

The Deliberate Absurdity of Patriarch Bartholomew:
The Dionysian Consolidation of
Masonic Control at the Phanar

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Text of Radio Lecture/Broadcast
Johnstown, PA
August 29 2018

I.

This lengthy and unwieldy title contains several interlocking concepts this paper will explain in detail, though, true to the target, with plenty of mockery and humor. The condition of the “New Orthodox Church,” or “World Orthodoxy” is in such a theological state that humor is the only way to deal with it. Consider it an intellectual defense mechanism. Objective analysis will give them a certain legitimacy to the subject that I don't want to provide. To parody these men is simple, largely because they are living parodies.

The Dionysian is irrational, feminine and sexual. It simply imposes rule from an invented foundation organized and enforced by violence and threats only. The result is aboulia, or a pathological lethargy by the victims that derives from the belief that there's nothing worth fighting for. It's a depressive resignation. This is what both Rome and Constantinople stand for today.

When even a handful of essays and speeches from these two characters is read, quickly, the scales fall from the eyes if the reader is properly disposed. Communion with these two can exist only on Dionysian grounds. That is, amnesiac, non-cognitive commitment and Janus-faced irrationality. Today, all elite powers have this as a “foundation.” It is not the work of the archetypal court jester because he speaks the truth. This role falls to me. No, these are the emperors who are naked and love the reality that no one will say anything. It is this fact that creates aboulia. To the New Orthodox, Lutherans are more Orthodox than their own traditionalists. These absurdities are the result of the Dionysian New Church reinvention of theology and canon law.

Many years ago, for eight years, “Bishop Bartholomew” (Dimitrios Arhondonis) was the vice president for the World Council of Churches' (WCC) Faith and Order Commission. Their rejection of Christ as the sole savior of the world is well known. To be an active member in this group is to tacitly accept this false but fashionable “theology.”

Dimitrios, from 1963 to 1968, began his graduate studies at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, the Ecumenical Institute of Bossey in Switzerland and the Ludwig Maximilians University of Munich. To add insult to injury, his doctoral research was on the Canon Law. Before serving as bishop, he became a visiting professor at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. Therefore, his education and professional practice is based on the ecumenical movement, financed by it, as well as the Roman Catholic church, where he both studied and worked.

Prior to the Nikonian Schism in Russia, such men were forced into a monastery before taking any official positions to remove any stain of Latinism from their minds. Further, that he was never a monastic serving in a monastery gives a clue as to his condition today. Technically, of course, all bishops must be monks, and usually Abbots of important monasteries to train them

in administration and ensure the strictest devotion to doctrine. That few bishops are taken from monasteries today is connected to the decline in their doctrinal purity.

II.

Today, he sits on the board of the Rockefeller-financed Elijah Interfaith Institute. This is not named for the prophet of course, though you're meant to think that. Rather, it is a Masonic, theosophist organization officially under UNESCO, but is quite independent from it. It is mostly a Jewish organization seeking ecumenical contacts with others.

Recently, the Jewish group loudly denounced Rabbi Yitzhak Shapira's book *Torat Hamelekh* where he, true to the Talmud, says that the *goyim* exist only to serve Jewry at the last times, when Judaism will be formally superior over the whole earth. Yet, all Jewish religious books have said this since the Talmud itself. The authors of this "condemnation" are more than well aware of this. We're supposed to say "see, they're not *those* kinds of Jews," but this is vitiated by the fact that they've not rejected the Talmud from which Shapira's quotes derive. Its typical double-speak.

In a letter signed by Bartholomew, among others, the Institute pompously states:

We are working together under the aegis of the Elijah Interfaith Institute, to bring to light teachings of Judaism that cohere to this worldview. Love of one's own group should not be equated with the hatred of others. Israel's calling is harmonious with the well-being of all humanity (Institute, 2010).

Now, this is precisely what the patriarch, this institute and the left in general has been saying for decades. When whites, Russians or Orthodox are nationalists, it is assumed to be "hateful to others." Only Jews get to be nationalists who's exclusivity is not inherently anti-"other." The Institute picked on an easy target who has written a book few can read (its in Hebrew) and piously condemned its "racism." At the same time, they state that Judaism alone has the right to be exclusive, just that they cannot loudly speak of their state to others. The crux, so to speak, of the matter is here:

We have been collaborating on a project of developing a contemporary Jewish approach to other religions, that would make our students and communities aware of the dangers inherent in such extremist views in our tradition, and that would inspire a broader view of Judaism, its ethical task and its vision for humanity (Institute, 2010).

Note the Masonic and Talmudic wordplay. It's not that the idea is false, its just that holding it with such vehemence is "dangerous" to Jewry. What this says is that they indeed all believe that gentiles are to be ruled, but yelling this from the housetops is dangerous at this time. Giving legitimacy to these views, they say. "Our scholars stand ready to debate the views under discussion." Yet they hold that nationalists and revisionists are "beyond debate."

In footnote 3, we read a very significant statement:

We are painfully aware that such problematic theoretical teachings can easily become transformed into practical guidelines for action, as witnessed by horrifying acts such as the Hebron massacre by Goldstein in 1994. We also recall

some tragic lessons of our history, and the actions of Israel's enemies in the past century, applying a perverted logic that we should not replicate within Jewish teaching. For example, the right to kill children lest they grow up to threaten us was cited by Otto Ohlendorf of the German Army Einsatzgruppe C at his trial, to justify his unit's shooting of tens or hundreds of thousands of Jewish children among the more than million Jews murdered by the shooting squads in Eastern Europe in 1941-1942 (Footnote 3, Institute, 2010).

Here, the absurd testimony of Otto Ohlendorf is used to justify and "explain" the "racism" of the Rabbi in Israel. This is a strange and arcane argument. This is an obscure event to reference and, for that reason, is suspicious. Himmler made it clear in instructions to the *Einsatzgruppe* that Jews were to be put to work and, of course, children were never harmed. These stories largely come from the Soviets covering up their own crimes. He never stated these things. No orders of this type have ever been provided or proved.

Lt. Col. Haensch of the SS who served with Ohlendorf denied his testimony altogether. He testified that no orders like that were ever given and "Jews" as such were never mentioned at all. Executions occurred all the time, but the starving and dying German army in the USSR was not about to waste ammunition, fuel and time by killing children. Very few men could commit such an act regardless.

The *Sonderkommando* units executed a verified 60 men during the period that Ohlendorf mentions. Ohlendorf of course, like so many others, had been promised leniency in exchange for testimony. Liberal historian Kershaw wrote:

In the Einsatzgruppen Trial the former Head of Einsatzgruppe D was able to get his co-defendants to submit to a line of defense put forward by him with the suggestion that if one had, from the very beginning, carried out the extermination operations against the Jews on 'order of the Fuhrer,' one could count upon a more lenient sentence (Wear, 2010).

The Jewish Chief Prosecutor of the *Einsatzgruppen* (C and D) trial, Benjamin Ferencz, said

You know how I got witness statements? I'd go into a village where, say, an American pilot had parachuted and been beaten to death and line everyone one up against the wall. Then I'd say, "Anyone who lies will be shot on the spot." It never occurred to me that statements taken under duress would be invalid (Wear, 2010).

Why would he even say this? It is a manifestation of their power. Its the same reason why its referenced in this footnote. They can admit the trials were a fraud and have nothing happen as a result. This is why its mentioned in footnote 3. The historical argument here is important in that they are comparing an atrocity that occurred in front of many witnesses, the Goldstein massacre, to an obscure one that never happened. The point was to justify what the likes of Goldstein did because it was from the trauma he never experienced from an atrocity that never occurred. The writers affirm a fictional world in order to justify the very act they condemn.

Ohlendorf was tortured before his testimony. By the time he actually testified in 1948, long after the main trials were over, he was vehement that he never said such things and what he

did say was obtained under torture. This, of course, is perfectly valid treatment for the *goyim*. He also mentioned the “gas van” idea, where allegedly, vans containing poison gas would go to Jewish settlements and waste gas, energy and manpower – all in critically short supply – to gas them for no reason. Ohlendorf said that such killing were from “rumors” only. The authors of this stupid statement are aware of this.

Finally, the letter states: “We recognize that there are voices in our tradition that have lost sight of these [sic] great principles, because of the unspeakable suffering that our people have undergone throughout history.” In other words, the evils perpetrated by the Jews are not evils. They are justified by the Patriarch as well as Judaism in general. This is the sort of grovelling that this “scholar” thinks is part of Orthodoxy.

Have you ever heard a Jew saying “Ukrainian nationalism is bad, but we must understand the role of Jews in Poland and the USSR as precipitating factors?” This footnote is here because it justifies the views in question, but also says they are problematic as guides for action, not that they are false.

Why do I mention this? Why do I explain the details of this myth, mentioned only in a footnote in one letter? The real question is why do *they* mention it? It is classically Dionysian since it is based on power and command, not thought. Of all the invented atrocities of the Germans in a war for their very existence, why zero in on this? Largely because it was obtained by torture and was considered a lie even by Jewish and mainstream historians (of which I am neither).

It is an occult way to justify the book's theses they are allegedly condemning. Because it is seen as fiction by most, they are showing their power in controlling the narrative and their ability to shape reality to their whims. That the information was provided under torture and with promises of lenient treatment show what they think a “truth” is. This is why they reference a very obscure example of “atrocities” against Jews. Truth and Jewish power are one in the same.

This issue goes to the heart of Bartholomew's character and political allegiances. The Orthodox of the world were pro-Hitler until it became impossible to be such. His own Greeks, generally, were as well. It was Mussolini they disliked, and with good reason. Letters like this and many others are the political manifestation of his liturgical and ecclesiastical revolution. It's the weaving of a make-believe world so their power will have the facade of Apollonian reason.

III.

Another example of this Talmudic double-speak and myth-making is the almost comical matter of the attempted “assassination” of Bartholomew. In order to gain sympathy, Israelis created an “assassination plot” with Turkey meant to coincide with the 560th anniversary of the May 29th conquest of Constantinople by the Turks. They do not explain how they could possibly know the inner workings of their minds. Allegedly, this operation and assassination is from a cabal of Turkish officers who want to destroy Turkey by isolating it from everyone for no obvious reason. They seek, or so the theory goes, to turn Turkey into a pariah.

It is highly doubtful that a Muslim group or the Turkish secular military planned this, since Bartholomew has shown nothing but deference to Turkish nationalism and Islamic movements throughout his career. Bartholomew served in the Turkish army from 1961 to 1965 and is a Turkish citizen. The only nationalism he opposes is Orthodox.

It was almost certainly a Mossad operation used to implicate Israel's enemies and draw Greece and Israel closer together. Turkey is a secular Islamic state with the second largest army in NATO. What if Islamic fundamentalists or militarists took over? What would become of Israel

then? Coups are an important part of Turkish history. Setting Greece and the west against Turkey would be an ideal solution. It would place Tel Aviv as kingmakers in Turkish politics and possibly decimate this potential threat.

It might have also been designed to purge problematic officers from the immense and fearsome Turkish army. No better explanation has been offered. A Turkish newspaper wrote:

The plot to kill Bartholomew is thought to be part of the Cage Operation Action Plan, a subversive plot allegedly devised by military officers that sought to undermine the government through the assassination of non-Muslims and other acts of terror. The Cage plan was allegedly drawn up on the orders of Ergenekon. The Cage plan documents specifically refer to the killings of Armenian-Turkish journalist Hrant Dink, Catholic priest Father Andrea Santoro and three Christians in Malatya as an “operation” (OCP, 2011).

The man detained by the Turks was a drifter, a lifelong criminal, a man utterly incapable of carrying out such a crime. These operations often use these patsies, usually with long criminal records, because they can be killed with impunity later. No one misses them and few can come forward with evidence in their favor. They are also easy to manipulate.

This is classic Mossad, not Turkey. The Turks never sought to kill Makarios III in Cyprus, but a cabal existed to murder a pro-Islamic bishop? Nothing, as usual, adds up. Assassinations are politically charged events and are almost always means of manipulating the population. It is a traumatic event that makes those witnessing it suggestible. It creates the chaos from which the adepts can extract a new order.

They are rarely done with the sole purpose to actually kill anyone (and those blamed are almost never involved), since those people are easily replaced by men far more militant. It makes no sense from the terrorist's point of view. A nationalist Turk would have no reason to eliminate Bartholomew, invigorate Greek and Orthodox nationalism, create sympathy for him and his mission, and detach Turkey from NATO.

Bartholomew is well aware of what the 1981 assassination attempt on Pope John Paul II did for his papacy. Note that the assassin there was too a Turk. It immediately raised his stock in the world's media and hoped galvanize Poland's Catholics into effective action. There too, the rationale for his attempt was very shaky and it has yet to be solved. Allegedly, the Bulgarian KGB and, yet again, the Turks were both involved.

A small army of journalists the world over are convinced that the would-be assassin, Mehmet Ali Agca, had nothing to do with it. He also had no obvious political or religious beliefs. It boosted Catholic respect for the Fatima apparitions (it occurred on that feast day) and permitted the pope to claim that this attempt was the “Third Secret” of Fatima. It was absolutely invaluable to his papacy.

In 2010, Agca said that Cardinal Agostino Casaroli was at the root of it and that it was an internal, Vatican affair. His story about Bulgarian involvement made no sense, knowing full well that the Party in Poland would be in serious trouble as a result of the pope's murder by a communist cabal. The Casaroli connection at least makes some sense, since assassinating the pope would be a disaster for his enemies.

If Casaroli were involved, it would only be to promote John Paul. Casaroli was anti-communist and applauded this pope's election due to its likely effect on Poland. If he was behind it, it was to increase his popularity, like all assassination attempts do. The Bulgarian story, first

uttered by Agca himself, was that the KGB in Sophia, working with former Soviet intelligence chief Yuri Andropov, needed this pope dead. In a trip to Bulgaria, the pope condemned this theory.

Regardless, to murder Bartholomew would be a disaster for his enemies too, diplomatically speaking. Like the attempt on John Paul, it would make his popularity soar and make Turkey look like a terror state. So who benefits? Speaking as if nothing had happened, he intoned:

“When the Cage plan was revealed, we thought the raid could be part of that plan,” [the Patriarch] said. “At the time we thought that they were just trying to scare us.” Patriarch Bartholomew said he is grateful to the security forces who uncovered the “dark plans.” “It is a very satisfactory development that the police and prosecutors have been revealing those dark plans so those responsible can be captured and tried” (Compass, 2009).

This is awfully articulate language from a man in fear. Here, he is blatantly unafraid, fully knowing this plan doesn't exist. He added no security to his entourage, proving he knew this wasn't a real threat. What “security forces” is he not identifying? The Turkish army of course, since they were protecting a Turkish citizen and soldier. He's confessing that the plan is a fake in his own typically Masonic double-speak language. He thanks the Turkish army for saving him from the Turkish army of which he was a member.

Sledgehammer is a suspected coup plot allegedly devised in 2003 at a military gathering. According to the plan, the military was to systematically foment chaos in society through violent acts, among which were planned bomb attacks on the Fatih and Beyazıt mosques in İstanbul. The plot allegedly sought to undermine the government and lay the groundwork for a military takeover (OCP, 2011).

But the chaos wouldn't benefit them. When it doesn't make sense, it's usually not true. Using names like “Cage” and “Sledgehammer” are meant to inflame the population and create mental chaos and fear. No, the “operation” was not the cause, but the news of the operation was the purpose. This was 2013. Today, no further information has been given as to this “assassination,” proving it is a fraud. What happened to it? No one knows. Do conspiracies like this just fall apart with no one noticing or taking credit? Does anything here make sense?

Not a single member of the military was ever arrested, but this same military was quick to defend the patriarch. Apparently, the “security forces” destroyed this “operation” that it itself was allegedly hatching, because the world has heard nothing more of it.

It was a fake assassination attempt to draw more attention to a man who few listen to. He believes he deserves a greater audience and a broader stage. He's complained about this many times. His speeches at the UN are attended by no one. Like all he does, this too failed and its obvious fakery is long forgotten. Even his fraud falls on deaf ears. Only Bartholomew benefits from this non-existent “operation,” and thus, it is fake by this fact alone.

IV.

Silly games like this show the nature of the Phanar and are the main weapon for the Dionysian idea. Bartholomew's patriarchate has completed the Masonic takeover of the

“Ecumenical Patriarchate.” Many are of the impression that his See is large and powerful. While it certainly has cash, it has few parishes. Most of its bishops are titular (and hence uncanonical) usually named for underwater or otherwise long-gone cities.

Under Demetrius, his predecessor, the policy of communing Roman Catholics became official. He added the pope's name to the diptychs in 1972, causing a muted but very real response and the True Orthodox (TOC) grew, stymied only by their own internal schisms. While Bartholomew is deeply Masonic, there is little evidence he is an official member of the Lodge. While the Phanar is itself one large Lodge, evidence for Bartholomew's membership is almost zero. Most of his 20th century predecessors were members, however. He couldn't be made a bishop without at least tacit acceptance. He's Masonic without being a Mason.

His doctrinal errors are worse than his political and personal foibles. The anathemas of the last four Ecumenical Synods against Monophysites were declared demonic and rejected. In November of 1998, a papal delegation visited the Phanar. It was then that Bartholomew gave what might be his most outrageous quote. Referring to those who anathematized the pope of Rome and the Monophysites, he opined, in this insane quote:

Those of our forefathers from whom we inherited this separation were the unfortunate victims of the serpent who is the origin of all evils; they are already in the hands of God, the righteous judge. . . And these men, being the causes for the schism, are now in the hands of God, the righteous judge (Azkoul, 2017).

The fathers of the church were not only wrong, they are damned. This is the “pope” of the Orthodox who has taken an oath to uphold just those he says were possessed at the time they made their decisions. He now officially rejects Chalcedon and all that come after. The Orthodox the world over are so ignorant and alienated that they refuse to split with this obvious and blatant heretic and schismatic.

A major part of his mission is to institutionalize communion between Rome and New Rome. One of the strangest aspects of this aspect of the ecumenical agenda is that the Church of Rome bears no resemblance to the Catholic world of just 50 years ago. Its liturgical tradition has been thrown out entirely and made illegal starting in 1971 and only permitted in the 1990s. Yet the Catholic Council of Trent, canon VII says “If any one saith, that the ceremonies, vestments, and outward signs, which the Catholic Church makes use of in the celebration of masses, are incentives to impiety, rather than offices of piety; let him be anathema.”

What replaced the service of Trent is a “mass” that's largely a Protestant inspired service written by a committee in 1969-1970. The main force behind the rewrite was “Archbishop” Annibale Bugnini, a high ranking Freemason with the Masonic name “Buan.” Like all liberal “reformers,” Paul VI and Buan lied and stated that his “new mass” comes from mysterious and unnamed “ancient traditions.”

Similarly, when the American church of Antioch eliminated fasting from Eastern Week to the Ascension, they claimed “ancient sources” that no one can seem to find. In fact, it is a rare ecumenical or liberal reform that is not claimed to be some “ancient tradition,” the documents of which are never found.

The church of Rome today has no liturgy to speak of at all, since it is invented anew as the years go by at the parish level. It is a “permanent revolution” begun precisely at the same time as the papacy reversed itself on the Jewish issue. That the new mass was introduced on the First Day of Passover is most certainly significant.

Many former Catholics can attest to this. This former altar boy saw it first hand. Only the Uniates retain any sort of liturgical tradition, taken as free-riders from Orthodoxy. The ancient Latin mass is one of the most beautiful objects in history, but this was banned for decades and today, is only heard when performed by societies that specialize in this service.

The church with which they seek full communion isn't even Catholic! The present "pope," Francis, rejects his own church and his own office, much like Bartholomew. Like all the popes in Bartholomew's long reign as Patriarch, they are close personal friends. "Pope" Frank says, concerning homosexuals,

If a person is gay and seeks the Lord and has good will, who am I to judge that person? The Catechism of the Catholic Church explains this point beautifully but says, wait a moment, how does it say, it says, these persons must never be marginalized and 'they must be integrated into society.' The problem is not that one has this tendency; no, we must be brothers, this is the first matter (BBC Video, 2013).

A man who stuffs male fecal matter into another man cannot have a "good will," Frank, they are mentally ill freaks. The false pope pretends that, while Catholic traditionalists and monarchists are evil, freaks like homosexuals are good Catholics, better even. For both Romes, the only people out of the church are their most sensitive and pious members.

Frank was and is rewarded with exaggerated positive media coverage. He knows homosexuals are never "marginalized." If they were, he wouldn't bother to speak of them. They aren't "integrated" into society, they *are* society. Every word this religious politician says is dripping with ill will and contempt. It can be described in no neutral terms. He doesn't deserve them.

Of course, he cannot believe in Hell given what he says elsewhere. About his enemies, he says,

They are not punished, those who repent obtain the forgiveness of God and enter the rank of souls who contemplate him, but those who do not repent and cannot therefore be forgiven disappear. There is no hell, there is the disappearance of sinful souls (Novus Ordo Watch 2013).

This doctrine was invented on the spot. There might well be some truth in the soul's "death," but here, he is placing the whole weight of his papacy behind that idea. Even if there is some truth to it, Frank's invented version removes it. His view is that, not that these souls die due to sin, but that this is the only way that sin is punished. This is because there is no sin except "racism" and "homophobia."

Christ spoke of Hell far more than he spoke of heaven. Frank's aware of this. The entire Gospel is denied and yet, millions (or perhaps hundreds of thousands today) follow his man as an actual "bishop" of some church. Frank realizes he's absurd and yet, so long as the press showers him with awards, he remains happy. The press more or less ignores Bartholomew.

We can mock Frank for his rank immorality and illogic, but the mockery stops on the Jewish issue. Perhaps worst of all, the papacy since John Paul II, has believed Talmudic Judaism to represent the "chosen people" of God, that is, by virtue of their race, Jews exist as superior to all others, as the Talmud itself intones. Frank wrote back in 2011:

There is a phrase from the Second Vatican Council that is essential: it says that God showed Himself to all men and rescues, first of all, the Chosen People. Since God is faithful to His promises, He did not reject them. The Church officially recognizes that the People of Israel continue to be the Chosen People. Nowhere does it say: “You lost the game, now it is our turn.” It is a recognition of the People of Israel. That, I think, is the most courageous thing from Vatican II on the subject. (Bergoglio and Skorpa, 2011: 188)

It takes no “courage” to take orders from the most powerful tribe in global history. It would only take courage to defy them. For Frank, this is defying God himself. That the Old Testament Israelites are even remotely the Jews of today takes such a leap of faith that only the most ignorant can believe it. They would be massively inbred. Furthermore, that this 4000 year old race maintains the exact same theology as the prophets is equally absurd. The Talmud clearly condemns the prophets. What the church fathers – to a man – condemned in Judaism Frank and Bart have resuscitated. They curry favor with the same Jews who then turn around and slander the church to the world.

Jews, that is, followers of the Talmud, Frank says, are the “Chosen People” and thus, superior to Christians. The latter are inferior by virtue of not being “Chosen.” In this language, he denies Christianity, the Trinity and the Prophets who condemned just these men. Frank and Bart know exactly what they mean, yet the average “church intellectual” remains benighted, though I've come to think, largely on purpose.

While Frank gets positive coverage, the Jewish media have harped on the “abuse” stories on the priesthood. Not a single person has asked how many of these priests have been convicted of anything. The answer is about five percent out of many thousands of accused. Maybe ten percent have been arrested, meaning that 90 percent of these accused priests didn't show even perfunctory probable cause. Many are dead today. While the [database](#) of every accused priest since the 1950s is available for free, no one has bothered to look at it.

Those convicted, to a man, have been treated harshly by the diocese long before their conviction, since these men are often quite sloppy and have priors. When the DA, aware that his political career would be made with a high profile conviction like this, cannot even arrest the suspect, you know they must be innocent or the most brilliant criminal masterminds since Lex Luthor.

These men are a lot of things, but stupid is not one. They know that popular ignorance is so intense that they can say anything is “Christian” and people will believe it. Few good teachers remain, thus people actually argue that adherence to an institution, rather than doctrine, are what makes a “Christian.”

In “not rejecting” the Jews, they must have the truth. Therefore, to be a good Catholic, one must follow this hypothetical model of what he thinks a “Jew” is. Over and over, both the canons and the New Testament, not to mention the old, say “You lost the game, now it is our turn.” That this is reduced to a game speaks volumes. That he needs to put it in such flippant language likewise. All the fathers claimed that the church was “Israel.” These two heretics deny it with vehemence. Only the Talmud is Israel.

Yet, the hierarchs of “World Orthodoxy” cooperate with both men and sign “joint declarations” with them. Clergy in World Orthodoxy will defend them all, often doing as much inventing as these politicians do. Frank said on January 17, 2016, in a talk greeting the Jewish

community in the Synagogue in Rome:

Dear Brothers and Sisters,

I am happy to be here today with you in this Great Synagogue. Our relationship is very close to my heart. Back in Buenos Aires I used to go to the synagogues and meet with the communities gathered there. *I would follow the Jewish festivals and commemorations and give thanks to the Lord, who gives us life and who accompanies us over the course of history.* Over time, a spiritual bond has been formed, fostering an authentic relationship of friendship and inspiring a common commitment. In interreligious dialogue it is fundamental that we encounter each other as brothers and sisters before our Creator and that we praise him; and that we respect and appreciate each other, and try to cooperate. And in the Jewish-Christian dialogue there is a unique and particular bond, by virtue of the Jewish roots of Christianity: Jews and Christians must therefore consider themselves brothers, united in the same God and by a rich common spiritual patrimony (Francis, Vatican Releases, 2016, emphasis mine).

Only a tiny minority of Jews even believe in God. He knows this, as does Bartholomew. It is strange that he “follows” Jewish festivals and prays accordingly. The pope of Rome rejects his own church and the papacy itself, but follows the Jewish calendar that most Jews ignore. A spiritual bond cannot exist with a body that rejects the spirit entirely.

He states plainly here that “dialogue” cannot exist until the Christians, Orthodox or Catholic, reject the truth. To be a “brother” is not to be a man we like hanging around with, its a man with whom we are in full spiritual communion. Therefore, Francis states here that we must assume the truth of the Jewish “faith” before we can even begin talking to them. The “dialogue,” an irritating buzz word, of course, like all else here, is a lie. There can be no “dialogue” with the Chosen People. Rather, it is an anti-Christian monologue. The devil, literally in this case, is always in the details.

Furthermore, he is quite well aware that Christianity does not derive from what he thinks Judaism is. Modern Judaism is based on the Talmud and the Zohar, not the first five books of the Old Testament. Now, generally, both ecumenical leaders reject the Old Testament in almost all respects. Therefore, even if the Jews did care about it, Francis could not mean this literally. The Talmud, as has been well established, hurls insult after insult onto Christ, Mary and the church he founded. His scholars in the Vatican know this in detail.

Making the typical error of the ecumenist, he assumes that the “god” of Judaism is the God of Christianity. Does his theoretical Jewish “faith” accept God in Trinity? Of course not. Therefore, this is a very sneaky way of denying the Trinity and, since it does not matter how God is conceived, of God himself.

The implication here is that God has never revealed himself and this “religion stuff” is all a human invention. He's talking about two powerful social institutions, not the revelation of God. Even more, if someone is alienated enough to believe this bile, then they are most certainly part of the anti-Christian, Jewish patrimony he speaks of. In a way, he speaks the truth, but only if the true meaning of his words is properly understood.

V.

So what is ecumenism? Why has it divided the church with such vehemence? Part of the

problem is the constant double-talk of court theologians and hierarchs. Only rarely will we hear a non-ambiguous statement on the matter, especially from Russian or American bishops. One example is here: Bartholomew shows his true colors, illogic and deliberate wordplay:

We do not hold that exclusivity means judgment or exclusion. The idea that membership in a visible Church organization is requisite for membership in heaven is based on a false paradigm – that we somehow parallel the kingdom of God in this world. The kingdom is not an exterior reality, rather it is interior, at least until the end of time (OP, 2013).

Yes, he said – and this is a man who speaks almost ten languages – that “exclusivity doesn't mean exclusion.” This is a mockery of language. It says that both men are profoundly Masonic and Talmudist, since this is precisely the language employed by these two infernal institutions. They use language in a manipulative way, defining terms as they please, using a well known word like “exclusion” that has a definite connotation and altering its meaning in context. Only adepts are aware of the truth. Their agenda cannot be justified with logic, thus the Dionysian becomes more and more relevant.

The denial that the City of God exists on earth is a denial of his own church, his own position and his own See. Again sneaking this ideology in using language without literalness, he says that the church is not this City. Here, the City of God exists only in an ecumenical gathering under the control of Francis and himself, that is, if he's not presently dodging bullets from would-be assassins.

Like Francis in Rome, the Patriarch denies his own church:

In reference to this subject, we remind all that every form of proselytism. . . is absolutely condemned by the Orthodox. Proselytism, practiced in nations already Christian, and in many cases even Orthodox, sometimes through material enticement and sometimes by various forms of violence, poisons the relations among Christians and destroys the road towards their unity (Bartholomew, 2009: 19).

Nowhere in the canons is proselytism condemned, it is mandated. He's just making it up as if he is the “pope” of Orthodoxy, which he aspires to be. There was never any demand for this. There was no mass uprising against the canons. It was imposed from above and is an error forced onto the church by bishops. As always, they write in faux-academic language in order to sneak this by the common parishioner.

That Kyrill in Russia backs this nonsense and supports Francis shows he's still not quite over the Soviet agenda. The church that has just thrown off the shackles – literally – of enforced atheism then preaches that it contains no real truth. The Ecumenical Patriarch denies his own church further:

We now clearly realize and understand that our two families [Orthodox and Monophysites] have always loyally guarded the same and authentic Christological Orthodox faith, and have maintained uninterrupted the apostolic tradition although they may have used the Christological terms in a different manner. It is that common faith and that continual loyalty to the apostolic tradition which must be

the basis of our unity and communion. . . . The two families accept that all the anathemas and the condemnations of the past which kept us divided must be lifted by the Churches so that the last obstacle to full unity and communion of our two families can be removed by the grace and the power of God. The two families accept that the lifting of the anathemas and the condemnations will be based on the fact that the Councils and the fathers previously anathematized or condemned were not heretics (Episkesis, 446).

The errors here abound. He's already denied Chalcedon and all the synods that accept it. The claim that it was only terminology that divided the two churches forgets that all the 4th century participants in this controversy spoke Greek. There was no question as to the language. That they are both loyal to the "same apostolic tradition" is a formal fallacy that assumes the consequent. This is what he is trying to argue and thus, cannot be in the argument itself. This poor reasoning is the foundation of their intercomunion.

The Dionysian element here is that command produces right, not a natural system of meaning. It is the ultimate inorganic, emotional imposition of alien law rather than ancient custom. This doesn't qualify as heresy, since it rejects any belief at all. It can't be said to be false because it rejects those very categories! Categories are foreign to the Dionysian. Ultimately, it implies that only the Ecumenical Patriarchate can properly interpret the canons and there is no limit to that power.

Brothers and sisters, the watchword of the Holy Orthodox Church today is unity. We are learning unity within our own house; we must pursue unity with all the children of God. . . Roman Catholics and Orthodox, Protestants and Jews, Muslims and Hindus, Buddhists and Confucians: the time has come not only for rapprochement, but also for an alliance and joint effort. We have within our grasp the vision of the Psalmist: "Behold, how good and how pleasing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" We pledge to you today that the Orthodox Christian Church will do everything in her power to fulfill that vision (Address, 1994).

At no time in Christian history has "unity" been a "watchword," that is, a word that defines a particular movement or person. Bartholomew has no power or authority to decide which trendy new concept is the "watchword" of a church he demonstrably dislikes. As if to prove my Dionysian thesis, his knowledge of comparative religion is poor. Buddhism and Confucianism are not even religions and Hinduism is only vaguely one. Judaism largely rejects God.

Jews, of course, are not required to denounce their Talmud, it is celebrated. Only the Orthodox are asked to denounce their own faith. That the "watchword" is the rejection of canonical boundaries is an open rejection of the truth couched in pseudo-intellectual language. This is an open denial of truth claims as such and is therefore manifestly Dionysian.

To mockingly quote the psalmist was done tongue in cheek. If any society rejected Bart's agenda, it was ancient Israel. The prophets he also rejects were extreme adherents to the old law that condemned even the slightest deviation as adultery. What then, would they say about him?

VI.

So much on the Phanar's ecumenism and corruption has already been written in English, Russian and Greek. I can offer little more. These are a few scattered thoughts about the present

Patriarch and his relationship to the present pope. Both men are de facto deposed by their own churches for their cavalier attitude toward doctrine. Nothing can be more obvious than the fact that these men are acting more or less under orders. They're both ingratiating themselves with the present power structure for the sake of positive media treatment.

In this regard, the pope's been more successful than Bartholomew, though that's because Orthodox remains obscure in the west. It is also clear that he envies Frank for his popularity, though its a popularity with atheists, liberals and elites. These are the very last group of people the Scriptures say favor should be carried with. The very last people.

What they all have in common is an obsession with administration, power and fiat. They are Dionysian because the Apollonian is thinking according to a cognitive pattern that is found in natural law or some other organic system. The Dionysian is either a top-down demand or a bottom-up mob. Either way, it is neither rational nor true. Worse, it rejects the concept of "the true" regardless. For both men, bishops are identical with the church, while the people in church are meaningless, ecclesiastically speaking. Everything seems to be about manipulation, force, fraud and condescension. None of these "reforms" are from any organic conception of history, but are artificially imposed onto an unwilling and often confused population.

Bibliography

Bartholomew I, Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople (1994) Address to the VI World Assembly of Religion and Peace, Riva del Garda, Italy

Bartholomew I, Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople (1990) Joint Declaration of the III Meeting of the Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches Episkesis, 446

Bartholomew I, Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople (2009) Cosmic Grace, Humble Prayer: The Ecological Vision of the Green Patriarch Bartholomew I. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing

Pseudo / World Orthodoxy. Orthodox People, 2013
<http://orthodoxpeople.blogspot.com/2013/01/pseudo-world-orthodoxy.html>

Bergoglio, Jorge, Francis I (2016) Visit to a Synagogue in Rome. Speeches of Pope Francis, Official Website of the Vatican
https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2016/january/documents/papa-francesco_20160117_sinagoga.html

Bergoglio, Jorge (Francis I) and Abraham Skorka (2013), On Heaven and Earth. Image

Novus Ordo Watch (2013) Francis: “There is no Hell, there is the Disappearance of Sinful Souls”
<https://novusordowatch.org/2018/03/francis-there-is-no-hell/>

BBC (July 2013) Pope Francis: Who am I to Judge Gay People? BBC Video News
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-23489702>

Brill, A (2010) Elijah Interfaith Institute Condemns Rabbi Yitzhak Shapira’s Book. Doctrines and Opinions
<http://elijah-interfaith.org/elijah-in-the-news/elijah-interfaith-institute-condemns-rabbi-yitzhak-shapiras-book>

Earl, Hilary (2009) The Nuremberg SS-Einsatzgruppen Trial, 1945-1958. Cambridge University Press

Brzezinski, Matthew (2005) Giving Hitler Hell. The Washington Post Magazine July 24

Wear, John (2010) The Einsatzgruppen Trial. CM Press

Mattogno, Carlo and Graf, Jürgen (2010) Treblinka: Transit Camp or Extermination Camp? The Barnes Review

Plot Targeting Turkey’s Religious Minorities Allegedly Discovered. Compass Direct News,

December 16, 2009

<https://wwrn.org/articles/32230/>

Case Against Plot to kill Patriarch Bartholomew Merged with Ergenekon. OCP Media Network, Today's Zaman (original, 2011)

<http://theorthodoxchurch.info/blog/news/case-against-plot-to-kill-patriarch-bartholomew-merged-with-ergenekon/>

Azkoul, Michael Fr (2017) The Lost Horizon: The Pursuit for Christian Unity. Xlibris Corporation