

# KOORY & FAKHOURY, PLC

## ATTORNEYS & COUNSELORS

210 E. THIRD ST., SUITE 204  
ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN 48067

TELEPHONE: (248) 399-9477

FAX: (248) 399-9645

April 6, 2005

ROBERT A. KOORY  
WALID Y. FAKHOURY  
ANDREW S. KHURANA

Ms. Anne Glynn Mackoul  
25 Gallup Rd.  
Princeton, NJ 08540

Dear Anne:

Glory to Jesus Christ! Glory forever!

As you indicated in your letter, it has been a long time since we have talked. Perhaps it is that failure to have discussed these questions with Charles, me or anyone else on behalf of our Archdiocese, that has resulted in many of the inaccuracies that we noted in your letter. It seems from the tone of your letter, that you have only consulted with those who have proffered themselves as advocates for reversing the decision of the Holy Synod irrevocably granting our Archdiocese self rule.

Both Charles and I feel that your letter, unfortunately, has numerous errors, false assumptions and misunderstandings. As we lawyers know to determine how a constitution is amended one must first look to the constitution itself. It is of course an elementary principle, but one that is overlooked by those not familiar with basic American jurisprudence or those who are result oriented. The constitution dictates the only manner that it may be amended and in addition when the amendment becomes effective.

Your erroneous assumptions simply ignore our Constitution, the numerous discussions that preceded it, the call for the special convention and the action that occurred in Pittsburgh. Your characterization of all that effort as only a "draft" is legally unsound as well as an insult to all those, including members of your own parish, who came, attended, voted and passed unanimously our newly amended Constitution. Efforts by others to render the amended Constitution as nothing more than a worthless piece of paper, as it would have been had it only been a "draft" suggests to me ulterior motives.

The Holy Synod of Antioch is and was fully aware that the only way our Constitution could be amended was by a general assembly. Our Constitution has been previously approved and on file with the Patriarchate for many years. The provision on amendment is not new. Moreover, Metropolitan PHILIP had repeatedly so advised the Holy Synod. In fact, the October 9, 2003 resolution required that an "amended Constitution" not a "draft" be presented to the Holy Synod.

I am sure there are a very few who wished that the Holy Synod did not irrevocably grant self rule to our Archdiocese but in God's providence the Holy Synod did so act. Few people in our Archdiocese would accept a reversion to a state of authority and self rule that would be less than it was prior to the Holy Synod so acting.

Rather than to promote division as your letter would, had you been at the Pittsburgh Convention you would have realized that the Constitution was amended unanimously and took effect immediately as it was approved there by our beloved Metropolitan. That action followed the decision in Los Angeles that was met by over 97percent approval to seek self rule. Your voice was one of an extreme few that spoke against self rule in Los Angeles.

What troubles me is not just the tone of your letter, but also the fact that as bright and dedicated a lawyer as you are, you would ignore basic legal principles and responsibilities. Moreover, for one who had been so involved in the Archdiocese and a former member of the Board of Trustees, it is surprising that you would question the role that Charles and I have in the Archdiocese as the duly appointed Chancellors.

Appointed by the Metropolitan, with the consent of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellors are the legal advisers to the Metropolitan and the Board. Our moral, ethical, and legal responsibilities are to give sound and appropriate counsel and, equally important, to act always in the best interest of the Archdiocese. Unlike others, regardless of their position, who may act motivated by their own personal benefit, such action by the Chancellors would be inappropriate and a basis for their removal.

While I would leave others to decide whether I have performed that role faithfully, I think it clearly inappropriate for you to question, as the tone of your letter does, the integrity and professionalism of Charles. In my humble opinion, our Archdiocese and Orthodoxy in this country and worldwide are deeply indebted to him.

I will not attempt to address all of your numerous errors. Since you have for your own reason courtesy copied all of the members of the Board of Trustees, Charles and I will gladly address any of these issues at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting in New York should any Board member so request it. Your letter seems to imply, again erroneously that these questions were not fully and completely discussed with the Board.

I am sorry that you have decided, in my opinion, to act with those who would bring into question our relations with the Mother Church. I would rather have expected you to have provided some more reasoned understanding of the state of Orthodoxy in North America as well as the legal requirements under which we act.

In Christ,



Robert A. Koory  
Chancellor

Cc: Metropolitan PHILIP  
Charles Ajalat  
Members of the Board of Trustees