people, and for the future, that is, if the government were to hide its indifference to Orthodoxy until it educates the people in the same coldness to its Church – it would produce the complete destruction of the whole fortress of Russia and the annihilation of the whole of her world significance. For for him who knows Russia and her Orthodox Faith, there can be no doubt that she grew up on it and became strong by it, since by it alone is she strong and prosperous (Ivan Kireyevsky. *On Our Relation to the Tsar*. Moscow, 2002, pp. 51-53 and 62).

Nationalism is merely the extended family. It is the ethnic group seen as a legal unit, growing through suffering and pain and seeing itself as a unified entity. Just like our own individuality, it changes and develops over time, but we do not change our names as a result: we are the same person. Those condemning have little understanding of the meaning of these words, and know next to nothing of the immense academic and popular literature on the topic. Their actions are thus arrogant, ignorant, self-aggrandizing, cowardly and hypocritical.

Apparently my detractors are innocent of the fact that the Kollyvades fathers placed national rebirth against Turkish terror and cultural genocide at the heart of their thought. St. Kosmas utters one example out of many,

My work is your work, it is of our faith, of our nation. I have two thoughts. One says for me to bless you and for you to bless me and then for me to get up and go to another place so that others who wait for me might hear me. My other thought tells me, no, don't go, but stay as you did in other villages and complete the remainder of the work because what we have said in three talks was brief. It is like a man who builds a church without a roof. What is left to be said is like that roof. What is the roof? I see our nation which has fallen in many bad ways; these are curses, excommunications, anathemas, oaths, blasphemies and others such as these [of which it is necessary] for Christians to cleanse themselves, to sanctify their villages, and be cleansed in body and soul (Teaching IV).

Condemning the long-standing Islamic-Jewish alliance, the Jewish elite, tiring of denouncing him to the Turks as a “traitor,” finally had him and many of his followers killed. It might be worth mentioning that the patriarch of Constantinople anathematized them in 1775 and excommunicated them in 1776. The constant stream of Jewish denunciations and the threat of a disruption of Phanar-based, simoniac incomes created these false “synodal decrees.”

The Archimandrite John (Shakhovskoy) wrote a brief essay on the USSR as the Germans invaded Stalin's empire. It will be presented at length and it is entitled “The Hour is Near” –

Blood and dirt came in, only leaving blood and dirt behind. The misanthropic doctrine of Marx started this world war. Death is the war cry of Bolshevism. Today or tomorrow will see the free proclamation of the church. Orthodox Russia is being liberated. Before his death in Moscow, the Elder Aristoclius of Athos said “The salvation of Russia will come when the Germans take up arms. . . . It will be necessary to the Russian people go through many more humiliations, but in the end it will become the lamp of faith for the whole world.” Blood, which began to spill on the Russian fields on June 22, 1941, will lead to the blood pumping through the veins of thousands of Russians who will soon be released from all prisons, torture chambers and concentration camps of Soviet Russia. This alone

fills my heart with joy. . . . it is Impossible to imagine the Russian people from the new civil war, urging foreign power to fulfill his destiny. The bloody operation to overthrow the Third International is entrusted to the skillful, scientific and precise German surgeon. Those under the surgeon's knife are sick, not shameful. Every nation has its own qualities and gifts. The operation began, the inevitable suffering it caused international hand created and connected to all the places the Russian people. . . [The German] army, which took its victories across Europe and are stronger than before, will win not only by its arms and principles, but also by the obedience of a higher call, a Providence it imposed over and above any political and economic ideology. Above all human acts rests the sword of the Lord. . . Summer has come. Russian Easter is close ... (The New Word. 27, June 29 1941, Berlin)

This statement was applauded by the Synod Abroad and all Orthodox people in the east at the time. Unfortunately, Hitler lost, and of course, those supporting Hitler were either sent to the camps, were killed outright, or were silenced. Seraphim Lade of the ROCOR was a National Socialist as was Metropolitan Dionysus (at least upon the success German invasion of Poland). The entire Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church at the time praised Hitler's policies and invasion of the USSR, with Polykarp and Nikanor being the most enthusiastic.

Attacking Matthew MH is a clear example of Sergianism. What was his sin? He persecuted the church of Christ out of fear for his own safety. He thought that by backing the USSR, he would be saved and those with him. They would grant him power and possibly, the state would find a place for the church. This is exactly what is happening: fear of persecution means that those actually doing the work of God will be attacked. This is the only reason why he is under attack today. I will not take the prattling, backbiting and gossiping cowards who brought this sort of trouble upon us seriously. You deserve only contempt.

## VII.

Early in the Summer of 2016, MH and his father in law, Matthew Parrot, spoke with Fr. Enoch over some of these issues. They explained themselves in a friendly exchange that was said to have solved these problems. Now, I hear that Fr. Enoch is asking for some sort of a trial. What has changed? Back when he was Gavin Fetter, he praised my work on both American and Russian politics. I've not changed a thing since then. MH agreed wholeheartedly. I see no difference between the two of us. What's changed?

The only thing that I can come up with is that the Eye of Sauron has fallen upon us. In fear, suddenly, several have reacted to this by lashing out. They cite mainstream media publications about people who condemn the mainstream media. Could they be that naive? Since when has the media been nice to us? Or truthful? Truth is not the issue – fear is.

To our detractors: Tell us what you've done. How many have you converted? How have you defended your people from the mass-invasion of aliens? How have you fought usury or globalization? You've done nothing. You're scared. You should be ashamed. You condemn Sergius for preferring collaboration with the CPSU to a slow death in the Gulag, but you cannot stomach being called names on the internet.

At least MH is in good company. The System did the same hatchet job on Solzhenitsyn. Attacks sounding very similar to those on MH can be found everywhere, suggesting they follow a script. For example, “Solzhenitsyn, the West and Nationalism” (1991) by Sephardic Jew M Confino is in an academic journal, but the editorial staff seems to have forgotten to include his citations. It contains the same level of honesty and faithfulness to fact as the attacks on MH do. The New York Sun's “The Limits of Solzhenitsyn” intones:

It is a sad testament to Russia's current mindset that it is Solzhenitsyn the anti-modernist crank who is being remembered, not Solzhenitsyn the towering foe of Soviet barbarism and mendacity. Today, his writing is seen as buttressing the state, not individual freedom.

Works such as "The Red Wheel" series of novels, a tedious account of the end of Imperial Russia and the creation of the USSR, or his last book, written in 2001, entitled "Two Hundred Years Together" on the history of Russian-Jewish coexistence, seems backward, preachy, conservative, unenlightened, at times even anti-Semitic, and smack of Solzhenitsyn's own grim authoritarianism.

Its the same rhetoric, the same dishonesty, the same oversimplification and the same lack of any critical insight are found here as in the attacks on MH. Going up against him would be most unpleasant for you, so you snipe from behind your keyboard. None are suicidal enough to take me on, so this is the sort of thing you do. Now, of course the above was written by Nikita Khrushchev's daughter Nina in 2008 (that fact is not mentioned in her author's bio, which seems a very strange omission), but nonsense like this can be read about Solzhenitsyn all throughout the mainstream press.

I address those specifically bringing these claims:

I firmly believe that this letter will have no impact at all on you, because truth is not driving this. You have no good intentions. You are full of guile. You are cowards, going behind our backs to tattle to the metropolitan; running to the king whining that three are three kids who won't bow to the golden statue of social respectability. Worse, its in an area you know nothing about. Even worse, its not even a theological issue at all. Even worse than that, you've not even read the relevant material from myself or MH. You couldn't have.

You created a problem that would not even have been known had you kept your mouth shut. You knew this. You're not righteous. The sins you've accumulated here are endless: slander, presumption, backbiting, hypocrisy, selective indignation, feigned outrage, lying, and double mindedness, just for a start. I personally am aware of my long list of sins and problems, but I recognize and fight them. You think your sins are virtues.

Threatening to leave, is childish, playground behavior. Its a threat of a spoiled child hearing the term "no" for the first time. This gets even worse: you've put the metropolitan in a terrible position, forcing him to choose between myself, Fr. Enoch and the growth of the church. You've done this after he's suffered the death of Fr. Brendan and Fr. Paisius and is currently worried about health issues. He's also worried about financial problems atop it all. Of course, you knew this too and yet issued your childish threat anyway. If he develops further health problems, I will hold you responsible. MRJ